

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Expository Times* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[Issue]_[1st page of article].pdf

Pharisees, they lay it on Caiaphas and the chief priests.

It seems now to be fairly certain that it was in Egypt, and not in Palestine, that God was first worshipped as one God. Akhenaton was a monotheist.

In the year 1375 B.C. Amenophis III. died, the last of the great warrior kings of the XVIIIth dynasty. He was succeeded by his son Amenophis IV. Amenophis IV. was thirteen years of age when he came to the throne. Within five years he completely overthrew the official religion, transferred the capital of the country from Thebes to El Amarna, and established the worship of one god.

When Amenophis IV. changed his religion he changed his name. Amenophis means 'Amun is satisfied.' The revolt which he headed was against the tyranny of Amun and his priests. He called himself Akhenaton, which means 'the Disk is pleased.' For now he worshipped the Aton or disk of the sun.

What led this lad of nineteen to make such a change in the religious life of Egypt? No one can tell. It was a revolt against the priesthood of Amun. That much is clear enough. But little else is clear. Once it was believed that the hand of his mother Ty was in it. And Ty was understood to have been a Syrian princess. Hence the

conclusion that we had a parallel in Egypt to the influence of Jezebel in Israel. But the tomb and the bodies of Yuia and Tuia, the parents of Ty, have been discovered, and it is sure enough that both were of Egyptian blood. So 'the theory of a Syrian origin for Akhenaton's reform has had its day and will not return.'

This is the opinion of Mr. T. Eric PEET, writing in *The Journal of the Manchester Egyptian and Oriental Society*, No. IX. (Longmans; 5s. net). Mr. PEET attributes the revolution to Akhenaton himself. In Egypt boys develop early. Akhenaton had an exceptionally early development. Perhaps he had what is called a genius for religion. In any case he made the mighty change before he was nineteen, the most momentous change that up till then religion had ever undergone.

For Mr. PEET has no doubt that Akhenaton was a monotheist. It has been doubted quite recently in *The Journal of Oriental Research* by Dr. Samuel MERCER, on the ground that a true monotheism 'involves the suppression of all gods but the one, and that such a complete suppression cannot be proved in the case of Akhenaton.' Mr. PEET concedes that at first, it may be, only the name of Amun was expunged from the monuments. But the rigorous erasure of the plural word 'gods' distinctly points to monotheism, and Mr. PEET is convinced that, if all the evidence is taken into account, the religion of Akhenaton was a truly monotheistic religion.

Jesus and the Four Men.

BY THE REVEREND JAMES MOFFATT, D.D., D.LITT., PROFESSOR OF CHURCH HISTORY IN THE UNITED FREE CHURCH COLLEGE, GLASGOW.

JESUS was sentenced and perhaps even crucified by nine o'clock in the morning; He died six hours later. Between the morning and the afternoon of this, His last day on earth, He met four men for the first time. Probably there were hundreds who had

never seen the famous Prophet from Galilee until He hung before their eyes upon the cross, but in less than twelve hours He had come into special touch with these four men, along different paths and with very different results.

I.

The first of the four was the Roman governor Pilate.

It was the first time that Jesus had met any of the authorities. John the Baptist had faced Herod, but Jesus in the far, provincial life of Galilee had never had the opportunity of coming across the civil or military authorities. He knew of them by hearsay. Once He had said, 'Those who wear soft clothing live in kings' palaces,' and when He met Pilate He met a man whose fibre of conscience had been softened and relaxed. Pilate was one of the people who do not hesitate upon occasion to allow professional life to make short work of moral considerations. What occupied his mind was how to keep on good terms with the suspicious emperor at Rome, how to retire in a few years without incurring any fresh unpopularity in his province. His patron at court had died, and it behoved him all the more to avoid giving offence to those touchy Jews, who might ruin his political career by complaining of him to the emperor. He would have liked to see justice done to Jesus, but he felt he could not take the risk of insisting on His acquittal.

If self the wavering balance shake,
'tis rarely right adjusted.

Pilate was putting his private interests first. He is the representative of those who weaken their powers of choice by repeated acts of selfishness, till upon some great occasion the secret flaw stands revealed, to their own inner disgust and to the surprise of outsiders. Sometimes a notable failure throws light upon what has been going on under the surface of life for a number of years; it is the outcome of a hidden course of action, of self-gratification at all costs, an easy-going choice of what is smooth and pleasant, which drifts people unawares into a false position. It was so with Pilate. Jesus did not meet a moral monster in Pilate. He met in him what He meets in many people still, a life weakened by the love of popularity, by the habit of moving along the line of least resistance, by the tacit consideration of one's own safety first, by the inability to face what is unpleasant. We may hate personal sacrifices. We may contrive to evade duty on a small scale. But this self-indulgence will make us slip from one deception to another, until we are incapable—

until we render ourselves incapable—of siding with God and doing what we know to be right. 'I have power to release you,' said Pilate to his prisoner. Officially he had. Morally he had frittered away that power. He was not an unjust man. He was not careless about his work; he heard the evidence patiently. No, he was simply a man who found himself unable to be just, because it would have cost him more than he could well afford. His sense of duty, his better mind, all had to be set aside, because under the circumstances his personal interests demanded it.

II.

During the preliminary stages of the trial, as Pilate was doing his best to avoid a decision, it occurred to him, as a happy way out of the difficulty, to let Herod Antipas have the opportunity of trying the prisoner. Jesus belonged to Herod's jurisdiction. Well then, let Herod look after the case! It was a cheap compliment to the princelet, and a relief to himself.

To Pilate Jesus was a troublesome case, of which he would be glad to be rid; to Herod He was welcome as an object of curiosity, to fill up a dull hour. Court-life is often dull, especially when it is the life of a second-rate, dependent little potentate, like Herod. The Jewish prince was as anxious to see this remarkable working man from Galilee as the Roman Governor was glad to wash his hands of Him. But Herod's love of sensation, mixed with a superstitious craving, was not gratified. Jesus refused to say a word to him, much less to perform a miracle in his presence, not because He was too tired, but because He had no words for a man who wanted a sort of religious performance in private to amuse him. Pilate failed because he felt, to his regret, that he could not afford to defy public opinion. Herod was in a position in which he did not need to please any one except himself, and he failed because his nature was frivolous. Pilate had never heard of Jesus before. Herod had often heard of him. But the Jewish princelet had no moral interest aroused by what he had heard, and the interview proved empty.

Nothing will ever come of the attitude which regards Christianity as a sensation or a spectacle. The faith of Christ has no message for those who merely wish to see it work outside their own lives, as one more phase of religious fervour. It

only annoys and puzzles such persons. Their idea is to watch Christianity display its powers, without committing themselves. They are willing to listen to it, to hear what it has to say or what can be said for it, with a patronizing air of detached interest. But they disqualify themselves by this very attitude. The meaning of it eludes them. When Jesus met Herod He met this temper of superficial curiosity, and He had nothing to say to it. He never has. Christianity as the religion which is religion holds together three ideas, the idea of power, the idea of righteousness, and the idea of love. Herod had no interest in any of them, except perhaps in the idea of power, and for him power in religion meant, not the power which subdues the conscience in awe and reverence, but the tricks of a religious conjurer. There was nothing for him in Jesus, no sense of moral need to be met. He was an idle, irresponsible creature. He expected from Jesus what Horace Walpole expected from John Wesley, when he went patronizingly to what he called 'Wesley's opera.' And he was equally disappointed, equally blind to the religious force before him.

It has been argued that the only things a man ever knows thoroughly are the things he has to know. This is not a law without exceptions, but it holds true in our religion. We may know a good deal about Christianity if we choose, but we can only know it, we can only know what Jesus means to us, as we realize this is a matter of life or death. There is an interest in Christianity which is superficial and frivolous, the interest taken by people who treat it as onlookers treat something with which they feel at liberty to amuse themselves now and then. But Jesus never appeals to us upon that level. He comes before us to subdue the heart, not to gratify the curiosity. His secret is hidden from us when we imagine we are in a position to patronize Him or to use His religion as a means of passing the time.

III.

These men missed their chance. But it was not so with the third and the fourth. They belonged to a humbler rank of life; in one sense they had fewer opportunities of being ready to receive the influence of Jesus, but both of them responded to Him.

The third was a native of Northern Africa, a Jew who had apparently come to Jerusalem for

the festival. He happened to meet the procession, and was curtly ordered by the soldiers to relieve Jesus of the heavy cross. Since Simon's two sons, Alexander and Rufus, are afterwards mentioned as members of the Church, we may infer from that circumstance, and also from the explicit reference to his name in the Gospels, that he became a Christian.

Now, the first introduction that Simon the Cyrenian had to Jesus had nothing attractive about it. He was simply commandeered to perform a distasteful bit of duty, enlisted by the troops to carry out the execution of a criminal in whom he had not the slightest interest. But probably, as he waited on beside the cross to see what happened, the impression of Jesus touched him. At anyrate this forced service was the beginning of his Christian experience. Herod was intensely glad to see Jesus, and yet he made nothing of it; Simon had no enthusiasm to begin with—rather the reverse. But he became a disciple.

So it happens, now and then, that we are brought into contact with the realities of religion by a sudden and even unwelcome turn in our affairs. Had Simon been left to himself, that forenoon, he would never have turned to follow Jesus to the cross. Humanly speaking, he owed his very soul to what seemed at first an extremely vexatious interference with his personal liberty. But when he looked back to it, he recognized in that disturbing interruption the hand of God. There are people who can understand what Simon felt. It is not uncommon to find that some distasteful piece of work which has been forced upon us, some position of awkwardness, some upset of our plans, has brought us into touch with a person or a truth of life which alters our whole view of the world. Life would be a far poorer thing for many of us if we had merely done as we pleased all along. Mercifully it has been otherwise. You and I have had to shoulder responsibilities which we disliked, to do things which we did not want to do, to go in some directions against our wills, and to undertake tasks which we told ourselves angrily were never meant for people like us. And—and, as we bent to them, perhaps with an ill grace at first, they have led us into far more than we dreamed of. There may be, there has often been, a sacrament in the things we have had to do against our will.

IV.

In an hour or two Jesus had another experience of the same kind. Simon was a man with life before him, a respectable citizen; the robber on the cross was a brigand, a pest of whom society considered itself well rid, a man with no more than the dregs of a wasted life. This was the fourth man whom Jesus met for the first time that day, and again the meeting was for good. In a dim way, this criminal felt a difference between Jesus and himself; he had enough rough sense of justice left to mutter a protest against the abuse heaped on Jesus; and then, not content with defending him, appealed with a vague, half-superstitious cry to the dying prophet at his side: 'Lord, remember me when thou comest in thy kingdom.' As if he had said, 'Don't forget me when *you* come into your kingdom!' The Romans had not forgotten him; they had not forgotten to put him to death in their kingdom. 'Jesus, remember me for life.' And instantly the Jesus who had refused to say a word to Herod replied to this dying robber, 'To-day shalt thou be with me in paradise.'

The point is, Jesus was not absorbed in His own pain. The personal agony He was suffering did not engross Him. Any acute suffering, in kind or in body, tends to drive us back upon ourselves. 'For the sick,' says Balzac, 'the world begins at their pillow and ends at the foot of the bed.' But Jesus had a word of hope for this outcast beside Him. And the incident deserves to be noted just on account of this. We commonly read it from the standpoint of the robber. We tell ourselves

rightly that the promise of Christ proves how wise and daring He can be in forgiveness. You can say tremendous things to a truly penitent soul. Jesus did, and never more so than here. But the incident has an even deeper meaning for us, from the side of Jesus. Even in His terrible suffering, He found work to do for God. It was not merely as He went up and down Galilee, in health and strength, that He served God and men; when the time of freedom was over, He moved Simon and this penitent robber through His passive endurance of pain and injustice. He could not stir a finger. He could only turn His head. The slightest movement caused Him sharp physical torture. Yet there went out something from His pure, patient, courageous spirit, something that had the power to impress others. This interview with the fourth man, therefore, reminds us that even when some handicap of ill-health falls upon us, when we can no longer do what we used to do, God has some influence to pass through us into the lives of some at our side. Life may cease to be happy; it may be deprived of its former buoyancy and verve; but life never ceases to be duty, it is never quite bereft of the power of telling upon others and, it may be, of drawing them to the feet of God. Up to the very end there was work to do for Jesus, and He did it, as we are called to do it, by lifting ourselves above our personal feelings, by checking fretfulness, by keeping a heart alive to the interests of other people.

They also serve who only stand and wait.

Yes, and they also serve who can only lie and suffer.

Literature.

PSYCHO-NEUROSIS.

'ONE of the most striking features of the war from which we have recently emerged—perhaps its most important feature from the medical point of view—has been the enormous scale on which it produced those disturbances of nervous and mental function which are grouped together by the physician under the heading of psycho-neurosis. The striking success in coping with the infectious diseases, which in all other recent wars have been

far more deadly than the weapons of the enemy, shows that modern medicine was prepared for this aspect of the war, and has ready for use the main lines of treatment which would take the sting from these scourges of warfare. Surgery also was forewarned and forearmed for its task of dealing with the wounds inflicted by modern weapons. Any increase in the deadly power of these weapons is due to the greater number they can reach rather than to the greater deadliness of the injuries they inflict upon the individual. Though surgery has