

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

Master of Sacred Theology Thesis

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

5-1-1991

A Study of the Old Testament Quote in Matthew 27:9, 10

Curtis Giese

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/stm>



Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Giese, Curtis, "A Study of the Old Testament Quote in Matthew 27:9, 10" (1991). *Master of Sacred Theology Thesis*. 52.

<https://scholar.csl.edu/stm/52>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Concordia Seminary Scholarship at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master of Sacred Theology Thesis by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact seitzw@csl.edu.

A STUDY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT QUOTE IN MATTHEW 27:9, 10

A Thesis Presented to the Faculty
Of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis,
Department of Exegetical Theology
In Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirement for the Degree of
Master of Sacred Theology

By

Curtis Paul Giese

May 1991

Approved by: Louis Brighton
Adviser

Robert Rosin
Reader

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....		1
CHAPTER		
I.	A TEXTUAL STUDY OF A SELECT GROUP OF MATTHEW'S QUOTATIONS.....	8
	Category Number One.....	8
	Matthew 4:4.....	8
	Matthew 19:18, 19.....	10
	Matthew 21:16.....	11
	Category Number Two.....	12
	Matthew 2:15.....	12
	Matthew 26:31.....	13
	Matthew 27:46.....	15
	Category Number Three.....	16
	Matthew 4:7.....	16
	Matthew 13:14, 15.....	16
	Category Number Four.....	18
	Matthew 1:23.....	18
	Matthew 2:6.....	22
	Matthew 18:16b.....	23
	Conclusion.....	24
II.	A TEXTUAL STUDY OF MATTHEW 27:9, 10.....	26
	Introduction.....	26
	Phrase A of Matthew 27:9, 10.....	27
	Phrase B of Matthew 27:9, 10.....	29
	Phrase C of Matthew 27:9, 10.....	30
	Phrase D of Matthew 27:9, 10.....	32
	Phrase E of Matthew 27:9, 10.....	40
	Conclusion.....	41
III.	EXPLANATIONS FOR THE ALTERATIONS IN MATTHEW 27:9, 10.....	45
	Theories which Propose an Alternate <u>Vorlage</u>	45
	An Apocryphal Jeremiah.....	45
	Eusebius' Claim of an Underhanded Removal.....	46
	G. D. Kilpatrick's Liturgical- Homiletical Theory.....	47
	Documentary-Redactional Views of Soltau and Bacon.....	49
	The Testimonia Book.....	50
	Kahle's History of the Septuagint Theory.....	54
	Summary.....	55

Confusion while Quoting from Memory.....	55
Deviation is Due to Matthew's Own Innovation.....	57
Lindars' New Testament Apologetic.....	57
The Ascription of the Passage to Jeremiah.....	60
The Discrepancy with Judas' Death.....	63
Summary.....	65
 IV. THE BEST SOLUTION TO THE ENIGMA OF MATTHEW 27:9, 10.....	 67
Introduction.....	67
Literary Genre.....	76
Methods of Appropriation.....	84
The Introductory Formula.....	84
Modification of the Text.....	87
Integration of Another Scriptural Passage.....	92
Typology.....	98
Hermeneutical Presuppositions.....	112
Introduction.....	112
Literary Genre.....	122
Introductory Formula.....	123
Alteration of Text.....	128
Integration of Other Passages.....	129
Conclusion Regarding the Solutions for Matthew 27:9, 10.....	129
 CONCLUSION.....	 135
 APPENDIX I. STENDAHL AND THE SCHOOL OF MATTHEW.....	 138
 BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	 143

INTRODUCTION

Upon examining the Old Testament quotations in the Gospel of Matthew, one observes that their wording occasionally differs from that of the Hebrew Masoretic Text, (MT) the Septuagint (LXX), or any other known text. Matthew 27:9, 10 is an especially striking example of this occurrence. Such deviation is immediately surprising because Jews and Christians contemporary to Matthew held the words of the Hebrew Old Testament, duly represented by the present Masoretic Text, in high esteem.¹ In addition, the Septuagint held a position at that time as a respected translation of the Hebrew.² One questions, therefore, why the deviations exist in the Gospel of Matthew. Could this occurrence demonstrate errors in Matthew's Gospel? Naturally, this opinion would denigrate the inspiration of

¹At the time of Matthew, the Masoretic Text had not yet reached its final form as we know it today. However, a moderately stable Proto-Masoretic text existed so that by the beginning of the second century an authoritative text, an archetype of the Masoretic Text, was promulgated. In addition, at the time of Matthew, other Old Testament recensions were being adapted to agree with the Proto-Masoretic text. See Frank Moore Cross, "The History of the Biblical Text in the Light of Discoveries in the Judean Desert," Harvard Theological Review 57 (1964):281-299.

²Ibid., pp. 282, 283.

Scripture. Could Matthew's renderings arise from other Old Testament texts? On the other hand, could Matthew have some theological objectives for such alterations? If there exists theological intent for the emendations, what sort of hermeneutics does Matthew demonstrate? In view of such divergent quotations, as well the questions which arise such as those above, this thesis intends to examine Matthew's quotations and present possible reasons for the deviations. This study consists of four chapters.

The first chapter includes a textual comparison of a portion of Matthew's Old Testament quotations with the Hebrew Masoretic Text, the Septuagint, and also other texts. The purpose of the chapter is to demonstrate the occurrence as well as the extent of deviation in the Old Testament quotations in Matthew. In order to present the material clearly, the thesis divides the quotations into four categories. First, there is a group in which Matthew's quotes demonstrate dictional agreement with the Hebrew as well as the LXX. Obviously, the latter two agree with each other in this group. The second category contains those quotations which verbally coincide with the Hebrew when the Septuagint does not agree with the Masoretic Text. The third category has quotes which coincide with the LXX against the Hebrew when the latter two disagree. In the final category, one finds those quotations of Matthew which differ from both the Masoretic Text and the Septuagint.

In the past some scholars also categorized the Old Testament quotations of the New Testament. One such work from this century, written by Gleason Archer and G.C. Chirichigno, is Old Testament Quotations in the New Testament: A Complete Survey.³ They place the Hebrew, LXX, and New Testament texts into columns from the left to right respectively. A final column includes the comments on the text by Archer and Chirichigno. Instead of four categories, Old Testament Quotations in the New Testament includes five and further subdivides each. The additional category arises because Archer and Chirichigno divide the fourth category of the present thesis into two groups. As stated above, the fourth category involves Matthew's quotations which deviate from both the Masoretic Text and the Septuagint. Within that group Archer and Chirichigno also distinguish between those New Testament quotations where the Hebrew and LXX agree and those in which the latter two disagree. Another work by Edward Earle Ellis from the twentieth century, Paul's Use of the Old Testament,⁴ also categorizes quotations in such a manner. As Archer's work above, Ellis also includes five categories but does not subdivide them. Unlike Archer, his categorization only occurs as an appendix. The majority of his work discusses the Old Testament

³Chicago: Moody Press, 1983.

⁴Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1957.

hermeneutics of Paul. In the nineteenth century there appeared a work by D. M. Turpie entitled The Old Testament in the New.⁵ Turpie devised a categorization system which is much more complex than those listed above. As the other two above, he includes five divisions, but has multiple subdivisions in each.

The criteria for placing these quotations into various categories may indeed differ. Turpie, for example, placed a quotation into the fourth category on account of one minor deviation. At the other end of the spectrum, Archer and Chirichigno allowed several minor deviations before they placed a quote into a category besides number one. This thesis takes a mediating position between the two extremes. It labels a quote in agreement with the Hebrew and LXX even if it contains a minor disagreement such as an additional "καί" or a variation in an adjective form. However, a divergent translation of a verb or an omission of a clause in the midst of a sentence can place the quote into another category. Consequently, this thesis does not strictly follow the categorizations of any of the works mentioned above.

As already stated, only a portion of Matthew's quotations will receive attention in the body of the paper. A categorization of the remainder of the quotations will

⁵London: William & Norgate, 1868.

appear in footnotes. No presentation of the variants within the remaining quotes will appear in these footnotes, since the emphasis of the first chapter this thesis does not lie with thoroughness in that area. Rather, the first chapter provides an overview of trends in Matthew.

Chapter two concentrates upon the passage which will receive the majority of attention in the thesis, Matthew 27:9, 10. Having the most deviants and, therefore, the most problems, this quote will serve as the example for explaining the textual deviation and hermeneutics of the Old Testament quotations in the Gospel. To this end, chapter two undertakes a comparison of this passage with the Masoretic Text and the LXX. Since Matthew 27:9, 10 holds such a primary position in the paper, the depth of the examination will accordingly be more involved.

As stated above, one indeed needs to explain how such alterations can occur in Matthew's quotations, especially, in the problematic passage of Matthew 27:9, 10. Thus, the third chapter categorizes and describes the major proposals by biblical scholars. As one would expect, many of the solutions would also account for other deviant quotations in Matthew. The paper divides these scholarly opinions into three groups. In the first group, theories appear which propose the employment of an alternate "Vorlage," namely, a text differing from the Masoretic Text or Septuagint which we possess. Therefore, one traces the variation to a hand

prior to Matthew. Supposedly, the evangelist simply quotes the text before him, usually without his own alteration. In the second group, one finds theories which propose a lapse of memory. In other words, because Matthew did not directly copy from an Old Testament text, his deviations are due to faulty recollection or carelessness. Thirdly, one finds theories which assume an alteration of the text by the evangelist himself. All major solutions are included in chapter three. The most feasible solution, however, will be given attention in the final chapter.

Although the emphasis of this third chapter concerns the deviant quotation in Matthew 27:9, 10, it must also touch upon two additional difficulties. While this passage demonstrates closest dictional agreement with Zechariah 11:13, Matthew ascribes the quotation to Jeremiah. Therefore, one must question whether this also denotes an error.⁶ An additional concern exists in Acts 1:16-20 where Luke presents a different account of Judas' fate than Matthew. According to Luke, Judas died by a fatal fall in a field which he had bought, while in Matthew the chief priests bought the field, and Judas lost his life by hanging in an unstated place. Moreover, in Acts 1:19 and Matthew 27:8 the field is called "field of blood" instead of "the potter's

⁶See pp. 60-62 for a discussion of the "Jeremiah" difficulty.

field" in 27:9.⁷

The fourth chapter, the emphasis of this thesis, will demonstrate that many of Matthew's alterations of the quotation in 27:9, 10 actually have significant similarity with methods of appropriating an Old Testament text among Jews in Matthew's day. The Jewish sources for consideration are the Midrashim of the Tannaitic rabbis, the Targums, and Qumran literature, especially the commentary to Habakkuk. However, although the methods of appropriation are similar, the hermeneutical presuppositions between Matthew and his contemporaries vastly differ.

⁷See pp. 63-65 for the discussion about the problem of Judas' death.

CHAPTER I

A TEXTUAL STUDY OF A SELECT GROUP OF MATTHEW'S QUOTATIONS

Category Number One

Matthew 4:4

There is a group of quotations in which little dictional deviation occurs between Matthew, the Hebrew Masoretic Text, and the Septuagint. In this group one example is Matthew 4:4 which includes a quotation of Deuteronomy 8:3b.¹

Matthew 4:4 ουκ επ αρτω μονω λησεται ο ανθρωπος, αλλ' επι παντι ρηματι εκπορευομενω δια στοματος θεου

Deut. 8:3b כי לא על-הלחם לבדו יחיה האדם כי על-כל-מוצא פי-יהוה יחיה האדם

Deut. 8:3b ουκ επ αρτω μονω λησεται ο ανθρωπος, αλλ' επι παντι ρηματι τω εκπορευομενω δια στοματος θεου λησεται ο ανθρωπος.

Regarding this quotation, only four very minor variations

¹All quotations from the Greek New Testament come from Eberhard Nestle, Erwin Nestle, Kurt Aland, et. al., eds., Novum Testamentum Graece, 26th ed. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelstiftung, 1979). All quotations of the Hebrew Masoretic Text come from A. Alt, O. Eissfeldt, P. Kahle, et. al. eds., Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelstiftung, 1977). Unless otherwise noted, all quotations of the Septuagint, variants, and other Greek versions and recensions such as Aquila, Lucian, Symmachus, and Theodotion come from John W. Wevers, Robert Hanhört, Werner Kappler, et. al., eds., Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum, Auctoritas Societas Litterarum Gottingensis editum (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1931-).

appear. While the Septuagint (with the exception of Codex Alexandrinus, Codex Ambrosianus, and Lucian's version)² includes a "τω" after "ρηματι," Matthew does not retain it. Secondly, both the LXX and Matthew include "ρηματι," whereas the Masoretic Text does not include its equivalent, "דבר." However, this interpretive translation of the LXX and Matthew does not need to be construed as a deviation. Thirdly, Matthew agrees with the LXX against the Hebrew by including "θεος" for "יהוה." But one should not overemphasize this point also. Although "κυριος" would be the literal translation of "יהוה," "θεος" occurs 272 times in the LXX Old Testament canonical books as a translation for "יהוה" and nineteen times in Deuteronomy itself. Fourthly, Matthew does not complete the original verse after "θεου" but leaves out the last few words "λησεται ο ανθρωπος" in the LXX and "יחיה האדם" in the Masoretic Text. But a simple omission at

²Lucian produced a recension of the LXX in the late third century after Christ. It is also known as the Antiochene recension. Other names of Greek Old Testament versions and recensions will appear in the paper. For example, another recension also from the end of the third century was produced by Hesychius. Greek versions independent from the LXX were composed by Aquila, Theodotion, and Symmachus. Aquila's version from A.D. 128 consists of a slavishly literal translation of the Proto-Masoretic text. Theodotion's version, produced shortly before Aquila's, strongly influenced the LXX manuscripts. In fact, his version of Daniel took precedence over the LXX rendition. The Ebionite Symmachus produced a periphrastic version toward the end of the second century after Christ. J. W. Wevers, "Septuagint, The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, vol. 4, ed. by George Arthur Buttrick (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1982), pp. 275, 276.

the end of a phrase does not constitute a deviation in wording. In summary, this quotation of Matthew demonstrates a very literal translation of both the LXX and Masoretic Text where the latter two agree.

Matthew 19:18-19

This passage also contains little deviation between Matthew, the Hebrew Masoretic Text, and the Septuagint. Matthew's quote is derived from Exodus 20:12-16 with possibly some reliance also on Deuteronomy 5:16-20. The last phrase of Matthew's quotation corresponds with Leviticus 19:18.

Matt. 19:18, 19 ου φονευσεις, ου μοιχευσεις, ου κλεψεις, ου ψευδομαρτυρησεις, τιμα τον πατερα και την μητερα, και αγαπησεις τον πλησιον σου ως σεαυτον

Ex. 20:12-16 כבד את־אביך ואר־אמך למען יארכון ימיך על האדמה אשר־יהיה לך. לא תרצח. לא תנאף. לא תגנב. לא־תענה ברעך עד שקר

Ex. 20:12-16 τιμα τον πατερα σου και την μητερα, ινα ευ σοι γενηται, και ινα μακροχρονος γενη επι της γης της αγαθης, ης κυριος ο θεος σου διδωσιν σοι. ου μοιχευσεις. ου κλεψεις. ου φονευσεις. ου ψευδομαρτυρησεις κατα του πλησιον σου μαρτυριαν θευδη

Deut. 5:16-20 כבד את־אביך ואר־אמך כאשר צוך יהוה אלהיך למען יאריך ימיך ולמען ייטב לך על האדמה אשר־יהיה לך. לא תרצח. ולא תנאף. ולא תגנב. ולא־תענה ברעך עד שוא

Deut. 5:16-20 τιμα τον πατερα σου και την μητερα σου, ον τροπον εντειλατο σοι κυριος ο θεος σου, ινα ευ σοι γενηται, και ινα μακροχρονιος γενη επι της γης, ης κυριος ο θεος σου διδωσιν σοι. ου μοιχευσεις. ου φονευσεις. ου κλεψεις. ου ψευδομαρτυρησεις κατα τον πλησιον σου μαρτυριαν ψευδη

Lev. 19:18b ואהבת לרעך כמוך

Lev. 19:18b και αγαπησεις τον πλησιον σου ως σεαυτον

First, regarding both Old Testament passages, Matthew agrees with the wording and the order of the commandments in the Hebrew and LXX Alexandrinus (and also Codex Ambrosianus and Lucian) with only one exception. Namely, Matthew places the fourth commandment after the eighth. LXX Vaticanus, cited above, gives a different order of the commandments than the Hebrew (and Matthew) in both Exodus 20:12-16 and Deuteronomy 5:16-20. Secondly, Matthew obviously cuts short the remainder of the wording from the original, namely, he leaves out "ἵνα εὐ σοὶ γενῆται . . ." from the LXX and then ". . . למען יארכון" from the Hebrew. (Obviously, the LXX includes an addition here.) Also Matthew leaves out "κατὰ τοῦ πλησίου σου . . ." from the LXX and "ברעך עד שוא" from the Hebrew. Then Matthew adds his "καὶ ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησιον σου ὡς σεαυτον" from Leviticus 19:18 in the exact wording of the LXX. Therefore, minimal deviation exists in this quotation. Matthew simply omits two phrases and adds one phrase from another portion of Scripture. As one can see, the omissions occur at the end of a phrase.

Matthew 21:16

Matthew also demonstrates considerable agreement with the the Septuagint and Masoretic Text in Matthew 21:16. In this passage, he quotes from Psalm 8:3(2).

Matt. 21:16 ἐκ στοματος νηπιων και θηλαζοντων κατηρτισω
αινον

Ps. 8:3 מפי עוללים וינקים יסדת עז

Ps. 8:2 εκ στοματος νηπιων και θηλαζοντων κατηρτισω
αινον

Matthew and the LXX appear at first sight to give a different meaning from that conveyed by the Hebrew "יִסַּדְתָּ." The Hebrew verb means "to set, place, lay a foundation" (see Is. 28:16, Ez. 3:10, 12, Is. 14:32). However, as laying the foundation is preparatory to raising the building, it is generalized into "prepare" which is the meaning of the Greek verb. Secondly, "עֹז," which normally means "strength," may seem strangely rendered by "αινον." But this Hebrew word at times has the connotation of praise. For example, in Ps. 29:1, Ps. 68:35(34) and Is. 12:2 it is rendered by "δοξα." Finally, Matthew omits the latter part of this Old Testament verse which proceeds "ενεκα των εχθρων σου . . ." in the LXX and ". . . למען צורריך" in the Hebrew.³

CATEGORY NUMBER TWO

Matthew 2:15

In this category, one finds quotations of Matthew which agree with the Hebrew against the Septuagint when they disagree. Matthew 2:15 is such an example when he quotes Hosea 11:1b.

Matt. 2:15 εξ Αιγυπτου εκαλεσα τον υιον μου.

³The other passages which fit into category number one are 3:3, 4:6, 5:21, 27, 38; 9:13, 10:35-36, 12:7, 40; 17:10, 11; 19:4, 5, 7, 19; 21:5, 9, 13, 42; 22:24, 37, 39, 44; 23:39, 24:15, 29, 30; 26:64.

Hos. 11:1b וממצרים קראתי לבני

Hos. 11:1 και εξ Αιγυπτου μετεκαλεσα τα τεκνα αυτου

First, the LXX differs from the MT by translating "לבני" with "τα τεκνα αυτου." However, Matthew remains with the original MT through "τον υιον μου." That the Masoretic Text is correct receives corroboration from the versions of Aquila, "εκ Αιγυπτου εκαλεσα υιος μου," Symmachus, "εκ Αιγυπτου κεκληται υιος μου," and Theodotion, "εκαλεσα υιος μου εξ Αιγυπτου." The LXX translator(s) of Hosea apparently read the Hebrew "לבני" as "לבניו."

Matthew 26:31

The next passage which demonstrates greater agreement with the Masoretic Text is Matthew 26:31. Here Matthew quotes Zechariah 13:7b.

Matt. 26:31 παταξω τον ποιμενα, και διασκορπισθησονται τα προβατα της ποιμνης

Zech. 13:7b הך את־הרעה ותפוצין הצאן

Zech. 13:7b παταξατε τους ποιμενας και εκσπασατε τα προβατα

This quotation could be placed in section number one if it were not for LXX Vaticanus (cited above), which is usually very reliable. Here Vaticanus and Alexandrinus (and others) disagree substantially. However, Matthew agrees both with Alexandrinus and the Masoretic Text with only one exception. In Matthew, "παταξω" is indeed a singular verb just as in the Hebrew. However, Matthew's verb is a future indicative

first person singular, whereas the Hebrew has a hiphil imperative second person singular. Because Vaticanus includes "παταξατε," it assumes the hiphil plural imperative of "נכח." Alexandrinus, Marchalianus, and two revisions of Sinaiticus agree with the Hebrew by rendering it with "παταξον."

After highlighting this one exception of Matthew, we turn to the LXX and its deviations from the Hebrew. As stated above, Matthew agrees with the Masoretic Text, LXX Alexandrinus and others in opposition to LXX Vaticanus. This becomes apparent in the following points. First, Matthew, the Hebrew and Alexandrinus (also Marchalianus and revisions of Sinaiticus) have the singular of "τον ποιμενα" (הרעה) whereas Vaticanus has the plural. Secondly, Matthew and Alexandrinus correctly translate the qal of "פּוּץ" (be dispersed, be scattered) with the passive of "διασκορπιζω." However, Vaticanus has "εκσπασατε," possibly a hiphil rendering of the verb. Finally, Matthew and Alexandrinus have the expansion of "της ποιμενης" whereas the Hebrew ends with "הצאן."

In summary, one could include this quotation in category one because it agrees so well with Alexandrinus. However, when such an important text as Vaticanus disagrees extensively, one must give further consideration to the text. Therefore, it appears in this category.

Matthew 27:46

Another quotation where Matthew agrees with the Hebrew against the Septuagint occurs in Matthew 27:46. Here Matthew's gospel quotes Psalm 22:2a (21:2a). He first provides an Aramaic transliteration.

Matt. 27:46 ηλι ηλι λεμα σαβαχθανι; τουτ' εστιν. θεε μου θεε μου, ινατι με εγκατελιπεις;

Ps. 22:2a יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי מִי יְהוָה

Ps. 21:2 Ο θεος ο θεος μου, προχες μοι. ινα τι εγ-
κατελιπες με;

First, Matthew gives the vocative of "θεος" instead of merely the nominative as the LXX. Secondly, the LXX omits a "μου" after the first "θεος," a word which Matthew and the Masoretic Text include. Thirdly, the LXX inserts "προσχες μοι" whereas Matthew omits it. Fourthly, Matthew does not agree with the LXX through his inclusion of "ινατι" and metathesis of "με."

Many textual variants exist among the Matthew texts. However, the text given above as found in Nestle-Aland appears best attested. Examples of variants include "ελωι" instead of "ηλι." In addition, there is "λαμα σαβαχθανι," "λιμα σαβαχθανι," or "λεμα σαβακθανι" instead of "λεμα σαβαχθανι." Moreover, the variants do not affect the discussion of Matthew's adherence to the Septuagint or Hebrew.⁴

⁴Other passages which fit into category number two are 2:18, 4:15, 16; 8:17, 9:36, 11:10, 12:18-21, 13:32, 35; 16:27, 27:35.

These variants are merely mentioned for the sake of thoroughness.

Category Number Three

Matthew 4:7

In this category, one finds quotations of Matthew which demonstrate greater dictional agreement with the Septuagint against the Hebrew Masoretic Text, even when the LXX could have rendered the translation better. One example exists in Matthew 4:7 where he quotes Deuteronomy 6:16.

Matt. 4:7 ουκ εκπειρασεις κυριον τον θεον σου

Deut. 6:16 לא תנסו את־יהוה אלהיכם

Deut. 6:16 ουκ εκπειρασεις κυριον τον θεον σου

First, Matthew and the LXX include the second person singular of "εκπειρασεις," whereas the Hebrew has the second person plural of a cognate verb "נסו." Secondly, Matthew and the LXX have the second person singular possessive pronoun "σου," whereas the Hebrew has the plural "כם." These emendations are minor, involving only changes in the pronoun. However, they only agree with the Septuagint.

Matthew 13:14-15

In Matthew 13:14-15 one finds a second quotation for this category where the evangelist quotes Isaiah 6:9b, 10.

Matt. 13:14, 15 ακοη ακουσετε και ου μη συνητε, και βλεποντες βλεψετε και ου μη ιδητε. επαχυνθη γαρ η καρδια του λαου τουτου, και τοις ωσιν βαρεως ηκουσαν και τους οφθαλμους αυτων εκαμμυσαν, μηποτε ιδωσιν τοις οφθαλμοις και τοις ωσιν ακουσωσιν και τη καρδια συνωσιν και επιστρωσωσιν και ιασομαι αυτους.

Is. 6:9b, 10 שמעו שמוע ואל-תבינו וראו ראו ואל-תדעו ואל-תדעו
השמן לב-העם הזה ואזניב הכבד ועיניו השע פן-יראה בעיניו
ובאזניו ישמע ולבבו יבין ושב ורפא לו

Is. 6:9b, 10 Ακοη ακουσετε και ου μη συνητε και βλεπον-
τες βλεψετε και ου μη ιδητε. επαχυνθη γαρ η καρδια του
λαου τουτου, και τοις ωσιν αυτων βαρεως ηκουσαν και τους
οφθαλμους αυτων εκαμμυσαν, μηποτε ιδωσιν τοις οφθαλμοις
και τοις ωσιν ακουσωσιν και τη καρδια συνωσιν και επι-
στρεψωσιν και ιασομαι αυτους

First, Matthew and the LXX have "ου μη ιδητε" for the MT
"על-תדעו." More literally it would be translated with "μη
γνωτε." Secondly, Matthew follows the Septuagint in its
translation of "ורפא לו" with "και ιασομαι αυτους" (and I
will heal them). More properly, the Hebrew means "and there
will be healing to it" or "and it will be healed." At any
rate the first person of the Greek does not appear in the
original Hebrew. Similar Hebrew grammatical constructions
appear in Ps. 31:10 "צר לי" literally rendered as "it is
straight to me" or better as "I am in a straight." There is
also the example of in 1 Kings 1:1 of "חם לו" literally
translated as "it is warm to him" or "he is made warm, gets
warmth."

In addition, whereas the Hebrew generally has the
imperative, sometimes with an accompanying infinitive ab-
solute, Matthew and the Septuagint often have a future or
aorist indicative. In this specific passage, the infinitive
absolute is translated by a participle, adverb, or noun.
Namely, The LXX and the Gospel of Matthew similarly have
"ακοη ακουσετε" for "שמעו שמוע." Matthew and the LXX have

"βλεποντες βλεψετε" for "ראו ראו." They have "επαχυνη" for "שמן." They have "ηκουσαν" for "הכבד" and "εκαμμυσαν" for "שח." However, the disparity between the renderings of the LXX and Masoretic Text need not be seen as totally opposite. The imperative has uses in which its ordinary force is lost. It sometimes approximates a promise or prediction to be fulfilled in the future, a use which is more emphatic than merely the imperfect. Therefore, the imperative and future are at times not far apart. The translators of the Septuagint apparently read the imperatives with such a viewpoint. Other examples occur in 2 Kgs. 19:29, Ps. 110:2, and Isa. 54:14.⁵

Matthew may have one difference with the LXX. Whereas the LXX (only omitted by Sinaiticus) has "αυτων" after the first "ωσιν" and the first "οφθαλμος" (included by Alexandrinus, Sinaiticus, and Marchalianus), Matthew has the "αυτων" only after the first "οφθαλμος." However, this difference has little significance.⁶

Category Number Four

Matthew 1:23

This category includes quotations where Matthew devi-

⁵David McCalman Turpie, The Old Testament in the New (London: Williams & Norgate, 1868), p. 88; Bruce K. Waltke and M. O'Connor, An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990), p. 572.

⁶Other passages which fit into category number three are 15:4 and 22:32.

ates from both the Masoretic Text and the Septuagint. The first passage for consideration is Matthew 1:23 which is a quotation of Isaiah 7:14b and also Isaiah 8:8b or 10b.

Matt. 1:23 *ιδου η παρθενος εν γαστρι εξει και τεξεται υιον, και καλεσουσιν το ονομα αυτου Εμμανουηλ, ο εστιν μεθερμηνευομενον μεθ' ημων ο θεος.*

Is. 7:14b *הנה העלמה הררה וילדת בן ויקראת שמו עמנו אל*

Is. 7:14b *ιδου η παρθενος εν γαστρι εξει και τεξεται υιον, και καλεσεις το ονομα αυτου Εμμανουηλ*

Is. 8: 8b, 10b *עמנו אל*

Is. 8:8b *μεθ ημων ο θεος*

Is. 8:10b *μεθ ημων κυριος ο θεος*

Alexandrinus, Sinaiticus, and Codex Marchalianus agree with Matthew by having "εξει." However, Vaticanus and Lucian have "λημψεται." Therefore, it is difficult to determine the original LXX text in this case. In addition, a distinct difference occurs between Matthew, the MT, and the LXX. Matthew has "καλεσουσιν" while the LXX most often has "καλεψσεις" and MT has "תקראת".

Regarding this variant one looks at Matthew's text. Some manuscripts have "καλεσουσεις." Codex Bezae, a fifth or sixth century Western text, is the main witness; there is also ff1 (an eighth century Latin text), several texts of the Bohairic version, Origen, and Eusebius. However, the best witnesses and majority have the plural.

Regarding the Masoretic Text, the Hebrew consonants can be taken as a qal perfect second masculine singular, a

qal participle feminine, or a qal perfect third feminine singular. It is pointed according to the perfect third feminine singular, thereby referring to the mother. A textual variant exists. 1QIs^a, the Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery, has "וקרא." However, the Masoretic text has the most reliable reading.

The LXX manuscripts of Vaticanus and Alexandrinus as well as the Greek versions of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion all have the "καλεσεις." Sinaiticus has "καλεσει." Marchalianus has "καλεσετε." The Syriac has 3rd person passive. Possibly, "καλεσουσιν" is an Aramaic-type third person plural, equivalent to a passive.⁷ Matthew's "μεθ ημων ο θεος" has an exact equivalent in Isaiah 8: 8, 10. "עמנו-אל" occurs in the Masoretic Text and "μεθ ημων ο θεος" or "μεθ ημων κυριος ο θεος" in the LXX (8, 10 respectively).

Of course much discussion has occurred regarding whether the LXX and Matthew have translated "עלמה" correctly by rendering it with "παρθενος." It must be admitted that "עלמה" is a term for a young marriageable female and indeed can include the idea of virginity.⁸ The fact that in the

⁷Gleason Archer and Gregory Chirichigno, Old Testament Quotations in the New Testament (Chicago: Moody Press, 1983), p. 95.

⁸M. Tsevat, "בתולה," in Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament, vol. 2, ed. by G. J. Botterweck and Helmer Ringgren, trans. by John T. Willis (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1983), p. 343; Richard Charles Henry Lenski, The Interpretations of St. Matthew's Gospel (Columbus: The Wartburg Press, 1943), p. 53.

Old Testament the term is never employed for a married woman is important. Extra-biblical evidence corroborates this. For example, the Ugaritic "glmt," a related word, also never denotes a married woman.⁹ In addition, Scripture normally assumes that virginity accompanies the term by an example such as Genesis 24:43. There the author refers to Rebekah as an "עלמה" and then appends the word "בתולה" the description. However, one must admit that "עלמה" in Proverbs 30:19 may denote an immoral girl but, again, not a married girl. If the word "בתולה" means "virgin," one may question why Isaiah did not employ that particular word. The answer comes from a passage such as Joel 1:8 where "בתולה" refers to a married woman. Moreover, the Aramaic equivalent of "בתולה" can refer to a married woman. If Isaiah had used that word, confusion would have existed regarding his intention. Now that it appears certain that "עלמה" denotes an unmarried woman, one may still question whether the child in Isaiah 7:14 may be illegitimate (especially because of Joel 1:8 above). The entire context speaks against it, for what special sign would there be if an immoral woman would give birth? Rather, the linguistic evidence and the context of Isaiah 7:14 speak of an unmarried woman who is also a virgin. Therefore, the LXX as also Matthew have correctly

⁹Edward J. Young, The Book of Isaiah, vol. 1 (Grand Rapids: Willim B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1985), p. 287.

rendered the intended meaning through "παρθενος."

In summary, Matthew here follows neither the LXX nor the Masoretic Text with "καλεσουσιν," where the latter two disagree. However, the remainder of Matthew's quotation coincides well with the LXX and Masoretic Text.

Matthew 2:6

Another example occurs in Matthew 2:6. Here Matthew quotes Micah 5:1(2).

Matt. 2:6 και συ Βηθλεεμ, γη Ιουδα, ουδαμως ελαχιστη ει εν τοις ηγεμοσιν Ιουδα. εκ σου γαρ εξελευσεται ηγου-
μενος, οστις ποιμανει τον λαον μου τον Ισραηλ

Micah 5:1 ואתה בית-לחם אפרתה צעיר להיות באלפי יהודה ומך לי יצא להיות מושל בישראל ומוצאתיו מקדם מימי עולם

Micah 5:1 Και συ, Βηθλεεμ οικος του Εφραθα, ολιγοστος ει του ειναι εν χιλιασιν Ιουδα. εκ σου μοι εξελευσεται του ειναι εις αρχοντα εν τω Ισραηλ, και αι εξοδρι αυτου απ αρχης εξ ημερων αιωνος

2 Sam. 5:2b אתה תרעה את-עמי את-ישראל

2 Sam. 5:2b συ ποιμανεις τον λαον μου τον Ισραηλ

The only difference worthy of mention between the MT and LXX is the insertion of "οικος" before "Εφραθα." However, regarding Matthew's deviations from the Hebrew and LXX, the evangelist has "γη Ιουδα" instead of the MT "אפרתה" or the LXX "Εφραθα." Secondly, Matthew inserts "ουδαμως." Thirdly, Matthew includes "ελαχιστη" instead of the LXX "ολιγοστος." Although the meanings of these two words are similar, the spelling obviously differs. Fourthly, Matthew omits the infinitive of the LXX "του ειναι" and MT "להיור."

Next, Matthew includes "ηγεμοσιν" (leaders) to replace the LXX "χιλιασιν," (thousands) the latter of which correctly translated the Hebrew "באלפי." Matthew's rendering would reflect a possible understanding of the word as "אלופי" or "אלפי." The Hebrew word "אלוף" is at times translated by "ηγενων" (Gen. 36:15, Ex. 15:1, 1 Chron. 1:50, Psalm 54:14). In these passages it reflects the idea of a "centurion." Matthew adds "γαρ." He omits the LXX "μοι" which is "לי" in Micah. He expands and reiterates the LXX "εις αρχοντα" and MT "להיות מושל" by his "ηγουμενος, οστις ποιμανει." Alexandrinus agrees by including "ηγουμενος." Matthew expands the last phrase with "τον λαον μου." Instead, the Masoretic Text, LXX Alexandrinus, and Marchalianus have "בישראל" and "εν τω Ισραηλ." Vaticanus has "του Ισραηλ." However, Matthew's last phrase may arise from 2 Samuel 5:2 which has "אתה תרעה את-עמי את-ישראל" and "συ ποιμανεις τον λαον μου Ισραηλ."

Matthew 18:16b

In this quotation also Matthew deviates from both the Masoretic Text and Septuagint when he quotes Deuteronomy 19:15.

Matt. 18:16b *επι στοματος δυο μαρτυρων και τριων σταθη παν ρημα*

Deut. 19:15b *על-פי שני עדים או על-פי שלשה-עדים יקום דבר*

Deut. 19:15b *επι στοματος δυο μαρτυρων και επι στοματος τριων μαρτυρων σταθησεται παν ρημα*

As one observes, Matthew makes an omission which is not at the end of a phrase as in other examples above. Rather, from the middle of a line, he omits "ἐπι στοματος τριων" from the LXX and "על-פי שלשה-עדים" from the Masoretic Text. Moreover, Matthew agrees only with the Hebrew by the use of "η," whereas the LXX has "και." Lucian's Greek version, however, includes the "η." Matthew agrees with the LXX against the Hebrew by including "παν." Matthew disagrees with the LXX by the form "σταθη." The Masoretic Text "יקום" can communicate a passive idea, although the Hebrew has an imperfect whereas Matthew has an aorist subjunctive. Therefore, this is one glaring example in which Matthew disagrees with both the LXX and Masoretic Text.¹⁰

Conclusion

As it became apparent, the Old Testament quotations in Matthew's Gospel demonstrate a variety of degrees of dictional agreement with the Hebrew Masoretic Text and the Septuagint. Some quotations show almost perfect agreement with the Hebrew and LXX where the latter two agree. Some demonstrate greater resemblance with the Hebrew when the Masoretic Text and LXX disagree. Some illustrate greater adherence to the LXX than the Hebrew when the latter two disagree. A final group of the quotations in Matthew's

¹⁰Other passages in category number four are 4:10, 5:31, 7:23, 11:5, 13:42, 50; 15:8-9, 27:9, 10.

Gospel contain passages which deviate from both the Masoretic Text and in the LXX.

CHAPTER II

A TEXTUAL STUDY OF MATTHEW 27:9, 10

Introduction

The text of this quote is difficult for interpreters. Although ascribed to Jeremiah, it most closely resembles Zechariah 11:13.¹ However, it has limited adherence even to Zechariah. It appears that the text has been altered in a number of ways in order to fit Matthew's context. In order to demonstrate the occurrence and extent of this textual deviation, this chapter will examine the Matthew quotation phrase by phrase, showing the relationship which it has to the Masoretic Text and Septuagint of Zechariah 11:13, as well as to other texts.²

¹Besides the obvious textual affinity with Zechariah 11:13 which Matthew demonstrates, Vogler presents two further aspects. First, Matthew introduces vocabulary in 26:15 which is based upon Zechariah 11:12. In addition, Vogler claims that since Matthew inserts a quotation into the Marcan "Vorlage" at Matthew 21:5, this also stands as a proof that 27:9-10 must also originate from Zechariah. Werner Vogler, Judas Iskarioth--Untersuchungen zu Tradition und Redaktion von Texten des Neuen Testaments und ausserkanonischer Schriften, Theologische Arbeiten, Band 42 (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1983), pp. 68, 192, n. 496.

²Matthew 27:9-10 belongs to a group of quotations which are either entitled "Reflexionszitate" or "Erfüllungszitate" in the German or "formula quotations" in the English. This group of passages in Matthew includes: 1:23, 2:5, 15, 18, 23, 4:15-16, 8:17, 12:18-21, 13:14-15, 35, 21:5, 26:56, and

Phrase A of Matthew 27:9, 10

Matt. 27:9a: *και ελαβον τα τριακοντα αργυρια*

MT, Zech. 11:13b: *הַכֹּהֵן שֵׁשׁ הִקְרִיא*

LXX, Zech. 13:b: *και ελαβον τους τριακοντα αργυρους*

This first phrase of Matthew adheres quite closely to the Hebrew and Septuagint where the latter two agree. Only a few minor variations appear noteworthy. First, Matthew's "ελαβον" grammatically can denote either a third person plural or first person singular. It appears that most

27:9, 10. (John's Gospel also contains a number of such quotations: 2:17, 12:14, 38, 40, 13:18, 15:25, 19:24, 28, 36, 37). Most German theologians refer to them as "Reflexionszitate" because an introductory formula, which stands before each quotation, demonstrates the evangelist's reflections concerning the relationship between the quotations and the Gospel context. There is substantial uniformity in these introductory formulae. They usually contain some form of "πληρω" plus an ascription to a prophet. (Hence, Matthew 2:7 is sometimes not included in the list of formula quotations because its formula contains "γεγραπται" instead of "πληρω." Also 13:14-15 is sometimes excluded because its formula differs from the others). Having read the above definition, one easily observes from whence the English definition, "formula quotation," arises. Wilhelm Rothfuchs, with ample cause, refers to them as "Erfüllungszitate." Wilhelm Rothfuchs, Die Erfüllungszitate des Matthäus--eine biblische Untersuchung, Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom alten und neuen Testament, Heft 8 (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1969), esp. pp. 20-26. Finally, they have a tendency to follow the Masoretic Text rather than the Septuagint. For a further description see Georg Strecker, Der Weg der Gerechtigkeit--Untersuchung zur Theologie des Matthäus, 3rd ed. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971), p. 49. See also Donald Senior, "The Fate of the Betrayer--A Redactional Study of Matthew XXVII, 3-10," Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses 48 (1972):391-394.

scholars accept this verb as a third person plural.³ If this is correct, it would seem that Matthew deviates from the Hebrew as well as the Septuagint which have the first person singular. The third person in Matthew's context would then denote the chief priests while formerly the first person in the Hebrew and LXX referred to Zechariah himself. Secondly, Matthew employs "αργυρια," the plural form of the noun "αργυριον."⁴ That differs from the Masoretic Text

³Joachim Gnilka, Das Matthäusevangelium, II. Teil, Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament (Freiburg: Herder, 1988), p. 442. Robert Horton Gundry, The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel--With Special Reference to the Messianic Hope, Supplements to Novum Testamentum, vol. 18 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1967), p. 126. Hermann L. Strack and Paul Billerbeck, Das Evangelium nach Matthäus, Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch, erster (Doppel-) Band, zweite Auflage (München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1956), p. 1029. Ernst Lohmeyer, Das Evangelium des Matthäus, Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament, Sonderband (Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1956), p. 378. Krister Stendahl, The School of Matthew and its Use of the Old Testament, Acta Seminarri Neotestamentici Upsaliensis, vol. 20 (Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksells, 1954), p. 124. Francis Wright Beare, The Gospel According to Matthew (San Francisco: Harper & Row Publishers, 1982), p. 525. Douglas J. Moo, The Old Testament in the Gospel Passion Narratives (Sheffield, England: The Almond Press, 1983), p. 192.

⁴One should note that Mark, upon speaking of Judas' actions, employs the singular of the same noun, "αργυριον." If one accepts the chronological priority of Mark, then one must assert that either Matthew or another source changed this word. For example, Stendahl believes that Matthew's choice of this word against the LXX may be ascribed to dependence upon Mark. Stendahl, School of Matthew, p. 124. For the same view, see Moo, The Old Testament, p. 192. Senior asserts that Matthew's form would more vividly emphasize the individual pieces of silver which had been "counted out." Donald Senior, "The Fate of the Betrayer, p. 383.

which uses the singular. It also differs from the Septuagint form⁵ which is the plural adjective of "αργυρους." This adjective is found in the Septuagint but never in the Gospels. Finally, one notices the metathesis which has taken place with the Hebrew wording. Matthew has placed "ואקחה שלשים הכסף" at the beginning of the quote, whereas, in the Masoretic text, it appears after "אשר יקרתי מעליהם." In summary, this section includes three alterations from the original: a change in person with "ελαβον," the form of "αργυρια," and a metathesis of phrases.

Phrase B of Matthew 27:9, 10

Matt. 27:9b: *την τιμην του τετιμημενου*

MT, Zech. 11:13b: אדר היקר

LXX, Zech. 11:13b: *και σκεψαι ει δοκιμον εστιν*

Obviously, Matthew closely follows the Masoretic Text here, whereas the Septuagint demonstrates significant deviation from the former two.⁶ It is noteworthy that Matthew's use of "τιμη," although primarily translating "אדר" (glory, magnificence) also can include the sense of "היקר" (price).

⁵Here Aquila and Symmachus agree with the LXX.

⁶One would translate the LXX thus: "And examine whether it is genuine." The LXX translator(s) may have seen "אדר" as a form of "ראה," thereby rendering it as "σκεψ-εσθαι." See Rothfuchs, Die Erfüllungszitate, p. 87, n. 122.

Therefore, one may translate "τιμη" as "(glorious) price."⁷ Then Matthew turns his primary attention to "היקר" (price). Interestingly, he seems to read it as "היקר" (the honored one)⁸ as seen by his rendering of "τετιμημενου."⁹ In summary, Matthew changes "glorious price" from the Hebrew to "(glorious) price of the honored one" in his Gospel. As one can see from the context, this alteration relates the quote to Christ.

Phrase C of Matthew 27:9, 10

Matt. 27:9b: *ον ετιμησαντο απο υιων Ισραηλ*

MT, Zech. 11:13b: *אשר יקרתי מעליהם*

LXX, Zech. 11:13b: *ον τροπον εδοκιμασθην υπερ αυτων*

Once again, the LXX deviates from the Hebrew Masoretic Text.¹⁰ However, Matthew again demonstrates greater adherence to the Hebrew with two exceptions. First, Matthew has changed the first person Hebrew verb "יקרתי" to the third person plural of the cognate verb "ετιμησαντο."

⁷Rothfuchs, Die Erfüllungszitate, p. 87, Stendahl, School of Matthew, p. 125, n. 2. Senior, "The Fate of the Betrayer," p. 383. Moo, The Old Testament, p. 193, Gundry, The Old Testament, p. 126.

⁸Thereby it agrees with the Old Testament Peshitta.

⁹Senior, The Fate of the Betrayer, p. 384. Moo, The Old Testament, pp. 192, 193.

¹⁰While one would translate the Hebrew, "which I was appraised from them," the LXX proceeds, "as I was tested on their behalf."

Secondly, he has expanded "מעליהם" to "απο υιων Ισραηλ."¹¹ The translation of "מן" with "απο" may point to a partitive understanding of the Hebrew by Matthew (some of).¹² Krister Stendahl asserts that this partitive serves to make a distinction between the chief priests and the remainder of the Jewish people. It places the blame solely upon the chief priests.¹³ But G. Stöckhardt considers the phrase "מעליהם" to denote the agent by which the act was completed and claims that Matthew carries the same intention. In this way, the phrase emphasizes that the entire people of Israel ridiculed Jesus.¹⁴ In summary, there is an emendation of person with "ετιμησαντο" and an expansion of the original with "απο υιων Ισραηλ."

¹¹Both Vogler and Rothfuchs claim this expansion to be derived from a Targum. Vogler, Judas Iskarioth, p. 68. Rothfuchs, Die Erfüllungszitate, p. 87.

¹²Gundry, The Use of the OT, p. 126, Senior, "The Fate of the Betrayer," p. 384, Stendahl, School of Matthew, p. 125. The usage of "απο" in the partitive sense here demonstrates a development which parts from classical Greek grammar. D. Blass and A. Debrunner, A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature, trans. and revised by Robert W. Funk (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1961), n. 164, 169.

¹³Stendahl, School of Matthew, p. 125.

¹⁴G. Stöckhardt, "Weissagung und Erfüllung," Lehre und Wehre 31 (September 1885):271. The interpretation of "מן" as agent is possible. Bruce K. Waltke and M. O'Connor, An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990), p. 213; Ronald J. Williams, Hebrew Syntax--An Outline, 2nd ed. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1974), p. 56. It is also possible for "απο" to denote agent. Blass, A Greek Grammar, n. 210.

Phrase D of Matthew 27:9, 10

Matt. 27:10: *και εδωκαν αυτα εις τον αγρον του κεραμεως*

MT, Zech. 11:13c: *ואשליך אתו בית יהוה אל-ה'יוצר*

LXX, Zech. 11:13c: *και ενεβαλον αυτους εις τον οικον κυριου εις το χωνευτηριον*

This section of the quotation causes the most difficulties.¹⁵ The first difficulty is Matthew's translation of "εδωκαν"¹⁶ for the Hebrew "ואשליך" and the Septuagint's "ενεβαλον."¹⁷ Matthew changes the first person singular in the Hebrew and in the Septuagint to the third person plural. Moreover, the verb Matthew chose, which means "to give" (*εδωκαν*), possesses a milder connotation than the verbs of the other two texts, "to throw or cast" (*ואשליך*, *ενεβαλον*). Therefore, Matthew's verb would be more appropriate for the

¹⁵Here the Septuagint demonstrates greater textual agreement with the Masoretic Text than in the preceding two sections. The main exception is the translation of "χωνευτηριον" (furnace).

¹⁶A textual variant in Matthew exists here with "εδωκαν." Codex Sinaiticus (κ), apparently a second corrector of Vaticanus (B^{2vid}), Freerianus (W), a few additional Greek manuscripts (pc), the Syriac (sy), and Eusebius (Eus) all read it as "εδωκα." Apparently, original scribe of Alexandrinus (A^{*vid}) read it as "εδωκεν." However, in spite of variants from a few important texts, the reading "εδωκαν" has the best and most textual witnesses.

¹⁷In the LXX, "εμβαλλω" is a translation for "שלך" in twelve of its 136 occurrences. However, "διδωμι" is never a translation for "שלך" in the LXX. Edwin Hatch and Henry Redpath, A Concordance to the Septuagint and Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament (Including the Apocryphal Books), vol. 1 (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1897; reprint ed., Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1987), p. 317.

act of purchasing.¹⁸ This is another example of an emendation to fit the context better. In other words, the context of 27:9, 10 involves the milder action of purchasing a field with silver by the chief priests instead of casting the silver with apparent aversion by Zechariah.

Secondly, "αγρον του κεραμεως"¹⁹ is the most problematic portion of the quotation. The word "κεραμεως" (potter) demonstrates that Matthew read the Hebrew word as "יֹצֵר".²⁰ However, some believe that this is not the correct reading in the Zechariah context. Rather, they promote "אֵוצֵר" (treasury) because it may make more sense, since the Syriac Old Testament includes this variant, and since "κορβαναν" (treasury) appears in verse 27:6, along with "ναος" (temple)

¹⁸Moo, The Old Testament, p. 194.

¹⁹This "יֹצֵר" is the LXX word for "potter" as a trade: 2 Sam. 17:28, 1 Chron. 4:23, Ps. 2:9, Is. 29:16, 30:14: 41:25, Jer. 18:2, 3, 6, 19:1, Lam. 4:2.

²⁰It is important to note that Aquila, whose Greek interpretations slavishly followed the Hebrew, included "προς τον πλαστεν" in this place, although Symmachus and the LXX of Origin's Hexapla do not (They have "χωνευτηριον"). Regarding Origin's Hexapla, one must remember that he often inserted extra material into the LXX, distinguishing this extraneous material through text-critical symbols. However, since these symbols disappeared through the work of numerous copyists, Origin's LXX text became a conglomeration of variants. Therefore, such may also be the case in this text. For a brief explanation of Origin's Hexapla, see J. W. Wevers, "Septuagint," in The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, vol. 4, 2nd ed. ed. by George Arthur Buttrick (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962; reprint ed., 1982), p. 275. For a more thorough description, see Henry Barclay Swete, An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1902), pp. 59-86.

in verse five.²¹ Other scholars object to such levity with the Masoretic Text. John A. Upton presents three noteworthy arguments against the variant of "אוצר."²² First, although "יוצר" and "אוצר" are very similar and possible to interchange, "יוצר" occurs twice in Zechariah 11:13. Therefore, the likelihood is less that a scribe would make the same error twice. Secondly, "יוצר" is definitely the more difficult reading. Therefore, it is likely that a scribe would have attempted to clarify the text by changing it to "אוצר." Upton writes:

"Scribes would know that the temple had a treasury, but would not a scribe ask himself about the relevance of a potter in the temple? The temptation to change the text into something more intelligible would speak against "אוצר" as the original reading."²³

Thirdly, one must note that Judas did not throw the silver

²¹Beare, Matthew, p. 526. Willoughby C. Allen, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to S. Matthew, The International Critical Commentary (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1907; reprint ed., 1957), p. 288. Eugen Hühn, Die alttestamentlichen Citate und Reminiscenzen im Neuen Testamente, Die messianischen Weissagungen des israelitisch-jüdischen Volkes bis zu den Targumin, II. Teil (Tübingen: Verlag von J. C. B. Mohr, 1900), p. 36. M'Neile also assumes that "האוצר" is the original reading in Zechariah. The emendation arose from scribes who altered it, because they saw the reading as derogatory to the temple. Alan Hugh M'Neile, The Gospel According to Matthew (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1965), p. 408. Eduard Schweizer, Das Evangelium nach Matthäus, Das Neue Testament Deutsch, Teilband 2, 13. Auflage (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1973), p. 329. Julius Wellhausen, Die kleinen Propheten, 4. Auflage (Berlin: Walter De Gruyter & Co., 1963), p. 194.

²²John A. Upton, "The Potter's Field and the Death of Judas," Concordia Journal 8 (November 1982):214.

²³Ibid.

into the treasury of the temple (*κορβαναν*) but merely into the temple (*ναος*).²⁴

As a result of such objections, some have attempted to preserve the integrity of the Masoretic Text by asserting some sort of alternate meaning to "יִוצַר." For example, C. C. Torrey challenges the reading of "אוֹצַר" because "יִוצַר" can also refer to the founder who melted down precious metals for temple use.²⁵ In addition, the Targum of Jonathan employed this term as a denotation of a temple official in charge of documents for the treasury.²⁶ Therefore, it is very possible to retain "יִוצַר" as a logical reading of Zechariah and also assume that Matthew's "*κορβαναν*" and "*κεραμεως*" originate from the very same word, "יִוצַר."²⁷

²⁴Gundry correctly disputes the assertion of Louis Dyer and E. Power that "*ναος*" must be equated with treasury. Louis Dyer, "Olympian Treasures and Treasures in General," Journal of Hellenic Studies 25 (1905):312. E. Power, "John 2:20 and the Date of the Crucifixion," Biblica 9 (1928):263. Dyer and Power corroborate their point by referring to a limited occurrence of this in Greek and Roman culture. However, Gundry argues that such a usage among the Greeks and Romans does not necessitate its connection with the Old Testament text. Gundry, The Use of the Old Testament, p. 123, n. 1. See also Upton, "The Potter's Field," p. 218, n. 5.

²⁵This could help explain the strange reading of "*χω-νευτηριον*" (furnace) in the LXX version of Zechariah 11:13. See p. 60 of this paper for Lindars' view of this LXX variant.

²⁶See Stendahl, School of Matthew, p. 124.

²⁷C. C. Torrey, "The Foundry of the Second Temple at Jerusalem," Journal of Biblical Literature 55 (1936):247-260. Stendahl admits the possibility of this interpretation for the Zechariah passage. However, he believes that Matthew is implying "אוֹצַר" through "*κορβαναν*." Stendahl, School

Another way of maintaining the integrity of the Masoretic Text is the example of Upton. He does not understand "יוצר" as one who melts precious metals or cares for temple documents. Rather, Upton calls the person an actual potter who worked for the temple but outside of the temple itself. In this way, one solves the dilemma of a potter in the sacred temple. Naturally, therefore, one would need to accept a wider definition of "temple" to include also an outer court.²⁸

If we accept the reading of "יוצר" and accept the term to mean an actual person who works in or near the temple, the term would most likely not be a colloquial term for an act of disdain as argued by Robert H. Gundry.²⁹ Rather, the prophet Zechariah actually threw the silver at the potter. The prophet may not have totally realized the meaning of the action commanded him. Nevertheless, one may assume that the action did not honor the wages he received.³⁰

The other problematic portion of the Matthew clause

of Matthew, pp. 124, 125. Upton agrees that Matthew was aware of and implied this alternate reading from the Syriac. Upton, "The Potter's Field," p. 219, n. 23.

²⁸Upton, "The Potter's Field," p. 216.

²⁹Gundry, The Use of the Old Testament, pp. 123, 124. For evidence he cites the work of L. Reinke, Die messianischen Weissagungen bei den grossen und kleinen Propheten (Giessen: n.p., 1859-62) Band 4, Teil 2, p. 144. There, Reinke compares this term to "zum Henker" or "zum Schinder."

³⁰Ibid.

quoted above involves the occurrence of "αγρον." It appears nowhere in Zechariah 11:13. Therefore, scholars have often suspected an allusion to another portion of the Old Testament. Because there are similar in Jeremiah and because Matthew ascribes this quotation to Jeremiah,³¹ some scholars have maintained that Matthew here alludes to Jeremiah. Most often, Jeremiah 18:2-3 and 32:6-9 (LXX 39:6-9) are the passages cited.³² In Jeremiah 32:6-9 a field is mentioned which Jeremiah purchases in Anathoth. For that he weighs out seventeen pieces of silver. However, there is no potter and only seventeen pieces of silver does not equal thirty. The context of 18:2-3 concerns a command of Yahweh to Jeremiah to observe how a potter remakes a marred pot. Thus Yahweh will reform his people. Although this passage refers to a potter, it does not include the purchase of a field.

³¹The textual evidence overwhelmingly supports the ascription to Jeremiah. There are only a few exceptions of little importance. For example, minuscule 22 and marginal notes of the Harclean version of the Syriac read "Ζαχαρίου." Minuscule 21 reads "Ἰησαίου." Codex Bezae Cantabrigiae, the Old Latin texts Vercellensis (a) and Veronensis (b), the Sinaitic Syriac (sy^s), the Peshitta (sy^p), and one witness of the Boharic version (bo^{ms}) all exclude any mention of a prophet. As it is apparent, all these variants arise from late, less reliable texts. The oldest and most reliable texts all ascribe the quote to Jeremiah.

³²Vogler, Judas Iskarioth, p. 68; Beare, Matthew, p. 526; Stendahl, School of Matthew, p. 122; Lohmeyer, Matthäus, p. 379; Schweizer, Matthew, p. 504; Torrey, "Fou-dry," p. 252. R. S. McConnel, Law and Prophecy in Matthew Gospel: The Authority and Use of the Old Testament in the Gospel of St. Matthew (Basel: Friedrich Reinhardt, 1969), p. 132; Stöckhardt, "Weissagung und Erfüllung," pp. 272, 273.

In addition, the contexts of Matthew 27:3-10 and Jeremiah 18:2-3 differ substantially. In Jeremiah 18, Yahweh is referred to as a potter, whereas "potter" has a mundane, commonplace connotation in Matthew.

Although the two Jeremiah passages above contain some affinities with Zechariah 11:3 and may have been considered by Matthew, there is a final passage which demonstrates the most impressive similarities with the Matthew passage. It is Jeremiah, chapter nineteen. Two verbal connections exist between this portion of Jeremiah and Matthew 27:3-10.

First, in Jeremiah 19:4 there is "דם נקים" (innocent blood) of the Masoretic Text and "αιματων αθων" (innocent blood) of the Septuagint. That matches Matthew's "αιμα αθων" in 27:4. Moreover, there is the occurrence of "potter," in Jeremiah 19:1, 11 (יוצר for the MT and πεπλασμενον for the LXX). Also impressive is the thematic similarity in the context. Jeremiah speaks about a piece of land, the valley of Ben-Hinnom (or Gehenna). This piece of land, associated with a potter (v. 1), receives a new name which implies violence, "גיא ההרגה" (valley of slaughter) (v. 6) and will be employed as a burial ground (v. 11). This all occurs to show God's judgment against Jerusalem, especially against the leaders.³³ Although one does not find the word field,

³³For these points, I am indebted to Gundry, The Use of the Old Testament, pp. 124-125; Senior, "The Fate of the Betrayer," pp. 389, 390; Moo, The Old Testament, pp. 193, 194; and Upton, "The Potter's Field," pp. 216, 217.

"αγρος," in this passage, the reference to a valley definitely involves a similar term.³⁴ Moreover, the thematic similarity in the context as well as the common term "κεραμειως" provide impressive evidence. Further corroboration arises from the possibility that the location of the potter was in the same valley, being situated close to the altars for human sacrifice, a theory posed by Gundry.³⁵

In summary, in this phrase, Matthew changes the verb from a first person singular in the original to a third person plural. In addition, this verb (εδωκαν) represents a less blunt choice than the original, an alteration which more aptly fits Matthew's context. Matthew retains the Zechariah noun "יוצר" in his translation. Finally, with "αγρον" Matthew most likely alludes to Jeremiah 19:1-15, a point demonstrated by the striking similarities with the context of Matthew. Less likely is the assertion that he had Jeremiah 18:2-3 and 32:6-9 in mind, although these may have been secondary passages in the apostle's mind.

³⁴As mentioned above, there is a piece of land associated with violence. Because of the bloody sacrifices of children here, one would not have to stretch his imagination to make the connection between the field's proposed name, "Valley of Slaughter" in Jeremiah and "field of blood" in Acts. Therefore, since Matthew and Luke refer to the same prophecy, this helps to reconcile the apparent disparity between the two. See Upton, "The Potter's Field," pp. 216, 217.

³⁵Gundry, The Use of the Old Testament, p. 125.

Phrase E of Matthew 27:9, 10

Matt. 27:10b: *καθα συνεταξεν μοι κυριος*³⁶

MT, Ex. 9:12: *וַיְחֹזֵף יְהוָה אֶת־לֵב פֶּרְעֹה וְלֹא שָׁמַע אֶל־הֵם
כַּאֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר יְהוָה אֶל־מֹשֶׁה*

LXX, Ex. 9:12: *εσκληρουσεν δε κυριος την καρδιαν
φαραω, και ουκ εισηκουσεν αυτων, καθα συνεταξεν κυριος.*

MT, Zech. 11:13a: *וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֵלַי*

LXX, Zech. 11:13a: *και ειπεν κυριος προς με*

While the resemblance between this portion of the quote and the Exodus passage above can be noted, Matthew may have reconstructed the first portion of Zechariah 11:13 to elicit remembrance of such a formula as that in Exodus.³⁷ One especially observes Matthew's adherence to the Zechariah passage through his use of "μοι" which corresponds with "אלי" and "προς με."³⁸ This reworking of the Zechariah passage gives a formula which occurs often in the Old Testament.³⁹ It demonstrates God's command being responsible

³⁶Vogler and Rothfuchs suggest that these words arise from a Targum. Vogler, Judas Iskarioth, p. 68. Rothfuchs, Die Erfüllungszitate, p.,. 87.

³⁷Heinrich August Wilhelm Meyer, Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Gospel of Matthew, Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament, vol. 2, trans. and ed. by William P. Dickson and William Stewart (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1879), p. 467; Moo, Old Testament, p. 197.

³⁸Rothfuchs, Die Erfüllungszitate, p. 88; Gundry, The Use of the OT, p. 127; Lohmeyer, Matthäus, p. 379; Stendahl, The School of Matthew, p. 123; Allen, Matthew, p. 288.

³⁹A similar formula occurs in Ex. 9:12, 34:4, 36:8, 12, 14, 29, 34, 28:20, 29:11, 40:19, 27, Lev. 8:13, 16:34, Num. 7:3, 22, 9:5, 15:23, 36, 17:11, 20:9, 27, 27:11, 23, 31:41, Joshua 4:8, 24:30, Judg. 4:8, Job 42:9.

for something which transpired. Therefore, one may explain the strange appearance of the first person singular in Matthew in such a manner. The evangelist reconstructs the beginning of the Zechariah quote after the fashion of a formula such as that in Exodus 9:12 in order to emphasize God's will in how events occurred.⁴⁰

Conclusion

In conclusion, one must concede that the text of Matthew 27:9-10 demonstrates greatest affinity with the Hebrew Masoretic Text of Zechariah 11:13. Upon further comparison with both the LXX and Masoretic Text, one can see that Matthew adapts the person and number of his verbs. He employs alternate nouns, verbs, and adjectives. Finally, he integrates at least one additional Old Testament passage into this quotation.

Upon taking note of these emendations, one must observe how they affect the interpretation of the text in the context of Matthew. To this end, one should take note of the Old Testament context in Zechariah 11:4-14 and its relationship to Matthew's usage of the quotation.

In the Old Testament context, Zechariah 11:13 concerns the prophet Zechariah as he acts in the role of a God-appointed shepherd over God's people. In spite of this

⁴⁰Meyer, Gospel of Matthew, p. 254, Moo, Old Testament, p. 197.

prophet's efforts, the people mock him by offering a paltry sum of money for his labors on their behalf. In response, the Lord commands Zechariah to cast the wages, thirty pieces of silver, to the potter in the house of the Lord. An introduction to the Lord's command occurs first in the passage, "וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֵלַי," "και ειπεν κυριος προς με." Then the Lord gives the actual command (imperative mood, second person singular) to Zechariah to cast the money to the potter. The remainder of the passage occurs in the first person, relaying Zechariah's actions regarding the money.

In Matthew's context, in spite of some alteration in the wording of the Old Testament passage, a distinct parallel exists between the main character in Zechariah and in Matthew. Namely, in Matthew, Christ becomes the anti-type of the person of Zechariah and that which he experiences. The focus of attention now concerns the God-appointed shepherd of Israel "par excellence," Jesus Christ. Just as Zechariah was mockingly "valued" or "honored" by his people, so also Christ received the same treatment. As Zechariah experienced this ridicule by a paltry sum of money, so also Christ received similar mockery through betrayal for a mere thirty pieces of silver, although he also had given of himself for God's people. The aspect of typology in this passage receives greater attention in chapter four.

Now that the similar aspects have been noted, we turn to the alterations, their effects, and the nuances of this

text's application in the Matthew context. The alterations in Matthew's quotation center around the integration of Judas and the chief priests into the account, although the shepherd of Israel remains the center of attention. Instead of the shepherd of Israel being mentioned in the first person singular, he receives attention in the third person singular. In addition, the description of the money as a "valued price" in Zechariah now speaks of Christ as a valued person. Then, the actions formerly done by Zechariah are given to Judas and the chief priests. Specifically, first of all, the wages which the prophet received in Zech. 11:12 are the wages which Judas acquired. Secondly, the remaining actions done by the prophet in Zechariah are now accomplished by the chief priests, namely, the taking of the pieces of silver and the action done with the pieces of silver. The alteration regarding what was done with the silver is indeed important. The money did not go directly to a potter. Rather, it went for the purchase of a potter's field in Matthew. As mentioned, one finds here the integration of the prophesy in Jeremiah, most likely from chapter nineteen. This integrated passage elicits the remembrance of a field denoting violence, as well as other aspects from the Jeremiah context. Thirdly, the sum given for the shepherd in Matthew resulted in the sentencing and death of the main character. Such does not appear in Zechariah. Finally, the introduction to God's commands from the

Zech. 11:13 passage, which originally occurred at the beginning, now appears at the end of the quote, having been altered to resemble Exodus 9:12. This clause demonstrates God's will in these occurrences.

Thus, the alterations here ingeniously involve Judas and the chief priests in the actions while still retaining the God-appointed shepherd of Israel as the focus of attention. Because Matthew uses such license with the text, he demonstrates hermeneutics which may be surprising. Nevertheless, much of Matthew's methodology was acceptable practice in his era, a point which will receive primary attention in chapter four.

CHAPTER III

EXPLANATIONS FOR THE ALTERATIONS IN MATTHEW 27:9,10

Theories which Propose an Alternate "Vorlage"

An Apocryphal Jeremiah

Already in the early church, theologians noted the difficulty which a passage like this poses. Therefore, they proposed solutions to explain it. Origen, for example, claims that it arises from an apocryphal version of Jeremiah which was lost through time.¹ Similarly, Jerome asserts the same solution regarding this quotation. He even claims to have seen this text among the Nazarenes.²

Also during the last few centuries, this view has

¹Origen Comm. in Matt. ad 27:9. Meyer holds this as a fanciful conjecture. Heinrich August Wilhelm Meyer, Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Gospel of Matthew, Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament, vol. 2, trans. and ed. by William P. Dickson and William Stewart (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1879), p. 250.

²Jerome Comm. in Matt. ad 27:9. "Hoc testimonium in Hieremia non invenitur, in Zacharia vero qui paene ultimus duodecim prophetarum est, quaedam similitudo fertur et quamquam sensus non multum discrepet, tamen et ordo et verba diuersa sunt. Legi nuper in quodam hebraico volumine quem Nazarenae secta mihi Hebraeus obtulit Hieremiae apocryphum in quo haec ad verbum scripta repperi. Sed tamen mihi videtur magis de Zacharia sumptum testimonium, evangelistarum et apostolorum more vulgato qui verborum ordine praetermisso sensus tantum de veteri testamento proferunt in exemplum."

found support. Important examples are Ernst Lohmeyer and Georg Strecker.³ In addition, Johann Bengel, having found this text in an Arabic source, sees this as proof for the existence of the apocryphal Jeremiah.⁴ However, it appears that this Arabic document was later and, therefore, interpolated the text from Matthew. The same holds true for Jerome, if indeed he did see this reading in a text of the Nazarene community.⁵

Eusebius' Claim of an Underhanded Removal

Eusebius of Caesarea makes an assertion which has not received support from others. He believes that the quotation in Matthew 27:9-10 originally stood in the prophet Jeremiah. However, it was craftily removed from the text shortly after Jeremiah had written it. Therefore, subsequent copies of the text do not include the passage.⁶

³Ernst Lohmeyer, Das Evangelium des Matthäus, Kritischer-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament, Sonderband (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1956), p. 378; Georg Strecker, Der Weg der Gerechtigkeit--Untersuchung zur Theologie des Matthäus, 3rd ed. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1973), pp. 80, 81.

⁴Johann Albrecht Bengel, Apparatus criticus ad novum Testamentum Driseios sacrae compendium (Tubin: Phillipo Davide Burkio, 1765), p. 142.

⁵Meyer, Matthew, p. 250.

⁶Eusebius of Caesarea Demonstr. evang. 10. 4. 13. "εἴτε χρη υπονοεῖν περιηρησθαι αὐτὰ ἐξ αὐτῆς κατὰ τινὰ ραδιοῦρ-γίαν,"

G. D. Kilpatrick's Liturgical-Homiletical Theory

G. D. Kilpatrick proposed a complex theory of the origin of Matthew's Gospel which also accounts for the occurrence of a quotation such as Matthew 27:9-10. Kilpatrick asserts that Mark, "Q," and "M" are the written sources for Matthew's Gospel.⁷ However, "M" here only includes the discourse sections peculiar to Matthew.⁸ Kilpatrick describes M as a "rudimentary" document, more "primitive" in style and having an earlier date of origin than Mark or "Q."⁹ Besides these sources, one must still account for the narrative material peculiar to Matthew, a category which includes the quotations peculiar to Matthew. According to Kilpatrick, this narrative material cannot orig-

⁷George Dunbar Kilpatrick, The Origins of the Gospel According to St. Matthew (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1946; reprint ed., 1950), p. 8.

⁸Ibid., p. 35. "(I) v. 21-24 (in part), 27f., 33-37, 38-41 (in part), 19f., vi. 1-8, 16-18. Here v. 23f., 36 at least, vi. 7f. are attached from other contexts. (II) The missionary charge, x. 5f, 8b, 16b, 23, 24-25a in part, 25b, 41(?). (III) Collection of parables. (a) Kingdom parables, xiii. 24-30, 36-52, xviii. 23-24, xx. 10-15, xxii. 2, 11-14, xxv. 1-10. (b) Others xxi. 28-32, xxv. 31-45. (IV) Against religious leaders, xxiii. 2f, 5, 7b-10, 15-22, 24, 26 (?), 27. (V) Fragments, x.7-9 with possibly 4 and 10, 14, 16f., vi. 34, vi. 6, 13f. in part, 15, xi. 28-30, xii. 5f., 7, 36f., xv. 12f., xviii. 10, 18-20, xix. 10-12."

⁹Ibid., p. 36. "These considerations of size, connection, and lack of narrative suggest that M was a rudimentary document, more primitive in type if not in date than Mark or even Q. Its use and survival are explicable only by the fact that it contained material which had not been preserved in another source. Once this material had been incorporated in Matthew, M was bound to disappear."

inate from a written source but rather an oral source.¹⁰ On the basis of these sources, he then describes the evolution which took place to produce the final Gospel of Matthew. The written sources just mentioned underwent development through liturgical-homiletical usage in the early Christian congregations. However, these written sources experienced minimal emendation.¹¹ The oral source consists of liturgical and homiletical works which the church produced upon expounding Mark, "Q," "M," and the Old Testament. Through usage and exposition in the worship, the expanded written sources (Mark, "Q," and "M") and oral source acquired a fixed form, although not yet written. The final editor of Matthew took these sources and committed them into written form, namely, the Gospel itself. The Gospel contained few emendations by the editor himself.¹²

Kilpatrick delineates the quotations of Matthew according to their adherence to the Septuagint and inclusion in Mark. For instance, he observes that those quotations derived from Mark closely adhere to the Septuagint text.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 37. "(a) The Nativity stories. (b) Petrine stories: xiv. 28-31, xvi. 17-19, xvii. 24-7, with which we must take xvii. 15-22; cf. xv. 15. (c) Passion and resurrection stories: xxvi. 52-4, xxvii. 3-10, 19, 24f., 51-3, 62-6, xxviii. 2-4, 9-20. (d) Miscellaneous narratives: iii. 14f., iv. 23, ix. 35, xv. 22-4, xvii. 6f., xxi. 10f., 14-16. (e) quotations."

¹¹Ibid., pp. 80-100.

¹²Ibid., pp. 80-100, 135-140.

This is a sign that Matthew only had ability in Greek.¹³ As a result, Kilpatrick assumes that quotations peculiar to Matthew which agree with the LXX may or may not have originated from Matthew's editorial hand.¹⁴ However, those quotations which diverge from the LXX arose from exposition in the liturgical-homiletical setting of the early church.¹⁵

Kilpatrick extrapolates his theory upon Matthew 27:9-10. After observing the substantial textual variations such as those delineated above,¹⁶ he ascribes this quote to homiletical development rather than liturgical. In addition, he finds three stages of development for this quotation which occurred in the church. First, it was related to the Marcan account of Judas. Secondly, it was influenced by the Peshitta version of Zechariah. Thirdly, the quotation itself caused emendation in the Matthean tradition of Judas in 27:3-8.¹⁷

Documentary-Redactional Views of Soltau and Bacon

W. Soltau and B. W. Bacon promote theories which concern both the production of the entire Gospel and the inclusion of the formula quotations. Soltau believes that a

¹³Ibid., pp. 55, 56.

¹⁴Ibid.

¹⁵Ibid., pp. 46, 56, 95.

¹⁶See pp. 26-44 above.

¹⁷Ibid., p. 81.

final redactor came upon a completed version of Matthew and mechanically added the formula quotations, among other small portions. These formula quotations were part of a larger collection of written traditions with Jewish-Christian characteristics, emphasizing the so-called "Peter and Pilate legends."¹⁸ Bacon does not believe that the final redactor came upon a finished product. Rather, he compiled the Gospel out of Mark and "S," a document based on "Q." The formula quotations arise from "N," a Nazarean Targum which was worked into the Gospel by the redactor.¹⁹

The Testimonia Book

The testimonia book is defined as a systematized collection of Old Testament quotations assembled by the early church for the purpose of apologetics against the Jews.²⁰ As these texts were collected, both intentional apologetic emendations and unintentional scribal errors crept into the text.²¹ Although James Rendel Harris is the man usually associated with the testimonia book, others had already proposed it before him such as Edwin Hatch, A.

¹⁸W. Soltau, "Zur Entstehung des 1. Evangeliums," Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 1 (1900):219-248. See especially pp. 222-224.

¹⁹Benjamin W. Bacon, Studies in Matthew (London: Constable & Company, 1930), pp. 156-164.

²⁰James Rendel Harris, Testimonies, vol. 1 (Cambridge: at the University Press, 1916), p. 1.

²¹Ibid., p. 8.

Ungern-Sternberg, and Francis C. Burkitt.²² These collections of texts, which Harris called the "first known treatise(s) on Christian theology,"²³ arose during the first Jewish persecutions of Christians and, hence, antedated the Gospels.²⁴ Such a testimonia book was seen as the solution to several difficulties which arise with some Old Testament quotations in the New Testament. These solutions also point one to the corroboration for the existence of such documents.

First, the testimonia book would explain the occurrence of New Testament quotations which agree with patristic sources but do not adhere to any known Old Testament text.²⁵ For example, Harris cites matching variants of Isaiah 54:1 which occur in Galatians 4:27, and also with two church fathers, namely, Justin's First Apology 53, and Cyprian's Testimonia 1. 20.²⁶

²²Several had already proposed this. In 1889 Hatch already suggested it. Edwin Hatch, Essays in Biblical Greek (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1889), pp. 203-214. There is also the work by A. Ungern-Sternberg, Der traditionelle alt-testamentliche Schriftbeweis "de Christo" und "de Evangelio" in der alten Kirche bis zur Zeit Eusebs von Caesarea (Halle: M. Niemeyer, 1913), pp. 8-19. The first to coin the term "testimonia" was F.C. Burkitt. Francis Crawford Burkitt, The Gospel History and its Transmission (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1907), p. 126.

²³Ibid., Introduction.

²⁴Ibid., pp. 2, 23.

²⁵Ibid., p. 8.

²⁶Ibid., p. 21-25.

Secondly, there are passages in which an erroneous source is ascribed. Examples are Matthew 27:9 and Mark 1:2. If the editors employed a testimonia book, this could be the source of the error.²⁷ Regarding Matthew 27:9-10 specifically, Harris asserts that both the quote and the false ascription arose from such a testimonia document which developed prior to Matthew's composition of the Gospel. Hence, because Matthew supposedly employed this testimonia document instead of the original Masoretic Text, the emendations crept in.²⁸ Thirdly, it would explain composite quotations because such a catena could have already existed in a prior document. Here one defines composite quotations as passages which consist of several Old Testament passages strung together to look as if they had originally belonged together. One may find such occurrences in 2 Corinthians 6:16-18, Matthew 27:9-10, and Mark 1:2.²⁹

Fourthly, it may account for the fact that certain Old Testament passages tend to be used in corroborating the same argument, an argument often built around a key word. The primary example for Harris comes in 1 Peter 2:6-10 where several Old Testament passages which include "stone" are organized together. The same combination also occurs in

²⁷Ibid., p. 8.

²⁸Ibid., pp. 52-60.

²⁹Ibid., p. 8. See also pp. 21-23.

Cyprian's Testimonia 1.19. Other examples which Harris brings forth on these pages are Romans 10:16 which occurs also in Justin's Dial. 42 and Ephesians 4:8 which appears in Justin's Dial. 39.³⁰

As stated above, Harris found evidence for a testimonia book from such occurrences in the New Testament and the patristic writers. He found further evidence from early church writers having produced their own testimonia books. Harris assumes that they received the idea and possibly also the texts from prior testimonia books. Such examples come with Cyprian's Testimonia and Tertullian's Tertullianus adversus Judaeos.³¹

Further evidence for the early existence of testimonia arose from the discoveries at Qumran. In the fourth cave a collection dubbed "4Q Florilegium" contains at least two Old Testament passages, 2 Samuel 7:12-14 and Amos 9:11. Also in cave four was the "4Q Testimonia" which contains the following: Numbers 24:15-17, Deuteronomy 5:28-29, 18:18-19, and 33:8-1. Joseph Fitzmyer has been especially instrumental in promulgating the Qumran testimonia as further proof for the use of testimonia in the New Testament.³²

³⁰Ibid., pp. 8, 26-32.

³¹Ibid., pp. 5-7.

³²For a description of these discoveries, see Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "'4 Q Testimonia' and the New Testament," Theological Studies 18 (1957):513-537. See also Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "The Use of Explicit Old Testament Quotations in Qumran Literature and in the New Testament," New Testament

Kahle's History of the Septuagint Theory

Paul Kahle's assertion regarding divergence of the Old Testament quotations in the New Testament reflects his theory about the origin of the Septuagint.³³ According to him, the Septuagint was not the original Greek translation of the Hebrew Old Testament from which other versions deviated. Rather, the Septuagint arose from Greek Targums which had already existed beforehand. Hence, the Letter of Aristeas simply demonstrates an attempt to promote the late-coming Septuagint as the official translation.³⁴ Accordingly, Kahle dates this letter at 130-100 B.C.³⁵

Studies 7 (1961):297-333.

³³Paul Ernst Kahle, The Cairo Geniza (London: Oxford University Press, 1947), pp. 132-179.

³⁴Taken at face value, the author named Aristeas writes a letter to a certain Philocrates. He describes the events surrounding the translation of the Hebrew Torah into Greek under the patronage of Ptolemy Philadelphus II in Alexandria (285-247 B.C.). This Aristeas, a pagan Greek, serves in the king's court, acts as an intermediary between Philadelphus and Eleazar, the high priest in Jerusalem, and witnesses all events regarding the translation. Having served the king faithfully, Aristeas communicates these events to Philocrates who supposedly would anxiously receive such an account. For an introduction to the History of the "Letter of Aristeas," see Henry Barclay Swete, An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1902), pp. 10-28. On pp. 519-574, he includes the actual text of this letter.

³⁵Paul Ernst Kahle, The Cairo Geniza, pp. 132-179, esp. pp. 137-139. However, Swete would date it much earlier, thereby assuming that the Septuagint came first and other texts were derived from it. Swete believes that the "Letter of Aristeas" arose possibly within fifty years after the translation of the LXX. Swete, Old Testament in Greek, p. 16. Paul Lagarde promulgated the widely held theory of the LXX as the official translation from which others then

Therefore, Kahle believes that deviant Old Testament quotations in the New Testament do not demonstrate emendations by the apostles. Rather, they illustrate the existence of various Greek Targums in use before the Septuagint became the official translation.³⁶

Summary

In summary, theories reviewed in this section propose an alternate Vorlage for Matthew 27:9-10. Namely, they assume that a hand prior to Matthew is responsible for this deviating quotation. Therefore, the evangelist simply took the quotations already emended from a text and placed them into the Gospel. Major theories in this area are the following: an apocryphal Jeremiah, an underhanded removal of the quote from the original Jeremiah, the liturgical-homiletical theory, the testimonia book, and the documentary-redactional views of Soltau and Bacon.

Confusion while Quoting from Memory

The second major category in the explanations for deviations of Matthew 27:9-10 in comparison to the Masoretic Text and the Septuagint is that the evangelist or unknown editor did not have a text of the Old Testament before him. Rather, he quoted from memory and accidentally committed

deviated. Paul Lagarde, Anmerkungen zur griechischen Übersetzung der Proverbien (Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1863), p. 3.

³⁶Kahle, Cairo Geniza, p. 165.

errors of recollection. This explanation, apparently, presupposes neither the inerrancy of Scripture nor its infallibility.

For example, Eduard Schweizer claims that complete copies of the Old Testament were rare at the time of Matthew. One often possessed small written portions of Scripture, but the rest one would have to commit to memory. This is one of the passages which Matthew had committed to memory and, while quoting, had remembered incorrectly, although he had every intention of a completely literal citation. In addition, Schweizer claims that the events surrounding the death of Judas likewise arose from Matthew's faulty memory.³⁷ Francis W. Beare illustrates this view when, quoting Willoughby Allen, he states:

Perhaps it is to be understood along the lines of Allen's suggestion, that the translator (the evangelist himself) allows the facts on which he is commenting to creep into his translation, and that he "seems to have the Hebrew text in mind, and to have quoted from memory." However he arrived at what he wrote, it must be agreed that he has botched it badly.³⁸

³⁷Eduard Schweizer, Das Evangelium nach Matthäus, Das Neue Testament Deutsch, Teilband 2, 13. Auflage (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1973) pp. 329, 330.

³⁸Francis Wright Beare, The Gospel According to Matthew (San Francisco: Harper and Row Publishers, 1982), pp. 526, 527. In this quotation, Beare quotes Willoughby Allen, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to S. Matthew, The International Critical Commentary (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1907; reprint ed., 1957), p. 288. Besides Beare and Schweizer, indeed others support this view that Matthew erred in memory. See William F. Albright and C. S. Mann, Matthew, The Anchor Bible (Garden City: Doubleday & Co., 1971), p. 341 and Alfred Plummer, An Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to Matthew (London:

Deviation is Due to Matthew's Own Innovation³⁹

Lindars' New Testament Apologetic⁴⁰

Regarding Matthew's formula quotations, as well as other New Testament quotations which show emendation from the original, Lindars proposes that the present text form arose from multiple stages of emendation caused by the early church for reasons of anti-Jewish apologetic.⁴¹ The evangelist, being the final editor, also altered the text, although he had little or no cognizance of the prior stages of development.⁴²

The stages of emendations took two forms: a "shift of application" and a "modification of text."⁴³ Regarding the shift of application, one expects that an Old Testament text

Elliot Stock, 1909), p. 386.

³⁹Besides Lindars' New Testament apologetic, there is one other theory which one could place into this category, namely, Krister Stendahl's assertion of a School of Matthew. However, because Stendahl's theory intimately concerns the Habakkuk Commentary at Qumran and because chapter four also emphasizes the same commentary, this paper has avoided repetition by relegating Stendahl's theory to "Appendix I."

⁴⁰Categorizing this New Testament apologetic is difficult. It includes Matthew having received an emended text for the quotations. However, Lindars also asserts that Matthew undertakes his own interpretive changes. Therefore, for lack of a better choice, Lindars is categorized here.

⁴¹Barnabas Lindars, New Testament Apologetic--the Doctrinal Significance of the Old Testament Quotations (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1961), pp. 16, 259.

⁴²Ibid., p. 16.

⁴³Ibid, pp. 17, 24.

employed in the New Testament should have the same application. In addition, when the same Old Testament text is quoted in several places in the New Testament, one expects the same application in all of them. However, such is not always the case. Comparing these applications in the New Testament, one may see stages of development. The latest stage has strayed furthest from the original in the Old Testament.⁴⁴ For example, Isaiah 6:9-10 is introduced and quoted in John 12:39-40, Acts 28:25-28, and Mark 4:11-12. In Isaiah, the context or application concerned the disobedience of God's people. The John passage demonstrates the earliest application since it concerns the reason why the Jews did not respond to Jesus' mission. Acts illustrates the next stage of development because it diverges a bit more in its application. It involves Paul's reasoning for transferring mission efforts from the Jews to the Gentiles. However, Mark shows the latest stage in development because it involves a topic most distant from the original in Isaiah. It concerns the reasons why Jesus spoke in parables.⁴⁵ In apparent contradiction, Lindars states that John, normally dated much later than Mark, has the most primitive shift in application. Presupposing such an objection, Lindars suggests that later Gospels may have simply employed

⁴⁴Ibid., p. 17.

⁴⁵Ibid., p. 18.

earlier traditions.⁴⁶ Secondly, Lindars asserts that stages of actual "modification of text" took place in a similar manner for the same apologetic purposes. He states that the emendations resemble the "midrash pesher" interpretations of the Qumran community as demonstrated in the Habakkuk commentary.⁴⁷

Lindars writes at length on Matthew 27:9-10. Agreeing with Stendahl's estimation of the text,⁴⁸ Lindars sees a process where two versions of Zechariah 11:13 were worked over and united with Jeremiah 18:1-6 and 32:6-9.⁴⁹ In total, Lindars sees four stages of textual development, stages which also demonstrate the "midrash pesher." First, the text was chosen from Zechariah, abbreviated, and applied to the context of the passion of Christ. The second stage involves the emendation of the quotation to the Judas context. For example, "the goodly price at which I was priced" was placed into the third person singular in order to point to Christ. For the third stage, the words "καθα συνεταξεν μοι κυριος" are taken implicitly from Jeremiah 32:12-14, but the exact wording arises from Exodus 9:12. Since the Exodus

⁴⁶Ibid.

⁴⁷Ibid., p. 24-31.

⁴⁸Krister Stendahl, The School of Matthew and its Use of the Old Testament. Acta Seminarii Neotestamentici Upsaliensis, vol. 20 (Uppsula: Almqvist & Wiksells, 1954), pp. 120-126, 196-198.

⁴⁹Ibid, p. 25.

context concerned the plague of boils and a foundry was the origin of the dust which Moses employed to produce the boils, an editor placed "χωμευτηριον" into the text, an interpretation of "יִוצֵר." Fourthly, Matthew, the last editor, finally drops the "χωμευτηριον" because it does not fit his point of view for the narrative.⁵⁰

In summary, this category includes a theory which propose that Matthew (or an unknown editor) emended the text of the quotation in Matthew 27:9, 10 for his own theological purposes. The major adherent proponent of this theory was Lindars with his *New Testament Apologetic*.

The Ascription of the Passage to Jeremiah

The emendations in the quotation of Matthew 27:9, 10 present substantial problems in themselves. But an additional problem arises. Matthew ascribes this passage to Jeremiah, although the quote obviously agrees with Zechariah 11:13 most closely.⁵¹ As one will notice, some of the explanations for the emended text also arise for the ascription to Jeremiah.

The solutions run the gamut.⁵² A slip of memory

⁵⁰Ibid., pp. 121, 122.

⁵¹See p. 37, note #31 for the textual evidence of the variants for the ascription to Jeremiah.

⁵²For this list, I am indebted to Robert H. Gundry, The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel with Special Reference to the Messianic Hope (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1967), p. 125, n. 3; Douglas Moo, The Old Testament in the Gospel Passion Narratives (Sheffield: The Almond Press), p. 191, n.

caused a mistake.⁵³ It was rabbinical practice to quote a number of prophets under one name if similarities occurred between their messages.⁵⁴ One should accept the textual evidence to omit "Jeremiah."⁵⁵ The Jews deleted the passage from Jeremiah.⁵⁶ The quotation and hence the ascription arise from an apocryphal Jeremiah.⁵⁷ The quotation was derived from a testimonia book in which this passage was ascribed to Jeremiah.⁵⁸ "Jeremiah" formerly appeared at the front of the prophetic section of the Old Testament. Therefore, "Jeremiah" is a general denotation for the prophetic

4; and Donald Senior, "The Fate of the Betrayer--A Redactional Study of Matthew XXVII, 3-10," Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses 48 (1972):396, 397, who provide an overview of the reviewed theories.

⁵³Stendahl, School of Matthew, p. 123.

⁵⁴Zebi Hirsch Chajes, The Student's Guide through the Talmud, trans. and ed. by Jacob Schachter (London: East and West Library, 1952), pp. 172ff.

⁵⁵A. S. Lewis, Light on the Four Gospels from the Sinai Palimpsest (London: Williams & Norgate, 1913), pp. 61-63. The textual evidence regarding the inclusion of "Jeremiah," appears on p. 37, note #31.

⁵⁶Eusebius of Caesarea Demonstr. evang. 10. 4. 13.

⁵⁷See pp. 45, 46.

⁵⁸Harris, Testimonies, vol. 1, pp. 56-60.

section of Scripture.⁵⁹ The term "δια του προφητου" arose from "בִּיד נְבִיאָ" the first word of which was mistaken for "בִּיר" and assumed to be an abbreviation for "Jeremiah."⁶⁰ The text from Zechariah had been inserted into a vulgar "Volksbibel" and hence copied by Matthew.⁶¹

However, there is one solution which respects both the integrity of Scripture and characterizes the profound emendations in the text. Thus, it seems the best solution. Many scholars assume that, while the affinity with Zechariah 11:13 is obvious, the ascription to Jeremiah arose in order to refer to the artfully integrated allusions to passages in Jeremiah. For example, Robert Gundry claims that this ascription makes sure that readers catch the connection with Jeremiah while Zechariah is the main focus.

Mt then sees two separate prophecies, one typical and one explicit, fulfilled in one event, and makes the ascription to Jer because the manifestness of the quotations from Zech and the lack of verbal resemblance to Jer would cause the Jer-side (sic.) of the prophecies to

⁵⁹Gaechter, Das Matthäusevangelium, p. 901; Strack-Billerbeck, Matthäus, vol. 1, p. 1030; J. P. Audet, "Notes and Studies," Journal of Theological Studies 1 (1950):136, 138, 150; H. F. D. Sparks, "St. Matthew's Reference to Jeremiah," Journal of Theological Studies 1 (1950):155, 156; Edmund F. Sutcliffe, "Matthew 27:9," Journal of Theological Studies 3 (1952):227, 228.

⁶⁰J. Kremer, Die Hirtenallegorie im Buche Zacharias auf ihre Messianität hin untersucht (Münster: Aschendorff Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1930), p. 99.

⁶¹E. Böhl, Die alttestamentliche Citate im Neuen Testament (Wien: Wilhelm Braumüller, 1878), pp. 75-79.

be lost.⁶²

Douglas Moo similarly states the case.

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."⁶³

Therefore, the ascription to Jeremiah was no mistake but rather a device to draw attention to a certain aspect of Matthew's quotation.

The Discrepancy with Judas' Death

As mentioned in the introduction, an additional concern remains regarding the integrity of Matthew. In Acts 1:16-20 Luke presents a different account of Judas' fate than Matthew. According to Luke, Judas died by a fatal fall in a field which he had bought, while in Matthew the chief priests bought the field, and the place of Judas' demise is not stated. Moreover, the field received the name "field of blood" (χωριον αιματος) instead of Matthew's version, "the potter's field" (τον αγρον του κεραμεως). One common solution denies the integrity of Scripture. For example, some scholars ascribe these variations to different traditions. The traditions may or may not be based upon truth.⁶⁴ Schol-

⁶²Gundry, The Use of the Old Testament, p. 125.

⁶³Moo, The Old Testament, pp. 197, 198.

⁶⁴Francis Wright Beare, The Gospel according to Matthew (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1982), p. 525; William Foxwell Albright and C. S. Mann, Matthew, The Anchor Bible (Garden City: Doubleday & Company, 1971), p. 340; Alfred Plummer, An Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to S. Matthew

ars such as R. T. France, E. Jacquier, and J. A. Motyer, who take a more conservative point of view, assume that a reconciliation of the two accounts is possible.⁶⁵

Their view is that no discrepancy exists with the names of the field. Matthew includes in verse eight "αγρος αιματος," an equivalent of "χωριον αιματος" in Acts 1:19. In addition, Matthew calls the field, "αγρον του κεραμεως" in 27:10. Therefore, the field could have received two distinct names among the populace at that time.⁶⁶ Moreover, regarding the purchase of the field, Matthew claims that Judas took immediate steps to rid himself of the blood money. Since the priests did not want to claim ownership of money, they could have purchased the field in Judas' name, thereby agreeing with Acts. In other words, the money was still considered Judas' possession. Therefore, the high priests merely acted as his agents.⁶⁷

The final apparent discrepancy comes with Judas'

(London: Elliot Stock, 1909), pp. 385, 386.

⁶⁵R. T. France, The Gospel According to Matthew, The Tyndale New Testament Commentaries (Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1985), p. 386. E. Jacquier, Les Actes des Apôtres (Paris: Gabalda, 1926), p. 34; J. A. Motyer, "Akeldama," in The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology, vol. 1, ed. Colin Brown, trans. and revised by Lothar Coenen, Erich Beyreuther and Hans Bietenhard (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1975), pp. 93, 94.

⁶⁶France, Matthew, p. 386.

⁶⁷Jacquier, Les Actes, p. 34; Motyer, "Akeldama," pp. 93, 94.

manner and place of death. Since Matthew does not specify the place where he hanged himself, one cannot cite a discrepancy between Matthew and Acts. Moreover, Motyer considers the expression "πρηνυς γενομενος" to denote "falling headlong" as the action which occurs subsequent to hanging.⁶⁸ Thus, Matthew and Luke do not conflict. Although differences may appear between the Matthew and Acts account of Judas' death, viable solutions exist which can harmonize them.

Summary

One task of this chapter was to categorize and describe the major proposals by biblical scholars to explain the deviations of the quote in Matthew 27:9,10 in comparison to the Masoretic Text and the Septuagint. The chapter categorized these solutions into three groups. One group proposed that the evangelist employed an alternate "Vorlage" for this quote. In the second group, one found theories which propose a lapse of memory on the part of the evangelist. The third group contained solutions which assert that Matthew himself altered the quotation for his own theological purposes. The chapter presented all major solutions for this enigma in Matthew 27:9,10 with the exception of that proposal which appears most probable to the present author. That proposal will receive attention in the

⁶⁸Motyer, "Akeldama," pp. 93, 94.

following chapter. In addition, in the present chapter evaluation of the theories was withheld. This task will also be a feature of the final chapter.

A second task was to present solutions for the puzzling ascription of the Matthew 27:9,10 quote to the prophet Jeremiah while the text shows greater agreement with Zechariah 11:13. Among the solutions presented, many appeared similar to those proposed above for the divergent wording of the quotation. The best proposal asserts that Matthew ascribed the quotation to Jeremiah in order to refer to the artfully integrated allusions to Jeremiah.

Finally, the chapter dealt with the apparent discrepancies between Judas' death in Matthew and Acts. At first glance, the two accounts may seem contradictory. However, upon closer examination, there are solutions which can account for the apparent disagreement and, therefore, bring the two accounts into harmony.

CHAPTER IV

THE BEST SOLUTION TO THE ENIGMA OF MATTHEW 27:9, 10

Introduction

Having presented some scholars' opinions regarding Matthew 27:9, 10, this chapter posits the solution which best accounts for Matthew's hermeneutics¹ in this passage. Namely, Matthew demonstrates hermeneutics which have some overlap with the hermeneutics in some extra-biblical literature of the intertestamental and New Testament eras. This literature includes the writings of the Tannaitic rabbis, first of all.² The Tannaitic rabbis existed from the time

¹Here the definition of hermeneutics involves both the presuppositions and methods utilized in interpreting a biblical text.

²The Tannaim were both scholars and teachers. They preached to people in the synagogues, taught in academic circles, and committed their learning to writing. The literature of the Tannaim may be divided into two categories. First, there were succinct halakhic passages categorized under abstract legal categories or other mnemonic devices. This first division of literature concerns foremost the "Mishna" and also the "Tosefta." Secondly, there were halakhic Midrashim arranged as exegetical commentaries on the text of the Pentateuch. Representatives of these Midrashim were the "Mekhilta de Rabbi Ishmael" and also one by Simeon b. Yohai, both on Exodus. There was the "Sifra" to Leviticus, the "Sifrei" and the "Sifrei Zuta" to Numbers, and the "Sifrei" and "Midrash Tannaim" to Deuteronomy. Daniel Sperber, "Tanna, Tannaim," in Encyclopedia of Judaism, vol. 15, ed. by Cecil Roth and Geoffrey Wigoder (New York: Macmillan, 1971-1972), cols. 798-803.

of Hillel to the compilation of the Mishnah (A.D. 20 to A.D. 200). Secondly, the important discoveries from Qumran³ will come under consideration, especially the Habakkuk Commentary.⁴ Finally, Targums are important when considering Matthew 27:9, 10 because they interpretively paraphrase the Old Testament text according to Jewish hermenetics. Such running commentaries in the Aramaic language possibly date back as far as the times of Ezra and Nehemiah.⁵

³A ruin of an Essene community on the northwestern coast of the Dead Sea received the name "Khirbet Qumran." The community was first occupied around 132 B.C. and destroyed in 68-70 A.D. as the Romans suppressed the First Jewish Revolt. Between 1947-1956 documents from these ruins were discovered which have proven helpful for biblical studies as well as an increased knowledge of this community. For further sources, see Geza Vermes, "Dead Sea Scrolls," in The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, supplementary volume, ed. Keith Crim (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962; reprint ed. 1982), pp. 210-219. F. M. Cross, The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Study (Garden City: Doubleday, 1958; reprint ed. 1961).

⁴The Habakkuk Commentary (DSH) has received much attention in scholarly circles. It involves comments upon Habakkuk 1:1-2:20 in a manner which demonstrates the fulfillment of the prophet's message supposedly having taken place in the midst of the Qumran community. Important studies have been written, among others, by William H. Brownlee, The Midrash Peshar of Habakkuk (Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press, 1979); Brownlee, "Biblical Interpretation Among the Sectaries of the Dead Sea Scrolls," Biblical Archeologist 14 (September 1951):54-76; Karl Elliger, Studien zum Habakuk-Kommentar vom Toten Meer (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1953); and Krister Stendahl, The School of Matthew and its Use of the Old Testament, Acta Seminarii Neotestamentici Upsaliensis, vol. 20 (Uppsula: Almqvist & Wiksells, 1954).

⁵This dating of Targums is attested by "Meg. 3a" in the Babylonian Talmud in its comments on Nehemiah 8:8. The fact that Targums existed anterior to the Mishna can be inferred from the Mishna passages "Meg. 4:4,6." "He who reads the Torah . . . may not read to the 'Meturgeman' (a writer of

In spite of the similarity between Matthew and the extra-biblical literature mentioned above, stark differences will also appear, especially in the area of hermeneutical presuppositions. One may account for these differences by the originality of the Messiah's life and ministry on earth. Hence, although Matthew may demonstrate some of the methods of his era, he writes his Gospel primarily in an original fashion because of the original nature of the Christ event.

Because the discussion emphasizes Matthew's hermeneutics, this chapter assumes that the emendations in the Matthew 27:9, 10 quotation arise from Matthew's own innovation. Such an assumption is made because of the extent of alterations in the quotation. The quote indeed seems "tailor-made" for the context.⁶ Such a quotation would be

Targums) more than one verse at a time or three from the prophets." "A minor may read the Law and translate (מתרגום) but he may not recite the 'shema' . . . one clothed in ragged garments may recite the 'shema' and translate but he may not read the Law . . . A blind person may recite the shema and translate." Philip Blackman, Mishnayoth, 7 vols. (New York: The Judaica Press, Inc., 1964), 2:457, 458. For such an early dating, see also M. Gaster, Samaritan Oral Law and Ancient Tradition, (London: The Search Publishing Company, 1932), pp. 47-52. "We have in the Targumim the oldest deposition of so much of the Oral Law and Traditions as could be brought within the compass of the Written Law." The "Sitz im Leben" of the Targums was the Synagogue. However, as one observes in the quotes above, Targums were not merely produced by rabbis but also by the laity. Daniel Patte, Early Jewish Hermeneutic in Palestine, Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series, vol. 22 (Missoula, Montana: Printing Department of the University of Montana, 1975), pp. 50, 51.

⁶See pp. 41-44 for a discussion of this.

difficult to explain outside of the context. Hence, the solution appears best that Matthew made the changes.

In observing and delineating the hermeneutics in the appropriation of this Old Testament quotation, the following chapter will observe the existence of three aspects in the four sources above, namely, Matthew, the Tannaitic rabbis, Targums, and Qumran literature. First, one must consider the presuppositions which an author demonstrates regarding the Old Testament and, consequently, how the Old Testament relates to the community which the author has in mind. Such presuppositions answer the question of how an Old Testament passage in its original context can have meaning for the time and community of the contemporary author. Secondly, one must consider the methodology employed in appropriating the Old Testament quotation. In Matthew 27:9, 10 several techniques become apparent: an introductory formula, an alteration of the text, the integration of another portion of Scripture, and typology. As one may expect, the hermeneutical presuppositions determine the methodology involved in appropriating the quotation. However, a matter to be confronted is whether authors with differing hermeneutical presuppositions can employ the same methodologies of appropriation. Thirdly, the literary genre becomes important for the questions of hermeneutics. The genre in which an author decides to appropriate Scripture communicates

aspects of his hermeneutical presuppositions.⁷

Before proceeding further, a few additional remarks about the literary genre are necessary. Thus far, the discussion in this thesis has primarily concerned the quotations of Matthew 27:9, 10 without giving much attention to the context in verses three through eight. However, a discussion of the literary genre must consider the context, since rabbinic literature has a genre called "midrash" in which a scriptural quotation occurs with elaboration of that passage. Hence, because of the similarity which some have found between Matthew 27:9, 10 and midrash,⁸ that genre, which includes quote and elaboration, will come into primary consideration.

A definition, and therefore the extent, of midrash in rabbinic literature is difficult because scholars assert various definitions and distinguishing characteristics of midrash. In reaction to this confusion, Addison Wright despairingly says: ". . . the word midrash at present is an equivocal term and is being used to describe a mass of

⁷Patte, Jewish Hermeneutic, pp. 250-255.

⁸Jan William Doeve, Jewish Hermeneutics in the Synoptic Gospels and Acts (Assen: van Gorcum, 1954), pp. 185-187; F. Mans "Un Midrash chrétien: le récit de la mort de Judas," Revue de Science religieuse 54 (1980):197-203; M. D. Goulder, Midrash and Lection in Matthew (London: SPCK, 1974), pp. 125-129.

disparate material."⁹ For example, Addison G. Wright claims that the distinguishing characteristic of midrash is its literary genre, namely, a genre of literature which begins with a text of Scripture and comments on it in some way.¹⁰ Pursuant to this definition, he distinguishes three types of midrashic literary structure: exegetical, namely, brief comments on the text; homiletical, which involves slightly longer discussion about the texts; and narrative, which includes extended exposition on the text.¹¹ S. Horovitz designates midrash as an exegetical method which delves more deeply than the literal sense of Scripture and thereby penetrates into the biblical text in a way not immediately obvious.¹² Daniel Patte views midrash as an attitude toward Scripture, namely an inquiring of God.¹³ He bases his opinion upon a delineation of "דרש," the Hebrew word from which "midrash" is derived. In the Old Testament it means "to inquire." It frequently refers to an inquiring of God for a solution of a problem or for knowledge of the fu-

⁹Addison G. Wright, "The Literary Genre Midrash," Catholic Biblical Quarterly 28 (1966):108.

¹⁰Ibid., pp. 108, 119.

¹¹Ibid., pp. 124-128.

¹²S. Horovitz, "Midrash," in The Jewish Encyclopedia, vol. 8, ed. by Isidore Singer, Isaac K. Funk, Frank H. Vizetelly, et. al. (New York: Funk and Wagnalls Company, 1912), pp. 548-550.

¹³Patte, Jewish Hermeneutic, pp. 117-122.

ture.¹⁴ Related to Patte's theory, Douglas Moo sees the hermeneutical presuppositions as the crucial aspect for midrash.¹⁵ These presuppositions involve the belief that God is no longer revealing himself in history, that Israelites must possess divine guidance for all aspects of life, and that Scripture provides the material for this guidance.¹⁶ In the opinion of the present author, it is best to follow the opinions of Patte or Moo and distinguish midrash according to hermeneutical axioms rather than by the disparity of literary genre as with Wright. However, for the purposes of this thesis, agreement on a definition is not primary. Most important is whether the characteristics of Matthew's handling of the Old Testament passage in 27:9-10¹⁷ occur at all in the rabbinic Judaism before or contemporaneously with Matthew.¹⁸

¹⁴S. Zeitlin, "Midrash: A Historical Study," Jewish Quarterly Review 44 (1953):21-25. This is cited by Patte, Jewish Hermeneutic, p. 118, notes 4 and 5.

¹⁵Douglas Moo, The Old Testament in the gospel Passion Narratives (Sheffield, England: The Almond Press, 1983), pp. 65, 66. Because the hermeneutical axioms for rabbinical Judaism will appear below, the thesis will forgo a delineation of them at the present time.

¹⁶Ibid.

¹⁷Also, as stated, one may need to integrate verses 3-8 into the discussion.

¹⁸Payne argues that midrash did not exist yet in Jesus' day. Rather, he claims that it developed later. Philip Barton Payne, "Midrash and History in the Gospels with Special Reference to R. H. Gundry's Matthew," in Gospel Perspectives--Studies in Midrash and Historiography, 6 vols., ed. by R. T. France and David Wenham (Sheffield, England:

Below one will find statements about tendencies which scholars assert regarding midrash. Although an all-inclusive definition of midrash appears difficult, tendencies are possible to delineate. In summary, this chapter assumes that the mere appearance of methodology similar to Matthew is sufficient grounds to integrate a particular rabbinic passage into the discussion about Matthew, regardless of whether the particular rabbinic passage can definitively be called midrash. Moreover, the chapter assumes that one may cite tendencies about the material labelled midrash, although a definitive list of characteristics is not possible.

A second type of Jewish literature receives some at-

JSOT Press, 1983), 3:197, 198. Most disagree, asserting that much of the Tannaim literature was indeed midrash. For example, see Moo, Passion, pp. 6, 12-14. Regarding the Mishnah, Metzger states that its dating goes back to the time of Christ. "Although the sixty-three tractates of the Mishnah were not finally reduced to writing until about the close of the second century, by the Patriarch Judah (died c. 219), it is commonly allowed that their contents faithfully reproduce the oral teaching of the generations of the Tannaim, who date from about the beginning of the Christian era." Bruce M. Metzger, "The Formulas Introducing quotations of Scripture in the NT and the Mishnah," Journal of Biblical Literature 70 (1951):297, n. 1. See also George Foot Moore, Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era, the Age of the Tannaim, 3 vols. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1932), 1:3-4. He also asserts an early date.

tention, namely, Targums.¹⁹ One may define them as elaborative paraphrases of Scripture.²⁰ Hence, this genre concerns only the quotation (27:9, 10), not the context as in midrash. Again definitions become hazy with Targums and the also the distinction between Targum and midrash. Generally, the distinction lies in the fact that a Targum paraphrases a text and midrash involves more extensive elaboration.²¹ As one can expect, therefore, much overlap exists between midrash and Targums. This is especially the case with the common exegetical techniques, the middoth, as taught by rabbis Hillel²² and Eliezer ben Jose ha-Gelily.²³ Renée Bloch sees Targums as the origin of the midrash and the

¹⁹Gundry is a strong advocate that Matthew altered this quotation in a targumic fashion. Robert H. Gundry, The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel with Special Reference to the Messianic Hope (Leiden, Netherlands: E. J. Brill, 1967), pp. 172-174.

²⁰Payne, "Gundry," p. 22. Patte, Jewish Hermeneutic, p. 49.

²¹For example, E. E. Ellis is uncertain regarding how much elaboration is required before targum becomes midrash. E. E. Ellis, "Midrash, Targum and New Testament Quotations," in Neotestamentica et Semitica: Studies in Honour of Matthew Black, ed. by E. Earle Ellis and Max Wilcon (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1969), pp. 64-65.

²²For a delineation of these seven middoth, see Moo, Passion, pp. 27, 28. Also see p. 96, n. 80 of this thesis where several of these middoth appear.

²³For a listing of these thirty-two middoth, see Hermann L. Strack, Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash (New York: Atheneum Press, 1931), pp. 95-98.

genre which contains all the themes of the later midrash.²⁴ Because there is a close relationship between these two types of genre, a delineation of the characteristics of one will appear (usually midrash) in the divisions of this chapter. Thereafter, a statement will appear regarding whether Targums agree or disagree in the respective point.

Literary Genre

In the area of literary genre, Matthew 27:3-10 has some similarities with midrash, Targums, and DSH. First, it has minor similarity regarding the basic structure of the genre employed. Specifically, a narrative is associated with a quotation. However, as one observes in this portion of Matthew, a narrative regarding Judas occurs first. Then the quotation appears as corroboration of this event as a fulfillment of the Old Testament. This structure in Matthew disagrees with a usual characteristic of midrash where a textual quotation appears first, and then comes the elaboration.

וַיֹּאמֶר מֹשֶׁה אֶל הָעָם אַל תִּירְאוּ הָרִי
 מֹשֶׁה מִזְרוֹן לְהוֹדִיעַ חֲכֵמְתוֹ שֶׁל מֹשֶׁה הַיָּאֵךְ הִיא
 עוֹמֵד וּמְפַיֵּס לְכָל אוֹתָם הָאֵלִפִּים וְהַרְבָּבוֹת וְעַלִּיו
 מִפּוֹרֶשֶׁבֶקְבֵּלָה וְהַחֲכָמָה תַּעֲזוּ לְחַכֵּם וְגוֹא²⁵

²⁴Renée Bloch, "Moïse dans la Tradition Rabbinique," Cahiers Sioniens 8 (1954):214-215.

²⁵Mekilta de-Rabbi Ishmael--A Critical Edition on the Basis of the Manuscripts and Early Editions with an English Translation, Introduction and Notes, 3 vols., ed. by Jacob Z. Lauterbach (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publications Society of America, 1949), 1:210. "And Moses said unto the people: 'Fear ye not.' Behold! Moses is rallying them. This is to

Payne states that midrash centers around consecutive Old Testament passages. It begins with a quotation and then makes comments. Besides brief comments as in the quote above, it also tells illustrative stories.²⁶ The same aspect of text and then commentary appears in the entire Habakkuk Commentary. Below one finds an example from DSH 7:17-8:3.

[וצדיק באמונתו יחיה]
 פשרו על כול-עושי התורה בבית יהודה אשר
 יצילים אל מבית המשפט בעבור עמלם ואמנתם
 במורה הצדק²⁷

However, the line of continuity in Matthew is not consecutive Old Testament passages but the life of Jesus. Deletion of the Old Testament quotations, including 27:9, 10, would not interrupt the narrative. It appears that Matthew was not interpreting the Old Testament. Rather, he interpreted the life of Jesus in terms of the Old Testament. Therefore, in the structure of literary genre, Matthew has only minor similarity with Qumran and midrash which fit more under the

proclaim the wisdom of Moses, how he stood there pacifying all these thousands and myriads. Of him it is stated in the traditional sacred writings: 'Wisdom is a stronghold to the wise man,' etc. (Eccl. 7. 19)."

²⁶Payne, "Midrash and History," pp. 199-201.

²⁷William H. Brownlee, The Midrash Peshar of Habakkuk, Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series, number 24 (Ann Arbor: Edwards Brothers, Inc., 1979), p. 125. "[But the righteous through their steadfast faith will live.] Its prophetic meaning concerns all the doers of the Law in the house of Judah whom God will deliver from the house of damnation, because of their patient suffering and their steadfast faith in the Teacher of Right."

category of a commentary because they begin with a text. Similarly, Targums do not have affinity with the genre of Matthew 27:3-10 because, as mentioned, they involve a running paraphrase of the Old Testament text. However, in taking the unit of 27:9, 10 Targums do appear very similar because both are interpretive paraphrases. The following example is a targumic paraphrase of Genesis 3:15.

ודבבו אשוי בינך ובין אתתא ובין בנךובין בנהא הוא
 28 יהא דכיר מה דעבדת ליה מלקדמין ואתתהי נטר ליה לסופם

Secondly, in a different aspect of literary genre, Matthew and DSH appear similar whereas midrash differs. The former two have in common a detailed correspondence of narrative and quotation.²⁹ Namely, when one reads the context of Matthew 27:9, 10 in comparison with the actual quotation, one observes common terms and themes.³⁰ The Habakkuk Commentary 10:5-13, for example, demonstrates this

²⁸A. Berliner, ed., Targum Onkelos, 2 vols. in 1 (Berlin: Gorzelanczyk & Co., 1884), 1:3. The following English translation comes from J. W. Etheridge, ed., The Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan ben Uzziel on the Pentateuch (New York: Ktav Publishing House, 1968), p. 41. "And I will put enmity between thee and between the woman, and between thy son and her son. He will remember thee, what thou didst do to him (at) from the beginning, and thou shalt be observant unto him at the end."

²⁹Douglas Moo, "Tradition and Old Testament in Matthew 27:9-10," in Gospel Perspectives: Studies in Midrash and Historiography, vol. 3, ed. by R. T. France and David Wenham (Sheffield: JSOT Press), p. 167.

³⁰For example there is τα (τριακοντα) αργυρια in verses three, four, six, and nine. One finds τιμη in six and nine. There are αγρος and τον αγρον του κερραμεως in seven and ten. One finds the purchase of the field in seven and ten.

characteristic also.

הוֹי
 בונה עיר בדמים ויכונן קריה בעולה הלוא
 הנה מעם יהוה צבאות יגעו עמים בדי אש
 ולאומים בדי ריק ויעפו
 פשר הדבר על מטיף הכוזב אשר התעה רבים
 לבנות עיר שוו בדמים ולקים עדה בשקר
 בעבור כבודה לוגיע רבים בעבודת שוו ולהרותם
 ב[מע]שי שקר להיות עמלם לריק בעבור יבואו
 למשפטי אש אשר גדפו ויחרפו את בחירי אל³¹

However, midrash often uses Scripture merely as a peg on which to hang a discourse.³² In midrash, the scriptural passage ". . . is very often little more than a stimulus for a composition which is developed in complete independence of it."³³ In the following quote, the rabbi comments on "מצרים בארץ" from Exodus 12:1 which reads thus in its entirety:

"וַיֹּאמֶר יְיָ אֱלֹהֵי מֹשֶׁה וְאַל אַהֲרֹן בְּאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם."

בארץ מצרים חוץ לכרך אתה אומר חוץ
 לכרך או אינו אלא בתוך הכרך כשהוא אומר
 ויאמר אליו משה כצאתי את העיר וגו' והלא
 דברים קל וחמר ומה אם תפלה הקלה לא התפלל
 משה אלא חוץ לכרך דבור החמור דין הוא שלא
 נדבר עמו אלא חוץ לכרך ומפני מה לא נדבר

³¹Brownlee, Habakkuk, p. 167. "'Alas, for him who builds a city through bloodshed and sets up an assembly through deceit!. Is it not, indeed, from YHWH of Hosts that peoples have toiled only for fire, and folks to no avail, and grow weary?' The prophetic meaning of the passage concerns the Prophet of Lies, who beguiled many into building through bloodshed his city of vanity and into erecting through falsehood a congregation for enhancing its glory. He thereby forced many into tiresome toil at his labor of vanity and sated them with [wor]ks of falsehood, so that their travail should be to no avail--with the result that they should enter the judgments of fire, since they have reviled and insulted the elect of God."

³²Moo, Passion, pp. 12, 13.

³³R. Le Deaut, "Apropos A Definition of Midrash," Interpretation 25 (1971):274.

עמו בתוך הכרך לפי שהיתה מלאה שיקוצים
 וגילולים. ועד שלא נבחרה ארץ ישראל היו כל
 הארצות כשרות לדברות משנבחרה ארץ ישראל
 יצאו כל הארצות עד שלא נבחרה ירושלים היתה
 כל ארץ ישראל כשרה למזבחות משנבחרה
 ירושלים יצאה כל ארץ ישראל...³⁴

A third area of literary genre requires discussion, the creation of narrative on the basis of the Old Testament Quotation. It does not appear that Matthew 27:3-8 was created from the quotation in 9-10.³⁵ Rather, the opposite appears most likely because the quotation had been altered

³⁴"Mekilta de-Rabbi Ishmael," 1:3, 4. "This means outside of the city. You say it means outside of the city; perhaps it means within the city? Since, however, it says: 'And Moses said unto him: As soon as I am gone out of the city, I will spread forth my hands unto the Lord (Ex. 9: 29),' should we not apply the argument of Kal vahomer? If with regard to prayer, the less important, Moses would utter it only outside of the city, it is but a logical inference that with regard to the divine word, the more important, He would speak it to him only outside of the city. And why, indeed, did He not speak with him within the city? Because it was full of abominations and idols. Before the land of Israel had been especially chosen, all lands were suitable for divine revelations; after the land of Israel had been chosen, all other lands were eliminated. Before Jerusalem had been especially selected, the entire land of Israel was suitable for altars; after Jerusalem had been selected, all the rest of the land of Israel was eliminated. . . ."

³⁵Montefiore argues the opposite. C. G. Montefiore, The Synoptic Gospels, vol. 2, 2nd ed. (London: MacMillan, 1927), p. 329. Also see Georg Strecker, Der Weg der Gerechtigkeit--Untersuchung zur Theologie des Matthäus, 3rd ed. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1973), pp. 76-80.

so drastically to fit this narrative.³⁶ Most strongly in favor of this assertion is the insertion of the Jeremiah passage in order to accord with this narrative.³⁷ Hence, Matthew is an historically accurate narrative with Old Testament quotations supporting it. The contents of the Habakkuk Commentary are also based upon historical occurrences. Admittedly, the vague terminology such as "Teacher of Righteousness," "Wicked Priest," and the "Liar"³⁸ do not

³⁶". . . 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 by them." P. Benoit, "The Death of Judas," in Jesus and the Gospel, 2 vols., trans. by Benet Weatherhead (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1973), 1:206. This book is helpful for a presentation of recent theories.

³⁷Moo, "Matt 27:3-10," p. 165.

³⁸Geza Vermes explains the quandary regarding these three men. Their identity and relationship to known historical events are impossible to pinpoint. Little about them is discernable except their opposition to each other. "Unfortunately, on the most vital topic of all, the question of the identity of the Teacher of Righteousness, we can be nothing like as clear. If the 'Wicked Priest' was Jonathan Maccabaeus, the Teacher would, of course, have been one of his contemporaries. Yet all we know of him is that he was a priest, no doubt of Zadokite affiliation, though obviously opposed to Onias IV since he did not follow him to Egypt and to his unlawful Temple in Leontopolis. He founded or re-founded the Community. He transmitted to them his own distinctive interpretation of the Prophets and, if we can rely on the Hymns, of the laws relating to the celebration of the festivals. The 'Liar' and his sympathizers in the congregation of the Hasidim disagreed with him, and after a violent confrontation between the two factions in which the Liar gained the upper hand, the Teacher and his remaining followers fled to a place of refuge called 'the land of Damascus': . . ." Geza Vermes, The Dead Sea Scrolls in English, 3rd ed. (Sheffield, England: JSOT Press, 1987), p. 32.

assist in matching known historical occurrences with specific Qumran passages. However, the history of the Qumran community is central in the Habakkuk commentary. The Old Testament does not create the events.³⁹

הוֹי מִשְׁקָה רַעִי הוּ מִסְפַּח
חַמְתוּ אֶפֶס שֹׁכֵר לְמַעַן הַבֵּט אֶל מוֹעֲדֵיהֶם
פָּשְׂרוּ עַל הַכּוֹהֵן הַרְשַׁע אֲשֶׁר
רָדַף אַחֲרַי מוֹרֵה הַצַּדִּיק לְבַלְעוּ בְכַעֲם
חַמְתוּ אֲבֵית גְּלוֹתוֹ וּבִקְצֵי מוֹעֵד מְנוּחַת
יּוֹם הַכַּפּוּרִים הוֹפִיעַ אֵלֵיהֶם לְבַלְעֵם
וּלְכַשִּׁילֵם בְּיוֹם צוֹם שַׁבַּת מְנוּחָתָם⁴⁰

The picture looks much different with midrash (and also Targums). Namely, a common characteristic is the creation of written narrative on the basis of the Old Testament text, often using earlier oral tradition.⁴¹ The narratives found in midrash tend to be homilies or illustrations for halakic purposes.⁴² For example, in a midrash on Exodus 14:13b, the

³⁹Brownlee, Habakkuk, p. 25; Vermes, Dead Sea Scrolls, pp. 24-27.

⁴⁰Brownlee, Habakkuk, p. 179. "Alas for him who makes his neighbors drink the outpouring of his wrath, year (sic.) strong drink, so as to gloat over their stumblers. Its prophetic meaning concerns the Wicked Priest who pursued the Righteous Teacher in order to make him reel, through the vexation of his wrath, at his house of exile. It was at the time of the festival of the resting of the Day of Atonement that he manifested himself to them, in order to make them reel and to trip them on the day of fasting, the sabbath of their resting."

⁴¹For midrash see Vermes, Scripture and Tradition, p. 7; Moo, Passion, pp. 53, 54. For Targums see Patte, Jewish Hermeneutic, pp. 53, 63, 64.

⁴²Moo, "Matt 27:3-10," p. 167; R. Bloch, "Midrash," Dictionnaire de la Bible. Supplément, vol. 5, ed. by L. Pirot, A. Robert, and Henri Cazelles (Paris: Librairie Letovzey et Ane., 1957):col. 1265.

author makes up the following events.

כי אשר ראיתם את מצרים וגו'...
 נעשו לישראל על הים אחת אומרת ניפול לים
 ואחת אומרת נחזור למצרים ואחת אומרת נעשה
 מלחמה כנגדן ואחת אומרת נצווה כנגדן זאת
 שאמרה ניפול לים נאמר לה התיצבו וראו את
 ישועת יי זו שאמרה נחזור למצרים נאמר לה כי
 אשר ראיתם את מצרים וגו' וזו שאמרה נעשה
 מלחמה כנגדן נאמר לה יי ילחם לכם וזו שאמרה
 נצווה כנגדן נאמר לה ואתם תחרישון.⁴³

Thus, in terms of historicity, Matthew and the Habakkuk Commentary indeed emphasize it. However, midrash is not known for emphasizing it. Indeed no other type of rabbinical genre comes close to Matthew. Hence, a noticeable difference exists here between Matthew, midrash, and Targums in this aspect of literary genre.

In summary, when taking the unit of Matthew 27:9, 10 alone, one does notice substantial similarity with Targums because both consist of interpretive paraphrase. Matthew 27:3-8 has some similarity in appearance to midrash because it is a narrative associated with a quotation. Obviously, 3-8 differs from midrash because the narrative is inverted in relationship to the quotation. With Matthew the quote

⁴³Mekilta de Rabbi Ishmael, 1:213, 214. "'For whereas ye have seen the Egyptians today, etc. . . . The Israelites at the Red Sea were divided into four groups. One group said: Let us throw ourselves into the sea. One said: Let us return to Egypt. One said: Let us fight with them. The one that said: "Let us throw ourselves into the sea," was told: "Stand still, and see the salvation of the Lord." The one that said: "Let us return to Egypt," was told: "For whereas ye have seen the Egyptians today," etc. The one that said: "Let us fight them" was told: "The Lord will fight for you." The one that said: "Let us cry out against them," was told: "And ye shall hold your peace."

serves as corroboration of the narrative rather than the basis of the narrative as with midrash. Other differences occur. Matthew and Qumran stand against midrash and Targum in the aspects of a detailed correspondence of quotation and narrative. In addition, Matthew and DSH agree against the midrash (and less so Targums) in not creating "historical" narrative from the Old Testament text. Therefore, Matthew 27:3-10 is a hybrid of some points of extra-biblical genre as well as original innovations.

Methods of Appropriation

The Introductory Formula

As one will notice, Matthew 27:9 includes a formula which sets the stage for the quotation. This formula asserts a relationship between the narrated text and the quotation. The formula's most important components are "τοτε επληρωθη."⁴⁴ Then it includes a further specification

⁴⁴The verb "πληρωω" indeed plays an important role in the New Testament and in this thesis. Therefore, a brief word study is in order. The verb occurs 86 times in the New Testament. It can refer to people being filled with the Holy Spirit (Acts 6:3, 5; 9:36). In 2 Tim 4:5, 17 it speaks of carrying out the preaching ministry. It refers to the fulfillment of time. First, there is a general sense of a coming to an end or an expiration (Luke 1:23, 57; 2:6, 21). Secondly, a more specific fulfillment of salvation history also occurs (Luke 9:51, 21:24, Acts 2:1). It can refer to the fulfillment of God's will (Matt. 5:17, Rom. 13:8, Gal. 5:14). It speaks of Christ, for example, being filled with grace and truth (John 1:16). It may speak of filling a need or something lacking (1 Cor. 16:17, Phil. 2:30). It speak of completing joy (John 15:11, 17:13). Finally, the verb refers to fulfillment of Old Testament Scripture. A list of these passages has already appeared on p. 26, note 2.

through the words, "το ρηθεν δια Ιερεμιου του προφητου λεγοντος." Primary attention will be placed on the former section of the formula since the latter merely specifies the former.

The occurrence of introductory formulae exists both in early rabbinic midrashim and Qumran. (Targums lack introductory formulae.) First, regarding the Tannaitic writings, Bruce M. Metzger has studied such formulae.⁴⁵ He discovered that formulae with a form of "אמר" by far occur most frequently, while "כתב" and "דבר" are less common, and "קום" only twice.⁴⁶ These two occurrences of "קום" are the closest formulae to the idea of a fulfillment.⁴⁷ There he cites the following formulae: "שני כתובים קימים" from Sheqalim 6:6 and "קימת" from Baba Qamma 3:9. Nevertheless, Metzger correctly cites them as having no similarity to Matthew, since they speak about Scripture being fulfilled when anyone complies with a certain Mosaic precept. In addition, Metzger notes that formulae in the Mishna are relatively short,

⁴⁵Bruce M. Metzger, "The Formulas Introducing Quotations of Scripture in the NT and the Mishnah," Journal of Biblical Literature 70 (1951):297-307. A specific study on midrashic formulae was not available. However, although the Mishna is not strictly considered midrash, the genres are similar. In addition, the Mishna and midrash arise from the same group of rabbis from the same time period. Therefore, the usage of formulae should be very similar.

⁴⁶Ibid., pp. 298-300.

⁴⁷Ibid., pp. 301, 307, n. 18.

normally three or four words.⁴⁸

Introductory formulae also occur at Qumran. Here one will notice similar formulae to the Mishna. Joseph A. Fitzmyer provides an exact count of the frequency of each formula. He cites thirty-two formulae with a form of "אמר," eleven entries for "כתב," one time for "נגד," and three occurrences for "כתב" and "אמר" together.⁴⁹ However, Fitzmyer notes a difference which he sees as important. Qumran formulae are much more diverse in wording than those of the Tannaites, which most often merely employ a form of "אמר" with little added to it.⁵⁰ One observes a difference between Qumran and the Tannaites not only with the key words cited above but also by the diversity of words which accompany.⁵¹ Surprisingly, however, no introductory formulae appear at Qumran which correspond to "πληρω." It is sur-

⁴⁸Ibid., pp. 299-305. A majority of the formulae he quotes are less than four words long. Some examples are "משום שנאמר, על זה נאמר, מהו אומר." In addition to that, longer ones appear: "ככתוב בתורת משה עבדך לאמר" and "ועליו הוא מפרש על-ידי".

⁴⁹Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "The Use of Explicit Old Testament Quotations in Qumran Literature and in the New Testament," New Testament Studies 7 (1960-61):300-301. The formulae cited by Fitzmyer occur not only in the Habakkuk Commentary but also in CD, 1QM, 4QFlor, 11Q Melch., and 1QS.

⁵⁰Ibid., p. 305.

⁵¹Ibid., p. 301. Metzger's article has such formulae, for example: "אשר כתוב בספר ישעיה הנביא לאחרית הימים," "ואמה אשר כתוב עליהמה בספר יחזקאל הנביא אשר".

prising because of the emphasis of fulfillment at Qumran.⁵² Fitzmyer provides two examples which have some affinity with "πληρωσ." However, one will observe the chasm which remains. Namely, they refer to a future event which shows a prophecy coming true, not the stark, purposeful and predictive idea of fulfillment in Matthew.

. . . בבוא הדבר אשר כתוב בדברי ישעיה בן אמוץ הנביא אשר . . .
RM' (C.D. 7:10-11)⁵³

. . . בבוא הדבר אשר כתוב ביד זכריה הנביא (C.D. 19:7)⁵⁴

In summary, the appearance of introductory formulae is an important factor which Matthew has in common with his DSH, midrash, and Targumim. However, one will notice that Matthew, unlike the others, has a formula which includes the idea of fulfillment of the Old Testament. This difference becomes a very important aspect in the section on hermeneutical presuppositions.⁵⁵

Modification of the Text

As already observed in chapter two, Matthew alters the wording of his quotation in order to correspond with the events surrounding Judas and the betrayal. However, it must

⁵²See pp. 118, 119.

⁵³Fitzmyer, "Quotations," p. 303. ". . . when the word will come true which is written in the words of the prophet Isaiah, son of Amoz, who said . . ."

⁵⁴Ibid. ". . . when the word will come true which was written by Zechariah the prophet . . ."

⁵⁵See pp. 122, 123.

be noted that in spite of some substantial changes, Matthew retains the basic thrust of the Zechariah and Jeremiah passages. First, Matthew takes the following from Zechariah: thirty pieces of silver are paid; the payment was a mockery to somebody; the children of Israel were the mockers; a potter is involved; all happened according to the Lord's command. Then from Jeremiah, Matthew imports a field associated with violence.

Emendations of a text occurred with extra-biblical literature also. With midrash, such alteration occurs rarely in comparison to Matthew and Qumran. Joseph Bonsirven provides an entire section on such alterations.⁵⁶ However, those which he includes are not in the style of Matthew or Qumran. The rabbis first provide the correct text and then propose a rendering in the commentary which they deem as better according to their presuppositions.⁵⁷ For the first example from comments on Exodus 12:17, the emendation fits the Jewish emphasis on the law.

ושמרתם את המצוות כדרך שאין
 מחמצין את המצה כך לא יחמיצו את המצוה אלא
 אם באת מצוה לידך עשה אותה מיד.⁵⁸

⁵⁶Joseph Bonsirven, Exégèse Rabbinique et Exégèse Paulinienne (Paris: Beauchesne et ses fils, 1939), pp. 117-130. The textual alterations mentioned by Bonsirven come from the Tannaitic writings listed in footnote number one of this chapter.

⁵⁷See pp. 112-115.

⁵⁸Mekilta de-Rabbi Ishmael, vol. 2, p. 74. "And Ye shall observe the (feast of) unleavened bread (ha-mazzot). R. Josiah says: Do not read it so, but: 'Ye shall observe

Bonsirven places the next example regarding Exodus 14:22 in the category of textual conjecture in the fashion of modern critics.⁵⁹

ויבאו בני ישראל רבי מאיר אומר בלשון
 אחד ורבי יהודה אומר בלשון אחר רבי מאיר
 אומר כשעמדו השבטים על הים זה אומר אני ארד
 תחלה לים וזה אומר אני ארד תחלה לים מתוך
 שהיו עומדין וצוהבין קפץ שבטו של בנימין וירך
 לים תחלה שנאמר שם בנימין צעיר רודם אל תקרם
 לים רודם אלא רד ים . . .⁶⁰

Therefore, although the rabbis do practice the emendation of texts, they pursue it in a different manner from Matthew and, as one will see, Qumran.

Targums have a close affinity with Matthew 27:9, 10 at this point of textual emendation. This genre consists of the Old Testament texts, often having been emended for the Jews' interpretive purposes. One already observed this in the quote about from a Targum on Genesis 3:15. Other instances can be cited. For example, with regard to Genesis

the commandments (ha-mizvot). Just as one should not be slow when making the *mazzah*, lest it leaven, so should one not be slow to perform a religious duty. But if a religious duty comes your way, perform it immediately."

⁵⁹Bonsirven, Exégèse, p. 123.

⁶⁰Mekilta de-Rabbi Ishmael, vol. 1, p. 232. "'And the children of Israel went into the midst of the sea.' R. Meir relates one version and R. Judah relates another version. R. Meir says: When the tribes of Israel stood by the sea, one said: 'I will go down to the sea first,' and the other said: 'I will go down to the sea first.' While they were thus standing there wrangling with each other, the tribe of Benjamin jumped up and went down to the sea first. For it says: 'There is Benjamin the youngest, ruling them' (Ps. 68:28). Do not read *rodem*, 'ruling them' but *rod-yam*, 'braving the sea.'"

14:18 a Targum clarifies the mysterious identity of Melchizedek by claiming him as Sem, son of Noah.⁶¹ In addition, a Targum of Numbers (16:25) claims that Dathan and Abiron kept manna against the Lord's command.⁶² In reverence to the Lord and in deference to humans, the Targum Onkelos alters Exodus 24:10 where the Masoretic Text states that Moses and the elders saw the Lord. The Targum states that they saw the glory of the Lord.⁶³

Again, there is similarity between Qumran and Matthew. For instance, there is an alteration of a verb from singular to plural in order to match the accompanying commentary. In column v, 8 DSH quotes Habakkuk 1:13b.⁶⁴ DSH changes the singular verb תביט to a plural.

MT: למה תביט בוגדים

DSH: למה תביטו בוגדים⁶⁵

This alteration matches nicely with the interpretation which follows concerning the "men" who keep quiet during a time of

⁶¹E. G. Clarke, ed. Targum of Pesudo-Jonathan of the Pentateuch: Text and Concordance (Hoboken: Ktav Publishing House, Inc., 1984), p. 15. "ומלכא צדיקא הוא שם בר נח מלכא." "דירו שלים."

⁶²Ibid., p. 178. "וקם משה ואזל לאוכחא לדתן ולאבירם." "ואזלו בתרוי סבי ישראל."

⁶³A. Berliner, Targum Onkelos, p. 87. "והזו ית יקר" אלהא דישראל ותחות כורסי יקריה כעובד אבן טבא וכמיחזי שמיא לברירו."

⁶⁴Brownlee, Habakkuk, p. 91.

⁶⁵"Why, O traitors, will ye (pl.) look on."

reproof.

פֶּשְׁרוֹ עַל בֵּית אַבְשָׁלוֹם
 וְאִנְשֵׁי עֲצַתָּם אֲשֶׁר נִדְמוּ בְּתוֹכָהּ מוֹרֵה הַצַּדִּיק . . .⁶⁶

A second example helps illustrate this similarity to Matthew. In Matthew 27:9, the evangelist has changed the noun "הֵיקָר" into a passive participle "τετιμημενου." In the Habakkuk Commentary viii:5, a fairly similar instance occurs where the author changes two active verbs from Habakkuk 2:5b into passive verbs (qal to niphal) in order to fit his commentary. The verbs in question are "וַיֵּאסֶף" and "וַיִּקְבֹּץ" from the Masoretic Text. In addition, the verbs were altered from singular to plural in order to fit the context.

MT: וַיֵּאסֶף אֱלֹהֵי כָל־הָעַמִּים וַיִּקְבֹּץ אֱלֹהֵי כָל־הָעַמִּים

DSH: וַיֵּאסְפוּ אֱלֹהֵי כָל־הָעַמִּים וַיִּקְבְּצוּ אֱלֹהֵי כָל־הָעַמִּים⁶⁷

The commentary which follows the quotes demonstrates the effect of the alteration. Thereby, the author states in viii, 9 how the Wicked Priest had success in the beginning, namely, all nations were gathered/gathered themselves unto him.⁶⁸

⁶⁶Ibid., "Its prophetic meaning concerns the house of Absalom and the men of their council who kept quiet at the time of the reproof by the Teacher of Right."

⁶⁷Ibid. "All nations have been gathered to him, and all peoples have been amassed to him."

⁶⁸"Nifal-Formen, die als freiwillige Unterordnung der Völker gedeutet werden könnten, während die Singularform des M.T. dem Gottlosen die Singularform des M.T. dem Gottlosen die Sammlung der Völker zuschreibt." Leonhard Rost, "Der gegenwärtige Stand der Erforschung der in Palästina neu gefundenen hebräischen Handschriften: 12 Bemerkungen zum neuen Habakuktext," Theologische Literaturzeitung 75 (1950):

פִּשְׂרוֹ עַל הַכּוֹהֵן הַרְשֵׁעַ אֲשֶׁר
 69 נִקְרָא עַל שֵׁם הָאֵמֶת בְּתַחֲלַת עוֹמְדוֹ

We see such a change in Matthew 27:9 when the "ελαβον/ואקחה" is altered from the first person singular in the Old Testament to the third person plural. In addition, there is another example with Matthew's "ετιμησαντο" versus the Masoretic Text's "יקרתו."

In summary, Matthew, the rabbinic midrashim, and DSH occasionally altered their quotations upon appropriating them to contemporary settings. Targums often consist of textual alteration. Therefore, this is an important aspect of hermeneutics which all four (Matthew, midrashim, DSH, and Targums) have in common. It demonstrates that Matthew employed no new and controversial practice in altering the wording of his quotation.

Integration of Another Scriptural Passage

As stated in chapter two, Matthew 27:9, 10 consists of a combination of two sources, Zechariah 11:13 and verses from Jeremiah 19. It appears most likely that the passages were combined or merged on the basis of their common word, "potter" (יֹצֵר, κεραμεως) and the theme of "field," although

col. 479. See also Stendahl, School, p. 186. There he provides interesting comments on this topic.

⁶⁹Brownlee, Habakkuk, p. 131. "Its prophetic meaning concerns the Wicked Priest who was considered a member of the Truth Party (and called by the Name of Truth) at the beginning of his rule; . . ."

an equivalent to "αγρος" does not appear in Jeremiah 19.⁷⁰ The remaining themes of each of the two Old Testament quotations then fit well with the occurrence described in 27:3-8.⁷¹

It is significant that two types of textual integration appear in Matthew 27:9, 10. One is verbal, one thematic. An exact verbal integration appears with the transfer of the word "potter" from Jeremiah 19. However, as mentioned in chapter two, the exact word for "field" (αγρος) in the LXX or the Hebrew equivalent in the Masoretic Text) does not occur in Jeremiah 19. Therefore, a thematic integration of a text occurred here. One cannot unequivocally exclude the possibility that Matthew also had Jeremiah 18:2-3 or 32:6-9 in mind, both of which include "field." In that case, Matthew 27:9, 10 would include only a verbal integration of texts, nothing thematic. However, this appears less likely. As it will be shown below, both composite quotations and thematic integration of texts occurred with Matthew's DSH, midrash, and Targumim.

In the Targums, verbal composites do not appear. However, thematic types occur. For example, a theme from Leviticus 21:9 is brought into Targum Pseudo-Jonathan of Genesis 38:6, 24. Leviticus 21:9 states that if a priest's

⁷⁰Moo, "Matt. 27:3-10," pp. 159, 160.

⁷¹See the section on pp. 38-39 above which describes the similarities between Jeremiah 19 and Matt. 27:9, 10.

daughter commits fornication, she must be burned. The Masoretic Text of Genesis 38:6, 24 merely states that Tamar committed adultery and was sentenced to be burned. However, in these passages from Genesis, the Targum Pseudo-Jonathan integrates an assertion that Tamar was the daughter of Shem (supposedly Melchizedek) and, consequently, was sentenced to be burned in accordance with Leviticus 21:9⁷²

Composite quotations appear among the rabbis very rarely.⁷³ Bonsirven states the situation well.

Fréquemment, il est vrai, les rabbins utilisent plusieurs textes pour prouver une thèse, mais alors ils introduisent dans chaque texte une formule (ordinairement: "il dit"): il est rare de le voir amalgamer plusieurs sentences bibliques.⁷⁴

No amalgamation appears in the early Tannaitic midrash.

However, in the later Babylonian Talmud,⁷⁵ it does appear.

⁷²E. G. Clarke, ed., Targum Pseudo-Jonathan of the Pentateuch: Text and Concordance (Hoboken: Ktav Publishing House, Inc., 1984), p. 47. Verse 6: "ונסיב יהודה איתא לער בוכריה ברת" שם רבא ושמהא תמר והוה בזמן תלת ירחין אשתמודעה" דמעברה היא ואיתני ליהודה למימר זניית תמר כלתך ואוף הא מעברא לזנו ואמר יהודה הלא בת כהין היא הנפקוהא ותיתוקד." Another example occurs in the Targum to Isaiah 57:19. This Targum understands the "peace" in this text to refer the peace of those who kept the Torah or came back to it from Exodus. For an elaboration of this latter example, see Patte, Jewish Hermeneutic, p. 65.

⁷³E. E. Ellis, Paul's Use, pp. 50, 51.

⁷⁴Bonsirven, Exégèse, p. 336. "Frequently, it is true, the rabbis employ a number of texts to corroborate a point, but then they introduce each text with a formula (ordinarily: 'it says'): It is rare to see an amalgamation of several biblical verses."

⁷⁵The Babylonian Talmud was written by the rabbis known as the Amoraim in the third to fifth centuries. Richard N. Soulen, Handbook of Biblical Criticism, 2nd. ed. (Atlanta:

In "Sanhedrin" 38b, a combined quotation appears which consists of the following passages: Gen. 1:26, 27; 11:7, 5; 35:7, 3; Deut. 4:7; 2 Sam. 7:23; Dan. 7:9.⁷⁶ That set of merged quotes were strung together around a common theme, namely, that God did not need to consult His heavenly court before acting. Another merged quote exists in "Shabbath" 20a with the Ezek. 15:4 and Jer. 36:22.⁷⁷ These verses are merged around the common word "fire." Since rabbinic exegesis is normally based upon the middoth,⁷⁸ and since the middoth existed in the Tannaitic period, it is possible that the practice of combined quotations existed in the Tannaitic period, although they did not come in written form at that time. However, the weak point of this argument is the lack of such a quote from the Tannaitic period.

On the basis of quotes from Tannaitic midrash above, it appears that midrash integrates other passages into its commentary but not into the quote. Thematic integration is also present. For example, on p. 75 of this thesis, there was the example of a verbal integration from Eccl. 7:19. In addition, the same commentary speaks about the wisdom of

John Knox Press, 1981), p. 189.

⁷⁶I. Epstein, ed., "Sanhedrin," in The Babylonian Talmud, (London: The Soncino Press, 1935), pp. 244, 245.

⁷⁷Epstein, "Shabbath, in The Babylonian Talmud, Seder Mo'ed, p. 85.

⁷⁸For a description of the middoth, the rabbinic methods of interpretation, see p. 96, note 80.

Moses. Certainly, a thematic integration from other points of Scripture help to show that Moses had wisdom. Obviously, the difference between Matthew 27:9, 10 and such an example from midrash involves the integration of text into the quote versus integration in the commentary. However, it seems feasible that Matthew's alterations in 27:9, 10 could be construed as commentary, much like the alterations of Targums are additional comments on the text.⁷⁹

For DSH no direct parallel with Matthew exists in which the OT quotation has a composite of several passages. Rather, thematic influence of other passages is likely within the commentary on the respective quotation. Brownlee cites this as adherence to the seven exegetical rules of Hillel, of which four speak of applying other passages in explicating a given quote.⁸⁰ Brownlee describes the rule in the following manner: "Other passages of scripture may illumine the meaning of the original prophet."⁸¹ For ex-

⁷⁹Patte, Jewish Hermeneutic, p. 49.

⁸⁰Ibid., p. 75. Moo nicely delineates those rules which concern association of texts. "7) Gezerah Shawah -- on the basis of a verbal similarity between two texts, consideration having to do with one can be applied to the other; 3) Binyan ab mikathub 'ehad -- the principle of gezerah shawah employed with a number of texts; 4) Binyan ab mishene kethubim -- a further extension of gezerah shawah in which two initial texts provide the basis for the building up of a "family" of related passages; and 6) Kayoze bo bemaqom 'aher ("as it is found in another place") -- explanation by means of similar passages (the point of contact not necessarily verbal)." Moo, Passion, pp. 27, 28. Moo himself places the rules out of order.

⁸¹Brownlee, "Dead Sea Scrolls," p. 62.

amples from Qumran, Brownlee cites two portions of the comments on Habakkuk 1:8-9.⁸²

וקול מנמרים סוסו וחדו
 מאבי ערב פשו ופרשו פרשו מרחוק
 יעופו כנשר חש לאכול כולו לחמם יבוא מגמת
 פנו הם קדים [פשרו] על הכתיאימ אשר
 ידושו את הארץ בסוס[יהם] ובבהמתם וממרחק
 יבואו מאי הים לאכו[ל את כ] ול-העמים כנשר
 ואין שבצה ובחמה וכ[עם ובח]רן אף וזעף
 אפים ידברו עם[כול העמים כי] א הוא אשר
 אמר מ[גמת פניו הם קדים].⁸³

First, Brownlee states that the eschatological application regarding the Kittim arises from Num. 24:24 and Dan. 11:30. Secondly, one finds in the commentary an emphasis on the connection of speech and the wind. Besides the obvious notion from Habakkuk 1:9, he sees the influence of Job 6:26, 8:2.⁸⁴

In summary, Matthew integrates a passage from Jeremiah 19 into Zechariah 11:13. Two types of integration appear,

⁸²Ibid., pp. 62-64.

⁸³Although Brownlee's comments come from "Dead Sea Scrolls," pp. 62-64, the Hebrew and English translation come from Brownlee, Habakkuk, p. 68. "Their horses will be swifter than leopards and more agile than evening wolves. Their steeds trample and scatter; from afar they will swoop as an eagle, hastening to devour all of it. Furiously will they come--the mutterings of their face are the east wind. Its prophetic meaning concerns the Kittim, who will thresh the land with their horses and with their beasts; and from afar will they come from (remote) shores of the sea, to dev[our] all the peoples as an eagle, but without being satisfied. With wrath and vex[ation], and with the hot brea[th] of (their) nose and angry storm of their face they will speak with [all] the peoples; fo[r] that is what He said," The mutterings of their faces are the east wind."

⁸⁴Ibid., p. 64.

verbal and thematic. A verbal integration or a composite quotation only appears in later Amoritic Judaism. However, although such quotes are not present in written form, the "middoth" already prescribed integration of various texts. Therefore, such a practice may have already existed in Matthew's day. Thematic integration definitely does occur. The closest example in form to Matthew 27:9, 10 is the instance cited above from the Targum Jonathan. In addition, midrash and DSH demonstrate thematic integration, which appears in the commentary. However, one must remember that the alterations of Targum as well as Matthew could be considered commentary on the text.

Typology

This section will demonstrate that Matthew 27:9, 10 is typological according to a rather narrow definition of typology. It will then present parallels from rabbinic and Qumran literature which may be typological, depending on one's definition of typology.

The definition and, therefore, the extent of typology in Scripture has been a debated item.⁸⁵ Richard M. Davidson proposes a valid definition of typology on the basis of the

⁸⁵One of the latest and best works in the area has been the work by Richard M. Davidson, Typology in Scripture--A Study of Hermeneutical $\tau\upsilon\pi\omicron\varsigma$ Structures, Andrews University Seminary Doctoral Dissertation Series, vol. 2 (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1981), pp. 15-114. There he provides a description about the views of typology throughout history.

narrow range of material which he studied. He concerns himself with the passages which include a form of τυπος and contain (in Davidson's opinion) a setting which provides hermeneutical principles for typology: 1 Cor. 10:6, 11; Rom. 5:14; 1 Pet. 3:21; Heb. 8:5.⁸⁶ Davidson's subsequent definition of typology speaks against scholars who assert mere consistency in God's actions, rather than a deliberate foreshadowing of Christ from the Old Testament, as the determining characteristic of typology.⁸⁷

Typology as a hermeneutical endeavor on the part of the biblical writers was defined as the study of certain OT salvation-historical realities (persons, events, or institutions) which God specifically designed to correspond to, and be prospective-predictive prefigurations of, their eluctable (devoir-être) and absolutely escalated eschatological fulfillment aspects (inaugurated/appropriate/consummated) within salvation history.⁸⁸

On the basis of the passages listed above, Davidson delineates the structures⁸⁹ in these passages which charac-

⁸⁶Ibid., p. 191.

⁸⁷Ibid., p. 95. Scholars who describe typology merely as a consistency in God's actions would be R. T. France, Jesus, p. 224 and Moo, Passion, p. 34.

⁸⁸Ibid., p. 421.

⁸⁹I am aware of the connotation of this word with regard to structuralist hermeneutics. It does not appear that Davidson uses the word in a crass structuralist manner such as Lévi-Strauss or Patte. Claude Lévi-Strauss, Structural Anthropology, trans. by Claire Jacobsen and Brooke Grundfest Schoepf (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1963); Daniel Patte, What is Structural Exegesis? (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976). Rather, terms such as "framework," "network," or even "aspect" probably communicate Davidson's intention while avoiding the structuralist connotation.

terize typology: historical structures, eschatological, Christological-soteriological, ecclesiological, and prophetic structures.⁹⁰ In the following section, it will be demonstrated that Matthew 27:9, 10 according to most of the criteria fits the requirements of these typological scriptural passages and, therefore, could be acceptable to others with a broader viewpoint of typology.⁹¹

Although Davidson only concerns himself with passages which include the word "τυπος," and only a small amount of those, he does admit the possible existence of typology beyond passages which include the word "τυπος."⁹² Nevertheless, some scholars have claimed that typology only exists where the word occurs.⁹³ This disagreement immediately presents a problem. Obviously, Matthew 27:9 lacks the term "τυπος." However, a word appears in verse nine which serves as an equivalent. The word which arises is "πληρωω."⁹⁴ It denotes a fulfillment of something already intimated in

⁹⁰Ibid., pp. 398-402.

⁹¹R. T. France, Jesus, p. 224; Moo, Passion, p. 34.

⁹²Davidson, Typology, p. 423.

⁹³Herbert Marsh, Lectures on the Criticism and Interpretation of the Bible (Cambridge: C. & J. Rivington, 1828), p. 373.

⁹⁴The word "πληρωω" places an Old and New Testament text into a seemingly typological relationship in other places also. Most prominent are examples such as Matt. 2:15, 23.

advance.⁹⁵ The advance notice obviously comes in Zechariah 11:13 and the various passages in Jeremiah 19.⁹⁶ The Old Testament passages serve as the type. Then the word "πληρωμα" sets the relationship between the Old Testament occurrence and New Testament occurrence as one of type and antitype respectively.

Another possible problem with this assertion lies in the question of whether the Zechariah and Jeremiah passages could be direct predictions which, upon an exegesis of the two OT passages in isolation, demand a fulfillment. However, such is not the case. The events in Zechariah and Jeremiah are self-sufficient occurrences which do not in themselves demand a future fulfillment.⁹⁷ In an exegesis of them alone, no predictive force exists. Hence, one must question from whence the idea of a fulfillment could arise from a text which does not demand a fulfillment, although

⁹⁵Gerhard Delling, "πληρης, πληρωω, πληρωμα . . .," in Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, vol. 6, ed. by Gerhard Friedrich and trans. by Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing company, 1983), pp. 295-297.

⁹⁶See pp. 37-39 above.

⁹⁷Such is also the case in Matthew 22:15, 23 when he cites Hosea 11:1 and Judges 13:5 respectively. A similar example of a narrative which does not, in itself, point to the future, yet is stated as fulfilled in Christ, is our Lord's discourse on the story of Jonah in Matthew 12:40, 41. The same occurs in John 19:36 where John characterizes Jesus' bones not being broken as a fulfillment of Exodus 12:46. This Old Testament passage on the paschal lamb does not include any direct prediction of Christ but typology.

Matthew says that it is being fulfilled. The solution comes by assigning the relationship between Zechariah 11:13/Jeremiah 19 and Matthew 27:9, 10 as one of typology.⁹⁸

With this definition of "τυπος," we can evaluate Matthew 27:9, 10's as a typological interpretation according to the criteria as delineated by Davidson. Regarding Davidson's criterion of historical structure,⁹⁹ there exists a strong historical correspondence between the persons and events in Matthew 27:9, 10, Zechariah 11:13, and Jeremiah 19. First, Zechariah serves as the God-appointed shepherd of God's people. So does Christ (cf. John 10). Secondly, in spite of Zechariah's efforts on behalf of the people, the latter mocked him by offering a paltry sum for his efforts. So also Christ was mocked, having been betrayed for the same sum of money. (Obviously, however, Jesus becomes the victim of Judas and the Jews in Matthew, whereas Zechariah retains the primary active role in his prophetic book. This marks a

⁹⁸"A type is not a prediction; in itself it is simply a person, event, etc. recorded as historical fact, with no intrinsic reference to the future. Nor is an antitype the fulfillment of a prediction; . . ." France, Jesus, pp. 39,40. "If every type were originally intended explicitly to point forward to an antitype, it might be correct to class typology as a style of exegesis. But this is not the case. There is no indication in a type, as such, of any forward reference; it is complete and intelligible in itself." France, Jesus, p. 41,42. Although this thesis looked negatively upon some of France's statements, much of what he says has value. A prime example are the above quotes.

⁹⁹Davidson, Typology, p. 398.

distinct difference between the historical accounts in the respective passages). Thirdly, it was specifically the children of Israel who mocked the shepherd of God's people in both Zechariah and Matthew. Fourthly, the money was thrown to the potter in Zechariah. Then the field (αγρος) is taken from Jeremiah and integrated into Matthew's quote. In Matthew the money went for the purchase of the potter's field. Hence, a remarkable resemblance in the history related by these passages.

An additional aspect of historical correspondence must receive mention. Davidson states that a Steigerung of the Old Testament type appears in the New Testament antitype.¹⁰⁰ Such indeed appears in the passage in question. Christ is the God-appointed shepherd "par excellence." He is God's Son, having come to shepherd His Father's people. God sends no intermediary such as Zechariah. In addition, the price appears even more mocking than in Zechariah. In Zechariah, it was an insulting price for the prophet's service. In Matthew, it was a mocking price for God's Son. Similarly, the shame suffered by the prophet did not involve death whereas such was the case with Jesus. Finally, the spiritual care of God's people by Zechariah involved proclamation. In Matthew both proclamation and redemption by death were involved.

¹⁰⁰Ibid, p. 398.

Thus, the relationship between Zechariah 11:13, Jeremiah 19, and Matthew 27:9,10 fulfills the criterion of historical correspondence. The only possible question could arise with the lack of total historical correspondence. As already stated, the persons accomplishing the actions are changed between the Old Testament and the New. In addition, the action done with the money varies as noted above. However, one must recognize that typology does not entail exact one-to-one correspondence at all times between type and antitype. This is seen in examples such as Matthew 12:40, 41; 22:15, 23; John 19:36.¹⁰¹

Next, Davidson proposes the criterion of an eschatological structure.¹⁰² The explicit mention of the eschatological age appears with a word already mentioned above, "πληρωω." With the fulfillment of the Old Testament prophecies in Christ, the Kingdom of God is established.¹⁰³ The passion texts such as Matthew 27:9, 10 are the witnesses which attest to the establishment of God's kingdom. Yet, the final eschatological context of Zechariah 9-14 did not fully come to pass at the death of Christ. True, there has been inaugurated a time of tension because the eschatological time is already here through the fulfillment of

¹⁰¹Ibid., n. 200.

¹⁰²Ibid., p. 398.

¹⁰³For a discussion of this see France, Jesus, p. 201.

prophecy. But the consummation of the ages has not yet arrived. In summary, the criterion of an eschatological structure appears in Matthew 27:9,10, but a tension exists until the end of time.

In addition, there arises the Christological-soteriological aspect.¹⁰⁴ The christological aspect is crystal clear in Matthew 27:9,10 and its context since the fulfillment arises in the life and death of Christ. Similarly, the betrayal served as an integral event which led to the death of Christ for our sins. This also becomes lucid in the context of 27:3-8 when Judas speaks about his actions as having betrayed innocent blood. Hence, the soteriological aspect is clear.

Next, Davidson asserts an ecclesiological significance as a criterion for typology.¹⁰⁵ Matthew 27:9, 10 does not meet this criterion. True, one could stretch the text by asserting that Christ's death is the foundation of the church. But such an interpretation does not appear on the surface level of the text.

The final criterion involves the prophetic aspect. Namely, the New Testament must describe the Old Testament event as a prefiguration of the New Testament event, one designed by God which requires fulfillment. This does not

¹⁰⁴Davidson, Typology, pp. 399, 400.

¹⁰⁵Ibid., pp. 400, 401.

appear in Matthew 27:9,10 as clearly as in 1 Corinthians 10 where the experience of ancient Israel in the wilderness is shown as a prefiguration of the experiences of the Christian Church. However, "πληρωω" implies a prophetic aspect of the Old Testament type. With fulfillment ascribed in the New Testament, one assumes that God intended the Old Testament event as a foreshadowing, although such was not stated explicitly in the Old Testament nor in the New (outside of πληρωω).¹⁰⁶ The foreshadowed element had to be fulfilled according to divine plan.

Hence, Matthew 27:9,10 almost perfectly fits all typology criteria, even according to a narrow definition of typology as derived from the hermeneutical "τυπος" passages. The historical structure is firmly established in Matthew 27:9, 10 by its close relationship to the occurrences in Zechariah 11 and Jeremiah 19. The Matthew passage also includes the Steigerung which is required in Davidson's criterion of historical structure. The eschatological structure is seen through "πληρωω" and the tension which exists because the passage has not yet been ultimately fulfilled. The Christological-soteriological criterion is

¹⁰⁶Goppelt, "τυπος, αντιτυπος, τυπικος, υποτυπωσις," in Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, vol. 8, ed. by Gerhard Friedrich and trans. by Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1983), pp. 251-256. On pp. 251, 252 he agrees that typology is a "technically 'advance presentation' intimating eschatological events."

obvious in the Matthew passage by its relationship to the passion of Christ. The ecclesiological criterion is the only criterion not clearly developed in Matthew 27:9, 10. Finally, the prophetic structure is connoted through "πληρω." Typology indeed appears the best manner of explaining the fulfillment relationship between the Old Testament passages in Matthew 27:9,10 and the context. Such is the case because no predictive element is clear upon an exegesis of the Zechariah or Jeremiah passage. However, Matthew nevertheless sees a fulfillment of these passages. Therefore, typology is the best answer.

Next, finding typology in rabbinic midrashim and Qumran poses a problem because one definitely cannot meet the criteria of a narrow definition such as the one from the "τυπος" passages. In addition, typology does not appear in the Targums.¹⁰⁷ Hence, ascribing typology to the rabbis or Qumran depends upon how wide one's definition of typology becomes.

For the Tannaitic midrashim, little occurs which even approaches Matthew's typology. Leonhard Goppelt provides a short section on the typology of the rabbis.¹⁰⁸ Even though Goppelt promotes a wide definition of typology, he neverthe-

¹⁰⁷Patte, Jewish Hermeneutic, p. 73.

¹⁰⁸Leonhard Goppelt, Typos: the Typological Interpretation of the Old Testament (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1982), pp. 28-32. See also Moo, Passion, p. 32.

less states that the examples which he found only come close to typology.

The Tannaim attempted to make this history more directly relevant for the times by a cautious and limited use of symbolical and allegorical interpretation, but above all by adding homiletical remarks liberally. This method of interpretation that finds a meaning more profound than the literal sense is frequently compared with the typological interpretation found in the NT.¹⁰⁹

Goppelt cites the example of Eliezer ben Hyrcanus (ca. A.D. 100) who interprets Exodus 17:11 where Moses held up his hands so that the Israelites would be victorious in battle. This rabbi claims that the holding high of Moses' hands was symbolic of the contemporary Jews holding fast to the teaching of Moses.¹¹⁰ A second example from Goppelt of rabbinic "typology" proves helpful.¹¹¹ The rabbi Eleazar comments on Exodus 15:27.

ויחנו שם על המים
לעולם אין ישראל חונין אלא על המים דברי רבי
יהושע רבי אלעזר המודעי אומר מיום שברא הקב"ה
את עולמו ברא שם שנים עשר מבויעין כנגד שנים
עשר שבטי ישראל ושבעים תמרים כנגד שבעים
זקנים ומה ת'ל ויחנו שם על המים אלא מלמד שהיו
עוסקים בדברי תורה שנתנו להם במרה.¹¹²

¹⁰⁹Ibid., p. 29.

¹¹⁰Mekilta de Rabbi Ishamel, p. 144.

¹¹¹Goppelt, Typos, p. 30. Goppelt does not cite any specific reference from Bacher or others.

¹¹²Mekilta de-Rabbi Ishmael, vol. 2, p. 98. "'And they encamped there by the waters.' The Israelites never encamped except near water--These are the words of R. Joshua. R. Eleazar of Modi'im says: On the very day when the Holy One, blessed be He, created His world, He created there twelve springs, corresponding to the twelve tribes of Israel, and seventy palm trees, corresponding to the seventy elders. And as for Scripture's saying: 'And they encamped

From these examples (as well as others mentioned by Goppelt on the above cited pages), it becomes apparent that one must use a different definition of "typology," if one indeed wants to label these examples as typology. Using the categories of Davidson, a brief comparison with the above rabbinic examples will be helpful. Firstly, the word "τυπος" does not appear in these two or any other examples in Goppelt. Secondly, an historical correspondent occurs in the first example, but the second is questionable. Namely, the holding high of Moses' hands, and at least some of the Jews keeping Moses' law, both involve historical events. However, that God created specifically twelve springs and seventy palm trees does not appear in Scripture. Nevertheless, within this category of an historical correspondence, one may observe a Steigerung with the second example but not the first. The twelve tribes and the seventy elders certainly involve a Steigerung in comparison with merely springs and palm trees. But the actions of Moses outweigh the actions of common Jews in keeping the Law. Thirdly, no eschatological aspects occur in these "typological" examples nor in the other examples provided by Goppelt. Fourthly, midrash obviously includes no Christological aspects nor

there by the waters,' it is merely to teach that they were occupied with the words of the Torah which had been given to them at Marah."

soteriological aspects in a Christian sense.¹¹³ .Fifthly, a possible relationship to ecclesiology could arise, even from one of the examples given. The first example demonstrates a concern about the Jewish community keeping the teaching of Moses. The emphasis of communal adherence to the Law indeed occurs in the midrashim.¹¹⁴ Hence, one may cite a similarity to typology here. Sixthly, no prophetic aspect occurs in these examples as is true of Matthew 27:9, 10. The examples indeed ascribe significance to the events as pointing toward the future. However, this is more allegorical than typological.

Hence, only a loose association appears between Matthew 27:9, 10 and the possible typological occurrences in midrash. The best examples as cited by Goppelt have significant differences with Matthew. It appears then that Matthew did not acquire his typology from the rabbis. However, the trend already exists that a consistency is expected between the Old Testament and God's actions in the times of Matthew, DSH, midrash, and Targumim.

With regard to the Habakkuk Commentary, typology is difficult to ascertain. Such is the case because a neces-

¹¹³The messiah for which they hope is of a political kind, one merely to deliver from worldly strife. France, Jesus, pp. 200, 201. For an example of this see, p. 115, note 131 of this thesis.

¹¹⁴Patte, Jewish Hermeneutic, pp. 122-125; Moo, Passion, p. 18.

sary criterion, even according to a wider opinion such as Lampe,¹¹⁵ involves the claim of significance of the Old Testament message for its own time, not only the time of its antitype. However, such is not the case in the Habakkuk Commentary. It claims that the prophecy of Habakkuk only spoke to the situation of the Qumran community.¹¹⁶ Hence, any possibility for a type/antitype relationship has already disappeared. This evaluation of the Habakkuk Commentary will receive further development below.¹¹⁷

In other Qumran documents, typology has been claimed to exist. In the Damascus Document (CD), Moo notes citations in which God's judgments in the past and future are placed in a typological relationship to each other.¹¹⁸ The author chides compromising Jews outside of the Qumran community with the warnings of God's denunciations of Israel in the past (CD 5:11b-19).¹¹⁹ In order to assert this passage

¹¹⁵G. W. H. Lampe, "Typological Exegesis," Theology 55 (1953):201. According to him, it is merely basic for typology that ". . . the history of God's people and of his dealings with them is a single continuous process in which a uniform pattern may be discerned."

¹¹⁶F. F. Bruce, Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1960), pp. 8-16, 77.

¹¹⁷See pp. 116-121.

¹¹⁸Moo, Passion, p. 33.

¹¹⁹David Clines, Philip Davies, and David Gunn, eds. The Damascus Covenant, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament, Supplement Series, vol. 25 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1983), pp. 244-247. Is 50:11 appears in 5:13, Is. 59:5 in 5:13b-14, Is. 27:11 in 5:16 and Dt. 32:28 in 5:17.

as typology, one must have a definition of typology such as Moo. He defines typology as merely an agreement of God's actions in the past and confidence of the same in the present.¹²⁰

Hence, it appears that Matthew has a very distinct, developed form of typology, one which emphasizes Christ and his salvific acts. If one is to accept the existence of typology in rabbinic and Qumran literature, one must accept a wider definition of typology. One must only demand the criterion of a consistency of God's acts in the past and present. Although that does not match the complexity of Matthew's typology, it may provide an example of the expectation of consistency.

Hermeneutical Presuppositions

Introduction

The hermeneutical presuppositions again consist of the doctrine of the Old Testament, namely, what one deems as the emphasis and purpose of the Old Testament and, frequently, how that relates to the particular community. This portion of the thesis regarding hermeneutical presuppositions will present the respective viewpoints of Matthew (as especially apparent in Matthew 27:9, 10), Tannaitic Judaism, Targums,

¹²⁰Moo, Passion, p. 34. See also Patte, Jewish Hermeneutic, pp. 291-293 for examples of supposed typology at Qumran. Similarly they are not closer to Davidson's criteria than the present example from the Damascus Document.

and Qumran (especially via the Habakkuk Commentary). Then it will trace how these hermeneutical presuppositions become apparent through the genre and various appropriation methods described above. Excluded among the appropriation methods will be typology, since that subject has received adequate attention above in the discussion of the structures which were claimed to exist in typology.

For Matthew, as especially apparent in this quotation, definite aspects regarding hermeneutical presuppositions come to the forefront. First, Matthew views the Old Testament as prophetic and also clear, regardless of whether it is direct prophecy or typological.¹²¹ Secondly, prophecy in the Old Testament does not exist for its own sake. It is telic with Christ as its goal. Not surprisingly, therefore, the Old Testament receives its completeness, its fulfillment in the light of the New Testament. Similarly, the Old Testament is interpreted and finds meaning in the New Testament historical occurrences. Hence, the Old Testament history as presented in Scripture is a God-molded history which also points to Christ, although such may not be apparent to humans in the Old Testament. Finally, with Jesus Christ, the eschatological times have arrived. The eschatological context of Zechariah 9-14 refers to Christ.¹²²

¹²¹Rothfuchs, Erfüllungszitate, pp. 114, 115.

¹²²For the christological significance of Zechariah 9-14, see Moo, Passion, pp. 173-224.

Jesus has inaugurated the era of salvation for His people. The prophecies have come true.

The hermeneutical presuppositions for the midrash and the Targums are much different. First of all, they were written under the assumption that God had ceased giving revelation. They were working within a closed system.¹²³ Nevertheless, the Jews assumed that they must have divine guidance, and that only in Scripture could this be found. Therefore, the rabbi was left to his ingenuity to integrate and employ this closed system for his era.¹²⁴ (As mentioned, the Targums were sometimes contrived by the laity and often based upon tradition which already existed.) What resulted was literature which served to determine the identity of the Jews as the people of God and give guidance for almost every aspect of life.¹²⁵ It emphasized what is proper and right for God's people to do and what not to do.

When such presuppositional differences occur in relation to the New Testament, it is not surprising that these core rabbinic presuppositions are extrapolated. For example, one is not surprised that midrash and Targums involve elaborations on the Old Testament text whereas Matthew (as

¹²³See Patte, Jewish Hermeneutic, p. 122 regarding midrash and Ibid., p. 72 regarding Targums.

¹²⁴Moo, Passion, pp. 59-61, 65-66.

¹²⁵Regarding midrash, see Patte, Jewish Hermeneutic, pp. 122-124; Moo, Passion, p. 18; Payne, "Midrash," pp. 200, 201. For Targums, see Patte, Jewish Hermeneutic, p. 76.

the rest of the New Testament) first presents the life of Christ and demonstrates it as the fulfillment of the Old Testament.¹²⁶ Midrash and Targums involve interpretation of the Old Testament text whereas the New Testament includes interpretation of events (the life of Christ) in light of the Old Testament.¹²⁷ Therefore, an obvious difference in temporal emphasis existed between midrash, Targums, and Matthew (and also Qumran). The writers of midrash and Targums were far removed from the events which they embellished whereas the New Testament spoke about the recent events in Jesus' life.¹²⁸ Moreover, the Jewish community had a non-eschatological perception of itself unlike the Christian church and, as soon will be discussed, also Qumran.¹²⁹ One could expect such when no event occurred in the Jewish eyes which entailed fulfillment. In the eyes of the rabbis, the eschaton was only in future times.¹³⁰ In addition, the type of messiah for which the Jews looked was political, much unlike Christ.¹³¹ The centrality of the events sur-

¹²⁶See pp. 76-82.

¹²⁷Payne, "Midrash," p. 201.

¹²⁸Payne, "Midrash," pp. 200, 201. France, Jesus, p. 200, 201.

¹²⁹Payne, "Midrash," pp. 200, 201; D. A. Carson, "Gundry on Matthew: a Critical Review," Trinity Journal 3NS (1982): 83.

¹³⁰Rothfuchs, Erfüllungszitate, pp. 137-139

¹³¹France, Jesus, pp. 191, 200, 201. The term "political" messiah refers to a savior who merely delivers from an

rounding Christ as Savior were the determinant factor which set Matthew apart from Jewish hermeneutics.¹³² Hence, in the hermeneutical presuppositions regarding the Old Testament, the rabbis differ significantly in comparison to Matthew. The distinction begins with the centrality of Christ, continues with the admission of additional divine revelation through Christ, and is extrapolated from these two points.

Regarding Qumran, especially the Habakkuk Commentary, some similarities occur with Matthew. Significantly, both Matthew and the Habakkuk Commentary emphasize that their messages are additional revelation from God. In Matthew, Christ is portrayed as a prophet. In Matthew 27:9 the revelation occurs by the joining of the revelatory type with the revelatory antitype.¹³³ In the Habakkuk Commentary revelation is also emphasized but in a manner which differs from the New Testament. The key terms for understanding the type of revelation in this commentary are "רו" and "פֶּשֶׁר." For this, the biblical background of the words explains the components of meaning assumed to exist behind these words. In Daniel, chapter two, the words appear in reference to Nebuchadnezzar's dreams.

earthly predicament. This becomes apparent, for example, in "Suk." 52a. There the messiah's function is to recapture Jerusalem from the Romans.

¹³²Samuel Amsler, L'Ancien Testament dans l'église (Neuchatel: Delachoux & Niestlé, 1960), p. 97.

¹³³See pp. 98-112.

אדין לדניאל בחזוא די-ליליא רזה גלי אדין דניאל ברך לאלה
שמיא (Dan 2:19)¹³⁴

ואנה לא בחכמה די-איתי בי מן-כל-חייא רזא דנה גלי לי להן
(Dan. 2:30a)¹³⁵ על-דברת די פשרא למלכא . . .

בלטשאצר רב חרטמיא די אנה ידעת די רוח אלהין קדישין בך
(Dan. 4:6)¹³⁶ וכל-רוז לא-אנס לך חזוי חלמי די-חזית ופשרה אמר

In the book of Daniel, the "רוז" is a secret whose interpretation "פשר" can only be known through divine revelation. Until the "רוז" and the "פשר" are brought together, the divine OT communication remains unintelligible. In addition, it is a chosen person of God who receives and communicates this "פשר." The situation is similar in the Habakkuk Commentary. The "רוז" was originally communicated to God's prophet.¹³⁷ However, at the prophet's time, the intent and interpretation of the message was unintelligible. The Teacher of Righteousness at Qumran became the chosen interpreter, the one to whom God would give the "פשר" in order to make plain the "רוז." This presupposition becomes

¹³⁴"Then the secret (רוז) was revealed to Daniel in a night vision. So Daniel blessed the God of heaven." New King James Version [=NKJV]

¹³⁵"Not because of any wisdom that I have more than all the living has this mystery (רוז) been revealed to me, but in order than the interpretation (פשר) may be made known to the king." NKJV

¹³⁶"Belteshazzar, chief of the magicians, because I know that the Spirit of the Holy God is in you, and no secret (רוז) troubles you, explain to me the visions of my dream, and its interpretation (פשר)." NKJV

¹³⁷See Bruce, Qumran, pp. 8-10.

apparent in the following quote which introduces the Habakkuk Commentary.

וידבר אל חבקוק לכתוב את הבאות על
 על הדור האחרון ואת גמר הקץ לוא הודעו
 ירוץ
 ואשר אמר למען הקורא בו
 פשרו על מורה הצדק אשר הודיעו אל את
 (DSH 7:1-5) עבדיו הגבאים¹³⁸

For the immediate topic of revelation, several important matters come forth. First, the interpretation of the words given to the prophets were not apparent at the time of the prophets.¹³⁹ Secondly, the interpretation could not be understood until the Teacher of Righteousness would be given the "פֶּשֶׁר." Thirdly, all the words of the prophets concern the end times, and the end times are now, namely, at the time of the Qumran community. Hence, the Old Testament prophecies lack all relevance regarding the time of their origin. One cannot study the historical setting of Habakkuk's prophecies and hope to come upon God's intent. The prophecy was in code and could not be unlocked until the Teacher of Righteousness would unlock it.¹⁴⁰ As a result of

¹³⁸Brownlee, Habakkuk, p. 107. "Then God told Habakkuk to write the things that are coming upon/upon (sic.) the last generation; but the fullness of that time He did not make known to him. And as for that which He said, 'for the sake of him who reads it' (or, 'that he who reads it may run [may divulge]'), its interpretation concerns the Righteous Teacher to whom God has made known all the mysteries of the words of His servants the prophets."

¹³⁹Moo, Passion, p. 70.

¹⁴⁰See Bruce, Qumran, p. 10; Gundry, Matthew, p. 201; Rothfuchs, Erfüllungszitate, p. 118.

this, Matthew and Qumran stand in opposition to the rabbis (and Targums) and their emphasis on revelation.¹⁴¹ However, Qumran disagrees with Matthew by ignoring the historical setting of the prophet and any possible relevance of the prophet's message to his day. In addition, Matthew saw the Old Testament as a perspicuous witness to Christ. He imported no new meaning to Scripture but demonstrated the proper application in the life of Christ. The rabbis, on the other hand, had to use complex scholarly ingenuity to apply the text to every day life. And the Qumran community needed a special interpretation which often robbed the text of its original meaning.¹⁴²

Related to revelation are the aspects of fulfillment

¹⁴¹Karl Elliger, Studien zum Habakuk-Kommentar vom Toten Meer (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1953), pp. 162-164.

¹⁴²Moo, Passion, pp. 390, 391. The Habakkuk Commentary would employ contiguous verses for various historical settings in the life of the community. In addition, the point of application for Scripture went far beyond the original historical meaning. As mentioned above, Matthew pays great respect to the historical occurrence in Zechariah 11:13 (See pp. 81, 83). A typical example from the Habakkuk Commentary involves an interpretation of Hab. 1:13 (DSH 5:1-12). There it originally speaks of Yahweh's eyes being too pure to look upon evil. However, the commentary claims that it does not relate to Yahweh at all but the pious ones in the community. Moreover, in Hab. 1:13 the prophet chides God for beholding evil and taking no action. In DSH the "House of Absalom" is chided for such action. At a first glance this may appear similar to Matthew's exchange of persons. However, in Matthew the exchange goes from either Zechariah to Christ (human to divine) or Zechariah to Judas or the chief priests (human to human). Matthew does not downgrade Scripture by having humans fulfill a divine action. See Bruce, Qumran, pp. 11, 12.

and the arrival of the eschaton, aspects which Matthew and Qumran emphasize in contradistinction to the rabbinic midrashim and Targumim.¹⁴³ Regarding fulfillment, the Teacher of Righteousness supposedly learned from God that the words of Habakkuk were being fulfilled in the midst of the Qumran community, namely, in the events of their recent history.¹⁴⁴ Therefore, with both Matthew and Qumran, the impact of recent events is primary, a distinguishing factor from the rabbis.¹⁴⁵ Secondly, as already observed in this quotation, the Qumran community believed that they were living in the last days, the eschaton.¹⁴⁶ As pointed out above, such also is something emphasized by Matthew. However, the Tannaitic rabbis believed only in a future eschaton.¹⁴⁷

Having noted some agreement between Matthew and Qumran, one must note some substantial differences. One of the greatest is the role ascribed to Jesus versus the Teacher of Righteousness. Jesus looms much larger and is ascribed much

¹⁴³For midrash see Gundry, Matthew, p. 205; Karl Elliger, Habakuk-Kommentar, pp. 156-164; Bruce, Qumran, pp. 7-10, 66-77. For Targums, see Patte, Jewish Hermeneutic, p. 72.

¹⁴⁴Gundry, Matthew, p. 205; Moo, Passion, pp. 166-168; Bruce, Qumran, pp. 51, 52.

¹⁴⁵Moo, Passion, pp. 167, 168, 390.

¹⁴⁶Gundry, Matthew, p. 201. Moo, Passion, p. 382.

¹⁴⁷For midrash see Rothfuchs, Erfüllungszitate, pp. 137-139. For the Targums see Patte, Jewish Hermeneutic, p. 72.

more importance than the Teacher of Righteousness.¹⁴⁸ In opposition to the Teacher of Righteousness, the entire Old Testament bears witness to Jesus.¹⁴⁹

*τουτω παντες οι προφηται μαρτυρουσιν, αφεσιν αμαρτιων λαβειν δια του ονοματος αυτου παντα τον πιστευοντα εις αυτον (Acts 10:43)*¹⁵⁰

Rather, Qumran emphasizes three things instead of the centrality of one person. Qumran emphasizes that Scripture speaks about the end times, the importance of their community in the eschaton, and the role of the Teacher of Righteousness as the interpreter of Scripture.¹⁵¹ In addition, the Teacher of Righteousness is a revealer whereas the role of Jesus has its primary thrust in redemption.¹⁵² The Teacher of Righteousness lacks a redemptive aspect. Finally, Jesus also acts as a prophet.

In summary, the hermeneutical presuppositions of Matthew, Tannaitic midrash, Targums, and Qumran (especially the Habakkuk Commentary) contain significant differences.

¹⁴⁸Gundry, Matthew, p. 205.

¹⁴⁹Bruce, Qumran, p. 68.

¹⁵⁰"To Him all the prophets witness that, through His name, whoever believes in Him will receive remission of sins." In Matthew a crystal clear summarizing passage such as this does not exist. But in considering the massive amount of formula Quotations and other Old Testament quotations, one can easily summarize Matthew's theology in such a manner as above. In addition, see passages such as Matthew 11:27 or 12:8.

¹⁵¹Bruce, Qumran, p. 68.

¹⁵²Gundry, Matthew, p. 205.

The differences primarily concern the centrality of Christ, the significance of the Old Testament witness, and the admission of additional divine revelation which centers on Christ.

Literary Genre

This portion will discuss the significance of the literary genre in Matthew 27:3-10, midrash, Targums, and Qumran. It concerns the significance of genre as it relates to the hermeneutical axioms regarding Scripture. Literary genre are indeed reflective of one's hermeneutical presuppositions.¹⁵³ From the rabbinic midrash, Targums, and Qumran, one notices that the text of the Old Testament determines the flow of the page. The Old Testament looks like it has primacy. However, as shown above, the commentary (of midrash, Targums, and Qumran) upon the Old Testament often diverges from the intent of the Old Testament text. Specifically, the rabbis use their ingenuity to arrive at rules for daily life. The Habakkuk Commentary allows no validity to the original text and lets its present history overpower the Old Testament message.¹⁵⁴ The Targums, in comparison, remain closest to the Matthew, if one only considers verses

¹⁵³Patte, Jewish Hermeneutic, pp. 250-255; ". . . valid interpretation is always governed by a valid inference about genre." E. D. Hirsch, Jr., Validity in Interpretation (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1967), p. 113.

¹⁵⁴See pp. 117-120 for a demonstration of this.

nine and ten. Matthew's Gospel does not consist of a commentary on the Old Testament text. Rather, the life of Jesus is primary; then the Old Testament is present to illuminate the Old Testament in light of Christ. Hence, whereas with the midrash, Targums, and DSH employ the Old Testament texts to guide the lives of the people, Matthew emphasizes the life of Christ as it illumines the Old Testament. As seen, the genre reflect these presuppositions.

Secondly, Matthew shows greater respect for the Old Testament historical event and its significance than the rabbis and DSH.¹⁵⁵ This is apparent through the fact that midrash creates narrative which is not historical and DSH ignores the significance of the OT text for its own time. Targums do not come into consideration because they merely paraphrase the Old Testament text.

Introductory Formula

The introductory formulae also have significance regarding hermeneutical presuppositions. It is noteworthy that the word "πληρω" (or a word denoting fulfillment in general) appears in introductory formulae only in Christian writings. The closest equivalents to fulfillment found in the rabbis and Qumran already received mention.¹⁵⁶

A first hermeneutical presupposition arises from the

¹⁵⁵Bruce, Qumran, pp. 8-10.

¹⁵⁶See pp. 84-87.

formula in Matthew 27:9. The claim that verses three to eight fulfill nine and ten connotes that verses three to eight are revelation from God.¹⁵⁷ The completion in the NT assumes that the Old Testament lacked closure. It was not complete in itself. It needed to be fulfilled.¹⁵⁸ Therefore, God provided the revelation which fulfilled it. It's "τελος" was Christ. Beforehand, without the additional revelation/fulfillment, not all matters regarding the "τελος" of the Old Testament were clear. Hence, the hermeneutical axiom is true that the Old Testament pointed forward and longed for further revelation which gave fulfillment.¹⁵⁹

¹⁵⁷Cf. Rothfuchs, Erfüllungszitate, pp. 118, 119.

¹⁵⁸A primary scriptural verse which demonstrates that the Old Testament lacked closure is Luke 24:44. Galatians 3:16-29 and the entirety of the book of Hebrews show this fact as well. Some scholars also assert that the Old Testament demanded fulfillment, specifically in Christ. For example, see Ellis, Paul's Use of the Old Testament, pp. 147, 148; Moo, Passion, p. 387; Rothfuchs, Erfüllungszitate, pp. 114-115, 117.

¹⁵⁹See especially Rothfuchs, Erfüllungszitate, pp. 114-115, 117 and Moo, Passion, p. 387. In addition, Rothfuchs points out an interesting occurrence regarding this particular introductory formula in Matthew 27:9. The only places the formula occurs with "τοτε" are here and in 2:17. Otherwise the formulae include "ινα πληρωθη" (1:23, 2:15, 4:14, 12:17, 21:4, 26:56), "οπως πληρωθην" (8:17, 13:35), and "και αναπληρουνται αυτοις" (13:14). Rothfuchs notes the similarity in the contexts of 2:17 and 27:9. Through "τοτε" Matthew precisely specifies a fulfillment when earthly authorities have acted in a hostile way against Jesus. In all other passages, Jesus actively fulfilled a passage. Here (2:17 and 29:9, 10) the acting agents are earthly authorities. Therefore, if Matthew intends a distinction through the usage of "τοτε," Rothfuchs may have a valid point regarding the adverb's significance. In addition, Rothfuchs correctly states that although one does not overtly notice the agency of God, one assumes that God's

Secondly, this formula demonstrates that this particular occurrence in Matthew 27:3-10 did not happen by chance.¹⁶⁰ The event had its basis and motivation in the Old Testament. Similarly, Matthew believed in a God who did not let events happen to his Son by chance. All worked according to His divine plan.

Thirdly, this formula, which appears only in the Bible,¹⁶¹ demonstrates a great respect for the Old Testament. For from the Old Testament the plan of God was revealed in part. However, the Old Testament lacked the full revelation of God, namely, its fulfillment.

Metzger delineates the hermeneutical presuppositions as illustrated by the rabbinic introductory formulae in comparison with those of the New Testament.¹⁶² According to Metzger, both the rabbis and the New Testament have a high regard for the inspiration of Scripture. They hold it in the highest esteem and employ it for guidance. Obviously, however, the difference of the use of "πληρω" is of the utmost significance. The New Testament views God as still

plan and action cause all fulfillment of Scripture. Namely, nothing happened which God did not ordain. Rothfuchs, Erfüllungszitate, p. 39.

¹⁶⁰Ibid.

¹⁶¹For examples, see Matt. 1:23, 2:5, 15, 18, 23, 4:15-16, 8:17, 12:18-21, 13:14-15, 35, 21:5, 26:56, 27:9, 10, John 2:17, 12:14, 38, 40, 13:18, 15:25, 19:24, 28, 36, 37.

¹⁶²Metzger, "Formulas," pp. 306, 307.

revealing himself in the life, death and resurrection of Christ. Therein, revelation becomes complete, not with the Old Testament as the rabbis thought.

Although introductory formulae rarely appear in the Habakkuk Commentary,¹⁶³ they do appear elsewhere, especially in the Damascus Document.¹⁶⁴ First, in Fitzmyer's survey of quotations at Qumran, he notes a similarity between Qumran and the Tannaitic writings in terms of formulae. He cites the frequent use of "אמר" and "כתב." Secondly, as reviewed above, the Qumran community saw itself as fulfillment of Scripture. This marks a similarity in the hermeneutical presuppositions between the New Testament and Qumran. However, if Qumran saw itself as a fulfillment of Scripture, it may appear strange that it includes no fulfillment introductory formulae. In solving this seeming discrepancy, Fitzmyer states the difference in hermeneutical presuppositions, as demonstrated by the formulae, when he notes, following F. F. Bruce, that Qumran's emphasis exists in

¹⁶³As one may recall, the Habakkuk Commentary does not have a narrative which then introduces a quote for corroboration. Hence, is not surprising that a lack of introductory formulae occurs. In 1QpHab iii. 2, 13-14; v. 6 "אמר" appears. "כִּי הוּא אֱשֶׁר" appears. "פֶּשֶׁר" is not an introductory formula because it appears at the beginning of the interpretation, not the actual quotation. "In CD it introduces an Old Testament quotation supporting the injunction which precedes, whereas in 1QpHab it repeats a portion of a longer text which has already been given and partly expounded." Fitzmyer, "Quotations," pp. 302, 303 n. 5.

¹⁶⁴See pp. 84-87 above for a listing of the formulae.

looking forward whereas the New Testament looks back at Christ.

Probably the real reason for the lack of "fulfillment" formulae in the Qumran literature is that they are a peculiarly New Testament type. More fundamental still is probably the difference of outlook which characterizes the two groups. The Qumran theology is still dominated by a forward look, an expectation of what is to come about in the *eschaton*, whereas the Christian theology is more characterized by a backward glance, seeing the culmination of all that preceded in the advent of Christ. As F. F. Bruce expressed it, "The New Testament interpretation of the Old Testament is not only eschatological but Christological." This difference is probably brought out most significantly in this use and non-use of the "fulfillment" formulae when Scripture is quoted.¹⁶⁵

As demonstrated above, Matthew, early rabbinic Judaism, and Qumran employed introductory formulae to introduce scriptural quotations. Therefore, all three demonstrate a great respect for Scripture by using it as a source of their theology. However, the appearance of "*πληρωω*" in Matthew communicates different hermeneutical presuppositions. Namely, unlike the rabbis, Matthew believes in revelation additional to the Old Testament. Unlike Qumran, Matthew ascribes significance to the Old Testament quote for its own time. In addition, the usage of "*πληρωω*" demonstrates the centrality of Christ as the fulfillment of the Old Testament in opposition to the rabbis and Qumran. Finally, a question posed at the beginning of the thesis has received an answer. It was asked whether books with various

¹⁶⁵Fitzmyer, "Quotations," pp. 303, 304. Fitzmyer quotes Bruce, *Qumran*, p. 68.

hermeneutical presuppositions use the same methods of appropriating Old Testament quotations. The affirmative to this question has been seen because Matthew, the rabbis, and Qumran similarly employ introductory formulae.

Alteration of Text

Matthew, rabbinic midrash, Targums, and Qumrans do not quote word for word but alter the text slightly in order to appropriate the quote more aptly to their own situation. It was not considered violence to the text but merely acceptable appropriation. The author's purpose was to find the primary thrust of the passage, match it with the common thrust of a contemporary matter, and then communicate primarily the sense of the passage.

We are long accustomed to distinguish carefully between the text which--in more senses than one--is sacred, and the commentary upon it and exposition of it. We tend to think of the text as objective fact and interpretation as subjective opinion. It may be doubted the early Jewish and Christian translators and expositors of Scripture made any such sharp distinction. For them the meaning of the text was of primary importance; and they seem to have had greater confidence than we moderns in their ability to find it. Once found, it became a clear duty to express it; and accurate reproduction of the traditional wording of the Divine oracles took second place to publication of what was held to be their essential meaning and immediate application.¹⁶⁶

Therefore, all four sources had the presupposition that one may alter the text for one's purposes in order to bring forth an interpretation of the quote in relation to

¹⁶⁶T. W. Manson, "The Argument from Prophecy," Journal of Theological Studies 46 (1945):135.

one's day. As observed above, each of the four had different overriding emphases which they wanted to communicate through the Old Testament text. The rabbis and Qumran altered Scripture to apply it to their lives. Matthew altered Scripture to demonstrate how Christ is the fulfillment of the Old Testament. Finally, one again observes that authors with varying presuppositions can employ similar appropriation techniques.

Integration of Other Passages

As stated above (pp. 93-99), this appropriation method was utilized by all four sources involved, at least on the thematic level. (Because Qumran and Targums do not include verbal integration of a passage but merely thematic, this is a weaker argument.) Here, unlike, other categories above, all four demonstrate a similar hermeneutical presupposition, namely, that one may alter the text. In addition, all four make the assumption that Scripture has a unified witness in that which it communicates. Therefore, one may combine texts to show forth this unified witness.

Conclusion Regarding the Solutions for Matthew 27:3-10

In the third chapter (pp. 45-60), theories were presented which also attempted to give a solution for the enigmatic quotation in Matthew 27:9, 10. These theories in chapter three do not adequately explain Matthew 27:9, 10

because they contain one or both of the following two weaknesses. First, many are based upon the assumption that Matthew quotes a document which no longer exists. Secondly, such theories do not account for the "tailor-made" nature of the emendations for Matthew 27:9, 10 to fit with the context of 27:3-8. Therefore, these two weaknesses mark major difficulties with the following theories: an apocryphal Jeremiah, Eusebius' claim of a devious excision, the Liturgical-Homiletical theory, any documentary-redactional hypothesis, Greek Targums, New Testament apologetic, or any supposed Old Testament text which no longer exists. Although testimonia and Greek Targums¹⁶⁷ do exist, none exists which has an exact rendition of Matthew 27:9, 10. In addition, such theories (the quotation of testimonia or Greek Targums) would not account for the great similarity between Matthew 27:9, 10 and its context, assuming that the context was not created to fit the quote. Regarding Kilpatrick's Liturgical homiletical theory, it has the added disadvantage of insufficient evidence that such liturgical-homiletical emendation took place in the early church.¹⁶⁸ A difficult point exists also regarding the assertion that Matthew's memory was in error while quoting Scripture. Obviously, that denigrates the doctrine of inspiration and infallibility.

¹⁶⁷For the presentation of this theory, see pp. 50-55.

¹⁶⁸Gundry, The Use, pp. 153-155.

Considering the points mentioned thus far in the present conclusion, the inspiration and infallibility of Scripture necessitate a theory which claims that the emendations arose from Matthew himself for his theological purposes. Lindars' New Testament apologetic does not suffice because it assumes that prior documents exist of which we have no knowledge. In addition, it assumes a remarkable development of texts for apologetic purposes within a relatively short span of time, specifically, the time between Jesus' life and the writing of the Gospels.¹⁶⁹ It is more likely that Jesus himself or the apostles altered such quotations at one instance, rather than a gradual apologetic process supposed by the church.¹⁷⁰

The solution which does not have the difficulties listed above is the solution presented in this chapter, namely, that Matthew employed some of the hermeneutical methods of his age for appropriating an Old Testament quotation. Obviously, however, Matthew has vastly different hermeneutical presuppositions in comparison to his Qumran, midrash, and Targumim. The convincing arguments for this solution were presented in this chapter. Specifically, Matthew 27:9, 10, the Tannaitic midrashim, Targumim, and Qumran (especially DSH) all arise from the common Jewish

¹⁶⁹Ibid., pp. 162, 163.

¹⁷⁰Ibid.

people and all exist shortly after the Lord's death. All except Targumim employ introductory formulae. All modify the text somehow, either directly in the quotation or they insert it into the commentary. All integrate additional Scriptural passages into their commentary.¹⁷¹ Targums seem to be closest to Matthew 27:9, 10 because of their nature as interpretive paraphrases. However, midrash and DSH also integrated other passages. Their comments just occur on a larger scale than Matthew or Targums. Typology may be common, if one accepts a wide definition of typology. At least all look for common activity by God in the past and in their respective times. Therefore, it has been demonstrated that Matthew 27:3-10 (primarily 9, 10) shows great similarity to the methods of appropriating a text with Targums, Qumran, and Tannaitic literature.

True, the unit of Matthew 27:3-10 demonstrates relatively little overlap with any of Matthew's counterparts in terms of literary genre. Such is not surprising because the life of Christ has become the major focus, not the Old Testament or traditional interpretations of the Old Testament. Taking the unit of Matthew 27:9, 10 alone, one does notice substantial similarity with Targums, however.

In summary, Matthew 27:3-8 has some similarity in

¹⁷¹Admittedly, this is a weak point for the argument, since Targums and DSH only integrate other passages in a thematic, not a verbal fashion.

appearance to midrash because it is narrative associated with a quotation. Obviously, 3-8 differs from midrash because the narrative is inverted in relationship to the quotation. With Matthew the quote serves as corroboration of the narrative rather than the basis of the narrative as with midrash. (Obviously, Matthew differs from midrash as well as Targum in presuppositions.) After the narrative, Matthew has a quotation which has similarity with Targums because they both are interpretive paraphrase. Therefore, Matthew 27:3-10 is a hybrid of some points of extra-biblical genre as well as original innovations.

Finally, it became clear that persons with varying hermeneutical presuppositions can use the same methodology for appropriating Old Testament quotations. The similarity in methodology has become apparent. However, the dissimilarity in presuppositions has also become clear. Matthew sees Christ as the fulfillment of the Old Testament. The entire Old Testament pointed toward Jesus. Therefore, Matthew demonstrated this presupposition in his handling of the Old Testament text. Midrashim and Targumim assume that revelation occurs no longer. Only the eschaton will bring God's intervention and revelation. As a result, Midrashim and Targumim demonstrate a search for the explanation of Scripture to guide the people in their daily lives. Qumran, especially DSH, presupposes that all Old Testament Scripture spoke about the end times (namely, Scripture spoke about the

time of the Qumran community, not about the prophets' times at all), the importance of its community in the fulfillment of Scripture, and the Teacher of Righteousness as the one to unlock the mysteries of the Old Testament. All four sources presupposed various things, yet all used many of the same exegetical techniques.

Therefore, the solution presented in this chapter best explains the quotation in Matthew 27:9, 10. It does not rest upon a tenuous matter such as a document which no longer exists because it assumes that Matthew made the alterations. It accounts for the "tailor-made" nature of Matthew 27:9, 10 to its context. Rather, it ascribes some of Matthew's methodology to the practice of some extra-biblical literature of the intertestamental and New Testament eras (Targums, midrash, Qumran). It is logical that Matthew would employ accepted methodology of his age in order to convince people regarding the Gospel.

CONCLUSION

The purpose of this thesis was primarily to present Matthew 27:9, 10 as an Old Testament quotation which diverges substantially from the Hebrew Masoretic Text as well as the Septuagint, to delineate many of the scholarly solutions for this quote, and to present the solution which best accounts for this quotation.

In the first chapter, thesis examined other Old Testament quotations from Matthew. Such was undertaken as background work to illustrate that Matthew 27:9, 10 is not the only example of such textual variation. Actually, Matthew demonstrates a variety of degrees of dictional agreement with the Masoretic Text and the LXX. The degrees of variation were categorized into four groups. A first category contained those quotes which had little or no divergence from the Masoretic Text or Septuagint. A second category included the quotes which agree more with the Hebrew than the Septuagint. A third category concerned those which agreed more with the Septuagint against the Masoretic Text. The fourth category presented those which showed substantial deviation from both the Septuagint and the Masoretic Text. Obviously, assigning quotations to the various categories

involved some subjectivity on the part of the author. However, the objective presentation of the quotes' deviations serves the purpose of showing that Matthew 27:9, 10 does not stand alone.

The second chapter of the thesis studied intricately the text of Matthew 27:9, 10 in comparison with the Hebrew Masoretic Text and the Septuagint. This text showed greatest agreement with the Hebrew text of Zechariah 11:13. However, even upon examining that Zechariah text, one observes substantial differences. Matthew demonstrated the adaptation of person and number of verbs to agree with the context. He employed alternate nouns, verbs, and adjectives to fit the context. Finally, he integrated at least one Old Testament quotation from Jeremiah to agree with the context.

The third chapter presented scholarly opinions of how to account for such an enigma as the quotation in Matthew 27:9,10. The thesis divided these scholarly opinions into three categories. A first category included explanations which propose that an alternate "Vorlage" was used by Matthew for this quotation. A second category included the theory that Matthew quoted from memory and, therefore, misquoted the Old Testament text. A third category included a theory which asserted that Matthew's deviation in this quotation is due to Matthew's own purposeful innovation. Also from the third chapter, it appears most likely that Matthew ascribed the quotation to Jeremiah to bring at-

tention to the fact that he had merged material from Jeremiah. Finally, no major discrepancy exists between the account of Judas' death in Matthew and in Acts.

In the fourth chapter, a solution was presented which best accounts for the enigma of Matthew 27:9, 10. The solution proposes that Matthew employed some of the methods of his era (from Targums, midrash, and Qumran) in appropriating an Old Testament quotation. However, Matthew obviously had hermeneutical presuppositions other than these literary counterparts. Christ is the primary thrust of the Old Testament and the dominant guide for interpreting it.

APPENDIX

STENDAHL AND THE SCHOOL OF MATTHEW

The theory of Krister Stendahl, concerning the School of Matthew, includes a solution for the origin of the Gospel which emphasizes the formula quotations of Matthew. Stendahl asserts that the Gospel arose from an exegetical school rather than an individual in the Christian community.¹ This school demonstrated exegetical practices similar to the community of Qumran² as illustrated in its Habakkuk commentary (DSH).³

¹Krister Stendahl, The School of Matthew and its Use of the Old Testament. Acta Seminarii Neotestamentici Upsaliensis, vol. 20 (Uppsula: Almqvist & Wiksells, 1954), pp. 20-29.

²A Ruin of an Essene community on the northwestern coast of the Dead Sea received the name "Khirbet Qumran." The community was first occupied around 132 B.C. and destroyed in 68-70 A.D. as the Romans suppressed the First Jewish Revolt. Between 1947-1956 documents from these ruins were discovered which have proven helpful for biblical studies as well as an increased knowledge of this community. For further sources, see Geza Vermes, "Dead Sea Scrolls," in The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, supplementary volume, ed. Keith Crim (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962; reprint ed. 1982), pp. 210-219. F. M. Cross, The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Study (1958; reprint ed. 1961). O. Eissfeldt, The Old Testament: An Introduction including the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha and also the works of the Similar Type from Qumran, trans. by Peter R. Ackroyd (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1965), pp. 637-638, 775-778.

³Ibid., pp. 195, 196

First, Stendahl asserts why a school had to produce the Gospel of Matthew. Specifically, it appears to be a community handbook for the life and benefit of a community.⁴ For example, it is similar to documents such as the "Manual of Discipline" of Qumran and the Didache in a number of ways.⁵ In its five part structure,⁶ Matthew's sources (i.e. Mark and Q) are systematized like a community handbook.⁷ The Gospel adapts the material toward casuistry instead of broad statements of principles,⁸ and it reflects upon the position of church leaders and their duties. Finally, the outstanding success of the First Gospel and the spiritual and religious milieu portrayed in the Gospel hardly point to the work of one man.⁹ On the contrary, these demonstrate a background (*Sitz im Leben*) of study and instruction from a community. Hence, to Stendahl, a scholarly school seems most reasonable to have been the originator for such a work.

⁴Ibid., pp. 20-29.

⁵Ibid., p. 23.

⁶For a description of this five part structure, see Martin H. Franzmann, The Word of the Lord Grows: An Introduction to the Origin, Purpose, and Meaning of the New Testament (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1961), pp. 174-179.

⁷ibid.

⁸Ibid., pp. 28, 29. For example, compare the broad principles for community life in Luke 17:4 with the more specific teaching in Matthew 18:21-22.

⁹Ibid., p. 30.

After Stendahl asserts a school as the source of this Gospel, he delineates why specifically the community at Qumran has the greatest similarity with the community which produced Matthew's Gospel. Besides the arguments above, this explanation centers around the formula quotations of Matthew. Namely, just as Matthew's formula quotations are expressly interpreted as fulfilled by the words and actions of Jesus, so also the Habakkuk commentary¹⁰ interprets Scripture¹¹ to speak about the Teacher of Righteousness.¹² Stendahl calls this interpretation, a "midrash pesher," an interpretation of the Old Testament to demonstrate its fulfillment in one's midst and that, thereby, the end times are at hand. Although the formula quotations of Matthew and the Habakkuk commentary deviate from the original substantially, they do not represent examples of "free paraphrase." Rather, they were composed by conscious study of the avail-

¹⁰Besides Stendahl, see Brownlee for a detailed study of the Habakkuk commentary. William H. Brownlee, The Midrash Pesher of Habakkuk, Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series, vol. 24 (Ann Arbor, MI: Edwards Brothers, Inc., 1979), pp. 8ff.

¹¹Ibid., pp. 35, 182.

¹²It does not appear certain whether the Teacher of Righteousness was the founder of the Qumran community or the messianic person whose coming they await. On p. 183 Stendahl approvingly cites articles by B. J. Roberts, Bulletin of the John Rylands Library 34 (1951, 1952):366-387 and 36 (1953, 1954):75-96. Roberts states that the apocalyptic character of the document and the verbs point to something which will happen in the future.

able textual variants.¹³ The school tried out the variants and allowed them to enrich and more fully communicate what was fulfilled.¹⁴ This explains why they (the Habakkuk commentary and Matthew) sometimes follow one text and sometimes another.

Concerning Matthew 27:9-10 Stendahl also argues that deliberate study produced this quotation. This is again a

¹³Ibid., pp. 191, 192, agrees with the following hermeneutical principles of the Habakkuk commentary as elicited by Brownlee and, of course, sees similarities with the work of the School of Matthew. "1. Everything the ancient prophet wrote has a veiled, eschatological meaning. 2. Since the ancient prophet wrote cryptically, his meaning is often to be ascertained through a forced or abnormal construction of the biblical text. 3. The prophet's meaning may be detected through the study of the textual or orthographic peculiarities in the transmitted text. Thus the interpretation frequently turns upon the special reading of the text cited. 4. A textual variant, i.e. a different reading from the one cited, may also assist interpretation. 5. The application of the features of a verse may be determined by analogous circumstance or by 6. Allegorical propriety. 7. For the full meaning of the prophet, more than one meaning may be attached to his words. 8. In some cases the original prophet so completely veiled his meaning that he can be understood only by an equation of synonyms, attached to the original word a secondary meaning of its synonyms. 9. Sometimes the prophet veiled his message by writing one word instead of another, the interpreter being able to recover the prophet's meaning by rearrangement of the letters in a word or by 10. The substitution of similar letters for one or more of the letters in the word of the biblical text. 11. Sometimes the prophet's meaning is to be derived by the divisions of one word into two or more parts, and by expounding the parts. 12. At times the original prophet concealed his message beneath abbreviation. 13. Other passages of scripture may illuminate the meaning of the original prophet." W. H. Brownlee, "Biblical Interpretation among the Sectaries of the Dead Sea Scrolls, The Biblical Archaeologist 14 (1951):60-62.

¹⁴Ibid., p. 190.

method involving the integration of various texts.¹⁵ For corroboration, Stendahl claims that Jeremiah 32:6-9 and 18:1-12 were employed.¹⁶ Then the school wanted to introduce a "double entendre" by the use of "יִוְצֵר." Besides "potter" "וְצֵר" should also denote the Peshitta variant of "אוֹצֵר," a fact demonstrated by "κορβαναν." Then the school went beyond available texts and altered the verbs from third person to first person.¹⁷ These emendations which show fulfillment in Christ took place in a parallel fashion in Qumran's exegesis of demonstrating fulfillment of the Old Testament through the Teacher of Righteousness.¹⁸

¹⁵Ibid. pp. 120-126.

¹⁶Ibid., p. 122.

¹⁷Ibid., pp. 120-126.

¹⁸Ibid., pp. 196-202.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Albright, William Foxwell and C. S. Mann. Matthew. The Anchor Bible. Garden City: Doubleday & Company, 1971.
- Allen, Willoughby C. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to S. Matthew. The International Critical Commentary. 3rd ed. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1957.
- Alt, A.; O. Eissfeldt; P. Kahle; et. al., eds. Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelstiftung, 1977.
- Amsler, Samuel. L'Ancien Testament dans l'église. Neuchatel: Delachoux & Niestlé, 1960.
- Archer, Gleason and Gregory Chirichigno. Old Testament Quotations in the New Testament--A Complete Study. Chicago: Moody Press, 1983.
- Audet, J. P. "Notes and Studies." Journal of Theological Studies 1 (1950):135-154.
- Bacon, Benjamin W. Studies in Matthew. London: Constable & Company, 1930.
- Bauer, Walter. A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. 2nd ed. Translated and revised by William F. Arndt, F. Wilbur Gingrich, and Frederick Danker. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1979.
- Beare, Francis Wright. The Gospel According to Matthew. San Francisco: Harper and Row Publishers, 1982.
- Bengel, Johann Albrecht. Apparatus criticus ad novum Testamentum Driseios sacrae compendium. Tubin: Phillpo Davide Burkio, 1765.
- Benoit, Pierre. "The Death of Judas." In Jesus and the Gospel. Vol. 1. Translated by Benet Weatherhead. London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1973.

- _____. Exegese und Theologie. Translated by Ernst Simon Reich. Düsseldorf: Patmos-Verlag, 1965.
- Berliner, A., ed. Targum Onkelos. Vol. 1. Berlin: Gorzelanczyk & Co., 1884.
- Blackman, Philip. Mishnayoth. Vol. 2. New York: The Judaica Press, 1964.
- Blass, F., and A. Debrunner. A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. Translated and revised by Robert W. Funk. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1961.
- Bloch, Renée. "Midrash." In Dictionnaire de la Bible, Supplément. Vol. 5. Cols. 1263-1281.
- _____. "Moïse dans la Tradition Rabbinique." Cahiers Sioniens 8 (1954):214-220.
- Bonsirven, Joseph. Exégèse rabbinique et Exégèse paulinienne. Paris: Beauchesne et ses Fils, 1939.
- Bornkamm, Günther; Barth, Gerhard; and Held, Heinz Joachim. Überlieferung und Auslegung im Matthäusevangelium. 6th ed. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1960.
- Brown, Francis; S. R. Driver; and Charles A. Briggs. A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament. 2nd ed. Translated by Edward Robinson. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1951.
- Brownlee, William H. "Biblical Interpretation among the Sectaries of the Dead Sea Scrolls." The Biblical Archeologist 14 (1951):54-76.
- _____. The Midrash Peshet of Habakkuk. Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series. Vol. 24. Ann Arbor: Edwards Brothers, 1979.
- Bruce, F. F. Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1960.
- _____. The Book of Acts. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1988.
- Bruce, William. Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Matthew. London: James Speirs, 1910.
- Carson, D. A. "Gundry on Matthew: A Critical Review." Trinity Journal 3NS (1982):71-91.

- Chajes, Zebi Hirsch. The Student's Guide through the Talmud. Translated and edited by Jacob Schachter. London: East and West Library, 1952.
- Chilton, Bruce D. A Galilean Rabbi and His Bible: Jesus' Use of the Interpreted Scripture of His Time. Good News Studies. Vol. 8. Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, 1984.
- Clark, E. G., ed. Targum of Pseudo-Jonathan of the Pentateuch: Text and Concordance. Hoboken: Ktav Publishing House, 1984.
- Clines, David; Philip Davies; and David Gunn, eds. The Damascus Covenant, Journal For the Study of the Old Testament, Supplement Series. Vol. 25. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1983.
- Cross, Frank Moore, Jr. "The History of the Biblical Text in the Light of Discoveries in the Judean Desert." Harvard Theological Review 57 (1964):281-289.
- _____. The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Study. 2nd ed. Garden City: Doubleday, 1961.
- Daube, David. The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism. London: Athlone, 1965.
- Davidson, Richard M. Typology in Scripture--A Study of Hermeneutical τυπος Structures. Andrews University Seminary Doctoral Dissertation Series. Vol. 2. Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1981.
- Delling, Gerhard. "πληρης, πληρωω, πληρωμα, . . ." In Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. Vol. 6, pp. 274-283. Edited by Gerhard Friedrich. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1983.
- Doeve, Jan William. Jewish Hermeneutics in the Synoptic Gospels and Acts. Assen: van Gorcum, 1954.
- Dyer, Louis. "Olympian Treasures and Treasures in General." Journal of Hellenic Studies 25 (1905):294-319.
- Ehrman, Albert. "Judas iscariot and Abba Saqqara." Journal of Biblical Literature 97 (December 1978):572-573.
- Eissfeldt, Otto. The Old Testament--An Introduction including the Apocrypha and Pseudopygrapha and also the works of the Similar Type at Qumran. Translated by Peter R. Ackroyd. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1965.

- Elliger, Karl. Studien zum Habakuk-Kommentar vom Toten Meer. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1953.
- Ellis, Edward Earle. "Midrash, Targum and New Testament Quotations." Neotestamentica et SEmitica: Studies in Honour of Matthew Black. Edited by E. E. Ellis and Max Wilcon. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1969.
- _____. Paul's Use of the Old Testament. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1957.
- Epstein, I., ed. "Sanhedrin." In The Babylonian Talmud, Seder Nezikin. London: The Soncino Press, 1935.
- _____. "Shabbath." In The Babylonian Talmud, Seder Mo'ed. London: The Soncino Press, 1935.
- Etheridge, J. W., ed. The Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan ben Uzziel on the Pentateuch. New York: Ktav Publishing House, 1968.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. "'4Q Testimonia' and the New Testament." Theological Studies 18 (1957):513-537.
- _____. "The Use of Explicit Old Testament Quotations in the Qumran Literature and in the New Testament." New Testament Studies 7 (1961):297-333.
- France, R. T. The Gospel According to Matthew. The Tyndale New Testament Commentaries. Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1985.
- Franzmann, Martin H. The Word of the Lord Grows. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1961.
- Gaster, M. Samaritan Oral Law and Ancient Tradition. Vol. 1. London: The Search Publishing Company, 1932.
- Gaechter, Paul. Das Matthäus Evangelium. Innsbruck: Tyrolia-Verlag, 1962.
- Gärtner, Bertil. Iscariot. Facet Books: Biblical Series. Translated by Victor I. Gruhn. Fortress Press, 1971.
- Gnilka, Joachim. Das Matthäusevangelium. Herders theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament. Vol. 2. Freiburg: Herder, 1988.

- Goppelt, Leonhard. "τυπος, αντιτυπος, τυπικος, υποτυποσις." In Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. Vol. 8, pp. 251-256. Edited by Gerhard Friedrich. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1983.
- _____. Tupos: the Typological Interpretation of the Old Testament. Translated by Donald H. Madvig. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1982.
- Goulder, M. D. Midrash and Lection in Matthew. London: SPCK, 1974.
- Gundry, Robert H. Matthew: A Commentary on His Literary and Theological Art. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1982.
- _____. The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel with Special Reference to the Messianic Hope. Leiden, Netherlands: E. J. Brill, 1967.
- Harris, James Rendel. Testimonies. 2 Vols. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1916-1920.
- Hatch, Edwin and Henry Redpath. A Concordance to the Septuagint and Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament (Including the Apocryphal Books). 3 Volumes in 2. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1897; reprint ed., Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1987.
- Hatch, Edwin. Essays in Biblical Greek. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1889.
- Haugg, Donatus. Judas Iskarioth in den neutestamentlichen Berichten. Freiburg: Herder & Co. G.M.B.H. Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1930.
- Hendrickson, William. Exposition of the Gospel According to Matthew. New Testament Commentary by William Hendrickson. Vol. 1. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1973.
- Hirsch, E. D. Jr. Validity in Interpretation. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1967.
- Horowitz, S. "Midrash." In The Jewish Encyclopedia. Vol. 8, pp. 548-550. Edited by Isidore Singer, Isaac K. Funk, Frank H. Vizetelly. New York: Funk and Wagnalls Company, 1912.

- Hühn, Eugen. Die alttestamentlichen Citate und Reminiscenzen im Neuen Testamente. Vol. 2. Tübingen: Verlag von J.C.B. Mohr, 1900.
- Jacquier, E. Les Actes des Apôtres. Paris: Gabalda, 1926.
- Jeremias, Joachim. Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus--An Investigation into Economic and Social Conditions during the New Testament Period. 5th ed. Translated by F.H. Cave and C. H. Cave. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984.
- Jerome. Commentarii in Euangelium Matthaei. In Patriologia cursus completus: Series Latina. Vol. 26:15-218. Edited by Jacques Paul Migne. Paris: Garnier Fratres, 1884.
- Johnson, Franklin. The Quotations of the New Testament from the Old--Considered in the Light of General Literature. Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1896.
- Johnson, S. Lewis, Jr. The Old Testament in the New--an Argument for Inspiration. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1980.
- Kahle, Paul. The Cairo Geniza. London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, 1947.
- Keil, Carl Friedrich. Commentar über das Evangelium nach Matthäus. Leipzig: Dörfling und Franke, 1877.
- Kilpatrick, George Dunbar. The Origin of the Gospel According to St. Matthew. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1950.
- Lampe, Geoffrey W. H. "Typological Exegesis." Theology 56 (1953):201-208.
- Lauterback, Jacob Z., ed. Mekilta de-Rabbi Ishmael--A Critical Edition on the Basis of the Manuscripts and Early Editions with an English Translation and Notes. 3 Vols. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publications Society of America, 1949.
- Le Deaut, R. "Apropos A Definition of Midrash." Interpretation 25 (1971):259-282.
- Lenski, Richard Charles Henry. The Interpretation of St. Matthew's Gospel. Columbus: The Wartburg Press, 1943.

- Lévi-Strauss, Claude. Structural Anthropology. Translated by Claire Jacobsen and Brooke Grundfest Schoepf. New York: Basic Books, 1963.
- Lewis, A. S. Light on the Four Gospels from the Sinai Palimpsest. London: Williams & Norgate, 1913.
- Lindars, Barnabas. New Testament Apologetic--the Doctrinal Significance of Old Testament Quotations. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1961.
- Lohmeyer, Ernst. Das Evangelium des Matthäus. Kritischer-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament. Sonderband. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1956.
- Lüthi, Kurt. Judas Iskarioth in der Geschichte der Auslegung von der Reformation bis zur Gegenwart. Zürich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1955.
- MacArthur, John F. Matthew 1-7, The MacArthur New Testament Commentary. Vol. 1. Chicago: Moody Press, 1985.
- M'Neile, Alan Hugh. The Gospel According to St. Matthew. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1965.
- Mans, F. "Un Midrash chrétien: le récit de la mort de Judas." Revue de Science religieuse 54 (1980):197-203.
- Manson, T. W. "The Argument from Prophecy." Journal of Theological Studies 46 (1945):129-136.
- Marsh, Herbert. Lectures on the Criticism and Interpretation of the Bible. Cambridge: C. & J. Rivington, 1828.
- Massebieau, Eugene. Examen des Citations de l'Ancien Testament dans L'Evangile Selon Saint Matthieu. Paris: Librairie Fischbacher, 1885.
- McConnell, Richard S. Law and Prophecy in Matthew's Gospel: The Authority and Use of the Old Testament in the Gospel of St. Matthew. Basel: Friedrich Reinhardt Kommissionsverlag, 1969.
- Metzger, Bruce M. "The Formulas Introducing Quotations of Scripture in the NT and the Mishnah." Journal of Biblical Literature 70 (1951):297-307.
- _____. The Text of the New Testament--Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1968.

- Meyer, Heinrich August Wilhelm. Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Gospel of Matthew. Critical and Exegetical Commentary on The New Testament. Vol. 2. Translated and edited by William P. Dickson and William Stewart. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1879.
- Migne, Jacques Paul, ed. Patriologia cursus completus: Series Graeca. Parisius: Migne, 1857-1866.
- _____. Patriologia cursus completus: Series Latina. Paris: Garnier Fratres, 1884-.
- Montefiore, C. G. The Synoptic Gospels. 2 Vols. 2nd Ed. London: MacMillan, 1927.
- Moo, Douglas J. The Old Testament in the Gospel Passion Narratives. Sheffield, England: The Almond Press, 1983.
- _____. "Tradition and Old Testament in Matt 27:3-10." In Gospel Perspectives: Studies in Midrash and Historiography, pp. 157-176. Vol. 3. Edited by R. T. France and David Wenham. Sheffield, England: JSOT Press, 1983.
- Moore, George Foot. Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era, the Age of the Tannaim. 2 Vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1932.
- Motyer, J. A. "Akeldama." In The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology, vol. 1., pp. 93, 94. Edited by Colin Brown. Translated and revised by Lothar Coenen, Erich Beyreuther, and Hans Bietenhard. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1975.
- Nestle, Eberhard; Erwin Nestle; Kurt Aland; Matthew Black; Carlo M. Martini; Bruce M. Metzger; and Allen Wikgren, eds. Novum Testamentum Graece. 26th ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelstiftung, 1979.
- Origen. Commentarii in Matthaeum. In Patriologia cursus completus: Series Graeca. Vol. 13:1599-1800. Edited by Jacques Paul Migne. Parisius: Migne, 1857.
- Patte, Daniel. Early Jewish Hermeneutic in Palestine. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series. Vol. 22. Missoula, MT: Printing Department of the University of Montana, 1975.
- _____. What is Structural Exegesis? Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1976.

- Payne, Philip Barton. "Midrash and History in the Gospels with Special Reference to R. H. Gundry's Matthew." In Gospel Perspectives: Studies in Midrash and Historiography, pp. 177-216. Vol. 3. Edited by R. T. France and David Wenham. Sheffield, England: JSOT Press, 1983.
- Plummer, Alfred. An Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to S. Matthew. London: Elliot Stock, 1909.
- Power, E. "John 2:20 and the Date of the Crucifixion." Biblica 9 (1928):257-288.
- Reinke, Lorenz. Die messianischen Weissagungen bei den grossen und kleinen Propheten. Giessen: n.p., 1859-62.
- Resch, Alfred. Ausserkanonische Paralleltexte zu den Evangelien, Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur, Band 10, I.-III. Teil. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1893-1897.
- Rost, L. "Der gegenwärtige Stand der Erforschung der in Palästina neu gefundenen hebräischen handschriften: 12 Bemerkungen zum neuen Habakuktext." Theologische Literaturzeitung 75 (1950):cols. 477-482.
- Rothfuchs, Wilhelm. Die Erfüllungszitate des Matthäus--eine biblische Untersuchung. Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom alten und neuen Testament. Heft 8. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1969.
- Russel, D. S. Between the Testaments. 9th Printing. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987.
- Sand, Alexander. Das Gesetz und die Propheten-Untersuchung zur Theologie des Evangeliums nach Matthäus. Rengensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet, 1974.
- Schlatter, Adolf von. Der Evangelist Matthäus. Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1948.
- Schweizer, Eduard. Das Evangelium nach Matthäus. Das Neue Testament Deutsch. Vol. 2. 13. Auflage. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1973.
- Selbie, John A. "Potter, Pottery." In A Dictionary of the Bible, pp. 24-26. Vol. 4. Edited by James Hastings and John A. Selbie. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1902; reprint ed., 1934.

- Senior, Donald. "The Fate of the Betrayer--A Redactional Study of Matthew XXVII, 3-10." Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses 48 (1972):372-426.
- Sparks, H. F. D. "St. Matthew's Reference to Jeremiah." Journal of Theological Studies 1 (1950):115, 116.
- Soltau, W. "Zur Entstehung des 1. Evangeliums." Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 1 (1900):219-248.
- Sperber, Daniel. "Tanna, Tannaim." In Encyclopedia of Judaism. Vol. 15, cols. 798-803. Edited by Cecil Roth and Geoffrey Wigoder. New York: Macmillan, 1971-1972.
- Stendahl, Krister. The School of Matthew and its Use of the Old Testament. Acta Seminarii Neotestamentici Upsaliensis. Vol. 20. Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksells, 1954.
- Stöckhardt, G. "Weissagung und Erfüllung." Lehre und Wehre 30 (February 1884):42-49, (April 1884):121-128, (May 1884):161-170, (June 1884):193-200, (July 1884):252-259, (August 1884):252-259, (October 1884):335-344, (November 1884):375-380, 31 (July and August 1885):220-223, (September 1885):265-275.
- Strack, Hermann L. and Paul Billerbeck. Das Evangelium nach Matthäus--erläutert aus Talmud und Midrasch. Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch. Erster (Doppel) Band. München: C. H. Bech'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1956.
- _____. Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash. New York: Atheneum Press, 1931.
- Strecker, Georg. Der Weg der Gerechtigkeit--Untersuchung zur Theologie des Matthäus. 3rd ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1973.
- Surburg, Raymond F. Introduction to the Intertestamental Period. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1975.
- Sutcliffe, Edmund F. "Matthew 27:9." Journal of Theological Studies 3 (1952):227, 228.
- Swete, Henry Barclay. An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1902.
- Torrey, Charles C. "The Foundry of the Second Temple at Jerusalem." Journal of Biblical Literature 55 (1936):247-260.

- Toy, Crawford Howell. Quotations in the New Testament. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1884.
- Tsevat, M. "בתוליה." In Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament, pp. 338-343. Vol. 2. Edited by G.J. Botterweck and Helmer Ringgren. Translated by John T. Willis. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1983.
- Turpie, David McCalman. The Old Testament in the New: a Contribution to Biblical Criticism and Interpretation. London: William & Norgate, 1868.
- Ungern-Sternberg, A. Der traditionelle alttestamentliche Schriftbeweis "de Christo" und "de Evangelio" in der alten Kirche bis zur Zeit Eusebs von Caesarea. Halle: M. Niemeyer, 1913.
- Upton, John A. "The Potter's Field and the Death of Judas." Concordia Journal 8 (November 1982):213-219.
- Vermes, Geza. The Dead Sea Scrolls in English. 3rd Ed. Sheffield, England: JSOT Press, 1987.
- _____. "Dead Sea Scrolls." In The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. Supplementary Volume. 3rd edition. Edited by Keith Crim. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1982.
- _____. Scripture and Tradition in Judaism: Haggadic Studies, Studia Post-Biblica. Vol. 4. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1961.
- Vogler, Werner. Judas Iskarioth--Untersuchungen zu Tradition und Redaktion von Texten des Neues Testaments und ausserkanonischer Schriften. Theologische Arbeiten. Band 42. Berlin: Evangelischer Verlagsanstalt, 1983.
- Waltke, Bruce K. and M. O'Connor. An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990.
- Weir, T. H. "Potter." In A Dictionary of Christ and The Gospels, p. 384. Vol. 2. Edited by James Hastings, John A. Selbie, and John C. Lambert. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1913.
- Wellhausen, Julius. Die kleinen Propheten. Berlin: Walter De Gruyter & Co., 1963.

- Wevers, J. W. "Septuagint." In The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, pp. 273-278. Vol. 4. 2nd ed. Edited by George Arthur Buttrick. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1982.
- Wevers, John W.; Robert Hanhört; Werner Kappler, et al. Septuaginta: Veuts Testamentum Graecum, Auctoritas Societas Litterarum Göttingensis editum. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1931-.
- Williams, Ronald J. Hebrew Syntax--An Outline. 2nd ed. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1982.
- Wright, Addison G. "The Literary Genre Midrash." Catholic Biblical Quarterly 28 (1966):105-138, 417-457.
- Young, Edward J. The Book of Isaiah. Vol. 1. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1985.
- Zeitlin, S. "Midrash: An Historical Study." Jewish Quarterly Review 44 (1953):21-36.