Matthew reworks his traditions to emphasize his case. Although this narrative contains prior tradition (cf. Acts 1:18-19), Matthew has clearly reworked it to emphasize a point found in this form in neither Markan nor Johannine traditions. Judas's end (27:3-10) is full of Matthean vocabulary, following the liberty he could take in putting an oral tradition into writing (cf. Van Tilborg 1972b: 83-84).

Although Matthew does not create the story, he may fill in its gaps on the basis of biblical prophecy (Hill 1972: 348). Matthew quotes Zechariah 11:13 as if *yoṣer* ("potter") could be read *'oṣer* ("treasury"), revocalizing to provide a new interpretation, as we know later Jewish interpreters often did (Longenecker 1975: 150; cf. Burkitt 1907: 125; Lindars 1961: 118). If the priests prevented the money from making it to the "treasury," Scripture would be fulfilled when it reached the "potter"; "One way or another the prophetic Scriptures must reach fulfillment" (Gundry 1982: 556; cf. Mt 5:18). In its original context (with which Matthew appears familiar), the prophecy referred to how cheaply (at the price of a slave) Israel had valued their shepherd, the prophet (or perhaps God himself), and how he would therefore give them a foolish shepherd so that they might learn by contrast how benevolent the prophet (or God) had been to them (Zech 11:4-17; cf. 13:7-9; Edgar 1958: 50).

By appealing to "Jeremiah" rather than to Zechariah, however, Matthew makes clear that he intends his biblically literate audience to link an analogous passage in Jeremiah (32:6-14) and to interpret them together (as in the *gezerah shewah* of Mk 1:2-3, which Matthew recognizes and modifies in Mt 3:3).[140] In so doing, Matthew reapplies Zechariah's prophecy with a message of Israel's coming restoration in Jeremiah. Matthew may well allude to Jeremiah 18–19 (regarding the potter; cf. Meier 1980: 339; Gundry 1982: 556; Upton 1982) as well; in this case he evokes a prophecy of the impending destruction of Jerusalem (Jer 19:10-13; Mt 27:25).[141]

The betrayal of innocent blood is central to the narrative. The phrase "innocent blood" reflects substantial LXX influence (it appears there fifteen times; Gundry 1982: 554).[142] Ancient Eastern peoples regarded very seriously the guilt of innocent blood, sometimes viewed in terms of corporate responsibil-

---

140. Cf. Lindars 1961: 120; Gundry 1982: 556-57; Meier 1980: 339; Brown 1994: 651. Jerome cites an apocryphal copy of Jeremiah that included these words (cf. Lachs 1987: 423), but some Jewish Christians had undoubtedly created that document to address the "problem" in Mt 27:9. Luther felt that Matthew's "error" here was inconsequential (Stanton 1995a: 8), but while Matthew may have been capable of such an error, it is unlikely that one occurred in this case. Given his ability to retranslate the entire Hebrew text based on revocalization (I have examined only the point most germane to the sense of our passage), it is unlikely that Matthew simply got his attribution wrong.

141. But cf. Gundry 1975: 202: "The connection with and the typological interpretation of Jer 19 would never have suggested itself apart from a prior tradition of the potter's field."

142. Overman 1996: 382 finds a specific allusion to 1 Sam 26:11; 2 Sam 1:16 (opposing killing "the Lord's 'christ'"), but if Matthew intended so narrow an allusion, one would expect clearer echoes of that phrase here.