drowsiness overpowered them. Luke has  
however only *kneeled down*, which is  
not so full as our account.

**prayed]**Stier finely remarks: ‘This **was** in truth  
a different prayer from that which went  
before, which John has recorded.’ But  
still in the same spirit, uttered by the  
same Son of God and Redeemer of men.  
The *glorifying* (John xvii. 1) begins with  
suffering, as the previous words, *the hour  
is come*, might lead us to expect. The  
‘power over all flesh’ shews itself first as  
power of the conflicting and victorious  
spirit over *his own flesh*, by virtue of  
which He is ‘one of us.’

St. Mark  
expresses the *substance* of the prayer, and  
interprets *cup* by *hour*. St. Luke’s report  
differs only in verbal expression from St.  
Matthew’s. In the address, we have here  
and in Luke **Father**—in Mark *Abba,*  
*Father*. In all, and in the prayer itself,  
there is the deepest feeling and apprehension  
in the Redeemer’s soul of *his Sonship  
and the unity of the Father*—the  
most entire and holy submission to His  
Will. We must not for a moment think  
of the Father’s *wrath* abiding on Him  
as the cause of his suffering. Here is  
no fear of wrath,—but, in the depth of  
His human anguish, the very tenderness  
of filial love.

The variation in Mark and Luke in the  
substance of the prayer, though slight, is  
worthy of remark.

**if it be possible,**—*all things are possible with thee,—if  
thou be willing*. All these three find their  
union in one and the same inward feeling.  
That in the text expresses, ‘If, within the  
limits of thy holy will, this may be ;’—that  
in Mark, ‘All things are (absolutely) possible  
to Thee—Thou *canst* therefore—but  
not what I will, but what thou *wilt:’*—  
that in Luke, ‘If it be thy *will* to remove,  
&c. (Thou canst): but not my will,  
but thine be done.’ *The very words used*by our Lord, the Holy Spirit has not seen  
fit to give us; shewing us, even in this  
solemn instance, the comparative indifference  
of the *letter*, when we have the  
inner *spirit*. That our Lord should have  
uttered *all three* forms of the prayer, is  
not for a moment to be thought of; and  
such a view could only spring out of the  
most petty and unworthy appreciation of  
the purpose of Scripture narrative.

**pass from me]** as we should say of a  
threatening cloud, ‘It has *gone over.*’  
But what is the *cup* or *hour*, of which our  
Lord here prays that it may *pass by?*  
Certainly, not the mere present feebleness  
and prostration of the bodily frame: not  
any mere section of his sufferings—but  
*the whole*—the betrayal, the trial, the  
mocking, the scourging, the cross, the  
grave, and all besides which our thoughts  
cannot reach. Of this all, His soul, in  
humble subjection to the higher Will,  
which was absolutely united and harmonious  
with the will of the Father, prays  
that if possible it may pass over. And  
this prayer *was heard*—see Heb. v. 7—  
“*in that he feared*”—on account of His  
pious resignation to the Father’s will, or  
*on the ground of* it, so that it prevailed—  
He was strengthened from Heaven. He  
did indeed drink the cup to the dregs—  
but He was *enabled* to do it, and this  
*strengthening* was the answer to his prayer.

**nevertheless not as I will....]**The Monothelite heresy, which held *but  
one will* in the Lord Jesus, is here plainly  
convicted of error. The distinction is  
clear, and marked by our Lord Himself.  
In his *human soul*, He willed to be freed  
from the dreadful things before Him—but  
this human will was overruled by the  
*inner and divine purpose*—the will at  
unity with the Father’s will.

**40.]** St. Mark agrees, except in relating the  
beginning of the address in the *singular*—  
—no doubt accurately—for it was Peter  
(“Simon, who was no *Peter* on this occasion,”  
Stier), who had *pledged himself to  
go with him to prison and death.*

The question is literally **could ye thus not  
watch...**?—it implies their *utter inability,*  
as shewn by their present state of slumber,  
**Are ye so entirely unable**, &c.

**one hour** need not imply that our Lord had  
been absent *a whole hour:*—if it is to be  
taken in any close meaning, it would be  
that the *whole trial would last* about that  
time. But most likely it is in allusion  
to the *time* of our Lord’s *trial*, so often  
called by that name.

**41.]** St. Luke gives  
this command at the beginning and end