**39—46.**] CHRIST’S AGONY AT THE MOUNT OF OLIVES. Matt. xxvi. 36–46.  
Mark xiv. 32—42. John xviii.1. For all  
comment on the general narrative, see  
notes on Matthew. Our account is compendious combines the three prayers of  
our Lord into one, and makes no mention  
of the Three Apostles being taken apart  
from the rest. On the other hand it inserts the very important additional details of vv. 43, 44, besides the particularity of  
ver. 41, *“about a stone’s cast.”*

**42.**] The sentence is broken off at **me...  
If Thou be willing ;—let it be so.** The A.V.  
is not a correct reading in grammar.

**43.**] With the early and weighty evidence  
cited in my Gr. Test. in favour of verses  
43, 44, it is impossible that they should  
have been an apocryphal insertion. The  
was perhaps expunged by the  
orthodox, who imagined they found in it  
an inconsistency with the divine nature of  
our Lord. We have reason to be thankful, that orthodoxy has been better understood since. The strengthening by means  
of the angel is *physical—*and the appearance likewise. It is strange how Olshausen can have so far deceived himself as to  
imagine that **appeared unto him** can  
imply a merely inward and spiritual accession of strength from above. It is strange likewise that the analogy of the ministration of angles in the Lord’s former temptation should not have occurred to those  
modern Commentators who have objected to this circumstance as improbable.

This strengthening probably took place *between the first and the second prayer ;—*and the effect of it is, that **He** **prayed more  
earnestly,** ver. 44, and arrived at the entire resignation expressed in the second and third Payer of St. Matthew’s narrative.

**44.**] The intention of the Evangelist seems clearly to be, to convey the  
idea that the **sweat was** (not *fell* like, but  
*was*) *like drops of blood;* —i.e. *coloured  
with blood,* —for so I understand the **as it were,** as just distinguishing the drops *highly coloured with blood,* from *pure blood.*  
Aristotle, speaking of certain morbid states of the blood, says, “when the  
blood is watery, grievous disease ensues:  
for it becomes serous and milky, to such  
an extent that some have been known to  
*perspire a bloody sweat.”* To suppose that  
it only *fell like drops of blood* (why not drops  
of any thing else? and drops of blood *from* *what,* and *where?*) is to nullify  
the force of the sentence.

We must not forget, in asking on what testimony  
this rests, that the marks of such drops  
would be visible after the termination of  
the agony. An interesting example of a  
sweat of blood under circumstances of  
strong terror, accompanied loss of  
speech, is cited in the Medical Gazette for  
December, 1848. It occurred in the case  
of certain Norwegian sailors in a tremendous storm.

**45.**] **for sorrow—**  
the effect of anxiety and watching. The