

Now it is, without any question, the teaching of our Lord, and it is the teaching as assuredly of all the Apostles, that conversion—call it what you will, and make it what you please—conversion comes first. Till that has taken place, none of all the things of which Mr. STREETER has been speaking can begin. Conversion is the recognition of the 'if.' It may be recognized early in life or late, the recognition may be followed by a crisis, or an imperceptible drawing to God. But it involves always the acceptance of God in Christ as the beginning of a new life. Then follow all the things which Mr. STREETER has put before it—love to God and man, the acceptance of the cross, the doing of the will of God and the knowledge of the doctrine. Then follow also prayer, meditation, work, and what else there may be to aid us to keep in the love of God; and finally the assurance of a life that is eternal.

Our Lord never dreamt of saying to any one who had not faced that 'if,' Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and thy neighbour as thyself—*unless in order to make him face it.* When that interesting Scribe came asking, 'What must I do?' He answered, 'Keep the commandments.' The Scribe answered, 'Who is my neighbour?' It was his attempt to get over the 'if.' Jesus showed him that he could not get over it in that way. He showed him that there was no way of getting over it on his present course of life. No one can keep the commandments, however clearly he sees the sum of them, by simply keeping them. He must lay all that method aside and try another. And the other method to try is to begin at the beginning, repenting, trusting, loving. He must enter the new life as a child—or, as in the inimitable figure, he must be born again.

Study: Travel in New Testament Lands.

BY PROFESSOR ADOLF DEISSMANN, D.THEOL., D.D., BERLIN.

I.

Two visits to the East had greatly strengthened a conviction of mine, that in studying St. Paul far more than the usual amount of stress should be laid on the Eastern background of the Apostle's personality, and that literary knowledge of the East must be supplemented by travel. To this view I gave expression in my book on St. Paul¹; and it has fared with me as I might have expected. I have met with warm approval, especially from those who themselves know the East, and scornful repudiation, especially from those who obviously do not. The most valuable to me is the approval in principle of a man who, in the enthusiasm of his own great knowledge of Asia Minor gained by explorations extending over many years, objects to the shortness of my visits, though he fully recognizes the importance of the theory that guided me: I refer to Sir William M. Ramsay.²

¹ *Paulus*, Tübingen, 1911. (*St. Paul*, London, 1912.)

² *The Teaching of Paul in Terms of the Present Day*, second edition, London [1914], p. 447: 'But I am glad to

Greatly as I am pleased to have the approval, at least in principle, of this great pioneer scholar, I am no less astonished at the misconception underlying his detailed criticisms of my journeys. Sir W. M. Ramsay judges my travels by the explorer's standard,³ although I have always spoken of them as journeys for study purposes, never as explorations. Thus the proper point of view for considering the question is altogether shifted, and it is important for me therefore to go into the discussion in some detail. The gratitude and esteem I feel for Ramsay the traveller and Roman citizen would alone forbid me to ignore his criticism.

I have no intention to discuss here all the details of Ramsay's criticism. But all that I do not touch on here (the climate of Asia Minor, the zone of the olive-tree, the heights of places visited agree with him that geography is so important in Pauline study.)

³ For example, p. 443f., where he uses the word 'exploring' more than once.

by St. Paul, etc.) will be fully dealt with elsewhere in a special publication. I hope there to be able to show that every single statement questioned by Ramsay in my *St. Paul* is well founded, and I shall also attempt a detailed justification of my historical estimate of St. Paul in general.¹ Here, however, I wish merely to raise the problem of study-travel itself, and to discuss briefly the objects, methods, and results of such travel.

The subject of my remarks is study-travel, not exploration. In other words, the purpose of the journey is first of all receptive, not productive. The journey is receptive in the sense that it enables us by personal observation to supplement and put life into all that we have learnt from the researches and explorations of others. Of course the journey should be and will be productive in the indirect sense owing to the abundance of new impressions that are absorbed and go to enrich a man's knowledge, experience, and powers when he has returned home. This will all stimulate, promote, and enliven his scientific output. But study-travel does not claim to be and cannot be productive in the other sense, as if its objects were to excavate, to carry out topographical and meteorological investigations, collect epigraphical material, and so on. Of course, every one who travels with an open eye and makes the most of the facilities afforded him may come in for various bits of new material, but that is a by-product. I have therefore, as I said, never ventured to speak of my journeys undertaken for purposes of study as if they were exploration. I am too well acquainted with the history of the 'exploration' of Asia Minor and Palestine to do that. I have always made it clear that the object of my journeys was to supplement my study of books by seeing things for myself—to gain knowledge which to me personally is beyond price.

The prerequisite of every such journey is a thorough study of the published original records of the New Testament countries and the literature of modern research in the East. Only thus can the object of the journey be attained by travellers to whom (since most of them are engaged in teach-

ing) speed is a necessary consideration.² As regards the original records and the modern literature, it generally happens that they are better understood and appreciated after one's return than before. The study of books is the preparation for the journey, but the journey in turn promotes the understanding of the literature. I gladly confess that a single hour on the Mount of Olives or on the Mons Silpius has done more to make me understand Jerusalem or Antioch than days spent in the study of maps and books, and that the view from the castle hill or from the 'prison of St. Paul,' with its unforgettable wealth of impressions, first revealed ancient Ephesus to me and enabled me at length really to study the monumental work of the Austrians³ on Ephesus with full profit. Similarly, of Sir William Ramsay's writings, those are now the most profitable to me which deal with things I have seen with my own eyes. Others may have no need to see things in this way; I have the need, and I know many people constituted like myself, who do not find their bearings historically until they begin to see things as a concrete image in space.

As regards the organization of New Testament study-travel there is still room for considerable discussion, since much experience has yet to be gathered. Of one thing I am perfectly sure: the starting-point of the Eastern tour proper must certainly not be Egypt or Palestine. Jerusalem must come at the end, as the last great goal. If you arrive in the Holy Land, the poorer country, fresh from the overwhelming wealth of observations you have made in Egypt, or if you are put ashore at Jaffa straight from the luxury of a big European steamer and are then hurled at Jerusalem on its most unfavourable side, you may easily deprive yourself of one of the greatest experiences it is possible to have. Jerusalem will constitute a climax of spiritual experience, a crowning vision, if you have first by some weeks of Eastern travel accustomed yourself to what is offensive and paltry about the East—when you have learnt to overlook that and have acquired the ability to give yourself up to high mystery of the Holy City undisturbed by Western prejudices.

¹ It is a vast misunderstanding to consider, as Ramsay does, that my picture of St. Paul (especially my judgment of his letters and of his Greek) is a degradation of the Apostle. In my opinion the real greatness of the man's genius comes out all the more when he is viewed in contrast to the heights of ancient culture.

² This applies not only to most German professors, but to all others who are not blessed with the 'sabbatical year' of the Americans.

³ *Forschungen in Ephesos*, vol. i., Wien, 1906; vol. ii., 1912.

Therefore the natural starting-point for the New Testament journey is the great gate leading from West to East—Constantinople with its rich abundance of noteworthy objects, either of the past or of the present, valuable not least to the student of Biblical and Christian antiquity. In the present situation of political affairs¹ Macedonia and Achaia (Philippi, Thessalonica, Beroæa, Athens, Corinth) would come next. From Smyrna one might then visit Ephesus and the valleys of the Mæander and the Lycus (Laodicea, Hierapolis, Colossæ), then the apocalyptic cities Thyatira and Pergamum, Sardes and Philadelphia, from which the Anatolian Railway to Galatia and Lycaonia could be easily reached. Angora and Iconium should be visited during this part of the journey, and also Antioch in Pisidia,² Lystra and Derbe. From Iconium the route would cross the Taurus to Cilicia and (in years to come by the Baghdad Railway) to Alexandretta; by the Beilan Pass to Antioch in Syria, and thence viâ Aleppo and Baalbec to Damascus, Galilee, Samaria, Jerusalem, and its environs.

These are the 'New Testament' stages of the journey, and for the most part they are Pauline.³ But of course a journey for New Testament study will not be so barbarously organized as to ignore the purely classical and medieval antiquities en route, nor will the traveller be so indifferent to the world as to shut his eyes to phenomena of the modern East. Thus the programme is enlarged on all sides, and the more varied the traveller's interests are the more he will feel his knowledge of the Sacred Book increased in the land of the Book.

As regards the practical management of such a journey there is the experience of years to draw upon, especially that gained by the German archæological expeditions for study purposes in the South and East. On the tour to Asia Minor, Greece, the islands, and South Italy, admirably conducted in 1906 by Professor Friedrich von

¹ Ramsay (p. 441) reproaches me for not having visited Philippi. I greatly regret it myself. Whether a journey to Philippi would have been possible in the spring of 1909, when communication with Macedonia was made difficult for a long time by the military measures taken during the revolution, he does not say. Apart from this I was prevented by lack of time.

² It is also easy to extend the journey in the Lycus valley and go viâ Egerdir to Antioch, and thence to Konia.

³ In 1906 and 1909 I visited by far the greater number of these places, and certainly the most important of them. Ramsay reckons up the places where I have not been; how gladly would I make good this *ὀρέσθη*!

Duhn for the Government of Baden, I became acquainted with the details of management, and saw how, by the strictest economy of time, by taking the fullest advantage of all the means of transport, by making the most careful preparations for each part of the journey, by enlisting the services of the best authorities residing on the spot as guides and demonstrators, it is possible to achieve great things in a relatively short time. This procedure was my model in 1909.⁴ Of course it makes considerable demands on the physical powers; frequently it means the renunciation of all ordinary conveniences; the nights are employed for covering great distances by ship; the days are lengthened by beginning early and shortening the rests; but then, if the traveller is prepared by long study at home,⁵ all this yields results so large and concentrated that one gladly puts up with a double portion of fatigue when the day demands.

This kind of travel will certainly not suit everybody. An Italian archæologist who joined us in 1906 had been warned by his countrymen against doing so because the Germans conduct their study-tours with the speed and all the hardships of military manoeuvres on a field-day. That is not a bad description, but my heart beats higher when I think of my field-days in the Neckar valley near Tübingen, our hardships in the flooded plain of the Mæander and on the Mons Silpius near Antioch, or our adventures on the Lycus valley. Our Italian friend, moreover, soon became accustomed to 'active service.'

That Ramsay should find fault with the arrangements adopted for these journeys, and should call the most hurried American tourist 'leisurely' in comparison with me,⁶ is astonishing in more than one respect. I had always thought that the energetic and, as it seemed to me, exemplary 'hustle' associated with American initiative⁷ was largely an inheritance with the blood from Scottish

⁴ Ramsay is therefore not justified in representing my procedure as a special method of my own. I have only made use of the experience accumulated by approved specialists during the last half-century.

⁵ This must be insisted on again and again; and I think that I was not altogether unprepared when, at the age of forty, I visited the East for the first time.

⁶ P. 444.

⁷ I have a number of young American friends who have done their New Testament tour on exactly this plan, with great profit to themselves.

ancestry. Moreover, on Christmas Eve, 1908, though doubtless more important matters have driven it from his recollection, I had the wished-for opportunity of discussing with Sir William himself, who was then my guest, the plan of the second journey which I was to begin in February 1909; and I cannot remember even the hint of a warning from him against the speed with which I proposed to travel. And it was Ramsay whose authority induced me to give up a portion of the route (from Konia viâ Gulek Boghaz, the Cilician Gates, to Tarsus) which I had planned for March. After long correspondence with experts at Constantinople and Konia, it was his letter (Aberdeen, 2nd February 1909) that decided me:

'The enclosed cards of introduction should be useful to you in Tarsus and Mersina its harbour. As the weather is often very cold and wet or snowy in the Cilician Gates and on the Plateau, I would venture to suggest that you should take that part of your journey last. If you are going to Egypt,¹ it is far more enjoyable there in March, while in April the heat is often great and the north winds have not then begun to blow. In March Konia and that region are most uninviting, and the country is often literally untraversable except where there is a railway.'

Ramsay's expectation was not fulfilled: at Konia and its neighbourhood we had glorious spring weather, but I could not then change our plans for the journey, so that I did not visit Lystra and Derbe, nor Antioch in Pisidia, but went by rail from Afium Kara Hissar to Smyrna, and from there by sea to Mersina, where, as also at Tarsus, Ramsay had kindly given me introductions. On 18th March 1909, while I was on the steamer, I wrote to him at Aberdeen. Surely I am entitled to think it strange, after this personal consultation with Ramsay in 1908 and 1909, that he should in 1913 object² to my choosing the sea-route viâ Mersina instead of the land-route from Konia to Tarsus.

The complete itinerary of the Asiatic part of my second journey which Ramsay tries to reconstruct in order to prove the undue haste with which I travelled, is in some main particulars entirely wrong.

¹ I could not, however, put Egypt first and Asia Minor last, for the reason already given above.

² P. 443.

This is really rather comic. We ponder over the itinerary of St. Paul and try by taking much thought to make the fragmentary authorities yield up the secret, but how often do they remain silent, and we cannot get beyond our dotted lines on the map, which are often merely imaginary. And now the leading authority on ancient Asia Minor, one who has devoted his best powers to the itinerary of St. Paul, indulges in the satiric sport of reconstructing the itinerary of a living person, one of his own humble colleagues. When a postcard would have sufficed to discover the whole trivial truth, Ramsay makes ironical calculations—simply to show how completely he misses the mark in a matter where I am able to check him absolutely to the hour. In spite of this failure I should never be so irreverent as to draw thence conclusions as to the accuracy of his critical acumen in general; I have always defended Ramsay's common sense as a Biblical scholar against the over-subtle dialectic of German writers. But I cannot help thinking that with somewhat more calm and with the employment of the *φιλανθρωπία* which he abundantly possesses, Ramsay might have done better in this instance. The grateful respect I bear to the eminent Hadji Baba, whose merits are so many, compels me to put right a matter which in itself is of no importance whatever.

Ramsay calls my two tours of 1906 and 1909 'the two train journeys.'³ As a matter of fact, of the 57 + 66 = 123 days that I was travelling from Constantinople to Genoa (1906) and from Constantinople to Marseilles (1909), even if I add together all the quarters and eighths of days that I spent on the railway, altogether only 15 days went in getting about by train.⁴ Is it really possible to speak then of two 'train journeys'?

The first 25 days of March on my second journey (1909) are so reconstructed by Ramsay⁵ that he says: 'of 26 (!) days only 10 are free from trains and steamers.' As a matter of fact, reckoning the day from sunrise to sunset, I spent by the most liberal computation 10 days on the railway and on shipboard, and this left me with 15 days at my disposal. It is easy to see how Ramsay

³ P. 4.

⁴ Add to this 11½ days and 25 nights at sea, and 12 days of driving, riding, and walking; the rest spent in quiet study mostly on foot at the places themselves (84½ days).

⁵ P. 443f.

arrives at his wrong statements: for example, he puts down in the catalogue of my sins a whole day (16th March) for the embarkation (of 4 [four] persons) for Cilicia, whereas in reality the whole of the 16th March was available for seeing Smyrna, and the embarkation took place after sunset, in half an hour. Again, he puts down the 24th March for the journey to Alexandretta, whereas in reality, making the most of the night according to the German method, I went on board at Mersina on the evening of 22nd March and landed at Alexandretta at 7 a.m. on the 23rd. So too he reckons the railway journey from Mersina to Tarsus and back, which I did twice, as two days spent in trains, whereas the four journeys over a distance

of 41 kilometres (not quite 25 miles)—about the same as from Gourrock to Glasgow, a little more than from Gravesend to London—might be estimated together at about $\frac{1}{4}$ day.

The correction of Ramsay's reconstruction of my itinerary is less important, however, in my eyes than another question, to which I have now arrived: the question of the means of transport. This is bound to come into the discussion of a New Testament study-journey. Two questions especially suggest themselves: why the steamer and railway have to be seriously considered at all, and what results for the purposes of the journey are to be expected from the days spent on ship-board and in trains?

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF ROMANS.

ROMANS XV. 13.

Now the God of hope fill you with all joy and peace in believing, that ye may abound in hope, in the power of the Holy Ghost.

1. LANGUAGE seems inadequate to set forth all that God is to believing souls. The Apostle piles epithet upon epithet so as to express the thoughts which well up in his mind. In a previous verse he speaks of God as the God of patience, and as the God of comfort, and now he calls Him the God of hope. With such conceptions of God and His attitude toward His children it is not surprising that he should sketch the Christian experience in glowing colours and dwell upon its radiance, its riches, its glorious consummation.

2. Hope is not only one of the joys, but, in our present condition, it is the highest joy of all. And it is so because it bursts the barriers of the present existence, overleaps time's boundaries, clasps eternity in its hands, and crowns this life, though imperfectly, with the diadem of everlasting salvation. It imports into the Christian's life on earth the earnest, at least, of endless joys. Hence we are said to be 'saved by hope,' as if by the dawn of hope salvation were achieved in its completeness; and hence also hope is described as an 'anchor sure and steadfast, which enters into that within the veil,' fastening its flukes in heaven,

which is then in as close proximity to the Christian as the anchor fixed on the shore is to the boat to which the rope is bound. To him who has this hope, life in this world is uniformly joyful, though it be strewn with superficial sorrows; for it carries on its surface the luminous reflexion of the glorious endless life, as the ocean receives from the full-orbed moon the broad band of silvery light. To him who has this hope, the termination of his present existence is not a point of sadness in the prospect, but a welcome bridge that touches both worlds, conveying from joy to joy, and from glory to glory.

We have then for our subject our hope in Christ, and we shall consider:

(i.) Its source; (ii.) the means by which it is produced; and (iii.) the purposes which it subserves in Christian life.

I.

THE SOURCE.

1. 'The God of hope.' This new name for God is very characteristic of the Christian Dispensation. In the Old Dispensation, it was the God of history, He who had wrought wonders in Egypt and the Red Sea, He who had led His people like a flock through the waste howling wilderness, the God of their progenitors Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob,