

J. A. BENGEL — “Full of Light”

ANDREW HELMBOLD, Ph.D.

Among the luminaries of the Lutheran Church, none should shine brighter than Johann Albrecht Bengel, who has met the underserved fate of being known only in academic circles. Yet he certainly was the greatest Biblical scholar of his century, and made more lasting contributions to Biblical studies than many more famous men. The purpose of this article is to point out those contributions. To do so one must look at Bengel's life and character, for his studies were the direct result of his own spiritual experience.

Bengel as a Christian

Bengel was born to a Lutheran parsonage family at Winnenden, Germany, on June 24, 1678. He lost his father at the age of six. As a child he read Arndt's *True Christianity* and Francke's *Introduction to the Reading of the Scriptures*.¹ Thus early was he influenced by the pietistic movement, although he never became a pietist. In later life he used Arndt's work and Francke's *Sermons* and Muller's *Hours of Refreshing* in family devotions. He completed his theological education at Tübingen in 1706. Then followed a curacy at City Church, Tübingen, a period as theological repentent at his *alma mater*, another curacy at Stuttgart, and a professorship at Denkendorf (1713-1741) which he left only to serve as prelate of the church. His home was blessed with twelve children, but six died in infancy. His comfort in his hours of sorrow was that “if a vacancy has been made in his family circle, another vacancy had been filled up in heaven.”² At his death, on Nov. 2, 1752, the words “Lord Jesus, to Thee I live; to Thee I suffer; to Thee I die: Thine I am, in death and in life; save and bless me O Saviour, for ever and ever. Amen.” were repeated over him. He signified his assent by placing his hand over his heart, thus reaffirming what he had said previously, “All that I am and have, both in principle and practice, is to be summed up in this one expression—the *Lord's property*.”³

The depth of his own spiritual life is seen in his hymns “Daysman! Source of Power” and “Word of the Father! Speak!”⁴ He constantly drew upon heavenly resources. As he began to revise his *Exposition of the Apocalypse*, he said, “O what cause have I to ask continual help of God in this important business.”⁵ Combining thus deep personal piety, which he considered the *conditio sine qua non*, with extensive learning, he was well qualified to become “the most important exegete since Calvin.”⁶ At the close of his edition of Cicero's *Epistles* he gives a word of warning against the danger of study separated from piety. “There is no bodily or mental labor which may not be made injurious to our secret and perpetual communion with God.”⁷ Understanding his spiritual and mental preparation, we can turn to his labors as a scholar.

Bengel as a Scholar

Bengel's lasting fame rests upon his labors on the New Testament. However, his first scholarly efforts were upon the Old Testament. He collaborated with his professor, Dr. Hochstetter, (later president of Denkendorf) in a corrected edition of the German Bible wherein the punctuation was made to conform to the Hebrew accents of the Massoretic text. This led him to write an essay on the Hebrew accents. All of this was good preparation for his critical studies in the New Testament. In later life he wrote the *Praefatio* to the *Gnomon in duodecim prophetas minores* of his son-in-law, P. D. Burke. Perhaps if he had not been weighed down with too many classes he could have produced, like Calvin in the 16th century and Grotius in the 17th, a commentary on the whole Bible. Certainly, “He would have

been one of the exceeding small number of those who have been found competent to comment upon the whole Bible."⁸

The unfolding of Bengel's literary career is an interesting story in itself. Denckendorf was somewhat of a junior college-seminary combination. Therefore part of his labors were in classical fields: Greek and Latin. He judiciously chose for reading material texts having a direct relationship to the ministry. For classroom use he brought out new editions of Cicero's *ad familiares* (1719). Gregory's *Panegyric on Origen* (1722), and Chrysostom's *de Sacerdotio* (1725). He also published *Annotationes ad Macarius* and *Annotationes ad Ephrem Syrus*. However, already the trend of his scholarly activities had been fixed. With his students he went through the Greek New Testament every two years, collecting notes carefully. Finally, in 1722, he determined to publish a commentary and completed it in two years. However, he kept it maturing for eighteen years more before publishing it. So the *Gnomon* actually represented thirty years of study and over twenty years of actual preparation.

The Greek Text

Before he could publish the *Gnomon* it was necessary to determine that he was commenting upon the best possible text. So he entered upon his prodigious and exceedingly fruitful labors as a critic. Even as a student he had been interested in the variant readings, and no little disturbed by them. In his edition of Chrysostom he appended a *Prodromus Novum Testamentum Graeci* which outlined his plan to publish a new Greek text, a critical apparatus and a commentary upon the whole New Testament. A brief summary of the important printed Greek texts up to his time will give some insight into the problems he faced.

The first printed portion of the Greek New Testament contained only six sections of John's Gospel, published by Aldus of Venice (1504). To Erasmus goes the honor of publishing the first complete Greek New Testament (1576) based on seven manuscripts available at Basel and collations of Latin versions. It went through four succeeding editions, each with fresh manuscript additions but no references to them—no documentation or critical apparatus. In fact, Bengel demonstrated that Erasmus was in such a hurry (his text was produced in one year) to print his text before that of Cardinal Ximenes that he substituted for the original Greek of the concluding part his own translation into Greek of the Vulgate.⁹ Erasmus won the race by six years, but his Greek Text suffered in quality as a result. A. T. Robertson remarks: "If Erasmus had known that he was working for the ages instead of getting ahead of Ximenes, he might have taken more pains to edit his Greek Testament. All his documents were late, and some were the poorest of the late ones."¹⁰ Actually Cardinal Ximenes had printed the Greek New Testament in 1514, using (probably) the Vatican manuscript and Codex Rhodiensis and other manuscripts in Spain. However, his text was not published until the completion of the Complutensian Polyglott Bible of which it formed part of volume five. The fourth Greek text was that of Robert Stephens (Paris, 1546). He used Erasmus' fifth edition (1535), the Complutensian and his own collation of fifteen manuscripts in the royal library at Paris. His first edition is noteworthy because it was the first to contain a critical apparatus, and became, with slight revision, the Textus Receptus. Other editions followed in 1549, 1550, 1551 (the first with verse divisions) and another by his son in 1569.

Theodore Beza (1565) published the fifth important Greek text at Geneva. He used the work of all his predecessors plus a fine collection of manuscripts in England. He was the owner of codices D and D₂. His work went through nine editions but didn't vary much from Stephen's fourth edition or offer much textual re-

search. However, it did serve to popularize the Textus Receptus. This came about because the Elzevir brothers used his first edition with the third of Stephens to publish their text of 1624. The second edition of Elzevir in 1633 had in the preface these words, "Therefore thou hast the text (*textum*) now received (*receptum*) by all, in which we give nothing altered or corrupt."¹¹ Their seven editions are of little critical value, but became the standard on the continent, as Stephens third edition was in England.

The sixth Greek Testament was in volume five of the London Polyglott, edited by Brian Walton, based on Stephens' third edition with variants from Codex Alexandrinus. Dr. Fell of Oxford gave the world the seventh Greek Text in 1675 based upon Elzevir's second edition with additions from eighteen manuscripts, Coptic and Gothic versions, and variants in Stephens, Walton and others. Then comes the great work of John Mill, the student of Fell, who published the eighth Greek Text in 1707 after thirty years labor. He used Stephens' third edition plus seventy-eight new manuscripts, with variants from Syriac, Old Latin, and the Vulgate. He collated nearly all manuscripts then in England and other abroad. He was the first to use the Church Fathers in any measure for textual criticism. His work had an excellent critical apparatus.

In 1711 the ninth Greek Text was published by the Amsterdam firm of Wetstein and Smith. It was a carefully corrected copy of Elzevir's text with variants from a Vienna manuscript. It is important because it contained the *Crisis* of Gerard von Maestricht, containing his forty three critical canons. These canons were ponderous and well received but erroneous or misapplied in many places by their author. Bengel had been working on the Greek Text for many years when he undertook the refutation of von Maestricht's errors. This he did in 1734 in his *Apparatus Criticus* to his Greek Testament. In the meantime a second edition of the *Crisis* appeared in 1735, so he wrote a second defense of his arguments against it and published it as an excursus to his *Harmony of the Gospels* in 1736 and later in the appendix to the second edition of his *Apparatus Criticus* (1763). Thus Bengel's judicious weighing of the canons of criticism¹² led to the formulation of his own canons which guided him in the production of his own Greek Testament.

The first edition of his Greek Testament appeared in 1734 in Tubingen in a quarto edition with the *Apparatus Criticus* appended. It was also published the same year at Stuttgart as an octavo without the apparatus. This went through five editions. It became the basis for the Danish version of 1745. Bengel's text was mainly based upon the Textus Receptus because he determined to print no reading in the text which had not been previously printed. However, he did put some better readings into the text. His marginal readings were divided into five groups: (1) genuine readings, (2) those superior to the text, (3) those just as good, (4) those inferior, (5) those to be rejected. In his preparation he used the texts of Walton, Fell, Mill, Wetstein, and Smith, plus twenty-four Greek manuscripts, in addition to a number of Latin manuscripts. Wishing to placate the idolizers of the Textus Receptus he adhered strictly to his rule of printing in his text (except in Revelation, where peculiar problems were encountered) only readings previously printed.¹³ So his text itself, perhaps, was not as important as his marginal readings and his notes on reasons for including or excluding readings, and most of all, the *Apparatus Criticus* and the various writings in which he expounded his critical principles. These have been briefly summarized as follows:¹⁴ (1) The antiquity of witnesses must receive the greatest consideration (*i.e.* manuscripts must be weighed as well as counted), (2) the diversity and ages from which readings come is important, (3) the number of witnesses to a reading must be observed, (4) the origin

of a corrupt reading must be sought, and if found, it is often possible to reconstruct the original text, (5) the greatest importance must be given to "the native appearance of the genuine reading," and his most important canon (6) the more difficult reading is to be preferred. Added to these canons was Bengel's observation that texts came in families. He divided them into two groups, Asiatic and African.¹⁵ Bengel was the first to recognize the extreme importance of Codex A.¹⁶ Scrivener said that Bengel "left the stamp of his mind deeply imprinted on the criticism of the sacred volume But the peculiar importance of Bengel's New Testament is due to the critical principles developed therein."¹⁷ Concerning Bengel's textual labors it has been said that "he always regarded the impulse which he had been the instrument of communicating to the pursuit of a perfect Greek text as one of the chief services which he had done to his age; and no one who rightly estimates the vast results of more modern criticism will think that he overvalued it."¹⁸ No wonder his prodigious labors on the Greek text¹⁹ merited for him the epithet "the father of modern textual criticism."²⁰

For all his careful labors Bengel was repaid, not with thanks, but with criticism from the right and from the left. On the right were those who had a "textus receptus is good enough for me" attitude. He was attacked by John George Hager in *Early Gathered Fruits* (1738) for his temerity.

If every bookmaker is to take into his head to treat the New Testament in this manner, we shall soon get a Greek text totally different from the received one. The audacity is really too great for us not to notice it, especially as such vast importance, it seems, is attached to this edition. Scarcely a chapter of it has not something either omitted, or inserted, or altered, or transposed. The audacity is unprecedented.²¹

From the Catholic party he was attacked by Rev. T. A. Berghauer in *Bibliomachia* (1746). Bengel's reply is appended to his *Sixty Practical Addresses on the Apocalypse* (1747), also found in the second edition of the *Apparatus Criticus* (1763). He showed that he had done no more than Cardinal Ximenes, and that the *Bibliomachia* was appropriately entitled "War with the Bible" because it was full of blasphemy against the word of God in all Bibles, Catholic and Protestant. Its threats of persecution he regarded as pointing to the fulfillment of many prophecies in Revelation. In his reply to Berghauer are these beautiful words:

O that this may be the last occasion of my standing in the gap to vindicate the precious original text of the New Testament! The children of peace cannot love contention; it is troublesome and painful to them to be obliged to contend even for the truth itself (Gal. vi. 17). May the Lord Jesus diffuse among us his peace, his grace, and his glory, ever more and more! Ruling even in this midst of his enemies, till he shall have subdued all things; yea unto Himself.²²

Bengel, whose own faith had been disturbed by the 30,000 variants in Mill's text until he had thoroughly winnowed the canons of criticism and had finally "found rest in the sure conviction that the hand of God's providence must have protected the words of eternal life which the hand of His grace had written,"²³ certainly could not be accused of playing fast-and-loose with the sacred text.

From the left his principal protagonist was J. J. Wettstein. This critic maintained that Bengel did not go far enough, that he should have put many of his marginal readings in the text because they were supported by superior manuscripts, and that caution did not secure freedom from persecution, for Erasmus was accused of being an Arian, and Stephens had to flee to Geneva to escape burning at the stake, and that Bengel himself had to abandon his cautious approach in editing

the text of Revelation.²⁴ In these points Wettstein was probably correct, but he certainly was in error in opposing Bengel's "more difficult reading" rule²⁵ and in insisting upon giving the preference to counting manuscripts instead of weighing their value.²⁶ Wettstein did admit, however, that Bengel's text was the best yet printed, although he never saw the value of Bengel's critical acumen. The critical principles of Bengel, with modifications, have been carried out by Semler, Griesbach, Tregelles, Westcott and Hort, and a host of others, but to Bengel goes the honor of putting textual criticism upon a scientific basis.²⁷

The Gnomon

Herculean as were his textual labors, for Bengel they were only a means to an end. His great desire was to understand the Word of God, for which a relatively pure text was a most important requirement, but not the goal itself. Therefore, his Greek Testament and the corollary writings were but preliminaries to his *magnum opus*, the *Gnomon of the New Testament* and his other exegetical writings. Because of his deep love for the Scriptures, he wanted to unfold their meaning to others, and to arouse in them a thirst for their life-giving waters. In his essay "On the Right Handling of Divine Subjects" he said, "Whatever, therefore, He tells and teaches us in His word, we are to suffer ourselves to be told and taught" and "It also possesses a supernatural efficacy . . . it takes men captive and kindles faith within them, before they even thought what faith is . . ." ²⁸ and we are to receive "all and every thing" which God puts before us in Scripture and "not of vain conceit to reject or strike out any portion or particle as useless."²⁹ No wonder Tholuck said of the *Gnomon*, "it was prepared with the devotion of an enthusiastic lover, whose searching eye noticed and admired even the most unseemly feature of the beloved, and carried out with a precision which weighed even the smallest particle."³⁰

His views of the inspiration of Scripture are reflected in these quotations, but if he were alive today he would be caught between two fires as he had been in the attacks on his Greek Testament. He would be called a Bibliolater by some because he thought the prophets wrote from dictation and that Hebraisms in the Apocalypse were due to the fact that "the whole style of John, and especially in the prophetic parts, takes its form, not from accustomed habit, but from *Divine dictation*, the resources of which are boundless."³¹ Others would dislike his idea that the apostles wrote freely from their intimate acquaintance with the mind of the Lord. His approach to the problem of inspiration serves to highlight his importance in the history of exegesis, for he was the first to free exegesis from the chains of dogmatic theology. He saw the weakness of Protestant theology in his day in using Scripture as a *standard* of a fixed system and not as a *source* of ever new and deeper truth.³²

Bengel outlined his exegetical principles in six points.³³ The fourth, on the self-sufficiency of Scripture, he elaborated as follows:

The Scriptures, moreover, carry in themselves convincing and independent evidence of the truth, validity, and sufficiency of all the narratives, doctrines, promises, and threatenings they contain. Truth is its own witness, and exacts our assent. I recognize the handwriting of a friend without needing to be told who has written to me. We want not the stars, much less a torch, to show us the sun: it is only the blind who cannot see it. Every Divine communication carries, like a diamond, its own light with it, showing whence it comes, and needing no touch stone.³⁴

No wonder he was unhindered by the trammels of dogmatics or philosophy and was free from the restrictions of following a party-line. His most famous axiom is "Adhere strictly to the text; apply the subject entirely to thyself," printed in the preface to his octavo Greek text. Another is "read nothing into the Scripture, but draw everything from them, and suffer nothing to remain hidden that is really in them."³⁵ Added to these is his principle of interpreting the Word of God *analogia Scriptura*, and not *analogia fidei*³⁶ and his insistence that "The proper exposition of Holy Scripture depends upon the gift of divine grace, though with this the science of language, history, and helps of that kind do service."³⁷ His over-all view of Scripture, which will be considered later, was that "we are to regard them . . . as a matchless, regular account of God's dealings with man through every age of the world, from the commencement to the end of time, even to the consummation of all things. They indicate together one beautiful, harmonious, and gloriously connected system."³⁸ With these principles of exegesis and this philosophy of the organic unity of Scripture he proceeded to produce a series of important exegetical works including his *Harmony of the Gospels* (1736), *Gnomon of the New Testament* (1742), *An Explication of the Book of Revelation* (1740), and *Sixty Practical Addresses on Revelation* (1747).

His *Harmony* went through three editions (1736, 1747, and 1766). Its chief contribution was his theory that the life of Christ encompassed only three Passovers, a theory now generally accepted.³⁹ The *Gnomon* appeared after thirty years of study and meditation. It went through numerous Latin and German editions. The first English translation was edited by Andrew R. Faussett in 1857-1858. This has gone through seven editions, and other English translations have followed it. *Gnomon* became the basis of Wesley's *Expository Notes upon the New Testament*⁴⁰ and the *German New Testament*, with notes and revision of Luther's translation, by Daniel Ch. Gottlieb Michaelis (1764), and of a *Paraphrase of the New Testament* by his son Ernest Bengel (1784).

Keeping in mind that the New Testament was informed by a Hebrew spirit,⁴¹ adhering strictly to the grammatico-historical method, aiming at pointing out the full force of the words and sentences of the New Testament, using words parsimoniously, Bengel produced a commentary which stood the test of time. It drives its readers back to the Scriptures themselves, as was his design. This is illustrated, as well as his terse style,⁴² in his comment on Matt. 26.8:

"*apoleia, waste or perdition.*—Nay, thou, Judas, art the son of perdition! See John xvii. 2."

Bengel's philological and grammatical finesse are responsible for much of the merit of the *Gnomon*. It is certainly true that "Many of its most striking beauties are the result of an exquisite appreciation, such as no modern criticism has surpassed, of the shades of meaning conveyed by the selection and order, and emphasis of the original words."⁴³ The same writer goes on to say, "It may be questioned whether any single commentary on the New Testament has ever exerted a greater influence, directly or indirectly, than the *Gnomon*."⁴⁴ Among the many tributes to Bengel's exegetical genius one may cite that of Philip Schaff:

upon the whole (Bengel was) the best exegete of the eighteenth century. His *Gnomon* is truly a pointer or indicator, like a sun dial. Farrar (p. 393) (*History of Interpretation*) calls it a 'mine of priceless gems.' It is one of the very few commentaries which, like Chrysostom's and Calvin's, have outlasted their generation, notwithstanding his faulty exposition of the Apocalypse, which exploded June 18, 1836 (the supposed date of the destruction of the beast.) A warning of humility and caution to lesser lights.⁴⁵

When the first edition of the *Gnomon* came off the press, March 28, 1742, he sang the well-known hymn:

O Thou, who our best works hast wrought,
And thus far helped me to success,
Attune my soul to grateful thought,
Thy great and holy Name to bless;
That I to Thee anew may live,
And to Thy grace the glory give.

Combining thus vital piety, spiritual insight, scholastic ability and indefatigable efforts, he produced a commentary which, as Fritsch correctly says, is altogether *sui generis*.⁴⁶ We may well denominate Bengel "the father of modern exegesis."

Before turning to the third field in which he labored mightily, let us reconsider his philosophy of Scripture as "an incomparable narrative of the divine economy with reference to the human race."⁴⁷ This adumbrated the *Heilsgeschichtliche Schule* of Von Hofmann (1810-1877) which starts with the assumption that the Bible is the perfect, self-contained memorial of the redemption acts and revelation of God.⁴⁸ Von Hofmann was the founder of the Erlangen school and deeply affected conservative theology in Germany and Scandinavia. Among his followers were Zahn, Hallesby, Frank, Bugge and Otto Piper.⁴⁹ The first two of these have had a strong influence upon American Fundamentalism. Thus his philosophy of revelation lives on.

Eschatology

With his basic premise of Scripture as the record of God's dealings with his people in every age, it is no wonder that Bengel became interested in chronological and prophetic studies. Beside his two works on Revelation, he published his *Ordo Temporum* (1741), *Cyclus sive de anno magno solis* (1745), and *Weltziet* (1746). Although these studies have not appealed to students of the twentieth century, yet they did have merit. Prior to his time millennial speculations (after the first three or four centuries of church history) were limited to mystical sects and Anabaptist groups. This Bengel changed by bringing eschatological study into the mainstream of theological endeavors. His principles of interpretation compelled him to carefully examine all of Scripture, not just the historical and dogmatic portions, and to publish his Apocalyptic studies, although he knew they would bring him into disrepute. So he wrote, "But truth is of more importance to one's credit or anything else. We must not be deterred from uttering truth by any concern as to what people will say of us."⁵⁰ His method of interpreting Revelation was the Continuous-historical one.⁵¹ He is considered as belonging to the "historical premillennialists." His eschatological and prophetic studies have come down to more recent days through his influence upon Chr. A. Crusius, whose memory "has been revived by Delitzsch in his *Biblico-prophetic theology*"⁵² and through Hengstenberg, Stier, von Hofmann, Kurz, Baumgarten, Beck and Auberlen, who all have striking affinities with Bengel's school, and most of them have a more or less immediate connection with it via their education. It is true that "Millennial views, varying in their expectations of a more sensuous or more spiritual Kingdom, have been revived from time to time since then [the Reformation], and owe their great modern development to Bengel."⁵³ Therefore, Bengel can be called "the father of modern eschatological study." We can close this discussion of his eschatological studies with these words from the *Lutheran Commentary*:

The chief importance of Bengel's system (Continuous-Historical method of interpreting Revelation) consists in this, that he brought to light again the primi-

tive Christian doctrine of the millennial kingdom, which had been misapprehended for nearly fifteen centuries. He laid the foundation for a dogmatic development of eschatology, and his world-chronology assisted greatly in promoting the idea of an organic historical development of the Kingdom of God.⁵⁴

Conclusion

Enough of Bengel's importance has been pointed out so that the claim can be justly made that he is the father of (1) modern textual criticism, (2) modern scientific exegesis, (3) modern eschatological study. Any one of these would have been sufficient honor for any scholar. Yet there are grounds for believing that a fourth such distinction could be claimed for Bengel. After taking two pages to pay tribute to Bengel's greatness, Karl R. Habebach drops this hint:

He founded a school, not, indeed, on any set system of doctrines, but moved rather by his broad and genial spirit, and the influence of his followers was widely beneficial. Under the conduct of men of this school, the first scheme of an alliance of all Evangelical Christians was carried into effect, and the basis of union, the broad, yet distinctive features of salvation through Christ, has been retained even until our own time, and is reproduced in the Evangelical Alliance of today.⁵⁵

If Hagenbach is correct, then Bengel is the father, or at least the grandfather of the evangelical ecumenical movement.

Other features of Bengel's life-work must pass unnoticed. They were incidental to his great labors upon the Scripture. His high estimate of the Sacred Word is given in these words:

Scripture is the foundation of the Church: the Church is the guardian of Scripture. When the Church is in strong health, the light of Scripture shines bright; when the Church is sick, Scripture is corroded by neglect; and thus it happens, that the countenance of Scripture and that of the Church, are wont to exhibit simultaneously, the appearance either of health, or else of sickness; so that it comes to pass that the treatment of Scripture corresponds, from time to time, with the condition of the Church.⁵⁶

Church history has proven time and again the sagacity of this observation.

What light Bengel had shed upon Holy Writ by his exhaustive labors on the Greek Text, by his careful exegesis, and his well thought out philosophy of revelation! It matters little that time has disproved his chronological speculations. His principles abide and flood our twentieth century researches with light. Yet all his labors were performed with the use of only one eye. This he kept secret until the day of his death. Although Bengel would certainly disapprove of such Scriptural hermeneutics, we may well remark that the whole body of Christ, the Christian Church, is full of light, because he, with but one eye, physically, labored with singleness of eye, spiritually, so that God's Word might light the path of man.

Frederick College
Portsmouth, Virginia

FOOTNOTES

1. *Christian Observer*, XI (1841), 661. In addition to the works cited in this article see the bibliography of Charles T. Fritsch, *Interpretation*, V (April, 1951), 215, for the most recent biographies.
2. *Gnomon of the New Testament*, 3rd. Latin ed. with additions by J. C. F. Steudel (1835), English tr. by Andrew R. Faussett (Edinburgh, 1860), V, xxix. All future references to the *Gnomon* are to this 2nd English edition.
3. *ibid.*, xxxii., xxx.
4. John Ch. Frederic Burk, "J. A. Bengel," *Lives of the leaders of our church Universal*, ed. by F. Piper (Philadelphia, 1879), II, 471.
5. John Ch. Frederic Burk, *A Memoir of the Life and Writings of John Albert Bengel*, tr. by Robert Francis Walker (London, 1837), 265. Hereafter cited simply as *Life*.
6. A. Immer, *Hermeneutics*, tr. by Albert H. Newman (Andover, 1877), 47.
7. *Life*, 219.
8. *London Quarterly Review*, XI (1858), 204. Biblical studies in the late 19th. and early 20th. centuries were often led astray by the sharp dichotomy between the O. T. and N.T. fields.
9. *Gnomon*, V, xvi., cf. I, 27 note.
10. *Studies in the Text of the New Testament*, p. 36, cited by H. S. Miller, *General Biblical Introduction* (Houghton, 1940), 293. Dr. Miller points out that Erasmus is responsible for the spurious reading in I John 5:7, 8a being in A.V. because he was tricked into including it in his third edition (1522), although it was not in any extant Greek manuscript.
11. Miller, *ibid.*, 294.
12. cf. *Gnomon*, I, 21-38 for his treatment of the *Crisis*.
13. *Gnomon*, I, 39f., 14, "No conjecture is ever . . . to be listened to."
14. Lyle O. Bristol, "New Testament Textual Criticism in the 18th century," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, XLIX (1950) 109, cf. *Gnomon*, I, 13-20 for Bengel's principles.
15. For the importance of this observation cf. Bristol, *ibid.*, Henry Ambrose Scrivener, *A Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament* (London, 1894), 211, and E. Von Dobschutz, "The Bible in the Churches," in *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, ed. by James Hastings (New York, 1961) II, 594.
16. Scrivener, *ibid.* Codex Vaticanus was virtually ignored for three centuries.
17. *ibid.*
18. *L. Q. R.*, XI (1858), 210.
19. *Gnomon*, V, 173-177. Preparation of his Greek text to Revelation alone took more than 400 days.
20. Miller, *op. cit.*, 295.
21. *Gnomon*, I, 12, note 1.
22. *Life*, 245, *Gnomon*, V, xvi.
23. *L. Q. R.*, XI (1858), 206. In spite of these attacks from the right Zinzendorf was wise enough to adopt Bengel's text for his own new German translation, for which he also suffered persecution, *L. Q. R.*, XI (1858), 210.
24. *Life*, 238, *Gnomon*, V, xv.
25. *L. Q. R.*, XI (1858), 210f.
26. *Life*, 238.
27. For a summary of recent textual labors see Kenneth W. Clark, "The effect of recent textual criticism upon the New Testament," in *The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology*, ed. by W. D. Davies and David Daube (Cambridge, 1956), 27-51.
28. *Life*, 253. The essay was prefixed to a volume of sermons by J. Ch. Storr (1750), and reprinted in the 2nd. edition of Bengel's German New Testament. It should be required reading for all seminarians.
29. *ibid.*, 255.
30. Quoted by Philip Schaff, *The Epistle of Paul to the Romans* (New York, 1872), 50 note.
31. *Gnomon*, V, 201, 183, cf. I, 62 (see. XXI) and *L. Q. R.*, XI (1858), 213, *Life*, 264 *contra* Charles T. Fritsch, "Bengel, the Student of Scripture," *Interpretation* V (April, 1951), 211.
32. Herman F. von der Goltz, "The Theological Significance of J. A. Bengel and His School," *British and Foreign Evangelical Review*, XI (April, 1862), 309.
33. *L. Q. R.*, 215, *Life*, 263.
34. *L. Q. R.*, 213, *Life*, 253 quoting essay mentioned above.
35. *Life*, 261, cf. W. Claus, "Extracts from the Life and Labors of Bengel," selected and translated from the German by Rev. H. C. Strickenberg, *Lutheran Quarterly*, XIX (1889), 113.
36. *Br. & For. Ev. Rev.*, XI (April, 1862), 313f. Cf. Luther's rule "Sacra Scriptura sui ipsius interpres."
37. *ibid.*, 312, quoting from *Expositions of the Apocalypse*, Lect. VIII.
38. *Life*, 254, cf. Piper, *op. cit.*, 470.
39. *Life*, 275, 363.
40. cf. Wesley's letter to Joseph Benson, Dec. 8, 1777 in John Telford, *The Letters of the Rev. John Wesley*, M.A. (London, 1931), VI, 291.
41. *Life*, 363, cf. *Gnomon*, I, 45f.
42. cf. *Interpretation*, V, 210 for other examples of his brevity.
43. *L. Q. R.*, 218.
44. *ibid.*, 219.
45. Philip Schaff, *Theological Propaedeutic*, (New York, 1893), 218.
46. *Interpretation*, V, 212.
47. *Br. & For. Ev. Rev.*, XI (April, 1862), 314, quoting Bengel's *Ordo Temporum*, xi., 13.
48. *ibid.*, 304, cf. C. Preus, "The Contemporary Relevance of von Hofmann's Hermeneutical Principles," *Interpretation*, IV (July, 1950), 311.
49. Preus, *ibid.*
50. *Life*, 284 note, cf. 310.
51. Futurist and Preterist schools existed in his day for Bengel complains that some see only the future anti-Christ and others only the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus in this book. *Life*, 320.
52. *Br. & For. Ev. Rev.* XI (April, 1862), 337.
53. J. A. MacCulloch, article "Eschatology," *E. R. E.*, V, 389, cf. Shirley Jackson Case, article, "Second Adventism" *E. R. E.*, XI, 285f. and Charles T. Fritsch, *Interpretation* V (April, 1951), 214.
54. Revere F. Weidner, *Annotations on the Revelation of St. John the Divine* (New York, 1898), xlv.
55. Karl R. Hagenbach, *German Rationalism* (Edinburg, 1865), 126f.
56. *Gnomon*, I, 7.