

Luke 22:43-44 and Judeo-Christian Memories

Claire Clivaz, *SIB, Lausanne (CH) & RSCS, UCLouvain (BE)*

Μέμνημαι δὲ τοῦ ῥητοῦ τοῦ κατὰ Λουκᾶν εὐαγγελίου
Epiphanius, *Ancoratus* 37.1

Résumé

Cet article discute la dernière décennie de débats à propos de la variante de l’ange et de la sueur de sang, dans l’Évangile selon Luc 22, 43-44, au Mont des Oliviers juste avant l’arrestation de Jésus. En se basant notamment sur les trois plus anciens manuscrits de cette variante – 0171, P⁷⁵, et P⁶⁹ –, il défend l’hypothèse d’une omission ancienne, résultant de désaccords parmi les Judéo-chrétiens d’Égypte, dans la première moitié du deuxième siècle de notre ère. La réception de la figure d’un Jésus martyr, fortifié par un ange silencieux dans un combat de prières, aura été la pomme de discorde : ce motif serait devenu embarrassant pour les Judéo-chrétiens dans un contexte politique délicat de la Révolte de la Diaspora (115–117), jusqu’à être retiré du texte. La mémoire d’un Jésus combattant a survécu plus tard dans des cercles minoritaires, comme attesté par plusieurs sources rapportant les paroles de l’ange.

Abstract

This article discusses the last decade of debates about the evidence of the angel and sweat like drops of blood, in the Gospel according to Luke 22:43–44, on the Mount of Olives, shortly before the arrestation of Jesus. Based notably on the three most ancient witnesses, 0171, P⁷⁵, and P⁶⁹, it supports the hypothesis of an early omission resulting from disagreements among Judeo-Christians in Egypt, in the first half of the second century CE. The reception of the figure of a Jesus martyr, strengthened by a silent angel in a fight of prayers, had become a bone of contention: this motive had become embarrassing for Judeo-Christians in the sensitive political context of the Diaspora Revolt (115-117), until it was withdrawn from the text. The memory of the fighting Jesus has then survived in minority circles, as attested in several sources reporting the angel’s words.

1. Introduction

Chapter 22 of the Gospel according to Luke, the third book of the New Testament, presents a textual criticism enigma. In the scene of the prayer on the Mount of Olives, shortly before Jesus is arrested, a passage is absent from several manuscripts, Lk 22:43–44: “Then an angel from heaven appeared to [Jesus] and gave him strength. In his anguish he prayed more earnestly, and his sweat became like great drops of blood falling down on the ground”.¹ Are these two verses an interpolation or an omission? The question has been disputed among Christian theologians since the fourth century, by Epiphanius, Jerome, and Hilary of Poitiers.² A little more than a decade after a monograph on Luke 22:43-44 was published,³ this article discusses

¹ *New Revised Standard Version*, New York, 2021.

² EPIPHANIUS, *Ancoratus* 31,46; JEROME, *Against Pelagians* 2,16-20; HILARY OF POITIERS, *De Trinitate* 10,40-42.

³ C. CLIVAZ, *L’ange et la sueur de sang (Lc 22,43-44), ou comment on pourrait bien encore écrire l’histoire*, Leuven, 2010.

the recent debates about this textual criticism⁴. It confirms the thesis of an early omission based on the three most ancient witnesses, 0171, P⁷⁵, and P⁶⁹. These manuscripts and the analysis of the file allow us to explain the situation in the second century CE in Egypt, relying on Judeo-Christian memories. The omission of Lk 22:43-44 transmitted by P⁷⁵ would attest to the willingness to forget the martyrdom memory of Jesus fighting in an empowering prayer after the disaster of the Diaspora Revolt (115-117).⁵ Several contributions have been devoted to this topic in the last decade, in articles or book chapters.⁶ I will argue that the scholarly discourse about the angel and sweat like drops of blood has started a new phase over the last decade.⁷

⁴ Many thanks are due to Andrea Stevens for English proof-reading and to the reviewers for their pertinent remarks. The writing of this article has been partly supported by the SNSF MARK16 found n° 179755.

⁵ About the Diaspora Revolt, see K. BERTHELOT, *Jews and Their Roman Rivals. Pagan Rome's Challenge to Israel*, p. 150: "The Diaspora Revolt [...] took place mainly in Cyrenaica, Cyprus, and Egypt".

⁶ In chronological order since 2010, see notably: C. CLIVAZ, "Some Remarks on Thomas A. Wayment, 'A New Transcription of P. Oxy. 2383 (P⁶⁹)'", *Novum Testamentum* 52 (2010), p. 83-87; S. VOORWINDE, *Jesus' Emotions in the Gospels*, London, 2011, p. 119-148; I. RAMELLI, "KOIMΩMENOYΣ ΑΠΟ ΤΗΣ ΑΥΠΗΗΣ (Lk 22:45): A Deliberate Change," *ZNW* 102/1 (2011), p. 59-76; D. LAFLEUR, "Which Criteria for Family 13 (P⁴³) Manuscripts?" *Novum Testamentum* 54/2 (2012), p. 105-148; R. GIL, "Gethsémani, prière dans la nuit, prière de la nuit. Une approche neuropsychologique," in N. SIFFER, D. FRICKER (eds), *La Prière dans le Nouveau Testament, Regards croisés, Cahiers de la Revue des Sciences Religieuses* 2 (2012), Strasbourg, p. 81-93; T. A. WAYMENT, "P.Oxy. 2383 (P⁶⁹) One More Time", *Novum Testamentum* 54/3 (2012), p. 288-292; C. CLIVAZ, "Jacob and Jesus in Alexandria as a Test-Case: 'the Most Ancient Angel' and 'the Mystic Angel,'" in S. C. MIMOUNI, B. POUDERON (eds), *La croisée des chemins revisitée. Quand "l'Eglise" et la "Synagogue" se sont-elles distinguées? Actes du colloque de Tours 18-19 juin 2010*, Paris, 2012, p. 213-225; J. T. CARROLL, *Luke: A Commentary*, Louisville, 2012, p. 443-446; C. CLIVAZ, "To 'become' a testimony: Jesus' bloody sweat on the Mount of Olives as a challenge for history (Luke 22:43-44)," in B. ESTRADA, E. MANICARDI, A. PUIG I TÀRRECH (eds), *The Gospels: History and Christology, The Search of Joseph Ratzinger-Benedict XVI, I Vangeli: Storia e Cristologia, La ricerca di Joseph Ratzinger-Benedetto XVI*, vol. 1, Vatican, 2013, p. 249-265; L. H. G. RIBEIRO, W. PAROSCHI, "A agonia no Getsêmani: um estudo crítico", *Kerygma* 9 (2013/1), p. 53-66; S. K. BROWN, *The Testimony of Luke*, Provo, 2013, chapter 22 [n. p., electronical edition]; I. RESNICK, "Luke 22:44 and Sweating Blood: Jesus and Medieval Natural Philosophers", *Viator* 44 (2013/1), p. 169-188; L. BLUMELL, "Luke 22:43-44: An Anti-Docetic Interpolation or an Apologetic Omission?", *TC: A Journal of Biblical Textual Criticism* 19 (2014), p. 1-35; M. POPE, "A Closer Look: Luke 22:43-44 and Questions of Interpretation," *Studies in the Bible and Antiquity* 6 (2014), p. 127-133; K. O. SANDNES, *Early Christian Discourses on Jesus' Prayer at Gethsemane. Courageous, Committed, Cowardly?* Leiden, 2015, p. 148-172; B. J. TABB, "Is the Lucan Jesus a 'Martyr'? A Critical Assessment of a Scholarly Consensus", *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 77 (2015/2), p. 280-301; M. POPE, "The Downward Motion of Jesus' Sweat and the Authenticity of Luke 22:43-44", *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 79/2 (2017), p. 261-281; S. ASIKAINEN, *Jesus and Other Men. Ideal Masculinities in the Synoptic Gospels*, Leiden, 2018, p. 160-166; T. van LOPIK, "Some Notes on the *Pericope Adulterae* in Byzantine Liturgy", in H.A.G. HOUGHTON (ed), *Liturgy and the Living Text of the New Testament*, Leiden, 2018, p. 151-176; J. KNUST, T. WASSERMAN, *To Cast the First Stone. The Transmission of a Gospel Story*, Princeton, 2018, part. p. 300-301; C. CLIVAZ, "Schweiss", *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum* 29 (233) 2019, p. 1268-1274; S. ECKHARD, "Der Kampf um den Glauben. Zum Agon-Motiv im Neuen Testament", in K. H. OSTMEYER and A. WYPLADO (eds), *Das Ziel vor Augen: Sport und Wettkampf im Neuen Testament und seiner Umwelt*, Stuttgart, 2020, p. 49-80; M. POPE, "Emotions, Pre-emotions, and Jesus' Comportment in Luke 22:39-42," *NovT* 62/1 (2020), p. 25-43; G. ADAMSON, "Luke 22:43-44 and the Mormon Jesus", *Journal of Bible and Its Reception* (8.04.2022), p. 1-21; J. READ-HEIMERDINGER, *Luke and Its Own Words* (LNTS 267), T&T Clark, 2022, p. 196 and p. 202-203.

⁷ In the recent references quoted in footnote 6, Blumell, Pope, Tabb, Read-Heimerdinger and I support or tend to support an early omission of the verses. Interestingly, Eckhard et Sandnes consider Luke 22:43-44 as an interpolation but in continuity with the text, whereas for conviction reasons, Gil, Voorwinde, S. K. Brown and Adamson (for J. Smith) consider the passage as historically true even if interpolated. Finally, Ramelli, Carroll, Ribeiro-Paroschi, and Asikainen consider the passage as foreign interpolated body; see for example RIBEIRO, PAROSCHI, "A agonia no Getsêmani," p. 64: "Da mesma maneira, os versículos em questão possivelmente tenham sido um fragmento de alguma tradição, seja esta escrita ou oral, que foi por algum tempo, em algum lugar, anotada à margem de algum Evangelho canônico, e que sem dúvida incluíam em sua narrativa um alto grau de autenticidade e valor intrínseco." Other quoted scholars in footnote 6 do not pronounce themselves about the interpolation/omission option.

The 1983 article of Bart Ehrman and Mark Allan Plunkett has created a strong consensus about the interpolation of Luke 22:43-44.⁸ The 4th edition of the Greek New Testament by the United Bible Societies rated the interpolation of the passage with an “A,” so in the strongest possible way. The 2012 Luke commentary by John T. Carroll distinctively illustrates its influence. Carroll repeats its main arguments in favor of the addition: “It is possible that the depiction of Jesus’ agitation in these verses troubled some early Christians (and copyists), resulting in the removal of the offending section [...]. However, several observations suggest later interpolation: the presence of the vocabulary atypical of Luke [...], the material’s disruption of a coherent literary pattern in the unit, the depiction of an emotional and struggling Jesus that differs from his characterization in the Gospel otherwise, and the plausibility of the section’s interpolation in service of polemic against docetic Christological teaching.”⁹

But, almost forty years after the publication of Ehrman and Plunkett’s article, this list of arguments is progressively being reconsidered. First, two elements are clarified and deserve to be more generally acknowledged: the manuscript evidence for 0171, C with the family *f*³, and P⁶⁹ (2.1), and the literary pattern or the so-called chiasmus argument (2.2).¹⁰ Second, two other elements are still disputed: the meaning of ἀγωνία and the evaluation of Jesus’ emotions in Luke (3.1 and 3.2). This debate will enlighten a recurrent missing point in recent publications about Luke 22:43-44: its Jewish background and the impact of early Judeo-Christian memories on the Lukan Gospel (3.3). Third, early Judeo-Christian memories draw the attention to two neglected elements: the silent prayer of Jesus, and the silent angel in Luke 22:43 (4.1 and 4.2). Several ancient sources attest to the development of the scene with words attributed to the angel,¹¹ and its role has been questioned since the second century testimony of Hippolytus of Rome.¹²

This three-step inquiry concludes by confirming the omission hypothesis, but not originally due to Christian polemics against Greco-Roman attacks, as recently argued¹³. It rather results from disagreements among Judeo-Christians¹⁴ in Egypt in the first half of the second century around the figure of a Jesus martyr strengthened by a silent angel in his fight. This motive had become embarrassing for Judeo-Christians in the sensitive political context of the Diaspora Revolt, until it was withdrawn from the text. The memory of the fighting Jesus survived in minority circles with a symbolic tone, as attested in sources reporting the angel’s words (4.2). The necessity of a Jewish and Judeo-Christian framework to understand the angel and the sweat like drops of blood clearly indicates that Christianity was born as a piece of the Jewish mosaic.¹⁵

⁸ B. D. EHRMAN, M. PLUNKETT, “The Angel and the Agony: The Textual Problem of Luke 22:43-44,” *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 45 (1983/3), p. 401-416; republished in B. D. EHRMAN (ed), *Studies in the Textual Criticism of the New Testament*, Leiden, 2006, p. 178-195. The first edition is quoted in this article.

⁹ CARROLL, *Luke: A Commentary*, p. 444.

¹⁰ BLUMELL, “Luke 22:43-44.”

¹¹ CLIVAZ, *L’ange et la sueur de sang*, p. 501-545.

¹² HIPPOLYTUS OF ROME, *Contra Noetum* 18.2 and *Commentary of Ps 2.7*, frag. 18.

¹³ BLUMELL, “Luke 22:43-44”, p. 135.

¹⁴ Around 100 CE in Egypt, Christians came to be understood mainly as Judeo-Christians, as generally recognized; see J. FREY, “Locating New Testament Writings in Alexandria: On Method and Aporias of Scholarship”, in B. SCHLISSER ET AL. (eds), *Alexandria*, Tübingen, 2021, p. 345-366 (364).

¹⁵ See C. CLIVAZ, B. POUDEIRON, S. C. MIMOUNI (eds.), *Les judaïsmes dans tous leurs états aux Ier-IIIe siècles (Les Judéens des synagogues, les chrétiens et les rabbins)*, Turnhout, 2015.

2. Elements that deserve to be more generally acknowledged

2.1 Manuscript evidence

There is a clear turn in the evaluation of Luke 22:43-44 evidence, specifically for these three items: 0171 (2.1.1), f^{13} with Codex C (2.1.2), and P⁶⁹ (2.1.3). The discussion also includes some reminders about P⁷⁵, Codex \aleph , and Codex A.

2.1.1 The uncial 0171 (around 300, Hermopolis Magna)

The uncial 0171 (=PSI II:124) has unfortunately been confused by Joseph Fitzmyer in his Luke commentary with the twelfth century minuscule 1071,¹⁶ a mistake still made today.¹⁷ Carroll correctly quotes it in a 2012 commentary,¹⁸ based on my remarks, and Blumell clearly underlines 0171 as the turning-point of the manuscript evidence file:

In the most recent paleographical 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. 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!¹⁹

Several factors explain why the 0171, until recently, has not been properly considered. First, it has been published in two steps, and the mention of Luke 22:44 was indicated only as the second step.²⁰ Second, important voices in this debate have simply not mentioned it,²¹ or have referenced it but without mention of the discussion surrounding Luke 22:43-44.²² Third, its reception was strongly influenced by Kurt Aland's classification of it as category "IV", following its "own way"²³ like P⁶⁹. Such a categorization is influenced by scholarship's high view of P⁷⁵, a phenomenon that should be critically analyzed.²⁴ In a 2018 essay, Brent Nongbri has convincingly argued that P. Bodmer XIV-XV could date from the fourth century CE, based

¹⁶ J.A. FITZMYER, *The Gospel according to Luke: Introduction, Translation, and Notes*, vol. 2, New York, p. 1443. See a comment in C. CLIVAZ, "The Angel and the Sweat Like 'Drops of Blood' (Luke 22:43-44): P⁶⁹ and f^{13} ," *Harvard Theological Review* 98 (2005/4), p. 419-440.

¹⁷ See RAMELLI, "KOIMΩMENOYΣ", p. 62, footnote 12; SANDNES, *Early Christian Discourses*, p. 149.

¹⁸ CARROLL, *Luke: A commentary*, p. 444; see CLIVAZ, *L'ange et la sueur*, p. 250-252.

¹⁹ BLUMELL, "Luke 22:43-44", p. 5-6. He refers to P. ORSINI, W. CLARYSSE, "Early New Testament Manuscripts and their Dates: A Critique of Theological Paleography", *ETL* 88/4 (2012), p. 443-474; here p. 466: "In only a few cases we propose an earlier date (P¹⁸, P³⁰, P⁶⁴+P⁶⁷+P⁴, P¹¹⁶, 0171, 0188, 0212, 0308) [than Nestle-Aland]".

²⁰ PAPIRI GRECI E LATINI DELLA SOCIETÀ ITALIANA DELLA RICERCA DEI PAPIRI GRECI E LATINI IN EGITTO (ed), "2. Evangelium Lucae XXII 45 spp", *PSI* I:2, 1912, p. 2-5; PAPIRI GRECI E LATINI DELLA SOCIETÀ ITALIANA DELLA RICERCA DEI PAPIRI GRECI E LATINI IN EGITTO (ed), "Evangelium Lucae XXII 44 sqq.", *PSI* II:124, 1913, p. 22-25. It is quite surprising that the critical apparatus of NA²⁸ mentions 0171 with a *vid* among the witnesses of the absence of Lk 22:43-44, whereas the *New Testament Virtual Manuscript Room* allows one to read clearly the end of Lk 22:44 at the bottom of col. 1, on the second little fragment: <http://ntvmr.uni-muenster.de/community/modules/papyri/?site=INTF&image=20171/undefined/30/10/11>. Moreover, Kurt Aland had included the end of Lk 22:44 in his 1987 reconstruction of 0171, see K. ALAND, "Alter und Entstehung des D-Textes im Neuen Testament. Betrachtungen zu P⁶⁹ und 0171," in S. JANERAS, R. ROCA-PUIG (eds), *Miscellània papirologica*, Barcelona, 1987, p. 37-61 (50).

²¹ J. DUPLACY, "La préhistoire du texte en Luc 22,43-44", in E. J. EPP, G. D. FEE (eds), *New Testament Textual Criticism: Essays in Honour of Bruce M. Metzger*, Oxford, 1981, p. 77-86 (356 and 374); R. BROWN, *La mort du Messie. Encyclopédie de la Passion du Christ, de Gethsémani au tombeau: un commentaire des récits de la Passion dans les quatre évangiles*, J. MIGNON (trans), Paris, 2005, p. 222; S. P. COWE, "Christological Trends and Textual Transmission: The Pericope of Bloody Sweat (Luke 22:43-44) in the Armenian Version," in S. AJAMIAN, M. E. STONE (eds), *Text and Context. Studies in the Armenian New Testament. May 22-28, 1992*, Atlanta, 1994, p. 35-49 (37). If 0171 is mentioned in EHRMAN, PLUNKETT, "The Angel," p. 402, it is absent in B. EHRMAN, *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture. The Effect of Early Christological Controversies on the Text of the New Testament*, New York-Oxford, 1993, p. 188.

²² L. HURTADO, *The Earliest Christian Artifacts. Manuscripts and Christian Origins*, Grand Rapids, Cambridge, 2006, p. 219; D. C. PARKER, *The Living Text of the Gospels*, Cambridge, 1997, p. 159-160 vs p. 157-159.

²³ ALAND, "Alter und Entstehung", p. 52 and 59.

²⁴ CLIVAZ, *L'ange et la sueur*, p. 467-480.

on the comparison with P.Herm. 4 and 5²⁵. Even without sharing this point of view, scholarship cannot continue to ignore that 0171 antedates P⁶⁹ and P⁷⁵, as demonstrated by Clarysse and Orsini, previously by Crisci in 1998, and now adopted in the databases *Trismegistos* and *PSI* online.²⁶ In other words, in early Egypt there was a *plural transmission of the Lukan prayer at Gethsemane*, a fact that explains why Codex \aleph falters nevidence (\aleph^{*2} with Luke 22:43-44; \aleph^1 without), or why Codex A does not have Luke 22:43-44, but gives the indication *prima manu* from the Eusebian canon in the f. 63v margin for Luke 22:43-44, just after Luke 22:42.²⁷

2.1.2. f^{13} and the Codex C

Thanks to Didier Lafleur in 2012,²⁸ the presence of Luke 22:43-44 after Matthew 26:39 in some manuscripts of f^{13} has been clarified. These results must now be considered in scholarship. Sandnes (2016) represents the common opinion on Codex C and f^{13} : “The fact that verses 43-44 in some manuscripts (C^{mg} and minuscule f^{13}) are found within Matthew’s Gethsemane scene rather than Luke’s is indicative that pieces of traditions circulated.”²⁹ This opinion was promoted by Kurt and Barbara Aland: “[Luke 22:43-44] are found after Matt. 26:39 in the minuscule family 13. [...] This kind of fluctuation in the New Testament manuscript tradition is one of the surest pieces of evidence for the secondary character of a text.”³⁰

But such an assertion is subject to the examination of each f^{13} manuscript, as already pointed out by Duplacy,³¹ and is now clarified by Lafleur. He asserts that “most of the [f^{13}] mss., whether they write [Luke 22:43-44] once or twice (min. 346, 828), or only keep it in Luke (min. 230, 1689), were clearly conscious of the transfer: they seem to have followed a double textual tradition where the text in use is superimposed on the ancient text of the Family 13 archetype.”³² He adds that “concerning the eight witnesses which displace the pericope, only min. 69 and 543 have no commentary at all, no sign, obelus or asterisk inside the text or in the margin, neither in Luke (f. 68r), nor in Matthew (f. 10r-v).”³³ He explains in a footnote that he has not been able to verify my indications for 543 because of a bad microfilm,³⁴ but in fact, even 543 shows an awareness of the Lukan origin of these verses. Indeed, a decade after Lafleur’s article, all

²⁵ B. NONGBRI, *God’s Library. The Archeology of the Earliest Christian Manuscripts*, New Haven, London, 2018, p. 202-203.

²⁶ See E. CRISCI, “Nr. 24”, in G. CAVALLO ET AL. (eds), *Scrivere libri e documenti nel modo antico. Mostra di Papiri della Biblioteca medicea Laurenziana 25 agosto – 25 settembre 1998 (Pap.Flor. XXX)*, Firenze: 1998, p. 105-106 and Tav. XX; www.trismegistos.org/text/61828; <http://www.psi-online.it/documents/psi;2;124>. See also L. PINCHARD, “L’uncial 0171, témoin-clef du développement du texte néotestamentaire avant le 3e s.: Un point sur Mt 10,17–32”, *NT* 61 (2019), p. 339-366. Based on this accepted article, the date has been now also updated on the *New Testament Virtual Manuscript Room*, <https://ntvmr.uni-muenster.de/liste?docID=20171>.

²⁷ This point has been noticed by Scrivener in 1894 (F. H. A. SCRIVENER, *A Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament*, vol. 2, London, 1894⁴, p. 353-354), confirmed by Geerlings in his study of the family Π (J. GEERLINGS, *Family P in Luke*, Salt Lake City, 1962, p. 4). See CLIVAZ, *L’ange et la sueur*, p. 459-460, and Blumell who adds that “there is also a deliberate space between v. 42 and v. 45.” (BLUMELL, “Luke 22:43-44”, p. 7, footnote 23). But Codex A is often simply quoted as witness of Lk 22:43-44 absence (see recently SANDNES, *Early Christian Discourses*, p. 149; or earlier DUPLACY, “La préhistoire du texte,” p. 356).

²⁸ LAFLEUR, “Which Criteria;” he is a specialist of the f^{13} , see D. LAFLEUR, *La Famille 13 dans l’évangile de Marc*, Leiden, Boston, 2013.

²⁹ SANDNES, *Early Christian Discourses*, p. 164.

³⁰ K. and B. ALAND, *The Text of the New Testament. An Introduction to the Critical Editions and to the Theory and Practice of Modern Textual Criticism*, E. F. RHODES (trans), Grand Rapids and Leiden, 1989², p. 310. Quoted in CLIVAZ, *L’ange et la sueur de sang*, p. 490.

³¹ DUPLACY, “La préhistoire du texte,” p. 352.

³² LAFLEUR, “Which Criteria;” p. 117.

³³ *ibid.*, p. 117.

³⁴ *ibid.*, p. 115, footnote 16: “Min. 543 has unnumbered folios on our microfilm but Claire Clivaz, who carefully worked on a more recent one, indicated ‘f. 37v’ for Matt 26:39 (HTR 98/4, 435; and *L’ange et la sueur de sang*, *Lc 22,43-44: Ou comment on pourrait bien encore écrire l’histoire* [Leuven: Peeters, 2010] 493). She also reported that the text of [Luke 22:43-44] in Matthew ‘est clairement relié à Luc ($\lambda\omicron$ dans la marge avant $\omega\phi\theta\eta$ $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$, même main, et $\mu\theta$ à la fin des versets transposés, même main).’ We detected none of those mentions due to the bad copy of our microfilm.”

scholars can now check 543 f. 37v for themselves in the *New Testament Virtual Manuscript Room* (NTVMR).³⁵ Only 69 does not have a sign of a Lukan origin for the verses added after Matthew 26:39.³⁶

This effect is so substantial that it cannot be ignored any longer: the f^{13} manuscripts that present Luke 22:43-44 after Matthew 26:39 “were clearly conscious of the transfer”³⁷ (Lafleur), a transfer explained by the fact that the “pericope is read in the lesson of the Maundy Thursday in the Byzantine Liturgy”³⁸ (Lopik). In a similar way, the marginal note of Codex C next to Matthew 26:39, edited by Tischendorf and referenced by van Lopik, also supports the Lukan origin of the verses.³⁹ In conclusion, the presence of Luke 22:43-44 after Matthew 26:39 in C, and eight manuscripts of f^{13} , should no longer be considered as “one of the surest evidences” of a secondary character of the verses.⁴⁰ This example illustrates well the difficulty of using textual elements from later centuries to guess what could have been at stake in the second century textual transmission of a Gospel. If one looks for the most probable scenario about the destiny of Luke 22:43-44, it is surely worth the effort to scrutinize more deeply the triple tradition of 0171, P⁶⁹, and P⁷⁵.

2.1.3. The P⁶⁹, another version of the Lukan prayer on the Mount of Olives

Among the external sources supporting this view, the P⁶⁹ (or P. Oxy. 2383) has drawn some attention in recent years. After my 2005 article on this topic,⁴¹ a third edition was proposed by Thomas Wayment in 2008,⁴² based on multispectral images produced in 2006, updated in 2015.⁴³ To summarize the debates, if editions disagree about the end of the gap in P⁶⁹ – 22:44 or 45a⁴⁴ –, all agree that it starts after 22:41, from Turner to Wayment⁴⁵, including the transcription in the *New Testament Virtual Manuscript Room*⁴⁶. Lk 22:42 is absent from P⁶⁹: this fact has to be fully recognized and integrated to the discussion about Lk 22:43–44 as a third version of the Lukan prayer on the Mount of Olives.⁴⁷

³⁵ GA 543, f. 37v: <http://ntvmr.uni-muenster.de/manuscript-workspace?docID=30543&pageID=800>.

³⁶ I agree with Didier Lafleur that the word $\lambda\upsilon\pi\acute{\iota}$, written in the margin of 69 f.68r is a comment of the owner of the manuscript, William Chark (see LAFLEUR, “Which Criteria,” p. 142 and 110).

³⁷ LAFLEUR, “Which Criteria,” p. 117; quoted in full above.

³⁸ LOPIK, “Some Notes,” p. 155.

³⁹ C. TISCHENDORF (ed), *Codex Ephraemi Syri Rescriptus*, Lipsiae, 1843, p. 25; T. van LOPIK, “Once Again: Floating Words, Their Significance for Textual Criticism,” *New Testament Studies* 41 (1995), p. 286-291 (288); quoted in CLIVAZ, *L’ange et la sueur de sang*, p. 494-495.

⁴⁰ As summarized by Lopik, “the transfer of the Bloody Sweat is no real evidence of the ‘floating’ character of the Lukan passage, as Raymond Brown affirms. Nor can it be maintained that the transfer of the Bloody Sweat to Matthew by Family 13 and several lectionaries strongly suggests that the Bloody Sweat is not part of the original text of Luke” (LOPIK, “Some Notes,” p. 155).

⁴¹ CLIVAZ, “The Angel and the Sweat.”

⁴² T. A. WAYMENT, “A New Transcription of P. Oxy. 2383 (P⁶⁹),” *Novum Testamentum* 50 (2008), p. 351-357; CLIVAZ, “Some Remarks on Thomas A. Wayment” (2010); WAYMENT, “P.Oxy. 2383 (P⁶⁹)” (2012).

⁴³ L. BLUMELL, T. A. WAYMENT (eds), *Christian Oxyrhynchus: Texts, Documents, Sources*, Waco, 2015, p. 38-41.

⁴⁴ Wayment argues convincingly for an end of the gap in 22:44, see WAYMENT, “A New Transcription,” p. 352.

⁴⁵ E. G. TURNER, “2383. Gospel According to St. Luke XXII”, in E. LOBEL ET AL. (ed), *Oxyrhynchus Papyri XXIV*, London, 1957, p. 1-4, here p. 2; K. ALAND, “Alter und Entstehung des D-Textes im Neuen Testament. Betrachtungen zu P⁶⁹ und 0171”, in S. JANERAS – R. ROCA-PUIG (eds., *Miscellanea papirologica*, Barcelona, 1987, p. 37-61, here p. 57; P. W. COMFORT – D. P. BARRETT (eds), *The Text of the Earliest New Testament Greek Manuscripts*, Cambridge, 2001, p. 464; WAYMENT, “A New Transcription,” p. 352.

⁴⁶ P⁶⁹ recto: <http://ntvmr.uni-muenster.de/manuscript-workspace?docID=10069&pageID=10>; POxy: *Oxyrhynchus Online*: <http://163.1.169.40/gsd/collect/POxy/index/assoc/HASH012f.dir/POxy.v0024.n2383.a.01.hires.jpg>.

⁴⁷ CLIVAZ, “The Angel and the Sweat,” p. 427 ; CLIVAZ, *L’ange et la sueur de sang*, p. 467 : “Le P⁶⁹ représente donc une troisième manière de donner accès au récit lucanien de la prière au Mont des Oliviers.” The recent debates around P⁶⁹ are presented in an extended way in C. CLIVAZ, “New Testament Textual Criticism from th

This particular version can be fully understood in the general framework of the diverse traditions and early receptions of the prayer on the Mount of Olives⁴⁸. Indeed, the plausibility of a conscious omission of v. 42 can be supported first by the later canonical Gospel of John, which avoids narrating Gethsemane and distances itself from this tradition (John 12:27). P⁶⁹ represents a kind of middle way between the synoptic Gospels and John: it transmits the prayer on the Mount of Olives, but without its content. Second, the history of the reception makes this Gethsemane version understandable: a reluctance in face of the word on the cup is present by Greco-Roman authors (Porphyry, Celsus) and early Christian authors (Justin, Origen, Ambrosius)⁴⁹, as validated recently by Sandnes, Wilson, and Pope.⁵⁰

In summary of 2.1, the late transfer of the passage after Matt 26:39 in certain manuscripts of *f*¹³ and C^{mg} is no longer understood as a signal of another source, but as the trace of a liturgical reading. Second, the three most ancient witnesses demonstrate a plural situation in Egypt in the third century CE: the oldest one, 0171, includes the passage, whereas P⁷⁵ does not have it; as for P⁶⁹, it lacks Luke 22:42-44, a third way to transmit the Lukan prayer on the Mount of Olives. The acknowledgment of these three early versions is a turning-point in the evaluation of external evidence.

2.2 The literary pattern or the chiasmus argument

The internal evidence has also been clarified in recent years: based on the argument of the chiasmic structure, Luke 22:43-44 would destroy the literary pattern of Luke 22:39-46. It has been used by Carroll, reassessing Ehrman and Plunkett's core argument.⁵¹ Otherwise, recent scholarship shows a disinterest in this argument. It plays no role at all in the arguments of Asikainen, Ramelli, Ribeiro, and Paroschi, who are all convinced that Luke 22:43-44 is a foreign body interpolated in the text.⁵² It also has no effect on the work of Eckhard or Sandnes, nor by Gil, Voorwinde, and S. K. Brown, who are attached to the literary value or to the historicity of the verses. Quite obviously, the chiasmus argument is not on trend anymore.

Blumell explains why: first, it has been largely demonstrated that a chiasmus can include Luke 22:43-44 (Feldkämper, Gamba), or that these verses do not disturb the alleged chiasmus in 22:39-46 (Brown).⁵³ Second, in 2010, I pointed to the limits of the concept of chiasm itself,

Margins to the Center: Jesus' Desire and Manuscripts in Lk 22:43-44," in J. K. ELLIOTT and L. PINCHARD (eds.), *The Variety and Importance of the Scriptural Witnesses to the so-called 'Western' Text. Diversité et importance des témoins scripturaires du texte « occidental » (NTTSD)*, Leiden, *forthcoming*.

⁴⁸ In a 2005 article, I suggested to understand P⁶⁹ as a fragment of Marcion's Gospel, a hypothesis suggested to me by François Bovon (CLIVAZ, "The Angel and the Sweat," p. 429-432). This proposal raised enthusiasm for some Marcionite scholars, in order that P⁶⁹ stands even on the cover of Jason David BeDuhn's 2013 book (J. D. BEDUHN, *The First New Testament. Marcion's Scriptural Canon*, Salem, 2013). But it was in my mind a very aside element, not necessary to understand the specificity of P⁶⁹. Dieter Roth correctly underlines that it is impossible to prove it, unless we find new Marcion's evidence (D. T. ROTH, *The Text of Marcion's Gospel*, Leiden, 2015, p. 46, footnote 1).

⁴⁹ CLIVAZ, *L'ange et la sueur de sang*, p. 347-364; p. 364.

⁵⁰ SANDNES, *Early Christian Discourses*, p. 158; B. E. WILSON, *Unmanly Men: Refigurations of Masculinity in Luke-Acts*, Oxford, 2015, p. 214; POPE, "Emotions, Pre-emotions," notably p. 26-28.

⁵¹ CARROLL, *Luke: A commentary*, p. 444-445; see EHRMAN, PLUNKETT, "The Angel," p. 412-414. Blumell comments: "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 chiasmic structure and therefore ought to be regarded as secondary" (BLUMELL, "Luke 22:43-44," p. 32).

⁵² RIBEIRO, PAROSCHI, "A agonia no Getsêmani."

⁵³ BLUMELL, "Luke 22:43-44," p. 32-33.

and according to Blumell, a “welcome forthright assessment.”⁵⁴ He concludes that “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.”⁵⁵ In the last decade, most scholars have disregarded the chiasmic structure as proof of Luke 22:43-44’s interpolation, demonstrating that this argument has dried up.

It is not an anodyne remark, since the chiasmic structure was a core argument in Ehrman and Plunkett’s work, in addition to the now reconsidered manuscript evidence. This evolution of the perception of two of their important arguments shows that the scholarly debate has changed. It has gone from a quite massive assessment of Luke 22:43-44 as a foreign interpolated element to a diversification of opinions.⁵⁶ Stefan Eckhard, after having quickly recognized the interpolation, emphasizes that Lk 22:43-44 is congruent with the agonistic tone of the Lukan prayer at Gethsemane.⁵⁷ From a similar perspective, Sandnes argues that “while the shorter version is to be treated separately, the longer version is seen in continuity with the shorter;” “within Luke 22, even if verses 43-44 are left out,⁵⁸ Jesus’ emotions are important.”⁵⁹ Beyond the case for omission or interpolation, scholars are now more interested in relating Luke 22:43-44 to the rest of the pericope, rather than to consider it as an intruder. This shift requires further discussion on elements still disputed or neglected in the debate.

3. Disputed elements: the ἀγωνία and Jesus’ emotions

3.1 ἀγωνία (Luke 22:44)

In regard to internal evidence, the presence of “vocabulary atypical of Luke (including the key words *agonia* [anguish or struggle], *hidros* [sweat], and *thrombos* [drop])” has been often seen as proof of interpolation because of the fact that “the depiction of an emotional and struggling Jesus differs from his characterization in the Gospel otherwise.”⁶⁰ A particular vocabulary is of course not sufficient to recognize an interpolation: the Gospel of Luke has other atypical expressions or words, for example ἐπιθυμία ἐπεθύμησα (22:15) which is a New Testament hapax and draws the attention to the Jewish memories in the chapter (see 3.2 and 3.3). But the meaning of ἀγωνία is a real disputed point in the internal evidence evaluation. In the last decade, ἀγωνία as struggle has been enrooted in a richer philological ground. As pointed in 2010⁶¹, the second century CE orator Aelius Aristides uses ἀγωνία to narrate his struggle to be able to speak: a dripping sweat resulted from the effort (συμβάντος ἰδρώτος δι’ ἀγωνίαν) after he had received the help of the god Asclepius.⁶² This rhetorical struggle is inspired from the theme of sport, sweat included. From the third century BCE, contests, games, festivities began to welcome oral performances, so that one could speak about an “agonistic explosion” from that

⁵⁴ BLUMELL, “Luke 22:43-44,” p. 33, footnote 148, referring to CLIVAZ, *L’ange et la sueur*, p. 256-263.

⁵⁵ BLUMELL, “Luke 22:43-44,” p. 33.

⁵⁶ See footnote 7 above.

⁵⁷ ECKHARD, “Der Kampf um den Glauben,” p. 74: “Zwar ist der Text Lk 22,43-44 ursprünglich nicht belegt, er wird jedoch frühzeitig in die Textzeugen eingefügt, weil die Schreiber die Stelle auf diese Weise angemessen deuten konnten. Die beiden Verse sind damit gut bezeugt.”

⁵⁸ As signaled in footnote 18 above, Sandnes mixes up 0171 with 1071 (SANDNES, *Early Christian Discourses*, p. 149).

⁵⁹ SANDNES, *Early Christian Discourses*, p. 149 and 154.

⁶⁰ CARROLL, *Luke: A commentary*, p. 444.

⁶¹ AELIUS ARISTIDES, *Sacred Discourses* 4.15-18. See CLIVAZ, *L’ange et la sueur de sang*, p. 429-430.

⁶² AELIUS ARISTIDES, *Sacred Discourses* 4.17.

time, according to van Nijf.⁶³ This cultural framework was largely present in people's minds and discourses in the following centuries. The philological file of the agonistic vocabulary, launched by Stauffer and developed by Neyrey,⁶⁴ has been summarized in a 2019 *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum* article.⁶⁵ But the strongest study outlining the sense of "struggle" in Luke 22:43-44 is a 2020 article by Stefan Eckhard on the *agon* motif in New Testament,⁶⁶ in a collection of essays entirely devoted to this topic.⁶⁷

For him, "the syntagma ἐν ἀγωνίᾳ represents a clear reference to the athletic-military agon-concept" (struggle for victory, contest, gymnastic exercise, fight), without excluding the fear of death.⁶⁸ Eckhard starts by presenting the semantic field of *agon*, including the ludic aspect, "Spiel und Krieg," meaning game and war, from the context of panhellenistic games to the theater.⁶⁹ The passage of Aristides mentioned above - sweat, effort in oral speech, divine help, and overcoming⁷⁰ - is the missing piece in Eckhard's argument: it allows one to grasp fully the cultural context of Luke 22:42-44, an oral performance struggle. Additionally, Michael Pope described in 2017 the perception of the drops of bloody sweat *falling* (καταβαίνοντες) to the earth as a "modest but previously unnoticed piece of internal evidence that may point toward the verses' authenticity."⁷¹ One point more in favor of internal evidence,⁷² even if Pope fails to notice that Zahn and Marshall had already recognized it.⁷³

To summarize the point, the double meaning of ἀγωνία is now more widely recognized, also by scholars supporting the interpolation of Luke 22:43-44, like Sandnes and Eckhard, who read Luke 22:43-44 as developing Luke 22:39-46.⁷⁴ If Bart Ehrman, in 1993, said that he was "puzzled" by Neyrey's use of *struggle* to understand ἀγωνία in Luke 22:43-44,⁷⁵ the road has now been paved to support Raymond Brown's opinion: ἀγωνία is "the central point of the verses."⁷⁶ Henceforth, it is not possible to agree with Gregory Sterling saying that "all the authors of early Christianity" had accepted ἀγωνία as meaning anxiety⁷⁷. This affirmation is

⁶³ O. VAN NIJF, "Local Heroes: Athletics, Festivals and Elite Self-fashioning in the Roman East," in S. GOLDHILL (ed), *Being Greek under Rome. Cultural Identity, the Second Sophistic and the Development of Empire*, Cambridge, 2001, p. 306-334 (310-311); CLIVAZ, *L'ange et la sueur de sang*, p. 430.

⁶⁴ E. STAUFFER, Art. "ἀγών [et al.]", *TWNT* 1, Stuttgart, 1933, p. 134-140; J. H. NEYREY, "The Absence of Jesus' Emotions - The Lukan Redaction of Luke 22:39-46," *Biblica* 61 (1980), p. 153-171; CLIVAZ, *L'ange et la sueur de sang*, p. 411-454.

⁶⁵ CLIVAZ, "Schweiss."

⁶⁶ ECKHARD, "Der Kampf um den Glauben."

⁶⁷ OSTMEYER, WYPLADO, *Das Ziel vor Augen*.

⁶⁸ ECKHARD, "Der Kampf um den Glauben," p. 74.

⁶⁹ *ibid.*, p. 57, p.58, footnote 39, and p. 64, footnote 59. About *agon* at the theater, see also A. WYPADLO, "Vom ἀγών τῆς ἀρετῆς hin zum ἀγών τῆς εὐσεβείας (Virt. 45). Agonale Motivik und Sportmetaphorik im Corpus Philonicum" and H. BLATZ, "Wettkampf im Lykostal? Agonale Motivik im Kolosserbrief und soziokultureller Kontext", in OSTMEYER, WYPLADO (eds), *Das Ziel vor Augen*, resp. p. 29-48 and p. 121-142.

⁷⁰ AELIUS ARISTIDES, *Sacred Discourses* 4.15-18.

⁷¹ POPE, "The Downward Motion of Jesus," p. 261.

⁷² Pope notably draws attention to a passage of Philostratus, *Vit. soph.* 541: the gladiator's sweat is a sign of a contest for his life (POPE, "The Downward Motion of Jesus," p. 272).

⁷³ See ZAHN, *Das Evangelium des Lukas*, p. 689-690 and MARSHALL, *The Gospel of Luke*, p. 833; Pope claims that I have missed to discuss the καταβαίνοντες (POPE, "The Downward Motion of Jesus," p. 263), but this discussion can be read in CLIVAZ, *L'ange et la sueur de sang*, p. 327-328.

⁷⁴ SANDNES, *Early Christian Discourses*, p. 149 and 154. ECKHARD, "Der Kampf um den Glauben," p. 74.

⁷⁵ EHRMAN, *The Orthodox*, p. 248.

⁷⁶ BROWN, *La mort du Messie*, p. 232.

⁷⁷ G. STERLING, "Mors philosophi: The Death of Jesus in Luke," *HTR* 94 (2001/4), p. 383-402 (396). It should be noted that Blumell does not discuss neither the meaning of ἀγωνία in his article, nor the struggle interpretation of the scene.

contradicted by several witnesses.⁷⁸ For example, Ephrem says that Jesus' sweat has replaced Adam's cursed sweat (*De Ecclesia* 51:8), and that Gethsemane is a martyrdom struggle, a "disputation," a words contest, through a "sweat of toil" (*De Virginitate* 36,2):

Let the place in which He sweated offer Him a crown.
 Let His sweat in disputation make the doubter sweat.
 For, although everyone sweats to a degree,
 the one whom He slayed without measure sweated without measure.
 Everyone sweats in a limited and measured way,
 While he sweated excessively, to confuse excessively.
 [...] put on
 [...] that at the right moment
 [...] sweat of toil [...].⁷⁹

This hymn allows one to understand why in French, the Lukan scene has led to the emergence of a metaphorical expression that insists on effort, and not at all on fear, *suer sang et eau*. This is in opposition to the English metaphor that illustrates anxiety, *I sweat blood*, whereas the German metaphor points to effort and fear with *Blut und Wasser schwitzen*.⁸⁰ If the wider audience sees the potential meaning of ἀγωνία in Luke 22:43-44 as struggle and sweat caused by great effort and associated with fear,⁸¹ another point is a progressive shift. Even without Luke 22:43-44, one cannot pretend that the Lukan Jesus is without emotions (3.2), even if the evaluation of this point remains in discussion (3.3).

3.2 Jesus emotions in Luke and on the Mount of Olives

Two turning-points can be observed in the twentieth century research on Luke 22:39-46: the reading of the Lukan Passion as a martyrdom story, proposed in 1933 by Dibelius, Brun, and Stauffer,⁸² and the publication of P⁷⁵ in 1961. Dibelius is commonly recognized as having started the comparison of the Lukan Passion narrative with Jewish martyrdom stories, however the comparison had been done before with Christian martyrdom stories.⁸³ It is striking that in the same year (1933), three works promoting this point of view were published shortly before the start of the Second World War. The cultural impact of a contemporaneous war on scholars' imaginations cannot be underestimated: the strong poetical words of Louis Aragon, in *La rose et le réséda* (1941), illustrate well the way in which the blood and the martyrdom were culturally present at that time.⁸⁴ Moreover, the switch from Christian martyrdom stories to Jewish ones to

⁷⁸ CLIVAZ, *L'ange et la sueur de sang*, p. 545-589.

⁷⁹ EPHREM, *De Virginitate* 36,2, in K. E. McVEY (ed), *Ephrem the Syrian. Hymns*, New York-Mahwah, 2006, p. 421.

⁸⁰ CLIVAZ, *L'ange et la sueur de sang*, p. 1.

⁸¹ E.g. ECKHARD, "Der Kampf um den Glauben," p. 74: "[D]ie beiden Bedeutungsebenen von 'Kampf' oder 'Wettkampf' einerseits und 'Todesangst' andererseits [schliessen sich] an dieser Stelle nicht aus."

⁸² M. DIBELIUS, *Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums*, Tübingen, 1933 (1919¹), p. 202; M. DIBELIUS, "La signification religieuse des récits de la Passion", *RHPR* 13 (1933), p. 30-45; STAUFFER, Art. "ἀγων"; L. BRUN, "Engel und Blutschweiss. Lc 22 43-44," *ZNW* 32 (1933), p. 265-276.

⁸³ J. W. VAN HENTEN, "Jewish Martyrdom and Jesus' Death," in J. FREY, J. SCHRÖTER (eds), *Deutungen des Todes Jesu im Neuen Testament*, Tübingen, 2005, p. 139-168 (155): "Martin Dibelius connected the Lukan passion narrative to Jewish martyrdoms in his *Formgeschichte des Evangeliums*." Before, with a comparison to Christian martyrdom stories, see K. L. SCHMIDT, "Die literarische Eigenart der Leidensgeschichte Jesu," *Die christliche Welt* 32 (1918), p. 114-116.

⁸⁴ L. ARAGON, "La rose et le réséda", in IDEM *Les yeux d'Elsa, suivi de La Diane française*, Paris, 1968, p. 180 (abstract): "Celui qui croyait au ciel, Celui qui n'y croyait pas, Un rebelle est un rebelle, Nos sanglots font un seul

interpret Luke 22:39-46 could have only impressed scholars after the Shoah.⁸⁵ This cultural atmosphere has promoted a pragmatic reading of the bloody sweat as a martyrdom sign, helping to maintain Luke 22:43-44 in the text.

But, the discovery of P⁷⁵ in 1961, in conjunction with distance from the memory of war, led to the development of a more *noble death* or *mors philosophi* perspective on the Lukan prayer at Gethsemane (Neyrey, Ehrman and Plunkett, Sterling notably).⁸⁶ It has culminated in the early twenty-first century with Peter Scaer's 2005 monograph, joining martyrdom and noble death together.⁸⁷ The Greco-Roman values are the leading point in Scaer's perspective, pointing to a "Jesus without emotions" and supporting the interpolation hypothesis for Luke 22:43-44. As summarized in 2005 by Culpepper: Jesus dies as an ideal martyr, "calm, coherent, in prayer until the end."⁸⁸ Susan Asikainen's monograph reassessed this interpretative line in 2018,⁸⁹ without any new contributions but with some argumentative weaknesses. For example, Asikainen does not comment the sense of "struggle" for ἀγωνία in Luke 22:44, a word that she understands only as "fear and anguish."⁹⁰ Moreover, she affirms that "Luke omits the mentions of Jesus' emotions elsewhere in the Gospel as well,"⁹¹ failing to comment on ἐπιθυμία in Luke 22:15, whereas she insists on the four passions rejected by Stoic ideal.⁹² She does not engage with Luke 12:50 or 23:46, only commenting on the tears of Jesus in Luke 19:41 as "problematic from the point of view of the Stoic ideal of self-control."⁹³ Such a massive reassessment of a Jesus "without emotions" in Luke remains an exception in the last decade scholarship.

This point of view neglects key scenes in Luke (12:50; 19:41; 22:15; 23:46) and does not fit with features of the Gethsemane pericope itself (Luke 22:41.42.46), as pointed in 2010.⁹⁴ As Sandnes summarizes: "Within Luke 22, even if verses 43-44 are left out, Jesus' emotions are important, as Claire Clivaz states: 'The reformulation of Jesus' *epithumia* between 22:15 and 22:42 shows that he evolves from the desire to be with his disciples to a concern for the Father's will.'"⁹⁵ The narrative structure of chapter 22 of Luke draws attention to 22:15 and 22:42, and confirms a narrative tension between Jesus' desire and will,⁹⁶ whether or not one considers Luke 22:43-44 as omission or interpolation. Luke 22:15 presents a NT hapax ἐπιθυμία ἐπεθύμησα, that is likely an allusion to Jacob in Gen 31:30 LXX, illustrating a similar delayed

glas. Et quand vient l'aube cruelle Passent de vie à trépas Celui qui croyait au ciel, Celui qui n'y croyait pas Répétant le nom de celle Qu'aucun des deux ne trompa. Et leur sang rouge ruisselle Même couleur même éclat Celui qui croyait au ciel, Celui qui n'y croyait pas. Il coule il coule et se mêle, A la terre qu'il aime, Pour qu'à la saison nouvelle Mûrisse un raisin muscat."

⁸⁵ The relationship between New Testament German scholars and the Second World War has really begun to be studied only in the last generation, see T. BAUTZ (ed), art. "Stauffer, Ethelbert," in *Biographisch-Bibliographisches Kirchenlexikon*, vol. 10, Herzberg, 1995, p. 1245; S. GEISER, *Verantwortung und Schuld: Studien zu Martin Dibelius*, Münster, 2001; CLIVAZ, *L'ange et la sueur de sang*, p. 214-216.

⁸⁶ See CLIVAZ, *L'ange et la sueur de sang*, p. 201-243.

⁸⁷ P. SCAER, *The Lukan Passion and the Praiseworthy Death*, Sheffield, 2005. For a complete presentation of this evolution in exegesis history.

⁸⁸ R. A. CULPEPPER, "Designs for the Church in the Gospel Accounts of Jesus' Death," *NTS* 51 (2005), p. 376-392, p. 384 and p. 385.

⁸⁹ ASIKAINEN, *Jesus and Other Men. Ideal Masculinities in the Synoptic Gospels*.

⁹⁰ *ibid.*, p. 145.

⁹¹ *ibid.*, p. 165.

⁹² *ibid.*, p. 135.

⁹³ *ibid.*, p. 147.

⁹⁴ CLIVAZ, *L'ange et la sueur de sang*, p. 297; p. 228-243.

⁹⁵ SANDNES, *Early Christian Discourses*, p. 134.

⁹⁶ CLIVAZ, *L'ange et la sueur de sang*, p. 365-410.

desire.⁹⁷ Laban declares that Jacob has “desired with great desire” (ἐπιθυμία γὰρ ἐπεθύμησας) coming back to his father, a delayed desire like 22:15. Luke 22:42, the saying on the cup, has been recognized as an expression of sensitivity, as underlined by Sandnes:

Even without these contested verses [Luke 22:43-44], Luke’s Passion narrative should not be read simply as a conventional Jewish example of martyrdom of a noble Greco-Roman death. Luke 22:42 displays in particular emotions, according to Clivaz. In my view, that is an observation which is fundamental and has far-reaching consequences; it is a blow against simplistic heroic interpretations of Luke.⁹⁸

This opinion is also shared by Blumell: “while there is certainly a tendency to minimize Jesus’ emotions in Luke, it is not as widespread as some commentators have alleged [...]. Jesus still entreats the Father to ‘remove this cup’, (v. 42) which at least shows some degree of anxiety about his impending fate.”⁹⁹ This argument, adding to the revised external evidence, leads Blumell to conclude that the explanation of anti-docetic interpolation is not sufficient.¹⁰⁰ This statement is reinforced by a masterful, unpublished 1975 PhD by Edith Wild. She demonstrated that the anti-docetic interpretation of Luke 22:43-44 was born with Justin and Irenaeus and preceded by a political lecture of Jesus as the perfect martyr.¹⁰¹ Moreover, an incarnate perception of Jesus can be argued even with only Luke 22:41, as we have seen with Epiphanius, without the help of Luke 22:43-44 (2.1.3). If the anti-docetic hypothesis is not sufficient to explain the interpolation, if the external evidence is strong, starting from 0171 with Luke 22:44, and if Jesus’ desire and will replace his sadness at the Lukan Mount of Olives, what could have been the reason for such an omission?

Blumell agrees with me that the verses could have been removed “for different reasons at different times”.¹⁰² Notably, the conflict between separationist and anti-separationist readings of this passage can be seen as one moment in the long reading history, but not the most ancient one.¹⁰³ In a similar way, the polemics with the Greco-Roman culture should be seen as posterior effects. Blumell suggests that the verses have “been removed from select copies of Luke

⁹⁷ The comparison between Jesus and Jacob will be remembered and discussed in part 4. As argued previously, Lk 22:15 is closer to Gen 31:30 LXX rather to Nb 11:4, see CLIVAZ, *L’ange et la sueur de sang*, p. 397.

⁹⁸ SANDNES, *Early Christian Discourses*, p. 12.

⁹⁹ BLUMELL, “Luke 22:43-44,” p. 33-34.

¹⁰⁰ *ibid.*, p. 35: “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.” Moreover, I have pointed that Ehrman is not consistent in his appreciation on P⁷⁵ and anti-docetic preoccupations. Indeed, on the one hand, he underlines that P⁷⁵ has integrated the Western non-interpolations as anti-docetic reaction but would have missed to integrate Luke 22:43-44. See EHRMAN, *The Orthodox Corruption*, p. 217; CLIVAZ, *L’ange et la sueur de sang*, p. 248.

¹⁰¹ E. WILD, *Histoire de l’exégèse de la péricope de Gethsemani. Mt 26,36-46; Mc 14,32-42; Lc 22,3-46. Les trois premiers siècles*, Strasbourg, PhD, 1975, p. 20: “Contrairement à leurs prédécesseurs, les apologistes Justin et Irénée ne placent plus l’accent essentiel de l’événement de l’agonie de Jésus à Gethsémani sur le thème du martyre, mais, sous l’influence des divergences et des luttes causées à l’intérieur du christianisme par le judaïsme et les hérésies à tendance gnosticiante, ils sont amenés à souligner d’autres aspects de la péricope.” See CLIVAZ, *L’ange et la sueur de sang*, p. 217-222.

¹⁰² BLUMELL, “Luke 22:43-44”, p. 4: “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)”.

¹⁰³ BLUMELL, “Luke 22:43-44,” p. 4: “Claire Clivaz [...] 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”. This gnostic reading, attested by Theodotus (CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA, *The Excerpts of Theodotus* 58.1), was born at a later stage in the region of Alexandria. The present article argues that the most ancient debates around Lk 22:43-44 were born among early Judeo-Christian memories in Egypt.

sometime after the middle of the second century and before the end of the third century as a result of anti-Christian attack and a Christian failure to achieve a convincing consensus interpretation of this passage.”¹⁰⁴ But in this framework, the entire prayer at Gethsemane was problematic, not only Luke 22:43-44, and more specifically the word on the cup. Numerous examples could be given here, notably Origen (2.1.3)¹⁰⁵ or Justin.¹⁰⁶ P⁶⁹ fits well with this step of the history of reading, attesting to the withdrawing of Lk 22:42. The potential omission of Lk 22:43–44 requests to look for more ancient steps of readings, to understand why these two verses only could have raised issue. To get a chance to understand it, one needs to start from the historical consensus about the Jewish beginnings of Christianity in Egypt, as summarized in 2021 by Benjamin Schliesser:

Scholars like Manfred Hornschuh, C. H. Roberts, Helmut Koester, A. F. J. Klijn, Birger Pearson, Adolf M. Ritter, Christoph Marksches, Attila Jakab, Joseph Méléze-Modrzejewski, Martin Hengel, Anna Maria Schwemer, Simon Mimouni, and Markus Lang are part of a new consensus on the Jewish context for the emergence of Christianity in Alexandria and an early date of its Jewish beginnings.¹⁰⁷

Such consensus matters for the study of Lk 22:39-46 since the three most ancient manuscripts of the passage come from Egypt, where Christianity started as Jewish communities. But this Jewish cultural background is a blind spot in Blumell’s article, and also globally in the last decade of research.

3.3. Jesus’ ἀγωνία: Jewish memories key

In summary of the precedent parts, the hypothesis of the omission has gained weight in the last years, as well as the sense of “fight” for ἀγωνία in Luke 22:44, particularly if one reads as the two parts of Jesus’ narrative program Lk 22:15 and 22:42. But the Hebrew roots of the particular expression ἐπιθυμία γὰρ ἐπεθύμησας are generally neglected, as well as its echo to Gen 31:30 LXX and the figure of Jacob. In the last decade, the impact of early Jewish memories on this text has been minimized or put aside,¹⁰⁸ notably the martyrdom interpretation, originating with Dibelius, Stauffer, and Brun. For example, in his 2015 article, Brian J. Tabb tries to distinguish Jesus’ passion in Luke from Jewish martyrdom stories that he describes as “relish[ing] the grotesque details of the martyrs’ torture” and based on a “different theological rationale.”¹⁰⁹ He prefers focusing on the Old Testament as a background to understand that “Luke stresses that Jesus’ ignoble death fulfills scriptural prophecy and Jesus’ repeated predictions.”¹¹⁰ Tabb distances himself from the understanding of ἀγωνία as a struggle, arguing that the Maccabean background gives the sense of distress, based on 2 Macc 3:14.16; 15:19.¹¹¹

But if ἀγωνία means anxiety in these passages, Tabb misses other instances of the four Maccabees books, all analyzed by Hartmut Aschermann in the fifties, a study quoted by Ehrman

¹⁰⁴ BLUMELL, “Luke 22:43–44”, p. 35.

¹⁰⁵ ORIGEN, *Contra Celsum* 2.27; see 2.1.3.

¹⁰⁶ JUSTIN MARTYR, *Dial. Try* 99.2; see CLIVAZ, *L’ange et la sueur de sang*, p. 363-364.

¹⁰⁷ B. SCHLIESSER, “Jewish Beginnings. Earliest Christianity in Alexandria”, B. SCHLIESSER ET AL. (eds), *Alexandria*, Tübingen, 2021, p. 367-397; here p. 371-372. Schliesser concludes that “in fact, the third stage of scholarship is a return to Adolf von Harnack” (372).

¹⁰⁸ There is of course the exception of ECKHARD, “Der Kampf um den Glauben.” When ἀγωνία in Luke 22:44 is understood as a contest, the Jewish cultural background is particularly taken into consideration in the interpretation. Another exception is Read-Heimerdinger (2022), who mentions Isaac’s bloody sweat in the Aqedah version of 4Q225, referring in footnote to a Martinez article (*Luke and Its Own Words*, p. 202, and footnote 25, p. 213). But one finds a mention of sweat neither in 4Q225 (see images and transcription on <https://maagarim.hebrew-academy.org.il/Pages/PMain.aspx?misyzira=11001>), nor in Martinez article (see F. G. MARTINEZ, “The Sacrifice of Isaac in 4Q225”, E. NOORT and E. TIGCHELAAR (eds), *The Sacrifice of Isaac: The Aqedah (Genesis 22) and its Interpretations*, Leiden, 2002, p. 44-57).

¹⁰⁹ TABB, “Is the Lucan Jesus a ‘Martyr?’”, p. 300 and 289.

¹¹⁰ *ibid.*, p. 301.

¹¹¹ *ibid.*, p. 300; he mentions also ἀγών in 4 Macc 17:11 but does not discuss this occurrence further in the article (*ibid.*, p. 286).

and Plunkett.¹¹² Developing Dibelius' proposal,¹¹³ Aschermann underlines the martyrdom-ἀγωνία struggle (4 Macc 11:20; 13:15; 16:16; 17:11-16), with sweat and blood (4 Macc 6:6.11; 7:8), and other stories in which the martyr is fortified by an angel (1 et 2 Macc *passim*; 3 Macc 5:51; 6:18).¹¹⁴ This background illustrates the tradition of the piety contest (4 Macc 11:20: διὰ τὴν εὐσέβειαν εἰς γυμνασίαν). This piety contest happens not only in martyrdom, but also in prayers: Jacob with tears in Hos 12:15 LXX, or in Wis 10:12, ἀγῶνα ἰσχυρὸν; Paul in Rom 15:30 and Col 4:12; Jesus in Heb 5:7 and Luke 22:43-44. Such oral contests remember the Greco-Roman ἀγωνία of Aristides and supports the idea of a common cultural background (see 3.1). The passage of 4 Macc 17:11-16 gathers together the sportive and oral performance contests within martyrdom, and presents a theater scene with spectators, with the tyrant as an antagonist and crowns, athletes, and immortality as awards: martyrdom is the γενναῖος ἀγών, the authentic fight (4 Macc 16:16).

This meaningful part of Jewish culture, deeply embedded in the Greco-Roman culture, has influenced further stories on a long-term scale, for example, the *Testament of Job*. Angelic help, athleticism, a fight against Satan, crowns, and sweat:¹¹⁵ all of these elements are present in this text making it hard to classify as Jewish or Judeo-Christian. It was probably written in Greek in the first century CE in Egypt,¹¹⁶ and partially rewritten in a Montanist milieu in the second century CE.¹¹⁷ This cultural context also explains why Origen describes the martyrs as “famous agonists,” encouraged by Jesus to endure “efforts and sweats.”¹¹⁸ Moreover, in the *Contra Celsum*, Origen defends the idea that Jesus has become “a big fighter” (μέγαν ἀγωνιστὴν γεγονέναι), overcoming temptation.¹¹⁹ Before him, Clement of Alexandria uses the title of *agonist* twice for the Christ Logos in the *Protrepticus*: the Logos is “the authentic agonist,” ὁ γνήσιος ἀγωνιστής, an expression remembering the real Maccabean fight.¹²⁰ Clement introduces it with a quotation combining Ezek 28:14 and Esth 2:3:¹²¹

‘For out of Sion shall go forth the law, and the Word of the Lord from Jerusalem’, that is the heavenly Word, the authentic agonist, (γνήσιος ἀγωνιστής) who is being crowned upon the stage of the whole world.¹²²

Moreover, he recalls in the *Excerpta* that the Valentinian Gnostic Theodotus also mentions the “great agonist Jesus Christ.”¹²³ But neither Clement of Alexandria nor Origen explicitly relate this agonist Jesus to Luke 22:43-44, a scene never mentioned in their extant writings. The

¹¹² See their summary in EHRMAN, PLUNKETT, “The Angel,” p. 410.

¹¹³ DIBELIUS, *Die Formgeschichte*, p. 202-203: “Im Vordergrund steht nun das Erscheinen des Engels als Antwort auf das Gebet Jesu und die Beschreibung des Gebetsringens (22,43.44) - beide typische Erlebnisse eines Märtyrers!”

¹¹⁴ H. ASCHERMANN, “Zum Agoniegebet Jesu, Luke. 22:43-44”, *Theologia Viatorum* 5 (1953-1954), p. 143-149.

¹¹⁵ *Test. Job* 5.2-10; 20:8; 21:1; 27:7; see CLIVAZ, *L'ange et la sueur de sang*, p. 552-553.

¹¹⁶ J. SPITTLER, “Testament of Job,” in J. CHARLESWORTH (ed), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, vol. 1, London, 1983, p. 830 and 833; W. C. GRUEN III, “Seeking a Context for the *Testament of Job*”, *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 18 (2009/3), p. 163-179.

¹¹⁷ SPITTLER, “Testament of Job,” p. 834 et 836.

¹¹⁸ ORIGEN, *Exhortation to Martyrdom* 18 and *Homily on Luke. Fragment* 87.

¹¹⁹ ORIGEN, *Contra Celsum* 1.69; see CLIVAZ, *L'ange et la sueur de sang*, p. 550-556.

¹²⁰ CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA, *Protrepticus* 1.2.3 ; 10.110.3; see CLIVAZ, *L'ange et la sueur de sang*, p. 556-562.

¹²¹ Clement associates this combined quotation to the *Kerygma Petri* in *Ecl. proph.* 58. See also W. RORDORF, “Christus als Logos und Nomos. Das Kerygma Petrou in seinem Verhältnis zu Justin”, in W. RORDORF, *Lex orandi - lex credendi. Gesammelte Aufsätze zum 60. Geburtstag, Paradosis. Études de littérature et de théologie anciennes*, Freiburg, 1993², p. 192-202.

¹²² CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA, *Protrepticus* 1.2.3. Translation slightly adapted from CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA, *Exhortation to the Greeks* 1.2.3, G. W. BUTTERWORTH (ed), Cambridge, London, 1960⁴, p. 7.

¹²³ CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA, *Ex. Th.* 3.58.1.

fighting Jesus at Gethsemane appears explicitly by Ephrem at the fourth century CE (see 3.1).¹²⁴ Even with this gap, the importance of the Jewish agonistic background cannot be missed and requires a correction of two points in recent research. First, Blumell reports that only Theodotus mentions Jesus as agonist, missing that Clement and Origen use the title also.¹²⁵ Moreover, he puts aside other elements of Jewish or Judeo-Christian background to understand Luke 22:43-44,¹²⁶ and does not discuss the plural meanings of ἀγωνία in Luke 22:43. Secondly, Sandnes, not convinced by an agon-motif in Gethsemane,¹²⁷ misses a part of Philo's description of it, as one can read in this statement:

In my view, Neyrey is mixing things up when he considers ἀγωνία to get the antidote against the power of the passions. Ἀγωνία is a metaphor for wrestling but not the antidote as such, which is *paideia*. [...] Constructing Luke's version as a combat about passion and grief in particular is therefore not as similar to Philo as Neyrey asserts. He ignores the role played by *paideia* in that combat and the fact that *paideia* is absent from Luke's passage.¹²⁸

I agree with Sandnes that Luke 22:39-46 is not the story of Jesus' fight against grief on account of the disciples (Luke 22:45).¹²⁹ But Neyrey is focused on Greco-Roman definitions of the passions, and in this cultural framework, Philo promotes the *paideia*.¹³⁰ He misses the way in which Philo anchors the agon-motif in his Jewish heritage and identity. Neither does Sandnes mention the title of *agonist* that Philo attributes to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob,¹³¹ nor does he mention that Clement of Alexandria and Origen nominate Jesus as agonist (see 3.2). In 2020, Wypadlo published a clever article on the agon-motif by Philo.¹³² He highlighted that for Philo, Jacob is the "athlete by excellence," (Gen 32:25-33 LXX) illustrating the "soul contest for the virtue."¹³³ In addition to Wypadlo's assertion, it is useful to remember the success of the agonist Jacob in the Second Temple period and further Jewish literature.¹³⁴ In the *Prayer of Joseph*, Jacob is even considered as a pre-existent angel, fighting against Uriel, the eighth archangel.¹³⁵

¹²⁴ EPHREM, *De Ecclesia* 51,8 and *De Virginitate* 36,2.

¹²⁵ BLUMELL, "Luke 22:43-44," p. 4, footnote 12.

¹²⁶ For example, the almost verbatim echo in the *Testament of Abraham* A 20:5 (ὁ ἰδρῶς τῆς ὄψεως αὐτοῦ ὡσεὶ θρόμβοι αἵματος). See BLUMELL, "Luke 22:43-44", p. 15, footnote 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. [...] But the addition is not attested in all the mss". The reference is indeed *Testament of Abraham* A 20:5 (not B 20:5). As pointed by Michael Pope, S. K. Brown neglects also this attestation in his commentary: "Had Brown engaged with Bovon's analysis of a passage from the *Testament of Abraham*, for example, he would have garnered ancillary justification for reading actual blood into the sweaty tableau" (POPE, "A Closer Look: Luke 22:43-44", p. 129).

¹²⁷ SANDNES, *Early Christian Discourses*, p. 164: "The picture is more complex than Ehrman and many others depict since verse 42a implies Jesus' concern to escape. In spite of this disagreement, I concur that the shift of focus does bear upon questions of authenticity. Verses 43-44 portray a dramatic picture not easily reconciled with what has come before in Luke."

¹²⁸ SANDNES, *Early Christian Discourses*, p. 167 and 168.

¹²⁹ See RAMELLI, "KOIMΩMENOYΣ"; C. CLIVAZ, "'Asleep by grief' (Luke 22:45): Reading from the Body at the Crossroads of Narratology and New Historicism," *The Bible and Critical Theory* 2 (3), 2006, p. 29.1-29.15.

¹³⁰ SANDNES, *Early Christian Discourses*, p. 167-168.

¹³¹ Notably PHILON, *De somniis* 1.167 for Jacob; *De somniis* 1.59 and *De migratione Abrahami* 26.1 for Abraham; *Quod deterius* 29,1 for Isaac. CLIVAZ, *L'ange et la sueur de sang*, p. 434: "Philon nomme aussi Abraham et Isaac ἀγωνιστής, mais il prend soin de les distinguer de Jacob. Si les trois patriarches sont des exemples à suivre [...], Abraham est guidé par l'enseignement, Isaac par sa propre nature et Jacob par les entraînements athlétiques, tels ceux des pénibles épreuves des concours de lutte". It is the figure of Abraham that is related to *paideia*.

¹³² WYPADLO, "Vom ἀγὼν τῆς ἀρετῆς hin zum ἀγὼν τῆς εὐσεβείας (Virt. 45)."

¹³³ *ibid.*, p. 43 and 44.

¹³⁴ CLIVAZ, "Jacob and Jesus in Alexandria as a Test-Case."

¹³⁵ Already underlined by Daniélou in 1957, this passage is commented by C. T. R. HAYWARD, *Interpretations of the Name Israel in Ancient Judaism and Some Early Christian Writings. From Victorious Athlete to Heavenly Champion*, Oxford, 2005, p. 215; C. H. FLETCHER-LOUIS, *Luke-Acts: Angels, Christology, and Soteriology*,

In the *Targum Neofiti* on Gen 32:25-30, Sariel fights against Jacob, who claimed to be superior to the angels before the Lord. In other versions of this tradition, the angel helps Jacob (*TestDan* 6.5; Hos 12:4-5 LXX).¹³⁶ Memories of Jacob the realistic fighter can be read during the fifth century CE under the pen of Cyril of Alexandria, describing him as “friend of the effort, well-known by his sweats and authentic beside God (φιλοπονώτατος, ἐν ἰδρῶσιν εὐδόκιμος καὶ Γνήσιος πρὸς Θεόν),”¹³⁷ whereas Rabbinic sources do not hesitate to narrate with ambiguity the encounter of a sweating Jacob receiving the benediction of his father:

R. Hoshaya said: When Isaac said to Jacob, ‘Come Near, I pray thee, that I may feel thee my son, perspiration poured over his legs and his heart melted like wax. But the Holy One, blessed be He, sent him two angels, one at his right side and one at his left, who supported him by his elbows so that he should not fall. Thus, it is written, Be not dismayed - *tishta*’ (Isa 41:10), which means, Be not like wax (*teshawa*).¹³⁸

This rich excerpt¹³⁹ leads to an obvious question: is it possible that the authentic agonist title has been attributed to Jesus (Clement, Origen) without relation to Jacob? In 2005, C.T.R. Hayward led a detailed inquiry about the name Israel in ancient Judaism and other early Christian sources. He attempted to understand Luke 22:43-44 as inspired by Jacob’s fight, underlining the presence of ἐνίσχυσας in Gen 32:39 LXX and Luke 22:43-44.¹⁴⁰ But a clear proof of this relationship is still missing.¹⁴¹ Blumell correctly asserts that no ancient text makes an explicit parallel between Jacob and Jesus around the Lukan Gethsemane prayer.¹⁴² We have only a “black hole” of evidence: at a certain moment, the “authentic agonist” title has been transferred to Jesus, as detailed by Clement of Alexandria, a title previously attributed to Jacob by Philo.

Some elements can help one understand more about this black hole. Philo never connects Jacob with the Logos,¹⁴³ whereas Justin of Neapolis, the first Christian writer who comments on Gen 32:25-30, understands Jesus as the Logos fighting against Jacob, as well as the fighter himself.¹⁴⁴ Before Justin, the New Testament’s silence on this scene is striking, not mentioned for example by Clement of Rome who comments several times Jacob’s figure.¹⁴⁵ In my view, the early *Christian sources should have stayed silent on Gen 32:25-30 until the moment when the Logos theology has made it possible to identify Jesus as the angel/Logos*. Justin identifies the man/angel seen by Jacob to Christ, using the attributes given by Philo regarding the Logos.¹⁴⁶ He insists that it is a specific interpretation (*DialTry* 125,1). The theology of the

Tübingen, 1997, p. 159-164, signals that three other texts present Jacob/Israel as an angelomorphic figure: *Joseph and Aseneth*; the *Prayer of Jacob* and the *Haggadah* of Gen 28.

¹³⁶ In Os 12:4-5 LXX, Jacob is “strong with an angel,” against / beside God, ἐνίσχυσεν πρὸς Θεόν καὶ ἐνίσχυσεν μετὰ ἀγγέλου.

¹³⁷ CYRIL OF ALEXANDRIA, *Twelve Minor Prophets Commentary* 6,171a; my English translation.

¹³⁸ H. FREEDMAN (ed), *The Midrash Rabbah. Genesis* 65.19, London-Jerusalem-New York, 1977, p. 595.

¹³⁹ CLIVAZ, *L’ange et la sueur de sang*, p. 545-589.

¹⁴⁰ HAYWARD, *Interpretations of the Name Israel*, p. 322-323.

¹⁴¹ CLIVAZ, *L’ange et la sueur de sang*, p. 318-319.

¹⁴² BLUMELL, “Luke 22:43-44,” p. 24, footnote 103: “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.”

¹⁴³ CLIVAZ, “Jacob and Jesus in Alexandria as a Test-Case,” p. 216-217: “Philo never associates Jacob directly with the Logos, contrary to the affirmation of Daniélou. In *De somniis*, the Logos trains Jacob the “agonist,” and as the wrestler Jacob is distinguished from the Logos (*De migratione Abrahami* 39).” See J. DANIELLOU, “Trinité et angélogologie dans la théologie judéo-chrétienne”, *RSR* 45 (1957), p. 5-41 (23).

¹⁴⁴ JUSTIN MARTYR *DialTry* 125.3 and 125.4-5; CLIVAZ, *L’ange et la sueur de sang*, p. 567-569.

¹⁴⁵ HAYWARD, *Interpretations of the Name Israel*, p. 333-336.

¹⁴⁶ Comp. JUSTIN MARTYR *DialTry* 125.3 and 125.4-5.

Logos is the bridge that has allowed for a connection between Jacob and Jesus as “authentic agonists” in a Judeo-Christian milieu in Egypt.

In this regard, the almost absent traces of this milieu are particularly frustrating.¹⁴⁷ While Schliesser clearly speaks about “Jewish beginnings” for Christianity in Alexandria¹⁴⁸, other scholars become more conscious of the presence of early alternative voices in Egypt, as Jörg Frey describes it: “The plurality of early Christian traditions is overlooked if we only follow the canonical writings with their strong focus on the Pauline and Post-Pauline tradition. Things were probably different in Alexandria and Egypt.”¹⁴⁹ Keeping this fact in mind, I will argue in part 4 that the omission of Luke 22:43-44 has first resulted from the internal Judeo-Christian identity debates in Egypt during the second century, not from apologetic reactions to Greco-Roman criticisms, a later stage (Blumell hypothesis). Fortunately, we have traces of early internal disagreements about the interpretation of two neglected elements: the silent prayer of Jesus and the silent angel in Luke 22:43.

4. Neglected elements: a silent prayer, a silent angel

4.1 Jesus’ silent prayer

The silent prayer of Jesus in Luke 22:43 has been seldom commented on by scholars focusing on Luke 22:42 and on the triple Markan prayer of Jesus, as illustrated in this statement by Sandnes:

Although verse 42a implies that Jesus was affected and sought a way out of distress, Luke has lowered the tone dramatically. In Mark’s Gospel, Jesus returns to the disciples three times and prays three times. In Luke’s shorter version, this is all mentioned only once, which certainly focuses the matter, but also makes it evident that according to that version, Jesus’ struggle did not last very long. The intensity is absent, and he embraces God’s plan more easily.¹⁵⁰

But this perspective does not fit with some elements of the text. Mark explicitly narrates that Jesus prayed only twice, in an identical way (Mark 14:37.39). The third prayer and its content are simply assumed, whereas Matthew mentions it explicitly, insisting on the fact that the three prayers are identical (Matt 26:39.42.44). Manuscript evidence confirms that early readers were aware of these nuances: indeed, D and the most ancient Latin manuscripts of Mark, k (Codex Bobbiensis) and a (Codex Vercellensis), keep silent the content of the second prayer: they omit τὸν αὐτὸν λόγον εἰπὼν in Mark 14:39. As for Luke, he mentions twice a prayer of Jesus, if one adheres to reading Luke 22:43 after 22:42, but the second prayer’s content remains inaccessible to the readers, as in Mark 14:39 for D, k, and a. Consequently, a dual opposition of Luke vs Mark and Matthew is not correct. Matthew reveals the content of a triple prayer; Mark keeps silent the content of the third prayer, and even of the second one in D, k, and a; Luke presents a progression between two prayers (Luke 22:42.43), without the content of the second one.

Within of the NT canon, the Gospel of John represents a fourth way to deal with the content of the Gethsemane prayer through a reformulation that expresses some reservation (John 12:27), whereas Heb 5:7 could be seen as a way to “fill the silence” of Jesus prayer, depending on its

¹⁴⁷ FREY, “Locating”, p. 347.

¹⁴⁸ See the quotation at the end of 3.2.

¹⁴⁹ FREY, “Locating New Testament Writings”, p. 362 and 364.

¹⁵⁰ SANDNES, *Early Christian Discourses*, p. 163.

relationship to Gethsemane.¹⁵¹ In the Coptic *Gospel of the Savior*, verses 45-59 show development in the content: Jesus prays on the Mount of Olives for Israel's salvation but is invited to extend his prayer to all of humanity, a version also supported by Origen, Jerome, and Epiphanius.¹⁵² As in Heb 5:7, Jesus cries while praying (*GosSav* 45.53).¹⁵³ In a 2008 article, I proposed connecting these two Jesus crying stories¹⁵⁴. They are rooted in a traditional motif attested by several sources: the “prayer in tears”, often done on one's knees and born from Jewish traditions, then used by Judeo-Christians, including in Heb 5:7. To summarize the sources attesting to it, the Jewish background of a supplication prayer with tears can be found in Philo (*Quis rerum divinarum heres sit* 1-29), and has been proposed by Harold Attridge and Patrick Gray as the background of Heb 5:5-10¹⁵⁵. While Marguerite Harl explained that Philo developed in this text a “Levitic spirituality” of the suppliant (ικέτης, § 124)¹⁵⁶, Valentin Nikiprowetzky completed the analysis by cleverly considering that Hellenistic Judaism had borrowed the Greek topos of the ικετεία.¹⁵⁷ I strengthened this proposal for Heb 5:6-10 and the *Gospel of the Savior*.¹⁵⁸

The “prayer in tears” of a suppliant on his knees has coursed its way through Jewish and Judeo-Christian sources and traditions,¹⁵⁹ and is clearly described in this passage of Justin of Neapolis: “For who of you knows not that the prayer of one who accompanies it with lamentation and tears, with the body prostrate, or with bended knees, propitiates God most of all?” (DialTry 90.5).¹⁶⁰ The motif was running in both milieus at least until the third century CE, including some interactions as attested by Origen, who was in touch with “three Hebrew people” commenting on the prayer with tears.¹⁶¹ The priestly tone of this Levitic supplication, found under the pen of Philo, is echoed in the figure of James as told by Hegesippus, a story highlighted by Simon Mimouni¹⁶² and Yaron Eliav: James is represented as “the prototype of

¹⁵¹ CLIVAZ, *L'ange et la sueur de sang*, p. 590-608.

¹⁵² C. CLIVAZ, “L'Évangile du Sauveur, He 5,7 et la prière de supplication : en quête d'autres traditions sur la prière au Mont des Oliviers”, *Apocrypha* 18 (2007), p. 109-137 (115-117).

¹⁵³ J. FREY, “Leidenskampf und Himmelreise. Das Berliner Evangelienfragment (Papyrus Berolinensis 22220) und die Gethsemane-Tradition”, *BZ* 46 (2002), p. 71-96 (84).

¹⁵⁴ “As far as I know, nobody has compared the tears of Jesus in *GosSav* 45.53 with He 5.7” (C. CLIVAZ, “Hebrews 5.7, Jesus' Prayer on the Mount of Olives and Jewish Christianity: Hearing Early Christian Voices in Canonical and Apocryphal Texts”, in R. BAUCKHAM, D. DRIVER, T. HART, N. MACDONALD (eds), *A Cloud of Witnesses, The Theology of Hebrews in Its Ancient Contexts, Library of New Testament Studies*, London/New York, 2008, p. 187-209 [195]).

¹⁵⁵ P. GRAY, *Godly Fear: The Epistle to the Hebrews and Greco-Roman Critiques of Superstition*, Atlanta, 2003, p. 201; H. W. ATTRIDGE, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, Philadelphia, 1989, p. 151.

¹⁵⁶ M. HARL (ed.), *Philon d'Alexandrie. Quis Rerum Divinarum Heres Sit. Introduction, Traduction et Notes*, Paris, 1966, notably p. 130.

¹⁵⁷ V. NIKIPROWETZKY, “Les Suppliants chez Philon d'Alexandrie”, *Études Philoniennes*, Paris, 1996², p. 11-43.

¹⁵⁸ CLIVAZ, “L'Évangile du Sauveur, He 5,7 et la prière de supplication” ; CLIVAZ, “Hebrews 5.7”, p. 187-188.

¹⁵⁹ See, for example, 2 Sa 15.30; Apoc Sedrach 14.2-4; 1st ApocJa 30.30-31.1; 2nd ApocJa 62.15; 4 Ezra 8; Acts of Paul 9.14; Avot-de Rabbi Natan A 3.

¹⁶⁰ JUSTIN MARTYR. *Dialogue with Trypho* 90.5, T. B. FALLS (trans), Washington, DC, 2003, p. 140.

¹⁶¹ See ORIGEN, *Selecta in Ezechiel* 9.4-6, PG 13, col. 801, l. 1-3; the motif is presented as a Jewish one, not a Judeo-Christian one, see CLIVAZ, “L'Évangile du Sauveur, He 5,7 et la prière de supplication”, p. 123. Unfortunately, this 2021 handbook does not consider Lk 22:43-44, transcribing Lk 22:39-46 without the two verses (B. D. CHILTON et al., *A Comparative Handbook to the Gospels of Matthew and Luke*, Leiden, 2021).

¹⁶² S. C. MIMOUNI, *Jacques le Juste, frère de Jésus de Nazareth*, Paris, 2015, Kindle edition l. 4815 : James is represented as having a permission “que seul un grand prêtre peut recevoir, à la limite un prêtre ou un lévite, mais jamais un étranger à la classe sacerdotale. Cette description, évidemment magnifiée, renvoie à celle d'un grand prêtre officiant lors de la fête de *Yom Kippour*, car lui seul est autorisé à entrer dans le Saint des Saints”. J. PAINTER, author of a 1999 monograph about James (*Just James*, Fortress Press, 1999), does not comment the topic in his recent article “What James Was, His More Famous Brother Was Also”, in A. AVERY-PECK et al. (eds), *Earliest*

the High Priest entering the holy of holies on the Day of Atonement”,¹⁶³ a background also present in Heb 5:5-10¹⁶⁴. Whereas Heb 5:5-10 and Hegesippus confirm the association of Jesus and James with a priestly figure praying for others, GosSav 43-55 confirms that the “suppliant prayer in tears” motif has been associated with the Mount of Olives prayer at a certain moment. But is it possible to say more about this junction?

The motif of the “prayer in tears” draws a renewed attention to Jesus kneeling in Lk 22:41, as a significant attitude, at a particular moment. But the prayer on the Mount of Olives is also described by Luke as Jesus habit (Lk 22:39). It is consequently plausible that, after the death, of Jesus, James has wished to pursue this regular intercession until he had knees “like a camel’s”,¹⁶⁵ and in the Temple, the place where the third Gospel ends (Lk 24:52-53). But when Luke starts to write, the situation has drastically changed: no more Temple and no more James. As he explains in Lk 1:1-4, he tries to present the events in a way “good to him”, distancing himself from certain interpretations. In my opinion, Luke highlights the singular aspect of the prayer on the Mount of Olives, a final and intensive one, and so distinguishes it from a necessary repeated prayer. The memory of James is around, but not named. Readers have then continued to be divided about the exact scope of the payer on the Mount of Olives: if Heb 5:7 remains allusive to it, GosSav validates its association with the “prayer in tears”, whereas Justin distances himself from this motif, negating that Moses or somebody else would have prayed with lamentation and tears, and bended knees.¹⁶⁶

In this interpretative landscape, the figure of the angel will confirm the empowering prayer on the Mount of Olives as a very ancient interpretation. Some later sources have then put words in its mouth: the angel’s silent presence (v. 43) and Jesus’ silent prayer (v. 44) have been points of early developments and divergencies about Lk 22:39-46.

4.2 From a silent to a talking angel

Whereas ancient sources have been curious to know more about Jesus’ silent prayer, modern scholars did not pay attention to this point in Luke 22:43, nor to the silent angel. But at least six ancient sources or authors transmit words told by the angel to Jesus at Gethsemane.¹⁶⁷ Three

Christianity within the Boundaries of Judaism, Leiden, 2016, p. 218-237. It just provides a canonical comparison between the Synoptic Gospels and the Epistle to James.

¹⁶³ Y. Z. ELIAV, “The Tomb of James, Brother of Jesus, as Locus Memoriae”, *HTR* 97 (2004), p. 33-59: here p. 37.

¹⁶⁴ See, for example, G. GELARDINI, “Hebrews, an Ancient Synagogue Homily for Tisha Be-Av: Its Function, Its Basis, Its Theological Interpretation”, in G. GELARDINI (ed.), *Hebrews: Contemporary Methods – New Insights*, Leiden, 2005, p. 107-127.

¹⁶⁵ According to Hegesippus, quoted by EUSEBIUS, *HE* II.23, 5-6.

¹⁶⁶ JUSTIN MARTYR. *Dialogue with Trypho* 90.5-6, p. 140: “For it was not because Moses so prayed that the people were stronger, but because, while one who bore the name of Jesus (Joshua) was in the forefront of the battle, he himself made the sign of the cross. For whom of you knows not that the prayer of one who accompanies it with lamentation and tears, with the body prostrate, or with bended knees, propitiates God most of all? But in such a manner neither he nor any other one, while sitting on a stone, prayed. Nor even the stone symbolized Christ, as I have shown”.

¹⁶⁷ EPIPHANIUS *Ancoratus*, 37.4-7; *Panarion* 5.62.7; some sentences of Epiphanius can be also found in a later scholion (J. CRAMER [ed], *Catena Graecorum Patrum in Novum Testamentum. Tomus II in Evangelia S. Lucae et S. Joannis*, Oxonii, 1844, p. 159); THEODORUS OF MOPSUESTIA, *Contra Ap. Fragment 4*; ANSELMUS, *Dialogus Beatae Mariae et Anselmi de Passione Domini, Patrologia Latina* 159, p. 273A; *Historia Passionis Domini*, Seq. Lc 22, in K. ALAND (ed), *Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum. Locis parallelis evangeliorum apocryphorum et patrum adhibitis*, Stuttgart, 1986, p. 457; the Syriac *Book of Hierotheos* 2.21.43.

others mention the fact that it happened at Gethsemane,¹⁶⁸ whereas others report that an angel spoke to Jesus at a certain time,¹⁶⁹ starting with John 12:29.¹⁷⁰ This finding, first published in 2010,¹⁷¹ should attract more consideration in the debates surrounding Luke 22:43-44. These sources signal developments and speculations in early Judeo-Christian and Christian circles around Luke 22:43-44. While scholars have largely commented on the bloody sweat, the silent angel deserves more attention.

In Blumell's impressive overview of the outside evidence of Luke 22:43-44, he correctly points to the importance of Epiphanius' work, supporting the exclusion of the verses and also quoting the words of the angel.¹⁷² Epiphanius attributes the omission of Luke 22:43-44 to "orthodox people" (ὀρθόδοξοι δὲ ἀφείλαντο τὸ ῥητόν), unable to understand the power of these words.¹⁷³ But Blumell sets aside the *Historia Passionis Domini*, even if it connects the talking angel to the *Gospel of the Nazoreans*.¹⁷⁴ Epiphanius and the *Historia Passionis Domini* have to be considered in the list of the sources mentioning a talking angel in order to get a more complete overview of the question at hand. In this section, I both summarize and further investigate the main elements of the sources that explicitly mention the words of the angel, setting aside those who simply mention that the angel spoke to Jesus or just allude to it.¹⁷⁵ As we will see, the study of this section leads us to draw attention to Hippolytus of Rome on Luke 22:43-44, in the second century CE.¹⁷⁶

The six sources or authors who mention the angel's words can be classified into three groups. First, Theodorus of Mopsuestia¹⁷⁷ and the later *Book of Hierotheos* 2.21.43¹⁷⁸ present a viewpoint that each reader could deduce from Luke 22:43-44: the angel encourages Jesus to take on his coming death with courage. In both passages, one can detect no clue of an external source, and the talking angel could be here as a simple prosopopoeia literary phenomenon. Secondly, the *Historia Passionis Domini* and the *Dialogus Beatae Mariae et Anselmi de Passione Domini*: the *Historia* passage refers to the Anselmus' "elegy" (*Anselmus in planctu suo*), which I have been able to identify as a passage of the *Dialogus*:¹⁷⁹

¹⁶⁸ Allusions to the angel's words: scholion about Ps 68,14-15 LXX (*Patrologia Graeca* 27, p. 309; attributed sometimes to Athanasius or to Origen, but Gilles Dorival helped me to identify this scholion as a later production); PSEUDO-DIONYSIUS of ALEXANDRIA, *Exegetical Fragments* on Luke 22:43-44; PSEUDO-DIONYSIUS THE AEROPAGITUS, *Celestial Hierarchy* 4,4,181C-D; HILARIUS OF POITIER, *De Trinitate* 10.39-42 could also be considered in this category.

¹⁶⁹ *Quest Barth* 1,9; TERTULLIAN, *De carne Christi* 14.34.

¹⁷⁰ C. CLIVAZ, "D'autres disaient qu'un ange lui avait parlé' (Jn 12,29)," in A. DETTWILER, U. POPLUTZ (eds), *Studien zu Matthäus und Johannes / Études sur Matthieu et Jean, Festschrift für Jean Zumstein zu seinem 65. Geburtstag / Mélanges offerts à Jean Zumstein pour son 65^{ème} anniversaire, Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments*, Zürich, 2009, p. 169-185.

¹⁷¹ CLIVAZ, *L'ange et la sueur de sang*, p. 508-544.

¹⁷² Blumell also attributes this scholion to Chrysostomus, but it is obviously later and contains some Epiphanius statements. For example, Blumell claims that "a scholium attributed to John Chrysostom gives an interesting explanation for the appearance of the angel. [...] It argues that the angel came to fulfill a prophecy uttered by Moses (Odes 2:43) and merely pronounced a doxology upon Jesus" (BLUMELL, "Luke 22:43-44", p. 27). But this information stands already in EPIPHANIUS, *Ancoratus* 37.4; see footnote 172 above and CLIVAZ, *L'ange et la sueur de sang*, p. 533-534.

¹⁷³ EPIPHANIUS, *Ancoratus* 31.4.

¹⁷⁴ BLUMELL, "Luke 22:43-44," p. 27, footnote 79.

¹⁷⁵ See footnotes 169-171 above.

¹⁷⁶ HIPPOLYTUS OF ROME, *Contra Noetum* 18.2 and *Commentary of Ps 2.7*, frag. 18.

¹⁷⁷ THEODORUS OF MOPSUESTIA, *Contra Ap. Fragment* 4. Quoted in CLIVAZ, *L'ange et la sueur de sang*, p. 511.

¹⁷⁸ Quoted in CLIVAZ, *L'ange et la sueur de sang*, p. 510, note 326.

¹⁷⁹ See CLIVAZ, *L'ange et la sueur de sang*, p. 498.

Angelus Domini apparuit ei confortans eum et dicens: “Constans esto, Domine, modo genus humanum redempturus es”.

An angel of the Lord appeared to him, comforting him, and saying: “Be constant, Lord, you will save the human race.”¹⁸⁰

Added to the encouragement is the idea that Jesus will save the human race, mentioned also in *GosSav* 49-53 as previously mentioned in 4.1. But this passage could also look like a prosopopoeia, if it was not quoted in the *Historia Passionis Domini* f. 32r, next to an obvious mention of an external source, the *Gospel according to the Nazoreans*:

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 Lc 22 [Et factus est sudor eius...].¹⁸¹

Here follows Luke 22. But an angel from heaven appeared to him and comforted him. How the angel comforted Christ in the agony of his prayer is told in the Gospel of the Nazoreans. And the same is described by Anselmus in his elegy. For the right time had come for the Lord, by his passion, to redeem the generation of men who were born of Adam. Here follows Luke 22. And he sweat.¹⁸²

The fourteenth century manuscript of the *Historia Passionis Domini* is unfortunately inaccessible to scholars since several years.¹⁸³ Read and studied by Bernhard Bischoff, it was introduced to Kurt Aland and Albertus Klijn by Bischoff.¹⁸⁴ Its quotations and allusions of the so-called *Gospel of the Nazoreans* were reported by Schneemelcher¹⁸⁵ and have been republished without further data by Marksches and Schröter in the *Antike christlichen Apokryphen*.¹⁸⁶ This evidence tends to disappear out of the scholarly landscape: Petri Luomanen devotes not even a line to the *Historia Passionis Domini* in his 2012 monograph *Recovering Jewish-Christian Sects and Gospels*.¹⁸⁷ The case of Luke 22:43-44 in the *Historia Passionis Domini* is one more reason for which it would be crucial to have access to this manuscript and evaluate it more deeply. It should be noted that it also reports a development of Luke 23:34a by the *Gospel of the Nazoreans*: Jesus' prayer for ignorant people was effective and resulted in conversions. As one knows, Luke 23:34a is also absent from P⁷⁵, and the two omissions may be related.¹⁸⁸ For the scope of this article, I have tried to contact some librarians in Germany to see if the manuscript was still known and may be included in Bischoff's papers and heritage. Unfortunately, no one knows who the owner of the manuscript is today. The *Monumenta Germaniae Historica Archives* summarizes the existing information on its website.¹⁸⁹

¹⁸⁰ PSEUDO-ANSELMUS, *Dialogus Beatae Mariae et Anselmi de Passione Domini*, PL 159, p. 273A. My English translation.

¹⁸¹ ALAND, *Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum*, p. 457. The last four words have been added by A. F. J. KLIJN, *Jewish-Christian Gospel Tradition*, Leiden-New York-Copenhagen-Köln, 1992, p. 143.

¹⁸² KLIJN, *Jewish-Christian Gospel Tradition*, p. 143.

¹⁸³ See F. BOVON, *L'Évangile selon Saint Luc*, vol. 4, Geneva, 2009, p. 241, footnote 16.

¹⁸⁴ ALAND, *Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum*, p. 585; KLIJN, *Jewish-Christian Gospel Tradition*, p. 23, note 61.

¹⁸⁵ W. SCHNEEMELCHER (ed), *New Testament Apocrypha*, R. MCL. WILSON (trans), vol. 1, Westminster, 2003, p. 163.

¹⁸⁶ C. MARKSCHIES, J. SCHRÖTER (eds), *Antike christlichen Apokryphen in der deutscher Übersetzung. I. Band: Evangelien und Verwandtes*, Tübingen, 2012⁷, p. 647.

¹⁸⁷ P. LUOMANEN, *Recovering Jewish-Christian Sects and Gospels*, Leiden-Boston, 2012.

¹⁸⁸ CLIVAZ, *L'ange et la sueur de sang*, p. 481-498.

¹⁸⁹ See https://www.mgh-bibliothek.de/archiv/k/K_00195_19.htm, point 6.

While the first examined sources adhere to a rather “low Christology,” the third group of sources puts completely different words in the angel’s mouth.¹⁹⁰ Epiphanius *Ancoratus* 37.4-7 is the most developed passage, starting with Phil 2:10 to state that Jesus is superior to the other angels (*Anc.* 37.4). The angel is said to bow down in front of Jesus while proclaiming a doxology (*Anc.* 37.7). Then, Epiphanius refers to a quotation of the “great song” of Moses (Deut 32:43 LXX, in *Anc.* 37.4-5)¹⁹¹ in order to explain that to “strengthen” Jesus means to proclaim a divine doxology. All the angles proclaim the “strength” of God (δύναμις and ἰσχύς). Having put his interpretative framework in place, Epiphanius concludes by quoting the angel’s words (*Anc.* 37.7):

Καὶ διὰ τὴν ὑπερβολὴν τῆς θαυμασιότητος ἐν τῇ δοξολογίᾳ ὁ ἄγγελος ἔλεγε προσκυνῶν· σὴ ἔστιν ἡ ἰσχύς, δέσποτα· σὺ γὰρ ἰσχυσας κατὰ θανάτου καὶ κατὰ Ἄιδου καὶ κατὰ διαβόλου, συντριῖσαι τὸ κέντρον αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐκβαλεῖν ἀπὸ τῆς ἀνθρωπότητος¹⁹².

And because of the extravagance of the astonishment in praise, the angel, bowing in worship, was saying: “Yours is the strength, master, for you had strength over death (and over Hades and over the Devil), to crush its sting and cast it away from humanity”¹⁹³.

Based on the song of Moses, the interpretation is one of a “strong” Jesus, whose power and force are proclaimed by an angel bowing down in front of him (ἐν τῇ δοξολογίᾳ ὁ ἄγγελος ἔλεγε προσκυνῶν), a scene witnessed by the disciples (*Anc.* 37.5). In other words, Epiphanius tries to present Jesus as strengthened by an angel in a way that is audible for the “orthodox people.” This “strong Jesus” is also present in Ephrem’s reading in *De Virg.* 36.2, as we have seen. Epiphanius is of course involved in the struggles of his time - notably against Arius, but his focus on the angel makes us more attentive to a special voice among the ancient accounts of Luke 22:43-44, Hippolytus of Rome. With Justin and Irenaeus, Hippolytus belongs to the earliest witnesses of the passage, and is even the first one to speak about the angel, as noted by François Bovon.¹⁹⁴ He is one of the last promoters of the Logos theology and was considered a “ditheist” by Zephyrinus and Callistos.¹⁹⁵ He refers to Luke 22:43-44 in two passages:

Contra Noetum 18.2: ποτηρίον πάθους παραιτεῖται, ὁ διὰ τοῦτο παραγεγονῶς ἐν κόσμῳ, καὶ ἀγωνιῶν ἰδροῖ καὶ ὑπὸ ἀγγέλου ἐνδυναμοῦται, ὁ ἐνδυναμῶν τοὺς εἰς αὐτὸν πιστεύοντας καὶ θανάτου καταφρονεῖν ἔργῳ διδάξας.¹⁹⁶

He requests that the cup of suffering be taken away, the cup for which he came into the world and, struggling, he sweats and is encouraged by an angel that he is the one who gives power to those who believe in him to defeat death, as he taught in Acts.

Commentary of Ps 2.7, frag. 18 ποτήριον πάθους παραιτεῖται, καὶ ἀγωνιῶν ἰδροῖ, καὶ ὑπὸ ἀγγέλου δυναμοῦται, καὶ ὑπὸ Ἰούδα παραδίδοται.¹⁹⁷

¹⁹⁰ EPIPHANIUS *Ancoratus*, 37.4-7; *Panarion* 5.62.7; CRAMER, *Catena Graecorum Patrum*, p. 159.

¹⁹¹ Deut 32:43 LXX is quoted in He 1:6 and Rm 15:10, as well as in Ode 2:43 in the Codex Alexandrinus. For Raymond Brown, Deut 32:43 LXX is the background explaining at the best Luke 22:43, see BROWN, *La mort du Messie*, p. 229.

¹⁹² EPIPHANIUS, *Ancoratus* 37.7, G. EMMENEGGER (ed), Fribourg, 2021, <https://bkv.unifr.ch/works/112/compare/698/151520/130>

¹⁹³ EPIPHANIUS, *Ancoratus* 37.7, Y. R. KIM (trans), Washington D. C., 2014, p. 116.

¹⁹⁴ BOVON, *L’Evangile selon Saint Luc*, 2009, p. 252.

¹⁹⁵ CENTRE D’ANALYSE ET DE DOCUMENTATION PATRISTIQUES (ed), *Biblia Patristica. Index des citations et allusions bibliques dans la littérature patristique*, vol. 1, Paris, 1975, p. 373.

¹⁹⁶ HIPPOLYTUS, *Contra Noetum* 18.2, SIMONETTI (ed), p. 187. My English translation.

¹⁹⁷ HIPPOLYTUS, *Commentary of Ps 2.7*, frag. 18., G. N. BONWETSCH- H. ACHELIS (eds), Leipzig, 1897, p. 146. My English translation.

He requests that the cup of suffering be taken away, and, struggling, he sweats and is encouraged by an angel and betrayed by Judas.

In these early, uncommon accounts, we see the angel making Jesus “powerful,” giving him power - with the δύναμις vocabulary. This double terminology δύναμις / ισχύς associated with an angelic experience is present in Hos 12:5 LXX for Jacob (καὶ ἐνίσχυσεν μετὰ ἀγγέλου καὶ ἠδυνάσθη), for example. The second point in the Hippolytus interpretation is the idea that the “empowerment” is a cause for concern for some people, particularly those who believe in Jesus. He is at the same time empowered by the angel and also empowers others (ὁ ἐνδυναμῶν τοὺς εἰς αὐτὸν πιστεύοντας). These elements attributed by the Apostolic Father to Luke 22:43-44, can be found in the *Pastor of Hermas*, in general statements about prayer. The *Pastor* would have been read by Hippolytus, as argued by Carolyn Osiek,¹⁹⁸ who notes that the *Pastor* is the most read writing by early Christians until the fifth century CE.¹⁹⁹ We can verify that similar ideas are present in Hippolytus and in some passages of *Hermas*. For example, an empowering prayer with the help of an angel is narrated in Sim. 5.4.4:

But the Lord is extraordinarily compassionate and unceasingly gives to those who ask of him. But you, who have been strengthened by the holy angel (σὺ δὲ ἐνδεδυναμωμένος ὑπὸ τοῦ ἐνδόξου ἀγγέλου), and have received from him such power of intercession and are not sluggish, why do you not ask for understanding from the Lord, and receive it from him?²⁰⁰

Sim. 9.1.2 explains that δύναμις and ισχύς are necessary to be able to see an angel; in case of weakness of the flesh, the spirit can first empower the believer, enabling him/her to see an angel.²⁰¹ This background was largely present in the minds of early Christian thanks to the *Pastor*. Through the Hippolytus account, we learn that this background has been linked to Luke 22:43-44 at least by the end of the second century. A Jesus empowered by an angel fits well with the “outside of orthodox boundaries” theology of Hippolytus, whereas Epiphanius, two centuries later, strongly affirms that Jesus did not need additional strength. This was not the perspective of the people writing and reading the *Gospel of Peter*. In Pet 5:19, on the cross, Jesus cries out “my Power (δύναμις), my Power, thou hast forsaken me,” which is a special version of Ps 22:2 LXX.²⁰² A Jesus empowered by an angel and being victorious through prayer and sweating may have sounded odd in Orthodox ears: the writing of Hippolytus allows one to listen to minor readings of Luke 22:43-44. Epiphanius and subsequent sources show that the later developments of the Lukan prayer have a focus on the talking angel, but in a quiet orthodox way: the angel kneels down and celebrates the *doxa* of Jesus, encouraging him in the face of death. This orthodox interpretation of the angel reveals *a contrario* what was at stake earlier. Having paid attention to the neglected points in the recent research on Lk 22:43-44—the Judeo-Christian memories of the scene with the silent prayer and the silent angel—Part 5 will present the most probable reasons for the omission of Lk 22:39-46 in Egypt in the early second century.

¹⁹⁸ C. OSIEK, *Shepherd of Hermas. A Commentary*, Minneapolis, 1999, p. 4.

¹⁹⁹ OSIEK, *Shepherd of Hermas*, p. 1.

²⁰⁰ HERMAS, *The Pastor* Sim. 5.4.4, M. HOLMES ET AL. (eds), Grand Rapids, 2007, p. 576-577.

²⁰¹ HERMAS, *The Pastor* Sim. 9.1.2, HOLMES ET AL. (eds), p. 618-619: “For since you were too weak in the flesh, it was not explained to you by an angel; but when you were given power by the spirit and grew strong in your strength (ἐνδυναμώθης διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος καὶ ἴσχυσας τῇ ἰσχύϊ σου), so that you could even see an angel”.

²⁰² The *Gospel of Peter* is available again : H.A.G. HOUGHTON, M. MONIER, “Greek Manuscripts in Alexandria”, *JThS* 71 (2020/1), p. 119-133 (122, note 5): <http://antiquities.bibalex.org/Collection/Detail.aspx?lang=en&a=522>.

5. Conclusion: an omission in its geo-historical context

Considering the scholarship of the last ten years regarding Luke 22:43-44, this article has underlined a progressive shift in research. The consideration of external evidence leans in favor of the omission, first in the category of manuscript evidence. Indeed, neither \mathcal{A}^{13} , nor C^{mg} (2.1.2), nor the *Historia Passionis Domini* (4.1) are signs of another source for the passage. A reassessment of the date of 0171 by Clarysse and Orsini (2.1.1), as well as the omission of Luke 22:42 in P^{69} (2.1.3), indicate the presence of three different versions of Luke 22:39-46 in Egypt at the third century, starting with 0171, followed by P^{75} and P^{69} . If the discovery of P^{75} in 1961 has fostered a new step in the discussion of Luke 22:43-44, the reconsideration of the date of 0171 indicates the next one.

The indirect evidence is seen as strong and diverse (3.2); the presence of v. 42 in the pericope illustrates Jesus' human weakness, even without Luke 22:43-44, and fails to support the hypothesis of an anti-docetic interpolation (2.1.3 and 3.2). Regarding the full scope of internal support, the chiasm argument has been set aside by almost all authors (2.2). The meaning of $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\omega\nu\acute{\iota}\alpha$ in Luke 22:43 is now often recognized as the word "fight," in addition to or instead of the word "anxiety" (3.1). Differences are still present in the evaluation of the agon-motif in regard to the rest of the Lukan gospel, even if it has been clarified that Jesus is not without emotions in Luke (3.2 and 3.3). Another important shift in research is the apparition of readings supporting the interpolation of Luke 22:43-44, but considering the scene in connection with the rest of the pericope (Brown, Eckhard, Gil, Sandnes, Tabb, and Voorwinde).

In step with these changes in scholarship, Blumell supports the omission of the passage and proposed to explain it as an apologetic action to counter Greco-Roman critics. But this explanation is not convincing as the most ancient one, since the saying on the cup (v. 42) was highly disturbing in the Greco-Roman culture: to withdraw only vv. 43-44 would not have been an efficient apologetic solution (3.2 and 3.3.). The later and particular P^{69} fits well with such debates. Looking for a plausible explanation, part 3 has highlighted the importance of the Jewish and Judeo-Christian memories around the scene, and part 4 has analyzed two neglected points in research: the silence of Jesus' second prayer and the silence of the angel in v. 43. Interpretations were birthed from these silences. In the *Gospel of the Savior* for example, Jesus wishes to pray for Israel on the Mount of Olives but is invited to pray for the human race (4.1); from the fourth century, sources and authors have put words in the mouth of the angel (4.2). The efforts of Epiphanius to keep the angel clearly subordinated to Jesus leads one to be attentive to the work of Hippolytus: the reading of a Jesus empowered by an angel through prayer reveals earlier debates at play (4.2). But why an omission in Egypt in the first half of the second century CE, some decades before the writings of Hippolytus?

The explosive political context in Egypt at the beginning of the second century CE, added to the fact that the Christianity essentially existed as Jewish communities at that time, allows us to understand what happened to Lk 22:39-46 in this framework. The ancient martyrdom reading of these verses had many reasons to be successful among the Judeo-Christian communities of Alexandria/Egypt. Associated with the memory of the repeated prayer of James, the image of Jesus praying on his knees and empowered by an angel acquired a tone of political resistance.²⁰³ The idea that other people could also experiment with empowering prayers²⁰⁴ was appropriate

²⁰³ The atmosphere of oppression was being all the stronger than taxes had increased enormously in the years before the Diaspora Revolt, see W. CLARYSSE, "Identifying Jews and Christians: the evidence of the papyri," in P. LANFRANCHI and J. VERHEYDEN (eds), *Jews and Christians in Antiquity. A Regional Perspective*, Leuven, 2018, p. 81-100 (89-96).

²⁰⁴ See HERMAS *Sim.* 5.4.4. and the comment of Hippolytus on Lk 22:43-44.

to raise enthusiasm under political pressure. In this framework, the repeated intercession of James for Israel can logically have been seen as the next step of the prayer of Jesus.

After the Diaspora Revolt, such a martyrdom reading became embarrassing for the surviving Judeo-Christians and Gentile Christianity. The memory of James, with his persistent prayer for Israel in the Temple, became out of agenda for several groups. I suggest that P⁷⁵ attests to a reading of Luke that has cut all links with the memory of James, omitting not only Lk 22:43-44, but also Lk 23:34a, a sentence placed on James lips during his martyrdom.²⁰⁵ P⁷⁵ may have copied an exemplar produced in a milieu similar to this one of the *Epistle of Barnabas*. Joseph Méléze-Modrzejewski describes this letter, written around 130 CE, as conveying anti-Jewish ideas but with a deep knowledge of Judeo-Christian traditions.²⁰⁶ Belonging to this kind of milieu, some groups of the Christian Alexandrian communities, in the first half of the second century CE, distanced themselves from the political martyrdom memory of the empowering prayer of Jesus, omitting Luke 22:43-44, and making the angel silent. But memories last a long time. Two centuries later, Epiphanius “has been reminded” of Lk 22:43-44: Μέννημαι δὲ τοῦ ῥητοῦ τοῦ κατὰ Λουκᾶν εὐαγγελίου.²⁰⁷

²⁰⁵ EUSEBIUS, *HE* II.23, 16 ; about Lk 23:34a, see CLIVAZ, *L'ange et la sueur de sang*, p. 481-498.

²⁰⁶ J. MÉLÈZE-MODRZEJEWSKI, *Les Juifs d'Égypte. De Ramsès II à Hadrien*, Paris, p.186 : “Dès le règne d’Hadrien, un texte comme la *Lettre de Barnabé*, rédigé dans un milieu non-gnostique vers 130 ou 132 de n.è., traduit déjà cette rupture par la tendance résolument anti-juive dans sa manière de traiter les traditions judaïques qu’il véhicule”. It should be noted that the complete text of this epistle stands in the Codex Sinaiticus immediately after the Revelation and before the *Pastor of Hermas*. As remembered in 2.1.1., \aleph^{*2} has Luke 22:43-44, whereas \aleph^1 does not, which attests to the debates raised by the passage through centuries.

²⁰⁷ EPIPHANIUS, *Ancoratus* 37.1, KIM (ed), p. 115: “I have been reminded of the saying of the Gospel of Luke”.