

Luke 22:43–44: An Anti-Docetic Interpolation or an Apologetic Omission?¹

Lincoln H. Blumell
Brigham Young University

Abstract: This article examines the text-critical history of Luke 22:43–44 and argues, primarily on external grounds, that it is more likely that this passage was deliberately excised from Luke rather than interpolated. Along these lines it argues that this passage was excised from some early manuscripts of Luke prior to the end of the third century for apologetic reasons. Additionally, this article will question the anti-docetic interpolation theory, which is seemingly held by the majority of interpreters of this passage, and will argue that this is not the only way to understand the text-critical evidence.

Introduction

The textual integrity of Luke 22:43–44 has long been a matter of dispute.² Since the pioneering work of Brooke F. Westcott and Fenton J. A. Hort on the Greek New Testament at the close of the nineteenth century the authenticity of this passage has been hotly disputed.³ In fact, over

¹ I would like to sincerely thank the anonymous reviewers of this article for their lucid and forthright critique of this submission at its various stages; as a result it has been greatly improved. For journal abbreviations and abbreviations of other standard works I have followed P. H. Alexander et al. (eds.), *The SBL Handbook of Style: For Ancient Near Eastern, Biblical, and Early Christian Studies* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1999). For Patristic abbreviations not appearing in the *SBL Handbook* I have followed G.W.H. Lampe (ed.), *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1961). For Latin Patristic abbreviations not appearing in the *SBL Handbook* I have followed H. Chirat, *Dictionnaire Latin-Français des auteurs chrétiens* (Paris: Librairie des Méridiens, 1954). English translations are my own unless otherwise noted.

² Luke 22:43–44 (NA²⁸): [Ἰ⁴³ὥφθη δὲ αὐτῷ ἄγγελος ἀπ’ οὐρανοῦ ἐνισχύων αὐτόν. ⁴⁴καὶ γενόμενος ἐν ἀγωνίᾳ, ἐκτενέστερον προσηύχετο· καὶ ἐγένετο ὁ ἰδρῶς αὐτοῦ ὡσεὶ θρόμβοι αἵματος καταβαίνοντες ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν.] (“⁴³Then an angel from heaven appeared to him and gave him strength. ⁴⁴In his anguish he prayed more earnestly, and his sweat became like great drops of blood falling down on the ground” [Luke 22:43–44 NRSV]).

³ B.F. Westcott and F.J.A. Hort, *The New Testament in the Original Greek: Introduction, Appendix* (London: Macmillan, 1896), appendix 64–67, argue that the passage represents an interpolation, although a very early one: “On the other hand it would be impossible to regard these verses [Luke 22:43–44] as a product of the inventiveness of scribes. They can only be a fragment from the traditions, written or oral, which were, for a while at least, locally current beside the canonical Gospels, and which doubtless included matter of every degree or authenticity and intrinsic value. These verses ... may be safely called the most precious among the remains of this evangelic tradition which were rescued from oblivion by the scribes of the second century.” Cf. D. B. Weiss, *Das*

the course of the past hundred-plus years this passage has been subject to dozens of studies.⁴ As a result, different Bible versions produced during this period have reflected the ongoing debate over this passage; some bibles have chosen to omit this passage altogether; others have chosen to place the verses in double brackets to highlight their uncertain nature; and still others have preferred to leave the passage in without any discriminating apparatus.⁵ In this schol-

Neue Testament: Die Vier Evangelien. Band I (Leipzig, 1905), 434 does not include Luke 22:43–44 in his NT text stating: “v. 43f verurteilt ist, da Jesus weder der stärkung bedarf, noch in heißem kampf ringt.” For earlier text critical treatments of this passage in the nineteenth century see: J.S. Porter, *Principles of Textual Criticism with their Application to the Old and New Testaments* (London: Simms and McIntyre, 1848), 462–64; S.P. Tregelles, *The Greek New Testament, Edited from Ancient Authorities, with their Various Readings in Full, and the Latin Version of Jerome. Part II: Luke and John* (London: Samuel Bagster and Sons, 1857), 357; C. Tischendorf, *Novum Testamentum Graece. Editio Octava Critica Maior: Vol. I* (Lipsiae: Giesecke & Deverient, 1869), 694–96; C.E. Hammond, *Outlines of Textual Criticism Applied to the New Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1872), 103–4; F.H.A. Scrivener, *A Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament* (3rd ed.; Cambridge: Deighton, Bell and Co., 1883), 599–602.

⁴ For a detailed listing of those supporting and rejecting the authenticity of Luke 22:43–44, see R.E. Brown, *The Death of the Messiah*, 2 vols. (New York: Doubleday, 1994), 1.180 n. 2. For listings in earlier scholarship, see D. Crump, *Jesus the Intercessor* (WUNT 2/49; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1992), 116–17 n. 25; I. H. Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978), 831–82; and L. Brun, “Engel und Blutschweiss Lc 22.43–44,” *ZNW* (1933): 265. For the more recent studies on the subject (post Brown [1994]) see: D.C. Parker, *The Living Text of the Gospels* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 157–59; J.M.-O’Connor, “What Really Happened at Gethsemane?” *BRev* 14.2 (1998): 28–39, 52; M. Patella, *The Death of Jesus: The Diabolic Force and the Ministering Angel* (CahRB 43; Paris: Gabalda et Cie, 1999), 9–15; B.D. Ehrman, “Text and Interpretation: The Exegetical Significance of the ‘Original’ Text,” *TC: A Journal of Biblical Textual Criticism* 5 (2000): 32–48; A. Fuchs, “Gethsemane: Die deuteromarkinische Bearbeitung von Mk 14,32–42 par Mt 26, 36–46 par Lk 22, 39–46,” *SNTNU* (2000): 23–75; R.G. Regorico, “Agonía de Getsemaní,” *Mayéutica* 26 (2000): 377–473; C.A. Smith, “A Comparative Study of The Prayer of Gethsemane,” *Irish Biblical Studies* 22 (2000): 98–122; P. Murray, “The Prayers of Jesus in Luke’s Passion Narrative,” *Emmanuel* 107.2 (2001): 88–95, 105–6; G. Sterling, “Mors philosophi: The Death of Jesus in Luke,” *HTR* 94.4 (2001): 383–402; J.J. Pilch, “The Nose and Altered States of Consciousness: Tascodrugites and Ezekiel,” *HvTSt* 58.2 (2002): 708–20; R. Riesner, “Versuchung und Verklärung (Lukas 4,1–13; 9,28–36; 10,17–20; 22,39–53 und Johannes 12,20–36),” *TBei* 33 (2002): 197–207; C.M. Tuckett, “Luke 22, 43–44: The ‘Agony’ in the Garden and Luke’s Gospel,” in A. Denaux (ed.), *New Testament Textual Criticism and Exegesis: Festschrift J. Delobel* (BETL 161; Leuven: Peeters, 2002), 131–44; C. Clivaz, “The Angel and the Sweat Like ‘Drops of Blood’ (Lk 22:43–44): Φ^{69} and f^3 ,” *HTR* 98.4 (2005): 419–40; B.D. Ehrman, “Did Jesus Get Angry or Agonize? A Text Critic Pursues the Original Jesus Story,” *BRev* 21.5 (2005): 17–26; P.W. Comfort, *New Testament Text and Translation Commentary: Commenting on the Variant Readings of the Ancient New Testament Manuscripts and How they Relate to the Major English Translations* (Carol Stream, Ill.: Tyndale House Publishers, Inc., 2008), 233–35; T.A. Wayment, “A New Transcription of P.Oxy. 2383 (Φ^{69})” *NovT* 50 (2008): 351–57; C. Clivaz, *Lange et la sueur de sang (Lc 22,43–44): ou comment on pourrait bien écrire l’histoire* (BiTS 7; Leuven: Peeters, 2010); T.A. Wayment, “P.Oxy. 2383 (Φ^{69}) One More Time,” *NovT* 54 (2012): 288–92; F. Bovon, *Luke III: A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke 19:28–24:53* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis, 2012), 201–11.

⁵ The RSV omits this passage entirely. The ASV, Phillips, and NJB leave the passage as is with no discriminating apparatus. In the GNB, NAB, NASV, NIV, NKJV, NRSV, this passage is either placed in double brackets or has an accompanying footnote explaining that these verses are not found in certain early manuscripts. Both the NA²⁷ and NA²⁸, as well as the UBS³ and UBS⁴, include the passage but place it in double brackets. See R.L. Omanson, *A Textual Guide to the Greek New Testament* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2006), 150.

arly quagmire perhaps the most widely cited and influential study of Luke 22:43–44, at least in English, is that of Bart D. Ehrman and Mark A. Plunkett.⁶ In their examination Ehrman and Plunkett surveyed a wide variety of evidence in an effort to determine whether this passage should be considered authentic. While they admitted that the evidence did not point in one definitive direction, they argued that the passage was likely not original but represented a later interpolation.⁷ Notwithstanding the tentative nature of their conclusions, their article seems to have largely carried the day. If there is anything approaching a “consensus” in the field, it is that Luke 22:43–44 is not genuine but represents an interpolation.⁸

Leaving aside for the moment the issue of the manuscript evidence, one of the primary reasons this view has obtained a majority position is because its proponents have been able to marshal a seemingly probable explanation for why these verses might have been added to the Gospel of Luke. Ehrman and Plunkett asserted that sometime before ca. 160 CE the passage was added to Luke as anti-docetic polemic.⁹ More recently, Ehrman has argued that in the second century one of the greatest threats to emerging “proto orthodoxy” was Docetism, and that Luke 22:43–44 was added because it reinforced the humanity and corporality of Jesus and thus served as an evangelistic safeguard against docetic views of Jesus.¹⁰ On the other hand, those who have argued that the passage is authentic to Luke but was subsequently excised have not generally put forth a detailed explanation of how this occurred; most often this suggestion is merely mooted as a passing remark that is not thoroughly argued and is usually tangential to some other primary argument for the authenticity of these verses.¹¹ The lone exception is the

⁶ B.D. Ehrman and M.A. Plunkett, “The Angel and the Agony: The Textual Problem of Luke 22:43–44,” *CBQ* 45 (1983): 401–16. Potentially the most significant study may turn out to be Clivaz, *Lange et la sueur de sang*, given that it is the first book-length treatment of this passage.

⁷ Ehrman and Plunkett, “The Angel and the Agony,” 416, state: “No one argument yields a definitive solution. Rather, the cumulative force of a group of arguments must be assessed, and even then the critic is left with a probability-judgment.” More recently, Ehrman has become more emphatic that this passage is in fact an interpolation. See B.D. Ehrman, *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture: The Effect of Early Christological Controversies on the Text of the New Testament. Updated and with a New Afterword* (2nd ed.; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 220–27.

⁸ The rating system employed by the UBS Greek NT is perhaps most indicative of this trend. Whereas the UBS³ places this passage in double brackets and gives it a “C” rating, signifying some degree of uncertainty about the decision, in the UBS⁴ the rating has now been upgraded to an “A,” signifying little or no doubt about the decision. On this point see Tuckett, “Luke 22, 43–44: The ‘Agony’ in the Garden and Luke’s Gospel,” 131 n. 2. Similarly, M.L. Soards, *The Passion according to Luke: The Special Material of Luke 22* (JSNTSup 14; Sheffield: Sheffield University Press, 1987), devotes an entire monograph to Luke 22 but can no more than devote a single footnote (144–45 n. 1) to Luke 22:43–44 stating why it is not authentic and therefore dismisses it. Likewise, P.M. Miller, “The Least Orthodox Reading is to be Preferred: A New Canon for New Testament Textual Criticism,” in D.B. Wallace (ed.), *Revisiting the Corruption of the New Testament: Manuscript, Patristic, and Apocryphal Evidence* (Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, 2011), 60 n. 16 summarily dismisses the authenticity of Luke 22:43–44 because: “Ehrman and Plunkett have persuasively argued that these verses were added by orthodox to combat against docetic theology.” Many other similar examples could be cited.

⁹ Ehrman and Plunkett, “The Angel and the Agony,” 416.

¹⁰ Ehrman, *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture*, 225–27. As evidence (p. 226) Ehrman points out that when Luke 22:43–44 is cited by patristic writers in the first few centuries it is typically used as part of an anti-docetic polemic; cf. Ehrman, “Did Jesus Get Angry or Agonize?,” 17–26.

¹¹ Brown, *The Death of the Messiah*, 183–84, raises a few possibilities for why it might have been omitted as well as added. Similarly, J. Duplacy, “La préhistoire du texte en Luc 22:43–44,” in E.J. Epp and G.D. Fee (eds.), *New Testament Textual Criticism: Its Significance for Exegesis* (Oxford:

recent monograph by Claire Clivaz in which she not only argues that Luke 22:43–44 (along with Luke 23:34a) is authentic but also that it was deliberately excised as part of an anti-gnostic polemic: specifically, that non-gnostic Christians omitted the passage(s) from early manuscripts of Luke in response to a gnostic separationist reading in which Jesus was viewed as an *agonist*/ἀγωνιστής (“fighter”) who struggled against the Demiurge.¹² Not to take away from Clivaz’s wide-ranging study, which has much to offer and certainly presents a historically plausible scenario in which these verses could have been excised from certain early copies of Luke, it seems possible that there could still be other contextual possibilities that could account for their excision in some early copies of Luke. As Clivaz convincingly demonstrates that there were different hermeneutical contexts in which Luke’s passion narrative was being read in antiquity (as well as modernity), it seems readily possible that if Luke 22:43–44 was at times deliberately excised then it could have been done for different reasons at different times.¹³ In fact, the evidence of Epiphanius of Salamis (treated below) who witnessed the excision of these very verses from select copies of Luke in his own day reveals that the reasons behind their excision were rooted in fourth-century problems directly arising from Arianism and emerging Nicene orthodoxy. Therefore, the present investigation is not merely intended to offer a competing narrative to Clivaz’s study that is mutually exclusive but draws on the momentum generated by her work to pursue an alternative scenario that could have arisen out of the complexity of different reading contexts in antiquity.

The present analysis seeks to address this problem by setting forth a plausible contextual explanation for the omission of this passage. It will be argued that Luke 22:43–44 was first omitted from certain copies of Luke sometime after the middle of the second century and before the end of the third century and that its excision was primarily done for apologetic reasons. Certain early Christians felt that these verses were especially challenging, as is shown by early Christian commentary on them, since they seemingly depicted Jesus in a rather feeble light and were the target of a growing anti-Christian polemic. Consequently, some Christians felt it was easier to simply excise this problematic material. While this analysis can only offer a circumstantial case for why this passage might have been omitted, it is no more circumstantial than the widely-accepted argument that this passage represents an interpolation that was

Clarendon Press, 1981), 86, proposes that perhaps the verses were first removed in Egypt in an attempt to harmonize the gospels but never moves to a fuller explanation of exactly why this may have happened. Likewise, A. von Harnack, *Studien zur Geschichte des Neuen Testaments und der alten Kirche: I. Zur neutestamentlichen Textkritik* (Berlin/Leipzig: de Gruyter, 1931), 88, believes these verses were omitted because they seemed offensive to some Christians since an angel should comfort Jesus and that as Lord he should agonize and bleed. Along the same lines see K. Jaroš, *Das Neue Testament und seine Autoren: Eine Einführung* (Cologne: Böhlau, 2008), esp. 85–87; Cf. C.S.C. Williams, *Alterations to the Texts of the Synoptic Gospels and Acts* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1951), 7; M.-J. Lagrange, *Évangile selon Saint Luc* (Paris: Lecoffre, 1927), 563. Clivaz, “The Angel and the Sweat,” 439–40, concludes her article with a plea that there needs to be some contextual examination “of the historical and sociological components” that may have led certain Christians to either omit, or possibly add, these verses to select copies of the Gospel of Luke.

¹² Clivaz, *Langue et la sueur de sang*, 609–18. Clivaz draws upon Theodotus, the Valentinian Gnostic, whose teachings are preserved in Clement of Alexandria (*Exc.* 3.58.1: ὁ μέγας Ἀγωνιστής, Ἰησοῦς Χριστός) to help make this case and even goes on to argue that the same persons who omitted Luke 22:43–44 and 23:34a also may have interpolated Luke 24:51b in an effort to stop the proliferation of “special revelation” to the disciples following the resurrection.

¹³ One of the most useful contributions of Clivaz’s study is her lengthy and lucid analysis of the different hermeneutical contexts in which Luke’s passion narrative has been read. See Clivaz, *Langue et la sueur de sang*, Part I.

added to Luke as part of an anti-docetic polemic. As such, this article hopes to show that the anti-docetic argument is not the only conceivable explanation for this difficult text-critical problem.

Luke 22:43–44: The Manuscript & Patristic Evidence Revisited

Before attempting to explain why this passage would have been especially susceptible to excision, it is worthwhile to briefly review the manuscript and patristic evidence since it is fundamental to any text-critical assessment and is periodically misrepresented. While those who argue that this passage is not genuine will sometimes assert that the available manuscript evidence favors, or even strongly favors, the view that Luke 22:43–44 represents a later interpolation, in actuality the current manuscript evidence is fairly even and is in no way lopsided.¹⁴ Though it could be admitted that the textual evidence is such that it slightly favors excluding the passage, overall this is not definitive as various early manuscripts both omit and include this passage.¹⁵ Most notably, this passage does not appear in $\mathfrak{P}^{69\text{vid}}$, \mathfrak{P}^{75} , \mathfrak{N}^{2a} , A, B, N, T, W, but it is attested in 0171, \mathfrak{N}^* ,^{2b} D, L, Θ , Ψ , 0233.¹⁶ Here the evidence of 0171 (=PSI II 124), which is sometimes simply unacknowledged or even misquoted,¹⁷ is very significant since this fragment represents a very early and important witness to this passage.¹⁸ In fact, in the most recent pa-

¹⁴ Comfort, *New Testament Text and Translation Commentary*, 233, states, “the manuscript evidence for this textual variant is decidedly in favor of the exclusion of [Luke] 22:43–44.” Cf. B.M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (2nd ed; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2002), 151, who notes that the manuscript evidence alone “strongly suggests” that this passage was not originally part of Luke.

¹⁵ Ehrman, *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture*, 220, concedes this point, “In this particular instance [i.e. Luke 22:43–44], the manuscript alignments prove inconclusive for resolving the textual problem”; Tuckett, “Luke 23,43–44,” 132, notes, “It is widely agreed that the manuscript evidence alone is inconclusive, though perhaps slightly inclining in favor of omitting the verses”; cf. Brown, *The Death of the Messiah*, 1.181.

¹⁶ For a more expansive listing of texts and manuscripts see Clivaz, *Lange et la sueur de sang*, 590.

¹⁷ J.A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel according to Luke: Introduction, Translation, and Notes* (2 vols.; New York: Doubleday, 1985) 2.1443, who confuses this fragment with the twelfth-century minuscule 1071. Not surprisingly, since Fitzmyer confuses this fragment he judges that the manuscript evidence is such that it decidedly favors the omission of this passage. Cf. Tuckett, “The ‘Agony’ in the Garden and Luke’s Gospel,” 131–32, who corrects this mistake. J. Hernández Jr., “The Early Text of Luke,” in C.E. Hill and M.J. Kruger (eds.), *The Early Text of the New Testament* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 121–39, who sets out to treat all pre-fourth century textual witnesses of Luke, completely disregards 0171 although he includes \mathfrak{P}^7 . Similarly, Comfort (*New Testament Text and Translation Commentary*, 233) cites this fragment as “0171^{vid}” but this is not entirely accurate: there is nothing about v. 44 at least that ought to relegate it to the realm of uncertainty as it can clearly be detected on the fragment. See also Clivaz, “The Angel and the Sweat,” 422–24 who appropriately highlights the importance of this fragment as early evidence for Luke 22:43–44.

¹⁸ 0171 is a parchment fragment that comes from Hermopolis Magna in Upper Egypt and contains portions of Matthew (10:17–23, 25–32) and Luke (22:4–50, 52–56, 61, 63–64). In 1966 K. Treu discovered a parchment codex fragment of Matthew 10:17–20 and 21–23 on one side and 10:25–27 and 28–32 on the other side in the Berlin Papyrussammlung. Since there were many similarities (paleographic, codicological, etc.) with the Luke fragments he determined that these fragments came from the very same codex. As a result these two fragments (of Luke and Matthew) have been treated together. See K. Treu, “Neue neutestamentliche Fragmente der Berliner Papyrussammlung,” *APF* 18 (1966): 25–28; cf. *NewDocs* 2.126–27. For detailed analysis of this fragment see J.N. Birdsall, “A Fresh Examination of the Fragment of the Gospel of St. Luke in ms. 0171 and an Attempted Reconstruction with Special Reference to the Recto,” in R. Gryson (ed.), *Philologia Sa-*

leographical assessment of this piece by Willy Clarysse and Pasquale Orsini, 0171 is dated to the late second or early third century—one of only a handful of New Testament fragments assigned to this early period.¹⁹ Therefore, in their opinion it predates both P⁶⁹ and P⁷⁵, which they assign to the third century, and so our earliest extant piece of manuscript evidence for Luke 22 attests vv. 43–44!²⁰ Similarly, the evidence presented by Sinaiticus needs to be highlighted and reevaluated. Though it is periodically minimized because the passage in question was omitted by a later corrector²¹—albeit some two hundred years after the manuscript was produced²²—it

cra: Biblische und patristische Studien für Hermann J. Frede und Walter Thiele zu ihrem siebzigsten Geburtstag (Herstellung: Beuron Kunstverlag, Beuron, 1993), 1.212–27; M. Naldini, *Documenti dell' antichità Cristiana* (Florence: Libreria Editrice Fiorentina, 1965), 16 (nos. 11–12); LDAB at: <http://www.trismegistos.org/ldab/text.php?tm=61828>.

- ¹⁹ P. Orsini and W. Clarysse, “Early New Testament Manuscripts and their Dates: A Critique of Theological Paleography,” *ETL* 88/4 (2012): 455, 458, esp. 466 where they note: “In only a few cases we propose an earlier date (P¹⁸, P³⁰, P⁶⁴, P⁶⁷, P⁴, P¹¹⁶, 0171, 0188, 0212, 0308). There are no first century New Testament papyri and only very few can be attributed to the second century (P⁵² P⁹⁰ P¹⁰⁴, probably all the second half of the century) or somewhere between the late second and early third centuries (P³⁰, P⁶⁴⁺⁶⁷⁺⁴, 0171, 0212). Biblical scholars should realize that some of the dates proposed by some of their colleagues are not acceptable to Greek paleographers and papyrologists.” Cf. R.S Bagnall, *Early Christian Books in Egypt* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009), 1–49, who earlier noted that dates proposed for certain New Testament papyri are too early and generally need to be re-evaluated.
- ²⁰ I might also add here that Brent Nongbri is presently making the argument that P⁷⁵ is likely a fourth-century composition. If this is the case, then the ms. evidence for the absence of Luke 22:43–44 is pushed back yet further. He currently has a forthcoming article titled “Reconsidering the Place of P.Bodmer XIV–XV (P75) in the Textual Criticism of the New Testament” where he makes a compelling case on paleographic and codicological grounds that P⁷⁵ fits very well in the fourth century. He notes that paleographically the closest parallels to the text of P⁷⁵ are P.Herm. 4 and 5 that can be objectively dated to the 320s. He also notes that on codicological grounds the Nag Hammadi codices, especially Nag Hammadi Codex II, is remarkably similar. I want to thank Brent Nongbri for providing me with a draft of this forthcoming article and for permission to reference it in this paper.
- ²¹ Comfort, *New Testament Text and Translation Commentary*, 233–34 gives the following erroneous report about the corrector of Luke 22:43–44 in Sinaiticus: “(The first corrector of **Σ** was a contemporary of the scribe who produced the manuscript of Luke; indeed, he was the diorthotes who worked on this manuscript before it left the scriptorium.) Other signs of its doubtfulness [i.e. Luke 22:43–44] appear in manuscripts marking the passage with obeli or crossing out the passage (as was done by the first corrector of **Σ**).”
- ²² The later corrector who removed the passage by placing hooks at the beginning and closing of each line and dots over the letters belongs to group “C” of correctors who are dated roughly to the sixth to eighth centuries, almost two hundred years after the manuscript was written. Then, another scribe belonging to group “C” of correctors erased the the dots and hooks, either because he felt the passage was legitimate or because he thought the text looked better without them. On the “C” correctors see J.M. Milne and T.C. Skeat, *Scribes and Correctors of the Codex Sinaiticus* (London: British Museum, 1938), 46–50, 65 where a seventh-century date for the “C” correctors is given. Cf. A. Myshrall, *Codex Sinaiticus, Its Correctors, and The Caesarean Text of the Gospels* (Dissertation, University of Birmingham, 2005), 90–92, where she notes that a seventh-century date for the “C” correctors is possible but also suggests that they may be a little earlier; on Luke 22:43–44 and Sinaiticus see pp. 564–65. See also D. Jongkind, *Scribal Habits of Codex Sinaiticus* (Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2007), 10–11: “The various C correctors (C, Cb, Cc, Cc*) are all placed around the seventh century.” According to Jongkind (p. 9) it was scribe “D” who served as the διορθωτής.

was nevertheless included by the original scribe (A) of Luke and as such is part of the text of Sinaiticus: thus, Sinaiticus is a witness of this passage. Likewise, the evidence of Codex Alexandrinus should at least have a caveat when it is cited as a witness against this passage; the scribe placed the Eusebian canon 10.283 (σπγ/ι), which corresponds to Luke 22:43–44, in the margin at the end of Luke 22:42 and otherwise suggests that the scribe was aware of the passage (i.e. Luke 22:43–44) even if it was not included in the manuscript.²³ Furthermore, it should be noted that if \mathfrak{P}^{69} does indeed preserve a fragment from a Marcionite recension of Luke, which has recently been argued, then the text-critical weight of this witness must surely be reevaluated.²⁴ Finally, the argument that Luke 22:43–44 is to be regarded as spurious because in certain manuscript families, such as f^{43} , it has been transferred so that it follows Mathew 26:39 and therefore suggests that it originated from a non-Lukan source,²⁵ can no longer be given much credence; Clivaz has convincingly demonstrated that the transfer only establishes the influence of the liturgy on the textual tradition of this manuscript family and not the non-Lukan origin of these verses.²⁶

Turning to the patristic evidence for the first four centuries, which is sometimes downplayed or even ignored in certain text-critical assessments, while there is some disparity, Luke 22:43–44 is known by a number of early and important Christian writers with geographic distribution all over the Mediterranean.²⁷ The first to reference these verses is Justin in his *Dialogue with Trypho* (ca. 155 CE). Here Justin remarks, “For in the memoirs which I say were drawn up by his apostles and those who followed them, [it is written] that ‘His sweat fell down like drops of blood’ while he was praying, and saying, ‘[Father] if it be possible, let this cup pass.’”²⁸ Granted that Justin does not specifically point out that this passage was from Luke, the reference to the “memoirs” that were written by the “apostles” should point in this direction.²⁹

²³ The Eusebian canon σπγ/ι appears in the top left margin of the left page of the codex at the end of Luke 22:42. For an image of this page see *Facsimile of the Codex Alexandrinus: New Testament and Clementine Epistles* (London, 1887), fol. 63. There is also a deliberate space between v. 42 and v. 45.

²⁴ Clivaz, “The Angel and the Sweat Like ‘Drops of Blood’ (Lk 22:43–44): \mathfrak{P}^{69} and f^{43} ,” esp. 425–32; Clivaz, *L'ange et la sueur de sang*, 460–67.

²⁵ Comfort, *New Testament Text and Translation Commentary*, 234; Omanson, *A Textual Guide to the Greek New Testament*, 150; Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 151.

²⁶ Clivaz, “The Angel and the Sweat,” 432–38; Clivaz, *L'ange et la sueur de sang*, 490–99.

²⁷ For useful treatments of Luke 22:43–44 in patristic literature see: J. Duplacy, *Études de critique textuelle du Nouveau Testament* (BETL 78; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1987), 349–85; J. Duplacy, “La préhistoire du texte en Luc 22:43–44,” 77–86; Clivaz, *L'ange et la sueur de sang*, 456–588, who surveys a wide variety of evidence (patristic, Jewish, apocryphal); Bovon, *Luke III: A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke 19:28–24:53*, 204–11, who surveys select patristic and even Byzantine and medieval commentary on the passage. Cf. The American and British Committees of the International Greek New Testament Project (eds.), *The Gospel according to St Luke Parts 1 and 2* (The New Testament in Greek, 3; Oxford: Clarendon, 1984, 1987), 2.190 is useful but is not comprehensive.

²⁸ *Dial.* 103.8: ἐν γὰρ τοῖς ἀπομνημονεύμασιν, ἃ φημι ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶν ἐκεῖνοις παρακολουθησάντων συντετάχθαι, (γέγραπται) ὅτι ἰδρῶς ὡσεὶ θρόμβοι κατεχεῖτο, αὐτοῦ εὐχομένου καὶ λέγοντος· (Πάτερ,) παρελθέτω, εἰ δυνατόν, τὸ ποτήριον τοῦτο·. Greek text taken from M. Marcovich (ed.), *Iustini Martyris Dialogus Cum Tryphone* (PTS 47; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1997), 249.

²⁹ Cf. Justin, *1 Apol.* 66.3; G.N. Stanton, “The Fourfold Gospel,” *NTS* 43 (1997): 330, notes that this was Justin’s way of referring to the Gospels; cf. C.E. Hill, *Who Chose the Gospels? Probing the Great Gospel Conspiracy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 123–50. A. Gregory, *The Reception of Luke and Acts in the Period before Irenaeus* (WUNT 169; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003),

Following Justin there is the evidence from Irenaeus. In a section of his *Against Heresies* (ca. 180 CE) where he criticizes Christians who denied that Jesus actually assumed flesh and experienced a fully human existence, he remarks among other things that he “sweated great drops of blood.”³⁰ To the second-century evidence of Justin and Irenaeus, Tatian could also be adduced, albeit with some caveats, since his *Diatessaron* is only extant in much later translations that may or may not be accurate renderings of the original composition.³¹

One other second-century writer who is occasionally cited in this debate is Marcion. In fact, he is sometimes even cited as a witness against the authenticity of these verses since it is alleged that they did not appear in his recension of Luke.³² However, invoking Marcion in such a way goes well beyond his capacity as a witness. Notwithstanding Adolf von Harnack’s erudite reconstruction of Marcion’s edition of Luke, it must be remembered that Marcion’s actual text of Luke is no longer extant, and that Harnack’s reconstruction is hypothetical in places.³³ Nevertheless, even if one were to concede that Marcion’s version of Luke likely did not contain Luke 22:43–44, how exactly would this constitute evidence for the non-Lukan origin of this passage since it is well known that Marcion’s version of Luke had excised considerable material

280–82 raises the possibility that the phrase “those who followed them” might be taken as a reference to Luke 1:3 so that Justin is referring to Luke’s Gospel.

³⁰ Irenaeus, *Haer.* 3.22.2 (PG 7.1. 957): *sudasset globos sanguinis*/ἵδρωσε θρόμβους αἵματος. Interestingly, as all of the examples Irenaeus gives for Jesus’ humanity in this section of his treatise are otherwise scriptural proof texts (e.g. John 4:6; Ps 68[69]:27; John 11:35; Matt 26:38; John 19:34), it is therefore probable that when Irenaeus mentions that Jesus “sweated great drops of blood” he was not talking about some oral story but had in mind a scriptural source.

³¹ The earliest Latin copy of the *Diatessaron* is contained in Codex Fuldensis and dates to the middle of the sixth century. See (*editio princeps*) E. Ranke, *Codex Fuldensis* (Marburg etc.: Elwert, 1868), 146: apparuit autem illi angelus de caelo confortans eum et factus est in agonia et prolixius orabat ... et factus est sudor eius sicut guttae sanguinis decurrentis in terram (Luke 22:43–44). Cf. ANF² 9.117; see also C. McCarthy, *Saint Ephrem’s Commentary on Tatian’s Diatessaron: An English Translation of Chester Beatty Syriac MS 709 with Introduction and Notes* (JSS Supplement 2; Oxford: Oxford University Press on Behalf of the University of Manchester, 1993), 297 (= *Commentary on Tatian’s Diatessaron* 20.11).

³² Comfort, *New Testament Text and Translation*, 233; Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 151; Ehrman and Plunkett, “The Angel and the Agony,” 402.

³³ A. von Harnack, *Marcion: Das Evangelium vom fremden Gott* (Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1924), 177–255; cf. A. von Harnack, *Marcion: The Gospel of the Alien God*, trans. J.E. Seely and L.D. Bierma. (Durham, N.C.: The Labyrinth Press, 1990). For a useful critique of Harnack’s reconstruction see D.T. Roth, “Marcion and the Early New Testament Text,” in C.E. Hill and M.J. Kruger (eds.), *The Early Text of the New Testament* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 302–12. See also L.E. Wright, *Alterations of the Words of Jesus as Quoted in the Literature of the Second Century* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1952), 128–34; Williams, *Alterations to the Texts of the Synoptic Gospels and Acts*, 10–18; E.C. Blackman, *Marcion and His Influence* (London: SPCK, 1948), 50–54, 57–60, 128–71. What little we know about Marcion’s version of Luke is drawn principally from Epiphanius and also from a few a quotations from Tertullian and Adamantius, and none of these yields any definitive insight about the status of Luke 22:43–44. In *Pan.* 42.11.1– 11.78 Epiphanius outlines the contours of Marcion’s recension of Luke but does not reproduce the treatise verbatim. While Epiphanius comments on Marcion’s rendering of Luke 22:41 and then 22:47b (*Pan.* 42.11.65–66), it cannot be automatically assumed that Marcion’s version did not contain anything from Luke 22:42–47a on this evidence alone.

from Luke?³⁴ Therefore, Marcion can hardly be invoked as a compelling witness against the authenticity of this passage.³⁵

Proceeding to third-century writers, it seems from the writings of a select few authors that they do not seem to be aware of the passage and the inference that could be drawn is that it was not in their copies of Luke. However, it needs to be noted from the outset that just because

³⁴ While Harnack believed that Luke 22:43–44 was not in Marcion’s recension of Luke he also pointed out that Marcion would have had good reason to omit this material had it been present: Harnack, *Marcion*, 234*; cf. Clivaz, “The Angel and the Sweat,” 429–30. Furthermore, Harnack had argued elsewhere for the authenticity of Luke 22:43–44. See A. von Harnack, “Probleme im Texte der Leidensgeschichte Jesu” in *Studien zur Geschichte des neuen Testaments und der alten Kirche*, vol. 1 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1931), 86–99. See also Tertullian, *Praescr* 38.9 (CCSL 1.219): Marcion enim exerte et palam machaera, non stilo usus est, quoniam ad materiam suam caedem scripturarum confecit. (“Marcion expressly and openly used the knife, not the pen, since he made such an excision of the Scriptures as suited his own subject matter”); and P. Lampe, *From Paul to Valentinus: Christians at Rome in the First Two Centuries*, trans. Michael Steinhauser (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003), 252–53, notes that Marcion seems to have almost exclusively excised text and that there is very little evidence that he made any additions to Luke. If Luke 22:43–44 was original it is more likely than not that Marcion would have omitted such material in his version of Luke since it would not have adhered to his theology. In *Pan.* 49.61.2 when Epiphanius was discussing Luke 22:43–44 and criticizing the Arians he noted that this passage opposed Marcionite and Manichaean theology since the verses stressed the humanity of Christ (GCS 3.209): καὶ οὐκ ἴσασιν ὅτι ἐὰν μὴ ἔχη πάντα ταῦτα καὶ τὸ «μὴ τὸ ἐμὸν βούλημα, ἀλλὰ τὸ σὸν» καὶ ἐὰν μὴ ἀγωνιάσῃ καὶ ἐὰν μὴ ἰδρώσ αὐτῷ γένηται ἐκ σώματος προχεόμενος, ἄρα δόκησις ἦν ἡ ἔνσαρκος Χριστοῦ παρουσία, καὶ εὐλόγως παρὰ Μανιχαίων καὶ Μαρκιωνιστῶν ἢ περὶ φαντασίας [δόκησις] τῆς ἐνσάρκου παρουσίας ὑπόθεσις ἄδεται, <ὅτι δόκησις ἦν> καὶ οὐκ ἀληθεστάτη (“And they do not know that the human nature of Christ would have been an illusion if he did not have all these things, including ‘Not my will, but yours’; and if Christ had not been in agony and sweat had not poured from his body, there would be some sense to the theory of the unreality of the human nature that Manichaeans and Marcionites yap about, since he would be an apparition and not real at all.” Translation taken from F. Williams, *The Panarion of Epiphanius of Salamis: Books II and III, (Sects 47–80, De Fide)* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1994), 379–80.

³⁵ Although, the evidence provided by him could perhaps lend some contextual weight to the present proposition that this passage was omitted from Luke. Marcion was not adding material to Luke but deleting material that did not conform to his theology. Therefore, the earliest evidence we have for the deliberate scriptural corruption of Luke is not in the form of interpolation but omission and deletion.

An interesting question raised by Marcion’s edition of Luke is whether or not it could have affected non-Marcionite copies of Luke or that perhaps some of the early papyri we possess emanated from a Marcionite milieu. Though some have argued that Marcion’s recensions of the scriptures indeed affected later non-Marcionite texts and that some of these alterations can be detected in certain papyri (Williams, *Alterations to the Texts of the Synoptic Gospels and Acts*, 10–18, has in mind P⁴⁵; cf. Harnack, *Marcion*, 206), others have rejected the possibility outright (A.F.J. Klijn, “Matthew 11:25 / Luke 10:21,” in E.J. Epp and G.D. Fee [eds.], *New Testament Textual Criticism: Its Significance for Exegesis* [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981], 14, who notes that “Marcionite influence on early Greek papyri seems impossible.”). Though such a possibility might seem unlikely, Clivaz has made a compelling, albeit circumstantial case, that P⁶⁹ may well represent a Marcionite fragment of Luke (“The Angel and the Sweat,” 429–32). Additionally, if the words of the Church Fathers can be trusted when they say that Marcionism had spread everywhere, including Egypt, such a possibility cannot be ruled out (Justin, *1 Apol.* 1.26, 58; Tertullian, *Praesc.* 30; Epiphanius, *Pan.* 42.1). Lastly, the presence of the “Marcionite Prologues” certainly suggests that Marcionite influence could be had upon later non-Marcionite texts (K.T. Schäfer, “Marius Victorinus und die marcionitischen Prologe zu den Paulusbriefen,” *RBén* 80 [1970]: 7–16).

a certain author does not cite Luke 22:43–44, it does not necessarily mean that they did not know the passage and should therefore be cited as a witness against it. It is important here not to confuse the absence of evidence with actual evidence and to realize that many authors never cited a number of verses they otherwise knew.³⁶ Thus, very little weight should be put on “negative proof.”³⁷ For example, while Tertullian has sometimes been invoked as a witness against the passage, because he never explicitly cites it, this is a tenuous argument at best.³⁸ Based on the extant literary remains of Tertullian it is difficult to know with a high degree of certainty that he definitely did not know the passage as he never devotes considerable attention to the Gethsemane³⁹ narrative in Luke.⁴⁰ Turning to Clement of Alexandria, who is regularly cited as a witness against this passage,⁴¹ while we may perhaps be a little more certain that the copies of Luke that Clement used did not have this passage there is still a significant degree of uncertainty and it goes well beyond the bounds of the evidence to state that Clement is a witness against the verse just because he never explicitly cites it.⁴² Like Tertullian, in none of Clement’s extant writings does he ever quote extensively from Luke’s passion narrative so it is difficult to be certain that he did not know the passage; while he may be referenced as an early witness who does not mention the passage, it goes too far to state that he is a witness against it.⁴³ Turning to Origen, who is also frequently cited as a witness against this passage, the same

³⁶ Duplacy, “La préhistoire du texte en Luc 22:43–44,” 78.

³⁷ On the problems of “negative proof,” generally speaking, see D.H. Fischer, *Historians’ Fallacies: Toward a Logic of Historical Thought* (New York: Harper & Row, 1970), 47–48.

³⁸ Brown, *The Death of the Messiah*, 180, who cites Tertullian as one of the Church Fathers whose copy of Luke supposedly did not contain 22:43–44.

³⁹ Though Luke never used the term Gethsemane, unlike Matthew and Mark (Matt 26:36, Mark 14:32), and instead speaks rather generically about the location and simply mentions “the place” (Luke 22:40; cf. TDNT 8.195–99) on the “Mount of Olives” (Luke 22:39), for convenience Gethsemane will be used inclusively in this paper to refer to Luke’s account.

⁴⁰ BiPa 1.373 cites Tertullian, *Prax.* 27.11 as evidence for Luke 22:44. However, an examination of this reference in Tertullian (*anxia usque ad mortem*) suggests that Luke 22:44 is not the putative source; a more likely possibility is Matt 26:38 (*tristis anima mea usque ad mortem*). There is no good reason for necessarily equating Tertullian’s *anxia* with Luke’s *agonia* (v. 44). Therefore, this passage should not be marshaled as evidence that Tertullian knew of Luke 22:43–44. On the other hand, Clivaz, *Lange et la sueur de sang*, 585 argues that this passage is “probablement allusion à Lc 22,44.”

⁴¹ Comfort, *New Testament Text and Translation Commentary*, 233; Ehrman, *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture*, 220; Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 151.

⁴² Clement cites Luke 22:31 (*Strom.* 4.74.4). The next verse in Luke explicitly cited by Clement is 22:32 (*Strom.* 4.74.4). See C.P. Cosaert, *The Text of the Gospels in Clement of Alexandria* (NTGF 9; Atlanta: SBL, 2008), 180–81. A possible allusion to Luke 22:42 might be found in *Paed.* 1.6.46 where Clement talks about the “cup” (ποτήριον) but this could just as easily refer to Matt 26:39. In *Paed.* 2.8.62–63 when Clement talks about the betrayal of Jesus by Judas and how he betrayed him with a “kiss” (φιλήμα) it is likely that he had Luke 22:48 in mind, although given his general description of the betrayal he could have also had Matt 26:48–49 or Mark 14:44–45 in mind.

⁴³ Here it needs to be remembered that we do not have all of Clement’s writings. If Eusebius is correct that Clement wrote commentaries (*Hypotyposeis* [ὑποτυπώσεις]) on certain scriptural books of the OT and NT (*Hist. eccl.* 6.14.1), and if we had his commentary on Luke and he never mentioned the passage, we would certainly be more sure about whether or not Clement knew of the passage. Given the nature of Clement’s extant writings caution and prudence needs to be exercised before automatically rushing to judgments about what he may, or may not, have known.

caveats apply.⁴⁴ We only have a small fraction of Origen's works and only a handful of his biblical commentaries.⁴⁵ While Origen produced a commentary on Luke in five books, it is no longer extant; if this commentary had survived we would be in a much better position to state with confidence whether or not he knew of the passage.⁴⁶ However, given that Origen does devote some attention in his extant works to the Gethsemane narrative and does not allude to any of the details preserved in Luke 22:43–44, there may be some reason to question whether he was aware of the passage.⁴⁷

Three other third-century writers who deserve mention because they have sometimes been invoked as evidence for Luke 22:43–44 are Hippolytus, Dionysius of Alexandria, and Eusebius of Caesarea. In the case of Hippolytus it is evident that he knew of the passage since he cited it on two different occasions. In his treatise *Against Noetus* (ca. 220 CE), where he highlights the humanity of Jesus, he cited this passage to show that Jesus could both suffer and need strengthening.⁴⁸ Additionally, in a fragment on Psalm 2:7 he reiterated the same sentiments.⁴⁹

Though Clivaz sees Clement, *Exc.* 3.58.1 (ὁ μέγας Ἀγωνιστής, Ἰησοῦς Χριστός) as an allusion to Luke 22:44, there is no word for word agreement between Clement and Luke 22:44. See Clivaz, *Lange et la sueur de sang*, 556–62.

⁴⁴ Comfort, *New Testament Text and Translation Commentary*, 233; Ehrman, *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture*, 220; Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 151.

⁴⁵ If we can trust what Eusebius reports about Origen (*Hist. eccl.* 6.24–32) then it seems that he produced a scriptural commentary on just about every book in the Bible. Not a single commentary of Origen is preserved in full and only his commentaries on the Song of Songs, Matthew, John, and Romans are preserved in any substantial fashion. From other commentaries only small pieces have been preserved in later catenae.

⁴⁶ Cf. Jerome, *Ep.* 33 (to Paulina) where he remarks that Origen produced a “fifteen-book” commentary on Luke. But in *Praef. Hom. Luc.* he mentions that it was a “five-book commentary” on Luke. I am inclined to think that the former is a scribal error and that the commentary consisted of five books. Only fragments of this commentary survive: see J.T. Lienhard (trans), *Origen: Homilies on Luke* (FC 94; Washington, D.C.: CUA Press, 1996), xxxvi–xxxviii, 165–227. Origen's *Commentary on Luke* is not to be confused with his *Homilies on Luke* (*Homiliae in Lucam*) preserved in Latin by Jerome (Jerome, *Praef. Hom. Luc.*; *Vir. ill.* 135).

⁴⁷ *Cels.* 2.25; *Mart.* 29; *Comm. ser. Matt.* 92. For a time an anonymous commentary on the Psalms, wherein Luke 22:43–44 is cited to help clarify Ps 68:14–15, was thought to be the work of Origen. However, this designation is to be doubted (ἀλλ' ἐξ οικείου προσώπου χριστός οικονομικῶς ἐκουσίως προσεύχεται μετὰ κραυγῆς, μετὰ δακρύων, μετὰ ἰδρωτος, καὶ θρόμβου αἵματος, μετὰ ἀγγέλου ἐνισχύοντος [“but Christ voluntarily and willingly prayed with proper appearance with crying, with weeping, with sweat, and drops of blood, with a strengthening angel”]). See J.B. Pitra (ed.), *Analecta sacra spicilegio Solesmensi parata* (Paris: Tusculum, 1883), 86. A virtually identical passage will appear in *expositiones in psalmos* attributed to Ps-Athanasius (PG 27.309).

While there are no word for word parallels in the extant writings of Origen with Luke 22:43–44, Clivaz (*Lange et la sueur de sang*, 547–56) believes that an allusion can be found in *Cels.* 1.69: διὸ πρὸς τοῖς ἄλλοις αὐτὸν φαμεν καὶ μέγαν ἀγωνιστὴν γεγονέναι (“Therefore, in addition to other things, we say that he [Jesus] was also a great wrestler”). As in the case of Clement of Alexandria (*Exc.* 3.58.1), so in the case of Origen, Clivaz sees in the use of ἀγωνιστής an allusion to Luke 22:44.

⁴⁸ *Noet.* 18.2: καὶ ἀγωνιῶν ἰδροῖ καὶ ὑπὸ ἀγγέλου ἐνδυναμοῦται (“and being in agony he sweated and was strengthened by an angel”). Greek text taken from R. Butterworth (ed. and trans.), *Contra Noetum* (London: Heythrop Monographs, 1977), 87 (on the dating of this text see pp. 27–29).

⁴⁹ *Fr. Ps.* 18: καὶ ἀγωνιῶν ἰδροῖ καὶ ὑπ' ἀγγέλου δυναμοῦται (“and being in agony he sweated and is strengthened by an angel”). Greek Text taken from G.N. Bonwetsch and H. Achelis (eds.), *Hippolytus Werke: Erster Band Exegetische Und Homiletische Schriften* (Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1897), 146. This passage is preserved by Theodoret, *Eran.* 2.15 (CPG 1.1882.2). See also G.H. Ettlinger

Though Dionysius of Alexandria has been occasionally cited as a witness for the passage,⁵⁰ his witness is to be doubted since the work attributed to Dionysius that contains this passage is almost certainly spurious.⁵¹ Turning to Eusebius, he too seems to be aware of Luke 22:43–44; but while commentators sometimes talk about Eusebius citing this passage, he never explicitly refers to it in any of his extant works.⁵² The only evidence that Eusebius knew of this passage comes from the *Eusebian Canons*, specifically Canon Ten, where he lists the material unique to each gospel for which no parallels could be found elsewhere and lists Luke 22:43–44 as number 283.⁵³

Two additional third-century figures that should be mentioned because an argument can be made that they both knew of the passage are Pontius, the biographer of Cyprian of Carthage, and Porphyry the anti-Christian writer. In the *Life of Cyprian* written by Pontius c. 260 CE there is potentially an allusion to Luke 22:44.⁵⁴ Near the end of the treatise as Cyprian is waiting for the arrival of the proconsul before his execution he is offered a fresh change of clothes by one of the officers because he had sweated excessively under the heat of the sun. Pontius, the narrator, then makes the following statement: “and he [Cyprian] doubtless coveted nothing further in respect of his proffered kindness than to possess the blood-stained sweat of the martyr going to God.”⁵⁵ It is certainly not a stretch to believe that the origin of the phrase “blood-stained sweat” (*sudores iam sanguineos*) is Luke 22:44.⁵⁶ Turning to Porphyry, he too should be regarded as a witness of Luke 22:44 because of a specific reference in his work *Against the Christians*. In this treatise, written sometime near the close of the third century,⁵⁷ he specifically criticizes Jesus’ actions in Gethsemane on the eve of his crucifixion.⁵⁸ Though Porphyry’s criticism targets a

(trans.), *Theodoret of Cyrus: Eranistes* (FC 106; Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2003), 138–39.

⁵⁰ Comfort, *New Testament Text and Translation*, 234.

⁵¹ In a fragmentary commentary on Luke 22:42f, which is attributed to Dionysius of Alexandria, the author discusses Luke 22:43–44. On this text see C. Feltoe, *The Letters and other Remains of Dionysius of Alexandria* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1904), 229–50 (Luke 22:43–44 on p. 241). However, it is highly unlikely that Dionysius is actually the author of this commentary. Feltoe argued (p. 230), “The Dionysian authorship of any of these extracts must be considered very doubtful.” He went on to point out that the commentary probably dates from the seventh century and that the commentary on vv. 43 and 44 is probably even later. Cf. W. Bienert, *Dionysius von Alexandrien. Zur Frage des Origenismus in dritten Jahrhundert* (PTS 21; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1978), 43, who echoes Feltoe’s doubts.

⁵² Neither BiPa 4.255 (s.v. Luke 22:43–44) or a search on the *TLG* reveals that Eusebius ever directly cited this passage. Cf. Clivaz, *L’ange et la sueur de sang*, 284 n. 496.

⁵³ In Canon Ten Luke 22:43–44 is referenced in section three (Gospel of Luke) number 283 (= $\overline{07\pi}$ in the manuscripts). See NA²⁸ p. 89* (84*–89*) and p. 234.

⁵⁴ I owe this reference to BiPa 2.322. See also Clivaz, *L’ange et la sueur de sang*, 219.

⁵⁵ *Vita Cypriani* 16.6 (PL 3.1496): videlicet nihil aliud in rebus oblatis ambiebat, quam ut proficiscentis ad Deum martyris sudores iam sanguineos possideret.

⁵⁶ Vulg. Luke 22:44: et factus est sudor eius sicut guttae sanguinis decurrentis in terram.

⁵⁷ While the exact date assigned to Porphyry’s work is contested, all agree that it was written sometime between 270–300. For a recent summary of the scholarship see J.G. Cook, *The Interpretation of the New Testament in Greco-Roman Paganism* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson Publishers, 2002), 119–25.

⁵⁸ Here I follow the growing consensus that Porphyry’s *Against the Christians* lies behind much of the *Apocritus* of Macarius Magnes. See A. von Harnack, *Porphyrius “gegen die Christen.” 15 Bücher, Zeugnisse Fragmente und Referate.* (Berlin: Reimer, 1921); R. Goulet, “Porphyre et Macaire de Magnésie,” *StPatr* 15 (1984): 448–52; R.J. Hoffman, *Porphyry’s Against the Christians* (Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books, 1994), 21–23; Cook, *The Interpretation of the New Testament in Greco-*

few different issues, which will be addressed in more detail later, one of his main criticisms of Jesus is that he lacked the proper courage and equanimity before death. Specifically, Porphyry charges that Jesus was “agonizing in expectation of his death” and prayed that “his suffering might be eliminated.”⁵⁹ While the latter reference is likely an allusion to Jesus’ plea to have the “cup” removed, which can be found in Matthew, Mark, and Luke,⁶⁰ the reference to “agonizing” (ἀγωνιῶν) is otherwise only found at Luke 22:44 where it states that Jesus was “in agony” (ἐν ἀγωνίᾳ). Though it is not an exact quote, it too should probably be read as an allusion. Thus, Porphyry should be taken as another third-century witness of this passage.

Moving to the fourth and early fifth century there are a number of witnesses from all over the Mediterranean who knew of the passage and cited or alluded to it as though it was authentic: Athanasius;⁶¹ Amphilochius of Iconium;⁶² Gregory of Nazianzus;⁶³ Gregory of Nyssa;⁶⁴ John

Roman Paganism, 172–73; R. Goulet, *Le monogénès. Macarios de Magnésie: introduction générale, édition critique, traduction française et commentaire* (Tome I) (Paris: Vrin, 2003), 127–36, 304.

⁵⁹ Macarius Magnes, *Apocr.* 3.2 (= Porphyry Frag. 62): καὶ αὐτὸς ἀγωνιῶν καὶ τῇ προσδοκίᾳ τῶν δεινῶν ἐπαγρυπνῶν καὶ δι’ εὐχῆς παρακαλῶν τὸ πάθος ἑαυτῷ παρελθεῖν. Greek text taken from R. Goulet, *Macarios de Magnésie: Le monogénès* (Tome II) (Paris: Vrin, 2003), 74.

⁶⁰ Matt 26:39; Mark 14:36; Luke 22:42.

⁶¹ Though Athanasius was credited with a work titled *expositiones in psalmos* (PG 27.60–545; CPG 2140), wherein Luke 22:43–44 is cited and explained (p. 309), Athanasian authorship for this work is to be rejected notwithstanding its citation in IGNTP 2.190. See M.-J. Rondeau, *Les commentaires patristiques du Psautier* (III^e–V^e siècles) (OCA 220; Roma: Pont. Institutum Studiorum Orientalium, 1985), 214 n. 593; G.C. Stead, “St. Athanasius on the Psalms,” *VC* 39 (1985): 65–78; G. Dorival, “Athanasie ou Pseudo-Athanasie?” *RSLR* 16 (1980): 80–89; Clivaz, *Lange et la sueur de sang*, 534–41, 546.

There is, however, a definite allusion to Luke 22:44 in *C.Ar.* 55.4 (PG 26.440; K. Metzler and K. Savvidis, *Athanasius: Werke, Band I. Die dogmatischen Schriften, Erster Teil, 3. Lieferung* [Berlin and New York, 2000], 367): πάνυ δέ μοι δοκοῦσιν ἀναισχυντίαν ἐσχηκέναι καὶ βλασφημίαν οἱ χριστομάχοι. ἀκούοντες μὲν γὰρ «ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πατήρ ἓν ἐσμεν» βιάζονται τὴν διάνοιαν παρεξηγεῖσθαι καὶ διαιρεῖν τὴν ἐνότητά τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ, ἀκούοντες δέ, ὅτι ἔκλαυσεν, ἰδρωσε, πέπονθεν, οὐκ ἐνορῶσι τῷ σώματι, ἀλλ’ ἐκ τούτων τῇ κτίσει συναριθμοῦσι τὸν δι’ οὗ γέγονεν ἡ κτίσις. (“And Christ’s enemies seem to me to show plain shamelessness and blasphemy; for, when they hear ‘I and the Father are one,’ they violently distort the sense, and separate the unity of the Father and the Son; but reading that ‘he cried,’ ‘he sweated,’ ‘he suffered,’ they do not avert to his body, but on account of these rank among creation him by whom the creation was made”). The use of the verb ἰδρώω is surely an allusion to ἰδρώς in Luke 22:44; ἰδρώς does not appear anywhere else in the New Testament and ἰδρώω is never used. J.D. Ernest, *The Bible in Athanasius of Alexandria* (Boston: Brill, 2004), 399, includes this among the genuine scriptural “allusions” of Athanasius; cf. Clivaz, *Lange et la sueur de sang*, 546–47. Therefore, Ehrman and Plunkett (“The Angel and the Agony,” 402) are simply mistaken when they cite Athanasius as a witness against this passage.

⁶² Ἀμφιλοχίου ἐπισκόπου Ἰκονίου ἐκ τοῦ εἰς τὸ κατὰ Λουκᾶν εὐαγγέλιον, ἔνθα λέγει· ἐν ἀγωνίᾳ γενόμενος ἐκτενέστερον προσήχετο. (“Of Amphilochius bishop of Iconium on the gospel according to Luke, it states there: ‘being in agony he prayed more earnestly’”). Greek text taken from F. Diekamp, “Ein christologisches Florilegium aus dem codex Athous Vatopedianus 507,” *OrChrAn* 117 (1938): 226.

⁶³ *Ep.* 102.27 (SC 208.82): καὶ τὸ μὲν ἠγωνίασε καὶ ἐσταυρώθη καὶ ἐτάφη (“and he was in agony and he was crucified and he was buried”); *De filio* (= *orat.* 29) 18: τὸ ὑπνοῦν, τὸ πεινῆν, τὸ κοπιᾶν, τὸ δακρύειν, τὸ ἀγωνιᾶν, τὸ ὑποδύεσθαι (“he [Jesus] slept, he hungered, he became weary, he cried, he was in agony, he feared”). Greek text taken from J. Barbel (ed.), *Gregor von Nazianz. Die fünf theologischen Reden* (Düsseldorf: Patmos-Verlag, 1963), 163. *In theophania* (= *orat.* 38) 15 (PG 36.328): καὶ ἐπεινήσε, καὶ ἐδίψησε, καὶ ἠγωνίασε, καὶ ἐδάκρυσσε (“and he [Jesus] hungered, and he thirsted, and he was in agony, and he cried”).

Chrysostom;⁶⁵ Ephrem;⁶⁶ Didymus the blind;⁶⁷ Theodore of Mopsuestia;⁶⁸ Theodoret;⁶⁹ Rufinus of Aquileia;⁷⁰ John Cassian;⁷¹ Augustine;⁷² Aponius,⁷³ Prosper of Aquitaine;⁷⁴ Eutropius

- ⁶⁴ *Apoll.* 1265M: ὁ σωτήρ, φησί, πέπονθε πείναν καὶ δίψαν καὶ κάματον καὶ ἀγωνίαν καὶ λύπην. (“The Savior, he said, experienced hunger and thirst and weariness and agony and sadness”). Greek text taken from F. Mueller (ed.), *Gregorii Nysseni Opera Dogmatica Minora III.1* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1958), 219.
- ⁶⁵ *Exp. Ps.* 109.8 (PG 55.277): ἀγωνίων, καὶ ἰδρῶν, καὶ οὕτως ἰδρῶν, ὡς καὶ θρόμβους καταρρεῖν, καὶ ἐνισχυόμενος (“being in agony he sweats, and thus he also sweats as drops of blood flow down, and he is strengthened”); *Hom. Matt.* 83.1 (PG 58.746): καὶ ἰδρῶτες ἐπιρρέουσι διὰ τὴν αἰτίαν πάλιν τὴν αὐτήν, καὶ ἵνα μὴ τοῦτο εἴπωσιν αἰρετικοί, ὅτι ὑποκρίνεται τὴν ἀγωνίαν. διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἰδρῶτες ὡς θρόμβοι αἵματος, καὶ ἄγγελος ἐνισχύων αὐτὸν ἐφάνη (“And sweat flows over him for the same cause again, even that the heretics might not say this, that he pretends to be in agony. Therefore, there is a sweat like drops of blood, and an angel appeared strengthening him”). In another treatise titled *De sancta trinitate* (PG 48.1087–96) and attributed to Chrysostom there is a lengthy reference to Luke 22:43–44 (1092–93); however, the attribution to Chrysostom is doubtful (CPG 2.4507).
- ⁶⁶ *Commentary on Tatian’s Diatessaron* 20.11: “His sweat became like drops of blood; the Evangelist said. He sweated to heal Adam who was sick. ‘It is by the sweat of your brow,’ said God, ‘that you will eat your bread.’ He remained in prayer in this garden to bring Adam back into his own garden again.” Translation taken from McCarthy, *Saint Ephrem’s Commentary on Tatian’s Diatessaron*, 297.
- ⁶⁷ The only place in the corpus of Didymus where this passage is referenced is in his work *De trinitate*: 3.21.188 (PG 39.900): καὶ τὸ, ὡφθη ἄγγελος κυρίου ἐνισχύων αὐτόν. (“and that, ‘an angel of the Lord appeared strengthening him’”; cf. 3.21.198 (PG 39.913): ὡφθη ἄγγελος κυρίου ἐνισχύων αὐτόν. But it is open to question whether this work was actually produced by Didymus. See CPG 2.2570; L. Doutreleau, “Le de Trinitate est-il l’oeuvre de Didyme l’Aveugle?” *RSR* (1957): 514–57; cf. L. Koenen, “Ein theologischer Papyrus des Kolner Sammlung: Kommentar Didymos’ des Blinden zu Zach 9,11 u.16,” *APF* 17 (1960): 61–105. Given Koenen’s argument one cannot dismiss out of hand Didymean authorship of *De trinitate*. More recently see M. DelCogliano, A. Radde-Gallwitz and L. Ayres, *Works on the Spirit: Athanasius and Didymus* (New York: St. Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 2011), 34 n. 78.
- ⁶⁸ H. B. Swete, *Theodori episcopi Mopsuesteni in epistolas B. Pauli commentarii. The Latin Version with the Greek Fragments* (vol. II) (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1882), *frag. incar.* 10.2 (p. 301): ὡφθη δὲ αὐτῷ ἄγγελος ἀπ’ οὐρανοῦ ἐνισχύων αὐτόν. καὶ γενόμενος ἐν ἀγωνίᾳ ἐκτενέστερον προσήχετο. καὶ ἐγένετο ὁ ἰδρῶς αὐτοῦ ὡσεὶ θρόμβοι αἵματος καταβαίνοντες ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν (“And there appeared to him an angel from heaven strengthening him. And being in agony he prayed yet further. And his sweat became as drops of blood falling down to the ground”).
- ⁶⁹ Theodoret, *Haer.* (PG 83.497–500): σαφέστερον δὲ τοῦτο τὸ δέος ἐδίδαξεν ὁ Λουκάς. οὕτω γὰρ αὐτὸν ἔφησεν ἀγωνιάσαι τὸ πάθος, ὡς ὑφαιμον γενέσθαι τὸν ἰδρῶτα τοῦ σώματος. «ἐγένετο γὰρ, φησὶν, ὁ ἰδρῶς αὐτοῦ, ὡς θρόμβοι αἵματος.» προστέθεικε δὲ καὶ τοῦτο, ὡς ἄγγελος ἐλθὼν ὑπεστήρισεν αὐτόν. (“Luke taught this very thing of reverence more clearly; thus he said the suffering would distress him, as the sweat of his body contained blood. For he said, ‘his sweat was as drops of blood’”). Theodoret also quotes Hippolytus (*eran.* 2.15) who cites this passage.
- ⁷⁰ Rufinus, *Ben. patr.* 2.26.53–55 (SC 140.126; CCSL 20.222): denique et scriptum est in Euangelio: Cum in oratione desudaret, accedens – inquit – angelus confortabat eum. (“And thereafter it is written in scripture: ‘at that time in prayer he sweated, an angel draws near,’ it states, ‘he was comforting him’”).
- ⁷¹ John Cassian, *Conlat.* 9.25 (CSEL 13.273): quern statum dominus quoque noster illarum supplicationum formula, quas vel solus in monte secedens vel tacite fudisse describitur, similiter figuravit, cum in orationis agonia constitutus etiam guttas sanguinis inimitabili intentionis profudit exemplo. (“Our Lord himself represented this condition in similar fashion in the form of those prayers that he is described as having poured out alone on the mountain and silently, and when he prayed in his agony he even shed drops of blood as an inimitable example of his intense purpose”).

of Aquitane;⁷⁵ Quidvultdeus.⁷⁶ Additionally, if the evidence of the “arch-heretic” Arius can be admitted, then there is yet another early fourth-century witness to these verses.⁷⁷ Furthermore, the emperor Julian “the Apostate” should also be included here since he cites the Gethsemane narrative as it appears in Luke to criticize Jesus and by extension his followers.⁷⁸ Finally, there might even be evidence for its use in certain Pseudepigraphical and apocryphal texts.⁷⁹ How-

⁷² *Enarrat. Ps.* 85.1 (CCSL 39.1177): *Pernoctabat, inquit, Iesus et perstabat in orando; et globi sanguinis decurrebant per corpus eius.* (“He prolonged [his prayer] throughout the night, the gospel tells us, and Jesus continued in prayer, and drops of blood ran down his body”); *Enarrat. Ps.* 140.4 (CCSL 40.2028): *Et cum oraret globi sanguinis de toto corpore eius distillabant. Sic scriptum est in euangelio. Oravit Iesus intenta oratione, et sudavit sanguinem.* (“While he was praying drops of blood were forced from all over his body; that is what the gospel says: ‘Jesus prayed vehemently, and he sweated blood’”). Cf. Augustine, *Ep.* 130.19 (CSEL 44.62): *nam et de ipso domino scriptum est, quod pernoctaverit in orando et quod prolixius oraverit.* (“For scripture says even of the Lord himself that he spent the night in prayer and that he prayed at great length”); cf. with *Vulg. Luke 22:44 prolixius orabat.*

⁷³ *Exp. Cant.* 9.565 (PLS I.969): *Et factus est in agonia, et coepit prolixius orare, et sudor eius distillare in terra sicut guttae sanguinis, et descendens angelus confortavit eum.* (“And being in agony he began to pray more earnestly, and his sweat dripped to the ground as drops of blood, and an angel descended and comforted him”).

⁷⁴ Prosper of Aquitane, *Epigr.* 71 (PL 51.520): *Orans cum sudore sanguineo Dominus Iesus Christus.* (“The Lord Jesus Christ prayed with bloody sweat. Cf. *Sent.* 68 (CCEL 68A.273) where the passage is quoted again.

⁷⁵ Eutropius of Aquitane, *Simil.* (f. 56^v): *usque ad sudorem sanguinis, ut Lucas tradidit.* (“even the sweat of blood, as Luke has handed down”). Latin text taken from G. Morin, *Études, textes, découvertes: contributions a la littérature et a l’histoire des douze premiers siècles* (Belgium, 1913), 141.

⁷⁶ Quidvultdeus, 2.38.4 (SC 101.378; CCEL 60.107): *illic orans, ut evangelista testator, sudans: pro lacrimis guttae sanguine stillare videbantur in terram.* (“As the evangelist testifies, He [Jesus] prays, he sweats; with tears, drops of blood are seen dripping down to the ground”).

⁷⁷ Arius *apud* Epiphanius *Pan.* 69.61.1–2 (GCS 37.209), uses Luke 22:43–44 against his (orthodox) opponents to highlight the distinctiveness of Jesus and the Father and to show the former’s subordination to the latter: *καὶ καθεξῆς δὲ ἐπιφέρει λέγων, ἐν τῷ εὐχέσθαι αὐτόν, ὅτι γενόμενος ἐν ἀγωνίᾳ, <ὡς> ἐμφέρεται ἐν τῷ κατὰ Λουκᾶν εὐαγγελίῳ «ἰδρωσέ» φησι «καὶ ἐγένετο αὐτοῦ ὁ ἰδρῶς ὡσεὶ θρόμβοι αἵματος κατερχόμενοι ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. καὶ ἐφάνη ἄγγελος κυρίου ἐνισχύων αὐτόν». προπηδήσαντες τοίνυν οἱ λεξιθηρες εὐθύς, ὡς πρόφασιν κατὰ ἐχθροῦ εὐράενοι, ἐπιφέρουσι λέγοντες· ὁρᾷς ὅτι ἐπεδέετο καὶ ἰσχύος ἀγγέλων; ἐνίσχυσε γὰρ αὐτόν ἄγγελος· ἐν ἀγωνίᾳ γὰρ αὐτὸς ἐγένετο.* (“And [Arius] adds next that, as we find in the gospel according to Luke, ‘Christ was in agony while he prayed and “He sweats, and his sweat was as it were drops of blood falling to the ground. And there appeared an angel of the Lord strengthening him.”’ The nit-pickers rush right out as though they had found an opening against an enemy, and add, ‘Do you see that he also needed the strength of angels? An angel strengthened him, for he was in agony.’” Translation adapted from Williams, *The Panarion of Epiphanius of Salamis: Books II and III*, 379.

⁷⁸ In *Against the Galileans* Julian takes special aim at the conduct of Jesus in Gethsemane and specifically singles out the account given in Luke 22:42–47a. See LCL 157.430, Frag. 4; T. Baarda, “Luke 22:42–47a, The Emperor Julian as a Witness to the Text of Luke,” *NovT* 30.4 (1988): 289–96.

⁷⁹ An allusion to Luke 22:44 may be found in a couple mss. of the longer recension of the Testament of Abraham B 20:5: *ἀφ’ οὗ γὰρ ἔθεασάμην σε τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς μου, ἢ ἰσχύς μου ἐξέλιπεν, πάντα δὲ τὰ μέλη τῆς σαρκός μου δίκην μολύβδου βάρους μοι φαίνονται, καὶ τὸ πνεῦμά μου ἐπὶ πολὺ ταλανίζεται. μεταστῆθι ἐν ὀλίγοις· εἶπον γάρ, οὐχ ὑποφέρω θεωρεῖν σου τὸ εἶδος. (κατήλθε γὰρ ὁ ἰδρῶς τῆς ὄψεως αὐτοῦ) ὡσεὶ θρόμβοι αἵματος.* (“For since I have seen you with my eyes my strength has failed me, all the limbs of my flesh seem to me a weight as of lead, and my spirit is distressed exceedingly. Depart for a little; for I have said I cannot bear to see your shape. For sweat

ever, it should also be noted that as one moves into the fifth and subsequent centuries there are two instances where it is alleged that the passage represents an interpolation.⁸⁰

descended from his face as drops of blood.”). Greek text taken from F. Schmidt, *Le Testament grec d'Abraham: Introduction, édition critique des deux recensions grecques, traduction* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1986), 164–66. But the addition κατήλθε γὰρ ὁ ἰδρῶς τῆς ὄψεως αὐτοῦ ὡσεὶ θρόμβοι αἵματος is not attested in all the mss. and so this passage is not included in the translation given in *OTP* 1.895. On this allusion see F. Bovon, *Luke III: A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke 19:28–24:53*, 201–2; Clivaz, *L'ange et la sueur de sang*, 286–87.

In a fourteenth-century text titled *Historia passionis Domini* (ms.: Theolog. Sammelhandschrift fol. 8–71), it is alleged that the story of the strengthening angel in Gethsemane could be found in the *Gospel of the Nazareans*: Sequitur Luc. 22. Apparuit autem ei angelus de celo confortans eum. Qualiter autem angelus Christum in agonia sue oracionis confortaverit dicitur in Evangelio Nazareorum. Et idem ponit Anselmus in planctu suo. Constans esto domine modo enim venit tempus quo per tuam passionem redimendum est genus humanum in Adam venditum. Sequitur Luc. 22. Et factus est sudor eius ... (32r). (“Here follows Luke 22. But an angel from heaven appeared to him and comforted him. And how the angel strengthened Christ in his struggle in prayer is told in the *Gospel of the Nazareans*. And the same is also adduced by Anselm in his lamentation: Be constant, Lord, for now comes the time in which through thy passion mankind sold in Adam will be ransomed. Here follows Luke 22. And it happened that his sweat ...”). This passage is otherwise unknown in the extant fragments of the *Gospel of the Nazareans*; due to the very late date of the attribution there are some grounds for questioning its accuracy. On this reference see Duplacy, “La préhistoire du texte en Luc 22:43–44,” 84; A.F.J. Klijn, *Jewish-Christian Gospel Tradition* (E.J. Brill: Leiden, 1992), 143–44 who notes, “It is possible that a passage like this was part of a Jewish-Christian Gospel. It is even possible to assume that it gave the content of the message of the angel. However, a definite answer to the question of the authenticity cannot be given.” Cf. Clivaz, *L'ange et la sueur de sang*, 495–98.

⁸⁰ There are only two late examples where it is alleged that Luke 22:43–44 represents an interpolation. In a letter to Caesaria, which only survives in Syriac, Severus of Antioch claims that in the twelfth book of Cyril of Alexandria's *Against Julian*, which was written as a defense of Christianity against Julian's *Against the Galileans*, Cyril claimed that Luke 22:43–44 was an interpolation (*Ep.* 100): “But, as to the passage about the sweat and the drops of blood, know that in the divine and evangelical scriptures that are at Alexandria it is not written. Wherefore also the holy Cyril in the 12th of the books written by him on behalf of the religion of the Christians against the impious demon-worshipper Julian plainly stated as follows: ‘But, since he said that the divine Luke inserted among his own words the statement that an angel stood and strengthened Jesus, and his sweat dripped like blood-drops or blood, let him learn from us that we have found nothing of this kind inserted in Luke's work, unless perhaps an interpolation has been made from outside which is not genuine. The books therefore that are among us contain nothing whatever of this kind; and I therefore think it madness for us to say anything to him about these things; and it is a superfluous thing to oppose him on things that are not stated at all, and we shall be condemned to be laughed at and that very justly.’ In the books therefore that are at Antioch and in other countries it is written [i.e. Luke 22:43–44], and some of the fathers mention it; among whom Gregory the Theologian made mention of this same passage in the 2nd homily on the Son; and John bishop of Constantinople in the exposition composed by him about the passage, ‘My Father if possible let this cup pass from me.’ And I myself therefore in the 64th homily showed the religious meaning thus brought about, according to the limited power that has been given me from above.” Translation taken from E. W. Brooks, “A Collection of Letters of Severus of Antioch, from Numerous Syriac Manuscripts,” *PO* 14 (1920): 245–46. Only books one through ten of Cyril's treatise are fully preserved in Greek (PG 76.509–1058); books 11–19 are only preserved in fragments (PG 76.1057–64). The passage quoted by Severus is not attested in any of the extant fragments for book 12. It is interesting, however, to note from this reference that Cyril betrays a knowledge of Luke 22:43–44 since he mentions features of the passage (i.e. bloody sweat) that are never actually

mentioned by Julian (LCL 157.430, Frag. 4). Furthermore, his claim that this passage does not appear in the “evangelical scriptures that are at Alexandria” is curious given that Arius, Athanasius, and Didymus know of the passages and cite it. The Syriac rendering of Luke 22:43–44 in the letter of Severus is not a mere harmonization to Luke 22:43–44 but rather a paraphrase: see G.A. Kiraz, *Comparative Edition of the Syriac Gospels: Aligning the Sinaiticus, Curetonianus, Peshîttâ and Harklean Versions* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1996), 453–54; P.E. Pusey and G.H. Gwilliam, *Tetraeuangelium Sanctum Tetraeuangelium Sanctum juxta simplicem Syrorum Versionem* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1901), 458.

In his homilies on Luke, preserved only in Syriac, Cyril likewise shows no awareness of Luke 22:43–44 and when commenting on the Gethsemane scene in Luke skips from 22:42 to 22:45 (*Lc.* 146.1). See R.P. Smith, *A Commentary Upon the Gospel According to S. Luke by Cyril of Alexandria. Now First Translated Into English From an Ancient Syriac Version, Part II* (Oxford: At the University Press, 1859), 683f. On the other hand, in the *Explanatio in Psalmos* (PG 69.717–1273), attributed to Cyril (CPG 5202), Luke 22:43–44 is clearly alluded to as though it were scripture (Ps. 68:1; PG 69.1161): καὶ κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον· «μετὰ ἰδρώτων, ἀγγέλου ἐνισχύοντος, ἐν ἀγωνίᾳ γενόμενος, ἐκτενέστερον προσήχετο.» (“And according to the Gospel: ‘with sweat, an angel strengthening, being in agony, he prayed more fervently’”). It therefore seems that either the Syriac fragments are mistaken or the attribution of the *Explanatio in Psalmos* to Cyril is incorrect; on the other hand, however, it could also be that Cyril knows the verses and that they are missing from the Alexandrian copies. It should be pointed out here that in the letter by Severus (*Ep.* 100) that while he claims that Cyril rejected the authenticity of Luke 22:43–44 that he held them as authentic and noted that they could be found in the scriptures in Antioch and elsewhere and that he had previously attempted to explain them in his 64th homily. This homily is preserved only in Syriac and may be found in M. Briere, “Les homiliae cathedrales de Sévère d’Antioche, version syriaque de Jacques d’Édesse. Homélie LVIII à LXIX, éditées et traduites en français,” *PO* 8 (1912): 313–20, Luke 22:43–44 is cited on 318–19.

The other reference where it is alleged that Luke 22:43–44 represents an interpolation can be found in the seventh or eighth-century work *Narratio de rebus Armeniae* (CSCO 132) where it is reported that John Mayragom (c. 668), a defender of the extreme monophysitism of Julian of Halicarnassus, accused the Chalcedonians (or according to John “the Nestorians”) of adding Luke 22:43–44 to the Gospel (*Narratio de rebus Armeniae* 132–33 [CSCO 132.45]): καὶ ὅτε ὑπέδειξε τὴν μαρτυρίαν τῆς γραφῆς, εἶπεν ὁ ἀντικείμενος Ἰωάννης· ταῦτα πάντα οἱ νεστοριανοὶ προσέθηκαν ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων, καθὼς καὶ ἐν ταῖς θεῖαις γραφαῖς ὁ τότε Σατορνίλος πολλὰς αἰρέσεις προσετίθει, ὡς καὶ εἰς τὸ κατὰ Λουκᾶν εὐαγγέλιον, ὅτι ἤρξατο ὁ Ἰησοῦς λυπεῖσθαι καὶ ἀδημονεῖν· «ᾧφθη δὲ αὐτῷ ἄγγελος ἀπ’ οὐρανοῦ ἐνισχύων αὐτόν», καὶ ὅτι «ἐκτενέστερον προσήχετο καὶ ἐγένετο ὁ ἰδρὼς αὐτοῦ ὡσεὶ θρόμβοι αἵματος», καὶ τὰ ὅμοια. (“And when he set forth the testimony of the scriptures, John [Mayragom], opposing, said, ‘the Nestorians [i.e. Chalcedonians] added all these things to the writings of the holy fathers, just as Saturnilus added many heresies to the divine scriptures, so too [have they added] to the Gospel of Luke, that Jesus began to be grieved and to be distressed, “and an angel appeared from heaven strengthening him,” and “he prayed more earnestly and his sweat became as drops of blood,” and the likewise.”). Though it is reported that John asserted that the Chalcedonians added Luke 22:43–44, this allegation can be easily disproved and represents the extremes monophysites might go to in order to deny the humanity of Jesus. Furthermore, John’s quotation is confused since while he talks about the “Gospel of Luke” when he states that “Jesus began to be grieved and to be distressed” he is actually quoting from Matt 26:37. Though Westcott and Hort, (*The New Testament in the Original Greek, Appendix*, 65), following Wettstein, took the passage to mean that John was alleging that Luke 22:43–44 was added by Saturnilus, the second-century Syrian gnostic mentioned by Irenaeus and others (*Haer.* 1.24.1; Hippolytus, *Haer.* 7.28; Tertullian, *An.* 23), this is a misunderstanding of the passage. John was not arguing that Saturnilus had added the passage but that the passage had been added by the Chalcedonians and thus they had corrupted the scriptures similar to Saturnilus. Gérard Garitte, the editor of the text, notes that the reference to Saturnilus should

To this body of evidence the witness of Hilary of Poitiers, Jerome, and Epiphanius should be added, although their testimonies are slightly different. While both Hilary and Jerome were aware of the passage and noted it, they also pointed out that it could not be found in all the manuscripts and take a somewhat agnostic approach to the passage as they neither confirmed nor contested its authenticity.⁸¹ The evidence provided by Epiphanius of Salamis is also somewhat unique. While he cites the passage he also points out that in certain manuscripts the passage was omitted. However, what is fascinating about Epiphanius' account is that he relates the circumstances under which the passage was deliberately excised:

[This passage (i.e. Luke 22:43–44)] is found in the unrevised copies of the Gospel of Luke, and St. Irenaeus, in his work *Adversus Haereses*, brings it as a testimony to confute those who say that Christ [only] seemed to be manifest [in the flesh]. But the orthodox, being afraid and not understanding the meaning and power of the passage, have expunged it. Thus, “when he was in agony he sweated and his sweat became as drops of blood, and an angel appeared strengthening him.”⁸²

Though some have cited Epiphanius as evidence against the authenticity of the passage, this is a fundamental misunderstanding of the passage.⁸³ When Epiphanius talks about Luke 22:43–44 being present in the “unrevised” or “uncorrected” copies of Luke (ἐν τῷ κατὰ Λουκᾶν εὐαγγελίῳ ἐν τοῖς ἀδιορθώτοις ἀντιγράφοις) he is not making a general statement about the nature of the manuscript evidence *per se*, or implying that in more reliable manuscripts the

be taken as a parenthetical aside [?] and that John is not attributing the interpolation to Saturnilus (CSCO 132:327): “L'incise concernant Saturninus est en réalité une parenthèse, et il faut lire le texte comme suit ... Ce sont donc les «nestoriens» (et non Saturninus) que Jean Mayragome 'i accuse d'avoir interpolé dan l'Évangile de Luc les versets de l'ange et de la sueur de sang. ». The apparent logic behind Mayragom's assertion that the passage was not authentic was that St. Gregory had never cited the passage. On this reasoning see S.P. Cowe, “Christological Trends and Textual Transmission: The Pericope of the Bloody Sweat (Luke 22 :43–44) in the Armenian Version,” in S. Ajamian and M.W. Stone (eds.), *Text and Context: Studies in the Armenian New Testament* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994), 42–43.

⁸¹ Hilary, *Trin.* 10.41.1 (PL 10.375): Nec sane ignorandum a nobis est, et in grecis et in latinis codicibus complurimis, vel de adveniente angelo, vel de sudore sanguinis nil scriptum reperiri. Ambigentibus igitur, utrum hoc in libris variis aut desit, aut superfluum sit (incertum enim hoc nobis relinquatur de diversitate librorum), certe si quid sibi ex hoc haeresis blanditur, ut infirmum affirmet, cui opus fuerit angeli. (“We must not ignore the fact that in several manuscripts, both Latin and Greek, nothing is written of the angel coming or of the bloody sweat. It is therefore ambiguous, whether this is an omission, where it is wanting, or an interpolation, where it is found (for the disparity of the copies leaves the question uncertain to us), let not the heretics flatter themselves that herein lies a confirmation of his weakness, that he needed the help of an angel”).

Jerome, *Pelag.* 2.16 (PL 23.578): In quibusdam exemplaribus tam Graecis quam Latinis inventur scribente Luca: Apparuit illi angelus de coelo confortans cum (haud dubium quin Dominum Salvatorem). Et factus in agonia prolixius orabat, factusque est sudor eius sicut guttae sanguinis decurrentis in terram. (“In some copies, Greek as well as Latin, the following words are found written by Luke: ‘There appeared to him an angel from heaven strengthening him’ (referring, undoubtedly, to the Lord, Savior). ‘And falling into an agony, he prayed more earnestly. And his sweat became as drops of blood running down to the ground’”).

⁸² *Ancor.* 31.4–5 (GCS 25.40): κείται ἐν τῷ κατὰ Λουκᾶν εὐαγγελίῳ ἐν τοῖς ἀδιορθώτοις ἀντιγράφοις, —καὶ κέχρηται τῇ μαρτυρίᾳ ὁ ἅγιος Εἰρηναῖος ἐν τῷ κατὰ αἰρέσεων πρὸς τοὺς δοκῆσει τὸν Χριστὸν πεφηνέναι λέγοντας, ὀρθόδοξοι δὲ ἀφείλαντο τὸ ῥητόν, φοβηθέντες καὶ μὴ νοήσαντες αὐτοῦ τὸ τέλος καὶ τὸ ἰσχυρότατον—καὶ «γενόμενος ἐν ἀγωνίᾳ ἰδρωσε, καὶ ἐγένετο ὁ ἰδρῶς αὐτοῦ ὡς θρόμβοι αἵματος, καὶ ὤφθη ἄγγελος ἐνισχύων αὐτόν».

⁸³ Comfort, *New Testament Text and Translation Commentary*, 234.

passage is not present. He is simply stating that in the copies not deliberately corrupted (i.e. “unrevised”) by the orthodox the passage is attested and is otherwise genuine.⁸⁴ Furthermore, on two other occasions Epiphanius effectively defends the authenticity of the passage by giving a detailed explanation of it;⁸⁵ why bother trying to explain a passage you do not think is genuine?⁸⁶ It is also noteworthy that it was not the “heretics” who were the ones charged with corrupting the scriptures but the “orthodox” who did so because the passage posed certain theological problems and was being used by their opponents to their advantage.⁸⁷ It is therefore readily apparent from Epiphanius that in this case the removal of Luke 22:43–44 was done for strictly apologetic purposes.⁸⁸ If certain Christians felt inclined to excise this passage in the

⁸⁴ On this interpretation see O. Kösters, *Die Trinitätslehre des Epiphanius von Salamis. Ein Kommentar zum “Ancoratus”* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2003), 202–3 n. 402; U. Holzmeister, “Spricht Epiphanius (Ancoratus 31,4) vom Blutschweiß des Herrn oder von seinen Tränen,” *ZKT* 47 (1923): 309–14.

⁸⁵ *Ancor.* 37.1–6; *Pan.* 49.61.1–3.

⁸⁶ For example, when Eusebius was faced with a tough question about an apparent contradiction between Matt 28:1 and Mark 16:9 over the exact timing of the resurrection he was quick to point out that it was a moot point since Mark 16:9–20 was unlikely to be authentic since it could not be found in all the manuscripts of Mark and the accurate copies did not contain it (*qu. Marin.* 1.1 [see also J.A. Kelhoffer, “The Witness of Eusebius’ *ad Marinum* and Other Christian Writings to Text-Critical Debates concerning the Original Conclusion to Mark’s Gospel,” *ZNW* 92 (2001): 84–85]). Cf. Origen, *Cels.* 6.34 (SC 147.262) where Origen rebuts a charge of Celsus by stating that the “gospels accepted in the churches” (τῶν ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις φερομένων εὐαγγελίων) do not contain such a reading.

⁸⁷ It is a surprising oversight that Ehrman’s *Orthodox Corruption of Scripture* fails to mention this passage as it is the only time in patristic literature when it is explicitly reported that “orthodox” (ὀρθόδοξοι) persons were corrupting the scriptures.

⁸⁸ R. Feldmeier, *Die Krisis des Gottessohnes: Die Gethsemaneerzählung als Schlüssel der Markuspassion* (Tübingen, 1987), 13–14 questions Epiphanius’ testimony regarding the excision of the passage and pleads that caution needs to be exercised when invoking it as evidence for the excision of Luke 22:43–44. While I agree with Feldmeier that caution needs to be exercised when invoking this passage (“Bei der Berufung auf Epiphanius sollte man vorsichtig sein” [p. 14]) I disagree with his overall assessment of this passage. According to Feldmeier Epiphanius’ testimony is to be largely discarded because he is not a reliable source and is purportedly to be distrusted here because he is writing about an alleged alteration about which he knows little because it happened at least 200 years earlier: “Generell ist es unwahrscheinlich, dass Epiphanius noch wirklich Kenntnis von den Hintergründen einer Textveränderung hat, die mindestens zweihundert Jahre vor seiner Zeit stattgefunden hat.” But it is clear from the wider context of the passage that Epiphanius is not alleging that it took place sometime earlier but in his very own day. A contributing factor to the “orthodox” excision was that the Arians had been using the very same passage to their advantage, which Epiphanius clarifies a little later in the treatise (*Ancor.* 37.1–7; cf. Arius *apud* Epiphanius *Pan.* 69.61.1–2); the “orthodox” were at a loss to explain the passage in terms of their own theology. Therefore, Epiphanius cannot possibly be talking about some scriptural alteration that took place centuries earlier as Feldmeier alleges.

Second, Feldmeier follows the erroneous reconstruction of K. Holl, Epiphanius (*Ancoratus* und *Panarion*), Herausgegeben von Karl Holl. I. *Ancoratus* und *Panarion. Haer.* 1–33 (Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte 25; Leipzig, 1915), 31.4 who added a <ὥς> after ἔκλαυσεν (“he wept”) which implied that the problematic text was not Luke 22:43–44 but rather Luke 19:41. But this error has been corrected by numerous later commentators who have recognized that Epiphanius is clearly referring to Luke 22:43–44: Holzmeister, “Spricht Epiphanius (Ancoratus 31,4) vom Blutschweiß des Herrn oder von seinen Tränen,” 309–14; Kösters, *Die Trinitätslehre des Epiphanius von Salamis. Ein Kommentar zum “Ancoratus,”* 202–3 n. 402; Y.R.

fourth century, is it conceivable that some Christians could have similarly done so previously, albeit for different reasons, but to serve some apologetic agenda?

Scriptural Corruption, Hermeneutics, Apologetics, and Luke 22:43–44

Allegations of deliberate scriptural corruption are widespread in early Christian literature during the first four centuries.⁸⁹ Likewise, the great disparity in the extant manuscript evidence readily attests to the deliberate alteration of certain verses or passages.⁹⁰ Therefore, there can

Kim (ed. and trans.), *St. Epiphanius of Cyprus: Ancoratus* (FC 128; Washington, 2014), 107 n. 9. Furthermore, this error has even been recognized in the updated critical notes of the *Ancoratus*: M. Bergemann and C.-F. Collatz, *Epiphanius I: Ancoratus und Panarion Haer. 1–33. Teilband I/2: Addenda & Corrigenda* (GCS 10/2; Berlin: De Gruyter, 2013), 502–3.

⁸⁹ Rev 22:18–19; Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.8.1; Dionysius [bp. of Corinth late II CE] *apud* Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 4.23.12; Victor [bp. of Rome ca. 190 CE] *apud* Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 5.28.13–17; Caius, *Disputation against Proclus*, 3.1; Tertullian, *Praescr.* 38; *Marc.* 4.2; Origen, *Comm. Matt.* 15:14; Celsus *apud* Origen, *Cels.* 2.27; Lactantius, *Inst.* 4.30; Julian, *Adv. Gal.* 327A; Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catech.* 1.7; Ambrose, *Fid.* 5.16; John Chrysostom, *Hom. Phil.* 11; Jerome, *Praef. in libro Iob* 41–48; Augustine, *Conf.* 5.11, 21; Socrates, *Hist. eccl.* 7.32. However, there were some allegations of deliberate scriptural corruption that are to be regarded as either baseless or inaccurate. When Justin asserts that the Jews had deliberately removed the phrase “from the tree” from LXX Ps 95:10 to obfuscate a prophecy of Christ (*Dial.* 71.2–73.1), his testimony is to be doubted (see J.D.M. Derrett, “Ο ΚΥΡΙΟΣ ΕΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣΕΝ ΑΠΟ ΤΟΥ ΞΥΛΟΥ,” *VC* (1989): 378–92); cf. *Dial.* 72.1–4 where Justin alleges that scriptural excisions took place “only a short time ago” (πρὸ γὰρ ὀλίγου χρόνου ταῦτα ἐξέκοψαν). Similarly, when Origen argued that the textual variant that adds the name “Jesus” to Barabbas in Matt 27:16 and 17 was the deliberate work of the “heretics,” since the name of Jesus could not possibly apply to an evildoer (*Comm. ser. Matt.* 121), or when he alleges that the enemies of the church had altered Luke 23:45 in order to attack the veracity of the gospel his testimony is to be doubted (*Matt. ser. Matt.* 134) (see B.M. Metzger, “Explicit References in the Works of Origen to Variant Readings in New Testament Manuscripts,” in J.N. Birdsall and R.W. Thompson (eds.), *Biblical and Patristic Studies in Memory of Robert Pierce Casey* [Freiburg, 1963], 94–95). Likewise when Ambrose accuses the Arians of inserting “nor the son” into Matt 24:26 (*Fid.* 5.16) or of erasing “because the spirit is God, and is born of God” (*Spir.* 3.10) from John 3:6, he is probably wrong (see P.M. Head, “Christology and Textual Transmission: Reverential Alterations in the Synoptic Gospels,” *NovT* 35.2 (1993): 107). Finally, we have good reason to doubt Augustine’s allegation that the *pericope de adultera* (John 7:53–8:11) was deliberately expunged from John due to moral prudence (*Incomp. nupt.* 2.6–7).

⁹⁰ One need only look at the manuscript evidence for Jesus’ teaching on divorce in Matt 19:9 to see how potentially difficult passages could be consciously changed. In Ⲙ C D L (W) Z Θ 078 this verse reads: ὃς ἂν ἀπολύσῃ τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ μὴ ἐπὶ πορνείᾳ καὶ γαμήσῃ ἄλλην μοιχᾶται (“who-soever divorces his wife, except for unchastity, and marries another, commits adultery”). But in B it reads: ὃς ἂν ἀπολύσῃ τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ παρεκτὸς λόγου πορνείας ποιεῖ αὐτὴν μοιχευθῆναι καὶ ὁ ἀπολελυμένην γαμήσας μοιχᾶται (“whosoever should divorce his wife, except by reason of unchastity, makes her to commit adultery, and the one having married the divorced woman commits adultery”). It is yet different in C* and N: ὃς ἂν ἀπολύσῃ τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ ποιεῖ αὐτὴν μοιχευθῆναι (“whoever divorces his wife makes her commit adultery”). The different readings of the verse, which drastically change its meaning, can hardly be considered accidental variants. Similarly, there is the case of Jesus’ teaching about the Sabbath in Luke 6:1–6 that differs so markedly between B, D, and Ω that one may almost wonder if they are narrating the same story. There is also the notable variant in Rev 13:18, which is noted by Irenaeus, *Haer.* 5.30.1 and attested in C and P¹⁵ (=P.Oxy. LXVI 4499), that reads 616 instead of 666. Even if this variant may have little impact on the meaning behind this isopsephism, it seems that the change was not accidental: 616 corresponds to Hebrew transliteration of the Latin NERO QSR; 666 corresponds to Hebrew

be little doubt that if some Christians had genuine concerns about Luke's depiction of Jesus in 22:43–44, they may have been inclined to “improve” the text by altering the passage. By the latter half of the second century Christians were beginning to become more widely noticed by Roman society and while they were being mocked and derided for their distinct beliefs and practices with a whole set of baseless accusations, like charges of cannibalism and incest, the attacks were slowly becoming more refined and accurate.⁹¹ Certain opponents of Christianity in the late second century had begun to elevate the discourse of the debate to a more intellectual level by inquiring into the writings of the Christians and by using them as the basis of their polemic. One of the first to conduct such an “exposé” of sorts was Celsus—the late second or early third-century author of the anti-Christian tractate *True Doctrine*.⁹² In his treatise against the Christians it is readily apparent that even if Celsus could not resist some “mudslinging” his overall attack was based on an in-depth knowledge of select Christian writings, specifically the Gospels, which he used to lampoon Jesus and discredit his later followers.⁹³ In fact, Celsus would set a pattern for subsequent attacks in the following centuries, by Porphyry, Julian, and perhaps even Sossianus Hierocles, who focused their polemics against Christianity by specifically attacking its scriptures.⁹⁴

transliteration of the Greek ΝΕΡΟΝ ΩΡΩ. See Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 676.

- ⁹¹ R.L. Wilken, *The Christians as the Romans Saw Them* (New Haven/London: Yale University Press, 1984), 1–117; R.M. Grant, *Greek Apologists of the Second Century* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1988), 9–27; S. Benko, “Pagan Criticism of Christianity During the First Two Centuries A.D.,” *ANRW* II.23.2 (H. Temporani and W. Haase, eds.; Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1980), 1055–118. Justin, *Dial.* 10.1: cannibalism and promiscuity; Minucius Felix, *Oct.* 9.4–5; Theophilus, *Autol.* 3.4: promiscuity and cannibalism; Athenagoras, *Leg.* 3.1: Thyestean banquets and Oedipean unions.
- ⁹² The most detailed analysis of Celsus’ anti-Christian invective is still C. Andresen, *Logos und Nomos: Die Polemik des Kelsos wider das Christentum* (Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte 30; Berlin: De Gruyter, 1955). A late second-century date for Celsus’ *True Doctrine* is based on three references, one from Origen and two from the treatise itself. In *Contra Celsum* Origen simply reports that Celsus had been dead “for a long time” (*C. Cels.* Praef. 4); however, it is impossible to determine an exact date given the reference. In the second reference, Celsus refers to the active persecution of Christians (*Cels.* 8.69). In the final reference Celsus refers to the “ones now ruling” (οἱ νῦν βασιλεύοντες) (*Cels.* 8.71). While earlier scholarship took these cumulative references to suggest that Celsus must have written *True Doctrine* sometime ca. 178 CE, recent scholarship is more cautious, dating the treatise to either the last third of the second century or beginning of the third century. See H.U. Rosenbaum, “Zur Datierung von Celsus’ Aléthēs logos,” *VC* 26 (1972): 102–11; J. Hargis, *Against the Christians: The Rise of Early Anti-Christian Polemic* (New York: Peter Lang, 1999), 20–24.
- ⁹³ *Cels.* 2.16, 34, 37, 74, 77. He specifically knew the Gospel of Matthew (*Cels.* 1.34), and appears to have had a knowledge of John (*Cels.* 2.36), Luke (*Cels.* 2.32) and quite possibly even Mark (*Cels.* 6.36). See Grant, *Greek Apologists of the Second Century*, 138; C.E. Hill, *Who Chose the Gospels? Probing the Great Gospel Conspiracy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 155–57. On Celsus’ knowledge of Jewish polemic against Christians see L.H. Blumell, “A Jew in Celsus’ True Doctrine? An Examination of Jewish Anti-Christian Polemic in the Second Century C.E.” *SR* 36.2 (2007): 297–315.
- ⁹⁴ It has long been recognized that Porphyry’s fifteen-book attack *Against the Christians* was primarily an attack on the scriptures and that by attempting to undermine their integrity and authority he was trying to undermine the very foundation of Christianity. Similarly, Julian’s *Against the Galileans* is based primarily on a scathing critique of the scriptures, both Jewish and Christian. See Cook, *The Interpretation of the New Testament in Greco-Roman Paganism* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson Publishers, 2002), 119–25; 134–67; A. Meredith, “Porphyry and Julian Against the

While the attacks of Celsus, Porphyry, and Julian focused on different aspects of the scriptures and singled out different episodes for criticism, interestingly all three found the depiction of Jesus in Gethsemane worthy of severe reproach. Central to their respective criticisms was the conviction that Jesus lacked the proper moral courage and composure before death. He was sad and weak since he entreated God to be excused from his impending fate. Celsus mocked Jesus: “Why then does he [Jesus] utter loud laments and wailings, and pray that he may avoid the fear of death, saying something like this, ‘O Father, if this cup could pass me by?’”⁹⁵ Celsus later remarks that Jesus was effectively a coward since he acted in such a manner and could not heroically accept his death with the proper disposition.⁹⁶ With these accusations Celsus was attempting to undercut any divine claims made about Jesus, either by himself or his followers, and to present him as little more than a pathetic charlatan. Porphyry too points out that Jesus was cowardly in attempting to avoid death, but his attack goes further in explicitly charging that Jesus’ conduct demonstrated he could not have been “the son of God, nor even a wise man who hated death.”⁹⁷ Julian will mostly repeat the charges of Celsus and Porphyry; however, he will focus part of his attack specifically on Luke 22:43. He chides the “Galileans” (i.e. Christians) that if Jesus were truly divine he would not need the strengthening of an angel.⁹⁸ Likewise, a distinct undercurrent in Hierocles’ *A Friend of Truth*, wherein he compares Jesus with Apollonius of Tyana to argue for the superiority of the latter, has to do with the subject of death and how one should appropriately approach it. While we do not know whether or not Hierocles dealt explicitly with the Gethsemane scene owing to the fact that only fragments of the treatise are preserved by Eusebius, there is an inherent juxtaposition of a courageous and calm Apollonius with an emotionally distressed Jesus who requires external strengthening.⁹⁹ Along the same lines but more explicitly Porphyry specifically contrasts Apollonius’ and

Christians,” *ANRW* II, 23.2 (1980): 1120–149; M.V. Anastos, “Porphyry’s Attack on the Bible,” in L. Caplan (ed.), *The Classical Tradition: Literary and Historical Studies in Honor of Harry Caplan* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1966), 421–50.

⁹⁵ *Cels.* 2.24 (SC 132.348): τί οὖν ποτιᾶται καὶ ὀδύρεται καὶ τὸν τοῦ ὀλέθρου φόβον εὔχεται παραδραμεῖν. Here Celsus has either Matt 26:39, Mark 14:36, or Luke 22:42 in mind since these are the only places where Jesus asks that the “cup” be removed.

⁹⁶ *Cels.* 2.33 (SC 132.366): τί δὲ καὶ γενναῖον ἔδρασεν οἶον θεός, καταφρονῶν ἀνθρώπων καὶ διαγελῶν καὶ παιζῶν τὸ συμβαῖνον ὁ Ἰησοῦς; (“What fine action did Jesus do like a god? Did he despise men’s opposition and laugh and mock at the disaster that befell him?”). Cf. *Cels.* 7.53.

⁹⁷ Macarius Magnes, *Apocr.* 3.2 (= Porphyry Frag. 62): καὶ αὐτὸς ἀγωνιῶν καὶ τῇ προσδοκίᾳ τῶν δεινῶν ἐπαγρυπνῶν καὶ δι’ εὐχῆς παρακαλῶν τὸ πάθος ἑαυτῷ παρελθεῖν λέγων τοῖς γνωρίμοις ... ταῦτα γὰρ οὐκ ἄξια παιδὸς Θεοῦ τὰ ῥήματα, ἀλλ’ οὐδ’ ἀνθρώπου σοφοῦ θανάτου καταφρονοῦντος. Greek text taken from Goulet, *Macarios de Magnésie: Le monogénès*, 74.

⁹⁸ Julian, Frag. 4: ἀλλὰ καὶ τοιαῦτα προσεύχεται ὁ Ἰησοῦς, οἷα ἄνθρωπος ἄθλιος συμφορὰν φέρειν εὐκόλως οὐ δυνάμενος, καὶ ὑπ’ ἀγγέλου θεὸς ὢν ἐνισχύεται; τίς δὲ καὶ ἀνήγγειλέ σοι, Λουκᾶ, περὶ τοῦ ἀγγέλου, εἰ καὶ γέγονε τοῦτο; οὐδὲ οἱ τότε παρόντες εὐχομένῳ κατιδεῖν οἰοί τε ἦσαν. (“Additionally, Jesus prays in such language as would be used by a pitiful wretch who cannot bear misfortune with serenity, and though he is a god he is reassured by an angel.”). Greek text taken from LCL 157.430, Frag. 4. Behind Julian’s attack of Jesus’ demeanor, or lack of εὐκόλως, may have been Aristotle’s statement (*Eth. Nic.* 1100b 31) that truly noble individuals bore pain and all other infirmities well because they were high-minded. People who did not bear such infirmities well were ignoble and feeble-minded. See Cook, *The New Testament in Greco-Roman Paganism*, 297–98.

⁹⁹ Sossianus Hierocles’ *A Friend of Truth* only survives very fragmentarily by way of Eusebius’ apologetic response *Against Hierocles*. From Eusebius’ treatise as well as from a brief description of it given by Lactantius (*Inst.* 5.3) it is clear that Hierocles contrasted Jesus and Apollonius on a number of fronts (deeds, miracles, teachings, etc.). Hierocles also seems to have contrasted Jesus’

Jesus' reactions to impending death in order to further demean and criticize Jesus.¹⁰⁰ That this specific anti-Christian polemic may have been pressing on certain Christians is evident from a statement of Tertullian. Commenting on Jesus' behavior in Gethsemane he states, "and when it [his ministry] was finished, I do not say he stood firm (*non dico stetit*), but He [Jesus] had no desire even to get from his Father the aid of hosts of Angels."¹⁰¹ With the statement "I do not say he stood firm" it is clear that while Tertullian believed that Jesus was ultimately resolute during his final ordeal that he also believed he exhibited signs of hesitancy and wavering.¹⁰²

Many Christians were aware of these caustic criticisms and the inherent problems posed by Gethsemane. If one surveys early Christian literature between the second and fifth centuries it becomes readily apparent that the whole Gethsemane narrative was a matter of serious concern and even embarrassment; many Christians seemed genuinely perplexed about it and did not quite know how to best explain the episode or defend Jesus' actions. To many patristic commentators Gethsemane was considered "a plague and embarrassment."¹⁰³ Highlighting

response to death with that of Apollonius and argued that Jesus' conduct was objectionable while Apollonius' conduct was clearly superior: Lactantius, *Inst.* 5.3.9; Cook, *The New Testament in Greco-Roman Paganism*, 271; cf. Philostratus, *Vit. Apoll.* 7.12–14. See also T.D. Barnes, "Sossianus Hierocles and the Antecedents of the 'Great Persecution,'" *HSCP* 80 (1976): 239–52. For a useful introduction to Apollonius of Tyana see M. Dzielska, *Apollonius of Tyana in Legend and History* (Trans. Piotr Pieńkowski; Roma: L'Erma di Bretschneider, 1986), 9–17.

¹⁰⁰ Macarius Magnes, *Apocr.* 3.1 (= Porphyry Frag. 63): ἀλλ' ἠνέσχετο καλάμῳ τύπτεσθαι καὶ περιπτύεσθαι καὶ στεφανοῦσθαι ἀκάνθαις, καὶ μὴ καθάπερ Ἀπολλώνιος μετὰ παρρησίας τῷ αὐτοκράτορι λαλήσας ("But, no, he [Jesus] only manages to be whipped and spit upon and crowned with thorns—unlike Apollonius who talked back to the emperor").

¹⁰¹ *Fug.* 8. In *De fuga in persecution* Tertullian was taking on certain Christians who wanted to justify flight in the face of persecution.

¹⁰² That Tertullian is referring to the Gethsemane account is evident since he refers to Matt 26:53. Moving to the fourth century it is clear from the evidence of Ambrose that some Christians continued to have a hard time reconciling Jesus' actions in Gethsemane. *Exp. Luc.* 10.56 (CCSL 14.361–62): Haerent plerique hoc loco, qui tristitiam saluatoris ad argumentum inolitae potius a principio quam susceptae ad tempus infirmitatis inclinant et naturalis sensum cupiunt detorque-re sententiae. ("Very many people have difficulty with this passage. They attribute the Savior's sorrow to a weakness implanted from the beginning, rather than received for a time. They also desire to distort the sense of the natural saying."). Cf. Hilary, *Trin.* 10.41.1. Cyril, *Lc.* 146.1 and 147.1 is initially perplexed by Jesus' fear and weakness in Gethsemane and even acknowledges that it is a "mystery" which he then attempts to elucidate.

It may be wondered how the emergence of Christian martyr literature in the late second century and early third century impacted Christian perceptions of Jesus' conduct in Gethsemane given that it tended to depict martyrs as absolutely resolute, courageous, and virtually impassible in the face of suffering and death: *Mart. Pol.* 2.2, 12.3; Clement, *Strom.* 4.22; *Pass. Perp.* 21.9; Minucius Felix, *Oct.* 37.1–37.6; Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 5.1.18–19, 51–52.

¹⁰³ K. Madigan, "Ancient and High-Medieval Interpretations of Jesus in Gethsemane: Some Reflections on Tradition and Continuity in Christian Thought," *HTR* 88.1 (1995): 157.

Clivaz (*L'ange et la sueur de sang*, 434f, 545f; 582–83) tries to make the case that the ἄγγελος of Luke 22:43 and the ἀγωνία of Luke 22:44 were viewed positively and were understood by some early Christians to refer to a struggle reminiscent of Jacob's struggle with the angel in Gen 32:22–30. To make this case Clivaz cites Philo, *De somniis* 1.167–68, where Philo talks about how the patriarchs (Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob) obtained virtue (ἀρετή), as a bridge for making this connection: ὁ δὲ τρίτος Ἰακώβ ἀσκητικαῖς μελέταις, καθ' ἃς οἱ ἔναθλοι καὶ ἐναγώνιοι πόνοι. ("The third, Jacob, relied on exercises and practisings preparatory for the strenuous toil of the arena"; cf. Ambrose, *Jac.* 7.30). The only ostensible parallel is Philo's ἐναγώνιος with Luke's ἀγωνία. Here it may be noted that the only verbal parallel between Luke 22:43–44 and LXX Gen 32:22–30 is ἐνισχύω in

this problem was the fact that from the very start there was no one accepted interpretation for Jesus' conduct and behavior on the eve of his crucifixion but a series of competing, and even contradictory, explanations. According to Origen there was an ancient Christian tradition that reported that when Jesus asked to have the "cup" removed it was not said out of fear for his own life but rather out of love since if he drank the cup and permitted himself to be betrayed to the Jews the whole Jewish nation would inevitably be destroyed.¹⁰⁴ However, Origen elsewhere argues that Jesus was actually asking for a much more severe form of martyrdom than those

Gen 32:29; Hos 12:5 identifies Jacob's wrestling opponent as an "angel" (ἄγγελος). However, there is not a single place where a Christian author explicitly makes a connection between Jacob in Gen 32:22–30 and Jesus in Luke 22:43–44. Clivaz's survey of indirect evidence, which even includes rabbinic material (Clivaz, *L'ange et la sueur de sang*, 578–83), is tenuous. Though Clivaz demonstrates that certain early Christian authors identified Jacob as an ἀγωνιστής the link with Jesus and Gethsemane is wanting. Though Justin (*Dial.* 125.3; cf. Clivaz, *L'ange et la sueur de sang*, 567–68) sees in the wrestling of Jacob a type of Christ who would combat and overpower Satan, he uses this typology in the specific context of the temptations (Matt 4) and then goes on to imply (*Dial.* 125.5) that Jesus was the one Jacob was wrestling (cf. Clement, *Paed.* 1.56–57).

Furthermore, that ἀγωνία was often seen in a negative light, and thus the object of criticism, is evident from both Epictetus and Diogenes Laertius: Epictetus, *Diatr.* 2.13.1–5: "Ὄταν ἀγωνιῶντα ἴδω ἄνθρωπον, λέγω· οὗτος τί ποτε θέλει; εἰ μὴ τῶν οὐκ ἐφ' αὐτῷ τι ἤθελεν, πῶς ἂν ἔτι ἡγωνία ... ἀνάγκη λοιπὸν τρέμειν καὶ ὠχρῖαν" ("When I see a person in agony, I say to myself, 'what is it that this person wants?' For if he did not want something that was outside his control, how could he still remain in agony? ... Wherefore, he must needs tremble and turn pale"); *Diatr.* 16.11–12: εἶτ' ἀποροῦμεν, πῶς φοβούμεθα ἢ πῶς ἀγωνιῶμεν; τί οὖν ἐνδέχεται, ὅταν τὰ ἐπιφερόμενα κακὰ ἡγώμεθα; οὐ δυνάμεθα μὴ φοβεῖσθαι, οὐ δυνάμεθα μὴ ἀγωνιᾶν. εἶτα λέγομεν 'κύριε ὁ θεός, πῶς μὴ ἀγωνιῶ;' μωρέ, χεῖρας οὐκ ἔχεις; οὐκ ἐποίησέν σοι αὐτὰς ὁ θεός; εὐχου νῦν καθήμενος, ὅπως αἱ μύξαι σου μὴ ῥέωσιν· ἀπόμυξαι μᾶλλον καὶ μὴ ἐγκάλει. ("Are we, then, at a loss to know how it comes about that we are the subject of fear and agony? Why, what else can possibly happen, when we regard impending events as things of evil? We cannot help but be in fear, we cannot help but be in agony? And then we say, 'Lord God, how may I escape agony?' Fool, have you not hands? Did not God make them for you? Sit down now and pray that the mucus in your nose may not run out! No, rather wipe your nose and do not blame God!" [translation adapted from LCL 131.317]); Diogenes Laertius 7.112–13: Ὁ δὲ φόβος ἐστὶ προσδοκία κακοῦ. εἰς δὲ τὸν φόβον ἀνάγεται καὶ ταῦτα· δεῖμα, ὄκνος, αἰσχύνη, ἐκπληξίς, θόρυβος, ἀγωνία ... ἀγωνία δὲ φόβος ἀδήλου πράγματος. ("Fear is an expectation of evil. Under fear are the following emotions: terror, nervous shrinking, shame, consternation, panic, agony ... agony is fear felt when something is still in suspense"). Clivaz does not treat these passages although they are very pertinent when considering the wider context of ἀγωνία.

¹⁰⁴ *Cels.* 2.25 (SC 132.354): οἶδα δὲ τίνα καὶ τοιαύτην εἰς τὸν τόπον διήγησιν, ὅτι ὁρῶν ὁ σωτὴρ οἶα ὁ λαὸς καὶ Ἱερουσαλήμ πείσεται ἐπὶ τῇ ἐκδικήσει τῶν κατ' αὐτοῦ τετολμημένων ὑπὸ Ἰουδαίων, οὐ δι' ἄλλο τι ἢ διὰ τὸ πρὸς ἐκείνους φιλόανθρωπον θέλων μὴ παθεῖν τὸν λαὸν ἃ ἔμελλε πάσχειν φησὶ τὸ «Πάτερ, εἰ δυνατόν ἐστὶ, παρελθέτω ἀπ' ἐμοῦ τὸ ποτήριον τοῦτο»· ὡς εἰ ἔλεγεν· ἐπεὶ ἐκ τοῦ με πιεῖν τουτὶ τὸ τῆς κολάσεως ποτήριον ὅλον ἔθνος ὑπὸ σοῦ ἐγκαταλειφθήσεται. ("I am aware that there is also an explanation of the passage to this effect: the Savior saw what disasters would befall the people and Jerusalem to avenge the acts which the Jews had dared to commit against him, and it was simply because of his love to them, and because he did not want the people to suffer what they were to suffer, that he said: 'Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me.' It is as if he had said: Since as a consequence of my drinking this cup of punishment a whole nation will be deserted by thee."). English translation taken from H. Chadwick (trans.), *Origen: Contra Celsum* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980), 90. Elsewhere Origen will repeat this explanation (*Comm. ser. Matt.* 92). Later Jerome will give a similar explanation in *Comm. Matt.* 4.26.29.

of ordinary martyrs.¹⁰⁵ Others, like Ambrose, Jerome and Augustine, matter-of-factly asserted that while Jesus was depicted as being fearful and in need of strength this was not really the case. Ambrose objects that “it was not out of infirmity” that Jesus prayed to God,¹⁰⁶ and Jerome denies the possibility that Jesus was fearful of death and will actually mock those who thought otherwise.¹⁰⁷

One interpretation that seems to have become increasingly popular was the explanation that Jesus was only feigning sorrow and suffering in Gethsemane and was thereby laying a crafty ruse to ensnare Satan with his divinity.¹⁰⁸ Proponents of this view held that Jesus was merely baiting Satan in Gethsemane by exposing his human attributes and that after Satan took the bait, so to speak, Christ would reveal his divinity through his atonement and resurrection, thereby conquering sin and death and ultimately triumphing over Satan. Thus, Satan’s taking of the bait was the crucial catalyst that put the whole process in motion and so he unwittingly initiated his own destruction. Though incipient forms of this interpretation can

¹⁰⁵ *Mart.* 29 (GCS 1.25): Ἀλλὰ εἰκός τινα διὰ τό· “πάτερ, εἰ δυνατόν ἐστι, παρελθέτω ἀπ’ ἐμοῦ τὸ ποτήριον τοῦτο” μὴ ἀκριβώσαντα τὸ βούλημα τῆς γραφῆς νομίζειν ὅτι οἰοῖται καὶ ὁ σωτὴρ ἐδειλίασε παρὰ τὸν τοῦ πάθους καιρόν· ἐκείνου δὲ δειλιάσαντος, εἶποι τις ἄν, ὅτι τίς γενναῖος εἰς αἰεὶ; ... ὅρα τοίνυν εἰ δύνασαι, παντὸς μαρτυρίου τοῦ καθ’ ὅποιαν οὖν πρόφασιν ἐξόδου ἀποτελουμένου ποτηρίου καλουμένου, φάσκειν ὅτι οὐ τὸ γένος τοῦ μαρτυρίου παρηγεῖτο ὁ λέγων· “παρελθέτω ἀπ’ ἐμοῦ τὸ ποτήριον τοῦτο” (ἔφασκε γὰρ ἄν· “παρελθέτω ἀπ’ ἐμοῦ τὸ ποτήριον”) ἀλλὰ τάχα τὸ εἶδος τόδε· καὶ πρόσχες εἰ δυνατόν ἐνορῶντα τὸν σωτήρα τοῖς εἰδέσιν, ἴν’ οὕτως ὀνομάσῃ, τῶν ποτηρίων καὶ τοῖς δι’ ἕκαστον γενομένοις ἄν, καὶ καταλαμβάνοντα μετὰ τινος βαθυτάτης σοφίας τὰς διαφορὰς τόδε τὸ εἶδος τῆς ἐξόδου παραιτεῖσθαι τοῦ μαρτυρίου ἄλλο δὲ τάχα βαρύτερον αἰτεῖν λεληθότως, ἵνα καθολικώτερον τι καὶ ἐπὶ πλείους φθάνον εὐεργέτημα ἀνυσθῆ δι’ ἑτέρου ποτηρίου. (“But perhaps because of the words: ‘Father, if it be possible, let this chalice pass from me,’ someone who does not understand the meaning of scripture thoroughly, may think that the Savior was in a way even afraid at the time of his passion. And if Jesus was afraid, a man may argue, how can a man remain steadfast forever? ... He did not ask for exemption from martyrdom as such when he said, ‘Let this chalice pass from me’—otherwise he would have said: ‘Let the chalice pass from me’; but that he probably meant this kind of chalice. One should remember the possibility that the Savior considered the different kinds, so to speak, of chalice and what is achieved through each of them; understood in His most profound wisdom their differences; asked to be excused from martyrdom with this particular issue; asked in silence, on the other hand, for a form of martyrdom much more severe, so that through this other chalice might be wrought a benefit more universal, one reaching to a greater number of men.”). Translation adapted from John J. O’Meara (trans.), *Origen. Prayer, Exhortation to Martyrdom* (ACW 19; London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1954), 169–70.

¹⁰⁶ *Exp. Luc.* 5.42 (CCSL 14.150): noli insidiaribus aperire aures, ut putes filium quasi infirmum rogare, rogare ut inpetret quod implere non possit (“Do not open your ears to those who lie in wait [i.e. Arians] so that you suppose the son [i.e. Jesus] prayed as though he was weak, as though he had to ask in order that he could accomplish that which he was not able to accomplish himself”).

¹⁰⁷ *Comm. Matt.* on Matt 26:39 (CCSL 77.244). Jerome argues that Jesus really showed no genuine emotion in Gethsemane and will draw a subtle distinction between being truly “sorrowful” and (Matt 26:38) “began to be sorrowful and troubled.” *Comm. Matt.* on 26:37 (CCSL 77.253). Augustine follows Jerome and flatly denies that Jesus felt any pain or sadness in Gethsemane and that with the reference to “take this cup from me” (transeat a me calix iste) Jesus was not pleading for himself but for the mystical “body of Christ’s church” (corpus Christi ecclesia) (*Enarrat. Ps.* 2 in Ps. 21:3 [CCSL 38.123]).

¹⁰⁸ For a concise overview of this interpretation see N.P. Constanas, “The Last Temptation of Satan: Divine Deception in Greek Patristic Interpretations of the Passion Narrative,” *HTR* 97.2 (2004): 139–63.

begin to be detected in the late second century,¹⁰⁹ and in the third century Origen will begin to articulate a slightly more refined version,¹¹⁰ it is not until the fourth century that the interpretation took a definite form. Gregory of Nyssa employs this explanation and details how Satan was ensnared with the “fishhook of the deity.”¹¹¹ Athanasius (or more likely Ps.-Athanasius) will similarly employ the imagery of the fishhook to explain Jesus’s actions in Gethsemane,¹¹² while Ps.-Chrysostom will use the imagery of a net.¹¹³ Later, the most common image used to describe Jesus’ deceptive entrapment of Satan will be the mousetrap, which Augustine used with much effect in some of his sermons on the passion.¹¹⁴ As this interpretation gained traction the whole Gethsemane scene was reconfigured to highlight the foolishness and weakness of Satan.¹¹⁵ Though such a blatant act of “divine deception” may appear distasteful, some who

¹⁰⁹ Justin, *Dial.* 72.1–3; Irenaeus, *Haer.* 4.33.

¹¹⁰ *Comm. Rom.* 5.10 (PG 26.257).

¹¹¹ *Cat. Disc.* 24 (SC 453.254): τὸ ἄγκιστρον τῆς θεότητος. Cf. *tres dii* (=E. Gebhardt, *Gregorii Nysseni opera*, vol. 9.1 [Leiden: Brill, 1967], 280–81). For a lucid treatment of Gregory’s use of the fishhook metaphor see: Constan, “The Last Temptation of Satan,” 143–49.

¹¹² *Homilia de passion et cruce domini* (PG 28.240): σὺ καὶ τὸν δράκοντα, τὸν ὄφιν, τὸν διάβολον, ἐν ἀνθρωπίνῳ ἄγκιστρῷ περιήγαγες ἐν τῷ τροπαίῳ τοῦ σταυροῦ. . . . σοῦ γὰρ πρώτου παίξαντος εἰς αὐτὸν, . . . πεπονημένου εἰς τὸ καταπαίζεσθαι. (“On the fishhook of your humanity, fastened to the trophy of the cross you led the dragon, the serpent, the devil . . . and you toyed with him from the very beginning . . . having created him for the purpose of mockery”). That this sermon may not belong to Athanasius see CPG 2.2247; H.R. Drobner, “Eine Pseudo-Athanasianische Osterpredigt über die Wahrheit Gottes und ihre Erfüllung,” in L. Wickham et al. (eds.), *Christian Faith and Greek Philosophy in Late Antiquity: Essays in Tribute to George Christopher Stead* (Leiden: Brill, 1993), 43–44, surveys scholarship on the homily and argues that it was likely written sometime before 350 CE. See also Constan, “The Last Temptation of Satan,” 150–54.

¹¹³ *De sancta trinitate* (PG 48.1092): διὰ τί οὖν λέγει, Πάτερ, εἰ δυνατόν, παρελθέτω ἀπ’ ἐμοῦ τὸ ποτήριον τοῦτο; Ἠγνόει ὁ διάβολος τίς ἦν· βλέπων γὰρ αὐτὸν διψῶντα, πεινῶντα, κοπιῶντα, καὶ τὰς ἄλλας αὐτοῦ οἰκονομίας, ἐνόμισεν αὐτὸν ἄνθρωπον εἶναι ψιλόν, ὁρῶν δὲ αὐτοῦ τὰ θεϊκὰ θαύματα, Θεὸν ὑπενόει· ἀμφέβαλεν οὖν περὶ αὐτοῦ, ἀγνοῶν αὐτόν. Εἰ γὰρ ᾔδει ἀκριβῶς, ὅτι Θεὸς ἦν, οὐκ ἂν ἐτόλμησεν αὐτῷ προσελθεῖν. . . . ὡς καὶ Παῦλος λέγει· Εἰ γὰρ ἔγνωσαν, οὐκ ἂν τὸν Κύριον τῆς δόξης ἐσταύρωσαν. Προβάλλεται οὖν ὁ Δεσπότης δειλίαν, ἐκείνον ἐπισπῶμενος, ἵνα ἐπελθὼν ὡς ἀνθρώπῳ, τροπωθῆ παρ’ αὐτοῦ, καὶ λυτρωθῶσι πάντες οἱ αἰχμάλωτοι, ὅσοι κατεῖχοντο ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ. (“And so why does he say, ‘Father, if possible, let this cup pass from me?’ Why was the devil ignorant, for seeing him being thirsty, hungry, weary, and the other things of his stewardship, he supposed him to be a mere man, seeing his divine wonders, he was thinking he was God. And so he cast a net around him, not comprehending him. For if he had known accurately, that he was God, he would not have dared to approach him. As Paul says, ‘for had they known it, they would not have crucified the Lord of glory.’ And so the master puts forward cowardice, alluring that one, so that appearing as a man, he should be put to flight by him, and all the captives should be set free, as many as are bound by him”).

¹¹⁴ *Serm.* 130.2 (PL 38.726): Sed venit redemptor, et victus est deceptor. Et quid fecit redemptor noster captivatori nostro? Ad pretium nostrum tetendit muscipulam crucem suam: posuit ibi quasi escam sanguinem suum. (“But along came the redeemer, and conquered the deceiver. And what did our redeemer do to our captor? To pay our price, he set the mousetrap of his cross; as the bait he placed there his own blood.” For an overview of the use of the “baited mousetrap” motif from Augustine to Thomas Aquinas and Thomas Cajetan see D.J. Saunders, “The Devil and the Divinity of Christ,” *TS* 9 (1948): 536–53.

¹¹⁵ In the *Gospel of Nicodemus (Acts of Pilate)*, a fifth or sixth-century composition (see B.D. Ehrman and Z. Pleše [eds.], *The Apocryphal Gospels: Texts and Translations* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011], 465–66; J.K. Elliot [ed.], *The Apocryphal New Testament: A Collection of Apocryphal Christian Literature in an English Translation* [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999], 164–66), Satan is

employed this explanation felt that it was justified on the basis that Satan was merely getting a dose of his own medicine since he had deceived Eve in the Garden of Eden.¹¹⁶

Turning specifically to Luke 22:43–44, similar apologetic explanations and strategies were marshaled in an attempt to explain and clarify the true meaning of these verses so that they might become more palatable. From patristic commentary perhaps the most troubling aspect of these two verses was verse 43, since many were at a loss to explain how it was that Christ, who scriptures says was superior to the angels and was “worshiped” by them, could possibly benefit from the strengthening of an angel.¹¹⁷ Hilary of Poitiers, who is not altogether sure of the authenticity of this passage, nevertheless assures his readers “let not the heretics flatter themselves that herein lies a confirmation of his weakness, that he needed the help of an angel.”¹¹⁸ Similarly, a scholium attributed to John Chrysostom gives an interesting explanation for the appearance of the angel. Like Hilary, it states that an angel could not in fact strengthen Jesus and that Jesus surely did not need the aid of the angel. Instead, it argues that the angel came to fulfill a prophecy uttered by Moses (Odes 2:43) and merely pronounced a doxology upon Jesus.¹¹⁹ Epiphanius took an almost identical approach. After lamenting that so few Christians actually understood the meaning of the passage [i.e. Luke 22:43] and deemed it basically “inexplicable” (ἀνεμῆνευτος), he asserts, like the author of the scholium, that the angel did not come to strengthen Jesus, as this would have been impossible, but rather in fulfillment of prophecy to pronounce a doxology upon Jesus.¹²⁰

actually mocked by Hades for being duped by Christ. *Gos. Nic.* 20.1–2 (CC Series Apocryphorum Instrumenta 3.303–4): Ἐγὼ γὰρ οἶδα ὅτι ἄνθρωπός ἐστι καὶ ἤκουσα αὐτοῦ λέγοντος ὅτι «περίλυπος ἐστὶν ἡ ψυχὴ μου ἕως θανάτου». Ἐποίησέ μοι καὶ πολλὰ κακὰ ἐν τῷ ἄνωθεν κόσμῳ τοῖς βροτοῖς συναναστρεφόμενος. ... εἰ δὲ λέγεις ὅτι ἤκουες αὐτοῦ φοβουμένου τὸν θάνατον, παίζων σε καὶ γελῶν ἔφη τοῦτο, θέλων ἵνα σε ἀρπάσῃ ἐν χειρὶ κραταιᾷ. Καὶ οὐαὶ οὐαὶ σοὶ εἰς τὸν ἅπαντα αἰῶνα. (“I [devil] know that he [Jesus] is a man and I heard him saying, ‘my soul is deeply grieved unto death.’ He [Jesus] caused me much trouble in the upper world going about with mortals ...” [Hades] “But if you [Devil] say that you heard how he feared death, he said this to mock and laugh at you, desiring to seize you with a mighty hand. And woe, woe, to you for all eternity.”).

¹¹⁶ Ps.-Athanasius, *Quaestiones aliae* 20 (PG 28.793c–d). On this passage see Constatas, “The Last Temptation of Satan,” 155–56.

¹¹⁷ Heb 1:6; cf. Phil 2:10; Col 1:16–17; 2:10, 15; Eph 1:20–22; Heb 1:5–13; 2:1–9; 1 Pet 3:22.

¹¹⁸ *Trin.* 10.41.1 (PL 10.375): certe si quid sibi ex hoc haeresis blanditur, ut infirmum affirmet, cui opus fuerit angeli. Here Hilary has in mind the Arians who were citing the passage to their theological advantage.

¹¹⁹ Catenae (Novum Testamentum), *Catena in Lucam* (typus B) (e codd. Paris. Coislin. 23 + Oxon. Bodl. Misc. 182). p. 159: οὐχ ὅτι τῆς ἰσχύος τοῦ Ἀγγέλου ἐπεδέετο, ὁ ὑπὸ πάσης ὑπουρανίου δυνάμεως φόβῳ καὶ τρόμῳ προσκυνούμενος καὶ δοξαζόμενος, ἀλλ’ ἵνα πληρωθῇ τὸ ἐν τῇ μεγάλῃ ψῆδῃ ὑπὸ τοῦ Μωϋσέως εἰρημένον, “καὶ ἐνισχυσάτωσαν αὐτὸν πάντες υἱοὶ Θεοῦ,” τουτέστι διὰ τὴν ὑπερβολὴν τῆς θαυμασιότητος δοξολογῶν αὐτὸν ὁ Ἄγγελος ἔλεγε πρὸς Κύριον. Σὴ ἐστὶν ἡ ἰσχύς, δέσποτα, σὺ γὰρ ἴσχυσας κατὰ θανάτου καὶ κατὰ τοῦ ἄδου καὶ κατὰ τοῦ διαβόλου, ἐλευθέρωσας τὸ γένος τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐξ αὐτῶν. (“He [Jesus] who is worshipped and glorified by all celestial powers with fear and trembling did not need the strengthening of an angel, but so that it should be fulfilled that which was spoken in the great song by Moses, and ‘all the sons of God strengthened him.’ This same angel praising him on account of the superiority of his most marvelous nature said to the Lord, ‘it is your power, master, you have prevailed against death and against Hades and against the devil, you have set free the race of men from them’”).

¹²⁰ *Ancor.* 37.1–7. Epiphanius is most concerned with an apologetic explanation of how ἐνισχύω (Luke 22:43) should be interpreted. In regards to the ἀγωνία (Luke 22:44) he merely states: ἐν τῷ γὰρ εἰπεῖν «γέγονεν ἐν ἀγωνίᾳ» τὸν κυριακὸν ἄνθρωπον ἀληθινὸν ἄνθρωπον ὄντα δείκνυσι. καὶ

Notwithstanding the various, and at times ingenious, explanations put forward to explain and defend Jesus's actions in Gethsemane, it may be wondered how persuasive they were and whether they adequately countered criticisms to the contrary. Given that no single explanation seems to have gained widespread acceptance it may be wondered whether some sought to blunt the force of such criticisms in another way. As recent scholarship has shown, one subtle way in which Christians sought to defend the integrity of Jesus, as well as the integrity of their texts, was to edit their texts in such a way as to smooth out difficulties or even remove them altogether.¹²¹ Such textual “improvements,” as they may be termed, can be detected at various junctures in the New Testament and at times can be shown to have arisen as a response to external criticism. For example, it is known from a passing remark in Jerome's *Commentary on Matthew* that Porphyry specifically criticized Mark 1:2–3, a quote containing Malachi 3:1 and Isaiah 40:3, because Mark 1:2 conflates the attribution and only credits the quote to “Isaiah” and fails to properly acknowledge Malachi.¹²² But in certain manuscripts of Mark 1:2 “in Isaiah” (ἐν τῷ Ἰσαΐᾳ) is changed to “in the prophets” (ἐν τοῖς προφήταις) thus deflecting the criticism and smoothing out any apparent problem.¹²³ While we cannot be sure that this was done as a direct result of Porphyry's criticism it certainly shows that some Christians were not averse to deliberately “improving” a passage of scripture that was perceived as being potentially problematic and susceptible to criticism.¹²⁴ To give another example, Celsus mocked Jesus because he was a lowly carpenter and finds some irony in the fact that as such he was nailed to a cross.¹²⁵ The only place in the Gospels

ἵνα δείξῃ ὅτι ἀληθινὸς ἦν ἄνθρωπος καὶ οὐκ ἀπὸ τῆς θεότητος ἡ ἀγωνία γέγονε, φησὶν «ἰδρῶσε καὶ ἐγένετο αὐτῷ ὁ ἰδρῶς ὡς θρόμβοι αἵματος». (“For the saying, ‘having come to be in agony’ shows that the Lord's man was a true man. And in order that he might show that he was a true man and that the agony did not come to be from the divinity, it states, ‘he sweated, and his sweat became for him as drops of blood’”).

Didymus, *De trinitate* (PG 39.913): τί οὖν βούλεται τό, «Ἐφθῆ ἄγγελος Κυρίου ἐνισχύων αὐτόν;» ἀντὶ τοῦ, δοξάζων αὐτόν. Τοῦτο γὰρ συνέταξεν καὶ Μωϋσῆς, ἄσας ὦδῆν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ τοιάνδε· «Προσκυνήσουσιν αὐτῷ πάντες ἄγγελοι Θεοῦ· καὶ ἐνισχυσάτωσαν αὐτῷ πάντες υἱοὶ Θεοῦ.» τοῦτ' ἔστιν, ἀνυμνήσουσιν. Ἐπαληθεύει δὲ ταῦτα καὶ ἄλλη γραφή, εἰσάγουσα ἀγγέλους λέγοντας· «Σὴ ἔστιν ἡ δόξα, σὸν ἔστι τὸ κράτος, σὴ ἔστιν ἡ δύναμις, σὴ ἔστιν ἡ ἰσχὺς.» (“And so what does the following passage intend, ‘an angel of the Lord appeared strengthening him?’ Instead he was glorifying him. For Moses also promised this: ‘all the angels of God will worship him, and all the sons of God strengthened him.’ This is it, they shall sing in praise. Another scripture also verifies these things, introducing the angels saying: ‘Yours is the glory, the majesty, the power, the strength’”).

¹²¹ W.C. Kannaday, *Apologetic Discourse and the Scribal Tradition: Evidence of the Influence of Apologetic Interests on the Text of the Canonical Gospels* (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 101–39.

¹²² Jerome, *Comm. Matt.* on 3:3 (= Porphyry Frag. 9 [CCSL 77.16–17]): Porphyrius istum locum Marci euangelistae principio comparat, ... cum enim testimonium de Malachia Esaiaque contextum sit, quaerit quomodo velut ab uno Esaias exemplum putemus adsumptum. (“Porphyry compares that passage to the beginning of the evangelist Mark, ... For since the testimony is woven together from Malachi and Isaiah, he asks how we can think that the citation has been taken from Isaiah alone.” Ambrosiaster also preserves a virtually identical statement concerning this problem in Mark (CCSL 78.432.33–36). All early witnesses of this verse read “Isaiah” instead of “prophets”: ⳨, B, D, L, as well as Irenaeus (*Haer.* 3.11.8) and Origen (*Cels.* 2.4).

¹²³ A, W, f³, M.

¹²⁴ Whatever the exact reason for the change from “Isaiah” to “the prophets,” there is broad consensus in scholarship that it was done to improve the passage so that the reading was more accurate. See Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 62.

¹²⁵ *Cels.* 6.34 (SC 147.262): πανταχοῦ δὲ ἐκεῖ τὸ τῆς ζωῆς ξύλον καὶ ἀνάστασιν σαρκὸς ἀπὸ ξύλου, διότι οἶμαι ὁ διδάσκαλος αὐτῶν σταυρῷ ἐνηλώθη καὶ ἦν τέκτων τὴν τέχνην. (“And everywhere

where Jesus is explicitly called a “carpenter” is in Mark 6:3. However, there is evidence for deliberate scriptural alteration of this passage already by the early third century so that Jesus is no longer the lowly carpenter but is instead identified in this verse as “the son of a carpenter” (ὁ τοῦ τέκτονος υἱός).¹²⁶ Though other examples could be given, these suffice to show that apologetic textual emendations were a real possibility.¹²⁷ Consequently, since Luke 22:43–44 was perceived to be a genuinely problematic passage that was sometimes singled out by anti-Christians it is certainly plausible that someone in the interest of an apologetic agenda could have omitted this material in order to “improve” the text. If such is the case, this is certainly not the first time someone omitted a problematic passage to improve a scriptural narrative; Josephus promises at the outset of his *Jewish Antiquities* to retell the Jewish scriptures to his Greco-Roman audience with precision and exactitude but deliberately excises the whole episode of the Golden Calf (Exodus 32) since it was embarrassing and subject to external criticism.¹²⁸

they speak in their writings of the tree of life, I imagine because their master who was nailed to a cross was a carpenter”).

¹²⁶ P⁴⁵, P^{33vid}, f³, 565, 579, 700, 2542, it, vg^{mss} and bo^{mss}. Though some scholars have argued that this change probably reflects scribal assimilation with Matt 13:55 (M.-J. Lagrange, *Évangile selon Saint Marc* [Paris: Gabalda, 1920], 148–49; V. Taylor, *The Gospel According to St. Mark* [2nd ed.; London: Macmillan; New York: St. Martin’s, 1966] 148–49; J. Gnilka, *Das Evangelium nach Markus* [EKKK 2/2; Zurich: Neukirchener Verlag, 1979], 231–32), others have pointed out that assimilation alone could not account for the alteration but that it demonstrates apologetic influences (K. Haines-Eitzen, *Guardians of Letters: Literacy, Power, and the Transmitters of Early Christian Literature* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000], 117–18; Kannaday, *Apologetic Discourse and the Scribal Tradition*, 118–19). What is especially interesting here is Origen’s response to Celsus on this point; he merely replies that in the “gospels accepted in the churches” (τῶν ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις φερομένων εὐαγγελίων) Jesus is nowhere identified as a carpenter. Given the use of the phrase “gospels accepted in the churches” one cannot help but think that Origen’s reply is a little evasive and that he is aware of this reading, which he seemingly finds embarrassing, and is able to deny it on certain technicalities.

¹²⁷ Elsewhere Celsus criticizes Jesus because he called “sinners” to come and follow him (*Cels.* 3.59 [SC 136.138]): ὅστις, φασίν, ἀμαρτωλός, ὅστις ἀσύνετος, ὅστις νήπιος, καὶ ὡς ἀπλῶς εἰπεῖν ὅστις κακοδαίμων, τοῦτον ἢ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ δέξεται. Τὸν ἀμαρτωλὸν ἄρα οὐ τοῦτον λέγετε, τὸν ἄδικον καὶ κλέπτην καὶ τοιχωρῦχον καὶ φαρμακέα καὶ ἱερόσυλον καὶ τυμβωρῦχον; Τίνας ἂν ἄλλους προκηρύττων ληστής ἐκάλεσε; (“Whosoever is a sinner, they say, whosoever is unwise, whosoever is a child, and, in a word, whosoever is a wretch, the kingdom of God will receive him. Do you not say that a sinner is he who is dishonest, a thief, a burglar, a poisoner, a sacrilegious fellow, and a grave-robber? What others would a robber invite and call?”). English translation adapted from Chadwick, *Origen: Contra Celsum*, 168. Celsus seems to be alluding to Matt 9:13 (cf. Mark 2:17) where it reads: οὐ γὰρ ἦλθον καλέσαι δικαίους ἀλλὰ ἀμαρτωλούς (“For I have not come to call the righteous, but sinners”). However, in certain manuscripts of Matt 9:13 εἰς μετάνοιαν has been added (C, L, Θ, 0281, f³, M) to clarify that Jesus is not simply calling “sinners” but that he is calling “sinners to repentance.” That this textual addition was added in direct response to Celsus is extremely doubtful; nevertheless, it is difficult not to see it as some kind of apologetic addition that helps to clarify the text and perhaps deflects the kind of criticism that Celsus was making. See Kannaday, *Apologetic Discourse and the Scribal Tradition*, 113–14.

¹²⁸ *Ant.* 3.98–99. This deletion is all the more significant since Josephus promised his readers at the start of his work that he would neither add nor omit anything to the scriptures (*Ant.* 1.17 [LCL 242.8]): τὰ μὲν οὖν ἀκριβῆ τῶν ἐν ταῖς ἀναγραφαῖς προῖων ὁ λόγος κατὰ τὴν οἰκείαν τάξιν σημανεῖ· τοῦτο γὰρ διὰ ταύτης ποιήσειν τῆς πραγματείας ἐπηγγελιάμην οὐδὲν προσθεῖς οὐδ’ αὖ παραλιπῶν. (“As I proceed, therefore, I shall accurately describe what is contained in our records, in the order of time that belongs to them; for I have already promised so to do throughout this undertaking, and this without adding anything to what is therein contained, or taking away

While this analysis has only been able to offer circumstantial evidence to contextualize the conditions in which some Christian(s) living in the latter half of the second century or third century would have been inclined to deliberately omit this passage, there may be more concrete evidence for its excision during this period. Returning to Celsus, almost immediately after he criticizes the depiction of Jesus in Gethsemane he alleges that some Christians, in the interest of defending the integrity of their scriptures, had deliberately changed their texts for apologetic purposes:

Some believers [Christians], as though from a drinking bout, go so far as to oppose themselves and alter the original text of the gospel three or four or several times over, and they change its character to enable them to deny difficulties in the face of criticism.¹²⁹

On a number of fronts this allegation is important and, given what has been discussed thus far, there is no reason to doubt Celsus' claim.¹³⁰ However, what is most significant about this passage for the present purposes is its position within Celsus' treatise, and the fact that it essentially follows his criticism of Gethsemane. As a number of commentators have pointed out, if we remove Origen's responses to Celsus, we get the genuine contours of a treatise—i.e. Origen has basically reproduced Celsus' treatise sequentially and broken it up with his various rebuttals and responses.¹³¹ The implication therefore is that when Celsus accuses the Christians of altering their gospels it is in the context of the Gethsemane narrative.¹³² While Celsus never points out what alterations were being made he does say that they were such that they enabled Christians "to deny difficulties in the face of criticism" (ἵν' ἔχοιεν πρὸς τοὺς ἐλέγχους ἀρνεῖσθαι). What possible alterations could this refer to? While there are variants in the Gethsemane narrative in Matthew¹³³ and Mark,¹³⁴ they are rather innocuous and none of the known variants are patently apologetic.¹³⁵ Therefore, while we cannot be certain that Celsus specifically had the omission of Luke 22:43–44 in mind, the seeming connection Celsus makes between the Gethsemane narrative and the charge of scriptural alteration makes this a tantalizing possibility.

anything therefrom"). English translation taken from LCL 242.9. Though Philo did not omit the episode of the golden calf from his retelling of the biblical narrative he will refashion the narrative so that blame was upon the Israelites who were "men of unstable nature" (τινὲς δὲ τῶν ἀβεβαίων) and not Aaron the High Priest (*Mos.* 2.269).

¹²⁹ *Cels.* 2.27 (SC 132.356): τίνας τῶν πιστευόντων ὡς ἐκ μέθης ἤκοντας εἰς τὸ ἐφειστάναι αὐτοῖς μεταχαράττειν ἐκ τῆς πρώτης γραφῆς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τριχῆ καὶ τετραχῆ καὶ πολλαχῆ καὶ μεταπλάττειν, ἵν' ἔχοιεν πρὸς τοὺς ἐλέγχους ἀρνεῖσθαι. English translation adapted from Chadwick, *Origen: Contra Celsum*, 90.

¹³⁰ Though Origen will contest Celsus' assertion, claiming that he is only aware that Marcionites and Valentinians have done such things, he notes that if this has gone on it is not a condemnation of Christianity per se "but only of those who have dared lightly to falsify the gospels" (ἀλλὰ τῶν τολμησάντων ῥαδιουργῆσαι τὰ εὐαγγέλια).

¹³¹ In *Cels. Praef.* 6 Origen explains how he has followed the general order of Celsus' treatise after 1.27. See also R.J. Hoffman (trans. and ed.), *Celsus On the True Doctrine: A Discourse Against the Christians* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987), 29–30; Chadwick, *Contra Celsum*, xxiii–iv.

¹³² Cf. *Cels.* 2.24 where the Gethsemane narrative is lampooned by Celsus. Clivaz, "The Angel and the Sweat," 429, has previously raised this possibility.

¹³³ 26:42: L, Θ, ^f, 124, 788, 1424, 69 add ὁ Ἰησοῦς; D, K, U, Γ, Δ*, Θ, Π^c, ^f³, 69, 124, 157, 579, ℣, add τὸ ποτήριον; 26:44: ℞³⁷, A, D, K, Π, ^f, 157, 565, omit ἐκ τρίτου; A, C, D, K, M, U, W, Γ, Δ, Π, ^f¹³, 28, 33, 69, 157, 565, 579, 1424 ℣, omit πάλιν; 26:45: D, U, W, 2, 28, 579, ℣, add αὐτοῦ.

¹³⁴ 14:32: M, N, U, ^f³, 28, 118, 1424, add ἀπελθών; 14:33: ^f, 118, use λυπέω instead of ἐκθαμβέω; 14:35: D, G, Θ, ^f¹³, 2, 700, 1424, add ἐπὶ πρόσωπον; 14:41: D, W, Θ, ^f³, 565, 1071, add τὸ τέλος.

¹³⁵ John effectively has no Gethsemane scene; as soon as Jesus and the apostles arrive at Gethsemane (18:1) Judas appears (18:3).

Additional Considerations

Up to this point this paper has sought to create an apologetic context in which Luke 22:43–44 may have been omitted from select copies of Luke sometime after the middle of the second century and before the close of the third century. While it has focused mainly on the patristic evidence and to a lesser extent on the manuscript evidence, a few additional issues need to be considered since they relate to the present argument and are periodically invoked by those who see this passage as an anti-docetic interpolation. The first has to do with what has been described as “transcriptional probability.” Proponents of the theory that Luke 22:43–44 represents an interpolation have long argued that on transcriptional grounds it is more likely that Luke 22:43–44 was added to a few copies of Luke, as opposed to deleted from a few copies, since the nature and diversity of the manuscript evidence is more easily explained by an addition rather than an omission.¹³⁶ As Metzger asserted:

On grounds of transcriptional probability it is less likely that the verses were deleted in several different areas of the church by those who felt that the account of Jesus being overwhelmed with human weakness was incompatible with his sharing the divine omnipotence of the Father, than that they were added from an early source, oral or written, of extra-canonical traditions concerning the life and passion of Jesus.¹³⁷

The apparent logic behind this assertion is that the diversity of the manuscripts not containing this passage is such that it is more likely that it was not original, since it would be difficult trying to imagine how an omission from a few early manuscripts could seemingly have such a broad influence on the latter manuscript evidence as a whole.¹³⁸ However, one of the unstated and underlying problems with such reasoning is the assumption that Luke 22:43–44 could have only been omitted once. If Luke 22:43–44 was omitted from select copies sometime between the latter half of the second century and the end of the third century, and if this was the only time this ever happened then it could be somewhat difficult to explain how exactly it could have penetrated all the later manuscript evidence. However, it must be remembered that there is clear evidence from Epiphanius that this passage was omitted from select copies of the scriptures, and “orthodox” copies at that, in the fourth century.¹³⁹ Likewise, there is evidence from Anastasius Sinaiticus that an attempt was made to remove this passage in the seventh century by Monophysites in Egypt,¹⁴⁰ and there is also an allegation made by Photius

¹³⁶ Ehrman and Plunkett, “The Angel and the Agony,” 403–7; Comfort, *New Testament Text and Translation Commentary*, 234.

¹³⁷ Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 151.

¹³⁸ To some degree the re-dating of 0171 by Orsini and Clarysse and the early evidence it provides for Luke 22:43–44 problematizes the transcriptional probability theory.

¹³⁹ Given that the excision Epiphanius refers to was a response to Arianism it would be interesting if other anti-Arian alterations could be identified in other mss. Juan Hernández Jr. has shown that the singular readings preserved in Revelation in Codex Sinaiticus demonstrate that the scribe had an anti-Arian bias and that he altered certain verses to prevent Arian readings. In particular Hernández notes that the singular readings preserved in Ⲙ Rev 3:14, 16c, and 5:3 (possibly also 2:13a) show that the scribal alterations are such that they are clearly anti-Arian: “it is possible to propose that the scribe of Sinaiticus was probably one of the first interpreters on record who attempted to prevent an ‘Arian’ reading of the Apocalypse. The only difference between our scribe and subsequent commentators is that our scribe did it *by altering the text*.” See J. Hernández Jr., *Scribal Habits and Theological Influences in the Apocalypse: The Singular Readings of Sinaiticus, Alexandrinus, and Ephraemi* (WUNT 218; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006), 182–83.

¹⁴⁰ *hod.* 22.3 (CCSG 8.297): Οὐκοῦν πίστις ἀπερίεργός ἐστιν ὁ Χριστιανισμός, καὶ δεόν ἐν ἀπλότητι καὶ εὐθύτητι καρδίας δέχεσθαι καὶ ἀκοῦειν πᾶσαν θείαν γραφὴν καὶ μάλιστα τὰς διδασκαλικὰς. Αἱ μὲν γὰρ εὐαγγελικαὶ καὶ ἀποστολικαὶ, οἶδαμεν, ὅτι ἀνόθευτοὶ εἰσι, καθάπερ περὶ τούτου

the bishop of Constantinople in the ninth century that this passage was removed closer to his own day by certain persons.¹⁴¹ When all this evidence is taken together it becomes probable that Luke 22:43–44 was not just excised once but that there were two or more occasions when it was expunged. The ripple effect of these cumulative deletions make it much easier to explain the diversity of the manuscript evidence and makes Metzger’s argument about “transcriptional probability” largely irrelevant.¹⁴²

Finally, a few words must be said about some intrinsic factors relevant to the inclusion/exclusion of Luke 22:43–44. On the whole this is well-trodden territory that cannot be treated here in any comprehensive manner.¹⁴³ However, a couple of points need to be briefly raised and clarified since they are continually invoked against the authenticity of Luke 22:43–44. The first has to do with the alleged “chiastic” structure of Luke 22:40–46 and how this structure apparently precludes vv. 43 and 44. Ehrman has repeatedly asserted that Luke 22:40–46 forms a chiasm where v.42 (Jesus prays) functions as the centerpiece and that vv. 43 and 44 are intrusive to the chiastic structure and therefore ought to be regarded as secondary.¹⁴⁴ But one of the

διαφόρως συνετάξαμεν λέγοντες, ὅτι, διαδοθέντος καὶ γραφέντος τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ἐν τοῖς γράμμασι τῶν ἑβδομήκοντα δύο γλωσσῶν καὶ ἔθνῶν, ἀδύνατόν ἐστι ῥαδιουργίαν ἢ μείωσιν ἢ προσθήκην ὑπομεῖναι αὐτό. Κἂν γὰρ μιᾶς ἢ καὶ δευτέρας γλώττης ἐπεχείρησέ τις νοθεῦσαι τὰ βιβλία, ἠλέγχετο εὐθὺς ὑπὸ τῶν ἄλλων ἑβδομήκοντα γλωσσῶν ἢ ῥαδιουργία αὐτοῦ. Ὅρα γοῦν, ὅτι τινὲς ἐπεχείρησαν παρεπᾶραι τοὺς θρόμβους τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ ἰδρώτος Χριστοῦ ἐκ τοῦ κατὰ Λουκᾶν εὐαγγελίου καὶ οὐκ ἴσχυσαν. Ἐλέγχονται γὰρ τὰ μὴ ἔχοντα τὸ κεφάλαιον ἐκ πολλῶν καὶ διαφόρων εὐαγγελίων ἔχόντων αὐτό· ἐν γὰρ πᾶσι τοῖς ἔθνικοῖς εὐαγγελίοις κείται καὶ ἑλληνικοῖς πλείστοις. (“Surely then the faith of Christianity is simple, and it is necessary to receive it in frankness and straightness of heart and to hear all the divine writing and especially the teachings. For we know that the evangelic and apostolic writings are pure, just as we instructed in a variety of ways concerning it saying that when the written gospel was given in the writings of the seventy-two tongues and nations, it is not possible for fraud or diminution or addition to remain in it. For even if a certain one or two of the tongues attempted to corrupt the books, his fraud was immediately exposed by the seventy other tongues. Observe then that some endeavored to remove ‘the drops of Christ’s sweaty blood’ from the Gospel according to Luke and were not able. They were exposed not having the authority from many and diverse gospels which have it. For it appears in all translations (lit. foreign) of the gospels and in most Greek copies”).

¹⁴¹ *Ep.* 138: ἀλλ’ ἐν τῇ ἀνθρωπίνῃ τὸ πάθος ἐδέξατο, καὶ προσήυξατο καὶ ἠγωνίασεν καὶ τοὺς παχεῖς ἐκείνους καὶ παραπλησίους αἵματος θρόμβους ἰδρώτας ἐξίδρωσεν. μηκέτι οὖν σοι τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τόδε τὸ χωρίον περικεκόφθαι, κἂν τισι τῶν Σύρων ὡς ἔφης δοκῆ, εὐπρεπὲς νόμιζε (“But he [Jesus] received suffering as a human, and prayed and agonized and sweated that thick sweat resembling drops of blood. Therefore, no longer consider it fitting for you to cut out this passage of the Gospel, as, you say, seemed appropriate to some of the Syrians”). Greek text taken from B. Laourdas and L.G. Westerink, *Photii patriarchae Constantinopolitani Epistulae et Amphilochia* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1983), 1.190.

¹⁴² I would also add here that Metzger’s claim (*A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 151) that the manuscript evidence alone “strongly suggests” that Luke 22:43–44 was not original is overstated.

¹⁴³ One of the best recent surveys of the internal factors relevant to the inclusion/exclusion of Luke can be found in Tuckett, “Luke 22, 43–44: The ‘Agony’ in the Garden and Luke’s Gospel,” 133–40; cf. J. Neyrey, *The Passion According to Luke: A Redaction Study of Luke’s Soteriology* (New York: Paulist Press, 1985), 55–57.

¹⁴⁴ Ehrman, *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture*, 223–24; cf. Ehrman and Plunkett, “The Angel and the Agony,” 412–14: A γενόμενος δὲ ἐπὶ τοῦ τόπου εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Προσεύχεσθε μὴ εἰσελεθεῖν εἰς πειρασμόν (22:40); B καὶ αὐτὸς ἀπεσπάσθε ἀπ’αὐτῶν ὡσεὶ λίθου βολήν (22:41a); C καὶ θεὸς τὰ γόνατα (22:41b); D προήυχετο λέγων, Πάτερ, εἰ βούλει παρένγκε τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον; ἀπ’ἐμοῦ, πλὴν μὴ τὸ θέλημα μου ἀλλὰ τὸ σὸν γινέσθω (22:41c–42); C καὶ ἀναστὰς ἀπὸ τῆς προσευχῆς

problems with this “chiasm” is that it is subjective and often tends to appear only in the eye of the beholder.¹⁴⁵ For example, both Ludger Feldkämper and Giuseppe G. Gamba also identified Luke 22:40–46 as a chiasm but have found vv. 43–44 integral and that the chiastic structure of the whole passage actually lends weight to the authenticity of verses 43 and 44.¹⁴⁶ Likewise, Raymond Brown has shown that the chiastic structure espoused by Ehrman is actually little affected by the inclusion of vv. 43 and 44 as even with these verses prayer remains the centerpiece of the passage.¹⁴⁷ Therefore, chiasmus cannot be used as a decisive indicator against the authenticity of vv. 43 and 44 (or for their authenticity for that matter) and on the whole does not constitute a very persuasive text-critical argument.¹⁴⁸

The other intrinsic argument that deserves brief mention, though it cannot be treated in an in-depth way, is the argument that because Luke tends to minimize the emotions of Jesus in his Gospel, and especially in his passion narrative, Luke 22:43–44 is incompatible with Luke’s overarching theology.¹⁴⁹ While there is certainly a tendency to minimize Jesus’ emotions in Luke, it is not as widespread as some commentators have alleged. Though Ehrman has argued that Luke presents a Jesus who “never appears to become disturbed at all” and is basically

(22:45a); B ἐλθῶν πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς (22:45b); A εὗρεν κοιμωμένους αὐτοὺς ἀπὸ τῆς λύπης, καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Τί καθεύδετε; ἀναστάντες προσεύχεσθε ἵνα μὴ εἰσέλθητε εἰς πειρασμόν (22:45c–46).

¹⁴⁵ One need only look at J. Dart, *Decoding Mark* (Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 2003), wherein he argues that the entire Gospel of Mark is best read as one extended chiasm, to see the subjective and contrived nature of certain “chiasms.” See also J. Welch, “Criteria for Identifying and Evaluating the Presence of Chiasmus,” *JBMS* 4.2 (1995): 1–13 who highlights various criteria for determining whether or not one is dealing with a genuine chiasm; cf. J. Welch, “Chiasmus in the New Testament,” in J. Welch (ed.), *Chiasmus in Antiquity* (Provo, UT: Brigham Young University, 1999), 211–49.

¹⁴⁶ L. Feldkämper, *Der Betende Jesus als Heilsmittler nach Lukas* (Veröffentlichung des Missionspriesterseminars 29; St. Augustin bei Bonn: Steyler, 1978), 228–29; A προσεύχεσθε μὴ εἰσελθεῖν εἰς πειρασμόν. (22:40b); A¹ καὶ αὐτὸς ἀπεσπάσθη ἀπ’ αὐτῶν ὡσεὶ λίθου βολῆν καὶ θεῖς τὰ γόνατα προηύχeto (22:41); B λέγων· πάτερ, εἰ βούλει παρένγκε τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον; ἀπ’ ἐμοῦ, πλὴν μὴ τὸ θέλημά μου ἀλλὰ τὸ σὸν γινέσθω. ὦφθη δὲ αὐτῷ ἄγγελος ἀπ’ οὐρανοῦ ἐνισχύων αὐτόν. (22:41–43); C καὶ γενόμενος ἐν ἀγωνίᾳ, ἐκτενέστερον προσηύχeto. (22:44); B καὶ ἐγένετο ὁ ἰδρῶς αὐτοῦ ὡσεὶ θρόμβοι αἵματος καταβαίνοντες ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν. A¹ καὶ ἀναστὰς ἀπὸ τῆς προσευχῆς ἐλθῶν πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς εὗρεν κοιμωμένους αὐτοὺς ἀπὸ τῆς λύπης καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, τί καθεύδετε (22:45–46a); A ἀναστάντες προσεύχεσθε ἵνα μὴ εἰσέλθητε εἰς πειρασμόν (22:46b).

G.G. Gamba, “Agonia di Gesù,” *RevistB* 16 (1968), 161: “la scena della preghiera di Gesù si articola in otto frasi narrative principali (vv. 40–46) studiatamente disposte. Le prime due frasi principali (vv. 40–41) e le ultime due (vv. 45–46) si corrispondono chiasmaticamente per senso: Gesù esorta a pregare per non entrare in tentazione. Le quattro frasi narrative principali poste al centro del quadro (vv. 42–44), anch’esse studiatamente accoppiate a due a due, ma parallelamente disposte quanto a senso, illustrano invece la scena della preghiera di Gesù e cioè della Sua *agonia* propriamente detta.”

¹⁴⁷ Brown, *The Death of the Messiah*, 1.183; D λέγων, Πάτερ, εἰ βούλει παρένγκε τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον; ἀπ’ ἐμοῦ, πλὴν μὴ τὸ θέλημά μου ἀλλὰ τὸ σὸν γινέσθω (22 :42); E ὦφθη δὲ αὐτῷ ἄγγελος ἀπ’ οὐρανοῦ ἐνισχύων αὐτόν. (22:43); D’ καὶ γενόμενος ἐν ἀγωνίᾳ, ἐκτενέστερον προσηύχeto. (22:43); καὶ ἐγένετο ὁ ἰδρῶς αὐτοῦ ὡσεὶ θρόμβοι αἵματος καταβαίνοντες ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν. (22:44). Cf. Tuckett, “Luke 22, 43–44: The ‘Agony’ in the Garden and Luke’s Gospel,” 135–36; Patella, *The Death of Jesus: The Diabolic Force and the Ministering Angel*, 11.

¹⁴⁸ Clivaz’s (*Lange et la sueur de sang*, 256–63) forthright assessment of the text critical use of chiasmus for this passage is welcome.

¹⁴⁹ Ehrman, “Did Jesus Get Angry or Agonize?”; Ehrman, “Text and Interpretation: The Exegetical Significance of the ‘Original’ Text”; Ehrman, *Orthodox Corruption of Scripture*, 223–25. Cf. Sterling, “Mors philosophi: The Death of Jesus in Luke,” 396.

“imperturbable,”¹⁵⁰ at Luke 19:41 Jesus is clearly depicted as “weeping” (κλαίω) over Jerusalem. Likewise, in the Gethsemane narrative itself, whatever one may think about the extent of Luke’s depiction of Jesus’ imperturbability, Jesus still entreats the Father to “remove this cup,” (v. 42) which at least shows some degree of anxiety about his impending fate. Furthermore, it needs to be recognized that there is a degree of circularity in the argument that vv. 43–44 should not be considered authentic because Luke otherwise minimizes the emotions of Jesus. While these counterpoints by no means end the argument, they ought to give some room for pause before rushing to judgment about vv. 43 and 44 on the grounds that they are allegedly “intrusive” because Luke likes to minimize Jesus’ emotions.¹⁵¹

Finally, on a related point, the whole “anti-docetic” argument needs to be seriously reconsidered. As Clivaz has pointed out, the anti-docetic argument could perhaps account for the omission of Luke 22:44 since this verse talks about Jesus’ agony and sweat, but questions whether it could adequately account for verse 43 and the appearance of the angel.¹⁵² What is there about verse 43 that is patently anti-docetic?¹⁵³ Similarly, Brown has questioned exactly how Luke 22:43–44 could have served as a persuasive anti-Docetic proof text against groups like the Valentinian Gnostics who explicitly denied that it was actually the Savior who was present in the Garden of Gethsemane.¹⁵⁴ Additionally, there are other passages in Luke that could have effectively served as anti-Docetic proof texts. In Luke 22:20 Jesus makes reference to the fact that he had “blood,” and after the resurrection he explicitly states that he is not a “ghost” (NRSV) and has a corporeal body and that he can eat real food (Luke 24:39, 41–43).¹⁵⁵ This is not to imply that no scribe could have ever manipulated a scriptural passage to combat Docetism, but in the case of Luke 22:43–44 this interpretation does not adequately account for all the complexities of the passage.¹⁵⁶

¹⁵⁰ Ehrman, “Text and Interpretation: The Exegetical Significance of the ‘Original’ Text,” 32.

¹⁵¹ Tuckett, “Luke 22, 43–44: The ‘Agony’ in the Garden and Luke’s Gospel,” 136–40; J.B. Green, *The Death of Jesus* (WUNT 2/33; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck] 1988), 55.

¹⁵² Clivaz, “The Angel and the Sweat,” 439–40.

¹⁵³ On this point it need not be automatically supposed that vv. 43 and 44 are a conjoined pair and that v. 43 is necessary to introduce v. 44. If both verses apparently represent anti-docetic interpolations then it ought to be clearly articulated by proponents of this theory exactly how v. 43 functions to combat Docetism.

¹⁵⁴ Brown, *The Death of the Messiah*, 1.184 cites Irenaeus, *Haer.* 3.16.1, as the source of this Valentinian belief.

¹⁵⁵ Luke 22:20b: οὗτο τὸ ποτήριον ἢ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἵματί μου τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυννόμενον. This passage is not attested in D although it is attested in Ψ⁷⁵, ⚭, B, D.C. Parker, *The Living Text of the Gospels*, 151–57, questions whether the longer reading, now accepted in NA²⁸, is correct and suggests that perhaps the shorter reading of D is to be preferred; cf. Ehrman, *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture*, 231–45. Luke 24:39: ἴδετε τὰς χεῖράς μου καὶ τοὺς πόδας μου ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμι αὐτός· ψηλαφήσατέ με καὶ ἴδετε, ὅτι πνεῦμα σάρκα καὶ ὀστέα οὐκ ἔχει καθὼς ἐμὲ θεωρεῖτε ἔχοντα.

¹⁵⁶ Furthermore, as Ehrman has had a penchant for spotting other “anti-docetic” interpolations in Luke, which are at times rather dubious, perhaps there may be additional grounds for doubting his argument here. In *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture*, 248–54, he argues that Luke 24:12 represents another anti-docetic interpolation. Notwithstanding the very strong manuscript evidence in support of this verse (Ψ⁷⁵, ⚭, B, W, Δ, 070, 079,) and the fact that it is only absent from certain Western manuscripts (D), Ehrman argues on intrinsic grounds that it is non-Lukan and that it can be explained as an early anti-docetic interpolation; Cf. F. Neirynck, “Luke 24,12: An Anti-Docetic Interpolation?” in A. Denaux (ed.), *New Testament Textual Criticism and Exegesis: Festschrift J. Delobel* (BETL 161; Leuven: Peeters, 2002), 145–58, who argues that there is nothing non-Lukan about the verse and questions Ehrman’s anti-docetic explanation. Additionally,

Conclusion

In closing, Luke 22:43–44 is admittedly one of the thorniest text-critical problems in the entire New Testament. Modern scholarship on this passage spans three centuries and any text-critical assessment of this passage can involve a number of complex variables. The present investigation has focused almost exclusively on external factors in an attempt to establish a plausible context in which this passage could have been removed from select copies of Luke sometime after the middle of the second century and before the end of the third century as a result of anti-Christian attacks and a Christian failure to achieve a convincing consensus interpretation of this passage. While this thesis is admittedly built upon some circumstantial evidence it is no more circumstantial than the argument that this passage represents an interpolation that was added to Luke as part of an anti-docetic polemic. In fact, the present argument for the deliberate omission of the passage has an inherent advantage over the anti-docetic interpolation theory since it more closely conforms to the extant manuscript and patristic evidence. All of the earliest evidence from the middle and latter half of the second century establishes that Luke 22:43–44 was otherwise known (i.e. Justin, Irenaeus, Tatian [?]), as well as the earliest extant fragment of Luke (0171), from the late second or early third century, whereas it is not until some time in the third century, and potentially even the latter part of the third century, when this passage is not attested (P^{69vid}, P⁷⁵). Given the nature of the evidence, it favors the interpretation that the passage was present and was then omitted, thus following the contours of the extant evidence, and not that it must necessarily have been added sometime in the early second century prior to its first attestation by Justin Martyr as Ehrman and others suppose. Furthermore, from Epiphanius there is direct evidence that this passage had a troublesome interpretive history through the fourth century and was indeed excised by “orthodox” Christians at this time. In sum, therefore, there are legitimate grounds for both seriously questioning the whole anti-docetic interpolation theory as well as taking seriously the theory for the early excision of Luke 22:43–44 from select manuscripts.

Ehrman (pp. 255–56) argues that Luke 24:40 is best seen as yet another anti-docetic interpolation. Without going into all his reasoning here, it may be pointed out that as with Luke 24:12, the manuscript evidence is decidedly in favor of its authenticity (include: P⁷⁵, ⋈, A, B, L, W, Δ, Θ, Ψ; omit: D, it, syr).