

part of Lead's work in the 1930s and 1940s. They viewed themselves as the guardians of Lead's writings and aimed at conserving them in veneration, while the Pentecostal Latter Rain movement did not treat them as authentic testimony but as "an anonymous voice to which they could add their own voices" (284).

Lumped together, the contributions in *Jane Lead and her Transnational Legacy* follow the lines of Lead's different networks, thereby not only correcting flaws of older scholarship but also illuminating connections in the often confusingly fragmented field of religious dissent in early modern England and, chronologically and geographically speaking, beyond. Certainly, the risks of emphasizing one single person are high. The authors, however, manage to focus on Lead without aggrandizing her for the sake of their own specialized interest. They achieve the balancing act of both centering on Lead as well as decentering her—as a mystic, as a writer, and, first and foremost, as a woman.

—Michael Leemann, Georg-August-Universität Göttingen (Germany)

Charles K. Telfer, *Wrestling with Isaiah: The Exegetical Methodology of Campegius Vitringa (1659–1722)* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2016). Hardcover, 219 pp., €100.

Campegius Vitringa was a leading scholar in eighteenth-century biblical studies. He had a wide influence not only during his life but also afterwards, long into the nineteenth century. Franke, Bengel, Delitzsch, Gesenius, and the Princeton theologians, among others, appreciated him greatly. In the twentieth century Vitringa was largely overlooked. In the postmodern climate of recent decades, however, growing attention has been paid to pre-critical biblical scholarship. Postmodernism has made people aware that everyone has his own prior understanding and that the Enlightenment claim of neutral scholarship is unfounded. Scholars—whatever their personal convictions—are rediscovering the value of the history of interpretation to biblical studies.

Convinced that the insights of a scholar such as Vitringa—who was the heir of centuries of Renaissance scholarship as well as of the theological heritage of the Reformation and Protestant Orthodoxy—may help us to understand the Bible better today. Charles K. Telfer, associate professor of Biblical Languages at Westminster Seminary California, has written a

monograph on Vitringa with a focus on his *magnum opus*, a commentary on Isaiah (1720). After a biographical chapter and an overview of what has been written on Vitringa, Telfer analyzes the *Praefatio* to the first volume of his Isaiah commentary, the second chapter of his *Doctrina Christianae religionis*, and the *canones hermeneuticos*. These *canones hermeneuticos* were the third part of a work published in 1708. Its full title was *Typus doctrinae propheticae, in quo de prophetis et prophetiis agitur, huiusque scientiae praecepta traduntur*. In this work, Vitringa gave rules for the interpretation of the prophetic literature in the Bible. The *canones hermeneuticos* are very insightful for understanding Vitringa's exegetical approach.

Four elements are crucial in Vitringa's hermeneutics: (1) A passage must be viewed in its immediate, broader and ultimately canonical contexts. (2) With regard to the concrete fulfilment of eschatological passages, the interpreter ought to show humility, preferring to keep professing ignorance in the hope that God will give greater light to coming generations in this area. (3) The interpretation that sets forth the most glorious fulfilment of the passage must be preferred. (4) Scripture must be interpreted by Scripture. The last element was the most important for Vitringa. It was inseparably linked with his high, orthodox view of the authority and inspiration of Scripture.

Vitringa believed the meaning of Scripture was what the words of the passage imply in their immediate and canonical contexts. Because he unreservedly included the latter as a category, he cannot be seen as a forerunner of the historical-critical approach to Scripture, although he certainly was aware of issues of textual criticism. His emphasis on canonical context stood in the tradition of a Christological reading of the Old Testament. The true meaning of the text had both literal and spiritual dimensions.

Vitringa did appreciate Grotius, but his main critique of him was that Grotius dismissed the normativity of the New Testament perspective. In Vitringa's understanding of Scripture, and especially the Old Testament, he must be seen as a moderate follower of Cocceius. His main critique of the latter is that Cocceius was too quick to connect Old Testament prophecies to the historical situation of European Christians, although this element was not wholly absent in Vitringa's own commentary on Isaiah. Vitringa took an optimistic view of the future of the church of Christ on earth, finding grounds for that conviction in the prophecies of Isaiah.

On several occasions, Vitringa emphasized that the regenerating and enlightening work of the Holy Spirit is necessary to interpret the Scripture rightly. His appeals to the spiritual experience of the interpreter, or

his complaints at the lack thereof, reveal him to be a representative of the *Nadere Reformatie* (Dutch Further Reformation). Vitringa himself spent his entire career at the theological faculty of Franeker University. Before going to Leiden, he had studied theology at Franeker. He formed a particular bond with Herman Witsius, a fellow professor. Witsius must be considered as one of the main representatives of the *Nadere Reformatie* in the academic world of the era after Gisbertus Voetius.

Although Telfer does not state it, Witsius can be seen as a Voetian, albeit one with sympathies for Cocceius. He thus formed a bridge between the “Voetian” and “Cocceian” streams of the *Nadere Reformatie*. Telfer also recognizes the importance of the friendship between Vitringa and Johannes d’ Outrein, who both studied at Franeker. D’ Outrein translated the works of Vitringa into Dutch. It seems that d’ Outrein was less critical of Cocceius’s exegetical approach than was Vitringa. However, like Vitringa, d’ Outrein was known for his pietistic emphasis, and it is for that reason that he is reckoned among the *Nadere Reformatie* divines.

Telfer shows Vitringa’s contextual sensitivity at every level of exegesis, his commitment to New Testament normativity in the reading of Isaiah (in which redemptive history is the ultimate hermeneutical horizon), his nuanced views of the historical fulfilment of prophecy, and his concern for pastoral application. A scholar who was widely admired for his mastery of the original languages and his intense historical focus in exegesis, Vitringa was also appreciated for his orthodox views, warm-hearted piety, and love for the church.

Telfer’s monograph will be of interest to Old Testament scholars, church historians (especially those focusing on piety), and also all who study the intellectual history of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries.

—Pieter de Vries, *Hersteld Hervormde Kerk
Seminarium Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam*

Irmtraut Sahmland and Hans-Jürgen Schrader, eds., *Medizin- und kulturgeschichtliche Konnexe des Pietismus: Heilkunst und Ethik, arkane Traditionen, Musik, Literatur und Sprache* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2016). Hardcover, 428 pp., €90.

Religion and healing constitute a growing and blossoming field of academic research that not only stimulates empirical investigation in disciplines like