

REFORMED THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY: CHARLOTTE

GETHSEMANE AND THE HUMANITY OF JESUS: A TEXT CRITICAL LOOK AT LUKE  
22:43-44

SUBMITTED TO DR. KRUGER  
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF  
NT508 – GOSPELS

BY  
RYAN RICHARDSON  
NOVEMBER 2015



# GETHSEMANE AND THE HUMANITY OF JESUS: A TEXT CRITICAL LOOK AT LUKE 22:43-44

## Introduction

When most Christians remember Jesus' prayer in the Garden of Gethsemane, perhaps the moment that most readily comes to mind is when an angel comes to comfort Jesus who was in so much agony that His "sweat became like great drops of blood." Drawn from Luke 22:43-44, this scene is a moving portrait of Christ's enduring love for His people in spite of His suffering. But there is debate among scholars about whether the scene actually took place and whether Luke actually wrote verses. Some argue that scribes intentionally altered the manuscripts as they copied them to present a theological argument against heresies of the day.<sup>1</sup> Conversely, others argue it to have been original to Luke (though he may have used a source), displaying consistent themes and language in these verses with the rest of Luke-Acts.<sup>2</sup> It should be recognized that these verses do say something about Luke's Christology – if they are original, Luke has presented a raw and emotional display of Jesus' humanity.<sup>3</sup>

## Text and Approach

The English Standard Version translates the passage<sup>4</sup> as: "And there appeared to him an angel from heaven, strengthening Him. And being in an agony He prayed more earnestly; and His sweat became like great drops of blood falling down to the ground." Most translations handle the passage in a similar fashion,<sup>5</sup> though many do leave a footnote with a disclaimer that some

---

<sup>1</sup> Bart D. Ehrman and Mark A. Plunkett, "The Angel and the Agony: The Textual Problem of Luke 22:43-44," *CBQ* 45 (1983): 401-416.

<sup>2</sup> Joel B. Green, "Jesus on the Mount of Olives (Luke 22:39-46): Tradition and Theology," *JSNT* 26 (1986): 29-48.

<sup>3</sup> Ehrman and Plunkett, "The Angel and the Agony: The Textual Problem of Luke 22:43-44," 401.

<sup>4</sup> In the UBSGNT as: ὡφθη δὲ αὐτῷ ἄγγελος ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ ἐνισχύων αὐτόν. καὶ γενόμενος ἐν ἀγωνίᾳ ἐκτενέστερον προσηγέρθη· καὶ ἐγένετο ὁ ιδρώς αὐτοῦ ὡσεὶ θρόμβοι αἷματος καταβαίνοντες ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν.

<sup>5</sup> There is some debate about whether ὡσεὶ θρόμβοι αἷματος καταβαίνοντες ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν should be understood metaphorically or literally on account of ὡσεὶ. Lucan style tends toward simile, but many have understood it literally, and there are documented cases of hematidrosis where people under intense stress may actually sweat drops of blood—see Green, "Jesus on the Mount of Olives (Luke 22:39-46): Tradition and Theology," 36; Raymond Brown, "The Lucan Authorship of Luke 22:43-44," *SBL* 31 (1992): 154-164.

manuscripts do not include the verses. To appropriately frame the debate, this paper will first look to the background of Luke 22:43-44 and place it in the wider context of Luke-Acts. Then the external evidence will be examined to review which manuscripts include the text, and who among the early church fathers refer to the text. Next, attention will be given to the internal evidence to look for coherency and consistency among themes and language used in Luke-Acts. Finally, the paper will turn to implications that should then be drawn from the text to see Scripture's view on Christ and His nature as fully human and fully divine.

### **Background of Luke 22:43-44**

In order to appropriately understand the text critical issues with Luke 22:43-44, a few words must be said about this Gospel's author and his purpose as they affect his style. First, the Gospel of Luke and the Book of Acts should be viewed as a cohesive unit. This is because the two share a narrative cycle, a common purpose, thematic elements, and style, and this paper will draw upon Acts for stylistic and internal arguments for Luke's authorship.<sup>6</sup> The Gospel and Acts are widely believed to be written by Luke,<sup>7</sup> and this paper will operate under that assumption. Luke himself was a physician, a Greek Christian, and a close friend of Paul's.<sup>8</sup> Beyond this and the moments in Acts where Luke lets his audience know that he was a part of particular events, there is little information on Luke as a person. Nonetheless, what little is known about him comes through strongly in his writing. His research is thorough and detailed, and his relation of the Gospel is highly organized – similar to what one might expect of a physician.<sup>9</sup> Luke is also highly proficient with the Greek language, displaying his Greek background and education.<sup>10</sup> His

---

<sup>6</sup> Developing this unity further is outside the scope of this paper, but an extended discussion may be found in Joel B. Green, *The Gospel of Luke* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 6-10.

<sup>7</sup> While outside the scope of this review, Robert C. Tannehill expresses doubts about this – see Robert C. Tannehill, *Luke* (ANTC; Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1996), 20-24. However, Tannehill does not offer any alternative solution and multiple scholars have offered compelling arguments affirming Luke's authorship – for extended examples, see Alfred Plummer, *The Gospel According to S. Luke* (ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994), xiii-xvii; I. Howard Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978), 33-35.

<sup>8</sup> Plummer, *The Gospel According to S. Luke*, xviii.

<sup>9</sup> Plummer, *The Gospel According to S. Luke*, xix-xx.

<sup>10</sup> D.A. Carson and Douglas J. Moo, *An Introduction to the New Testament*, 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed. (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2005), 204-206.

audience gives even more confidence in this – Theophilus<sup>11</sup> is a fairly common Greek name, and the title Luke ascribes to him – κράτιστε<sup>12</sup> – seems to suggest that he is an individual of high standing,<sup>13</sup> and moreover a new believer.<sup>14</sup> However, Luke’s Gospel was not intended for Theophilus’ eyes only. Theophilus’ position would have enabled him to distribute Luke’s Gospel, and Luke writes with an emphasis on Jewish themes as well.<sup>15</sup>

With all this in mind, it should then be asked – why would a Greek Christian, who was not an eyewitness to the events he is relaying, write a Gospel account? Thankfully Luke himself tells us, “it seemed good to me also, having followed all things closely for some time past, to write an orderly account for you, most excellent Theophilus, that you may have certainty concerning the things you have been taught” (Luke 1:3-4).<sup>16</sup> Moreover, Luke realizes that there is strife between Jewish and Gentile Christians involving the place of the law and Jewish customs. Thus Luke writes this Gospel, and subsequently Acts, as a way to frame the Gospel in continuity with God’s plan for salvation throughout Israel’s history, with emphasis on how that salvation has spread to all men.<sup>17</sup> In the Gospel of Luke particularly, this leads to a focus on who Jesus is, and how He will bear out His role as Savior.<sup>18</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> Θεόφιλε – “God-lover”

<sup>12</sup> “most excellent”

<sup>13</sup> There is some debate surrounding this point, but the general consensus is that it is at least someone that Luke respects – either a patron or an official – and addresses him in eloquent Greek with a title of respect as such – for further discussion, see Tannehill, *Luke*, 24-25; Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 44-45.

<sup>14</sup> Darrell Bock notes that there is some debate over this, but finds it unpersuasive that Theophilus was just “interested in becoming a Christian” – see Darrell L. Bock, *Luke: Volume 1: 1:1-9:50* (BECNT 3a; Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1994), 14-15.

<sup>15</sup> Multiple scholars find it likely that, before his conversion, Luke was a “God-fearer” a Gentile who practiced in the Jewish synagogue. For further discussion on this and the Jewish themes throughout Luke see Bock, *Luke: Volume 1: 1:1-9:50*, 6-7, 15. While dating Luke late in the 1<sup>st</sup> century in contrast to Bock, Francois Bovon affirms this – see Francois Bovon, *Luke 1: A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke 1:1-9:50*, (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2002), 8-10.

<sup>16</sup> In the UBSGNT as: ἔδοξεν καμοὶ παρηκολουθηκότι ἀνωθεν πᾶσιν ἀκριβῶς καθεξῆς σοι γράψαι, κράτιστε Θεόφιλε, ἵνα ἐπιγνως περὶ ὧν κατηχήθης λόγῳ τὴν ἀσφάλειαν.

<sup>17</sup> Bovon, *Luke 1: A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke 1:1-50*, 10-11. Note that Bovon also argues that Luke was writing as an explanation for the delay of the Parousia, however Green points out that Luke actually builds the anticipation of Jesus’ second coming – see Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 832.

<sup>18</sup> Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 22-24.

We should therefore anticipate Luke 22:43-44 to be an articulately written text from a physician to an important member of Roman society. We should also expect it to eloquently, but simply explain details about Jesus' identity, and how he fulfilled his role as Messiah. However, before exploring the internal evidence to see if this passage meets this expectation, this paper will first turn to the external evidence found in the manuscripts and church fathers.

### External Evidence

Unfortunately, discussions on the external evidence for this passage have been convoluted, misleading and, at times, incorrect.<sup>19</sup> However, that is not to say that the external evidence should not bear weight in the discussion, and there is still value in examining the evidence as many of the arguments have used the external evidence as support for their case.<sup>20</sup> In order to outline this information in a slightly more organized fashion, there is an appendix at the end of this paper that outlines how the manuscripts and church fathers have handled the text.

#### Manuscript Evidence

First, it will immediately stand out that there are two witnesses, *f*<sup>13</sup> and *Lect<sup>1/2</sup>* [*l 184<sup>1/2</sup>*], that provide a distinctly minority reading, appending Luke 22:43-44 after Matt 26:39. As these are the only witnesses to hold this reading, this is certainly not original to Matthew, however there is an important point for consideration in regards to Luke. The reading has been used to “show” the existence of a source outside of Luke that scribes drew from to add the passage to Luke.<sup>21</sup> However, upon closer examination, every manuscript in *f*<sup>13</sup> actually makes reference to Luke in

---

<sup>19</sup> For further discussion – see Claire Clivaz, “The Angel and the Sweat Like “Drops of Blood” (Lk 22:43-44): *𝔓<sup>69</sup>* and *f<sup>13</sup>*,” *HTR* 98 (2005): 419-440. Clivaz points out that parts of the manuscript evidence (particularly noting fragment 0171) have been ignored, mislabeled, or mistaken, and notes inconsistencies in classifying manuscript evidence as well.

<sup>20</sup> For discussion on the value of the external evidence see – Eldon Jay Epp and Gordon D. Fee, *Studies in the Theory and Method of New Testament Textual Criticism*, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993), 124-140.

<sup>21</sup> Kurt Aland and Barbara Aland, *The Text of the New Testament: An Introduction to the Critical Editions and to the Theory and Practice of Modern Textual Criticism*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., trans. by Errol F. Rhodes. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989), 310. The Alands argue that “This kind of fluctuation in the New Testament manuscript tradition is one of the surest evidences for the secondary character of a text.” Bruce Metzger makes a similar, though less definite argument as well – see Bruce Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament: A Companion Volume to the United Bible Societies’ Greek New Testament (Fourth Revised Edition)*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994), 151. However, as it will be seen, though the text’s position fluctuates, Luke is always mentioned.

one fashion or another – either in the body of the text itself or as notes in the margins. Based on these references, it is an untenable hypothesis that the scribes definitively had another, secondary source. Rather, it is more likely that the text was intentionally moved from Luke to Matthew.<sup>22</sup> Further, there is precedent among the witnesses for intentional modification by shifting passages to avoid repetition.<sup>23</sup> Thus, these witnesses should be disregarded as evidence in favor of omission.

In examining the rest of the witnesses, the evidence is split relatively evenly – generally, widespread nature of the text tends to favor the text's addition, and the Western, Caesarian, and Byzantine witnesses tend to include the text. However, based off of dating, omission is favored –  $\text{P}^75$  is the oldest manuscript and leaves it out,<sup>24</sup> characteristic of the Alexandrian witnesses, as well as B and  $\text{s}$ , that tend to favor the text's omission.<sup>25</sup>

However, there are also early witnesses that leave it in such as D, 0171, Justin Martyr, and others.<sup>26</sup> Further, while  $\text{P}^69$  has often been used as further evidence for omission,<sup>27</sup> it is a fairly unreliable manuscript that tends to have a very free style and its omission should not be weighed too heavily.<sup>28</sup>

---

<sup>22</sup> Clivaz, "The Angel and the Sweat Like "Drops of Blood" (Lk 22:43-44):  $\text{P}^69$  and  $f^{13}$ ," 434-435. Clivaz notes that even in the cases where the verses are omitted from Luke 22 in  $f^{13}$  (only 5 of the 12 manuscripts), there are references to Luke either in the margin or in the body of the text in Matthew. Clivaz concludes based on this and a reference to Luke in the Ephraim Codex (C) (note: the Gospel of Luke is not included in that codex), that the transfer was a conscious transfer from Luke to Matthew as opposed to the existence of another source.

<sup>23</sup> Brown, "The Lucan Authorship of Luke 22:43-44," 155-156.

<sup>24</sup> Darrell L. Bock, *Luke: Volume 2: 9:51-24:53* (BECNT 3b; Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1996), 1763.

<sup>25</sup> There are however, numerous exceptions to this – see Ehrman and Plunkett, "The Angel and the Agony: The Textual Problem of Luke 22:43-44," 402-403; Brown "The Lucan Authorship of Luke 22:43-44," 155.

It should also be noted that while  $\text{s}^1$  includes the text,  $\text{s}^{*2}$  do include it, albeit with obeli

<sup>26</sup> Bock, *Luke: Volume 2: 9:51-24:53*, 1764; Green, "Jesus on the Mount of Olives (Luke 22:39-46): Tradition and Theology," 35. Justin Martyr's testimony will be examined more in detail later.

<sup>27</sup> Ehrman and Plunkett, "The Angel and the Agony: The Textual Problem of Luke 22:43-44," 402. Oddly, Ehrman and Plunkett do initially note the uncertainty of the testimony of  $\text{P}^69$  due to its omission for vs. 42 as well, but go on to conclude that it provides support for the omission of 43-44 and neglect to mention its free style at all.

<sup>28</sup> Juan Hernández, Jr. "The Early Text of Luke," in *The Early Text of the New Testament*, ed. Charles E. Hill and Michael J. Kruger (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 123; Philip Comfort, *Encountering the Manuscripts: An Introduction to New Testament Paleography & Textual Criticism* (Nashville: Broadman & Holman Publishers, 2005), 269.

Based off of this, the external evidence from the manuscripts alone is inconclusive. Multiple scholars conclude that it weighs towards omission,<sup>29</sup> but when the *f*<sup>13</sup> witnesses are disregarded, the suspect quality of  $\mathfrak{P}$ <sup>69</sup> is considered, along with the number and dispersion of witnesses that include the text, the reason to assume this position is considerably weakened. To further support the text's inclusion, the testimony of a church father should now be considered.

### Justin Martyr's Testimony<sup>30</sup>

Beyond the convoluted testimony of the manuscripts, the evidence provided in the church fathers merits looking to as well. While they do not carry the inerrant, authority of the Scriptures, they do provide an early testimony to the tradition of the text and its originality to Luke.

Of particular note, Justin Martyr's witness in *Dialogue with Trypho* stands above the rest. His 2<sup>nd</sup> century<sup>31</sup> testimony gives us an exposition on the text that will merit reflecting on later:

In the memoirs of the apostles and their successors, it is written that his perspiration poured out like drops of blood as he prayed and said, “If it is possible, let this cup pass from me.” His heart and bones were evidently quaking, and His heart was like wax melting in his belly. We therefore may understand that the Father wanted His Son to endure in reality these severe sufferings for us. We may not declare that since He was the Son of God, He did not feel what was done and inflicted on Him.<sup>32</sup>

Justin Martyr states that his witness came from the “memoirs of the apostles” which he viewed as surpassing the authority as the Old Testament and not to be changed, and he reports of the church preaching from them regularly.<sup>33</sup> Justin's respect for these sources and his indication that he is drawing from them here leave clues about his belief in the passage's originality. At the very least, this means he is drawing from sources created less than one hundred years after Luke

<sup>29</sup> Ehrman and Plunkett, “The Angel and the Agony: The Textual Problem of Luke 22:43-44,” 408. Even Brown, who ultimately argues in favor of the passage's inclusion, says (with reservations) the external evidence weighs in favor of omission – see Brown, “The Lucan Authorship of Luke 22:43-44,” 155.

<sup>30</sup> It is important to note that there are other church fathers that testify to the passage as well, and they will be discussed later, however, Justin's early testimony makes his the most important for the discussion here, especially in relation to its earlier date than  $\mathfrak{P}$ <sup>75</sup>.

<sup>31</sup> Bruce M. Metzger, *The Canon of the New Testament: Its Origin, Development, and Significance* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), 144. Metzger dates *Dialogue with Trypho* around 160; however, he notes an earlier discussion with Trypho in 135.

<sup>32</sup> Quoted in Arthur A. Just, *Luke* (ACCS III; Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2003), 344.

<sup>33</sup> Michael J. Kruger, “Early Christian Attitudes toward the Reproduction of Texts,” in *The Early Text of the New Testament*, ed. Charles E. Hill and Michael J. Kruger (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 77-78.

was written.<sup>34</sup> Further, his testimony provides basis in the genuine nature of the text that predates  $\text{P}^{75}$  by quite a number of years,<sup>35</sup> and Justin's earlier testimony allows for the possibility that  $\text{P}^{75}$  drew from an altered manuscript as a source. This is particularly important considering the highly strict, accurate, and professional style of  $\text{P}^{75}$  and that its omission of the passage should not be taken lightly.<sup>36</sup> While Justin's testimony should not be overstated as a testimony from a fallible man, it should bear how we look back upon the manuscripts in searching for the infallible, inerrant original.<sup>37</sup>

The external evidence provides a divided picture, and it is difficult to draw any firm conclusions based on it. However, the external evidence does not give definitive proof for the later interpolation of the passage that many have claimed. Given this, it is necessary to look to the internal evidence to draw further conclusions on whether the text is a later creation or not.

### Internal Evidence

In examining the internal evidence, there two important categories that should be considered: transcriptional and intrinsic probabilities. The passage is fairly long for any sort of accidental omission such as homoeoteleuton, and even if it were, it is unlikely that such an omission would have gone without being corrected.<sup>38</sup> As such, the relevant discussion on the internal evidence will be based around the possibility of intentional scribal change due to harmonization or doctrine followed by an examination of the structural, linguistic, and literary style and whether it

---

<sup>34</sup> It is possible Justin drew from Matthew instead of Luke, however, it has already been shown that the Matthew reading is not original to Matthew and the scribes who inserted the text there made reference to Luke.

<sup>35</sup> Comfort, *Encountering the Manuscripts: An Introduction to New Testament Paleography & Textual Criticism*, 73. Comfort dates  $\text{P}^{75}$  in the late 2<sup>nd</sup> Century.

<sup>36</sup> Comfort, *Encountering the Manuscripts: An Introduction to New Testament Paleography & Textual Criticism*, 72-73. Comfort notes the scribe as the “best of all early Christian scribes.”

<sup>37</sup> For extended discussion on the issues in using the testimony of the Greek Fathers in text criticism see Gordon D. Fee, “The Use of the Greek Fathers for New Testament Textual Criticism,” in, *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis*, ed. Bart D. Ehrman and Michael W. Holmes (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 191-207.

<sup>38</sup> Ehrman and Plunkett, “The Angel and the Agony: The Textual Problem of Luke 22:43-44,” 403-404. Ehrman and Plunkett note that few scholars have ever even tried to argue for accidental omission.

holds to Lucan patterns and can be validated with other passages within the narrative of Luke-Acts as well as if there are parallels outside of Luke-Acts in the rest of Scripture.

### Transcriptional Probabilities

In opening the discussion, there are a few important points to be made. First, the more “difficult reading” is probably closer to the original.<sup>39</sup> Additionally, it should also be noted that passages that have no synoptic parallel should also be considered more likely to be original as the scribes tended to synchronize the gospel accounts.<sup>40</sup> Finally, some have observed that the shorter reading is to be preferred. However, this preference should be carefully applied – often the scribes would omit text as well,<sup>41</sup> and there is good reason to believe that is the case here.

In analyzing these points, the passage is certainly the harder reading, and it is highly unlikely that a scribe created the passage from nothing.<sup>42</sup> To solidify this point, the verses have no synoptic parallel, ruling out a creation due to harmonization.<sup>43</sup> That said, it is also unlikely that the verses were omitted for harmonization as well – as it has already been seen, the tradition for both inclusion and omission began too early for scribes to have possessed and reviewed copies of all three synoptics and consider harmonizing them.<sup>44</sup> Further, it should be noted that there are few occurrences of the deletion of such a large portion of text on account of

---

<sup>39</sup> Bruce M. Metzger and Bart D. Ehrman, *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration*, 4<sup>th</sup> ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 314. Metzger and Ehrman note that scribes would generally alter the text to make it easier to read.

<sup>40</sup> Epp and Fee, *Studies in the Theory and Method of New Testament Textual Criticism*, 14; Metzger and Ehrman, *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration*, 14.

<sup>41</sup> Epp and Fee, *Studies in the Theory and Method of New Testament Textual Criticism*, 14. Fee notes that the scribes would tend to add text, but subtract if they found something that they would find theologically disagreeable. For further discussion on the see Eldon Jay Epp, “Issues in New Testament Textual Criticism: Moving from the Nineteenth Century to the Twenty-First Century,” in *Rethinking New Testament Textual Criticism*, ed. David Alan Black (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2002), 27-30. Epp further points out the problems with following this principle without exception.

<sup>42</sup> Plummer, *The Gospel According to S. Luke*, 509. “It would be impossible to regard these verses as a product of the inventiveness of the scribes.”

<sup>43</sup> Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke (X-XXIV)* (AB, Garden City: Doubleday, 1983), 1443-1445. Rather, as it will be shown shortly, it is more probable that the opposite is true.

<sup>44</sup> Brown, “The Lucan Authorship of Luke 22:43-44,” 158. Brown also notes arguments that use the same evidence to reach different conclusion – for example, harmonization to make the text match a martyrdom account.

harmonization, and finally, if the scribes went to such lengths to harmonize this text, why did they not harmonize the rest of the passage, with all of its distinctive attributes, as well.<sup>45</sup>

Ruling out harmonization and noting the passage's inclusion makes the reading "more difficult," the question should now be raised: why would the scribes have omitted the text? Scholars have raised the point that Docetism was rampant at the time, and have concluded that text was created to combat the heresies of the day – particularly noting Justin Martyr's account.<sup>46</sup> However, as it has already been seen, Justin's view of the "memoirs of the apostles" is exceedingly high, and it seems untenable that he would have created a passage for the sake of combatting Docetists when plenty of other texts could have been used. Further, his assurance that the early church taught from and viewed the "memoirs" as authoritative provides corroboration from a multitude in the early church that would have viewed the text as valid as well.<sup>47</sup> It should be noted that similar accusations have been raised against the testimonies of Irenaeus<sup>48</sup> and Hippolytus<sup>49</sup> as well, however they are inadequate for similar reasons.<sup>50</sup> This argument loses

---

<sup>45</sup> Ehrman and Plunkett, "The Angel and the Agony: The Textual Problem of Luke 22:43-44," 404.

<sup>46</sup> Ehrman and Plunkett, "The Angel and the Agony: The Textual Problem of Luke 22:43-44," 406-407.

<sup>47</sup> Metzger, *The Canon of the New Testament: Its Origin, Development, and Significance*. 145-146.

<sup>48</sup> Irenaeus testifies in *Against Heresies*: "Had he received nothing from Mary [as the Gnostics believe], he would never have taken the foods which come from the earth, the foods by which the body taken from the earth is nourished. Nor would he have felt hunger after fasting, like Moses and Elijah, for forty days, if his body had not been seeking its proper nourishment. Nor would John his disciple have written: 'Jesus, wearied by the journey, sat down,' nor would David have prophesied of Him: 'They added to the pain of my wounds. Nor would he have wept over Lazarus, nor would he have sweated drops of blood, nor would blood and water flowed from His pierced side. For these are all signs of flesh taken from the earth, the flesh which the Lord recapitulated in Himself, in order to save His own handiwork.'" Quoted in Hans Urs von Balthasar, *The Scandal of the Incarnation: Irenaeus Against the Heresies*, trans. by John Saward, (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1981), 61-62.

<sup>49</sup> Hippolytus testifies in *Against Noetus*: "Although he was God clearly revealed, he did not disown what was human about himself as well. He is hungry and exhausted, weary and thirsty; he fears and flees and is troubled when he prays. He sleeps on a pillow, yet as God he has a nature that does not know sleeping. He asks to be excused the suffering of the cup, yet he was present in the world for this very reason. In his agony, he sweats and an angel strengthens him, yet he strengthens those who believe in him and has taught them by his example to treat death with contempt." Quoted in Just, *Luke*, 344.

<sup>50</sup> For an extended discussion of Irenaeus' and Hippolytus' view of Scriptures, see Metzger, *The Canon of the New Testament: Its Origin, Development, and Significance*, 149-156. For further discussion on Irenaeus' view, see Kruger, "Early Christian Attitudes toward the Reproduction of Texts," 78. "Irenaeus expresses his concern about careful copying of his own writings when he adds an exhortation at the conclusions of one of his letters, 'I adjure thee, who shalt copy out of this book... that thou compare what thou shalt transcribe and correct it with this copy whence thou art transcribing, with all care.' If Irenaeus was so concerned about changes to his own writings, then no doubt his concern about changes in the scripture would be equal if not greater.

further weight considering that the Gnostics would have had similar arguments refuting the Savior's presence there as they did with the parallel account in Matthew that already portrayed Jesus' suffering, albeit to a slightly lesser extent.<sup>51</sup> Finally, it is also worth noting that the entire argument is based on the assumption that the text was created by those combatting the Docetists; however, it could have just as easily been an omission by Docetists attempting to solidify their view according to Scripture.<sup>52</sup>

Beyond the inadequate reasoning for the text's creation, Epiphanius also provides us with a testimony affirming the probability of the text's omission, noting the fear of some scribes to include them.<sup>53</sup> Accusations that he was merely commenting on the scribal tradition of his day and was unable to look back to the second century are somewhat hollow on a couple of levels, but it especially bears considering that Epiphanius remarked that it was often the orthodox scribes, ignorant of what they were doing, who tended to omit them – not heretics.<sup>54</sup> This scribal tradition of the time was not a casual and disconnected group of scribes, but rather a professional and attentive group, and there is good reason to find a justifiable “window” that Epiphanius could look through.<sup>55</sup> This position is further supported given what we know from Origen's writings against Celsus, that Celsus would often find support for the denial of Christ's divinity based around Gethsemane. This provides basis to Epiphanius' claims that it would have been the orthodox scribes desiring to combat heresy who would want to omit the text.<sup>56</sup>

---

<sup>51</sup> Brown, “The Lucan Authorship of Luke 22:43-44,” 158.

<sup>52</sup> Patella, Michael, *The Death of Jesus: The Diabolical Force and the Ministering Angel: Luke 23:44-49*, (CahRB 43; Paris: Gabalda et Cie, 1999), 11.

<sup>53</sup> Ehrman and Plunkett, “The Angel and the Agony: The Textual Problem of Luke 22:43-44,” 404-405.

<sup>54</sup> Ehrman and Plunkett, “The Angel and the Agony: The Textual Problem of Luke 22:43-44,” 406-408. Ehrman and Plunkett discredit Epiphanius' saying that his testimony is unreliable as it is coming from the fourth century saying they “tell us nothing about what led to the initial alteration of the text in the second century.” However, they also note John Mayragomec'i in 700 AD accusation that the passage was created by the Chalcedonians, but do not discredit his accusation, despite its even later date. They conclude that the

Raymond Brown also finds this conclusion untenable. Even though Epiphanius was writing when Arianism was the more concerning heresy, Brown finds his interaction with orthodoxy of his day a window into earlier orthodoxy as well – see Brown, “The Lucan Authorship of Luke 22:43-44,” 158.

<sup>55</sup> Kruger, “Early Christian Attitudes toward the Reproduction of Texts,” 63-80.

<sup>56</sup> C.M. Tuckett, “Luke 22,43-44: The “Agony” in the Garden and Luke's Gospel,” (*New Testament Textual Criticism and Exegesis: festschrift J. Delobel* Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2002), 141.

Ultimately, any argument based purely on scribal intent will fall short and unable to make any definitive claims. However, the previous discussion has shown there is good reason to believe the text was written by Luke originally, and that the text was omitted by scribes arguing against heresies that denied Jesus' divinity. Discussion will now turn to an examination of the intrinsic evidence to see if the text matches Luke's matches Luke's literary and structural style.

### Intrinsic Probabilities – Arguments Within of Luke-Acts

In opening the discussion on the intrinsic probabilities – whether there are any inherent attributes to include or omit the text – it should be noted that the discussion is sprawling. Significant work has been in researching the text's emotional, structural, literary, and linguistic styles and each of these will be addressed in turn.

First, some have found the verses to be to disrupt the emotional context of the passage.<sup>57</sup> However, in contrast to this, it has been shown that there are parallels between Jesus' ἀγωνία and the disciples' λύπη<sup>58</sup> in verse 45.<sup>59</sup> In light of this it seems not only untenable to remove the verses due to an emotional disconnect the verses, but actually more logical to include them for that very reason.<sup>60</sup>

Further, it has been suggested that Luke is writing about a different sort of Jesus than the Jesus portrayed in Mark. While “Mark’s Jesus” is distressed and tormented, “Luke’s Jesus” is calm and collected.<sup>61</sup> However, this claim is overstated – in verse 42, Luke still shows Jesus pronouncing the submission of his will to the Father’s will, implying that he did wish for the

---

<sup>57</sup> John Nolland, *Luke 18:35-24:53* (WBC 35c, Dallas: Word, 1993), 1080-1081. Nolland considers it to be the primary reason to omit the text, and does so on that basis and secondarily for the chiastic structure, which will be discussed shortly.

<sup>58</sup> “sorrow”

<sup>59</sup> Green, “Jesus on the Mount of Olives (Luke 22:39-46): Tradition and Theology,” 37.

<sup>60</sup> Brian E. Beck, “‘Imitatio Christi’ and the Lucan Passion Narrative,” in *Suffering and Martyrdom in the New Testament: Studies Presented to G.M. Styler by the Cambridge New Testament Seminar*, eds. William Horbury and Brian McNeil (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981), 40. “If Luke represents the disciples as trying, within their limits, to be obedient to Jesus, and carrying out the command to pray, he may have considered that, if the demands of prayer were such that even Jesus sustained them only with difficulty and by angelic help, the disciples would have been totally exhausted by them.”

<sup>61</sup> Ehrman and Plunkett, “The Angel and the Agony: The Textual Problem of Luke 22:43-44,” 411. “In all of Luke’s passion narrative...only here does [Jesus] fail to approach his fate with calm assurance.”

Father to “remove this cup” from him.<sup>62</sup> However, even if you deny this and still argue that Luke is depicting a different Jesus than Mark, the argument is still tenuous. There has been some discussion over “ἀγωνία” (one of the *hapax legomena* of the text, but arguments about Luke’s linguistic style will be discussed more shortly) and whether it actually refers to physical or mental anguish or to Jesus’ “readiness for the great contest and conflict that is about to come.”<sup>63</sup> If one takes the view that Mark and Luke have different depictions of Jesus, then the Luke’s particular imagery can be upheld anyway.<sup>64</sup>

Then there is the issue of the chiastic structure – Jesus tells His disciples to pray, then Jesus goes away by Himself, then He kneels to pray, then He prays, then He stands up from His prayer, then He returns to the disciples, then He tells them to pray again.<sup>65</sup> This chiasm has led to the rejection of the text as an intrusion that “shifts the entire center of gravity of the chiasm away from the focal point of the pericope (Jesus’ prayer).”<sup>66</sup> While certainly chiasm is a Lucan characteristic, numerous scholars have remarked that this a rather grandiose claim, and the chiastic structure here has been overstated.<sup>67</sup> Further, a chiastic structure can also be made that includes the verses where Jesus’ prayer, the “focal point of the pericope,” can be further broken down and remain central – Jesus prays, the Father responds by sending an angel, and Jesus prays again.<sup>68</sup>

---

<sup>62</sup> Tuckett, “Luke 22:43-44: The “Agony” in the Garden and Luke’s Gospel,” 137.

<sup>63</sup> J.H. Neyrey, *The Passion According to Luke* (New York: Paulist, 1985), 49-68. Interestingly, Neyrey did the research in 1980 that paved the way for Ehrman and Plunkett to argue for Luke’s “calm and collected Jesus.” Later in 1985, he updated the research to account for ἀγωνία.

<sup>64</sup> It should be noted that Green convincingly refutes Neyrey’s hypothesis regarding ἀγωνία and different depictions of Jesus in Mark and Luke, but still arrives at the conclusion based on the linguistic style that the passage is Lucan. However, I felt Neyrey’s research was worth mentioning considering it was the basis of Ehrman and Plunkett’s claims to deny the Lucan authorship of the text. For further discussion see – Green, “Jesus on the Mount of Olives (Luke 22:39-46): Tradition and Theology,” 33-34.

<sup>65</sup> Ehrman and Plunkett, “The Angel and the Agony: The Textual Problem of Luke 22:43-44,” 413.

<sup>66</sup> Ehrman and Plunkett, “The Angel and the Agony: The Textual Problem of Luke 22:43-44,” 415-416. They further note, “The verses are structurally intrusive, breaking into an otherwise clear and concise chiasmus.”

<sup>67</sup> Clivaz, “The Angel and the Sweat Like “Drops of Blood” (Lk 22:43-44): Ψ<sup>69</sup> and *f*<sup>13</sup>,” 434-435; Brown, “The Lucan Authorship of Luke 22:43-44,” 157.

<sup>68</sup> Bovon *Luke 3: A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke 19:28-24:53* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2002), 198; Brown, “The Lucan Authorship of Luke 22:43-44,” 157.

The linguistic style of the text has also been shown to be consistent with Luke's. In opening the discussion, there are three *hapax legomena*: ἀγωνίᾳ, ἵδρως, and θρόμβοι. Additionally, ἐκτενέστερον only appears only here and twice in Acts.<sup>69</sup> Without reading too much into this,<sup>70</sup> the lexical depth is typically Lucan.<sup>71</sup> Beyond these, the rest of the vocabulary is also distinctively Lucan – ώσει is typically Lucan.<sup>72</sup> To lesser degrees, προσηγέτο, καὶ ἐγένετο, and ὥφθη are used frequently in Luke compared to the rest of the NT. Additionally, ώσεὶ θρόμβοι αἴματος καταβαίνοντες ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν does follow Luke's tendency to use simile.<sup>73</sup> The final linguistic note is more complicated and regards the phrase ἄγγελος ἀπ' οὐρανου.

Scholars have observed that angels in Luke are not referred to as coming “from heaven,” and so the construction should not be considered Lucan.<sup>74</sup> However, this accusation is overreaching, especially considering the rarity of angelic appearances. Further, the phrase ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ appears multiple times in Luke.<sup>75</sup> Additionally, angels are often sent “τοῦ θεοῦ” or “κυρίου,” and a group of angels do “ἀπῆλθον ἀπ' αὐτῶν εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν.”<sup>76</sup>

However, perhaps most the most convincing argument comes from a couple of accounts in Acts that closely parallel the passage. The first parallel comes in Acts 21:13-14, where Agabus tries to convince Paul not to go to Jerusalem. After Paul displays his submission to the Father, regardless of whatever fate may await him in Jerusalem, Luke and the crowd respond with Τοῦ

---

<sup>69</sup> Green, “Jesus on the Mount of Olives (Luke 22:39-46): Tradition and Theology,” 35.

<sup>70</sup> For further discussion on the problems of over-interpretation see Moisès Silva, “God, Language, and Scripture,” in *Foundations of Contemporary Interpretation*, ed. Moisès Silva (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996), 197-276.

<sup>71</sup> Green, “Jesus on the Mount of Olives (Luke 22:39-46): Tradition and Theology,” 36.

<sup>72</sup> Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke (I-IX)* (AB, Garden City: Doubleday, 1982), 109, 111.

<sup>73</sup> Green, “Jesus on the Mount of Olives (Luke 22:39-46): Tradition and Theology,” 36.

<sup>74</sup> Ehrman and Plunkett, “The Angel and the Agony: The Textual Problem of Luke 22:43-44,” 409.

<sup>75</sup> Green, “Jesus on the Mount of Olives (Luke 22:39-46): Tradition and Theology,” 36. Green particularly notes Luke 9:54, 17:29, and 21:11.

<sup>76</sup> Green, “Jesus on the Mount of Olives (Luke 22:39-46): Tradition and Theology,” 36. τοῦ θεοῦ – “of God,” appears in Luke 12:8-9; 15:10; Acts 10:3; 27:23; κυρίου – “of the Lord,” appears in Luke 12:11; and ἀπῆλθον ἀπ' αὐτῶν εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν – “went away from them into heaven,” appears in Luke 2:15.

κυρίου τὸ θέλημα γινέσθω. This response sounds closely to Jesus' prayer in Luke 22:42. But to tighten this parallel, immediately before in Acts 21:13 Paul proclaims Τί ποιεῖτε κλαίοντες καὶ συνθρύπτοντες μου τὴν καρδίαν ἐγὼ γάρ οὐ μόνον δεθῆναι ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀποθανεῖν εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἐτοίμως ἔχω ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ.<sup>77</sup> In this passage συνθρύπτοντές performs a similar task as ἀγωνίᾳ, after the temptation to shirk the will of the Father, Jesus and Paul both suffer – Jesus in agony and Paul with a broken heart – but remain resolute to follow the will of the Father. The second parallel happens in Acts 27:23-24 when Paul is about to be shipwrecked. There is less linguistic parallelism here so much as overarching pattern, but the parallel is clear – Paul is in on board a prison ship, caught in a storm at sea, facing his death, and an angel of God appears to him to give him hope.<sup>78</sup>

In summary, there is very good reason to refute the claims that the style, structure, language, and themes are not Lucan. Moreover, on account of the language, the parallels in Acts, and the emotional continuity with verse 45, there is actually very good reason to believe the text is Lucan. As a closing argument, this paper will now examine the parallels in the rest of Scripture.

#### Intrinsic Probabilities – Arguments Outside of Luke-Acts

While certainly Jesus' sweating drops of blood is a unique occurrence, there is certainly one notable parallel that can be found in Scripture – namely in the Servant Messiah portrayed in Isaiah, that Jesus often identifies Himself with.<sup>79</sup> While the verses do not have direct ties to a specific passage of verses, parallels have been shown between Jesus' suffering here and with the experiences of the foretold Servant Messiah throughout Isaiah – with particular parallels to be drawn from the Lord strengthening his Servant.<sup>80</sup>

---

<sup>77</sup> “What are you doing weeping and breaking my heart? For I am ready not only to be imprisoned but even to die in Jerusalem for the name of the Lord Jesus.”

<sup>78</sup> Tuckett, “Luke 22,43-44: The “Agony” in the Garden and Luke’s Gospel,” 142-143.

<sup>79</sup> W.J. Larkin, “The Old Testament Background of Luke xxii. 43-44,” NTS 25 (1979): 253. Larkin notes specifically Isaiah 41:4; 42:4,6; 49:4,6; 50:5,7; 52:13-53:12. He also notes a few other possible parallels to be found in Elijah, Daniel, and others, however systematically rules them out or renders them as secondary parallels at best.

<sup>80</sup> Larkin, “The Old Testament Background of Luke xxii. 43-44,” 253. Larkin draws parallels for ἐνισχύων αὐτόν in Isaiah 42:6; Isaiah 49:4,6; Isaiah 50:5-6; and Isaiah 53:12.

Beyond this parallel from the Old Testament however, there are also some notable accounts from the other Gospels as well. This is not the only time Jesus has angels meet with Him – Matthew and Mark both recount angels ministering to Jesus after His temptation by Satan.<sup>81</sup> Matthew also notes Jesus’ response during His arrest that He is confident in the Father’s willingness to supply Him with angelic support if He asked for it.<sup>82</sup> John also notes the Father Himself strengthens Jesus at His request.<sup>83</sup>

While these parallels are small, they do provide a wider context to provide further assurance of the legitimacy of the text. It has been noted that Luke particularly builds up Jesus’ association with the Messiah Isaiah foretold, and this association is important to show the text’s consistency with the rest of Luke.<sup>84</sup> Further, each of the other Gospels provide similar accounts at other points in Jesus’ ministry and this passage in Luke is not completely without precedence.

When all of the internal evidences are considered, combined with the refutation of the arguments against the inclusion of the text, the evidence weighs in favor of the inclusion of the passage.<sup>85</sup> Bearing that in mind, it is now worth considering what impact they have on Christian theology and why fighting for the inclusion of the text is important.

### Implications and Reflection

Thus, having argued for the text’s inclusion, reflection must be made on why it matters and what the church stands to gain by the inclusion of the text. Most notably, there are two implications that can be drawn from the text: first, it gives us a vivid description of the faithfulness of God the Father, and secondly, it declares that Christ is not merely the Divine Savior, but also a human

---

<sup>81</sup> Brown, “The Lucan Authorship of Luke 22:43-44,” 159. Mark 1:13 and Matt 4:11. Interestingly, Brown also makes a case for Luke’s moving the angelic aide here as this is the “opportune time” that Satan was looking for to return to tempt Jesus further. In the pattern of Jesus’ responses to Satan’s temptations from Deuteronomy, Brown argues Luke is creating a parallel to Moses’ song from Deut 32:43. Darrell Bock argues against this, saying the allusion is more a “conceptual allusion to God’s willingness to help his own,” and points to Deut 32:36-38 as well as 2 Macc 4:6 and 4 Macc 18 to show it is a theme throughout Judaism – see Bock, *Luke*, 1761. For a more extended discussion on possible allusions – see Patella, *The Death of Jesus: The Diabolical Force and the Ministering Angel*, 48-82.

<sup>82</sup> Brown, “The Lucan Authorship of Luke 22:43-44,” 160. Matt 26:53.

<sup>83</sup> Brown, The Lucan Authorship of Luke 22:43-44,” 160. John 12:27-29.

<sup>84</sup> Larkin, “The Old Testament Background of Luke xxii. 43-44,” 253.

<sup>85</sup> Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, 832.

Savior who is able to relate to the sufferings of mankind. Additionally, of secondary importance to proclaiming the identity of the Father, the text reinforces the importance of prayer.

### God's Faithfulness and Christ's Divinity

As the Divine Son of God, He turns to the Father in prayer and we see the Father answer by sending an angel. This event testifies to God's faithfulness – that when we suffer, we know that God is with us.<sup>86</sup> It also bears noting that this is not some far off help either – the Father immediately answers Christ's prayer and sends Him the help He needs. It also gives us insight into the manner in which we should pray. Jesus prays that God would accomplish His will through Jesus and God responds by bringing that to pass. Even in prayer, God reveals Himself as sovereign – He will answer the prayers of His people, but He will do so “in a way that brings glory to Him, and salvation to His suffering people.”<sup>87</sup> Moreover, Jesus' complete and perfect agreement with the Father's will in His prayer attests to His own divinity. This is not the prayer of a fallen man, rather it is the prayer of God, understanding that the joy set before Him is worth enduring the cross, and all the sufferings with it, that stand before Him.<sup>88</sup> His prayer and refusal to submit to the temptation to pursue His own will and deny the cup reveal His divine nature with the power and capability to stand as the second Adam, and as a new covenant head for God's people so that they may be found righteous.<sup>89</sup>

### Christ's Humanity

Not only testifying to God's faithfulness, it also displays Jesus' humanity. Whether one takes the view that Jesus is ἐν ἀγωνίᾳ unto the point of actually sweating literal blood, or sweating profusely, He shows himself in the middle of a great struggle.<sup>90</sup> Jesus, facing His own death, wrestles with the same anxiety that any of us might face – if not more so because He is aware

---

<sup>86</sup> Bock, *Luke*, 1761.

<sup>87</sup> Philip Graham Ryken, *Luke: Volume 2, Luke 13-24*, (Reformed Expository Commentary; Phillipsburg: P&R Publishing, 2009), 509.

<sup>88</sup> Ryken, *Luke: Volume 2, Luke 13-24*, 508-509.

<sup>89</sup> David W. Pao, and Eckhard J. Schnabel, “Luke,” in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*, ed. G.K. Beale and D.A. Carson (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007), 389, 398.

<sup>90</sup> Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 780. Green notes that the language used comes close to what might be used to describe an athlete.

that the death He faces isn't just a normal death, but rather the due punishment for the sins of the entire world. Based on this, Philip Graham Ryken rightly asks, "Who can ever tell what suffering Jesus endured for our salvation, not just on the cross of Calvary, but also in the Garden of Gethsemane."<sup>91</sup> But in spite of this temptation to give in to His anxiety, He stays the course, on account of his great love for us. Ryken again movingly notes, "The lesson from Gethsemane is not that Jesus suffers *with* us, but that He suffered *for* us."<sup>92</sup> However, being strengthened, he faces his death anyway – in contrast to our nature that succumbs to that temptation.<sup>93</sup> The faithfulness of the human Savior reveals the fulfilment of the second Adam. While only God could bear the burden of our sins, only a man could be sacrificed for sin.<sup>94</sup>

There are a couple of minor points to note the order of the text as well. First, Jesus goes to the Lord in prayer in the midst of His greatest struggle. Jesus' response to suffering is not one of trying to shoulder the burden Himself, but rather of turning to the Father for aid. It bears noting that this response is the exact opposite of what we do in our struggle for autonomy. Second, while it might make more logical sense that Jesus would be portrayed as γενόμενος ἐν ἀγωνίᾳ before the ἄγγελος ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ ἐνισχύων αὐτόν,<sup>95</sup> however that is not the case. The Father does not remove the cup, and object of Jesus' ἀγωνίᾳ is still there, but he is now prepared to meet the fate awaiting him.<sup>96</sup> It is worth noting that this is absolutely opposite to the prosperity gospel that often says that if you pray enough, tithe enough, and have enough faith then God will spare you from suffering and will give you everything you ask for. No, rather in being conformed to the image of our Savior there is a call to be submissive to the will of the Father, wherever that may lead, and in the case of our Savior, it lead Him to His death.

---

<sup>91</sup> Ryken, *Luke: Volume 2*, Luke 13-24, 504.

<sup>92</sup> Ryken, 505-506.

<sup>93</sup> Patella, *The Death of Jesus: The Diabolical Force and the Ministering Angel*, 15.

<sup>94</sup> R. Kent Hughes, *Luke, Volume II: That You May Know the Truth*, (Preaching the Word; Wheaton: Crossway, 1998), 334-335.

<sup>95</sup> Marshall, 832.

<sup>96</sup> Bock, *Luke*, 1762.

## Conclusion

In closing, while the field of textual criticism may not seem pastoral, in arguing for the inclusion of Luke 22:43-44, we find that Luke has left us the testimony of two verses that proclaim the Gospel itself. The text proclaims the identity of our Savior, and we see not only the Divine Messiah, but also the Suffering Servant, heading to the cross for our sins. Jesus is a man faithful and righteous in the Garden in spite of the temptation before him, truly displaying his identity as the second Adam, and He is God, capable of bearing the burden for our sins. Further, the passage also displays the relationship within the Trinity as the Son goes to the Father as He faces His darkest trial, and the Father immediately responds.

The text then attests to the tradition proclaimed in the Apostles' Creed that the church has confessed for centuries:

We believe in God the Father almighty, Maker of heaven and earth, and in Jesus Christ, His only-begotten Son, our Lord: who was conceived by the Holy Spirit, born of the virgin Mary; suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead, and buried; he descended into hell, the third day he rose again from the dead; he ascended into heaven and sits at the right hand of God the Father almighty; from thence he shall come to judge the living and the dead. We believe in the Holy Spirit; the holy catholic Church; the communion of saints; the forgiveness of sins; the resurrection of the body; and the life everlasting.<sup>97</sup>

Through Luke's testimony in Luke 22:43-44, we see the Son praying in perfect unity with God the Father almighty. We see His physicality, and that He was a man who was born. Through His prayer and faithfulness to the Father, we see His divinity, attesting to His conception by the Holy Spirit. Through His sweat and agony, we see one of the most vivid displays of His suffering in all of Scripture. We can be assured that through His life, suffering, death, burial, and resurrection we can be forgiven our sins and drawn into a new covenant relationship with the Father.

---

<sup>97</sup> Quoted in Mark A. Noll, *Confessions and Catechisms of the Reformation*, (Vancouver: Regent College Publishing, 1991), 141.

## Appendix

Text Included	Text Included (continued)	Text Included with Asterisks or Obeli	Text Appended after Matt 26:39 <sup>98</sup>	Text Omitted <sup>99</sup>
ς <sup>*,b</sup>	Diatessaron <sup>a</sup> , earm, i, n	Δ <sup>c</sup>	<i>f</i> <sup>13</sup>	𝔓 <sup>75</sup>
<i>f</i> <sup>1</sup>	Justin	Π <sup>c</sup>	<i>Lect</i> <sup>1/2</sup> [ <i>l</i> 184 <sup>1/2</sup> ]	𝔓 <sup>69</sup>
D	Irenaeus	892 <sup>mg</sup>		ς <sup>a</sup>
K	Hippolytus	1079		A
L	Ps-Dionysius	1195		B
X	Eusebius	1216		N
Θ	Didymus	bo <sup>pt</sup>		R
Δ <sup>*</sup>	Jerome			T
Π <sup>*</sup>				W
Ψ				579
0171				1071 <sup>*</sup>
565				<i>Lect</i> <sup>pt</sup>
700				arm <sup>ms</sup>
892 <sup>*</sup>				bo <sup>pt</sup>
1009				geo
1010				it <sup>f</sup>
1071 <sup>mg</sup>				sa
1230				syr <sup>s</sup>
1241				pc
1242				Marcion
1253				Clement
1344				Origen
1365				MSS <sup>acc. to Hilary</sup>
1546				Athanasius
1646				Ambrose
2148				MSS <sup>acc. to Epiphanius</sup>
2174				MSS <sup>acc. to Jerome</sup>
arm				Cyril
Byz				John-Damascus
eth				
it				
syr <sup>c, p, h, l, pal</sup>				
vg				

<sup>98</sup> *Lect*<sup>1/2</sup> [*l* 184<sup>1/2</sup>] transposes Luke 22:43-44 after Matt 26:39 along with καὶ ἀναστὰς ἀπὸ τῆς προσευχῆς from Luke 22:45a.

<sup>99</sup>𝔓<sup>69</sup> also does not include verses 41-42

## Bibliography

Aland, Kurt and Barbara Aland. *The Text of the New Testament: An Introduction to the Critical Editions and to the Theory and Practice of Modern Textual Criticism*, 2nd ed. Translated by Errol F. Rhodes. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989.

Balthasar, Hans Urs von. *The Scandal of the Incarnation: Irenaeus Against the Heresies*. Translated by John Saward. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1981.

Beck, Brian E. “‘Imitatio Christi’ and the Lucan Passion Narrative.” in *Suffering and Martyrdom in the New Testament: Studies Presented to G.M. Styler by the Cambridge New Testament Seminar*. Edited by William Horbury and Brian McNeil. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.

Bock, Darrell L. *Luke: Volume 1: 1:1-9:50*. BECNT 3a. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1994.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Luke: Volume 2: 9:51-24:53*. BECNT 3b. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1996.

Bovon, François. *Luke 1: A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke 1:1-9:50*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2002.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Luke 3: A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke 19:28-24:53*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2002.

Brown, Raymond. “The Lucan Authorship of Luke 22:43-44.” SBL 31 (1992): 154-164.

Carson, D.A., and Douglas J. Moo. *An Introduction to the New Testament*. 2nd Ed. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2005.

Clivaz, Claire. “The Angel and the Sweat Like ‘Drops of Blood’ (Lk 22:43-44):  $\ddot{\text{p}}^69$  and  $f^{13}$ .” HTR 98 (2005): 419-440. ATLA Religion Database with ATLASerials, EBSCOhost (accessed November 11, 2015).

Comfort, Philip. *Encountering the Manuscripts: An Introduction to New Testament Paleography & Textual Criticism*. Nashville: Broadman & Holman Publishers, 2005.

Ehrman, Bart D., and Mark A. Plunkett. “The Angel and the Agony: The Textual Problem of Luke 22:43-44.” CBQ 45 (1983): 401-416. ATLA Religion Database with ATLASerials, EBSCOhost (accessed November 11, 2015).

Epp, Eldon Jay. “Issues in New Testament Textual Criticism: Moving from the Nineteenth Century to the Twenty-First Century.” Pages 17-76 in *Rethinking New Testament Textual Criticism*. Edited by David Alan Black. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2002.

Epp, Eldon Jay and Gordon D. Fee. *Studies in the Theory and Method of New Testament Textual Criticism*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993.

Fee, Gordon D. "The Use of the Greek Fathers for New Testament Textual Criticism." Pages 191-207 in *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis*. Edited by Bart D. Ehrman and Michael W. Holmes. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.

Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *The Gospel According to Luke (I-IX)*. AB. Garden City: Doubleday, 1982.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Gospel According to Luke (X-XXIV)*. AB. Garden City: Doubleday, 1983.

Green, Joel B. *The Gospel of Luke*. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Jesus on the Mount of Olives (Luke 22:39-46): Tradition and Theology." JSNT 26 (1986): 29-48. ATLA Religion Database with ATLASerials, EBSCOhost (accessed November 11, 2015).

Hernández, Jr., Juan. "The Early Text of Luke." Pages 121-139 in *The Early Text of the New Testament*. Edited by Charles E. Hill and Michael J. Kruger. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Hughes, R. Kent. *Luke, Volume II: That You May Know the Truth*. Preaching the Word. Wheaton: Crossway, 1998.

Just, Arthur A. *Luke*. ACCS III. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2003.

Kruger, Michael J. "Early Christian Attitudes toward the Reproduction of Texts." Pages 63-80 in *The Early Text of the New Testament*. Edited by Charles E. Hill and Michael J. Kruger. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Larkin, W.J. "The Old Testament Background of Luke xxii. 43-44." NTS 25 (1979): 250-254.

Marshall, I. Howard. *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. NIGTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978.

Metzger, Bruce M. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament: A Companion Volume to the United Bible Societies' Greek New Testament (Fourth Revised Edition)*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Canon of the New Testament: Its Origin, Development, and Significance*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997.

Metzger, Bruce M. and Bart D. Ehrman. *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration*. 4th ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Neyrey, J.H. *The Passion According to Luke*. New York: Paulist, 1985.

Noll, Mark A. *Confessions and Catechisms of the Reformation*. Vancouver: Regent College Publishing, 1991.

Nolland, John. *Luke 18:35-24:53*. WBC 35c. Dallas: Word, 1993.

Pao, David W., and Eckhard J. Schnabel. “Luke.” Pages 251-414 in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*. Edited by G.K. Beale and D.A. Carson. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007.

Patella, Michael, *The Death of Jesus: The Diabolical Force and the Ministering Angel: Luke 23:44-49*. CahRB 43. Paris: Gabalda et Cie, 1999.

Plummer, Alfred. *The Gospel According to S. Luke*. ICC. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994.

Ryken, Philip Graham. *Luke: Volume 2, Luke 13-24*. Reformed Expository Commentary. Phillipsburg: P&R Publishing, 2009.

Silva, Moisès. “God, Language, and Scripture.” Pages 193-280 in *Foundations of Contemporary Interpretation*. Edited by Moises Silva. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996.

Tannehill, Robert C. *Luke*. ANTC. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1996.

Tuckett, C.M. “Luke 22,43-44: The “Agony” in the Garden and Luke’s Gospel.” Pages 131-144 in *New Testament Textual Criticism and Exegesis: festschrift J. Delobel*. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2002.