



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

### Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

### About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

Digitized by Google

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA

AND

THEOLOGICAL REVIEW.

CONDUCTED BY

B. B. EDWARDS AND E. A. PARK,  
Professors at Andover,

WITH THE SPECIAL CO-OPERATION OF

DR. ROBINSON AND PROF. STUART.

---

VOL. I.

---

LONDON:  
WILEY AND PUTNAM,  
1844.

fig to him, he took it in his hand, held it up as a child would do, cried out, Great Diogenes, and then returned it to the giver. Three things, he remarked, are needful for becoming a learned man, talents, instruction, practice. Having heard that he had been reviled by a certain one, he exclaimed, Let them scourge me, while I am absent from them.—When asked, What is the difference between the learned and the unlearned, he replied, The same as between the living and the dead. In prosperity, he said, is learning an ornament; in adversity, a refuge. To the question, What is a friend? he answered, One soul dwelling in two bodies. Some men, he remarked, live as sparingly as if they were never to die, others, as prodigally, as if they were to live no longer. To the question, Why do we love to converse with beautiful persons, he replied, It is the question of a blind man. What good have you received from philosophy? was once asked him, and he responded, I have learned to do of my free will, what others do through dread of the laws. How may learners make the greatest progress, was another question which he answered thus, By following those who go before, and not waiting for those who come after. To a loquacious man who had poured forth many words in his presence, and then inquired, Have I not wearied you, he replied, *Mà Ai'* no, I have not been listening to you.—To the query, How ought we to treat our friends, his response was, As we wish them to treat us." The last is one among the many *morceaux* of this heathen sage, in which he feebly anticipates the wisdom of an after time.

[To be concluded in the next Number of the Review.]

---

### ARTICLE III.

INTERPRETATION OF THE NUMBER 666 ( $\chi\zeta\epsilon$ ) IN THE APOCALYPSE (13: 18)  
AND THE VARIOUS READING 616 ( $\chi\iota\epsilon$ ).

By Ferdinand Bonyar, Professor of Theology in the Frederic-William University, Berlin.  
Translated from the "Zeitschrift für speculative Theologie," 1836. Vol. I. Part II. By Rev.  
Henry Boynton Smith, West Amesbury, Ms.

AFTER the almost innumerable interpretations and applications which the "number of the beast," ( $\alpha\rho\iota\theta\mu\acute{o}\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \theta\eta\rho\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu$ ) has received since the earliest Christian antiquity, from Irenæus to our own

times, it may appear difficult, if not impossible, to succeed in a new attempt. Many may think it only a fruitless task. But, so long as we have not a satisfactory interpretation, the introductory challenge of the author of the Apocalypse, "*Let him that hath understanding count the number of the beast,*" still sounds as a living warning in our ears. Hence the diligent reader, and, above all, the careful interpreter, will ever feel himself impelled anew to the solution of the proposed problem; and this feeling should be strong in proportion to the importance of such a solution to the right understanding of the whole book. The later commentaries have made a great advance towards a correct interpretation of this part of Scripture.

It is not necessary to give the many unsuccessful interpretations of this passage, as preliminary to the exhibition of our own views. J. C. Wolf, and the works which he cites, as well as Hartwig and Heinrichs, give a very copious, although somewhat incomplete register of them. We will begin at once, from what we consider the correct position of the matter, as Ewald has stated it. He justly remarks, that the general application of the number presents no difficulty; for, the name of a Roman emperor, perhaps of Nero himself, must necessarily be contained in it. But there is a two-fold difficulty attending the elimination of the *definite* name. For, in the first place, the reading is questionable, as is well known. Irenaeus found not only the common reading, 666, but also the number 616. And, secondly, it may be questioned, whether John based himself upon the Hebrew or the Greek language; and, hence, in determining the number,  $\chi\xi\zeta'$  or  $\chi\iota\varsigma'$ , whether we are to make use of the numerical value of the letters of the one alphabet or of the other. On this account, Ewald has reduced the choice to only two interpretations; which he, at the same time, divides between the two readings and languages. 1. According to the usual reading, and the value of the letters in the Greek language, we have, *Αρειος*, that is,  $30+1+300+5+10+50+70+200=666$ . This, as is well known, is the interpretation given by Irenaeus. 2. According to the other reading, and the value of the letters in Hebrew, we have, קיסר רומ *Caesar Romae*, [Emperor of Rome,] that is,  $100+10+60+200$  and  $200+6+40=616$ .

Considering for a moment, these two interpretations, apart from the reading, we think that the second is to be unhesitatingly preferred. For, in general, it seems improbable, that an artificial designation, current only among the Jews, should be reckoned in the Apocalypse by the value of the letters in a strange language. EV.

ery interpretation, then, is to be rejected, which is based upon any other value of the letters, than that which they have in the Hebrew language. A special reason against the first interpretation is also to be found in the vagueness of the designation—Latin; for, in the number, as must be acknowledged, is intended to be concealed a designation of an individual, as definite as possible.

The second interpretation, Caesar Romae, that is (Caesar being taken as the designation of the imperial rank) emperor of Rome, comes nearer to satisfying this intention. But it presupposes the correctness of the reading, 616; and rejects the usual reading, 666, which Irenaeus found in all the ancient and exact manuscripts. And it rejects this reading as spurious, on almost the same grounds, on which it is received as genuine in the first interpretation; that is, that it originated in the desire to get a round number.

Our own interpretation is as follows. In the number, we have the value of the letters in Hebrew, that form the name of Nero himself, as this is given in the Talmud, and other rabbinical writings:  $\text{נריון קסר} = 50 + 200 + 6 + 50$  and  $100 + 60 + 200 = 666$ . And when we add, that along with the Grecian and Hebrew pronunciation of his name, the shorter Roman pronunciation also existed, Nero Caesar, and that this, in Hebrew, is written  $\text{נרו קסר} = 50 + 200 + 6$  and  $100 + 6 + 200$ , which together make up 616; the ancient various reading is also entirely accounted for.

The correctness of this interpretation has, thus, a double voucher.

---

## ARTICLE IV.

### THE STRUCTURE OF THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO MATTHEW.

By Dr. C. A. Harless, Professor of Theology in Erlangen, Bavaria. Translated by Rev. Henry Boynton Smith, West Amesbury, Ma.

[The following dissertation was published, as a University Programm, at Erlangen, in 1842. Its author is principally known by his elaborate Commentary upon the Epistle to the Ephesians, which appeared in 1834. This has been cited, even by German critics, as being the model of a commentary. And it is no less dis-

---

<sup>1</sup> The fuller form,  $\text{נריון קסר}$ , is usually found in Jewish writings; e. g. Thalm. Bab. Gittin. Fol. 56 a. But this comes from the same effort to be clear, which makes them, in the same place.  $\text{עינה בירה}$  for  $\text{בירה}$ , etc.