



**Global Scientific JOURNALS**

GSJ: Volume 8, Issue 6, June 2020, Online: ISSN 2320-9186  
[www.globalscientificjournal.com](http://www.globalscientificjournal.com)

**THE FAITH OF BETRAYER IN THE PERISCOPE OF  
MATTHEW 27:3-10 VIEWED FROM THEOLOGICAL  
EXPLANATION**

**BY**

**DR T.T. BELLO**

**DEPARTMENT OF RELIGIOUS STUDIES**

**EKITI STATE UNIVERSITY, ADO-EKITI, NIGERIA.**

**PHONE NUMBER: 07039 14 0729**

**E-mail: venttbello@gmail.com**

## ABSTRACT

This paper examines extent of describing the Fate of Judas Iscariot in betraying Jesus Christ. This study examines the relationship between the use materials of Matthew material and that of Jeremiah which could also be linked with that of Zechariah. In this paper mention is going to be particularly in the last half of Matthew 16, where the rejection and suffering of Jesus Christ parallels with that of Jeremiah.

This paper also describes the use of allegory in Matthew and Zechariah 9:9. Hear the writer connected the sacral narrative in which the Shepherd of the “flock deemed to slaughter was paid the insulting wage of shekels of silver.” The writer tries to explain that money and Judas are linked through Zechariah.

There was x-ray of Jeremiah and Zechariah in a Potter's Field. It was here that the researcher made the Jeremiah account loosely brings together porters and the field of blood of innocent echoing the Innocent blood in Jeremiah 27:7 and the Field of blood 27:8.

The writer also tries to explain the silver and blood in Judah's actions the author explains that there are the element of admonition that the money taken is that of blood which is with Dean the periscope that is purely Matthew. The word meta mellitus is used to describe Judas state and Matthew is the only gospel writer to use the word. This might mean the state of rejection.

It was explained by the researcher that the death of Judas Iscariot is compared with that of Ahithophel suicide (The son of David)

Keywords: Betrayer, periscope explanation, material, handling, procedure testimony, Potter and field.

## INTRODUCTION

Out of synoptic gospels only Matthew includes a passage (27:3 – 10) describing **the fate of Judas Iscariot. The character of Jesus and his actions are firmly in the** tradition: some kind of betrayal took place which he personifies, and a locate table field is associated with him in living memory. Money is involved. To attribute grade to Judas as motive springs easily to mind as ‘apologetic’ especially

if the historical facts were not known to the tradition, or were-known but were awkward to acknowledge. These traditional elements came to Matthew from a source Mark.

Matthew, along with Mark and Luke, accounts for Judas' acts as foreordained by scripture and for known by Jesus: the Messiah must be handed over, and Jesus is the one who will do it. Mark and Luke leave it at that. Judas leaves the fellowship, and we are not told what becomes of him. Only Matthew elaborate on Judas' end. why? What are his intentions? Where it sands, the periscope of Matthew 27: 3-10 impede the flow of an exciting story. It is impossible on a realistic level surely there wasn't time between trials for the Saharan to make a land purchase given Matthews customer is witness The awkward narrative here suggests it was of major importance to him to include the content of 27:3-10.

Although this periscope, and the gospel as a whole, permit much speculation recharging methods of composition and historical veracity<sup>1</sup>. I will limit my investigation to Matthew reductional agenda – the work of the author as Author. To view Matthew as author more clearly, I will examine his use of Old Testament sources and themes in light of his methods and intentions as discernible elsewhere in the gospel, in the hope of discovering how the character of Judas Iscariot functioned for Matthew, and his motives for constructing the pericope as he did.

### **Matthew's use of Jeremiah material**

Why is the formula attribution in verses 9 - 10 ('then was fulfilled what had been spoken by the prophet...') made to Jeremiah, when the citation is said as well as in the periscope is a blend of material from Zachariah? 'And they took the thirty pieces of silver' (Matthew 27:9) is identical with the second major clause in Zechariah 11:13. Because the second aorist construction of the verb 'to take' is identical in the first person singular and the third person plural the 'I took' (elabon) of Zechariah is very softly shifted by Matthew into its new context<sup>2</sup>. The rest of the verse is also based on Zechariah 11:13; its deviations from the Old Testament text models are possibly due to Matthew's desire to weave the quotation and the broader context of the periscope more tightly together<sup>3</sup>. Jeremiah enters the quotation only in verse 10, for the field of the potter. Why then the attribution to him?

Donald Senior suggests that reference to his name 'evokes the atmosphere of judgement and condemnation commonly associated with his general message<sup>4</sup>, a conditional use of Jeremiah which M.J.J. Menken also notes, particularly in the last half of Matthew 16, where the rejection and suffering of Jesus Parallels with that of Jeremiah's<sup>5</sup>. Jeremiah, from the thirteenth year of the reign of Josiah until after the destruction of Judah by the Babylonians and the destruction of Jerusalem, preached judgement on an unrepentant people. He challenged the nation's leaders, especially the priests. His temple sermon, interpreted as blasphemous nearly cost him his life. He said that his word was the ancient word of the covenant.

He saw in the exile of the national leaders the expression of the divine verdict... and that the God worshipped in the Temple of Jerusalem was too great to be localized.... The worship of the God of Israel ...thus could not disappear even if he's trying and the sacrificial system disappeared, for it needed not more than prayer and obedience to his word<sup>6</sup>.

What a banquet of allusions Matthew offered his contemporaries in this name! As a 'type' Jeremiah would not only coincide with Mathew's presentation of Jesus as prophet and real interpreter of covenant, but would give me any two events of Matthew's on time: the destruction of the Jerusalem temple in 70 CE might be seen as a judgement on unrepentant people; worship did not require the temple Jeremiah situation fits with Matthew's larger gospel themes: the rejection of Jesus by the chief priests and elders as a scene of Israel worthy the of judgement, and a rationale for the extension of the covenant to the Gentiles.

Matthew, the only New Testament author to mention Jeremiah by name, does so three times. In 2:79 using the same words as in 2:17<sup>7</sup>, introducing neither by a final conjunction, but by the adverb tote, which characteristically uses to avoid ascribing evil to the divine plan.

These are the only two fulfillment quotations in which Matthew sees scripture fulfilled in evil which is caused by men. In both instances, the evil is of the same nature: it concerns the enmity against and rejection of Israel's messiah on the part of the authorities<sup>8</sup>.

## Matthew's Use of Zechariah Material

Matthew uses Zechariah 9:9 as the basis of his description of Jesus' entry into Jerusalem (on the back of two animals Matthew 21:4). More significantly, the passage: 'It is written I will strike the shepherd and the sheep will be scattered' from Matthew 26:31, comes originally from Zechariah 13:7. It is from the Zechariah 11 narrative in which the Shepherd of 'the flock doomed to slaughter was paid the insulting wage of 30 shekels of silver (the price owed for a gored slave in exodus 21:32), that Matthew takes not only the amount of the betrayal money (and only be specific the amount), but the precipitating action or 27:3-10.

F.F. Bruce contends that Zachariah 9:14 is among the primary sources of testimony used by the primitive church and, as in the case of Jeremiah, is used in a broadly allusive sense:

There is in this interpretation of Zechariah 9-14 something quite different from the atomistic procedure which characterizes the Qumram commentaries on the Old Testament. One dominant principle – here the portrayal of the Shepherd-King is discerned throughout the whole section of prophecy, and becomes determinative for the application of any part of it<sup>9</sup>.

In Zechariah 11 the prophet is commanded by God to serve as Shepherd because the existing shepherds exploit the flock. He obeys, and deposit or destroys the three of unfaithful shepherds, but the sheep do not appreciate his services. He refuses to continue, breaks his staffs of Grace and Union, and asks for his wages – an insulting sum, whose insult passes to God, who then commands that the money be thrown into the temple foundry and melted down. Especially given the clear association in Matthew 26:31, can we see Jesus as the 'repudiated and smitten shepherd' and Israel as the ungrateful flock; what is problematical for this pericope is that it might seem to cast Judas in the role of the Shepherd. Douglas Moo addresses this issue by suggesting that Matthew responds to it by.

substituting circumlocutory constructions for the first person verbs of the Old Testament passage:... 'they' [the priests] rather than the rejected Shepherd himself as the prophecy strictly requires, take the silver coins and give them to the potter.

Although the image lingering with the modern reader is of Judas throwing down the coins associating him and not Jesus with the Shepherd - in Matthew's time what would register would not be exact narrative correspondence so much as the presence of the meaningful elements the echoes of prior usage. Moo's agreement as to what Matthew was attempting is plausible.

....there is no departure from the basic thrust of Zechariah's prophecy. While Judas is the direct recipient of the 'wages' in Matthew Jesus is the one being evaluated at this level just as the prophets worth is evaluated in Zechariah 11....<sup>11</sup>

The money and Judas are linked through Zechariah. The money would have been cast into the temple-treasury-foundry, as in Zechariah but for the intervention of the chief priests who use it to buy the Potter's Field, the elements of the citation belonging to Jeremiah. What is behind this element? Of everything in Jeremiah. why a potter's field?

### **Jeremiah and Zechariah meeting in a Potter's Field**

The 'Jeremiah connection' has produced an enormous amount of scholarly speculation, much of it involving textual and linguistic examinations too technical for this investigation. Of the possibilities, Jeremiah 19 is preferred as a source for this passage.

...in front of elders and priests, Jeremiah has to shatter an earthen potter's vessel as a symbol of the disasters which will strike in Judah and Jerusalem because of their idolatry, and because 'they filled this place with blood of Innocents' (Jeremiah 19:4). The prophet has to do this on the place that is called the Tophet but will be called Valley of Slaughter and will be one large burial place<sup>12</sup>.

The Jeremiah 19 account loosely brings together potters and a field and the blood of innocents echoing 'The Innocent blood' in 27: 4 and the 'Field of blood in 27:8. In Jeremiah also, the Lord calls the valley outside the potsherd's Gate an alien place because of its profanation with heathen sacrifices which matches 27:7 field to bury strangers in. The purpose of [the prophet's] action is to announce God's judgement upon Jerusalem. By buying the Potter's Field the religious leaders unknowingly do the same thing<sup>14</sup>.

Somehow the silver has to be thrown either to the Treasury or to a potter; it is assumed the money as tainted cannot be used within the temple precincts, and that since a field is in the tradition, the Treasury/potter/field link-up is necessary. Moo comes at this from another angle. Against the general belief that Field of blood is the historical kernel of the legend, and the connection with the potter invented in order to bring the money into contact with a field via Jeremiah, he suggests that both come together in the one-time 'Potter's Field' as part of the original tradition. He refers to work by Benoit who asserts that the traditional site for Hakeldama was an area which was a source of clay for the potters of Jerusalem and which... was a natural location for the burial of strangers<sup>15</sup>.

### **The theological explanation of silver and blood in Judas' actions**

As we have seen, the money and Judas are linked through Zachariah; Judas is linked to the field and the field is linked to Jeremiah, who is loosely linked to Zachariah through a potter or potter's Field. At the centre of this web of links we find the chief priest they are image picking up and taking the pieces of silver lingers as vividly as that of Judas throwing them down. They admit it is blood money. They 'take counsel' (as they have at key moments throughout the narrative 26:4 59; 27:1). They are the elements of the periscope that is purely Matthew, and likely the reason for the composition. They sit at the centre of the periscope, and told them the rest of it is bent. We can guess why from what we know of Mathews intent in The Passion Narrative: to place the final responsibility for rejection of Jesus as messiah on the heads of the chiefs and elders and through their steering ultimately up on the heads of all the people [27:25]).

As we move into the judges material it is important to resist the temptation to move to the level of psychological motivation. That concern, why valid, needs to be kept separate from what party was attempting to convey to his readers. He uses the characters as representatives of attitude as literary devices i.e. as Bearer of meaning. While is contemporary could hear illusions will not only artificially recreate, it was does they wish they were sensitive – not till our notion of 'personality.' It is particularly important to keep this in mind because 27:3 raises questions about the nature of Judas' repentance following his sight of Jesus condemned.

The word *metameletheis* is used to describe Judas' state, and Matthew is the only gospel writer to use the word. He uses it in the parable of the two sons (Matthew 21:29 and 32) where it seems to mean a change of mind or regret, but stop short of *metanoein*, to repent. While scholarly opinion this is regarding depth and kind of Change in Judas<sup>16</sup>. Willem Van Unnik, translating *metalmellitus* as 'first one did a thing, later one decided to do something else, which ...for some reason another one thought was the better course, says that in any case of repentance/regret is not what Matthew exercises emphasizes, it is merely a step toward the real emphasis: he brought back the 30 pieces of silver'<sup>17</sup>.

It is that shiny silver trail that interest Matthew. He alone of the evangelists calls attention to the money by specifying his amount. Judas is actually has it in hand; it is not merely promised, as a (Mark 26:4-16). From the priest to Judas and back to the priest Judas has washed his hands of it. The priests say 'See to it yourself.' (27:4), yet nonetheless and with the responsibility for the blood money which they literally 'ground', they are the last to touch it taint. It is a dramatic necessity on the story level that Judas handover Jesus; on the level of Matthew's special agenda it is equally necessary that they hand over the money and blame – to the chief priests.

It then becomes necessary dramatically that Judas be seen to die, to be gotten off age so that we lost points to him at the ultimately guilty party. He hangs himself confessing his sin of betraying Innocent blood, and Innocence the chief priest recognize, without confessing, in their knowledge meant of blood money which cannot go into the Treasury. (Was the irony of their misplaced scrupulosity intended?)

There are other traits besides the silver one to follow in exploring the Judas portion of the periscope. The 'Innocent blood' trail begins in Matthew 23:35 ('all the righteous blood shed on earth,' from innocent Abel through Zechariah the son of Barachiah – blood to come upon 'this generation') pools around the terms usage in 27: 4, flows through Pilate's rearrangement of the phrase in 27:24 'I am innocent of this man's blood,' and spills is built upon 'all the people' and their children (27:25). The trail followed by Jesus as he is handed over will be considered after looking at why hanging was the end of the trail for Judas.

### **Death by hanging**



Acts 1:8 makes no mention of hanging as part of the tradition about Judas' end. It has been pointed out that David's counselor Ahithophel's suicide by hanging (2 Samuel 17:23) is likely the pattern for Judas' end<sup>18</sup>, but, as van Unnik says the similarity 'hangs' on two was only: 'having departed' and 'he hangs himself'<sup>19</sup>. There is no hint that Ahithophel betrayed David (we may draw that inference but it is not in the text); his advice was rejected, and fear of unpleasant consequences might have caused him to kill himself but there is no expression of he's feeling guilty such as expressed by Judas I have sinned in betraying Innocent blood which is Matthew's highlight, not the movements of Judas' soul<sup>20</sup> Van Unnik's case is that Judas hung himself to do away with the curse that comes up on him by shedding of Innocent blood. Citing many Old Testament presidents fun unique shows that this makes a man unclean and brings terrible destruction (Deuteronomy 27:25): such a man stands in the line of Cain. Cain is not immediately punished for his mother because he offers a sacrifice to God. But that where is not open to Judas; the money cannot go into the Treasury or be used as a sacrificial gift. A curse can only be removed if the object of it is taking away, which Judas does in hanging himself<sup>21</sup>.

Daniel Patte observes that the cause falls on 'the man [or those] by whom the son of man is betrayed or delivered – paradidomi' 26:24). This might explain why this periscope is said where it is in the narrative: a verse 2 those to whom Jesus has been delivered by Judas in turn deliver him Pilate. Especially in view of the fact that Jesus removes the curse from himself by his suicide, it might then be implied that the 'woe' now rests solely with the chief priests and elders, resuming it is they, or their representatives, who are the 'they' of verse 2<sup>22</sup>.

### **Death by 'Handing over'**

Although J.D.M. Derrett is primarily interested in 'correct lines of approach' to the motivations and psychology of Judas, in an article on the role of the masor (informer/denouncer), masur (the victim of the masor) and mesira (the transaction), he suggests a possible way Matthew might have understood Judas' function, especially given Matthew's overall theme of the creation of a new Israel and a New Covenant since Old Israel has rejected Jesus.

Jesus gives himself up and yet is given up by Judas the handing-over, can be righteous if it is done with the proper authority:

The theory, which is found in various strata of the Old Testament, is clear. The sufferings of the Jewish under Gentile oppression are not fortuitous. They are the results all the people's sins. By being handed over... into the hands of the nations, they will be purified, refined, and a remnant will 'return' to God, and a new covenant will be made with them all the times of the old covenant will be restored...<sup>23</sup>

In terms of Matthew's intend to show blame falling of chief priests and elders, but also 'on us and all our children' – this generation – the judgement of the temple destruction of 70 CE and being handed over to Gentiles' world resorts in a new covenant that does not exclude them forever. Derrett notes as the most famous mesira before Jesus, the transaction of the Twelve brothers of Joseph, who schemed (while they were 'eating bread') to dispose of him (Judah takes the lead) in return for 20 pieces of silver (Genesis 37:26-28).

### **Conclusion**

Matthew's overriding interest in placing blame on the chief priest and elders causes him to introduce them in relation to Judas' death. Their presence in 27:3-10 is solely his contribution, and it involves him in some odd, forced connections of scripture Judas suicide may be an interesting fact, but it is not Matthew's focus. Suicide may capture our attention but what captures Matthew's is Judas 'I have sinned in betraying Innocent blood.' However one interpret that theologically or psychologically, dramatically it is a reversal throwing down the silver and leaving this dude is off the hook. He is finished, but the responsibility is not. What is fulfilled as spoken by the prophet, as we have seen is not Judas' singular action but the action of some of the sons of Israel' (27:9).

It is not Judas who delivers Jesus to crucifixion; he has delivered Jesus to the chief priests and elders; they deliver him to Pilate (27:2) 'when do this or that he Jesus was condemned, he repentant.' Why does seeing Jesus delivered to Pilate suddenly convince Judas of Jesus' innocence? It seems probably from the point of view of Matthew's concerns, and suggest a reason for the placement of the pericope where it is in the narrative, that just has a cockcrow signals to Peter that Jesus' prediction (of 26:34) has come true (26:69-75) and he weeps bitterly, the son of man being

delivered up (predicted by Jesus in 26:2) occurs in 27:2 and is a moment of knowledge for Judas.

For all that I have attempted not to deal with Matthew's attitudes to Jesus as a personality, the figure of Judas seems to a much more humanely in Matthew's gospel than it does a Mark or Luke. This is partly due to Matthew's assistance on the guilt of the chief priests and elders. While setting Judas apart in 26:25 by having him call Jesus 'Master' and not 'Lord' Matthew nevertheless has added a personal exchange between the two. Matthew has also added the enigmatic line. Friend, why are you here? (26:50) or, in another possible construction. Friend, do that for which you have come.' John Suggit that in the parables the word *hetairoi* is used of people who have not rightly responded to the demands of the situation he takes the words used in (26:50) as describing 'with heavy irony the falsity of Judas' response to the love and comradeship of Jesus<sup>25</sup>.

Yet earlier in his article he has stressed the use of the word seeing the time of former it tends to be used of those who have shared... in trials and adventures in Aristotle the used corresponds to the New Testament use of *mathetes*. 'The collective noun *hetairoi* is used to refer to a group of people joined together for a common purpose and refers essentially two political parties.'

'Heavy irony' I don't find especially characteristics of Matthew; in need notes have read Aristotle to have added a comment acknowledging that a part in Jesus' story which needed to be played was indeed being played, by Judas. This interpretation would be consistent with a Matthew who insists on the Fore knowledge of Jesus and the Divine plan of God: the chief priests, elders and people are shown as being given the clear-cut choice of Barnabas; Judas and Pilate on the other hand, are portrayed as characters who act more as they must than as a would.

Matthew fully succeeded (perhaps beyond his intentions and unhappiness so for history) in shifting the blame for Jesus get onto the deals that we still possible over the figure of Judah's indicates he was not equally successful in getting The Iscariot off-stage.

## NOTES

1. See, for Example, M.D, Goulder, *Midrash and Lection in Matthew* (London, SPCK, 1974); R.H. Gundry, *The used of the Old Testament in Matthew's Gospel* (Leiden, E.J. Brill,1967); Barnaba Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic: The Doctrinal Significance of Old Testament Questions* (London, SCM Press, 1961); Douglas J. Moo, *Tradition and Old Testament in Matthew 27:3-10; Gospel Perspectives*, 3, eds. R.T. France and David Wenham (1983) (Sheffield, England, JSOT Press), pp 157 – 175.
2. Donald P. Senior, *The Fate of the Betrayer: A Redactional study of Matthew 27:3-10*. *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses*, 60(1972) pp.372-426, included as The appendix to *The Passion Narrative According to Matthew: A Redactional study*, Leuven University Press, Louvain, Belgium, 1975, pp.355-356 (pagination according to book, not article).
3. Senior, 'The Fate,' p. 369
4. M.J.J. Menkem, (1984). *The References to Jeremiah in the Gospel according to Matthew* (Mt. 2:17, 16:14; 27:9) *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses*, 60 (1984) p. 24. See also Luc Desautels, 'La Mort de Judas (MT 27, 3-10; AC 1, 15-26), *Science et Esprit*, 38 (1986), pp. 224: le type de l'homme de Dieu persecute par son peuple, une figure du Christ.'
5. Edwards Lipinski, *Jeremiah*, *encyclopaedia Judaica* (1971) (Jerusalem: The Macmillan Company), pp. 13:46 – 13:56, quotation p. 1350.
6. The fate of Judas periscope, placed where it is, makes a slight 'echo-pattern' with chapter 2. There, the pursuit of the infant Jesus by Herod/chief priests/scribes is separated from Joseph's dream by death (of the innocents) and a Jeremiah citation. In 27:3 – 10, the condemnation of Jesus by chief priest/elders is separated from Pilate's wife's dream by death (of Judas) and a Jeremiah citation.
7. Menken, 'References, pp.8-9.
8. F.F. Bruce, (1960). *The Book of Zechariah and the Passion Narrative*, *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, 43, pp. 342, quotation 348. The Zechariah/shepherd's theme comes to Matthew from source Mark, see 14:27
9. Moo, 'Tradition,' p163.
10. *Ibid.*, p. 166.
11. Menken, *References*, p. 11.
12. Gundry, *Use*, p 556.

13. F. J. Matera (1987), *The Passion According to Matthew, Part 2: Jesus Suffers the Passion, 27:1 – 16,* Priests and people, 1987, p. 14.
14. Moo, *Tradition* (1973), p. 165, note 48; P. Benoit, 'The Death of Judas,' *Jesus and the Gospel* London: Darton, Logman & Todd, 1973, pp.200-202.
15. See senior, *Fate,* p. 375; Desautels, 'La Mort,' pp.225, 226.
16. Willem C. Van Unnik (1974), 'The Death of Judas in St. Matthew's Gospel,' *Anglican Theological Review, Supplement series 3,* 1974 p. 48
17. Senior, *Fate,* p. 384; Gundry, *Use,* p. 555.
18. As we read 2 Samuel now, that is so but L.R. Fisher argues for the early association of Psalm 41:9, 'He who ate my bread has lifted his heel against me' (likely used by the early church in reflecting upon the actions of Judas, and hence is the betrayal story told in the passion narrative during meal fellowship) with the hands of Absalom.' Rabbinic interpretation of Psalm 41:9 identified the traitor as Ahithophel. The rabbis may have been wrong but the review indicates what Jews were thinking about this verse. Fisher also notes a development in interpretation that leads to considering David as Ahithophel's teacher ('to eat my bread' meant 'to learn my teaching'), and in the New Testament, the Qumran material, and the Talmud the quotation is used against those who would betray their teachers (L.R. Fisher, *Betrayed by friends,* interpretation, 18, 1964, pp. 33 – 36). Goulder connects Judas with Psalm 55:12. 'It is not an advisory who deals insolently with me... but it is you, my equal, my companion, my familiar friend' and says that Psalm was also connected by rabbis to Ahithophel who betrayed David and went over to Absalom (M.D. Goulder, *Midrash and Lection in Matthew,* p. 446).
19. Van Unnik, 'Death,' pp. 48 – 50.
20. *Ibid,* pp.51 – 57. Van Unnik refers to the story in 2nd Samuel 21:1, where the hanging of seven members of Saul's family atoned for The killing of Gibeonites and restored God's favour. Also note at this point the faint parallel between Judas hanging on a tree and Jesus hanging on a cross just, as there is one between Judas throwing down the silver and the good Shepherd doing so. This is tenuous, like a negative image, a dark version of what Jesus does in light, or does right.
21. Daniel Patte (1987), *The Gospel According to Matthew: A Structural Commentary on Matthew's Faith,* fortress press, Philadelphia, p. 376.

22. J.D.M. Derrect (1980), 'The Iscariot, Mesira, and the Redemption,' *Journal for the Study of the New Testament*, 8, 1980, p. 6.
23. Gundry makes much of the Judas role as a warning for potential betrayers within the church of Matthew's time who might be tempted to handover others in the face of persecution: 'do not do it – you will be sorry' (Gundry, *Use*, p. 553). That is unarguable; we may say the role functions of the same way for us today, but that does not address Matthew's motive in including the periscope of Judas' end. Nor does it seem likely that Matthew's motive was to include a contrast with Peter and his denial (Senior, *Fate*, pp. 349-351); although such a contrast can certainly be made, the function of the character of Judas would likely not change if Peter's denial were not included. Peter's denial of Jesus has no consequences in the world of plot; Judas' actions are, or cause, a major part of the plot. Gundry's points about warning potential betrayers would be more aptly posted to Peter's actions, since his character and position has been developed throughout the gospel, it will be more suitable to reflect larger discipleship themes.
24. John Suggil (1988), 'Comrade Judas: Matthew 26:50,' *Exegetical Comment, Journal of Theology for Southern African*, 63, 1988, pp. 56, 57.
25. John Suggil *Ibid* p. 62.