

ing that by the faithful use of the same spiritual arithmetic, would come the same power and blessing in the future.

XII. THE ARITHMETIC OF STEADFAST HOPE.

Ro 8¹⁸: 'For I am reckoning (λογίζομαι) that the sufferings of this present season are not worthy to be compared with the coming glory to be revealed towards us.'

The Apostle is here putting down in two parallel columns the great facts, experiences, and hopes of present sufferings and future glory. On the one side he puts down a long list: tribulation, persecution, and other sorrows (Ro 8³⁵). As he writes down the various elements of his past and present experiences the list grows longer and longer until he can say, 'we were reckoned as sheep for slaughter' (v. 36). Then he commences his balance-sheet, and on the other side he places Christ and all the present grace and future glory stored up in Him (Ro 8¹⁹⁻³⁹). Then he adds up his two columns of figures, and the result is overwhelming

in its proof of the smallness of the amount of suffering compared with the huge total of glories to be revealed. This is the true arithmetic of life, the mathematics that takes every factor into account, that works by the law of spiritual 'proportion,' and whose conclusion is thus based on the certainty of spiritual law.

N.B.—Assuming Hebrews to be Pauline, He 11¹⁹ comes in here: 'Having reckoned (λογισάμενος) that even out of dead people God was able to raise him.' This was a marvellous feat of spiritual arithmetic, for there had never been a previous experience of anyone else doing the same sum!

The Apostle urges us to be 'imitators of him' (1 Co 11¹). It will be well for us to do so among other things in regard to our spiritual arithmetical calculations. If the accurate keeping of accounts is a mark of true life and a test of genuine character in things temporal, much more are the methods of spiritual calculation laid down by the Apostle a proof positive of a sound, strong, and vigorous Christian life.

Recent Biblical and Oriental Archaeology.

BY PROFESSOR A. H. SAYCE, LL.D., OXFORD.

The Kasdim.

WHO were the Kasdim of the Old Testament? The question is not so superfluous as it looks; for though Kasdim in the plural denotes the Babylonians, Kesed in the singular was an Aramæan (Gn 22²²), and neither the one nor the other has been found in the cuneiform inscriptions. Various attempts have been made by Assyriologists to explain the name, since it was first discovered that the Kaldâ or Chaldæans with whom the Kasdim had been identified were an Aramæan tribe in the marshes south of Babylonia, and that though *sd* might become *ld* in Assyrian, the converse change could not take place. Nearly forty years ago I suggested that the name represented the Assyrian *Kasidi* or 'conquerors,' and for a long while this was the accepted explanation of it. But as our knowledge of Babylonian history progressed, the explanation was shown to be impossible, and other suggestions were accordingly put forward. One of them was that Kesed or Kasdim was

Kardu, an abbreviated form of Kar-Duniyas, a name given to northern Babylonia after the Kassite conquest; another, that Kasdim was derived in some way from Kassu, 'Kassite,' itself. Then I pointed out that Kasda actually occurs as the name of a district adjoining Babylonia (*W.A.I.* iii. 66. 31), and *Kasdû* as a word signifying 'the earth' (81. 2-4, 287). But nothing of this was free from objections.

At last, however, a satisfactory explanation of the name can be offered, which I gather from a note in his recently published *Grundriss der Geographie und Geschichte des alten Orients* (p. 187, n. 4) has already occurred to Professor Hommel. Babylonia was called by the Sumerians the Edin or 'Plain' (Ass. *tšêru*), a word which was borrowed by the Semitic Babylonians under the form of Edinnu. It came to signify 'the country' as opposed to 'the city,' and is the term used in the phrase, 'the beasts of the field.' Thus in an inscription of Entemena, king of Lagas (B.C. 4000), the *edin Lagas* is the district or territory of Lagas.

The *edin* was bounded by the *gu* or 'bank' of the Euphrates or Tigris, *Kisad* in Semitic Babylonian; Entemena, for example, describes the canal which separated the territory of Lagas (*Tells*) from that of Jokha as extending from 'the Great River'—apparently the Euphrates—to Gu-Edin, 'the Bank of the Plain,' which later on in the same inscription (Col 5⁹) is defined as the bank of the Tigris. Similarly Khammu-rabi in one of his letters speaks of 'the bank of the river of Eden' (*Kisad nâr Edinna*). The cultivated land of Babylonia, it will be seen, was thus divided between the Eden or Plain, and the *Kisad* or River-bank.

Kisad is the Hebrew *Kesed*; and since the Aramæan tribes lived on the banks of the Euphrates and its tributaries, according to the Assyrian inscriptions, we can understand how *Kesed* came to be the uncle of Aram. Arphaxad, which Schrader has long since shown to be 'the boundary (قفا) of *Kesed*,' and thus the equivalent of the Sumerian *Edin*, naturally represents the Babylonians, while for those who dwelt westward of the Euphrates—*Ebir-nâri*, 'beyond the river,' as it was called in later days—the inhabitants of the *Kisad* or River-bank would give their name to the rest of the native population of the Babylonian plain. Indeed, Babylon was built on the *Kisad* rather than in the *Edin*, and so, too, was 'Ur of the Chaldees,' מְהַגְ הַמְמָה (2 S 8¹).

The expression 'Metheg-ammah' has long puzzled the commentators. Some time back I pointed out that it is Assyrian, and was the name given to the coast-road of Palestine which had fallen into the hands of the Philistines after the expulsion of the Egyptians, and the possession of which gave David the military control of the country. It is, in fact, the Assyrian *metiq ammati*, or, as it would be written in the Babylonian of the Tel el-Amarna tablets, *metiq ammati*, 'the high road of the coast-land.' The Sumerian equivalent would have been *Kharran Sarsar* (*W.A.I.* v. 18. 32), and *Sarsar* was a Sumerian title of 'the land of the Amorites.' *Ammati* was a rare word, confined, so far as we know, to poetry, and it was, I believe, derived from the borrowed Hittite *amma*, 'land.' *Amma*, written *Am* and *Ammi* in the Tel el-Amarna tablets, denotes northern Syria in the Hittite texts.

But whatever be the derivation of *ammati*, the

interesting point is that we have a Hebraized Assyrian phrase in the fragment of David's annals preserved in 2 S 8. Were the annals written in Assyrian and in cuneiform characters like the pre-Israelitish literature and correspondence of Canaan? We have lately learnt from Mr. M'Alister's excavations that Assyrian was still used at Gezer in the reign of Manasseh. Or was *metiq ammati* a technical phrase which survived only in the military language of the country? At all events, the fact that *ammati* has been changed into מְהַגְ, unless due to copyists, goes to show that the phrase was still understood when 2 S 8 was written.

The actual annals of David and Solomon, with the events arranged in years as in the annals of the Babylonian and Assyrian kings or of the king of Gebal in the Golénischeff papyrus, must have perished before the compilation of the Books of Samuel, and only fragments of them are preserved. Hence it is that the beginning of the war with Hadadezer is narrated in a later chapter (10), and that it is only with Solomon's successor Rehoboam that the exact length of the kings' reigns comes to be known. The sole explanation of this can be that the royal annals had been destroyed when Jerusalem was sacked by Shishak in the fifth year of Rehoboam—the year, in fact, in which the exact chronology of the kings of Israel and Judah first begins.

The war with Hadadezer gave David the control of Western Asia as far as the banks of the Euphrates. The decisive battle took place when Hadadezer was on the march 'to restore his boundary-stela at the Euphrates,' where he had set it up in imitation of Thothmes III., who had erected similar 'boundary-stelæ' at the same place. From chap. 10 it would appear that Ammon was tributary to Hadadezer, like the rest of the country northward of Moab and Israel; David, accordingly, crossed the Jordan into Ammon, and there pursued the Syrians along the road which leads through Damascus and Homs to the north. This brought him to Aleppo, the Khalman or 'land of Khalma' of the Assyrian inscriptions, and the district south-westward of Carchemish, whose inhabitants are called Akhlamê in the Assyrian texts, Khalammê on the Hittite monuments. In Khalma or Khalma-n we have plainly the Helam of 2 S 10¹⁶, to which the Aramæans from the eastern side of the Euphrates had succeeded in

making their way. In Josephus the name (which has been transformed into that of a person) appears as Khalaman (cf. the Sept. Χαλαμάκ for Heb. חלמאן).

The epoch of Hadadezer coincides with that of the Assyrian king Assur-irbi, who, as we learn from Shalmaneser II., lost Syria; 'the king of the land of Aram' having captured Pethor and Mutkinu, which commanded the passage of the Euphrates and the high road to the Mediterranean. For about a century Assyria was thus shut off from Syria, where, accordingly, David and Solomon were allowed full freedom of action. 'The king of the land of Aram,' who had driven the Assyrians back

from the Euphrates, was probably Hadadezer. With his overthrow all Aram west of the Euphrates passed into the hands of David; Hamath naturally became tributary, and it is not surprising that Solomon in the earlier part of his reign should have built forts there (2 Ch 8^{3,4}, where the Chronicler seems to imply that he had suppressed a rebellion in 'Hamath of Zobah'; cf. 1 K 11^{24,25}). At all events the battle of Helam and the subsequent reduction of Damascus brought Syria under Israelitish supremacy, and extended the boundaries of David's empire to Tiphseh on the Euphrates (1 K 4²⁴). North of that came the Hittites, whom David took care not to disturb.

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF JEREMIAH.

JEREMIAH XXXI. 3.

'The Lord appeared of old unto me, saying, Yea, I have loved thee with an everlasting love: therefore with lovingkindness have I drawn thee.'—R.V.

EXPOSITION.

'The Lord appeared of old unto me.'—The Church of the faithful Israel is the speaker. 'From afar?' (so we ought to render, rather than 'of old') she sees Jehovah, with the eye of faith, approaching to redeem her; comp. Is 40¹⁰ 50²⁰ (only that in these passages it is to Jerusalem, and not to Babylon, that Jehovah 'comes' as the Redeemer); also the promise in Ch 30¹⁰, 'I will save thee from afar,' and Ch 51⁶⁰ (Septuagint reads, 'unto him'; but an abrupt change of person is not uncommon in Hebrew).—CHEYNE.

'Saying, Yea, I have loved thee.'—'Saying' is inserted to make the connexion plainer. The genius of Hebrew does not require such a distinct indication of a change of speakers as our Western languages. For other instances of this, see Gn 4²⁵ 26⁷ 32²¹, 1 K 20³⁴.—CHEYNE.

'Therefore with lovingkindness have I drawn thee.'—Some translators render, *I have preserved (or respited) thee*; others, *I have continued my lovingkindness to thee*, as in Ps 36¹⁰ 109¹²; but the LXX, Vulg., and Luther agree with the English Version, and it finds sufficient support in the meaning of the Hebrew verb and in the parallel of Hos 11⁴.—PLUMPTRE.

THE SERMON.

Lovingkindness.

By the Very Rev. John Tulloch, D.D., LL.D.

To every thoughtful and awakened mind the

most vital of all questions is, 'Am I an object of Divine care?' When clouds are all around our lives we fail to see the Divine love shining behind. At such moments, when all is dark and we feel ourselves the sport of an unknown fate, there is wonderful power to soothe and enlighten in the old words of Scripture. 'I have loved thee with an everlasting love' comes like fragrant balm upon our smitten heart, and awakens the slumbering chords of faith and hope.

Let us look at the different aspects of these words.

i. *Divine love is a fact.*—There can be no doubt about the teaching of Scripture on this subject. The God of the Bible is a God of love, He is a Father in heaven. We are like sheep, constantly wandering; but He is the good Shepherd who spends His time looking after the sheep and bringing back the strayed ones. The fact of Divine love is the very core of the Gospel, though it is sometimes hard for us to realize it. It encounters two obstacles within us—our fear and our pride. Many of us realize our sin so strongly that we can more readily believe that God is angry with us than that God loves us. We fail to distinguish between the sin and the sinner. But still more of us are kept from God by our self-sufficiency. We feel as if the powers of nature were strong in us; we trust in God's good nature