International Archives of the History of Ideas 213
Archives internationales d'histoire des idées

Andrew Crome

The Restoration of the Jews: Early Modern Hermeneutics, Eschatology, and National Identity in the Works of Thomas Brightman

Springer

The Restoration of the Jews: Early Modern Hermeneutics, Eschatology, and National Identity in the Works of Thomas Brightman

ARCHIVES INTERNATIONALES D'HISTOIRE DES IDÉES

INTERNATIONAL ARCHIVES OF THE HISTORY OF IDEAS

213

THE RESTORATION OF THE JEWS: EARLY MODERN HERMENEUTICS, ESCHATOLOGY, AND NATIONAL IDENTITY IN THE WORKS OF THOMAS BRIGHTMAN

Andrew Crome

Andrew Crome

The Restoration of the Jews: Early Modern Hermeneutics, Eschatology, and National Identity in the Works of Thomas Brightman

Springer

Andrew Crome
School of Arts, Languages and Cultures
University of Manchester
Manchester, UK

ISSN 0066-6610 ISSN 2215-0307 (electronic)
ISBN 978-3-319-04761-4 ISBN 978-3-319-04762-1 (eBook)
DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-04762-1
Springer Cham Heidelberg New York Dordrecht London

Library of Congress Control Number: 2014939014

Printed on acid-free paper

Springer is part of Springer Science+Business Media (www.springer.com)

Dedicated to the memory of my sister,
Vanessa Jane Crome (1985–2002),
and for my parents.

Acknowledgements

It is a pleasure to be able to acknowledge some of the many wonderful people who have helped and supported me during the writing of this book. This work is a much expanded and revised version of my Ph.D. thesis, and with that in mind, I would like to express my deep gratitude to Prof. Graham Ward for his supervision of my work. Combining incisive criticism with encouragement, he was a model supervisor. Professor Jeremy Gregory's encouragement after serving as external examiner, and later as a colleague, is also gratefully recalled.

I was able to conduct additional research and subsequently expand and revise my thesis, due to a very enjoyable 1-year lectureship at the University of Manchester. The book was fully revised at the start of a Postdoctoral Fellowship at Trinity College Dublin, generously funded by the Irish Research Council for Humanities and Social Sciences (IRCHSS). I would like to thank all of my colleagues in Manchester and Dublin for creating congenial and friendly working atmospheres and the IRCHSS for their support and funding. Now that I have returned to the University of Manchester, I am grateful to my colleagues and students for making it such a wonderful place to work.

In terms of this book, I am indebted to librarians at the British Library, University of Edinburgh, John Rylands Library Manchester, and the National Library of Scotland for their help. Crawford Gribben read an earlier draft of this manuscript and offered advice and encouragement. The comments of two anonymous readers for Springer were extremely encouraging and helpful and pointed out areas which needed reworking. They have all helped me to avoid some embarrassing mistakes. Needless to say, any remaining errors are entirely my own. My thanks also to Anita van der Linden-Rachmat at Springer for her editorial guidance. I am also thankful for the patience of the Lay Reader who bumped into me at Hawnes Church, where I turned up in 2009 clutching a picture of Thomas Brightman like some sort of obsessed fan. She was very kind in showing me the building, and even apologising for areas that Brightman would not approve of (an unnecessary gesture given the beauty of the church).

Some parts of this book have appeared in less-developed forms elsewhere. Earlier elements of Chaps. 5 and 6 appeared in '"The Proper and Naturall Meaning of

the Prophets": The Hermeneutic Roots of Judeo-centric Eschatology', *Renaissance Studies* 24:5 (2010), pp. 725–741. I am grateful to Wiley-Blackwell and current editor Jennifer Richards for permission to reuse them here. Parts of the final section of Chap. 7 appeared as "Friendship and Enmity to God and Nation: The Complexities of Jewish-Gentile Relations in the Whitehall Conference of 1655" in *Friendship in the Middle Ages and Early Modern Age*, eds Albrecht Classen and Marilyn Sandidge (Berlin: de Gruyter Press, 2011), pp. 749–777. I would like to thank de Gruyter and the editors for their permission to reuse them in this book.

Finally, on a personal note, I would like to thank all of those friends and family members who have supported me outside of the academy. In Manchester, Sam Carey, Jon Ainscough, Dan Rozday, Tim Wickham, Stef Esltub, Anna Green, Helen Hardwick, Alison Pimblott, Lizzie Slingsby, Dave Woodbridge, Jason Whitt and Sonke Enkelgen deserve special mention. In Dublin, special thanks to all of the members of "Early Modern Tavern Soc", as well as Tim and Clare Roulson, Adam Fleming, Ian and Jennifer Horner and Paddy Griffin, all of whom gave me a great welcome to Irish life. There are countless others I have forgotten to mention and I offer my apologies if the current reader is amongst them.

My final thanks must go to my parents, who supported me both emotionally and financially throughout my Ph.D. and have constantly encouraged my work. I owe them more than I can say – and I hope that this book engages them (and all readers) with the wonderful world of early modern eschatology.

Contents

1 Introduction 1
1.1 Returning to the Puritan Apocalypse 9
1.2 Thomas Brightman 13
1.3 Brightman: A Brief Biography 16
References 24

2 Hermeneutics and the Jews in Protestant Thought 29
2.1 The Literal and Allegorical Senses of Scripture 30
2.2 Hermeneutics, Eschatology and the Jews in the Middle Ages 36
2.3 Hermeneutics and the Book of Revelation in the Reformation 39
2.4 Hermeneutics, Eschatology and the Jews in Early Modern England 42
References 55

3 Historicising Allegory: Thomas Brightman and the Historicising Commentary 59
3.1 Recasting the Historical Sense 60
3.2 The Seven Letters to the Churches: Dealing with Historical Tension 69
3.3 The Millennium and the Opening of History 76
3.4 Historicising Allegory: The Song of Songs and the Jewish Promises 81
References 93

4 Consistent Literalism and the Restoration of the Jews 97
4.1 The Role of the Jews 98
4.2 The Jewish Promises: "Consistent" Literalism 107
4.3 The Re-created Self: Emphasising "Englishness" 118
References 127

5 Thomas Brightman and Judeo-Centrism 1610–1640 131
5.1 Separatist Readings of Brightman 132
5.2 The Early Reception of Brightman's Work 137

5.3 The Development of Brightman's Hermeneutic, 1610–1620 141
5.4 Controversy: Sir Henry Finch 150
5.5 The Influence of Brightman on Joseph Mede 154
References 163

6 Tracing Brightman's Influence: Judeo-Centrism, 1640–60 167
6.1 Brightman as Radical Prophet 168
6.2 Consistent Literalism and the Jews 173
6.3 The Whitehall Conference 188
References 203

7 Conclusion 207
References 215

Appendix: A Comparison of Editions of Brightman's *Revelation of the Revelation* 217
References 220

Select Bibliography 221
Primary Sources: Manuscripts 221
Primary Sources: Printed Works 221
Secondary Sources: General Reference Works 226
Secondary Sources: Unpublished Theses 226
Secondary Sources: Books 226
Secondary Sources: Articles and Essays 232

Index 239

Abbreviations

Brightman, *Daniel* – Thomas Brightman, *A Most Comfortable Exposition of the Last and Most Difficult Part of the Prophecie of Daniel* (Amsterdam, 1635).
Brightman, *Revelation* – Thomas Brightman, *The Revelation of St. John Illustrated with an Analysis & Scholions . . . The Fourth Edition, Corrected & Amended* (London, 1644).
Brightman, *Song* – Thomas Brightman, *A Commentary on the Canticles or the Song of Solomon* (London, 1644).
DNB – *The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004).

A Note on Quotations

Original spelling and punctuation has been retained when quoting from early modern sources. The exception to this is when sources make use of “u” for the modern usage “v”, “v” for “u”, “vv” for “w” or “i” for “j” – in all such quotations I have modernised the use of these letters. Thus “seruant” becomes “servant”, “vpon” becomes “upon”, “vvorlde” becomes “worlde” and “Iewes” becomes “Jewes”. When listing titles of seventeenth-century works, however, I have left the spelling as the original. Any instance where emphasis was not in the original is highlighted in the footnotes. All scripture quotations are taken from the New International Version.

Chapter 1
Introduction

"The Puritans of the 17th century, who gave us democracy in its present form and the now famous Authorized Version of the Bible in 1611 were Christian Zionist by belief" proclaimed the website of the International Christian Embassy Jerusalem (ICEJ) in 2011.[1] While critics (and King James himself) might be taken aback by some of claims made in this sentence, its boldest assertion is in tracing Christian Zionism – the Christian support for a Jewish state in Palestine – back to seventeenth-century Protestant orthodoxy. This form of eschatology has usually been thought to have emerged in the nineteenth century, primarily through the writings of John Nelson Darby and his development of "dispensational" eschatology. Yet the ICEJ's desire to root Christian Zionism deeper in history is not an isolated claim. Speaking at a conference for Christian Zionist ministers in 2004, dispensational scholar Thomas Ice attacked those who "like to blame J.N. Darby and dispensationalism as the modern source of evangelical views [of Israel]", instead highlighting "that love for Israel was well entrenched by Bible-believing Christians long before 1830". Ice proceeded to name a succession of figures that could be labelled as Christian Zionist in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries: Francis Kett, Henry Finch, Joseph Mede – but above all, Thomas Brightman (1562–1607).[2] A former fellow of Queens' College, Cambridge and a near anonymous Church of England rector in life, Brightman's reputation as a prophetic expositor of some skill was only confirmed with the posthumous publication of three commentaries on the books of Revelation, Daniel and Song of Songs on the continent from 1609, and later in England. Brightman's commentaries had a number of unique features, from an imaginative re-reading of the millennium of Revelation 20 to a novel exegesis of Song of Songs as narrative history, but were marked by a particular focus of the

[1] Malcolm Hedding, 'Position Statements: The ICEJ's Core Beliefs', http://int.icej.org/about/position-statements, accessed online 15/10/2011.

[2] Thomas Ice, 'Lovers of Zion: A History of Christian Zionism', http://www.pre-trib.org/data/pdf/Ice-LoversofZionAHistory.pdf, accessed online 26/08/2010, p. 2.

A. Crome, *The Restoration of the Jews: Early Modern Hermeneutics, Eschatology, and National Identity in the Works of Thomas Brightman*, International Archives of the History of Ideas Archives internationales d'histoire des idées 213,
DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-04762-1_1,

restoration of the Jews to Palestine as the culmination of God's apocalyptic plan on earth. It is perhaps unsurprising that Ice chose him as a central figure in what the contemporary Christian Zionist viewed as the historical emergence of his own belief.

This use of puritan writers to justify contemporary theological/political beliefs is interesting for two reasons. Firstly, it highlights that the work of the early modern historian, at first glance far removed from the world of modern geo-political debate, in fact continues to influence and support contemporary beliefs and political positions. No historical work is ever written in an ahistorical vacuum. Perhaps more importantly, it highlights the emergence of a significant eschatological trend in the seventeenth century focused on the restoration of the Jews to Palestine. This "restorationism" was more than Hebraism or a generalised belief in an end time Jewish conversion, but a detailed focus on the importance of both the Jewish people and the Holy Land itself as both a political and sacred space. These eschatological themes have been increasingly noted by scholars of early modern England. Of course, recognition of the importance of the seventeenth-century interest in the Jews in the period is not entirely new. David S. Katz's magisterial examinations of *Philo-Semitism and the Readmission of the Jews to England 1603–1655* (1982) and the wider-ranging *The Jews in the History of England 1485–1850* (1994) both emphasised the importance of the Marrano community in London, the growth of interest in Hebraic studies and an increasing attention to Jewish conversion in early modern England. Approaching the subject from another angle, James Shapiro's 1996 study *Shakespeare and the Jews* stressed the ways in which the English used the Jews to help construct English national identity as an "other". By doing so, Shapiro argued, Englishmen were able to build up and redefine their own national identity. Achsah Guibbory has also recently focused upon English interests in the Jews, producing a useful volume examining the extent of English engagement with Jewish themes in the seventeenth century.[3] To these works can be added a number of impressive studies on Hebraism in England, looking at figures from the legal theorist John Selden[4] to John Milton,[5] and recent work on the rabbinic influence on English political writing.[6] As important as these books have been, the question of Jewish restorationist belief, as distinct from a more general philosemitism, has received little detailed study until the past decade, with the notable but dated exception of

[3] Achsah Guibbory, *Christian Identity, Jews, and Israel in Seventeenth-Century England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010).

[4] Jason P. Rosenblatt, *Renaissance England's Chief Rabbi: John Selden* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006).

[5] Frank Mattern, *Milton and Christian Hebraism: Rabbinic Exegesis in Paradise Lost* (Heidelberg: Winter, 2009); Jeffrey S. Shoulson, *Milton and the Rabbis: Hebraism, Hellenism and Christianity* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2001).

[6] Eric Nelson, *The Hebrew Republic: Jewish Sources and the Transformation of European Political Thought* (Cambridge, MA. and London: Harvard University Press, 2010).

Douglas Culver's *Albion and Ariel*.[7] The most important works in emphasising this theme have been a series of articles by Richard W. Cogley. Labelling the focus on Jewish restoration to Palestine "Judeo-centrism", he described the concept in detail in his 2003 "The Fall of the Ottoman Empire and the Restoration of Israel in the "Judeo-Centric" Strand of Puritan Millenarianism".[8] In 2005, he returned to the idea with the more specific "'The Most Vile and Barbarous Nation of all the World': Giles Fletcher the Elder's *The Tartars Or, Ten Tribes* (ca. 1610)", examining beliefs about the location of the ten "lost" tribes, who were exiled to Assyria in 722 BCE and subsequently vanished from the historical record.[9] Cogley's work is important in emphasising the way in which the belief in Jewish restoration was held by a wide range of figures in both Old and New England, and in probing into some of the eschatology's many contours. Recently, other scholars have begun to follow Cogley's footsteps in this area.[10] Yet the question of how and why Judeo-centrism emerged with such force in the early seventeenth century, and what exegetical methods were employed by those who held to it, has not been examined in depth. What was different about Judeo-centrist exegesis that led its proponents to move away from the more conservative and well established eschatological positions that were available to them? This book suggests that the key element in the emergence of Judeo-centrism was an appropriation and logical development of Reformation hermeneutical norms to reread Old Testament promises to the Jews. The over-riding "literal" hermeneutic of Protestantism was developed to a logical conclusion which led Judeo-centrists back to the importance of the future of ethnic Israel.

On the surface this is a deceptively simple claim. Yet it is a powerful one. From what initially appears a "simple" hermeneutic position, a number of assumptions taken from scripture – especially those related to the role of the Gentile church – had to be reassessed in creative and often surprising ways. It is the argument of

[7]While Culver's book is meticulously researched, he cites no secondary work published later than 1968, meaning that the work ignores the explosion of interest in puritan millennialism seen in the 1970s. Other discussions of the theme can be found in Nabil Matar, *Islam in Britain 1558–1685* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998) and Danielle Frison, "Millénarisme et Judaïsme dans l'Angleterre du XVIIe Siècle" in *Formes du Millénarisme en Europe à L'aube des Temps Modernes*, eds Jean-Raymond Fanlo and André Tournon (Paris : Honoré Champion, 2001), pp. 285–306.

[8]Richard W. Cogley, "The Fall of the Ottoman Empire and the Restoration of Israel in the "Judeo-Centric" Strand of Puritan Millenarianism", *Church History* 72:2 (June 2003), pp. 304–332.

[9]Richard W. Cogley, "'The Most Vile and Barbarous Nation of all the World': Giles Fletcher the Elder's *The Tartars Or, Ten Tribes* (ca. 1610)", *Renaissance Quarterly* 58:3 (Fall 2005), pp. 781–814. This study follows Cogley in using "Judeo-Centrism" to refer to an eschatology predicting a return of the Jews to Palestine and a Jewish empire there.

[10]See for example Andrew Crome, '"The Proper and Naturall Meaning of the Prophets": The Hermeneutic Roots of Judeo-centrism in Puritan Eschatology', *Renaissance Studies* 24:5 (Nov. 2010), pp. 725–741; Adam Shear, "William Whiston's Judeo-Christianity: Millenarianism and Christian Zionism in Early Enlightenment England" in *Philosemitism in History*, eds Jonathan Kemp and Adam Sutcliffe (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), pp. 93–110.

this book that the central figure in this hermeneutical development was Thomas Brightman. His use of the literal sense served to undermine several key categories of puritan selfhood,[11] leading to Brightman's focus on a distinctly English Christian identity. This is to claim a great deal for the importance of the literal sense of scripture. Yet it remains true that in examinations of puritan eschatology the complexity of the hermeneutic positions assumed by authors have often been overlooked. Studies of the tradition therefore tend to presume the primacy of the literal sense without asking why it was important or how it was actually used in practice. Thus scholars have often argued that puritan eschatology was marked by "the literal interpretation of key prophetic Scriptures… [previously] interpreted in either an allegorical or symbolic manner"[12]; or "directed by the literal rather than the allegorical interpretation of divine prophecy".[13] To illustrate the difficulty of such apparently straightforward claims we can turn to Richard Hayter's 1675 commentary on Revelation. Describing the efforts of his predecessors, he noted that "other men expound the Prophecies of the *Revelation* mystically… making them symbols, types, and figures".[14] For, as Hayter correctly recognised, the "literal" sense of prophecy never meant a simplistic reading of the text as it was presented. For the majority of commentators to view the book of Revelation as predicting a series of events in direct chronological order was unusual; to claim that the "stars falling from the sky" in Revelation 8 referred to a literal fall of heaven (as Hayter believed) was almost unthinkable. Thus Hayter attacked those who "turn the literal sense into a mystical, and partly because they make a History of that which is yet a Prophecy, and seek for things future in ages past… they shall never find

[11] A note on the use of "puritan" in this study: The term is problematic. As Thomas Fuller noted in 1655: "I wish that the word *Puritan* were banished [from] common discourse, because so various in the acceptions thereof" (Thomas Fuller, *The Church-history of Britain from the birth of Jesus Christ until the year M.DC.XLVIII* (London, 1655), Book VIII, p. 76). This is well recognised in recent studies: William Lamont, for example, noted that "the term itself is hopeless" (William Lamont, *Puritanism and Historical Controversy* (London: U.C.L. Press, 1996), p. 7). However, as Crawford Gribben has argued, the term is useful to describe a broad group of the "Godly" defined no more rigidly than by their "desire for the further reformation of the Protestant churches within the three kingdoms" (Crawford Gribben, *The Puritan Millennium: Literature and Theology, 1550–1682* (Revised Edition) (Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2008), pp. 7–8). I follow this broad definition here. This is similar to the position of Peter Lake, who describes puritanism as "a synthesis made up of strands… [that] taken together formed a distinctly Puritan synthesis or style" rather than a set of concrete positions agreed upon by each and every puritan (Peter Lake, "Defining Puritanism – again?" in *Puritanism: Transatlantic Perspectives on a Seventeenth-Century Anglo-American Faith*, ed. Francis J. Bremer (Boston: Massachusetts Historical Society, 1993), p. 6). For a fuller discussion of this issue see John Coffey and Paul C.H. Lim, "Introduction" in *The Cambridge Companion to Puritanism*, eds John Coffey and Paul C.H. Lim (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), pp. 1–7.

[12] Donald E. Wagner, *Anxious for Armageddon* (Scottdale: Herald Press, 1995), p. 87.

[13] Avihu Zakai, *Exile and Kingdom: History and Apocalypse in the Puritan Migration to America* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), p. 17, also pp. 44, 45, 47.

[14] Richard Hayter, *The Meaning of the Revelation* (London, 1675), sig. A2^{ii}r.

them".[15] This confusion over the use of the "literal sense" in eschatology suggests that while we might presume an increasing shift towards "straightforward" literal readings of prophecy in puritan thought, the picture was in fact more complex. Indeed, puritan readings of Bible prophecy were inherently unsatisfactory for a self-proclaimed "literalist" such as Hayter. What then, did the literal sense mean when it was used by puritan commentators on Revelation? If, as in Hayter's complaint, puritan interpretations ignored the "plain" sense of the text, what readings did they employ in its place? In addressing the way in which Brightman and those who followed him made use of the literal sense in creative ways, this book seeks to answer these questions. Against suggestions that use of a "literal" hermeneutic was straight-forward when reading apocalyptic texts in the Bible, this book aims to both aid and complicate our understanding of the complex matrix of hermeneutical rules which formed the "literal sense" for seventeenth-century readers.

This is important, as historically the complexity of the literal sense has been overlooked. In recent years, however, an increased understanding of the importance of the history of biblical hermeneutics has developed[16] with a number of studies aiming to provide a background to the evolution of hermeneutical thought throughout church history.[17] These works emphasise that scriptural interpretation was in a constant state of flux. It should therefore never be assumed that there was an exegetical consensus that characterised certain historical periods.[18] Yet for all of this interest, the hermeneutical positions held by seventeenth-century English puritans, a group noted for their biblical emphasis,[19] have been curiously overlooked. While several works have noted variations within Reformation hermeneutics,[20] few have focused on the complexities presented by puritan readings of the Bible. Sadly, much

[15]Hayter, *Meaning*, p. 134.

[16]Pioneered by Henri de Lubac, *Medieval Exegesis, Volume 1: The Four Senses of Scripture* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998); *Volume 2* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000) and Beryl Smalley, particularly *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1964).

[17]For example: Donald McKim and Jack B. Rogers, *The Authority and Interpretation of the Bible: An Historical Approach* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1979); James Samuel Preus, *From Shadow to Promise*: *Old Testament Interpretation from Augustine to the Young Luther* (Cambridge, MA.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1969); Werner B. Jeanrond, *Theological Hermeneutics: Development and Significance* (London: SCM, 1997).

[18]For example, that medieval exegesis was based slavishly on the *quadriga*. For an example of this reading of exegetical history see Frederic W. Farrar, *History of Interpretation* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1961).

[19]See for example, Christopher Hill, *The English Bible and the Seventeenth-Century Revolution* (London: Allen Lane/The Penguin Press, 1993); John R. Knott, *The Sword of the Spirit: Puritan Responses to the Bible* (Chicago and London: Chicago University Press, 1980).

[20]For example, E.F. Klug, *From Luther to Chemnitz: On Scripture and the Word* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1971), Thomas Torrance, *The Hermeneutics of John Calvin* (Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press, 1988) and *Articles on Calvin and Calvinism: Calvin and Hermeneutics*, ed. Richard Gamble (New York and London: Garland, 1992).

discussion has been marked by an overly simplistic interpretation of the puritan hermeneutic. Much as with readings of eschatology, the general puritan hermeneutic has often been characterised as overly dependent on a crude application of the "literal" sense of scripture. Puritan thought, it is claimed, was "a product of a literal-minded scripturalism"[21]; guilty of a "misplaced literalism"[22]; held by those for whom "The Bible said what it meant and meant what it said, and that was that".[23]

Such statements make three major assumptions. Firstly, they presume that readers had an inherent understanding of what the literal sense was. The need for interpretation was negated if the text simply "meant what it said". The fact that the majority of puritan controversies were rooted in arguments over exactly *what* the scripture said can therefore be conveniently ignored. Secondly, these views imply that puritans were guilty of a simplistic surface reading of scripture. Any perceived misinterpretation could thus be blamed on a misplaced Biblicism: "They idolised the record to such an extent as wholly to miss its extended meaning".[24] Finally, these views make the assumption that puritans (and their opponents) had reached a consensus on what the literal sense actually *was*. Protestant hermeneutic positions can be contrasted with Catholic exegesis as a battle between the literal and the allegorical methods, as if there were only two forms of exegesis with firmly drawn lines between them. To presume that such a clear-cut dichotomy existed is to grossly over simplify the nature of seventeenth-century hermeneutics.

Positively, recent work has begun to explore the complexities and nuances of the puritan use of the literal sense in much greater depth. Building on earlier studies such as John R. Knott's *Sword of the Spirit: Puritan Responses to the Bible* (1980)[25] and Christopher Hill's *The English Bible and the Seventeenth-Century Revolution* (1993), Thomas H. Luxon's *Literal Figures: Puritan Allegory and the Reformation Crisis in Representation* (1995) examined the numerous allegorical and typological readings of texts in the seventeenth century. Luxon was led to conclude that "at the heart of Puritan literalism lies a hard kernel of allegory".[26]

Within studies of puritan eschatology, Crawford Gribben's work has also emphasised a hermeneutical shift in reading the book of Revelation in the period 1580–1660. He found that a stable "Genevan" hermeneutic was undermined by

---

[21] Peter Lake, *Moderate Puritans and the Elizabethan Church* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), pp. 2–3.

[22] Paul J. Korshin, *Typologies in England 1650–1820* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1982), pp. 42–43.

[23] Douglas Culver, *Albion and Ariel* (New York: Peter Lang, 1995), p. 56. While Culver defines this approach later as an "*usus loquendi*, grammatical-syntactical hermeneutic" (p. 67 n36), he does not maintain this definition throughout his study.

[24] Farrar, *History*, p. 375.

[25] Knott, *Sword*, pp. 7, 48, 89, 94. Knott stressed that while puritan readings of the Bible were committed to a "literal" interpretation, they also featured a rich typological and figurative stream of thought.

[26] Thomas H. Luxon, *Literal Figures: Puritan Allegory and the Reformation Crisis in Representation* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995), pp. 108–165.

an increasing interiorisation of the text, with puritan thought drifting towards the conflation of "sign and thing signified" found in Quakerism.[27] Most recently, Jeffrey K. Jue argued for a "double-literal sense" within puritan readings of the Old Testament. In Jue's view, the "double-literal sense" was closer to analogy than typology. He argued that for New England settlers in particular, this provided a paradigm for reading both themselves and their texts.[28] Similarly, Lisa Gordis has claimed that in seventeenth-century New England, ministers and congregations struggled to come to terms with the hermeneutical openness of the text suggested by a "literal" and individual Spirit-led reading. She sees a shift towards a more structured form of interpretation *through* ministers, as controversies exposed the inadequacies and dangers of an uneducated "literal" reading.[29] Peter Harrison's *The Bible, Protestantism and the Rise of Natural Science* noted the use of a literal hermeneutic served to aid the scientific revolution and promote a more nuanced, rationalistic view of the world.[30] Marcus Walsh has similarly served to highlight the attempts of Protestant interpreters to position themselves as impartial interpreters of the text in contrast to the didactic judges of the Roman Catholic Church.[31]

Perhaps most importantly, Kevin Killeen has shown the ways in which the literal sense served to present a number of complex positions and form a vital part of the history of reading. His work has highlighted, in particular, a growing historicist drive in seventeenth-century thought; a desire to understand ancient works in their own historical contexts.[32] This book follows Killeen in emphasising the importance of an increasing sense of historicity among early modern commentators, and asking the question of how this historicity emerged specifically in commentaries on apocalyptic scripture. Where it diverges from his work is in both its focus, and the kind of historicity it chooses to emphasise. Where Killeen has traced a

[27]Crawford Gribben, *The Puritan Millennium: Literature and Theology, 1550–1682* (Revised Edition) (Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2008), e.g. pp. 177–204, 214–229.

[28]Jeffrey K. Jue, *Heaven Upon Earth: Joseph Mede (1586–1638) and the Legacy of Millenarianism* (Dordrecht: Springer, 2006), pp. 195–211.

[29]Lisa M. Gordis, *Opening Scripture: Bible Reading and Interpretive Authority in Puritan New England* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2003), pp. 13–226.

[30]Peter Harrison, *The Bible, Protestantism and the Rise of Natural Science* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999); "Reinterpreting Nature in Early Modern Europe: Natural Philosophy, Biblical Exegesis and the Contemplative Life" in, *The Word and the World: Biblical Exegesis and Early Modern Science*, eds Kevin Killeen and Peter J. Forshaw (Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 2007), pp. 25–44. See, however, James Dougal Fleming's response in the same volume, which accuses Harrison of over-simplifying the idea of the literal sense (Fleming, "Making Sense of Science and the Literal: Modern Semantics and Early Modern Hermeneutics" in *Word and the World*, pp. 45–57).

[31]Marcus Walsh, 'Profession and Authority: The interpretation of the Bible in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries', *Literature and Theology* 9:4 (Dec. 1999), pp. 383–398.

[32]Kevin Killeen, *Biblical Scholarship, Science and Politics in Early Modern England* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2009); 'Chastising with Scorpions: Reading the Old Testament in early modern England', *Huntington Library Quarterly* 73:3 (2010), 491–506. See also the introduction in Killeen and Forshaw's *Word and the World*.

growing historicity in attempts to understand the cultural backgrounds to texts (often focused on seemingly insignificant cultural details or *curosia*) and the influence of hermeneutics on science, this book examines a growing historicist reading from a different angle – as an interest in understanding scripture in accordance with the meaning that it would have had for its original readers. Of course, these two approaches are inherently linked. But by considering how ancient readers had read the Bible, seventeenth-century exegetes had to ask particularly uncomfortable questions that did not necessarily arise in the context of historical scholarship and the examination of *curosia*. The interpretation of unfulfilled prophecies which seemingly predicted a restoration of the Jews to the holy land was one of these questions. As Richard Muller has noted, Old Testament promises of a restored Jewish kingdom emphasise "more pointedly than any other class of texts, the problem of literal meaning, future referent, and ultimate intended implication of a text".[33] Was a "spiritual" application to the Gentile church a valid reading within this new hermeneutical context? This book argues that for a number of Judeo-centric writers, the answer to this question was "no". The promises of a restoration of the Jews were to be literally fulfilled.

This obviously touches on a number of other areas, as puritans exhibited a range of attitudes towards Jews and Judaism. The Jews were a visual reminder of God's judgement, destroyed for their crime of deicide,[34] those who "refused & murdered the Lord of glory . . . [who] to this present houre, cease not to blaspheme & spit out their venim against Christ his church, his gospel and his servants".[35] At the same time, however, the righteous Jew in the Old Testament represented the ideal Christian, a fellow member of the universal church and of the one covenant people of God. Abraham, David and the prophets were not only types of Christ, but also types of the puritans themselves. As Thomas Luxon noted, the Jew became a remarkable figure that embodied the complexities of puritan typology and selfhood. The Jew was simultaneously the other and the self, always the type of which the puritan was the antitype.[36] This reading of the figure of "the Jew" obviously presented a challenge to literal readings of Old Testament prophecy. If the Jew was merely a type, it followed that any literal reading of Old Testament promises was flawed. The typological conception of the Jew demanded a figurative reading of the Old Testament. National Israel became a "perfite example of a Churche, and common wealth",[37] a type of the church (and the individual Christian) awaiting their antitype.

---

[33]Richard A. Muller, "The Hermeneutic of Promise and Fulfilment in Calvin's Exegesis of the Old Testament Prophecies of the Kingdom" in *The Bible in the Sixteenth Century*, ed. David Steinmetz (London: Duke University Press, 1990), p. 70.

[34]Nathanael Homes, *The New World, or, The New Reformed Church* (London, 1641), p. 31.

[35]Thomas Draxe, *The Worldes Resurrection, or The Generall Calling of the Jewes* (London, 1608), sig. 2v.

[36]Luxon, *Literal Figures,* pp. 54–62.

[37]Heinrich Bullinger, *A Hundred Sermons Upon the Apocalipse of Jesu Christ* (London, 1573), sig. 10v.

The tension between typological readings of the self and "literal" readings of the text was immediately highlighted and had to be confronted by puritan interpreters. This problem was magnified in the prophetic books of the Old Testament. Daniel and Ezekiel in particular provided clear – and unfulfilled – descriptions of a restored and glorified Jewish kingdom, which suggested either a strictly literal interpretation of a Jewish restoration, or an entirely mystical application to the church triumphant. By an application of an increasingly historicised literal sense – an approach I label as "consistent literalism" – it became possible to focus on the importance of the physical restoration of the Jews to Palestine and predict a millennial future based around a Jewish empire.

In emphasising the importance of an increasingly historicised reading of scripture in the seventeenth century, this book therefore suggests that Judeo-centrism was tied explicitly to the emergence of important hermeneutical trends in the period. This was not an "arbitrary" exegesis, but one build on solid historical methods. Such a claim can, of course, appear to be suggesting that the first signs of the emergence of higher criticism were evident in puritan England. This is not my intention; this book does not aim to present a Whiggish reading of exegetical history, in which puritans stumbled towards the light of a clear, enlightened, "modern" hermeneutic (if such a thing can even be said to exist). It does, however, aim to highlight once again the inherent complexity and sophistication of thought within puritan hermeneutics; an important task, as the old view of the period as naively Biblicist can still be seen in some contemporary scholarship.[38] It also aims to address an important gap in the literature of puritan millennialism by engaging the question of hermeneutics head on.

1.1 Returning to the Puritan Apocalypse

Interest in puritan apocalyptic has waxed and waned since the subject's own golden age in the 1970s. William Lamont's *Godly Rule: Politics and Religion 1603–1660* (1969) was the first work to argue that millenarian speculation was not unusual amongst puritans, and was instead the driving force in many of their

[38]Norman Vance, "More Light? Biblical Criticism and Enlightenment Attitudes", *Religion in the Age of Enlightenment* 2 (2010), pp. 131–152. Vance does make the crucial recognition that a "literalistic" exegesis which viewed the Old Testament as containing scientifically exact descriptions of events such as creation has rarely been the mainstream position in historical Christianity; it was certainly not affirmed by the majority of the Fathers, Scholastics or Enlightenment Christian thinkers. However, his contention that an over-emphasis on the Bible in the Reformation led to overly-simplistic hermeneutical positions is unfair – see the studies cited above for evidence of the complex nature of early modern hermeneutics.

beliefs. This was followed by John Wilson's *Pulpit in Parliament* (1969),[39] Peter Toon's edited collection *The Puritans, The Millennium, and the Future of Israel* (1970),[40] Christopher Hill's *Antichrist in the Seventeenth Century* (1971),[41] Bernard Capp's *The Fifth Monarchy Men* (1972),[42] Tai Liu's *Discord in Zion: The Puritan Divines and the Puritan Revolution 1640–1660* (1973)[43] and Bryan Ball's *A Great Expectation: Eschatological Thought in English Protestantism to 1660* (1975).[44] A second wave of literature emerged at the end of the decade, with key works such as Richard Bauckham's *Tudor Apocalypse* (1978) and Paul Christianson's *Reformers and Babylon: English Apocalyptic Visions from the Reformation to the Eve of the Civil War* (1978), which traced a shift towards an emphasis on political action in apocalyptic commentaries into the 1640s. Katherine Firth's *Apocalyptic Tradition in Reformation Britain 1530–1645* (1979), meanwhile, argued for the application of eschatology to history by puritans. All of these works examined broad traditions, rather than focusing on a single author. Arthur H. Williamson applied a similar approach to Scotland in his *Scottish National Consciousness in the Age of James VI* (1979). Few works on the subject appeared in the 1980s,[45] although Richard Popkin's important works helped to maintain interest in the subject throughout the 1990s.[46] In that decade millennialism was an important part of the debate

[39]John F. Wilson, *Pulpit in Parliament: Puritanism during the English Civil Wars 1640–1648* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969). Wilson argued for a millennial theme running through the Long Parliament fast sermons.

[40]*The Puritans, The Millennium, and the Future of Israel*, ed. Peter Toon (Cambridge: James Clark & Co., 1970, rpt. 2002). A useful collection covering a range of themes including the restoration of the Jews, Quaker eschatology and objections to millenarian thought.

[41]Christopher Hill, *Antichrist in Seventeenth Century England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1971). Hill traced the Antichrist theme used to demonise the pope and (later) parliament and protector.

[42]Bernard Capp, *The Fifth Monarchy Men* (London: Faber and Faber, 1972). Studying those who believed that the "fifth monarchy" (i.e. Christ's earthly monarchy) of Daniel 2 would soon be set up on earth, often by violent means instituted by his people.

[43]Tai Liu, *Discord in Zion: The Puritan Divines and the Puritan Revolution 1640–1660* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1973). Liu traced the use of eschatology in the Civil Wars.

[44]Bryan W. Ball, *A Great Expectation: Eschatological Thought in English Protestantism to 1660* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1975). An excellent overview and analysis of eschatology in the period as a whole.

[45]David Brady examined views on the "number of the beast" in *The Contribution of British Writers between 1560 and 1830 to the Interpretation of Revelation 13:16–18* (Tubingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1983). C.A. Patrides and Joseph Wittreich edited a thoughtful collection of papers in *The Apocalypse in English Renaissance Thought and Literature*, eds C.A. Patrides and Joseph Wittreich (Manchester: University of Manchester Press, 1984). George Kroeze's 1985 doctoral thesis, "The Variety of Millennial Hopes in the English Reformation 1560–1660", trod little new ground and drew broadly on Firth, Bauckham and Christianson.

[46]Richard Popkin produced a number of key works. These include *Millenarianism and Messianism in English Literature and Thought 1650–1800*, ed Richard Popkin (Leiden: Brill, 1988), which included a fine essay by Christopher Hill on Jewish conversion in Andrew Marvell. See also *Menasseh ben Israel and His World* eds Yosef Kaplan, Henry Méchoulan, Richard H. Popkin

on how New England settlers viewed themselves and their purpose in America.[47] The most important recent studies of the subject has been Crawford Gribben's *Puritan Millennium* (2001, revised edition 2008) and Jeffrey K. Jue's *Heaven upon Earth: Joseph Mede and the Legacy of Millenarianism* (2006). Together, their works have shown the most nuanced treatment of hermeneutics of any studies of the puritan apocalyptic. Where Gribben's study remains the most sophisticated examination of a range of puritan authors within the millennial tradition,[48] Jue's work on Mede represents a compelling attempt to move the field forward. Jue aimed to complicate readings of seventeenth-century eschatology, arguing for a broad "moderate" millenarianism with Mede at its centre. Jue also provided a brief but extremely useful overview of puritan millenarianism in the 2008 *Cambridge Companion to Puritanism*.[49]

Although most studies of puritan millenarianism have touched upon the literal sense within prophetic hermeneutics, their research has focused primarily on radical readings.[50] However, as Jue and Gribben have shown, even the "heresy" of millenarianism[51] could be accepted by conservative thinkers such as Mede and

(Leiden: Brill, 1989); *Jewish Christians and Christian Jews* eds Richard H. Popkin and Gordon Weiner (Dordrecht: Kluwer, 1994); and the four volumes of *Millenarianism and Messianism in Early Modern European Culture*, published in the same series as this book in 2001.

[47]Most clearly seen in Theodore D. Bozeman's magisterial *To Live Ancient Lives: The Primitivist Dimension in Puritanism* (Chapel Hill and London: University of North Carolina Press, 1988). Bozeman attacked Perry Miller's "Errand in the wilderness" thesis which saw millenarianism as the driving force behind puritan emigration, emphasising instead the puritan desire to return to an Edenic idyll. Avihu Zakai attempted to rebut Bozeman in his *Exile and Kingdom: History and Apocalypse in the Puritan Migration to America* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), which also emphasised an increasing focus on linking readings of Revelation to particular historical events. Other works of interest include Rodney Petersen's study of the interpretation of the "two witnesses" in Revelation (*Preaching in the Last Days: The Theme of 'Two Witnesses' in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993)).

[48]See also Gribben's wider ranging *Evangelical Millennialism in the Transatlantic World, 1500–2000* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011).

[49]Jue, "Puritan Millenarianism in Old and New England" in *The Cambridge Companion to Puritanism*, eds Coffey and Lim, pp. 259–276. There is little focus on the development of millenarianism prior to Mede.

[50]Knott focuses his prophetic reading on Gerrard Winstanley, though he does mention the prophetic readings of Richard Baxter in passing (*Sword*, pp. 75, 85–105). Luxon concentrates his prophetic readings on radicals like Thomas Tany (*Literal Figures*, pp. 108–109). Gordis does not discuss eschatological concerns.

[51]The terms "millennial/ist" and "millenarian/ist" have been the victim of loose definition in several studies. These misuses have been catalogued by both Gribben (*Puritan Millennium*, pp. 8–11) and Kenneth Gibson ("Eschatology, Apocalypse and Millenarianism in Seventeenth Century Protestant Thought" (Unpublished PhD thesis, Nottingham Trent University, 1999), pp. 8–17). While some have equated millenarianism with a belief in the imminent end of the world (e.g. J.T. Cliffe, *The Puritan Gentry* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1984), p. 208), millenarian belief instead revolved around a period of future, earthly blessing. Additionally, a distinction is sometimes made between a pacifistic "millennial" belief and an activist, potentially radical "millenarian" position. This is not a helpful distinction, as it can often descend into needless terminological hair-splitting.

James Ussher. To ignore these writings in favour of those at the fringes of the puritan tradition represents an unfortunate oversight. This is noteworthy for two reasons. Firstly, it highlights the continued misconception that puritan millenarian belief was limited to either a small number of sectaries, or that it inevitably led to radical behaviour. While it is accepted that millenarian beliefs were in no way unorthodox, the idea that they led towards radicalism still persists.[52] This assumption leads to a second oversight. It suggests that the study of puritan prophetic hermeneutics has little value and application to the understanding of mainstream readings of the Bible in the seventeenth century. However, the recognition that eschatological concerns often proved to be the driving force behind core beliefs and actions suggests that the strategies employed in their interpretation should prove central to puritan hermeneutics as a whole. Biblical prophecy was highly symbolic and demanded an immediate appreciation of the difficulties of a "literal" interpretation. It challenged the interpreter to define clearly the difference between symbolism, allegory and typology. It is an area we should expect to see puritan interpreters wrestling with and defining the literal sense of scripture. Far from being viewed as the domain of radicals, there should be a greater appreciation of the creative interpretive energy expended by mainstream biblical commentators on the prophetic passages.

By recognising that eschatological hermeneutics were a broadly orthodox concern, it is possible to appraise the puritan use of the literal sense in prophecy, and to form a greater understanding of its nuances by examining its application in the most challenging scriptural contexts. This enables a greater appreciation of the depth and complexity of the puritan millenarian tradition. While Gribben and Jue have added welcome nuance to the debate, there remains an over-simplistic reading of the "literal" sense in a number of recent studies.[53] Such interpretations are often based on a desire to read contemporary Evangelical positions into seventeenth-century

In this study "millennial/ism" and "millenarian/ism" will be used interchangeably to describe a position which held to any form of future, earthly blessing *based upon* Rev. 20 (see Jue, "Puritan Millenarianism", pp. 260–261). Millenarianism can be further defined by using contemporary theological terms. Three major millennial positions are recognised. "Pre-millennialism" refers to the belief that Christ will return and physically inaugurate the millennium at its start. "Post-millennialism" refers to a belief that the earth will move into a millennial state through a series of great conversions, with Christ returning at the period's end. "Amillennialism" is the belief that there will be no specific millennial period in the future, but rather a "spiritual" reign of the Saints through Christ. While these theological terms are anachronistic when used in a seventeenth-century context, they nonetheless prove a useful basis from which to define more detailed millenarian positions.

[52] See for example, Liu, *Discord in Zion*.

[53] To the statements quoted above we can add Dan Cohn-Sherbok's claim that puritan millenarianism developed from "a millenarian concept which interpreted the Bible literally". Dan Cohn-Sherbok, *The Politics of Apocalypse*: *The History and Influence of Christian Zionism* (Oxford: Oneworld, 2005), p. 3.

texts.[54] Here, the "literal" sense is loaded with negative connotations – it is used to suggest an over-simplistic reading that fails to understand the hermeneutical challenges presented by prophecy. Such views, however, reflect a failure to appreciate the complexity of the puritan position. By a detailed examination of the commentaries and sermons of those puritans who held millenarian beliefs, this book aims to foster an appreciation of the use of the "literal sense" in prophecy and move to an understanding of the depth and complexity of puritan prophetic interpretation. Such an interpretation can also aid attempts to understand contemporary Christian eschatological movements. By deepening our knowledge of how the literal sense was used in prophetic interpretation in the past, we can appreciate the complexities and difficulties of the term when it is used in contemporary contexts.[55]

1.2 Thomas Brightman

The question of hermeneutics is therefore central to forming an understanding of the puritan millenarian tradition. It is unsurprising, then, that hermeneutical questions were at the forefront of the commentaries of one of the most influential writers in that tradition, Thomas Brightman (1562–1607). Brightman presents an ideal subject for a study of developing puritan prophetic hermeneutics. A fellow of Queens' College, Cambridge and later minister of Hawnes (or Haynes) in Bedfordshire, Brightman wrote commentaries on Revelation, Song of Songs and Daniel between 1600 and 1607. Despite the early date of Brightman's work, his first commentaries were printed posthumously on the continent (from 1609 onwards); he did not receive an English publication until 1644. However, his books circulated well in advance of this date, and provoked strong reactions soon after their initial publication. By understanding both Brightman's work itself and the reception and influence it had, it is possible to chart the ways in which the literal sense was used in the period leading up to the Civil Wars.

[54] Wagner is particularly guilty of this in his desire to see contemporary dispensational thought as being prefigured in "heresies" of the seventeenth century (Wagner, *Anxious*, p. 86). See also Iain H. Murray, *The Puritan Hope: A Study in Revival and the Interpretation of Prophecy* (Edinburgh: Banner of Truth, 1971), p. 78.

[55] The term is often used by dispensational Evangelicals to describe the hermeneutics of their eschatology. For example Tim LaHaye: "the word of God means what it says and says what it means . . . Those millions that I'm trying to reach take the Bible literally. It's the theologians that get all fouled up on some of these smug ideas". Quoted in David Gates, "Religion: The Pop Prophets" in *Newsweek*, 24/05/06, http://www.newsweek.com/id/105396. Accessed 26/09/06.

A full length study of Brightman and his influence is long overdue.[56] While he has been recognised as a key influence on the puritan apocalyptic tradition, there have been no detailed examinations of his thought. Instead, Brightman is usually discussed only as one figure amongst many in general works on puritan millenarianism. In focusing upon Brightman, this book seeks to fill this gap in the literature of puritan eschatology. Brightman's commentaries themselves also represent the ideal subjects for a targeted study. His major commentary on Revelation, *Apocalypsis Apocalypseos*, was written to address the problems of a "literal" hermeneutic. Writing in response to Cardinal Roberto Bellarmine, Brightman aimed to correct a reading he saw as overly "proper"[57] or "simple".[58] Unsurprisingly, he was therefore concerned with the correct use of the "literal" sense of scripture, dealing with hermeneutical questions in some detail. Brightman's position challenges a simplistic reading of prophetic hermeneutics. Indeed, his work suggests an ambiguity often ignored by writers on the period. Beyond this, Brightman's eschatology engages with a vital hermeneutical question – the precise eschatological role of the Jewish people. His commentaries therefore showed great concern for the correct reading of the Old Testament promises made to ethnic Israel. This was, I argue, based on his own increasingly historically based reading of the literal sense – an interpretation which saw him return those prophecies he saw as rightly referring to the Jewish people as their original referents.

Of course the danger of engaging in a study focusing on one individual and his reception is that the influence of that one figure can be inflated, while that of others is downplayed. The risk that such a study might become overly narrow is ever present. Yet such an approach also has a number of advantages over a more general overview. A focused examination, looking at the hermeneutical approaches

[56]There have been some studies of Brightman outside of these general works.. Philip Almond's recent examination of Brightman's philo-semitism is welcome, but is overly focused on the *political* role that Brightman suggested for the Jews ("Thomas Brightman and the Origins of Philo-Semitism: An Elizabethan Theologian and the Return of the Jews to Israel", *Reformation and Renaissance Review* 9:1 (Spring 2007), 3–25). Beyond this, three theses go some way to remedying the situation. Kenneth Gibson's "Eschatology, Apocalypse and Millenarianism in Seventeenth Century Protestant Thought" (1999) contained a useful rebuttal of the suggestion that Brightman was a premillennialist, but was too hasty in dismissing Brightman's influence in other areas, especially around the theme of Jewish restoration. Robert James Surridge's "The Art of Apocalyptic Persuasion: The Rhetorical Dynamics and History of Influence of the Letter to Laodicea" (2000) examined the rhetoric of Brightman's reading of Rev. 3:14–22, arguing that it formed the rhetorical centrepiece of his commentary on Revelation. However, Brightman was not the sole focus of the study, which moved on to examine later Millerite use of the same scripture. The only work to have Brightman as its direct subject is Kenneth Troy Peterson's 1991 ThM thesis, "Thomas Brightman: A Transitional Figure". Peterson argued that Brightman represented a key link between optimistic and pessimistic eschatology in the seventeenth century. Nonetheless, Peterson's work was limited and its treatment of Brightman's hermeneutics extremely poor, arguing that Brightman read the biblical text "according to his own whim or convenience".

[57]Brightman, *Revelation.,* p. 276.

[58]Brightman, *Revelation.,* p. 646.

and reception of one highly influential writer enables both greater depth and focus on the range of hermeneutical techniques employed in the period. The second and third chapters of this study therefore include a detailed close reading and analysis of Brightman's hermeneutics as this book examines the basis of the approaches he employed. The detailed emphasis on Brightman's works in these chapters aims to highlight a unique, influential and important hermeneutical system which will then, in Chaps. 4 and 5, be used as a lens through which to examine the development of Judeo-centric eschatology after Brightman. These chapters therefore offer a wider view of Brightman's influence and the way in which his hermeneutic was adapted over time in a range of political and religious contexts. This book, then, aims to provide a "genealogical" history of Brightman's methods and his reception. In doing so, it will complicate understandings of both the role of the Jews in early modern eschatology and the way in which different hermeneutic positions were employed in eschatological debates in early modern England.

It also aims to do justice to the thought and influence of Thomas Brightman. The lack of a detailed examination of Brightman's thought has led to him being credited with a surprising number of intellectual and religious innovations. Brightman has been claimed as the "Father of Presbyterianism"[59] and the first Christian Zionist.[60] He is said to have inspired the rise of female prophets such as Anna Trapnel[61] and the Witch Hunts of the 1640s,[62] as well as provoking the puritan migration to America.[63] He is cited as holding a "modified Augustinian" millennial view,[64] and as signalling the end of such a view[65]; as promoting a chronological reading of Revelation,[66] and of writing against a chronological reading.[67] It is even alleged

[59]Le Roy Edwin Froom, *The Prophetic Faith of Our Fathers: The Historical Development of Prophetic Interpretation Volume II: Pre-Reformation and Reformation, Restoration, and Second Departure* (Washington: Review and Herald, 1948), p. 512.

[60]Wagner, *Anxious*, p. 86; Ice, "Lovers of Zion".

[61]Elizabeth Gilman Richey, *The Politics of Revelation in the English Renaissance* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1998), pp. 60–62, 202, 229.

[62]William Lamont, *Godly Rule: Politics and Religion 1603–1660* (London: Macmillan, 1969), p. 100.

[63]Avihu Zakai, "Thomas Brightman and English Apocalyptic Tradition", in *Menasseh ben Israel and His World*, (Leiden: Brill, 1989), eds. Yosef Kaplan, Henry Méchoulan and Richard H. Popkin, p. 43.

[64]Bryan Ball, *A Great Expectation: Eschatological Thought in English Protestantism to 1660* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1975), p. 162; Robert Gordon Clouse, *The Influence of John Henry Alsted on English Millenarian Thought in the Seventeenth Century* (Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Iowa, 1963), p. 60.

[65]Zakai, "Thomas Brightman", p. 31.

[66]Kenneth G.C. Newport, *Apocalypse and Millennium: Studies in Biblical Eisegesis* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), p. 68.

[67]Katherine Firth, *The Apocalyptic Tradition in Reformation Britain 1530–1645* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979), p. 203.

that Brightman was "the first futurist premillennial dispensationalist".[68] With such a confusing variety of contradictory views set forth on Brightman, it is important that a detailed review of his work and life is carried out, so as to ascertain what his ideas actually were – and what has been read back into his work to suit a particular academic or confessional position. In providing a detailed assessment of Brightman's thought, work and reception, this book aims to meet this need, and to suggest constructive ways in which Brightman may be read.

1.3 Brightman: A Brief Biography

The lack of direct studies of Brightman's work has left something of a gap in his biography. Before we come to Brightman's work itself, it is therefore important to briefly examine both his life and publication history. Biographically, little information survives. "You have desired and have been put into an expectation of receiving some information concerning Mr. Brightman," wrote Edward Gibson to the biographer John Aubrey in December 1681, "tho I have little or nothing to serve you".[69] Nonetheless, it is possible to sketch both Brightman's life and character through the sources which have survived.

Apart from the fact that he was born in Nottinghamshire in 1562,[70] nothing is known of Brightman's early life. He was admitted to Queens' College, Cambridge on 21st February 1577,[71] graduating as a Bachelor in 1581. By 1584 he had gained his M.A. and was appointed a fellow, graduating B.D. in 1591.[72] While Queens' was not the hotbed of puritan ideas which marked colleges such as Christ's and Emmanuel in the period, Brightman was nonetheless active within the emerging presbyterian group at the University.[73] H.C. Porter presents him as a prominent member of that party, alongside William Perkins of Christ's and Henry Alvey of

[68] Wagner, *Anxious*, p. 87.

[69] John Aubrey, *'Brief Lives,' Chiefly of Contemporaries, Set Down by John Aubrey, between the Years 1669 & 1696* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1898), p. 125.

[70] Fuller claims that this was at Nottingham itself ("where some of his brethren were lately alive". Thomas Fuller, *The History of the Worthies of England* (London, 1662), p. 319), though my attempts to trace his family through the parish records have proven unsuccessful.

[71] Charles Henry Cooper and Thompson Cooper, *Athenae Cantabrigienses Volume II: 1586–1609* (Cambridge: Deighton, Bell, and Co., 1861), p. 458.

[72] Theodore Dwight Bozeman, 'Brightman, Thomas (1562–1607)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004).

[73] The President of Queens' in Brightman's time was Humphrey Tyndall, a moderate Calvinist who had little time for what he viewed as more "extreme" puritanism. See Joseph Henry Gray, *The Queens' College of St. Margaret and St. Bernard in the University of Cambridge* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1926), pp. 121–126.

St. John's.[74] He was certainly involved in the local *classis* movement,[75] a system of conferences between ministers and students who shared the ambition of establishing a presbyterian form of government for the Church of England.[76] In 1589 Brightman signed a petition in favour of Francis Johnson, who had been imprisoned for refusal to comply with university authorities after preaching a pro-Presbyterian sermon on 6th January that year.[77] Indeed, it is likely that Brightman subscribed to the presbyterian "Book of Discipline".[78]

Brightman soon moved to a parish after gaining his B.D. Sir John Osborne (or Osbourne/Osborn), the son of Peter Osborne, Keeper of the Privy Purse under Edward VI, had recently rebuilt the rectory of Hawnes in Bedfordshire.[79] In 1592 he was searching for a suitable man to minister there. William Whitaker recommended Brightman to Osborne, who awarded him not only the living, but also the parish profits from the previous two years.[80] Brightman was the sole incumbent in the parish,[81] and soon became a preacher of some local celebrity.[82] He was known for his learned nature, love of reading and piety. All of these features were nicely captured in Thomas Fuller's vignette that Brightman routinely read through the Greek New Testament every fortnight.

His later years at Hawnes were, however, filled with controversy. Brightman was included in the large number of Lincolnshire ministers suspended in 1604/5. On 8th November 1604, Brightman appeared before William Chaderton, Bishop of Lincoln, to answer charges of non-conformity. His defence survives, and reveals that he was charged with three offences.[83] Firstly, that he had been involved

[74]H.C. Porter, *Reformation and Reaction in Tudor Cambridge* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1958), pp. 209–210.

[75]Porter, *Reformation and Reaction*, p. 208.

[76]Patrick Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1967), p. 329.

[77]Porter, *Reformation*, p. 210. The petition displays the comparative lack of enthusiasm for radical ideas in Queens' at the time. Brightman was one of only three fellows from the college to sign the petition, compared to twelve from St. John's, eleven from King's, eleven from Emmanuel, nine from Clare's and six from Christ's.

[78]Cooper and Cooper, *Athenae*, p. 458.

[79]A resolutely Puritan parish. See J.T. Cliffe, *The Puritan Gentry* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1984), p. 162.

[80]Fuller, *Church-History*, Book IX, p. 49.

[81]Lincoln Record Society, *Volume 23: The State of the Church in the Reigns of Elizabeth and James I as Illustrated by Documents Relating to the Diocese of Lincoln, Vol. 1* (Lincoln: Lincoln Record Society, 1926), pp. 192, 363–366.

[82]Fuller, *Church-History*, Book IX, p. 49; Copper and Copper, *Athenae*, p. 458.

[83]The statement was published in Volume 23 of the Lincoln Record Society's series of reprints in 1926. However, Brightman was given little attention by the editors, who note only that he was an academic writer. It seems that this record has escaped the attention of scholars who have examined Brightman's position in later years and is examined here for the first time.

in prophesyings (then banned)[84]; secondly, that he did not wear the surplice in his services; and finally, that he did not catechise his parishioners using the Prayer Book. Brightman admitted every charge, providing a particularly detailed description of the prophesying, at which he preached for two hours on Nehemiah 9:38, using the text to describe the corruption of the Church of England.[85] He also admitted a catalogue of other offences: he refused to pray at the times set by the church; he rejected the full liturgy as being too long; administered communion without wearing the surplice; and refused both the sign of the cross in baptism and the ring in marriage. Finally, he admitted catechising his parishioners using a Presbyterian catechism from Scotland.[86] Understandably, these positions infuriated the Bishop. Brightman appeared before him again in December 1604. On December 12th the Bishop wrote to James Montague, Dean of the King's chapel, complaining bitterly about the dissenting ministers. He bemoaned the fact that "they could not yield either to conformity in apparel, or the Cross in baptism, or subscription".[87] While the majority of ministers had received nothing more severe than a reprimand, eight were suspended, including "Mr Brightman of Hawnes and Mr Fisher of Tring, who have made divers bitter invectives against the ecclesiastical government and governors". Their suspension was to last "till they shall subscribe and yield to conformity".[88] William Ames later claimed that Brightman was one of the authors of the Lincolnshire Abridgement, an attack on the prayer book sent to the James I by suspended ministers of Chaderton's diocese.[89] This may have come about on account of his suspension, although his authorship is not attested elsewhere. Certainly, the sentiments of the abridgment would be at the very least shared by Brightman. During his suspension, Brightman took advantage of his close relationship to his patron, sheltering in Sir John Osborne's house.[90] Laurence Chaderton, Master of Emmanuel, appears to have supplied a minister to cover

[84]These were a system of informal meetings in which scripture was discussed. See Collinson, *Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, pp. 168–176.

[85]The prophesying took place on September 28th 1604 at John Bostocke's church in Southill, Brightman being invited by letter. It lasted from nine until five ("without intermission") and was attended by Andrew Dennie (vicar of St. Pauls, Bedford), Thomas Dillingham (curate at Deane), and Francis Dillingham (Vicar at Wilden, a prolific anti-Catholic writer). Brightman expressed particular anger towards the episcopate.

[86]Diocese of Lincoln Ms. Misc. 1603/105 in Lincoln Record Society, *Volume 23*, pp. cxvi–cxvii.

[87]Salisbury Ms. 330 in *Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Most Hon. the Marquess of Salisbury Pt. 16* (London: H.M.S.O., 1933), pp. 379–380.

[88]Salisbury Ms. 330. The *DNB* records that Chaderton was criticised for his weakness in dealing with non-conformists in his diocese. That Brightman provoked him to such anger implies that his "bitter invectives" must have been quite severe.

[89]The petition was presented to James I on December 1st 1605, and published (illegally) as *An Abridgment of that Booke which the Ministers of Lincoln Diocess Delivered to his Majestie* (London, 1605). See William Ames, *A Fresh Suit Against Human Ceremonies in God's Worship* ([Amsterdam], 1633), p. 502.

[90]Francis Osborne, *The Works of Francis Osborne,* (London, 1700), p. 485. Here the younger Osborne notes that his Father harboured Brightman "under his roof". Bozeman (*To Live*,

Brightman's duties while he was deprived.[91] At some point, probably in 1605,[92] he was restored to his living – he does not appear on any lists of suspended ministers after that of December 12th 1604. Whether he submitted is unknown.[93]

Brightman did not live much longer to enjoy his ministry. On 24th August 1607, while riding with Sir John in his carriage, he suddenly lost consciousness and died within minutes.[94] He was buried on the same day inside his own church, his funeral sermon preached by anti-Jesuit writer Edward Bulkeley. Brightman had apparently been a sickly man, troubled by obstructions of the liver and the gallbladder: "and is supposed by Physicians to have died of the later".[95] When Gibson found Brightman's resting place in 1681, he recorded a 12 line verse inscribed above his tomb, lauding Brightman's credentials as an interpreter of the Apocalypse: "specially to Brightman's recommendacion/[Here] bee entomed a light to th' revelation".[96]

Brightman appears to have made a considerable impression on those who met him. He obviously formed a close bond and friendship with John Osborne, and his son Francis later recalled Brightman as "known by my self pious and learned".[97] Fuller described Brightman as "never known to be moved by anger",[98] while the translator of his commentary on Daniel noted that those who knew him saw the

---

p. 211 n.42) claims that Osborne held a negative opinion of Brightman, but this is not supported in Osborne's text. Brightman wrote his letter to Chaderton from Chicksands, Osborne's home.

[91]Lambeth Palace Ms. 2550 f.176r; "Sir, I understand by Mr Lickering how careful you were I should be provided of an helper in this time of my restraint for which I do very heartisely and humbly thanke you". Brightman is keen to have the new minister in place as soon as possible ("I would crave he would come at the furthest the next weeke following" f.176v). It seems he had previously arranged cover with a neighbouring minister, causing concern that the workload was proving intolerable – "by parting my neighbours labour for his congregations, to make himself fit and profitable to either" f.176r.

[92]The letter to Chaderton is dated 10th January 1604/5. It seems unlikely that the suspension lasted less than six months – Francis Osborne implies it lasted a reasonable length of time. Fuller, despite mentioning Brightman's distaste for church ceremonies, does not mention the suspension.

[93]An interesting parallel can be drawn with the case of a Mr. Stephens described in the manuscript "Life of Thomas Pierson" (Brit. Lib. Lansdowne Ms. 721). Suspended for similar offences, Stephens was reinstated partly through the efforts of his congregation, and partly through those of a local noble. See f.144v–145r.

[94]The Parish records of Hawnes attest this date. See *Genealogia Bedfordiensis: Being a Collection of Evidences Relating Chiefly to the Landed Gentry of Bedfordshire A.D. 1538–1700*, ed. Frederick Augustus Blaydes (London: Privately printed for the Editor at the Chiswick Press, 1890), p. 134.

[95]Fuller, *Church-History,* Book IX, p. 50. One of the more amusing stories circulating about Brightman noted that he regularly prayed that his death (when it came) would be sudden. Fuller feels compelled to deny the rumour that Brightman desired such a demise simply to spite the Book of Common Prayer, which included a plea for the Lord to deliver the congregation from sudden and unexpected death.

[96]Aubury, *'Brief Lives'*, p. 125. This was destroyed or built over during the extensive Victorian renovation of the church at Hawnes.

[97]Osborne, *Works*, p. 101.

[98]Fuller, *Church-History*, Book IX, p. 50.

"great measure of meekness and humilities that God had graced him withall".[99] His one surviving letter, written to Laurence Chaderton in January 1605, supports this view. While he was writing to his "very good friend", with whom he shared "speciall love",[100] he nonetheless felt compelled to discuss the controversy over church ceremonies. Peter Lake is right to remark that Brightman's argument is "notable for its unpolemical and gentlemanly tone".[101] However, Brightman could also be stubborn and appears to have been a forceful debater. Fuller, while defending him, noted that "when his pen falls foul on Romish superstition, his friends account it zeal, and no passion". His hatred of the established church structure was well known: "his daily discourse was against Episcopal Government, which he declared would shortly be pulled down".[102]

One woodcut print of Brightman survives. It originally appeared in Dutch editions of Brightman's work, as well as in the 1641 tract *A Revelation of Mr. Brightman's Revelation*. It was later resold separately by print seller Peter Strent.[103] The picture itself claims to depict Brightman aged 45. It portrays a middle aged man, of seemingly short stature with a clipped beard, dressed in cap, ruff and gown. Behind him, the parapets and flags of a heavenly city are barely visible through what appear to be clouds. A poem beneath the portrait describes Brightman as a man "bright in prophecy". This epithet was the result of his imposing commentaries on the apocalyptic portions of the Bible. It seems likely that Brightman wrote his commentaries in the period 1600–1607. The preface to the first edition of *Apocalypsis Apocalypseos* was dated 25th February 1606, although this has been changed by hand to either 1607 or 1609.[104] The text itself contained several clues to the date of composition. Aside from references made to the "last *Constitutions* and *Canons*, which are wont to be wisest, discussed *in a Synod at London*, and set forth Anno 1597",[105] Brightman celebrated "these *forty* and *two* yeeres" of peace under the "most gracious Queen".[106] This dates his work to 1600 at the earliest. Laurence Chaderton was proof reading the first part of the Revelation commentary in 1604/5,[107] making it likely that the book was either completed or nearing completion by this period. However, none of his commentaries were

[99] Brightman, *Daniel.,* p. 111.

[100] Lambeth Palace Ms. 2550 f. 176r.

[101] Lake, *Moderate Puritans*, p. 254.

[102] Fuller, *Church-History*, Book IX, p. 49.

[103] Strent's printing, as held by the British Museum, is the clearest copy extant.

[104] It is likely that this difference is due to different calendar systems operating in England and Germany at this time. 25th Feb 1606 would be 25th Feb 1607 in the Gregorian calendar. However the amendment can also be read as 1609 – the printed figure is clearly a six, but the modified figure could conceivably be read as either a seven or nine. The date is omitted from later editions.

[105] Brightman, *Revelation.*, p. 145.

[106] Brightman, *Revelation.*, p. 126 He also describes those who "seek her death" in the present tense, p. 382.

[107] Lambeth Palace Ms. 2550 f.176v. The date on the letter is January 1604.

published prior to his death. They first appeared in the spring catalogue of the 1609 Frankfurt Book Fair.[108] This was the Frankfurt printing of his commentary on the book of Revelation, *Apocalypsis Apocalypseos*. The following year, a section of the commentary aimed specifically against Cardinal Roberto Bellarmine's views on the Antichrist was published at Amberg in *Antichristus. Disputatio bipartite* as *Antichristum Pontificiorum & Jesuitarum, fictitium, & contra veritatem Sacrarum literarum ementitum monstrum esse*. Brightman's work followed Daniel Tilenus's *Papam Romanum Magnum Antichristum esse* in the volume. The first edition of his commentary on Song of Songs appeared in 1614 at Basel along with his study of the latter part of Daniel (*Commentarius in Cantica canticorum Salomonis, analysi & scholiis illustratus. Adjecta est eiusdem, Danielis, à ver. 36. cap. 11. ad finem cap. 12., explicatio*). The Daniel commentary appeared separately later that year, also at Basel.

The first English edition of Brightman was published in 1611 in Amsterdam as *A Revelation of the Apocalyps*,[109] with controversial separatist Jean de l'Ecluse apparently among its translators.[110] A second, revised edition appeared in 1615, also at Amsterdam, entitled *A Revelation of the Revelation*. A year later a third

[108]Such fairs presented an opportunity for a publisher to promote their wares across Europe, with the Frankfurt fair being the biggest. See Keith L. Sprunger, *Trumpets from the Tower: English Puritan Preaching in the Netherlands 1600–1640* (Leiden: Brill, 1994), pp. 165–166.

[109]Here we must take note of Donald Wagner's claim that Brightman's work first appeared as "a pamphlet of less than fifty pages" in 1585 (*Anxious*, p. 85). This dating is used in contemporary works on the Christian Zionist tradition (for example, Cohn-Sherbok *The Politics of Apocalypse,* pp. xii, 3) and if correct, calls for a radical re-reading of Brightman's influence. However, Wagner's claim appears to be incorrect. The *STC* does not list Brightman's works as appearing prior to 1609. Wagner describes the book he examined as "available at the British Museum" where he claims to have read it. Enquiries at the British Museum and British Library confirm that they are not aware of it. It is possible that Wagner is confusing Brightman's study with Francis Kett's 1585 *The Glorious and Beautifull Garland of Mans Glorification*. Another possibility is that he was reading a later popularisation of the work – which would account for his otherwise unsubstantiated report of controversy over Brightman's views, and claims that he was "driven underground". However none of these run to 50 pages, or deal explicitly with Jewish restoration. In the text of *Anxious*, Wagner repeatedly stresses the materiality of the work he read – he speaks of touching the cover, removing the rope binding, etc. Given that the quotes he cites are from Brightman's commentary on Daniel, it is likely that he has conflated that commentary, *Apocalypsis Apocalypseos* and Kett's work in his note taking.

[110]Jean de l'Ecluse *An Advertisement to Everie Godly Reader of Mr. Thomas Brightman his Book* (Amsterdam, 1612), in which he claims that he "had a hand in the translating and printing of M.B. book" (p. 3). This claim is supported in an attack on de l'Ecluse, which accused him of doctoring the manuscripts he worked on. See Robert Bulwarde, John Fowler and Clement Saunders *A Shield of Defence Against the Arrowes of Schisme Shot Abroad by Iean de L'escluse in his Advertisment against Mr. Brightman* (Amsterdam, 1612), p. 3. l'Ecluse was often involved in disputes among the foreign congregations of Amsterdam, and played a part in the split of the Walloon church before leaving to join Henry Ainsworth's congregation. After Ainsworth's death he served as temporary pastor to part of the congregation in the English Church in Amsterdam. By 1616 he was a schoolmaster. See Keith L. Sprunger, "Puritan Church Architecture and Worship in a Dutch Context", *Church History*, 66:1 (Mar., 1997), p. 45.

edition appeared at Leiden. Emmanuel graduate Thomas Pierson was involved in the publication of some of these works, although it is impossible to ascertain which ones.[111] There followed a gap of nearly 20 years before Brightman was republished, with the exception of a 1618 reprint of the Latin *Apocalypsis Apocalypseos* and a Dutch translation of the same work.[112] The commentary on the latter part of Daniel was finally translated into English and published in 1635 at Amsterdam as *A Most Comfortable Exposition of the Last and Most Difficult Part of the Prophecie of Daniel*. Following the end of Laudian publishing restrictions in 1640, a number of brief, anonymous tracts claiming to summarise Brightman's views were published.[113] His actual works, however, remained unprinted in England until 1644, when a number of editions were published. All three of his commentaries appeared together in the *Works of that Famous, Reverend, and Learned Divine, Mr Tho. Brightman,* which contained the first English translation of his commentary on the Song of Songs. This appeared in both London and Amsterdam. Each commentary also appeared separately in the same year, though in the same translations as found in the *Works*.

In 1646/7 two further works appeared, both comprised of his sermons and published by Thomas Floret for John Rothwell. *The Art of Self-Deniall* was a straight-forward examination of Luke 9:23. The second work was a collection of four sermons, published as *Brightman Redivivus: or The Post-Humian Of-spring of Mr. Thomas Brightman, in IIII. Sermons.* The sermons dealt with the allegory of Sarah and Hagar (Gal. 4:22–26), "The Danger of Scandalls" (Mt. 18:7), God's commission to Christ to preach the Gospel (Lk. 4:18), and "The Saints' Securitie" (Jude 21,22). While the first three sermons were undated, the sermon on Jude was preached at St. Mary's in Cambridge on December 4th 1590. From this date, and the fact that Brightman's views on certain elements seem to be less developed than in his commentaries, it seems likely that they date from his last years as a fellow at Cambridge, or early years at Hawnes.

It is probable that additional works by Brightman were in circulation amongst English writers during the early-to-mid seventeenth century. An entry in the Stationer's Register for 24th February 1640/41 recorded the licensing of "Three

[111]See Brit. Lib. Lansdowne Ms. 721 f.90v. Pierson was at Cambridge until 1612, where he was employed in compiling William Perkins' works, as well as "Publishing Mr. Brightmans Workes". We are told that this involved "Correction the first most Extream faulty Impresion of his Commentarie on the Apocalyps", though it is impossible to say whether this was the Latin manuscript edition or not. It is possible that the faults were de l'Ecluse's additions.

[112]This was published by Jans Evertsz Cloppenburch in 1621 as *Een Grondighe Ontdeckinghe ofte Duydelijcke Uytlegginghe, met een Logicale Ontknoopinghe, over de Gantsche Openbaringe Johannis des Apostels* (Amsterdam, 1621).

[113]For example, [Anon.], *Brightmans Predictions and Prophecies Written 46 Yeares Since: Concerning the Three Churches of Germanie, England, and Scotland* ([London], 1641); [Anon.], *A Revelation of Mr. Brightmans Revelation,* ([London], 1641); [Anon.], *Reverend Mr. Brightmans Judgement or Prophesies* (London, 1641). On these see Andrew Crome, 'Constructing the Political Prophet in 1640s England', *The Seventeenth Century* 26:2 (Oct. 2011), pp. 279–298.

sermons" to printer Richard Hearne (or Heron). Two of the sermons were by Thomas Bilson, late Bishop of Winchester, while the other was "upon Nehem 9.38 by Master Brightman".[114] This sermon is likely to have been the same mentioned in Brightman's confession before the Bishop of Lincoln, preached in Southill in September 1604. It does not, however, appear to have ever been printed: no other record of it exists. However, a fascinating commentary upon the reason for its non-appearance was included in James Howell's 1656 critique of the Long Parliament. "Master Heron", a printer, had been approached by Lady Mary Vere when the proposal that England took the Solemn League and Covenant had become public knowledge. According to Howell, "she had a Sermon in a fair manuscript of that great light of the Church Master *Brightman* which treats of *universal Covenants,* how far they are agreeable to Scripture". Heron agreed to print the sermon, and submitted it for licensing. After three days, finding his sermon licensed, Heron was taken aback at the modifications made by the licensers. The text was "most pittifully *falsified, interlined* and *adulterated* in many places; For whereas the opinion of *Brightman* throughout the whole Sermon, was, that a Nationall and Generall Covenant was agreeable to the Word of God, Provided, *the King did give his Royall assent thereunto, without which it was both detestable and damnable;* The *holy Synodicall* man had expung'd the word *King* every where, and foisted in the room of it, sometimes the word *Parliament,* sometimes the *Trustees of the Common wealth*". Heron's response was forceful: "were he to get 1000 *l.* by printing that Sermon, he would not be so arrand a Knave as to wrong the Dead so much, by making him speak what he never meant, nay things quite contrary to his meaning".

Howell claimed that the sermon had originally been preached before the House of Commons, but this seems unlikely, as it seems to have been the same sermon Brightman preached at the 1604 prophesying.[115] The link with Mary Vere is interesting, as she was a noted supporter of puritan preachers and is known to have had correspondence with William Ames, William Gurnall and James Ussher, amongst others.[116] It is certainly possible that Vere obtained the sermon through the network of puritan preachers in the South East of England at the time. William Ames also appears to have had a number of Brightman's notes, printing "M. Brightmans Answer to B. Jewels Allegations, For the Antiquitie of Distinct Ceremonious Apparel used by Ministers in their Ministration".[117] The content of this small

[114] *A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London*, ed. Edward Arber, (London: Privately Printed, 1874–8), Entry for 24th February 1640/1.

[115] James Howell, *Some Sober Inspections Made into Carriage and Consults of the Late Long-Parliament* (London, 1656), pp. 148–150.

[116] Jacqueline Eales, "Vere, Mary, Lady Vere (1581–1671)", *DNB.*

[117] Ames, *Fresh Suit*, pp. 502–510. It is not certain that this work is written by Brightman, despite Ames' claims. Jewel died in 1571, and it is difficult to see why Brightman would feel the need to write a personally directed criticism of Jewel's work in the period 1585–1607, especially since the work seems to presume that Jewel is still alive – the criticism, in particular is directed directly at "you" throughout. Having said this, it is entirely possible that Jewel's work was being used as a defence of ceremonies in the 1580s and 1590s, or that Brightman merely used a popular rhetorical

treatise, which took up eight pages in Ames' *Fresh Suit Against Human Ceremonies*, set forth Brightman's usual negative view of church ceremonies. Ames claimed to have further "papers of Mr. Brightman" in his possession.[118] The fact that Ames had access to Brightman's notes in Amsterdam, combined with Vere's own links with the Netherlands, suggests a way in which Brightman's manuscripts may have reached the continent in 1609.

While Brightman may not have published at all in his lifetime, and his total number of works was small, these works nonetheless exercised a powerful influence on the eschatological positions of those writers who followed him. This may seem an unlikely claim, but through examining the way in which Brightman's work re-imagined standard eschatological and hermeneutic tropes of his day, this book aims to highlight both the uniqueness of his thought, and the impact that his findings had from an early date. In the opening chapter, I will explore the standard hermeneutical and eschatological positions in the early seventeenth century. A writer's position on these issues was crucial for the way in which they portrayed the Jews and the future they imagined for them. As we will see, these positions grew increasingly complex as the period wore on.

References

A revelation of Mr. Brightmans revelation. 1641. London.

Almond, Philip. 2007. Thomas Brightman and the origins of philo-semitism: An Elizabethan theologian and the return of the Jews to Israel. *Reformation and Renaissance Review* 9(1): 3–25.

Ames, William. 1633. *A fresh suit against human ceremonies in God's worship*. Amsterdam.

Anon. *A memoir of the life and writings of the Rev. Thomas Pierson*. British Library Landsdowne Ms. 721/8.

Anonymous. 1605. *An abridgment of that booke which the ministers of Lincoln Diocess delivered to his Majestie*. London.

Arber, Edward (ed.). 1874–8. *A transcript of the registers of the company of stationers of London*. London: Privately Printed.

Aubrey, John. 1898. *'Brief Lives', chiefly of contemporaries, set down by John Aubrey, between the years 1669 & 1696*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Ball, Bryan W. 1975. *A great expectation: Eschatological thought in English Protestantism to 1660*. Leiden: Brill.

Blaydes, Frederick Augustus (ed.). 1890. *Genealogia Bedfordiensis: Being a collection of evidences relating chiefly to the landed Gentry of Bedfordshire A.D. 1538–1700*. London: Chiswick Press.

Bozeman, Theodore D. 1988. *To live ancient lives: The primitivist dimension in puritanism*. Chapel Hill/London: University of North Carolina Press.

Bozeman, Theodore Dwight. 2004. Brightman, Thomas (1562–1607). In *Oxford dictionary of national biography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. doi:10.1093/ref:odnb/3425.

style. Whether the work is actually by Brightman or not is essentially unimportant – the key point being that Ames had a collection of Brightman's notes in the 1620s.

[118] Ames, *Fresh Suit*, p. 502.

Brady, David. 1983. *The contribution of British writers between 1560 and 1830 to the interpretation of Revelation 13:16–18*. Tubingen: J.C.B. Mohr.

Brightmans predictions and prophecies written 46 yeares since: Concerning the three churches of Germanie, England, and Scotland. 1641. London.

Brightman, Thomas. 1635. *A most comfortable exposition of the last and most difficult part of the prophecie of Daniel from the 26. verse of the 11. chap, to the end of the 12. chapter. Wherin the restoring of the Jewes and their callinge to the faith of Christ, after the utter overthrow of their three last enemies, is set forth in livelie coulours*. Amsterdam.

Brightman, Thomas. 1644. *The revelation of St. Iohn illustrated with an analysis & scholions . . . The Fourth Edition, Corrected & Amended*. London.

Brightman, Thomas. *!Letter to Laurence Chaderton, 10th January 1604/5*. Lambeth Palace Ms. 2550.

Bullinger, Heinrich. 1573. *A hundred sermons upon the apocalipse of Jesu Christ*. London.

Bulwarde, Robert, John Fowler, and Clement Saunders. 1612. *A shield of defence against the arrowes of schisme shot abroad by Iean de L'escluse in his advertisment against Mr. Brightman*. Amsterdam.

Calendar of the manuscripts of the most Hon. the Marquess of Salisbury Pt. 16. 1933. London: H.M.S.O.

Capp, Bernard. 1972. *The fifth monarchy men*. London: Faber and Faber.

Cliffe, J.T. 1984. *The puritan gentry*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Clouse, Robert Gordon. 1963. *The influence of John Henry Alsted on English millenarian thought in the seventeenth century*. University of Iowa, Unpublished PhD thesis.

Coffey, John, and Paul C.H. Lim. 2008. Introduction. In *The Cambridge companion to puritanism*, ed. John Coffey and Paul C.H. Lim, 1–7. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Cogley, Richard W. 2003. The fall of the Ottoman Empire and the restoration of Israel in the "Judeo-Centric" strand of puritan millenarianism. *Church History* 72: 304–332.

Cogley, Richard W. 2005. 'The most vile and barbarous nation of all the world': Giles Fletcher the Elder's *The Tartars or, Ten Tribes* (ca. 1610). *Renaissance Quarterly* 58: 781–814.

Cohn-Sherbok, Dan. 2005. *The politics of apocalypse: The history and influence of Christian Zionism*. Oxford: Oneworld.

Collinson, Patrick. 1967. *The Elizabethan puritan movement*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cooper, Charles Henry, and Thompson Cooper. 1861. *Athenae Cantabrigienses volume II: 1586–1609*. Cambridge: Deighton, Bell, and Co.

Crome, Andrew. 2010. "The proper and naturall meaning of the prophets": The hermeneutic roots of Judeo-centrism in puritan eschatology. *Renaissance Studies* 24: 725–741.

Crome, Andrew. 2011. Constructing the political prophet in 1640s England. *The Seventeenth Century* 26: 279–298.

Culver, Douglas. 1995. *Albion and Ariel*. New York: Peter Lang.

de l'Ecluse, Jean. 1612. *An advertisement to everie godly reader of Mr. Thomas Brightman his book*. Amsterdam.

de Lubac, Henri. 1998. *Medieval exegesis*, The four senses of scripture, vol. 1. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

de Lubac, Henri. 2000. *Medieval exegesis*, vol. 2. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Diocese of Lincoln Ms. Misc. 1603/105 in Lincoln Record Society, vol. 23.

Draxe, Thomas. 1608. *The worldes resurrection, or the generall calling of the Jewes.* London.

Eales, Jacqueline. 2008. Vere, Mary, Lady Vere (1581–1671). In *Oxford dictionary of national biography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. doi:10.1093/ref:odnb/40534.

Farrar, Frederic W. 1961. *History of interpretation*. Grand Rapids: Baker.

Firth, Katherine. 1979. *The apocalyptic tradition in reformation Britain 1530–1645*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Frison, Danielle. 2001. Millénarisme et Judaïsme dans l'Angleterre du XVIIe Siècle. In *Formes du Millénarisme en Europe à L'aube des Temps Modernes*, ed. Jean-Raymond Fanlo and André Tournon, 285–306. Paris: Honoré Champion.

Froom, Le. Roy Edwin. 1948. *The prophetic faith of our fathers: The historical development of prophetic interpretation*, Pre-reformation and reformation, restoration, and second departure, vol. II. Washington, DC: Review and Herald.
Fuller, Thomas. 1655. *The Church-history of Britain from the birth of Jesus Christ until the year M.DC.XLVIII*. London.
Fuller, Thomas. 1662. *The history of the worthies of England*. London.
Gamble, Richard (ed.). 1992. *Articles on Calvin and Calvinism: Calvin and hermeneutics*. New York/London: Garland.
Gates, David. 2006. Religion: The pop prophets. *Newsweek*. May 24.
Gibson, Kenneth. 1999. *Eschatology, apocalypse and millenarianism in seventeenth century protestant thought*. Nottingham Trent University, Unpublished PhD thesis.
Gordis, Lisa M. 2003. *Opening scripture: Bible reading and interpretive authority in puritan New England*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Gray, Joseph Henry. 1926. *The Queens' College of St. Margaret and St. Bernard in the University of Cambridge*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
Gribben, Crawford. 2011. *Evangelical millennialism in the transatlantic world, 1500–2000*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
Gribben, Crawford. 2008. *The puritan millennium: Literature and theology, 1550–1682*, Revised ed. Milton Keynes: Paternoster.
Guibbory, Achsah. 2010. *Christian identity, Jews and Israel in seventeenth-century England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Harrison, Peter. 1999. *The Bible, Protestantism and the rise of natural science*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
Harrison, Peter. 2007. Reinterpreting nature in early modern Europe: Natural philosophy, biblical exegesis and the contemplative life. In *The word and the world: Biblical exegesis and early modern science*, ed. Kevin Killeen and Peter J. Forshaw, 25–44. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.
Hayter, Richard. 1675. *The meaning of the revelation*. London.
Hedding, Malcolm. 2011. *Position statements: The ICEJ's core beliefs*. http://int.icej.org/about/position-statements. Accessed 15 Oct 2011.
Hill, Christopher. 1971. *Antichrist in seventeenth century England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Hill, Christopher. 1993. *The English Bible and the seventeenth-century revolution*. London: Allen Lane/The Penguin Press.
Homes, Nathanael. 1641. *The new world, or, the new reformed church*. London.
Howell, James. 1656. *Some sober inspections made into carriage and consults of the late long-parliament*. London.
Ice, Thomas. 2004. *Lovers of Zion: A history of Christian Zionism*. http://www.pre-trib.org/data/pdf/Ice-LoversofZionAHistory.pdf. Accessed 26 Aug 2010.
Jeanrond, Werner B. 1997. *Theological hermeneutics: Development and significance*. London: SCM.
Jue, Jeffrey K. 2006. *Heaven upon Earth: Joseph Mede (1586–1638) and the legacy of millenarianism*. Dordrecht: Springer.
Jue, Jeffrey K. 2008. Puritan millenarianism in Old and New England. In *The Cambridge companion to puritanism*, ed. John Coffey and Paul Chang-Ha Lim, 259–276. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
Killeen, Kevin. 2009. *Biblical scholarship, science and politics in early modern England*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
Killeen, Kevin. 2010. Chastising with scorpions: Reading the Old Testament in early modern England. *Huntington Library Quarterly* 73: 491–506.
Klug, E.F. 1971. *From Luther to Chemnitz: On scripture and the word*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
Knott, John R. 1980. *The sword of the spirit: Puritan responses to the Bible*. Chicago/London: Chicago University Press.
Korshin, Paul J. 1982. *Typologies in England 1650–1820*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Kroeze, George. 1985. *The variety of millennial hopes in the English reformation 1560–1660*. Fuller Theological Seminary, Unpublished PhD thesis.
Lake, Peter. 1982. *Moderate puritans and the Elizabethan church*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Lake, Peter. 1993. Defining puritanism – Again? In *Puritanism: Transatlantic perspectives on a seventeenth-century Anglo-American faith*, ed. Francis J. Bremer, 3–29. Boston: Massachusetts Historical Society.
Lamont, William. 1969. *Godly rule: Politics and religion 1603–1660*. London: Macmillan.
Lamont, William. 1996. *Puritanism and historical controversy*. London: U.C.L. Press.
Liu, Tai. 1973. *Discord in Zion: The puritan divines and the puritan revolution 1640–1660*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.
Luxon, Thomas H. 1995. *Literal figures: Puritan allegory and the reformation crisis in representation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Matar, Nabil. 1998. *Islam in Britain 1558–1685*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Mattern, Frank. 2009. *Milton and Christian Hebraism: Rabbinic exegesis in paradise lost*. Heidelberg: Winter.
McKim, Donald, and Jack B. Rogers. 1979. *The authority and interpretation of the Bible: An historical approach*. San Francisco: Harper & Row.
Muller, Richard A. 1990. The hermeneutic of promise and fulfilment in Calvin's exegesis of the Old Testament prophecies of the kingdom. In *The Bible in the sixteenth century*, ed. David Steinmetz, 68–82. London: Duke University Press.
Murray, Iain H. 1971. *The puritan hope: A study in revival and the interpretation of prophecy*. Edinburgh: Banner of Truth.
Nelson, Eric. 2010. *The Hebrew Republic: Jewish sources and the transformation of European political thought*. Cambridge, MA/London: Harvard University Press.
Newport, Kenneth G.C. 2000. *Apocalypse and millennium: Studies in biblical eisegesis*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
Osborne, Francis. 1700. *The works of Francis Osborne*. London.
Patrides, C.A., and Joseph Wittreich (eds.). 1984. *The apocalypse in English renaissance thought and literature*. Manchester: University of Manchester Press.
Petersen, Rodney. 1993. *Preaching in the last days: The theme of 'two witnesses' in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Peterson, Kenneth Troy. 1991. *Thomas Brightman: A transitional figure*. Fuller Theological Seminar, Unpublished ThM thesis.
Popkin, Richard (ed.). 1988. *Millenarianism and messianism in English literature and thought 1650–1800*. Leiden: Brill.
Porter, H.C. 1958. *Reformation and reaction in Tudor Cambridge*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
Preus, James Samuel. 1969. *From shadow to promise: Old Testament interpretation from Augustine to the Young Luther*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
Reverend Mr. Brightmans judgement or prophesies. 1641. London.
Richey, Elizabeth Gilman. 1998. *The politics of revelation in the English renaissance*. Columbia: University of Missouri Press.
Rosenblatt, Jason P. 2006. *Renaissance England's Chief Rabbi: John Selden*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Shear, Adam. 2011. William Whiston's Judeo-Christianity: Millenarianism and Christian Zionism in early enlightenment England. In *Philosemitism in history*, ed. Jonathan Kemp and Adam Sutcliffe, 93–110. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Shoulson, Jeffrey S. 2001. *Milton and the rabbis: Hebraism, Hellenism and Christianity*. New York: Columbia University Press.
Smalley, Beryl. 1964. *The study of the Bible in the middle ages*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.
Sprunger, Keith L. 1994. *Trumpets from the tower: English puritan preaching in the Netherlands 1600–1640*. Leiden: Brill.

Sprunger, Keith L. 1997. Puritan church architecture and worship in a Dutch context. *Church History* 66: 36–53.
Surridge, Robert James. 2000. *The art of apocalyptic persuasion: The rhetorical dynamics and history of influence of the letter to Laodicea*. King's College London, Unpublished PhD thesis.
Toon, Peter (ed.). 2002 [1970]. *The puritans, the millennium, and the future of Israel*. Cambridge, UK: James Clark & Co.
Torrance, Thomas. 1988. *The hermeneutics of John Calvin*. Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press.
Vance, Norman. 2010. More light? Biblical criticism and enlightenment attitudes. *Religion in the Age of Enlightenment* 2: 131–152.
Wagner, Donald E. 1995. *Anxious for Armageddon*. Scottdale: Herald Press.
Walsh, Marcus. 1999. Profession and authority: The interpretation of the Bible in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. *Literature and Theology* 9: 383–398.
Wilson, John F. 1969. *Pulpit in parliament: Puritanism during the English civil wars 1640–1648*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
Zakai, Avihu. 1989. Thomas Brightman and English apocalyptic tradition. In *Menasseh ben Israel and his world*, ed. Yosef Kaplan, Henry Méchoulan, and Richard H. Popkin, 31–44. Leiden: Brill.
Zakai, Avihu. 1992. *Exile and kingdom: History and apocalypse in the puritan migration to America*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Chapter 2
Hermeneutics and the Jews in Protestant Thought

In Genesis 12:7 God promises Abraham the land of Canaan as an eternal possession. Three chapters later the exact boundaries of this possession are laid out more clearly. Abraham's descendants are pledged all the land from "the river of Egypt unto the great river, the river Euphrates". Throughout the Old Testament this promise is repeatedly described as an "everlasting covenant" (1 Chr. 16:16–17, Ps. 105:10); Israel's ownership of the land as an "everlasting possession" (Gen. 17:8, 48:4). Although God will sometimes exile his people, he will bring them back "and they shall no more be pulled up out of their land which I have given them" (Amos 9:15); "I will make them one nation in the land, on the mountains of Israel . . . I will make a covenant of peace with them; it will be an everlasting covenant. I will establish them and increase their numbers, and I will put my sanctuary among them for ever" (Ezk. 37:22a, 26). Although these promises appear to contain clear predictions of the future of the restored Jewish nation, those writing on these verses in early modern England were at pains to show that the prophecies of a restoration to the land should not be taken literally. How was it, asked Nicholas Gibbons in his 1601 *Questions and Disputations*, that the Jews were "long agoe expelled [from] the land of Canaan, seeing the Lord here promiseth it to Abram and his seed forever"? The answer to this problematic question was found in the fact that "forever" did not necessarily mean "eternal" in scripture – the same word signifying either a never-ending period or signalling a dispensation that would be ended by the coming of the messiah. Secondly, "the promises of God, besides the litterall meaning, containe also a spiritual understanding . . . God promises herein by word the land of *Canaan*, he giveth therin to *Abraham* the inheritance of the world: meaneth by *his seed*, not onelie those that were derived from his bodye, but also those that should be partakers of his faith".[1]

[1]Nicholas Gibbons, *Questions and Disputations Concerning the Holy Scripture* (London, 1601), pp. 497–498.

A. Crome, *The Restoration of the Jews: Early Modern Hermeneutics, Eschatology, and National Identity in the Works of Thomas Brightman*, International Archives of the History of Ideas Archives internationales d'histoire des idées 213,
DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-04762-1_2,

Recognition of the fact that English Protestants generally favoured the "literal" sense of scripture is uncontroversial.[2] Yet such a straight-forward observation can mask the fact that a preference for the "literal" presumed a number of complex hermeneutical rules and theological presuppositions that were set out at length in sermon manuals, anti-Romanist polemic and biblical commentaries across the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The way in which the "literal" was understood is especially pertinent when dealing with the interpretation of biblical prophecy, and in particular, with the question of the role played by the Jews in future events. When modern commentators such as Avihu Zakai claim that puritan eschatology was often based "upon the literal interpretation of prophecy",[3] the presumption remains that there was an easily understandable, self-evident reading of the text which would be agreed upon by both seventeenth-century and contemporary readers. Yet as the snapshot of Gibbons' view above suggests, while the "literal" sense was maintained in interpreting the prophecies of Jewish restoration to the Holy Land, this sense did not necessarily mean the words exactly as written. To maintain the literal sense a commentator must be aware of the whole flow of biblical prophecy, the current position of the Jews and the spiritual meaning of carnal predictions. This was no arbitrary interpretation, but rather built upon a foundation of patristic, medieval and reformation exegesis that was developed in the distinctive ecclesiastical situation of sixteenth and early seventeenth-century England. As I suggested in the introduction, it is my contention that a particular hermeneutical position, built upon an understanding of the literal sense through the "analogy of faith", was developed by Thomas Brightman and later writers, leading to a new understanding of prophecies of Jewish restoration to Palestine. Before looking at the way in which English writers constructed this hermeneutical tradition, it is necessary to examine the building blocks they used – in particular the patristic (and especially Augustinian) roots of their thinking.

2.1 The Literal and Allegorical Senses of Scripture

One of the key questions for Christian authors has always been the way in which Old Testament promises made to Israel were to be read after Christ's coming. This was a topic which inevitably touched upon relations between Christians and Jews. Christian writers were anxious to show that Christ's death and resurrection had been clearly predicted in the Hebrew Bible. A strategy present in the New Testament itself was to adopt Christological interpretations of Old Testament events, rituals and institutions as types prefiguring Christ. This allowed for the fulfilment of the tabernacle (Heb. 9), the law (Mt. 5:17) and the priesthood (Heb. 2:17) in Christ. Although messianic typology had been popular with rabbis of the Palestinian

[2] See for example, Killeen, *Biblical Scholarship*, especially pp. 1–64.

[3] Zakai, *Exile*, p. 45.

school from the third century BCE onward,[4] its use in early Christian texts often had a polemic purpose. Christian writers, frequently surrounded by hostile Jewish communities, sought to defend their faith as the true continuation of Judaism and Christ as the fulfilment of Israel's promises. The early second century Epistle of Barnabas argued that Christians enjoyed the true fulfilment of the covenant made to Abraham on the basis that the examples of Esau and Jacob, and Manasseh and Ephraim demonstrated God's will to bless the younger son as opposed to the older, natural heir.[5] The Jews were therefore criticised for their role in Christ's death and for failing to see the spiritual types hidden in Old Testament prophecies. "The Jews lose heavenly blessings, by confining their hopes to earthly ones"[6] wrote Tertullian. "Christ is the Israel and the Jacob," argued Justin Martyr, "even so we, who have been quarried out from the bowels of Christ, are the true Israelitic race".[7] The Jews were seen to have been rejected as God's people, with the Christian Church inheriting the blessings made to Israel. This meant an active typological interpretation being applied to the Old Testament.

Nonetheless, hopes for the conversion of a large number of Jews persisted. These were largely based upon Paul's discussion of the issue in Romans 9–11, which concluded with the statement that: "Israel has experienced a hardening in part until the full number of the Gentiles has come in. And so all Israel will be saved" (Ro. 11:25b–26a). As Jeremy Cohen has shown, whether "all Israel" meant all Jews or only a small remnant was an open question for exegetes in the first centuries of Christianity.[8] From an early date hopes for such a conversion were bound up with apocalyptic speculation. This was partly due to the eschatological language used by Paul in linking the salvation of Israel with the "fullness" of the Gentiles, but could also be attributed to both Old Testament promises and passages such as Revelation 7 which predicted the sealing of 144,000 from "all the tribes of Israel" (Rev. 7:4). Similarly influential was the most problematic apocalyptic passage in the New Testament, Revelation 20:1–6. This text appeared to predict the earthly reign of Christ with his saints for a period of a thousand years while Satan was bound. This concept of an earthly "millennium" of Christ's rule was reminiscent of Jewish messianism, which imagined the reign of the messiah in a restored Jerusalem. Some Christians embraced exactly that position. Irenaeus argued for both the literal desecration of the Jewish temple by the Antichrist

[4] R.P.C. Hanson, *Allegory and Event: A Study of the Sources and Significance of Origen's Interpretation of Scripture* (London: SCM, 1959), pp. 13–25.

[5] *The Epistle of Barnabas* XIV.

[6] Tertullian, *On the Resurrection of the Flesh*, Trans. Peter Holmes, in *The Anti-Nicene Fathers Vol. II*, eds James Donaldson and Alexander Roberts (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1968), p. 564.

[7] Justin Martyr, *Dialogue with Trypho*, Trans. James Donaldson and Alexander Roberts, in *The Anti-Nicene Fathers Vol. I*, eds James Donaldson and Alexander Roberts (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1969), p. 267.

[8] Jeremy Cohen, "The Mystery of Israel's Salvation: Romans 11:25–26 in Patristic and Medieval Exegesis", *Harvard Theological Review* 98:3 (July 2005), pp. 247–281.

and an earthly kingdom based in Jerusalem. Those who attempted to allegorise such prophecies were, in his opinion, inconsistent and confounded by the clear predictions of scripture.[9] Yet the restoration should not be used to argue for a Jewish kingdom: "the Church is the seed of Abraham".[10] Similarly, Justin Martyr claimed that "I and others, who are right-minded Christians on all points, are assured that there will be a resurrection of the dead, and a thousand years in Jerusalem, which will then be built, adorned, and enlarged, [as] the prophets Ezekiel and Isaiah and others declare".[11] Justin's claim that all "right-minded Christians" acquiesced in this belief was something of an exaggeration. Belief in a literal millennium, especially one based in Jerusalem, proved contentious. It had particularly problematic links to the beliefs of the gnostic Cerinthius, who had argued that the millennium would be a thousand year period given over to the sating of fleshly appetites. The fact that such readings of this passage were possible un-nerved some commentators and led them to seek "spiritual" readings of the book of Revelation.

This sort of interpretation was evident from the first extant commentary on Revelation by Victorinus, Bishop of Petau (d. c. 304 CE) which made active use of Origen's allegorical method. Using the dichotomy in 2 Corinthians 3:6 between the killing letter and life-giving spirit, Origen had argued that taking scripture as written was tantamount to superstition.[12] He suggested a threefold sense of scripture. As man had body, soul and spirit, a passage may have a literal, moral and tropological sense.[13] In contrast to the "Jewish" interpretation of the literal sense,[14] the allegorical sense was for the mature Christian.[15] The Holy Spirit had left clues hidden within biblical narrative in the form of nonsensical statements to shock the reader, with the aim of pointing to the importance of allegory.[16] Using this method, Victorinus read Revelation for its spiritual value. Thus the seven churches in Asia that receive instruction from Christ (Rev. 2–3), were seen not as seven, historical churches, but rather as describing seven classes of saints. The text did not depict the future in a sequential fashion, but rather repeated a number of themes and spiritual

[9]Irenaeus, *Against Heresies* v.35.1, trans. James Donaldson and Alexander Roberts in *The Anti-Nicene Fathers Vol. I*, eds James Donaldson and Alexander Roberts (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1969), pp. 560–66.

[10]Irenaeus, *Against Heresies* v.34.1.

[11]Justin Martyr, *Dialogue*, p. 239. See also discussion of Irenaeus' *Against Heresies* above.

[12]Beryl Smalley, *Studies in Medieval Thought and Learning: From Abelard to Wyclif* (London: Hambledon Press, 1981), p. 122. See also Farrar, *History of Interpretation*, p. 193.

[13]de Lubac, *Medieval Exegesis, Volume 1*, pp. 90, 211–222; See also Bernard Ramm, *Protestant Biblical Interpretation: A Textbook of Hermeneutics* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1970) p. 32. Origen did not find all senses in each passage, but was guided by the context.

[14]"Ιουδαιξωσ". Hanson, *Allegory and Event*, p. 237.

[15]See August Zöllig, *Die Inspirationslehre des Origenes* (Freiberg: Herder, 1902), p. 108 n1 for a list of phrases used by Origen for the allegorical sense. The Latin translations show this to some extent, where the sense was variously described as the *sensus mysticus, Allegoricus, Actior, Spirtalis Intelligentia*.

[16]Hanson, *Allegory and Event*, pp. 264–265.

realities which ran through all salvation history. This repetition of events, known as "recapitulation", would prove particularly important in the way in which Revelation was read.[17]

The most important figure for the development of both later hermeneutic and apocalyptic thought remains Augustine (354–430). While influenced by Victorinus, he made greater use of seven hermeneutical rules developed in the Donatist Tyconius' commentary on Revelation. Tyconius's commentary has not survived, but his "Book of Rules" has. Tyconius's first rule noted that there may be additional meanings hidden beyond the literal sense. For example, when the Bible spoke of the Lord, it could be speaking of the Lord directly, or of his body. The second rule urged recognition that within the body of the Lord there was a twofold nature, of both the good and the wicked. The third rule noted the importance of the law both for Israel, and now, the church. In the church the law was at work arousing good works, as opposed to the work of condemnation it achieved within Israel. The fourth rule admitted that the text often expressed a general truth "through seemingly simple reference to particular persons and events".[18] The fifth looked to understand chronological figures of speech within narratives. Tyconius suggested that a day in prophecy could, in fact, be equal to a year. The sixth rule established that scriptural chronology was not straightforward. Rather, events seemingly in chronological order may be placed as such simply to reiterate other events. As with the first rule, the final noted that when scripture referred to the Devil, the reference may in fact be to his followers.[19] These rules remained an important part of Reformed exegesis of Revelation into the sixteenth century, as Irena Backus's work has shown.[20]

Augustine's writings on exegesis proceeded with Tyconius's rules as a backdrop. For Augustine, the main aim of the exegete was to grasp the intention of the author.[21] Often, Augustine argued, the author of a text had intended a figurative, rather than a literal interpretation. The Song of Songs, for example, was beneficial when read according to the letter, but much more so when the images presented led the reader to a contemplation of the things signified beyond the words.[22] Allegory was therefore sometimes necessary to enable the reader's sinful mind to contemplate the eternal

[17] *Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture: Revelation*, ed. William C. Weinrich (Leicester: IVP, 2005), pp. xx–xxi.

[18] Paula Fredriksen, "Tyconius and Augustine on Apocalypse" in *The Apocalypse in the Middle Ages*, eds Richard K., Emmerson and Bernard McGinn (Ithaca and London: Cornell, 1992), p. 26.

[19] Fredriksen, "Tyconius", pp. 26–27.

[20] Irena Backus, *Reformation Readings of the Apocalypse* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), pp. xii–xiv. Tycnoius's commentary is lost, but Gennadius of Marseille (d. c. 496) recorded that he had read nothing "in the carnal, but all in a spiritual sense". See *Ancient Christian Commentary*, ed. Weinrich p. xxiii.

[21] Augustine, *De Doctrina Christiana*, Trans. R.P.H. Green (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), p. 61.

[22] Augustine, *De Doctrina*, pp. 61–63.

God.[23] If the figurative was taken as literal, the soul was killed: "subjecting it to the flesh according to the letter".[24] It was ignorance of the allegorical sense that led the Jews, "devoted to signs as if they were things", to kill Christ.[25] The interpreter should therefore be careful when approaching scripture that he understood which parts existed purely as signs and which as actual things. Thus, "when something meant figuratively is interpreted as if it were meant literally, it is understood in a carnal way . . . the intelligence, which is what raises the soul above the level of animals, is subjected to the flesh by following the letter".[26] This was especially pertinent when interpreting difficult passages of the Old Testament. Particularly in the law, signs could exist as both a sign and an actual thing (for example, an ox in the law was both an actual ox and could refer to ministers),[27] or could refer only to the thing signified and have no literal sense. It was therefore possible for the "literal" to dissolve into nothingness to reach the "true" meaning of the text. Even when the sense was apparently clear, as with the laws given to the Israelites, the historical reality of the text could become unimportant: it was the meaning cloaked beneath the literal sense which took priority. This is not to suggest that Augustine's method was arbitrary. To correctly read difficult passages it was necessary to submit them to the rule of the virtues. This was the extent to which a given passage built up the interpreter in love for God and for his neighbour.[28] If the interpretation did not build the reader up in this way, then the passage should be taken in the figurative sense. Thus, "Any harsh and even cruel word or deed attributed to God or his saints that is found in the Holy Scriptures applies to the destruction of the realm of lust. If the message is clear, it should not be treated as figurative and related to something else".[29] Morally difficult passages were to be understood "not only historically and literally but also figuratively and prophetically, and interpreted according to the aim of love, whether it be love of God or love of one's neighbour, or both".[30] The text should only be read "as written" when a passage was clearly edifying.

This rule was important for later Protestant hermeneutical development. Augustine had allowed texts which seemed absurd in their literal sense to be read in a figurative fashion. This was known as the *analogia fidei*, the "analogy (or rule) of faith", which allowed exegetes to reinterpret a text which was immoral or nonsensical in its literal sense by reference to a much "clearer" text of scripture.

---

[23] Augustine, *The Sprit and the Letter* in *Later Works*, Trans. John Burnaby (London: SCM Press, 1955), p. 225.

[24] Augustine, *De Doctrina*, p. 141.

[25] Augustine, *De Doctrina*, p. 143.

[26] Augustine, *De Doctrina*, p. 141.

[27] Augustine, *De Doctrina*, p. 71.

[28] Augustine, *De Doctrina*, p. 51.

[29] Augustine, *De Doctrina*, p. 151.

[30] Augustine, *De Doctrina*, pp. 153–155.

The phrase itself had first been used by Tertullian,[31] though it was through Augustine that it was primarily transmitted to the Protestant tradition. Of course, the question of *who* judged whether a text could be considered absurd or immoral was a pregnant one. For Augustine both other (clear) passages of scripture and the church together had the authority to determine this. For Protestants, it would remain a live issue.

Using these interpretative rules to read Revelation, Augustine was led to agree with Victorinus that the book described the history of the church from Christ's first coming until his return. This reading included the dismissal of any "carnal" reading of Rev. 20:1–6. While once a millenarian himself, he now believed that any literal reading of the passages was too materialistic: "such beliefs can only be held by carnal people".[32] Instead, the thousand years referred either to the final thousand years before Christ's return, or to a spiritual reign of Christ, binding Satan from attacking believers or deceiving Christian nations. The first resurrection was figurative, referring to the spiritual participation of dead believers as members of the universal church. However, Satan would be unleashed in the last three and a half years of human history (based on the "time, times and half a time" in Dan. 7:25 and 12:7),[33] when he would persecute the church through the Antichrist, an individual who would act as his vice-regent on earth.[34] While he was uncertain of the timing of events, Augustine believed that the Jews would also be converted by the bodily return of Elijah (Mal. 4:5–6), who would expound the spiritual meaning of the law to them. As he summarised his reading: "Elijah the Tishbite will come; the Jews will believe; Antichrist will persecute; Christ will judge; the dead will rise; the good will be separated from the wicked; the world will be destroyed by fire and renewed".[35]

Augustine's denial of a literal millennium was to prove particularly important due to his continuing influence on both Catholics and Protestants into the seventeenth century. As with all his readings of scripture, he had used the *analogia fidei* to interpret Revelation 20, and finding it dangerous in its literal sense, had read it allegorically. For Augustine, therefore, the "literal" sense of the Bible was not necessarily the surface reading of the text. While his hermeneutic was focused on interpreting the intention of the original author, in practice he was often led to downplay the historicity of the scripture he was examining. The "literal" for

[31] Tertullian, *The Prescription Against Heretics*, Trans. Peter Holmes, in *Anti-Nicene Fathers Vol. II*, pp. 249–50.

[32] Augustine, *The City of God Against the Pagans*, Trans. R.W. Dyson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), p. 979.

[33] Augustine, *City of God*, pp. 1021–24.

[34] Augustine, *City of God*, pp. 1007–11 His reading here was particularly based on "the lawless one" of 2 Thes. 2:1–12. Augustine was far from the first to broach this subject (see, for example, Irenaeus above) but the influence of *City of God* was to have a major impact on the acceptance of the idea.

[35] Augustine, *City of God*, pp. 1042–43.

Augustine was therefore not the text's meaning for its original recipients, but rather the spiritual truth it imparted to the church. This position was central to readings of both hermeneutics and eschatology over the medieval period.

2.2 Hermeneutics, Eschatology and the Jews in the Middle Ages

Mainstream readings of Revelation remained mostly within the Augustinian pattern in the medieval period. There was, however, an increasing interest in the figure of the Antichrist and the role that he would play. A detailed "Antichrist legend" had developed which suggested that the Antichrist would be a Jew masquerading as the Messiah. In this role he would lead the Jews to Jerusalem to rebuild the temple and be enthroned there. Enoch and Elijah would prophesy against him, before being killed and ascending to heaven, at which point Christ would intervene. While there would be a minor Jewish conversion at this point, there was no general restoration expected – the very idea of a restored Jewish kingdom now being intimately linked with the lies of the Antichrist.[36] This maintained the hermeneutic strategy followed by Augustine and the majority of patristic commentators, of reading the physical promises of Jewish restoration as references to the spiritual promises of the church.

These interpretations developed through the archetypal method of exposition in the medieval church: the *quadriga* or fourfold sense of scripture. Although Henri de Lubac's work has done much to highlight the complexities and potential diversity within this system,[37] it is nonetheless useful to use the *quadriga* as a baseline from which to understand medieval exegetical practice – particularly as it was the hermeneutic position most often attacked by English reformers. The *quadriga* presumed that a passage of scripture may have a literal sense (the grammatical-historical meaning), an allegorical sense, a tropological (or moral) sense and an anagogical (eschatological)[38] sense. This method of exegesis received considerable emphasis in the medieval period. As Thomas Aquinas (1225–1274) stated:

> That first meaning whereby the words signify things belongs to the sense first mentioned, namely the historical or literal . . . That meaning, however, whereby the things signified by the words in their turn also signify other things is called the spiritual sense; it is based on and presupposes the literal sense.[39]

---

[36]Richard Bauckham, *Tudor Apocalypse* (Oxford: Sutton Courtenay Press, 1978), pp. 17–31; Curtis V. Bostock, *The Antichrist and the Lollards: Apocalypticism in Late Medieval and Reformation England* (Leiden: Brill, 1998), pp. 22–47.

[37]de Lubac, *Medieval Exegesis Vol. 1*, pp. 82–83.

[38]This may be in either the sense of the eschatological hope of the individual soul, or the church in general.

[39]Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae* (London: Blackfriars, 1964–73) 1a. 1,10.

This spiritual sense could be divided into three further senses: "the allegorical sense is brought into play when the things of the Old Law signify things of the New Law; the moral sense when the things done in Christ and in those who prefigured him are signs of what we should carry out; and the anagogical sense when the things that lie ahead in eternal glory are signified".[40] When applying this sort of exegesis to Old Testament promises to the Jews it was straightforward for an interpreter to look beyond the "historical" sense of the words and instead concentrate on the spiritual meaning of the text for Christians.[41]

There were occasional challenges to this reading of apocalyptic events however. The most important was that of Calabrian Abbot Joachim of Fiore (1145–1202).[42] While his hermeneutic was firmly within the medieval tradition,[43] his re-reading of Revelation was unique. Joachim adopted a Trinitarian view of history, dividing it into three *status* (epochs): one of the Father, one of the Son and one of the Holy Spirit. History could also be subdivided into seven *etates* (ages) spanning the two testaments. The final *status* of the Spirit would be inaugurated through a special dispensation of God, a "spiritual coming" of Christ.[44] Through his reading of Romans 11, Joachim became convinced that the third *status* would be marked by Jewish conversion. As Robert E. Lerner has observed, Joachim saw "the conversion as marking the onset of a new 'status' – humanity's greatest fulfilment on earth".[45] Similarly, Joachim dismissed the idea of a Jewish Antichrist. His ideas of a major Jewish conversion were adapted by some to include the idea of a physical return of the Jews to the Holy Land in glory, though these interpretations were rare and had little influence.[46]

---

[40]Aquinas, *Summa* 1a. 1,10 He directly credits Augustine as the originator of this system.

[41]E. Ann Matter, "The Apocalypse in Early Medieval Exegesis" in *The Apocalypse in the Middle Ages*, eds Richard K. Emmerson and Bernard McGinn (Ithaca and London: Cornell, 1992), pp. 49–50.

[42]See Marjorie Reeves' works, *Prophecy in the Later Middle Ages: A Study in Joachimism* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969); "English Apocalyptic Thinkers (c. 1540–1620)", in *Storia e Figure Dell'Apocalisse fra '500 e '600*, ed. Roberto Rusconi (Rome: Viella, 1996), pp. 259–273 and *Joachim of Fiore and the Prophetic Future* (Stroud: Sutton Publishing, 1999) for the English connection. Joachim was particularly popular due to the (perhaps apocryphal) story of his identifying a future pope as Antichrist to Richard the Lionheart. Bullinger noted with pleasure that Joachim "likewise calleth the Pope, Antichrist" (Bullinger, *Hundred Sermons*, sig. B^{iiii}v).

[43]"For the abbot, the basic or child's level of understanding scripture pertains to the letter (*secundum litteram*)", Delno C. West and Sandra Zimdars-Swartz, *Joachim of Fiore: A Study in Perception and History* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1983), p. 43. Nicholas M. Healy finds Aquinas' distaste for Joachim to be in part inspired by the abbot's opposition to the literal sense. See Healy's "Introduction" in *Aquinas on Scripture: An Introduction to his Biblical Commentaries*, eds D.A. Keating, T.G, Weinandy, and J.P. Yocum (London: T&T Clark, 2005).

[44]Theodore Dwight Bozeman, *To Live Ancient Lives: The Primitivist Dimension in Puritanism* (Chapel Hill and London: University of North Carolina Press, 1988), p. 207.

[45]Robert E. Lerner, *The Feast of Saint Abraham: Medieval Millenarians and the Jews* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001), p. 31.

[46]The heretic Rupescissa (1310–1365), for example, saw the conversion of the Jews in 1370 under a new Emperor who would destroy Rome. The Jews would survive and flourish until the end of

There were, however, some significant changes in the way in which the Antichrist was viewed occurring in England by the thirteenth century. Many of these were polemically motivated. This is perhaps best seen in Lollard thought, which focused predominantly on the literal sense. The Wycliffite Bible stated that "Ghostly understandings" should be rejected, unless "grounded openly in the text of holy scripture".[47] Lollards therefore emphasised the historicity of the "literal" sense. This was sometimes taken to extremes: some argued that even parables had a literal occurrence in history beyond their parabolic meaning. The key to understanding was not simply to grasp what the human author had meant, but also what the divine author intended. Thus the literal sense was now "the originally full sense of a passage in God's mind".[48] This led Lollards to re-read Revelation. The Antichrist was not seen to be an individual, but rather an institution which had infected the church. While Wyclif himself believed the Antichrist to be both personal and corporate,[49] the influential Lollard study *Opus Arduum* pointed its finger directly at the papacy: "[Antichrist] must not be associated with a person but with an office and a seat of power which opposes, even tramples upon the evangelical law".[50] While there was no place for Jewish conversion in this reading, later Lollard interpreters did touch upon it. The early fifteenth-century work *Lantern of Light* predicted that Jewish conversion would occur once Antichrist was defeated.[51] The debate on the extent of Lollard influence on English reformation thought (and therefore later English Protestant thought) is one that continues and any direct line of influence is not easily traceable.[52] Nonetheless, it is significant that the major apocalyptic concerns expressed so clearly in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries should have been espoused by Lollard thinkers at a much earlier date. At the very least, this should be considered as a potential influence upon later apocalyptic thought along with the continental background that will be examined below. The move to identify the Antichrist as the representative of an organisation rather than an individual was not necessarily entirely new, but it was a trope that took on a life of its own in Reformation England. Combined with an active focus on the "literal" sense of scripture, English apocalypticism was able to pick up influences from both European and native traditions to form a particularly important understanding of the book of Revelation.

---

the world, enduring the onslaught of Gog and Magog, with Jerusalem as the centre of faith and of a new world empire. There is no evidence of his ideas having any great influence. Lerner, *Feast*, pp. 79–82.

[47]Kantik Ghosh, *The Wycliffite Heresy: Authority and the Interpretation of Texts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), p. 35.

[48]Ghosh, *Wycliffite Heresy*, p. 42.

[49]Bostock, *Antichrist*, pp. 60–64.

[50]Quoted in Bostock, *Antichrist*, p. 93.

[51]Bostock, *Antichrist*, p. 122.

[52]For a summary of recent contributions see Peter Marshall, "(Re)Defining the English Reformation", *Journal of British Studies* 48:3 (July 2009), pp. 582–3.

2.3 Hermeneutics and the Book of Revelation in the Reformation

Much of this influence was obviously derived from continental thought, particularly that of the mainstream reformers. Reforming thought often focused upon the issues of scriptural translation and interpretation, and it is unsurprising that reformers were actively critical of those exegetes who had gone before them. Martin Luther thus viewed Origen's work as guilty of over allegorising, in that his readings never allowed the text to be taken in "the Jewish tradition". He believed that this had contributed to a misunderstanding of 2 Cor. 3:6 – the "letter" and "spirit" did not refer to the "literal" and "spiritual" sense, but rather to the aim of the law. The letter of scripture was always death if read without grace, which opened the reader's eyes to the spiritual truth contained within.[53] This provided an interpretive key. If the interpreter was still under law, any exegesis he produced would necessarily be corrupt. If, however, the interpreter was under grace (and thus endowed with the Spirit) he could bring forth a correct interpretation of the text. This led Luther to place a greater emphasis on both pneumatology and the literal sense than previous commentators. The Bible's words were "to be retained in their simplest meaning as far as possible. Unless the context manifestly compels it, they are not to be understood apart from their grammatical and proper sense, lest we give our adversaries occasion to make a mockery of all the Scriptures".[54]

Unsurprisingly, this led to a greater emphasis on the importance of the *analogia fidei*. Where Augustine had emphasised the witness of the Church in forming the analogy, Luther focused on the role of scripture. Scripture was to be compared with scripture in order to reach the correct understanding: "If words are obscure in one place, they are clear in another. What God has so plainly declared to the world is in some parts of scripture stated in plain words, while in other parts it still lies hidden under obscure words".[55] The law/grace dichotomy was the key factor governing Luther's hermeneutical thought. All scripture should lead the reader to a contemplation of his sins, either in a way which damned (law) or a way which pointed towards Christ (grace): "Take Christ from the scriptures – and what more will you find in them?"[56] This shifted the focus which Augustine had placed on the "virtues". The primary rule in interpretation was no longer concerned with the way in which the text encouraged the reader to grow in love for God and

[53]Martin Luther, *Luther's Works* (St Louis: Concordia and Philadelphia: Fortress, 1955–86) Vol. 27, p. 313. de Lubac claims this view on 2 Cor. 3:6 for Augustine (de Lubac, *Medieval Exegesis Vol 2*, p. 55), though he does not mention Luther's view in his discussion. For Luther's views on "Jerome and his friend Origen" see Martin Luther, *The Bondage of the Will* Trans. J.I. Packer and O.R. Johnston (Cambridge: James Clarke & Co., 1957), pp. 240–247 and Luther, *Works* vol. 39 p. 178.

[54]Luther, *Works*, vol. 36, p. 30.

[55]Luther, *Bondage*, pp. 71–72.

[56]Luther, *Bondage*, p. 71.

their neighbour. Rather, the aim of the Bible was to make the reader aware of their current soteriological status before God, whether saved or lost. The law/grace dichotomy allowed Luther to argue that passages which might previously have seemed "absurd" could in fact be taken literally or as historically true. As Luther reminded Erasmus, controversial doctrines such as election were no less "absurd" than the Virgin birth or incarnation.[57] The effect of Luther's use of the *analogia fidei* was to allow a greater focus on the historicity of narrative in Old Testament interpretation. Nonetheless, this did not preclude the use of rhetorical tropes such as allegory. Crucially, however, this should not be constructed as a separate sense of scripture. If the context of a passage supported an allegorical reading, then the allegorical sense was allowed as the true literal sense: "One must let Aaron be just Aaron in the simple sense, unless the Spirit himself interprets him in a new sense, which then would be a new literal sense - as when St. Paul makes Christ out of Aaron for the Hebrews [Heb. 9–10]".[58] The "literal" was therefore no longer one among many senses of scripture, but the one true sense. Allegorical, typological and anagogical meanings existed through rather than in addition to the literal sense of scripture.

This allowed Luther to argue that scripture was perspicuous when read with a focus on Christ. It was this focus that led him to initially reject the book of Revelation. The prophecy, he argued in his 1522 preface to the book, was too obscure and did not teach Christ clearly. By 1530, however, he had come to a more positive view of the book, believing it to broadly describe the history of the church. As Richard Bauckham noted, Luther changed his mind after seeing how Revelation could be used to assure readers of the survival of the true church against the forces of Antichrist (specifically, the papacy).[59] Luther's new focus on Revelation found no place for a conversion of the Jews, however. After his early attempts at Jewish evangelism failed, he produced the notorious *On the Jews and their Lies*, arguing that Jews were "surely rejected by God, are no longer his people, and neither is he any longer their God". Their conversion was seen to be impossible and promises of their future restoration should be interpreted spiritually.[60]

Similar hermeneutical positions were evident in the work of John Calvin, whose writings were profoundly influential on the development of theological positions in England. As T.H.L. Parker has noted, Calvin's emphasis on a "literal" reading of scripture meant an increased focus on the historicity of the text, to a greater degree than even Luther.[61] For Calvin, a historically based reading acted as the basis for

[57]Luther, *Bondage,* p. 201.

[58]Luther, *Works*, vol. 39, p. 178.

[59]Bauckham, *Tudor Apocalypse*, pp. 43–44. Luther also wrote of the Ottoman Empire as a second branch of antichrist.

[60]Luther, *Works*, vol. 47, pp. 138–139.

[61]T.H.L Parker, *Calvin's Old Testament Commentaries* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1986), pp. 83–121. Indeed, the Lutheran Aegidius Hunnius criticised Calvin for adopting a historical reading of certain Old Testament texts rather than reading them as typological references to Christ. See

an understanding of both the narrative and theological positions contained within it. While this meant that, like Luther, allegorical and tropological senses could be part of the literal sense, it also necessitated a more contextualised reading of the circumstances of a text's production. However, this had little impact upon Calvin's readings of Old Testament predictions of the restoration of the Jews. In his thought a type or figure was a person or thing that has been set up deliberately by God to stand as an effective pre-figuration of Christ and his kingdom. This meant that he could affirm a spiritualised reading of promises of a future Jewish kingdom: "For we must grasp this analogy in the prophets: when they discuss Christ's Kingdom, they set forth God's outward blessings as figures of spiritual goods".[62] The type could not be divorced from the antitype; where individuals were considered, their primary reason for existence was to prefigure Christ.[63] Calvin could therefore argue that God "gave his covenant to the people of Israel in a veiled form, the grace of future and eternal happiness signified and figured under earthly benefits, the gravity of spiritual death under physical punishments".[64] Promises made to "Israel" were actually made to the elect: "I extend the name of Israel to all the people of God".[65] While some Jews would be saved in every period of church history, he did not believe that there would be any large scale end-times conversion.

The key to understanding the "earthly" promises made to the Jews was the concept of accommodation. Due to man's darkened ability, "as nurses commonly do with infants, God is wont in a measure to 'lisp' in speaking to us… as [to] accommodate the knowledge of him to our slight capacity".[66] As Christ "accommodate[d] his replies to those with whom he saw that he had to deal",[67] so scripture gave the reader only what they could understand, walking "softly, as with a mother's step, in accommodation to our weakness".[68] This dealt immediately with concerns on anthropomorphisms or seemingly immoral acts of God.[69] This concept could also be applied to the criticism that God demonstrated a changeable character

William McKane, "Calvin as an Old Testament Commentator" in *Calvin and Hermeneutics*, ed. Richard Gamble, pp. 250–60.

[62]John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, Trans. Ford Lewis Battles, (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1960). 3.13.4. Hereafter *Inst*.

[63]Parker, *Old Testament*, p. 75.

[64]Calvin, *Inst* 2.11.3.

[65]John Calvin, *A Commentarie Upon the Epistle of Saint Paul to the Romanes* (London, 1583), f.156r.

[66]Calvin, *Inst* 1.13.1. Interestingly, this illustration is also found in Origen. See Hanson, *Allegory and Event*, p. 227.

[67]Calvin, *Inst* 3.18.9.

[68]Calvin, *Inst* 3.21.4.

[69]Ford Lewis Battles, "God Was Accommodating Himself to Human Capacity" in *Calvin and Hermeneutics,* ed. Richard Gamble, p. 21.

in his relationship with the Jews. Answering criticism that it was unjust for God to have ordained different modes of communication with man in the old and new dispensations, Calvin wrote:

> I reply that God ought not to be considered changeable merely because he accommodated diverse forms to different ages, as he knew would be expedient to each. If a farmer sets certain tasks for his household in the winter, other tasks for the summer, we shall not on this account accuse him of inconstancy, or think that he departs from the proper rule of agriculture, which accords with the continuous order of nature.[70]

This doctrine of accommodation allowed Calvin to understand scriptural difficulties without recourse to allegory. The literal-historical sense of the words, as revealed by the Spirit was preserved. While having its basis in patristic thought, the extent to which this doctrine was employed by Calvin represented his major exegetical development. While a doctrine of accommodation had been present in the commentaries of Origen and Augustine, it was only in Calvin that it was highlighted as a method of responding to difficult passages. It allowed a continued focus on the literal-historical sense, while at the same time dealing with difficulties presented in the text.

Despite his detailed commentaries, Calvin had generally avoided the book of Revelation, producing no work dedicated to it.[71] He was nonetheless negative towards any idea of an earthly millennium.[72] The issue of a literal reign of the Saints had been raised forcefully in Münster in 1534, where an Anabaptist rising took the town and proclaimed it the New Jerusalem. The abuses, extreme communism and resulting massacre had shocked Protestant thought, and provided ammunition to Catholic interpreters who used the disaster as evidence of the danger of the Bible in the hands of the common man. From this point onwards, pre-millennial thought appeared to be an increasingly dangerous heresy.[73] The second Helvetic Confession of 1566, for example, condemned the doctrine as a "Jewish dream".[74] The interpretation of Revelation remained, therefore, a particular challenge for biblical commentators. Nonetheless, it was a challenge often embraced with relish in England.

2.4 Hermeneutics, Eschatology and the Jews in Early Modern England

Hermeneutical thought in England therefore picked up trends in continental Protestantism. Nonetheless, there were a number of developments that formed what can be seen as a distinctive English tradition. English writers expressed their hermeneutical

---

[70] Calvin, *Inst* 2.11.13. See Parker, *Old Testament*, p. 55ff for further discussion of this view.

[71] See Backus, *Reformation Readings*, pp. 70–72; Parker, *New Testament*, pp. 76–78.

[72] "Now their fiction is too childish an error to need or to be worth a refutation . . . [they] do not realise how much reproach they are casting upon Christ and his Kingdom". Calvin, *Inst* 3.15.5.

[73] Norman Cohn, *The Pursuit of the Millennium* (London: Secker & Warburg, 1957), pp. 272–306; Bauckham, *Tudor Apocalypse*, p. 211, Gribben, *Puritan Millennium*, pp. 31–32.

[74] Gribben, *Puritan Millennium*, p. 31.

positions in a range of different works. These include the obvious, such as sermon manuals and biblical commentaries, but also particularly in works of polemic against Rome. According to William Tyndale, England's misplaced obedience to the papacy had "sprang first of allegories"[75]; while Andrew Willet's *Synopsis Papismi* argued that a difference in the interpretation of scriptures was the root cause of all other disputes with the Roman church.[76] The hermeneutic differences between papist and Protestant were often expressed in the way in which the literal sense was used. As Tyndale argued, Catholics: "divide the scripture into four senses, the literal, tropological, allegorical, and anagogical. The literal sense is become nothing at all: for the pope hath taken it clean away, and hath made it his possession".[77]

The analogy of faith was emphasised as a particularly useful way to maintain the literal sense, while also proving helpful in combatting claims that Protestants adopted a "private" interpretation. The argument that Protestants, in assuming the perspicuity of scripture, allowed an overly individualistic reading of the text was a common one among both continental and English opponents.[78] The *analogia fidei* allowed this claim to be rebutted, while maintaining both a belief in the sufficiency of scripture and the claim to remain within the received tradition of the universal church. William Fulke's response to the assertion that English Protestants interpreted "after their owne private conceite and phantasie" therefore highlighted the way in which the true literal sense of scripture maintained rather than destroyed the historical faith of the church. Protestants interpreted scripture "according to the plaine and natural sense of the same, agreable to the rule or proportion of faith, which bene approved by the ancient fathers and Catholike Church of Christ, in al matters necessarie to eternall salvation".[79] As John Rainolds informed the Jesuit John Hart: "[we] learne of Christ himselfe the meaning of his word, and let the Spirit teach it: that is to expound scripture by scripture. A golden rule, to know and try the truth from errour: prescribed by the Lord, and practiced by his servants for the building of his Church from age to age through all posteritie".[80] This was not, as Jesuits in particular charged, a simplistic method of exegesis. Whereas the *quadriga*

[75]William Tyndale, *Doctrinal Treatises and Introductions to Different Portions of the Holy Scriptures* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1848), p. 307.

[76]Andrew Willet, *Synopsis Papismi, That is a general view of papistire* (London: Felix Kyngston, 1600), sig. B4^{iii}r.

[77]William Tyndale, *Doctrinal*, p. 303.

[78]This had been articulated clearly at Trent. For particular English examples see the complaints of English convert to Rome William Alabaster, published along with refutations in Roger Fenton, *Answere to William Alablaster* (London, 1599) and John Racster, *William Alablasters Motives Removed* (London, 1598); also the record of the conference between English Jesuit John Hart and John Rainolds, published as *The Summe of the Conference . . . Touching the Head and the Faith of the Church* (London, 1584).

[79]William Fulke, *A Defense of the Sincere and True Translations of the Holie Scriptures into the English Tong* (London, 1583), pp. 5–6.

[80]John Rainolds, *The Summe of the Conference betweene John Rainoldes and John Hart: Touching the Head and the Faith of the Church* (London, 1584), p. 82.

presumed that scripture could contain four (or more) diverse meanings, for English exegetes the literal was equated with the full meaning of the passage in God's mind. This meaning could be allegorical, anagogical or tropological, but it remained the literal sense if it could be associated with the Spirit's intention in setting the scripture forth. "We affirme", wrote Willet, "that of one place of scripture there can bee but one sense, which we call the literall sense, when as the words are either properly or figuratively to expresse the thing which is meant". While "an allegorie or type may be part of the literall sense" interpreters should not make the Jesuits' mistake of framing a range of meanings. It would therefore be ludicrous to apply multiple senses to a passage such as Genesis 3:16 – while figuratively expressed, the progeny of Eve who crushes the serpent's head is literally meant of Christ, even though "spoken in a borrowed and figurative speech".[81] Although scripture had allegorical, tropological and anagogical senses, noted Weemes, "these are not properly divers senses, but divers applications of one sense to our instruction, faith and manners".[82] The analogy of faith allowed the interpreter to discern the difference between the sense of scripture and ways in which it could be applied.

This emphasis on the analogy of faith was obviously self-consciously constructed upon the tradition of reformed apologetics and the desire to demonstrate the continuity of Protestant churches with the universal church of true believers. The use of the analogy also presumed a certain level of understanding on the part of the exegete. This was shown, firstly, through the use of the historical beliefs affirmed by the fathers and the church, expressed particularly through the Apostles' Creed and those points on which there was near universal patristic assent. However, when the fathers were less clear, or appeared to contradict the clear testimony of the *analogia fidei*, they were to be rejected.[83] This historical imperative also included a critical understanding of the different circumstances and customs surrounding the composition of individual sections of scripture, particularly in those areas likely to cause controversy. To understand these correctly the exegete should make use of a number of academic skills in the form of sanctified scholarship. Thus to avoid perverting "the more obscure places" Roger Fenton declared that Protestant exegetes made use of the "meanes which God hath provided" for their interpretation. These included "the rules of reason and humane arts sanctified by Gods grace . . . also the record of antiquitie, consent of Fathers, testimony of learned men, conferring places, waighing circumstances, examining translations, with such like".[84]

Interpretation should therefore begin with an understanding of the genre of the particular books being examined. A common division saw scripture broken down into "Historical", "Dogmaticall" or "Propheticall" books, with an awareness of

[81] Willet, *Synopsis*, p. 34.

[82] John Weemes, *The Christian Synagogue, Wherein is contained the diverse reading, the right poynting, translation, and collation of scripture with scripture. With the customs of the Hebrewes and Proselytes and of all those nations, with whom they were conversant* (London, 1623), p. 228.

[83] Rainolds, *Summe of the Conference*, p. 194.

[84] Fenton, *Answere*, p. 16 misl. 14.

the different use of language in each.[85] Once the genre had been identified, the expositor was to make use of their academic training. The exegete was, in William Perkins' words, to adopt a "grammaticall, rhetoricall, and logicall analysis".[86] An understanding of the liberal arts was therefore a key element of interpretation for English writers. Richard Sherry's *Treatise of Schemes and Tropes* warned those interpreting scripture that "if you be ignoraunte in the fygurative speches and tropes, you are lyke in manye greate doubtes to make but a slender solucion".[87] Likewise, Henry Peacham's 1577 primer in rhetoric *The Garden of Eloquence* advised readers that without an understanding of the key elements of his art "no man can reade profytably, or understand perfectly eyther poets, orators or the holy scriptures".[88] Both works therefore went on to highlight the complexities of language and the range of different ways in which both speech and prose could be used to modify the apparently simple sense of the words, shifting from the "proper and naturall signification, to another not proper, but yet nye and likely".[89] At times it could be argued that "the sense of scripture is against the shew of wordes" for rhetorical or theological purposes.[90]

Alongside rhetoric, logic also played an important part in deciding interpretations. English hermeneutical positions (and theology in general) were heavily influenced by the system developed by Pierre de la Ramée (Petrus Ramus) in Paris from the 1530s onwards. Against the prevailing Aristotelian thought of the French university, Ramus had argued that logic was to be considered an essential part of philosophy rather than a separate discipline. He defined this as *ars bene disserendi* – the art of analysing or discussing something well. To facilitate this, he divided logic into two – *inventio*, through which concepts were arranged as individuals and *iudicium,* through which these individuals were then arranged into arguments. Where Aristotle had taught the use of a number of complex syllogistic formulae to organise the arguments, Ramus preferred the use of the self-evident axiom as

[85]For example, see William Perkins, *The Arte of Prophecying* (London, 1607), pp. 8–17 and Nicholas Byfield, *Directions for the Private Reading of the Scriptures* (London, 1618), pp. 1–3. In Perkins these divisions can be further broken down into "Greater" or "Lesser" prophetic books. The historical books are: The Pentateuch, Joshua, Judges, Ruth, 1 and 2 Samuel, 1 and 2 Kings, 1 and 2 Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, and Job. The dogmatic are Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and Song of Songs. The greater prophetic books are Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel and Daniel. The remainder are classed as the "lesser propheticall" books. The books of the New Testament are divided simply along the lines of Gospel/Acts, Pauline Epistles, General Epistles (Including Hebrews), and Revelation.

[86]Perkins, *Arte,* p. 26. Of course he was thinking particularly of using scripture for preaching.

[87]Richard Sherry, *A Treatise of Schemes of Tropes* ([London], 1550), sig. A^{iiii}[iii]v.

[88]Henry Peacham, *The Garden of Eloquence, conteyning the figures of grammar and rhetorick* (London, 1577), sig. A^{iiii}r.

[89]Peacham, *Garden of Eloquence*, sig. B^{i}v.

[90]Rainolds, *Conference*, p. 69.

the primary mode of *iudicium.*[91] His most important advance came in his definition of method. Aristotelians of the period had generally agreed that there were several forms of method. Ramus, however, argued that there was only one type, and this was visible from nature. This method for arranging arguments always moved from the general to the particular, just as a doctor would begin by examining a patient's body as a whole before examining the constituent parts.[92] This was the hallmark of Ramist logic, representing a desire to cut through the "parts" of the work analysed, reducing it to its one root meaning.[93] Ramus believed this method to be universal and applicable to all disciplines. As the English Ramist Abraham Fraunce noted, "This methode onely, and none other is to bee observed, so often as wee teach any art or science, or take upon us to intreate perfectly of any generall matter".[94] Ramist analyses were often displayed visually through large charts of branching dichotomies, as a treatise moved through its constituent parts from the general to the particular. This "analysis" aimed to exclude arbitrary arguments with the divisions of a subject always arising from the subject itself.[95] Of course, when the subject in question was the Bible, this allowed an interpreter to bring in portions from one section of the text to illuminate another without making arbitrary connections. The text was to be treated as a whole. Biblical texts, when "analysed" in this way, became more easily understood. For both the preacher and congregation, this logical system allowed sermons to be implanted in the memory with ease.[96] The manner in which this form of logic could be used to support the application of the *analogia fidei* should be obvious.

In England, Ramism gained popularity from the 1570s onwards. Wilbur Samuel Howell finds the first evidence of Ramism being taught in England in 1579, through the lectures of Brightman's friend and colleague Laurence Chaderton.[97] Indeed, Ramism emerged with particular force at Cambridge in this period. Fraunce's *Lawyers Logike*, for example, explicitly stated that it was based on "my eight yeares labour at Cambridge".[98] The particular application of Ramism to theology was most clearly seen, however, in William Perkins at Christ's College. As Lisa

[91]Donald McKim, "The Functions of Ramism in William Perkins' Theology", *Sixteenth Century Journal* XVI:4 (Winter 1985), p. 505; Donald McKim, *Ramism in William Perkins' Theology* (New York: Peter Lang, 1987), p. 73.

[92]Erland Sellberg, "Petrus Ramus", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Summer* 2006 *Edition)*, ed. Edward N. Zalta, http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2006/entries/ramus/, Section 3.4. Accessed 30/05/08.

[93]Walter J. Ong, *Ramus, Method and The Decay of Dialogue* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1958), p. 191; McKim, *Ramism in William Perkins*, p. 32.

[94]Abraham Fraunce, *The Lawyers Logike* (London, 1588), f. 113r-v.

[95]McKim, *Ramism in William Perkins*, pp. 115–116.

[96]Keith L. Sprunger, "Ames, Ramus, and the Method of Puritan Theology", *Harvard Theological Review* 59:2 (April 1966), p. 134.

[97]Wilbur Samuel Howell, *Logic and Rhetoric in England, 1500–1700* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1956) p. 179.

[98]Fraunce, *Lawyers Logike*, sig. 2v.

Gordis has suggested, Perkins' writings on exegesis were hugely influential on the hermeneutical thought of puritans throughout the seventeenth century.[99] In his works on the subject, Perkins stated that Bible prophecy presented unique challenges to the exegete. For: "the word of God doth not alway set downe things, as they follow in order of time just one after an other: but sometime it doth anticipate, putting such things in former histories, as are already done and accomplished, which in regard of their event should be related afterward. Sometime againe it useth by recapitulation to declare things as following in order of time, which doe properly belong to a former narration".[100] Perkins argued that human conceptions of time and history – which presumed a linear chronological flow – were themselves corrupted. Human logic was so far removed from God and a true understanding of his purposes that scripture appeared absurd without spiritual illumination. Prophecy, therefore, required a logical system to understand it, a framework through which it could be read. This framework was governed by Ramist logic. The appeal of Ramism to the puritan exegete is obvious. When used to study the Bible, it presumed that a universal hermeneutic could be applied to the whole work. While the Bible itself may be the work of different authors at different times, each book acted as the logical outworking of a single mind – the mind of God. If Ramism was the one true logic, it therefore followed that it should be used to understand the logical flow of the Bible. In other words, the true literal sense of the scripture could be reached only through the use of a logical system built around Ramism. In all of this, Perkins emphasised the importance of the *analogia fidei* to a far greater degree than previous writers. He defined the analogy as a measure of orthodoxy formed from key scripture and creedal doctrine.[101] Thus, scripture was "either Analogical & plaine, or Crypticall and darke". The "plaine" places reflected the *analogia fidei* and were relatively simple to interpret in their "literal" sense. Thus, "If the naturall signification of the words of the place propounded doe agree with the circumstances of the same place, it is the proper meaning of the place".[102] This was the case, for example, in all matters which were essential to individual salvation. However, if the words of scripture appeared cryptic, then the following rule was to be applied:

> If the native (or naturall) signification of the words doe manifestly disagree with, either the analogy of faith, or very perspicuous places of the Scripture: then the other meaning, which is given of the place propounded, is naturall and proper, if it agree with contrarie and like places, with the circumstances and wordes of the place, and with the nature of that thing, which is intreated of.[103]

---

[99] Gordis, *Opening Scripture*, p. 13.

[100] William Perkins, *The Whole Treatise of the Cases of Conscience,* (London, 1606), pp. 247–248.

[101] Perkins, *Arte*, pp. 31–32. This concept was derived from Augustine, as noted by Knott, *Sword of the Spirit*, p. 36. Stanley Fish has sarcastically described this approach as "Whenever you find something that doesn't say what it is supposed to say, decide that it doesn't mean what it says; and then *make* it say what it's supposed to say" *Self-Consuming Artifacts* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1972), p. 22.

[102] Perkins, *Arte,* pp. 45–46.

[103] Perkins, *Arte*, pp. 46–47.

Yet knowledge of rhetoric and logic alone were not enough to fully equip the exegete for their task. Along with the rise of Ramist logic came a growing interest in tracing the historical background of the text. This is unsurprising given the emphasis placed upon establishing the context of each part of scripture and the situation it was addressed to. This historicism extended far beyond a simple desire to explain the scope of individual sections of the Bible. In particular, increasing importance was placed on the value of understanding Jewish customs and linguistic practices. This was particularly true of the study of the Hebrew language, with the first Regius chairs of Hebrew established at Oxford and Cambridge in the 1540s. By the 1580s rabbinic commentaries were available in a number of colleges in both institutions, and the study of Hebrew was a commonplace amongst students. When Franciscus Junius dedicated his *Grammatica Hebraeae Linguae* to Philip Sidney, he therefore noted that Englishmen "were friends of art and friends of Hebrew; that their soules breathed out only Hebrew flowers, so to speak; that their voices intoned only Hebrew".[104] This use of Jewish scholarship provided ammunition to Catholic critics. Gregory Martin, lecturer at the English College in Rheims, charged that Protestants had formed an ungodly alliance with "the sworne enemies of our saviour Christ" in making use of rabbinic work. In responding to this charge William Fulke was dismissive. It was only for a better understanding of scripture's literal sense –"to learne the proprietie of Hebrew wordes of the learned Rabbins" – that Protestants made use of Jewish scholarship.[105] This growing interest in Hebrew led to an increased awareness of the Jewish people as a still living race, and of the breadth and depth of rabbinic scholarship on the Old Testament.[106] Combative Hebraist Hugh Broughton went so far as to affirm that "Maimonides hath infinite much that cleareth the Apostles truth more fitly then Greek and Latin Fathers do".[107] In his introduction to John Weemes's manual on exposition *The Christian Synagogue*, William Symson thus praised the author who had "read with deliberation also, the ancient customes of the Jewes, in their owne *Rabbines*, and hath mentioned so many of them, as gives no small light for the understanding of the text".[108] Indeed, Weemes dedicated no fewer than 148 pages of the 207 page volume to this theme. A growing awareness of the historical and cultural background to the text increasingly led writers to affirm that the literal sense of a text should be in line with the way in which it was understood by its original recipients. As Fulke cautioned, the text "must be

[104]Quoted in Eliane Glaser, *Judaism without Jews: Philosemitism and Christian Polemic in Early Modern England* (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2007), p. 44.

[105]Fulke, *A Defense*, p. 223.

[106]See Harold Fisch, *Jerusalem and Albion: The Hebraic Factor in Seventeenth-Century Literature* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1964), pp. 44–117; David S. Katz, *The Jews in the History of England 1485–1850* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1994), pp. 107–144; David S. Katz, *Philo-Semitism and the Readmission of the Jews to England 1603–1655* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1982) pp. 43–88; Peter Toon, 'The Latter Day Glory' in *The Puritans, The Millennium & The Future of Israel: Puritan Eschatology 1600–1660*, ed. Peter Toon (Cambridge: James Clarke & Co., 1970), pp. 23–26.

[107]Hugh Broughton, *A Revelation of the Holy Apocalyps* (Middelberg, 1610), p. 3.

[108]William Symson in Weemes, *The Christian Synagogue,* sig. A2v.

translated according to the signification [it] had in the time of the writer whome you translate".[109] Unsurprisingly, this tied into the way in which the Old Testament in particular was understood: "We must not, neither is it safe for the strengthening of our faith, to drawe places of scripture unto Christ, which by the holy Ghost had an other meaning: so shall the Jewes laugh us to scorne".[110]

Yet while there was an increasing awareness of the historical background to scripture across the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, both a historicist reading of Revelation and a typological reading of Old Testament promises to the Jews remained an established part of the English hermeneutic tradition. Partially, this can be attributed to the reformed belief (particularly seen in Calvin) that the promises were always understood spiritually by the faithful, even by the Old Testament patriarchs.[111] Yet it was also a product of the combination of rhetoric, logic and historical background discussed above, which allowed an interpreter to argue that the scriptures could express a meaning beyond the bare letter. This was in no way an abandonment of the literal sense. Rather, it was a recognition that the literal sense acted as an umbrella term with a panoply of meanings potentially contained within it. In Tyndale's words, "the scripture useth proverbs, similitudes, riddles, or allegories, as all other speeches do; but that which the proverb, similitude, riddle, or allegory signifieth, is ever the literal sense, which thou must seek out diligently".[112] When interpreting the promises by the *analogia fidei* writers were thus keen to avoid the dangers of an over-literalistic reading often linked to the extremism seen in Münster. It was therefore vital that Christ's fulfilment of the types and images of Old Testament ceremonies and promises be taken into account when reading prophecy. In his 1590 *De Universali et Novissima Judaeorum Vocatione*, Willet warned that while the Jewish people as a whole would be called to Christ, the Old Testament promises of national restoration should not imply any return to the land of Israel: "Praedictiones Prophetarum de Iudaeis non ad littera expendendae".[113] When scripture promised the "rest of Canaan" he noted in *Synopsis Papismi*, it was talking spiritually of "the Kingdom of God".[114] This was the true sense of these promises. In Nicholas Gibbon's words, as "the seed of *Abram* in the flesh injoyed the possession of *Canaan*: his seed after the Spirit enjoy the Kingdom of rest, an immortall inheritance".[115] So the promises were "but shaddowes and significations to put the Jewes in remembraunce of [Christ's]

[109]Fulke, *A Defense*, p. 115.

[110]Fulke, *A Defense*, p. 512.

[111]Guibbory, *Christian Identity*, pp. 15–17.

[112]Tyndale, *Doctrinal*, p. 304.

[113]"The predictions of the Jewish prophets are not to be taken literally". Andrew Willet, *De Universali et Novissima Iudaeorum Cocatione Secundum Apertissimam Divi Pauli Prophetiam* (Cambridge, 1590), sig. C3r.

[114]Willet, *Synopsis*, p. 34.

[115]Nicholas Gibbons, *Questions and Disputations Concerning the Holy Scripture* (London, 1601), p. 499.

comming before he came".[116] In John Foxe's more acerbic phrasing, the Jews were still fooled by taking spiritual promises literally: "sweetely beguiling them selves, with a glauering shew of a false shadow, flattering them selves likewise, with a fantasticall hope of a terrene kingdome, whereof they had never any one word promised by God".[117] For Foxe and other Protestants these promises were read through the same New Testament texts used by patristic and medieval commentators to spiritualise them. The true children of Israel were those who had believed the promises, not those who merely had an ethnic connection to the Jewish race, for as Paul concluded in Romans 9:6 "they are not all Israel, which are of Israel". God could raise children of Abraham up from the stones if he so wished (Mt. 3:9, Lk. 3:8), and with the partition wall between Jew and Gentile now broken down (Eph. 2:14) there was no special earthly future for ethnic Jews. God's true church had always been made up of believers, not of those of one particular ethnic background or another. While the majority of those saved in the Old Testament were Jewish, and the majority after Christ Gentiles, the church had always contained an ethnic mixture – whether Rahab, Ruth and Naomi in the Old Testament, or the mixture of Jewish and Gentile believers in the New Testament. The church, or "true Israel" had thus continued in an unbroken line "since the beginning of the world".[118] As the popular 1577 translation of Andreas Hyperius' *Practis of Preaching* noted, "if we beleeve and obey [God] in deede, then are we true Israelites, and citizens registered in the kingdome of heaven".[119]

The Old Testament promises were therefore rightly read as referring to the spiritual blessing of the church and Christian life rather than the earthly promises of restoration to Canaan. While the idea of restoration to Holy Land had been broached by occasional radicals,[120] the idea of any Jewish return was usually greeted with Foxe's characteristic horror:

---

[116]Thomas Becon, *The Demaundes of Holy Scripture* (London, 1577), sig. E^{iii}v.

[117]John Foxe, *A Sermon Preached at the Christening of a Certaine Jew* (London, 1578), sig. C1v.

[118]Nicholas Byfield, *The Patterne of Wholesome Words* (London, 1618), p. 349.

[119]Andreas Hyperius, *The Practis of Preaching* (London, 1577), fol.81v.

[120]These include Francis Kett (d.1589), who was accused of holding that Christ "is now in his human nature gathering a church here in earth in Judea", that he would return before the final judgement, and reign as King from Jerusalem, and that there would be two literal resurrections before judgement day. However, Kett's printed work appears almost completely orthodox. Certainly, the majority of references to "Judah", "Israel", and "David" referred allegorically to the church (See *The Glorious and Beautiful Garland of Mans Glorification* (London, 1585)). Kett was executed in 1589, probably for Arian tendencies. For more on his thought see Dewey D. Wallace Jr., "From Eschatology to Arian Heresy: The Case of Francis Kett (d.1589)", *Harvard Theological Review* 67 (1974), pp. 459–473. Other radicals to suggest the idea included Ralph Durden, who styled himself as the new Jewish messiah, and was considered insane (Bauckham, *Tudor Apocalypse*, pp. 188–191). A similarly eccentric interpretation was found in Roger Edwards. He wrote his manuscript work in 1580 and dedicated it to Bishop Aylmer (British Library Ms. Lansdowne 353/3). The work (described by the manuscript editor as "A Phantastic Booke"), though rich in scriptural detail was bizarre – Edwards was imprisoned in the Tower at the time of its composition. His literal reading of the prophets is interesting (for example, see ff. 198v,

> the perpetuall establishment of the kingdome of David, must be farre otherwise understoode, [in this] you [Jews] either lye shamefully in the order of your exposition, or els that your owne Prophets did prophesie contrary to the trueth . . . But let us imagine and graunt by way of a case put, that you may recover your Jerusalem againe: which notwithstanding will never come to passe, (unlesse God himselfe and all his Prophets doe lie).[121]

While a national restoration was out of the question, a general hope for Jewish conversion was commonly held. Unsurprisingly, this was largely based around the hope of Israel's salvation expressed in Romans 11:26. In John Bale's 1545 commentary on Revelation, *The Image of Both Churches,* for example, the author argued for a final conversion of the Jews: "That Christes prophecye may be founde true. The last to be the fyrst, and the fyrst the last. For he that hath dispersed Israell, shall bringe him againe to his folde, as Heiremy recordeth".[122] The marginal notations of the 1560 Geneva Bible thus described a great end-times Jewish conversion based upon Romans 11: "He sheweth that the time shal come that the whole nation of ye Jewes thogh not every one particularly, shalbe joined to the church of Christ".[123] A note in the Bible's indices on Isa. 10:22b contained a comment suggestive of Jewish millennial blessing: "This smalle nomber, which seemed to be consumed, and yet according to God's decree is saved, shalbe sufficient to fil all the worlde with righteousness".[124] Even Foxe at his most virulent was consoled with the hope of Jewish conversion. After a long polemic accusing the Jews of deicide he could sound a note of optimism addressed to an imagined Jewish audience: "I hope well of your amendement: for why should I not hope, when as I finde S. Paul to conceive so well of your returne againe? . . . That is to say, that [God] wil vouchsafe to reduce you againe into his owne familie, with his elect Saints, and make you partakers of his gladsome Gospell".[125] It is important to note that this conversion envisaged the dissolution of Judaism not just as a religion, but also as a racial identity. The Jews were to be subsumed into a new Christian identity, with all marks of distinctiveness removed in conversion. As the popular English edition of Heinrich Bullinger's sermons concluded, the Jews must "forsake their Jewishnes . . . [and] goe to the Christen religion".[126] The category of "Jew", both as a racial and religious category, would be extinguished.

199v, 224r), especially in his belief in "Perpetua pax Israelis in terra" (198r) but it is impossible to argue that his little known manuscript work had any influence.

[121] Foxe, *Sermon*, sig. f.[iiii][iiii]r.

[122] John Bale, *The Image of Both Churches* (London, 1580), I.142. See also I.96–99.

[123] *The Geneva Bible: A Facsimile of the 1560 Edition* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1969), New Testament, p. 75 l.

[124] *Geneva Bible 1560,* Old Testament, p. 287.

[125] Foxe, *Sermon*, sigs. L[iiii][iii]r; M1r. See also Weemes, *Christian Synagogue*, p. 141.

[126] Bullinger, *Hundred Sermons*, sig. 53v. For further examples see John Napier, *A Plaine Discoverie of the Whole Revelation of Saint John* ([Edinburgh], 1594), p. 120; Foxe, *A Sermon*, sig. L.iiii[iiii]v, Perkins, "A Fruitfull Dialogue Concerning the end of the World" (1587) in *Workes,* Vol. III (London, 1631), p. 470.

This hope of Jewish conversion must be located within a wider English apocalyptic expectation which was itself heavily concerned with hermeneutic issues. As Tyndale had noted, "The apocalypse, or revelations of John are allegories whose literal sense is hard to find in many places".[127] This did not, however, stop his contemporaries from attempting to understand the book. The usual approach was to adopt a broad historicism in which the symbols in Revelation were applied to events in church history.[128] Several writers therefore used this method to produce important commentaries on Revelation from the mid-sixteenth century onwards. Bale's highly influential *Image of Both Churches*, produced during a period of exile late in Henry VIII's reign and published in three parts from 1545 onwards, read Revelation as descriptive of a battle between two churches, one of Christ and one of Antichrist: "Hee that knoweth not thys booke, knoweth not what the church is whereof he is a member".[129] The commentary was not concerned with the minutiae of apocalyptic details, but aimed instead to correct corrupt doctrine in the English church. Revelation thus described the history of the true church: "It is a full clerenesse to all the cronicles and most notable histories which hath bene written since Christes ascension".[130] As with Augustine, Bale believed the first resurrection to be spiritual and the millennium to refer to the first thousand years after Christ.[131] Hermeneutically, Bale was aware of the numerous challenges posed by the book. Acknowledging the difficulties of figurative speech, he believed the only way in which it could be interpreted was by using the *analogia fidei*: "The more the figurative speech aboundeth heere, the more let them conferre it with the other scriptures without all honyed colours of retoricke or of crafted philosophy, specially with those which of their owne nature jointly agreeth to the same".[132]

Bale had, during his first exile, become part of a community of Englishmen absorbing Reformed ideas on the continent. While most Henrician exiles had returned to England during Edward's reign, it was not long before a new exilic community began to form in the wake of Mary's persecutions. This created a new community of Englishmen abroad, who absorbed a number of continental ideas on both hermeneutics and, specifically, on Revelation. These ideas slowly filtered into the English mainstream as exiles returned under Elizabeth.[133] Continental attacks on the Papacy as Antichrist, combined with earlier Lollard thought and growing persecution, came together to form a particularly strong anti-Catholic tradition in England.[134]

---

[127]Tyndale, *Doctrinal*, p. 305.

[128]See Firth, *Apocalyptic Tradition*, pp. 1–110.

[129]Bale, *Image*, sig. A^{iii}r.

[130]Bale, *Image*, sig. A^{iiii}r.

[131]Bale, *Image*, III.103–169.

[132]Bale, *Image*, sig. B.iv.

[133]Bauckham, *Tudor Apocalypse,* p. 33; Gribben, *Puritan Millennium*, pp. 59–86.

[134]This is not to question the value of revisionist interpretations of the English reformation, but rather to highlight the prevalence of anti-Catholic thought in apocalyptic works.

While Bale's work was important it was Foxe, another exile, who would have a greater general influence on English thought. In his *Actes and Monuments*, he not only set out a history of martyrs of the English church, but also placed it within an apocalyptic framework.[135] From the 1570 edition onwards, Foxe saw a fivefold division of church history, beginning with the persecution of the godly until roughly three hundred years after Christ, a period analogous to the 42 months in which the Gentiles trample the temple in Rev. 11:2 and for which the beast rules in Rev. 13:5. The second period described the millennium of Rev. 20, which Foxe argued began with Constantine's accession. There followed a "time of backsliding", beginning in roughly 750. From around 1080, with the ascension of Hildebrand and Innocent III, the church was thrown into turmoil and pure doctrine obscured. In 1324, the "time of antichrist and loosing of Satan", the great reformers Wyclif and Hus were harshly persecuted by the established church and the millennium ended. This final period included Foxe's own day and was marked by "reformation and purging, wherin antichrist beginneth to be revealed, and to appear in his colours". It would continue until an unspecified date in the future, but there was now nothing holding back the final judgement.[136] The impact of Foxe's historiography cannot be overestimated. With its resolutely English and pro-Elizabeth basis, it proved to be a useful tool for supporting both state policy and constructing English identity.[137]

An equally important influence on English thought was the Geneva Bible, which went through 140 re-printings from 1560 to 1644.[138] Four different editions appeared from 1557 onwards, each containing a number of annotations on the text. The 1576 edition contained Laurence Tomson's adaptation of Theodore Beza's notes on Revelation, and represented a reduction in size from the 1560 edition. The 1599 printing contained the 1576 translation with the replacement of Beza's notes with those of French minister Franciscus Junius. The Geneva notes were an adaptation of his short commentary on Revelation published in 1592 as *Apocalypsis, A Briefe and Learned Commentarie upon the Revelation of Saint John.* Junius' reading was both more historiographically and rhetorically based than that of his predecessors – he began his commentary with a table of historical events and the symbols they fulfilled.[139] Otherwise, his interpretation differed little from the

[135]There were several editions of Foxe's work. The schema here was first used in his 1570 edition. See Paul Christianson, *Reformers and Babylon: English Apocalyptic Visions from the Reformation to the Eve of the Civil War* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1978), pp. 41–45.

[136]John Foxe, *Actes and Monuments* (London, 1596), p. 1.

[137]For example, "every good man well to weigh with himself the long tranquillity, the great plenty, the peaceable liberty, which the Lord of his mercy hath bestowed upon this land during all the reign hitherto of this our Sovereign & most happy Queen ELIZABETH . . . ", Foxe, *Actes and Monuments*, f. 26r. This theme will be discussed more fully in Chap. 4, particularly in terms of William Haller's claim that Foxe developed an idea of the elect nation.

[138]See Gribben, *Puritan Millennium*, pp. 71–86 for a detailed history of this reading and the different editions of the Geneva Bible.

[139]Franciscus Junius, *Apocalypsis, A Briefe and Learned Commentarie Upon the Revelation of Saint Iohn*, (London, 1592) f. 7r.

standard Reformation model. The thousand years "falleth precisely upon the times of that wicked Hildebrand"[140] and the first resurrection was spiritual.[141]

Also adding to this developing stream of apocalyptic thought (and influenced both by the continental tradition and Ramist logic) Scottish commentator and mathematician John Napier published an influential historicist reading of Revelation in 1593. Napier wrote in English particularly to appeal to readers south of the border. The defeat of the Armada in 1588 had been a forceful reminder to him that Antichrist's forces were proving to be a growing threat.[142] Napier was keenly aware of the difficulties presented by the literal sense of Revelation, yet believed that he could reach the "true sense and meaning" of the text through "the analytick or demonstrative maner". He aimed for a work in which scripture was interpreted "not of the literal sense of the chapter, but of the true meaning and interpretation of the same".[143] Each verse was divided into a paraphrase and a history, and set forth as a series of analytical prepositions. This analysis allowed him to be critical of over-literalism. The millenarian heresy, for example, had sprung from taking the text "literally and definitely".[144] Revelation should therefore be read "not literally . . . but after a prophetical and figurative manner of speech".[145] Napier's method and mathematical interest allowed him to be more precise than previous commentators in dating events in the book. He believed that each trumpet and vial judgement in Revelation described a period of 245 years, beginning with the first jubilee year after Jerusalem's destruction in 71 CE. This allowed him to suggest 1786 as the last possible date for the day of God's judgement and renovation of the world. Noting that Jesus had promised that the final days would be cut short for the sake of the elect (Mt. 24:22), he argued that the downfall of Babylon (Rome) would come at some point prior to that year. Daniel 12:11–12 had predicted that two periods would follow the time when "the daily sacrifice" was abolished, one of 1,290 days, the other of 1,335 days. Christian interpreters usually took these days to equal years (as per Tyconius and Ezk. 4:5), dating them from the destruction of the Jerusalem temple. Napier, however, believed that they did not begin until the attempted reconstruction of the temple by the Emperor Julian ("the Apostate") in 365 CE. Using this as his starting point, he added the 1,335 days and found 1700 as the final date for judgement on Rome (although he believed that it could arrive as early as 1688).[146]

The detail of Napier's historical framework was representative of a drift towards particularism in commentaries on Revelation, as a focus on the need for a detailed, historical structure to surround the text grew. As Broughton wrote in 1590, knowledge of history was "needefull to be knowen for to strengthen our Fayth, that we may

[140]Junius, *Apocalypsis,* p. 79 n.3.

[141]Junius, *Apocalypsis*, p. 79 n.11.

[142]Firth, *Apocalyptic Tradition,* p. 138.

[143]Napier, *Plaine,* sig. A4^{iii}v.

[144]Napier, *Plaine*, p. 240.

[145]Napier, *Plaine*, p. 190. Other examples include pp. 114, 187, 250.

[146]Napier, *Plaine*, pp. 7–22.

see a constant agreement in severall ages".[147] An understanding of history therefore allowed the reader to grasp the relationships between each of scripture's constituent parts. In other words, it helped form the basis of the *analogia fidei*. The emphasis on this type of framework for understanding the minutiae of the apocalyptic text would become increasingly common over the seventeenth century. This desire for greater historical understanding was no aberration from the hermeneutical norms of medieval writers or continental reformers. Rather it was a development of their positions and a desire to better understand the literal sense of scripture which drove writers to seek a more historical, contextualised understanding of the past – and, in the case of Revelation – the future as well. In spite of this increasing focus upon the meaning the historical background of the text, however, Old Testament promises to the Jews were still read as spiritualised promises made to God's true Israel – the Church. While there was unquestionably a widespread hope for Jewish conversion, this could only be conceived of as an influx of Jews into the Gentile church as per Romans 11. While these positions may have held at the end of the sixteenth century, they were soon to be challenged – not, however, by radical forms of thought, but by the very tools through which they themselves had been constructed.

References

Aquinas, Thomas. 1964–73. *Summa Theologiae*. London: Blackfriars.
Augustine. 1955. *The Sprit and the Letter in Later Works*. Trans. John Burnaby. London: SCM Press.
Augustine. 1996. *De Doctrina Christiana.* Trans. R.P.H. Green. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Augustine. 1998. *The City of God Against the Pagans*. Trans. R.W. Dyson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Backus, Irena. 2000. *Reformation readings of the apocalypse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Bale, John. 1580. *The image of both churches*. London: Thomas East.
Battles, Ford Lewis. 1992. God was accommodating himself to human capacity. In *Calvin and hermeneutics*, ed. Richard Gamble, 13–32. New York/London: Garland.
Bauckham, Richard. 1978. *Tudor apocalypse*. Oxford: Sutton Courtenay Press.
Becon, Thomas. 1577. *The demaundes of holy scripture*. London.
Berry, Lloyd E. (ed.). 1969. *The Geneva Bible: A facsimilie of the 1560 edition*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
Bostock, Curtis V. 1998. *The antichrist and the lollards: Apocalypticism in late medieval and reformation England*. Leiden: Brill.
Bozeman, Theodore D. 1988. *To live ancient lives: The primitivist dimension in puritanism*. Chapel Hill/London: University of North Carolina Press.
Broughton, Hugh. 1590. *A concent of scripture*. London: Gabriell Simson and William White.
Broughton, Hugh. 1610. *A revelation of the holy apocalyps*. Middelberg.
Bullinger, Heinrich. 1573. *A hundred sermons upon the apocalipse of Jesu Christ*. London.
Byfield, Nicholas. 1618a. *Directions for the private reading of the scriptures*. London.
Byfield, Nicholas. 1618b. *The patterne of wholesome words*. London.

[147]Hugh Broughton, *A Concent of Scripture* (London, 1590), sig. 2^{ii}r.

Calvin, John. 1960. *Institutes of the Christian Religion.* Trans. Ford Lewis Battles. Philadelphia: Westminster.
Christianson, Paul. 1978. *Reformers and Babylon: English apocalyptic visions from the reformation to the eve of the civil war*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
Cohen, Jeremy. 2005. The mystery of Israel's salvation: Romans 11:25–26 in patristic and medieval exegesis. *Harvard Theological Review* 98: 247–281.
Cohn, Norman. 1957. *The pursuit of the millennium*. London: Secker & Warburg.
Edwards, Roger. 1580. *Collections out of the Prophets and New Testament concerning the conversion and restoration of the Jews*. British Library Ms. Lansdowne 353/3.
Farrar, Frederic W. 1961. *History of interpretation*. Grand Rapids: Baker.
Fenton, Roger. 1599. *Answere to William Alablaster*. London.
Firth, Katherine. 1979. *The apocalyptic tradition in reformation Britain 1530–1645*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Fisch, Harold. 1964. *Jerusalem and Albion: The Hebraic factor in seventeenth-century literature*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
Fish, Stanley. 1972. *Self-consuming artifacts*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Foxe, John. 1578. *A sermon preached at the christening of a certaine Jew*. London: Barker.
Foxe, John. 1596. *Actes and monuments*. London.
Fraunce, Abraham. 1588. *The lawyers logike*. London.
Fredriksen, Paula. 1992. Tyconius and Augustine on apocalypse. In *The apocalypse in the Middle Ages*, ed. Richard K. Emmerson and Bernard McGinn, 20–37. Ithaca/London: Cornell.
Ghosh, Kantik. 2002. *The Wycliffite heresy: Authority and the interpretation of texts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Gibbons, Nicholas. 1601. *Questions and disputations concerning the holy scripture*. London.
Glaser, Eliane. 2007. *Judaism without Jews: Philosemitism and Christian polemic in early modern England*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
Gordis, Lisa M. 2003. *Opening scripture: Bible reading and interpretive authority in puritan New England*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Gribben, Crawford. 2008. *The puritan millennium: Literature and theology, 1550–1682*, Revised ed. Milton Keynes: Paternoster.
Guibbory, Achsah. 2010. *Christian identity, Jews and Israel in seventeenth-century England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Hanson, R.P.C. 1959. *Allegory and event: A study of the sources and significance of Origen's interpretation of scripture*. London: SCM.
Healy, Nicholas. 2005. Introduction. In *Aquinas on scripture: An introduction to his biblical commentaries*, ed. D.A. Keating, T.G. Weinandy, and J.P. Yocum, 1–20. London: T&T Clark.
Howell, Wilbur Samuel. 1956. *Logic and rhetoric in England, 1500–1700*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
Hyperius, Andreas. 1577. *The practis of preaching*. London.
Irenaeus, 1969. *Against Heresies.* Trans. James Donaldson and Alexander Roberts. In *The Anti-Nicene Fathers*, vol. I, eds. James Donaldson and Alexander Roberts. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
Junius, Franciscus. 1592. *Apocalypsis, a briefe and learned commentarie upon the revelation of Saint Iohn*. London.
Katz, David S. 1982. *Philo-semitism and the readmission of the Jews to England 1603–1655*. Oxford: Clarendon.
Katz, David S. 1994. *The Jews in the history of England 1485–1850*. Oxford: Clarendon.
Kett, Francis. 1585. *The glorious and beautiful garland of mans glorification*. London.
Killeen, Kevin. 2009. *Biblical scholarship, science and politics in early modern England*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
Lerner, Robert E. 2001. *The feast of Saint Abraham: Medieval millenarians and the Jews*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
Luther, Martin. 1955–86. *Luther's works*. St Louis/Philadelphia: Concordia/Fortress.
Luther, Martin. 1957. *The Bondage of the Will.* Trans. J.I. Packer and O.R. Johnston. Cambridge: James Clarke & Co.

Marshall, Peter. 2009. (Re)defining the English reformation. *Journal of British Studies* 48: 564–586.
Martyr, Justin. 1969. *Dialogue with Trypho*. Trans. James Donaldson and Alexander Roberts. In *The Anti-Nicene Fathers,* vol. I, eds. James Donaldson and Alexander Roberts. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
Matter, E. Ann. 1992. The apocalypse in early medieval exegesis. In *The apocalypse in the Middle Ages*, ed. Richard K. Emmerson and Bernard McGinn, 38–50. Ithaca/London: Cornell.
McKane, William. 1992. Calvin as an old testament commentator. In *Articles on Calvin and Calvinism: Calvin and hermeneutics*, ed. Richard Gamble, 250–260. New York/London: Garland.
McKim, Donald. 1985. The functions of Ramism in William Perkins' theology. *Sixteenth Century Journal* XVI: 503–517.
McKim, Donald. 1987. *Ramism in William Perkins' theology*. New York: Peter Lang.
Napier, John. 1594. *A plaine discoverie of the whole revelation of Saint John*. Edinburgh.
Ong, Walter J. 1958. *Ramus, method and the decay of dialogue*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Parker, T.H.L. 1986. *Calvin's old testament commentaries*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
Peacham, Henry. 1577. *The garden of eloquence, conteyning the figures of grammar and rhetorick*. London.
Perkins, William. 1606. *The whole treatise of the cases of conscience*. London.
Perkins, William. 1607. *The arte of prophecying*. London.
Perkins, William. 1631. A fruitfull dialogue concerning the end of the world (1587). In *Workes*, vol. III. London.
Racster, John. 1598. *William Alablasters motives removed*. London.
Rainolds, John. 1584. *The summe of the conference betweene John Rainoldes and John Hart: Touching the head and the faith of the church*. London.
Ramm, Bernard. 1970. *Protestant biblical interpretation: A textbook of hermeneutics*. Grand Rapids: Baker.
Reeves, Marjorie. 1969. *Prophecy in the later Middle Ages: A study in Joachimism*. Oxford: Clarendon.
Reeves, Marjorie. 1996. English apocalyptic thinkers (c.1540–1620). In *Storia e figure Dell'Apocalisse fra '500 e '600*, ed. Roberto Rusconi, 259–273. Rome: Viella.
Reeves, Marjorie. 1999. *Joachim of Fiore and the prophetic future*. Stroud: Sutton Publishing.
Sellberg, Erland. 2006. Petrus Ramus. In *The Stanford encyclopedia of philosophy* (Summer 2006 Edition), ed. Edward N. Zalta. http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2006/entries/ramus/, Section 3.4. Accessed 30 May 2008.
Sherry, Richard. 1550. *A treatise of schemes of tropes*. London.
Smalley, Beryl. 1981. *Studies in medieval thought and learning: From Abelard to Wyclif*. London: Hambledon Press.
Sprunger, Keith L. 1966. Ames, Ramus, and the method of puritan theology. *Harvard Theological Review* 59: 133–156.
Tertullian. 1968a. *The Prescription Against Heretics*. Trans. Peter Holmes. In *Anti-Nicene Fathers*, vol. II, eds. James Donaldson and Alexander Roberts. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
Tertullian. 1968b. *On the Resurrection of the Flesh*. Trans. Peter Holmes. In *The Anti-Nicene Fathers*, vol. II, eds. James Donaldson and Alexander Roberts. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
Toon, Peter. 2002 [1970]. The latter day glory. In *The puritans, the millennium & the future of Israel: Puritan eschatology 1600–1660*, ed. Peter Toon, 23–41. Cambridge: James Clarke & Co.
Wallace Jr., Dewey D. 1974. From eschatology to Arian heresy: The case of Francis Kett (d.1589). *Harvard Theological Review* 67: 459–473.
Weemes, John. 1623. *The Christian synagogue, wherein is contained the diverse reading, the right poynting, translation, and collation of scripture with scripture. With the customs of the Hebrewes and proselytes and of all those nations, with whom they were conversant*. London.

Weinrich, William C. (ed.). 2005. *Ancient Christian commentary on scripture: Revelation*. Leicester: IVP.
West, Delno C., and Sandra Zimdars-Swartz. 1983. *Joachim of Fiore: A study in perception and history*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
Willet, Andrew. 1590. *De Universali et Novissima Iudaeorum Cocatione Secundum Apertissimam Divi Pauli Prophetiam*. Cambridge.
Willet, Andrew. 1600. *Synopsis papismi, that is a general view of papistire*. London: Felix Kyngston.
Zakai, Avihu. 1992. *Exile and kingdom: History and apocalypse in the puritan migration to America*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Zöllig, August. 1902. *Die Inspirationslehre des Origenes*. Freiberg: Herder.

Chapter 3
Historicising Allegory: Thomas Brightman and the Historicising Commentary

The accuracy of Old Testament prophecies was so great, wrote Heinrich Bullinger in the preface to his collected sermons on the Apocalypse, that when read in the sixteenth century they may appear to resemble a "playne historie", despite being written hundreds of years prior to the events which they predicted. The same was true of John's writing in the book of Revelation: "if we reade with diligence this same booke of ye Apocalips, and confer those things which he speaketh under a shadow with the same that stories testifie to be done: We shall say also . . . he telleth playne histories".[1] The historicist approach to the book of Revelation, in which the text was seen to include a general history of the church on earth, was the most common form of interpretation in sixteenth and seventeenth-century England. The true church was, as Paul Christianson noted, in a constant battle against the Antichristian Babylon represented by the Roman Church.[2] Old Testament prophecies, particularly the mystical numbers of the book of Daniel, were used to construct timelines which showed that the dates of the church's corruption by the papacy had been clearly predicted and that the ultimate vindication of God's people was therefore also certain. The wide variety of historicist interpretations – agreeing on the general principle which should be applied to the book of Revelation but differing on the details – might lead us to the conclude that commentators operating within the tradition used entirely arbitrary analysis to reach their conclusions. However, this would be to ignore the effort commentators went to (and the nuance they displayed) in finding accurate historical antitypes to the abstract figures in Revelation. Indeed, it would be to overlook an important development within the hermeneutics of historicism itself. This chapter argues that the desire to find historical fulfilments of the figures in the Bible's apocalyptic texts, combined with the increasing focus on historicity in early modern hermeneutics, created a situation

[1] Bullinger, *Hundred Sermons*, sig. 12r.

[2] Christianson, *Reformers and Babylon*, pp. 12–38.

A. Crome, *The Restoration of the Jews: Early Modern Hermeneutics, Eschatology, and National Identity in the Works of Thomas Brightman*, International Archives of the History of Ideas Archives internationales d'histoire des idées 213,
DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-04762-1_3,

in which an increasingly historicised reading of Old Testament Jewish promises could be undertaken. The key figure in this shift was Thomas Brightman and it is his work which forms the basis for both this and the next chapter. Brightman's readings have been derided as obtuse and random; the text being read "according to his own whim or convenience".[3] This sort of reading of Brightman is unfortunate, as it ignores the way in which his hermeneutic position developed and applied the *analogia fidei* to construct a complex and influential hermeneutic system with the fulfilment of Old Testament promises to ethnic Jews at their centre.

3.1 Recasting the Historical Sense

The ubiquity of the historicist reading of Revelation in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries was partly down to its usefulness in anti-Catholic polemic. As Anthony Milton has shown, the apocalyptic casting of Rome as the "whore of Babylon" in Rev. 17, combined with the call for the faithful to "come out of her" (Rev. 18:4), was particularly useful in helping to justify the Protestant split from the papacy.[4] John Bale's position had developed this reading further into a dualistic battle between two churches – the true, Christian church which had existed in perpetuity and the false, anti-Christian church now represented by Rome. The conflict between the two would finally end with the two churches facing their respective fates: "a most fearful and terrible destruction, under title of the old whorish Babylon" for Rome, while the true church would experience in full God's spiritual promises: "obtaining a most glorious raise, under the name of the holy new Jerusalem".[5] Yet there was more to the polemic use of the apocalyptic texts than this. A reiteration of the historicist approach might also serve as an assault on a popular Catholic interpretation of Revelation that emerged with particular force in the work of Cardinal Roberto Bellarmine, whose own position had developed through his reading of fellow Jesuit Francisco Ribera's writings.

Ribera (1537–1591) had published his commentary on Revelation in around 1590. His reading returned to and developed Augustine's position in *City of God*. The "time, times and half a time" of Dan. 7:25, 12:7 and Rev. 12:14, and the three-and-a-half years of the witnesses' prophesying in Rev. 11 were taken to refer to a literal period of three-and-a-half years at the end of human history. Ribera aimed to prove that the Antichrist was a unique, future individual, rather than an organisation or inherited title, and could therefore not be equated with the papacy.[6] In other words, he espoused a futurist interpretation of Revelation. Following this approach,

[3] Peterson, "Thomas Brightman", p. 94.

[4] Anthony Milton, *Catholic and Reformed: Roman and Protestant Churches in English Protestant Thought, 1600–40* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), pp. 33–40.

[5] Bale, *Image*, sig. AA.^{ii}r-v.

[6] Newport, *Apocalypse and Millennium*, pp. 76–78.

Bellarmine explicitly attacked the Protestant historicist reading of Revelation and restated the medieval antichrist legend, arguing for a future Jewish antichrist who would rule from the temple in Jerusalem, convincing the Jews that he was their messiah.[7] Much like debates on transubstantiation, this led to a reversal of normal hermeneutic positions – with Protestants decrying the literalism of their Roman opponents, while they suffered accusations that they needlessly allegorised the text. Protestant writers therefore denied that the three-and-a-half year period in Rev. 12 described a literal period of time in which the Antichrist would reign: "This place is not to be understood literally, but mystically: as many other things in this book . . . a certain number for an uncertain".[8] A firm re-affirmation of the importance of historicist interpretation was therefore a key element of defending the orthodoxy of an individual's reading of Revelation.

Practically, this meant that many of the interpretations suggested by writers within the tradition differed only in the ways in which they applied the various numbers and figures within the text. The historicist form itself could appear rigid, while the particular applications of the text could vary to such an extent that Bellarmine could mock the variety of readings his opponents were producing. Yet while this criticism was hard to deny, historicism nonetheless helped to foster a greater focus on historical details, if simply to see how they could be applied to the various trumpets, seals, and vials of the book of Revelation. This was more than an interest in historical minutiae. A greater understanding of the past could, conversely, act as a sign of the approaching end of history. The idea of progressive revelation was useful in that it allowed commentators to dismiss interpretations which had now been proven false while retaining the general historicist interpretative framework. "I graunt ye the olde expositours of this booke have sticked full oft in expounding ye same & could not always winde themselves out," cautioned Bullinger, "but in the meane season it is evident, that the same men have sayd oftner then once, that hardely should this booke be understand before it were fulfilled".[9] With the fullness of time, the text could thus be described as "a full clearness to all the chronicles and most notable histories".[10] Prophecy and history therefore enjoyed a symbiotic relationship. Ironically, this meant that while writers on Revelation were more concerned with prophecy than at any point in the past, they were not driven to a greater historicity in their interpretations. There was therefore little concern as to the way in which the first readers of the text might have interpreted it – indeed, such information was of minimal interest, due to the fact that prophecy became clearer as time passed. By necessity the first readers of Revelation would have received (after the seven letters of Rev. 2-3, at least) a largely obscure text.

Thomas Brightman's reimagining of the historical sense did not solve all of the problems inherent in the historicist reading of Revelation. The argument of this

[7] Froom, *Prophetic Faith*, Vol. II, pp. 501–502.

[8] Arthur Dent, *The Ruine of Rome, or, An Exposition upon the Whole Revelation* (London, 1622), p. 176.

[9] Bullinger, *Hundred*, sig. B^{iii}r.

[10] Bale, *Image*, sig. A4v.

chapter (and indeed this book as a whole) is that Brightman recast elements of this reading in line with a consistent application of the *analogia fidei*, leading to a more consistently historicised (as well as historicist) interpretation. His reading of apocalyptic texts conversely confronted and exaggerated some of the problems inherent in the historicist interpretive structure – and it was this confrontation that helped move his own position (and the eschatological debate in England) forward. For Brightman, the standard historicism promoted by the likes of Bale and Napier had failed to successfully deal with the issues raised by the text of Revelation. Part of the reason for this was the rigidity of the historicist approach and its refusal to accept readings that differed significantly from the normal template. For Brightman, this kind of thinking represented a failure to consistently apply the logic of progressive revelation. As the unclear predictions of scripture revealed themselves as they began to unfold in history, so commentators should be open to new methods and new interpretations which came with increased clarity. While Brightman's interpretation was "new",[11] the "great variety of Interpretations old and new" argued for a revised reading of the text: "the Revelation doth still require necessarily a Revelation".[12]

The upshot of this was that Brightman believed that commentators could freely use "novel" interpretations as they were increasingly verified by history. In a passage that bears quoting in full, he therefore answered the reader struggling with some of his more unusual readings:

> But it may be you will cry out, that this is a new interpretation. But do not offer to binde the *Holy Ghost* to be at your command and pleasure. It is he that sorteth out the measure of knowledge to *every time*, according to his own good will, and that most wisely. Consider rather the consent of the whole Prophecy, which will give most plaine and evident proofe of its own authority and certainty, and count that to be most ancient, which ye shall finde to be most true.[13]

The passage is interesting on several levels. Protestant orthodoxy, in general, disliked "novelty". The Catholic question – "Where was your Church before Luther?" – presented a problem for Protestant apologists. The Catholic Church was a visible authority and institution persisting for 1,500 years, while Protestantism in Brightman's day was barely 100 years old. As Anthony Milton has shown, this remained a live issue for Protestants throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.[14] The apocalyptic tradition offered a useful answer to this question that allowed Protestants to claim a continuity of both faith and practice. This was through the distinction of the visible (false) and invisible (true) church, a conception given

[11]Katherine Firth notes that his reading was marked by "an indefatigable love of invention"; Murray, that "there is a good deal that is fanciful" in Brightman's reading, See Firth, *Apocalyptic Tradition*, p. 166; Murray, *Puritan Hope*, p. 270 n. 15. Contrary to the positions of these commentators, this chapter will argue that while there was "novelty" in Brightman's work, it was marked by a consistent application of Reformed hermeneutics.

[12]Brightman, *Revelation.*, sig. A2r.

[13]Brightman, *Revelation.*, p. 580.

[14]Milton, *Catholic and Reformed,* esp. pp. 93–172.

apocalyptic resonance by Bale.[15] To claim novelty was therefore not a normal rhetorical strategy. Yet in Brightman's reading antiquity was no longer the measure of truth – instead, it was to be measured by growing perspicuity as time moved forward and knowledge progressed. Appealing to antiquity was therefore a flawed strategy, as older commentaries were almost certain to be wrong. While the Fathers were thus forgiven for their failure to anticipate Antichrist in the form of the Papacy ("as who being further off from the last event, could the lesse perceive the matter"),[16] their interpretation should also no longer form the basis of contemporary apocalyptic exegesis. "Why," Brightman asked his readers, "do you suffer your selves to be deceived with the names of the Fathers, whom the *most certain event* doth teach, to have been exceedingly blinded with errour, in the most places of this book of the Revelation?"[17]

The idea of progressive revelation was therefore a consistent theme in Brightman's work on Revelation. While this had always been part of the historicist tradition, Brightman allowed the concept a central place within his interpretive scheme. For example, the four beasts of Rev. 4:6-7 (a lion, an ox, a man and an eagle) that worshipped before God's throne were seen as representing both the chronological progression of apocalyptic scripture and the attitudes found in godly ministers in distinct historical periods. The Lion thus represented the period from John to Constantine and the Ox from Constantine's accession until the middle ages (a time when ministers were yoked). The man represented the time from Wyclif until the Reformation (increasing strength amongst believers), while the eagle represented the final conversion of the Jews.[18] Similarly, the image of two mystical temples in scripture (Ezk. 40-47, Rev. 21) served as an illustration of the historical movement towards greater illumination. The heavenly temple of Revelation 21 was larger than the temple of Ezekiel due to "the different measure of the cleernesse of the times… For after the coming of Christ, came their greatest light".[19] In a similar way, knowledge increased as Christ's coming approached – the hope of early reformers was that "more plentifull light would break forth every day more and more".[20] As the predictions in scripture came to pass "in very deed, [they] may seeme rather a Historie than a prophecie".[21] It was this conception that allowed Brightman to speak of his interpretation as both accurate and "novel" without claiming direct divine inspiration. If, as he claimed, "The doctrine of the truth hath been illustrated with more heads, hath been more exactly also and distinctly known and delivered, then was seen in many ages that have been in times past",[22]

[15] Bozeman, *To Live*, p. 76; Christianson, *Reformers*, p. 15; Zakai, *Exile*, p. 13.

[16] Brightman, *Revelation.*, p. 231. See also p. 819.

[17] Brightman, *Revelation.*, pp. 580–81.

[18] Brightman, *Revelation*, p. 181.

[19] Brightman, *Revelation*, p. 865.

[20] Brightman, *Revelation*, p. 342.

[21] Brightman, *Daniel.*, p. 9.

[22] Brightman, *Revelation*, p. 385.

then it was only to be expected that his interpretation was clearer than those which preceded it. Repeatedly, he was drawn to re-enforce that his approach was not caused by any ill-motive ("as if I desired to be the first broacher of new found and strange opinions to the world") but was formed "because the whole order of matters & the marvellous consent of the rest of the Scriptures, compel me to follow this interpretation".[23]

This focus on the importance of truth as an unfolding reality might initially appear to signal an almost positivist approach to history from Brightman. However, his focus on the importance of unfolding prophetic knowledge did not diminish his belief that the early church represented the purest form of Christianity before its corruption by Rome. The model of the first churches was to be the basis upon which the contemporary church should be built. This was evident through the way in which Brightman read the structure of the book of Revelation itself. The book began with a thematic preface in Rev. 1, before dividing into three major sections – the letters to the seven churches (Rev. 2-3), a "new prophecy" of the whole church age in Rev. 4-5, and a more clearly chronologically delineated set of prophecies in Rev. 6-22. The prophecies of this final section were divided into three further sub-sections:

> It is manifest therefore, that this whole space of time from *John* to the comming of the *Lord*, is divided into three Periods of time, and that each of those Periods is again divided into seven members, so as the first member of that Period which followeth, beginneth under the last member of the former, that is so; that as the *seven Trumpets* have their Originall from out of the *last Seale* so the *seven Vials* have their of-spring out of the *last Trumpet*. Which manner of distributing the time makes this prophesie to be easie unto us, and to go currently on to our understanding, which otherwise would not be able to be unfolded.[24]

This threefold/sevenfold division was Joachimist in origin – a scheme built on three *status* divided into seven *etates*.[25] This Joachimism was somewhat more subtle than that found in writers such as Giacopo Brocardo.[26] In Brightman, the divisions were based on the seal, trumpet, and vial judgements. Each septenary had its origin in the previous set of judgements. Thus the seventh seal gave birth directly to the first trumpet and so on. While this was not a straightforwardly chronological reading (in that various chapters, such as Rev. 7 and 12, synchronised with one another) it nonetheless allowed Brightman to construct a coherent historical understanding of the development of the text. The seven seals, the first set of judgements, were therefore poured upon Roman persecutors. The first seal represented early apologies for the faith and peace under Antonius Pius; the second described persecutions under Marcus Aurelius; the third dealt with famine in the time of Severus, while the fourth described tyrants rising to rule the Empire. The fifth seal depicted a

[23] Brightman, *Revelation*, p. 833.

[24] Brightman, *Revelation.*, p. 506, for a similar statement see pp. 205–206.

[25] Reeves, *Joachim*, pp. 155–56; See also West and Zimdars-Swartz, *Joachim*, p. 22.

[26] In Brocardo the theme is repeatedly emphasised, and linked to a conception of circular history. For example, see his reading of history as three wheels of decreasing size contained within one another. Each wheel represents a member of the trinity (Giacopo Brocardo, *The Revelation of S. Ihon Reveled* (London, 1582), f.44r).

time of persecution which lasted until 303, with the sixth seal describing the final persecutions of Maximian and Diocletian. The accession of Constantine under the seventh seal led to the trumpet judgements and a time of peace.[27]

The second of the three periods, from Constantine's accession to 1300, unfolded through the seven trumpets (Rev. 8-11). The first four trumpets described contention, ambition, heresy and war. Brightman read these as the rise of Arianism, the establishing of the primacy of Bishops, Constantius II misdirecting the church into heresy and the Vandal invasions of 483.[28] The fifth trumpet was sounded in 607, when Boniface III recognised Rome as the universal bishopric. The locusts described in this passage referred both to wicked monks and the Saracens, with the demonic Apollyon seen to be both Mohammed and the pope.[29] The sixth trumpet encapsulated the period 506–1350, with the four angels representing four dynasties of Turkish rulers who were loosed fully in 1300 to kill a third of men.[30] With the final trumpet, Christ began to appear more fully to his church as he was preached more clearly, while the mystery of the Jews' conversion began to be understood. At the same time, the light of prophecy (i.e. true preaching) was returned to the church. This occurred in the year 1558, at Elizabeth's accession.[31] This entire period was summarised further in Revelation 11. Brightman believed that this chapter described a period beginning in Constantine's reign. The two witnesses who prophesied for 1,260 days (Rev. 11:1-14) were the scriptures and the assemblies of the faithful. The days, each taken to represent a year, ended in 1546 at the Council of Trent. During that time, scripture appeared to have been "slain" by the Catholic Church, but was triumphantly revived three-and-a-half years later (Rev. 11:9-11) at the publication of the Magdeburg Centuries in 1550. Revelation 12, meanwhile, described the civil and spiritual functions of the beast reigning at that time. The figure of the woman (Rev. 12:1-6) was read as representative of the true church, and the child she gave birth to seen as a reference to Constantine. At his accession, the true church fled to the temple of Rev. 11:1-3 to avoid persecution caused by declining church standards. Both this chapter and Revelation 13 synchronised with Revelation 17 and were (again) recapped in Revelation 20.

The final division was based around the seven vial judgements found in Revelation 15 and 16. The first three vials represented past actions: the expelling of the Catholic clergy by Elizabeth, the publication of Martin Chemnitz's refutation of the Council of Trent, and English legislation against the Jesuits. The fourth vial described the greater light of the gospel appearing in Brightman's time, while the final three vials depicted the (future) overthrow of Rome and the conversion of the Jews. This was divided into a minor conversion, in which a zealous core of Jewish believers would come to Christ (in around 1650) and march across the Euphrates, and a major, more general conversion in the 1690s, with 1695/6 seen as a probable

[27] Brightman, *Revelation,* pp. 209–60.

[28] Brightman, *Revelation,* pp. 266–83.

[29] Brightman, *Revelation*, pp. 283–320.

[30] Brightman, *Revelation*, pp. 321–29.

[31] Brightman, *Revelation*, pp. 380–83.

date. Brightman based these calculations on his reading of the 1,290 and 1,335 days in Daniel 12:11-12. Using the day/year theory, Brightman was able to use these passages to date the time of the Jews' conversion. Like Napier, Brightman believed that the "abomination" of Daniel 12 referred to the Emperor Julian's attempt to reconstruct the Jerusalem temple, an event he dated to 360 CE. With this as the starting point, the 1,290 days would end in 1650 and the 1,335 days in 1695.[32] Revelation 18 and 19 contained a typological description of Rome's downfall based on the fall of Tyre (Ezekiel 27).

There were a number of problems generated by these conclusions. Firstly, while they allowed Brightman to conceive of the pre-Constantinian church as being predominantly pure, they nonetheless raised awkward questions about the imperial role in the corruption of Christianity. As with other works within the English tradition, Brightman had equated a prophetic day to a year in Revelation and Daniel.[33] The beginning of the 1,260 days described in both Revelation 11:3 and 12:6 was therefore crucial to establishing any apocalyptic timetable. Denying that the days were the same as Daniel's weeks ("It is quite destitute of all example and reason to equal the *moneths to the weekes*"),[34] he argued instead that they referred to 1,260 years in which the true church remained hidden – from the time of the dragon's fall from heaven in Rev. 12:9. This signified the fall of pagan Roman emperors through Constantine's accession. As the dragon fell, so the hidden enemy of the church (the beast – that is, Rome and the papacy) arose. This potentially undermined both established readings of the millennium, which found its start at Constantine's accession, and the positive connections that the figure of Constantine suggested. To imply that Constantine was the tool through which the beast had appeared contained obvious dangers, particularly as the Emperor was used to prefigure Elizabeth by Foxe. If Constantine's rise had traditionally been seen as the start of a period of peace for the church, Brightman also placed the rise of Antichrist in this period.[35] This, as both William Lamont and Esther Gilman Richey have noted, was a major change to the standard exegesis of the passage.[36] Brightman was deeply aware of this problem: "In the meane while let not any man make a stir with importunate out-cryes, and say it is a matter unworthy, ungodly, and the like, to which was never heard, that I should make those first Christian worthies to be the *Horns of Antichrist*".[37]

---

[32]Brightman, *Revelation*, pp. 519–40.

[33]Brightman, *Revelation*, p. 324. See also Ball, *Great Expectation*, pp. 68–69.

[34]Brightman, *Revelation*, p. 352.

[35]A problem which Howard Hotson has seen as essential for the formation of millenarian thought. See Hotson, "The Historiographical Origins of Calvinist Millenarianism" in *Protestant History and Identity in Sixteenth-Century Europe Volume 1*, ed. Bruce Gordon (Aldershot: Scholar, 1996), pp. 170–81.

[36]Lamont, *Godly Rule*, p. 95; Richey, *Politics of Revelation*, p. 44.

[37]Brightman, *Revelation*, p. 426.

For Lamont, Brightman's focus therefore shifted from a focus on religious reform led by the monarch onto a reformation led by the "godly" within England.[38] Similarly, Richey suggests that Brightman used the figure of Constantine to implicitly critique Elizabeth and James's involvement in the English Church as a corrupting influence. Basing her argument on Brightman's interpretation of Rev. 11 and 12, Richey argues that in reading the post-Constantinian church as hidden in the temple, or wandering in the wilderness, Brightman automatically viewed imperial ambitions as dangerous to the survival of the church itself.[39] Such analyses of Brightman would have obvious repercussions for the use of his works in the Civil Wars. Yet his reading need not signal a break from the support of godly princes as the key to reformation. Indeed, it is incorrect to find an anti-imperial theme emerging in Brightman's work. Both Richey and Lamont, in their desire to read events of the 1640s into late-Elizabethan/early-Stuart works, move too far, and fail to see how Brightman coped with the difficulty his interpretation created. In fact, for Brightman it caused no greater problem than Augustine's adherence to Rome:

> But that every such caviller may have his mouth stopped, let him know once again, that it is one thing to do a matter with advice and of set purpose, another thing to do it at unawares, and through an erronious conceit of minde. *Constantine* augmented the estate of Christian Religion to his power, and had not the least thought to help *Antichrist* but endeavoured rather to cut off all the wayes whereby he might enter in; and yet he made the way (besides his knowledge and purpose) more ready for him, by adorning, amplifying, and defending the *Pope of Rome*.[40]

Brightman's concept of the opening of prophetic truth therefore allowed him to maintain a positive reading of the emperor while condemning the impact of his actions. Constantine acted without the benefit of the "greater light" that was slowly breaking forth into the world.[41] Far from being radical, as Christianson has noted, Brightman's reading of political history was primarily imperial.[42] Rhetorical appeals, while addressed to churches as a whole, were directed especially to "*ye Princes* and *Peers*".[43] Appeals for action were aimed at "*Christian Princes . . . most mighty and renowned*".[44] Constantine therefore remained the

[38]Lamont, *Godly Rule*, pp. 94–95. There were earlier continental "attacks" on Constantine, such as that of Francois Bonivard (active 1550–1566) who dated the decline of the faith from Constantine. See Markus Wriedt, "Luther's Concept of History and the Formation of an Evangelical Identity", in *Protestant History,* ed. Bruce Gordon, pp. 30–31.

[39]Richey, *Politics*, pp. 41–47.

[40]Brightman, *Revelation.*, p. 426.

[41]"Was not [Antichrist's] first beginning unknown even to those that were most sharpe sighted?", Brightman, *Revelation.*, p. 426, as he states later "They knew as much as belonging for their times to know". Brightman, *Revelation.*, p. 654.

[42]Christianson, *Reformers*, p. 104.

[43]Brightman, *Revelation,* p. 81.

[44]Brightman, *Revelation*, pp. 606–607.

"manlike and stout champion"[45] of the church. Indeed, Brightman went so far as to argue that Constantine was the "man child" who would rule the nations described in Rev 12:6, a figure almost universally interpreted as referring to Christ.[46] Rather than be seen as a figure who attacked royal supremacy, Brightman was instead viewed as one of its champions, especially given that his work was used for this purpose in the 1610s. Samuel Collins's defence of Lancelot Andrewes from Jesuit attacks poured scorn on the claim that Protestantism (particularly puritanism) led to sedition and rebellion against the monarch. Alongside Calvin, Collins cited Brightman as the "meanest of puritans", but repeated with satisfaction the reading of Constantine from his Revelation commentary. While Collins admitted that he could not accept Brightman's interpretation of Revelation, he was nonetheless glad to find in it an answer to those who claimed that Protestantism automatically led to sedition.[47] Rather than undermining the Foxean position, Brightman therefore reinforced it and was able to support his understanding through his belief in an ever increasing openness of prophecy.

This focus on the progression of history could seem at odds with Brightman's other great interest in the early church. While prophecy was always becoming clearer, paradoxically, if the church wished to move forward it "*must have recourse unto the first beginnings*".[48] This sort of passage has led to suggestions, predominantly in Theodore Dwight Bozeman's work, that Brightman was the key figure in popularising a primitivist impulse in puritan apocalypticism. Yet although his examination of Brightman's historical interpretation is perceptive, and he correctly emphasises the importance of progressive revelation in puritan thought,[49] Bozeman never adequately explains how this combines with a primitivist impulse. In his reading, the way to greater light is through a restoration of the first things; an avoidance of novelty; a return, through a dramatic re-enactment, to the early church.[50] Brightman, however, held that the truth was revealed by the Spirit as time progressed, and the church "grew into" it: "There are many things in the scripture which are not cleared and opened sufficiently to this day. But by how much nearer we shall come to that day, a more plentifull light shall grow every day, as the beames of the Sun rising up shall be nearer".[51] While primitivism was certainly

[45]Brightman, *Revelation*, p. 396.

[46]For example, Napier, *Plaine*, p. 158. See also Backus' analysis. The only exception she finds is Nikolaus Selnecker, who read the "man child" as referring to Luther (*Reformation Readings*, pp. 130–133). Edward Hellwis had also advanced a reading of the woman in the wilderness as Elizabeth (Bauckham, *Tudor Apocalypse*, p. 179).

[47]Samuel Collins, *Epphata to F.T., or, The defence of the Right Reuerend Father in God, the Lord Bishop of Elie* (London, 1617), pp. 532–5.

[48]Brightman, *Revelation*, p. 50

[49]Bozeman, *To Live*, pp. 198–236.

[50]Bozeman, *To Live*, pp. 124–46.

[51]Brightman, *Revelation*, p. 537.

a facet of Brightman's thought it was only a part of his historical interpretation. Indeed, as Anthony Smith has pointed out, the desire for a renewed "golden age" is not merely a backward looking impulse, but one which (by its very nature) must look forward as well.[52] Instead Brightman's work represents an approach to history that looked to the ecclesiastical practice of the early church as the norm for Christians to follow while also focusing on the continual unfolding of truth as prophecies were cleared by events. This is precisely the historical consciousness that Bryan Ball found in his examination of puritan eschatology.[53] Brightman's work thus pointed in the direction that later writers in the historicist tradition would follow.

3.2 The Seven Letters to the Churches: Dealing with Historical Tension

While Brightman's approach to the progressive revelation of prophecy emphasised the way in which historical understanding opened up as time moved forward, it might seem that his focus avoided a historicised reading of the text. This tension was nowhere more apparent than in his reading of the letters to the seven churches in Revelation 2-3. Brightman's interpretation of this section was not only controversial, but also evidenced a dual desire to provide an exegesis that actively connected with his English readers and that would have had a firm historical application to readers in the early church.

Rather than read the seven letters as pastoral in nature, Brightman took them as prophetic. In the majority of previous works the letters to the churches had been seen to contain no prophetic material. Rather, they were viewed as a collection of warnings and encouragements applicable to the church throughout history. In Bullinger's words, "in these seven Churches is figured unto us, the nature, maners, vices, medicines, rebukes and prayses of all Churches in all tymes".[54] They were therefore useful for practical application by preachers, but did not contain any distinct prophetic material: "a narration of those things [which] then were . . . [they] belongeth solely unto instruction".[55] For Brightman, however, each church described a *specific* time period. He therefore argued that the first letter addressed the church in John's day, with the final letter intended for the seventeenth-century Church of England. His reading of the churches can be set out as follows:

---

[52] Anthony D. Smith, *Chosen Peoples* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), pp. 166–89.

[53] Ball, *Great Expectation*, p. 24.

[54] Bullinger, *Hundred Sermons*, sig. 22r. misl. 23.

[55] Franciscus Junius, *The Revelation of St. John* (London, 1600), sig. Ar.

Church	Referent	Period
Ephesus (Rev. 2:1-7)	Early Church	0–300
Smyrna (Rev. 2:8-11)	Emergence of Arian heresies	300–380
Pergamum (Rev. 2:12-17)	Decline in Rome, while remnant preserved	380/400–1300
Thyatira (Rev. 2:18-28)	Reformation begins	1300–1520
Sardis (Rev. 3:1-6)	German Church	1517–
Philadelphia (Rev. 3:7-13)	Church of Scotland/Geneva/France	1519–
Laodicea (Rev. 3:14-21)	Church of England	1548–

His most controversial reading was his equation of the Church of England with Laodicea, the church which Christ threatened to "spit" out due to their luke-warmness. Brightman saw that the Church's most serious sin was her degenerate episcopacy.[56] It is possible that the commentator Giacopo Brocardo, whose Joachimist commentary on Revelation was published in England in 1582, may have been an influence on Brightman's reading here.[57] He had seen the churches as representative of seven ages, each signifying one temporal division of the *status* of the Father, the Son and the Spirit. Thus, "The Church of Laodicea bryngeth the seventh age, and the seventh time into judgement that shall be ever after in the Kingdome of Israell".[58] Nonetheless, Brocardo's reading was markedly less specific than that advanced by Brightman, and the extent to which the Italian could be said to influence English writers is uncertain.[59]

To support his position, Brightman used both historical data and geographical detail. Thus he found chronological clues in the Spirit's ordering of the churches:

> For the *Holy Ghost* doth not reckon up the Churches in leaps, without order . . . but in the order wherein they are laid down. First of all then he goeth on to the North, on which side about a hundred and twenty *fadoms* or *furlongs* is *Smyrna* placed on the shore. From when *Pergamus* bendeth again further Northward; from *Pergamus* the rest bend in their order Southward. And no doubt this order doth demonstrate the like proceeding of the *Church.* In that part of the world where we are, the further wee go *Northward* the further we go back from the sunne.[60]

Geography corresponded to chronology – the closer the churches were in distance from one another, the closer they were to each other in time. Thus Sardis, Philadelphia and Laodicea, being closer geographically, were nearer to one another chronologically.[61] Each church was then further set against another church as a

[56] Brightman, *Revelation,* pp. 123–162.

[57] Brocardo is largely ignored. Bauckham gives the best treatment: see *Tudor Apocalypse*, pp. 218–21.

[58] Brocardo, *The Revelation,* f.42r.

[59] Brocado does not apply each church to only one antitype: " . . . those things which are sayd to be in one Church ought to be referred to all, when the like thinges be they well, or be they ill, come to passe, and spring up". Brocardo, *The Revelation*, f.48r.

[60] Brightman, *Revelation*, p. 56.

[61] Brightman, *Revelation*, p. 90.

"contrary" partner, providing a negative mirror image of its parent church. Ephesus was set against Thyatira, Smyrna against Sardis and Pergamum against Philadelphia. Only Laodicea remained unpartnered: "[she] wanteth a Paralel to match her, as being a *peerlesse Paragon*".[62] In this complex interplay between text, chronology and geography, nothing was left to chance.[63] On the one hand, the fact that Brightman clearly believed that even geographical distances contained a deep meaning strongly suggests the influence of Ramist logic at work. As Walter Ong has shown, a key preoccupation of Ramism was to extend the art of logic to other disciplines. To do this in biblical exposition was to argue that the text being studied had been written in a "logical" way. In broad terms, it was to claim that the argument proceeded from general to particular and that the Spirit (as author) had fitted every word in place for a particular reason. Even seemingly supplemental details, then, had to have relevance – as they were part of the logical flow of the argument.[64] More than this, it was to see the text as a complex matrix of geography, history and theological truth. Where the majority of exegetes presumed that the seven letters contained no prophetic detail, for Brightman no element of the text could be said to be without both historical and prophetic import. Even those places in the text which seemed to have little relevance to the contemporary reader were found to contain a foreshadowing of prophetic events. The name of the martyr Antipas at Pergamum (Rev. 2:13), for example, "declare[s] unto us, that the Martyrs of this time should be *Antipape*". Antipas therefore had a twofold significance. At one level, he was a historical figure. The Spirit identified him "not indeed by a fained, but by a true name".[65] On another level, however, he was a useful chronological signifier. His name served to point out the time in which the church at Pergamum would find its historical fulfilment. It is clear from this that the Spirit's mode of identification was both historical and typological. A Spirit led reading of prophecy, for Brightman, created a text in which every word existed as a prophetic sign.

It would be easy to see this kind of reading as the opposite to a more historicised approached. As Robert Surridge has pointed out, Brightman had suggested that

[62]Brightman, *Revelation*, p. 123.

[63]Firth has noted this connection as "endemic in educated Elizabethan society" and suggested that this may show neo-Platonic and Pythagorean influences on Brightman (Firth, *Apocalyptic Tradition*, p. 167 n.61). Brightman shows at times that he thinks in terms of mathematical theory – though never to the extent of Napier. There are two clear examples of this. The first involves the beasts before the throne (Rev. 4) – "they are as it were foure beaemes of two diamiter lines dividing a circle at the right angles, wherewith the circumference is on every side, and equally joyned with the middest of the Throne" (Brightman, *Revelation.*, p. 179). The second instance refers to the 144,000 "Jews" sealed (Rev. 7) – "let there be a Geometricall Figure made, with lines set one over against another, whose shorter side is one foot long, divided into twelve parts, the other a thousand feet long, whose void place containeth this number: now this Figure will seeme to be of no latitude almost but the sides of it being dis-joyned in so little a space, will make a certaine shew of lines that fall together one within another: Such should this *Church be*". (Brightman, *Revelation.*, p. 247).

[64]Ong, *Ramus*, pp. 274–315, esp. 299.

[65]Brightman, *Revelation*, p. 67. There is a similar argument in Brocado's work. See *The Revelation*, f.50v.

the true meaning of Laodicea was hidden from readers until his own time. This would appear to radically de-historicise and destabilise scripture, leaving the text bereft of meaning for some fifteen centuries.[66] What Surridge does not see is that Brightman attempted to avoid this danger by his recognition that the churches each existed as historical realities. It was impossible to ascertain whether the type or the antitype was the primary meaning, as both were as real as one another. Thus he argued that the blessing promised to readers of Revelation (Rev. 1:3) was valid for all ages. The passage could not be seen as only having relevance to the current time: "For why, were men that lived by the space of these 1500 yeeres which are now past, since the writing of the Apocalypse, altogether devoid of this felicity?" At the same time, Brightman emphasised the need for his readers to find historical identification in the book: "can any man be happy, by reading or observing such things, as do nothing at all concerne them?"[67] The key point for Brightman was not merely to connect the text with contemporary readers, but also to ensure that his interpretation would have made sense for the original readers of the book of Revelation. While certain elements of the book were only understandable as the antitypes were revealed, there was nonetheless universal meaning and blessing contained within each type.[68] There was, by implication at least, a cyclical pattern at work in history. The historical reality of the seven churches was bound to be repeated and reapplied in the lives of future individuals. Yet while this repetition had clear pastoral applications (indeed, applications made by Brightman in his commentary), the key meaning of the text was left to the application of the type (to the original readers) and antitype (to Brightman's contemporaries). The reader was thus drawn into a wider community of historical readers, all of whom had experienced the "felicity" of the blessing promised in Rev. 1:3. Brightman's readers could therefore experience pleasure both at becoming a part of this interpretative community, and through awareness that the prophecies of Revelation often applied directly to both their own time and (often) country. This was particularly true of the casting of the Church of England as Laodicea. This direct application was not the same as a simple moral use of scripture to describe an analogous situation. To claim that a particular individual's life reflected elements of the Laodicean church was uncontroversial. The Spirit was expected to apply scriptural examples to believers through private

[66]See Robert J. Surridge, "'An English Laodicea': the influence of Revelation 3:14–22 on mid-seventeenth-century England" in *Cross, Crown and Community: Religion, Government and Culture in Early Modern England, 1400–1800*, eds D. J. B. Trim and P. J. Balderstone (Bern: Peter Lang, 2004), pp. 143–76 and "Art", pp. 263–270.

[67]Brightman, *Revelation,* p. 8.

[68]In arguing that Calvin's thought on providence affected historical conceptions I would challenge Lamont's claim that Calvin's teaching on the inscrutable nature of God presupposes the impossibility of reading history into prophecy (*Godly Rule,* p. 175). While Calvin did display a certain discomfort with Revelation, it is not correct to argue that his teaching on inscrutability ruled out a correspondence between history and prophecy.

reading, with direct application also seen as a key part of the sermon.[69] Brightman, while supporting this kind of reading, moved beyond it in arguing that the Church of England did not only share characteristics with the Laodicean church, but that it *was* that church. This was a form of interpretation which allowed English readers to engage with the text to a much greater extent than merely applying the moral lessons of each letter to their lives. Brightman's reading offered an interpretation that bridged the gap between the first and seventeenth centuries as the text offered meaning for both the historical and contemporary reader.

Indeed, the English reader in particular would be the recipient of a number of blessings. This extended beyond his identification of Laodicea with the Church of England. Brightman believed that a number of Revelation's prophecies were fulfilled within his nation. Revelation 14, in which two angels emerge from the temple in judgement, was seen to refer to Thomas Cranmer and Thomas Cromwell attacking the Roman Church in England. The third vial of God's judgement referred to William Cecil pushing through anti-Jesuit legislation. The Church of England, while in peril now, would enjoy a glorious future.[70] This confidence in England's status and future role *presumed* that Brightman's rhetorical appeals to his English readers would succeed. Far from seeing what Esther Gilman Richey claimed was an "inevitable" judgement on the Church of England,[71] the danger of losing God's favour was used only as a rhetorical device in Brightman's commentaries. Before discussing the "danger" the English Church found itself in, he had already included Laodicea (that is, England) among "the *four latter* [churches] which begin to come to health again after the sicknesse is over, and to do better and better".[72] While seemingly the worst of churches, Laodicea was in fact already guaranteed to reform and become the best. Brightman's eschatology presumed that his appeal to the English church could not fail to be heeded. Conversely, this meant that his appeals to other groups, such as his Catholic adversaries and the German church, were destined never to succeed. This form of thinking is demonstrated in a long excursus against Bellarmine and his futurist eschatology. Even if Brightman's words were read, they were divinely ordained to fail as his eschatological scheme required that repentance not be granted to the Catholic Church before their destruction. Brightman's awareness of this fact was revealed in his appeal to Rome to repent of their idolatry. Directly after his plea he admitted the pointlessness of his

[69]The key example being Nathan's use of narrative to highlight David's sin in 2 Samuel 12. See Thomas Granger, *The Application of Scripture, or the maner how to use the word to most edifying* (London, 1616) and the detailed explanation of application in John Weemes, *Exercitations Divine* (London, 1632), p. 185 ff.

[70]Brightman, *Revelation*, pp. 154–155.

[71]Richey, *Politics of Revelation*, p. 40.

[72]Brightman, *Revelation*, p. 87.

effort: "But I know that neither thou wilt be admonished with words thou art so incorrigible, neither can [the Turk] be overcome, till thou be overthrown with fire and sword; as it shall be made manifest afterward".[73]

Not only was Brightman's appeal for repentance useless, but even if Rome were to heed his words, *their* repentance would also prove useless, as the eschatological scheme Brightman found in Revelation required Rome to fall. His logic in the above passage was simple. The Roman Church held back the conversion of the Jews,[74] who must convert to destroy the Ottomans. The Roman Church must therefore be destroyed to allow this conversion to happen. This highlights something of the difficulty in working with apocalyptic rhetoric. While Brightman's work was intended to persuade and convert, it simultaneously recognised its own inability to do so. In this way it is possible to argue that Brightman's commentary is an example of Stanley Fish's "self-consuming" artefact. That is, in and of itself the text was not important; it was the *effect* of the work which ultimately mattered most. The work itself was powerless: "it points *away* from itself to something its forms cannot capture".[75] Brightman's commentary manifests exactly this kind of thought – his text was simultaneously guaranteed to achieve certain aims, and guaranteed to fail. His rhetorical appeals, while passionate, already assumed a preordained outcome.[76] Although Fish failed to see that his theory could be applied to puritan theological works,[77] Crawford Gribben has noted that the puritan texts were "required to question the sufficiency of the human mind, of post-Fall epistemological patterns". At the heart of this was a desire to allow readers to know God and his ways. Thus, "[the texts] undermined the authority of their own words and pointed instead towards the eternal *logos*".[78] Gribben has noted that at the root of this was the iconoclastic concern central to puritan thought – the fear that words could stop being merely signs of "things" and become the "things" themselves. That is, a fear of a kind of rhetorical idolatry. Apocalyptic commentaries are unique in that they represent a special type of this "self-consuming" text. They create a tension within themselves, challenging their own appeal as texts. On the one hand the

[73] Brightman, *Revelation*, p. 330. The idea at the root of Brightman's thought here is that the Turk is upheld by Rome's idolatry. That is, through their idolatry the Roman Church promotes an image of Christianity repugnant to Jews in Ottoman regions. As Turkish power rests (in Brightman's opinion) on the Jews remaining in a powerless, non-converted state, Roman idolatry upholds the Turk. See Cogley, "Fall", pp. 314–315 and Matar, *Islam*, p. 154.

[74] Through their idolatry. It was a commonly held belief that the Jews were appalled at the idolatry of the Roman Church, and therefore deliberately avoided Christianity. For a later example of this see Samuel Brett, *A Narrative of the Proceedings of a Great Councel of Jewes* (London, 1655), p. 11.

[75] Stanley Fish, *Self-Consuming Artifacts* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1972), pp. 1–4.

[76] A concept identified in Fish, *Self-Consuming*, pp. 70–75.

[77] While Fish does discuss Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress*, he explicitly describes puritan sermons as both "self-effacing" and "self-glorifying" – that is, they are self-effacing in their style, but glory in their own claims of being unadulterated truth (Fish, *Self-Consuming*, p. 70).

[78] Gribben, *Puritan Millennium*, pp. 16–17.

apocalyptic commentary aimed to provoke a response of change in the reader, to avert judgement through moral reformation and encourage the avoidance of God's wrath. On the other hand, these commentaries purported to offer a preordained picture of a future judgement and traumatic change, a world radically altered and reshaped by the deity. While the reader may therefore be assured of their own salvation, the rhetorical appeals of the apocalyptic text, even if successful in the lives of individual readers, had little impact on the wider apocalyptic narrative – judgement would still come, though the reader may now be equipped to live through it. To put this more bluntly, an apocalyptic commentary must ultimately fail as a call for reformation to succeed as an announcement of the apocalypse. If every reader were to heed the author's call for repentance and reform (the stated intention of the text) then the prophetic warnings of certain judgement and destruction for the unreformed would automatically become invalid. Indeed, there would be nothing left to judge. Instead, the text *itself* would have become the apocalypse – in that it would lead to the creation of the heavenly paradise it so confidently predicted. Paradoxically, such a state of affairs would not leave the apocalyptic commentary a powerful, self-sufficient text, but rather one which was inherently self-consuming. For in providing such a powerful reformation, it would invalidate not only its own claims of prescience, but also those of scripture itself. The text could only succeed as a call for widespread repentance and transformation if its prophecies were denied.

This is, of course, hypothetical to some degree. No mainstream seventeenth-century commentator was so naïve as to think that their text would result in any such universal reformation.[79] This certainty does not mean that they were unaware of the problematic nature of their work. The challenge for the apocalyptic commentator (both then and now) was to balance this tension; to provide the reader with a real motivator for change in their own lives whilst maintaining the inevitability of judgement.[80] For the puritan commentator, this problem persisted. While Bale and Napier focused on individual (and even national) repentance, there was no distinct role for the reader within their commentary. They became part of the international community of the redeemed, the elect who would be blessed at Christ's Second Coming. While this was hardly an insubstantial reward, it provided no *direct* role for the reader in the drama of the apocalypse. Brightman made a definitive step in addressing this tension, by emphasising the importance of national identity, and the role of England, for his readers to relate to. As England was given a unique, providential role in fulfilling the events of Revelation, so the reader was invited to

[79]This does not apply, of course, to all radical writers and prophets in the interregnum.

[80]An attempt to solve this problem can be seen in contemporary dispensational eschatology, through the concept of the "rapture". The "rapture" is a popular term for the "catching up" found in 1 Thes. 4:16-17. This is seen as an event at which Christ will return and remove all true believers from the earth. The rapture is (usually) presented as occurring before a final "tribulation" period during which the book of Revelation will be fulfilled in chronological order. This allows interpreters to balance apocalyptic tension – the reader's response to a rhetorical appeal allows an escape from "tribulation", whilst maintaining the fixed and certain character of that same judgement.

play an active part in the apocalyptic drama – to join with the (English) people of God. While more will be said of this in the following chapter, it is important to recognise the way in which Brightman allowed the reader to find identification within the text.

3.3 The Millennium and the Opening of History

It remains one of the paradoxes of historicist interpretation that a reading that emphasised the importance of history was nonetheless broadly focused upon the end of time through Christ's return and final judgement. One of the few things that appeared clear among the variety of apocalyptic interpretations active in the seventeenth century was that Revelation described Christ's second coming and the judgement of the world. According to Napier, the text ended with the "Godlesse kingdoms . . . extinguished, and Christ . . . come to judge all men according to their demerits".[81] Nonetheless, there were several challenges for exegetes in attempting to work out the timeline of these final events. The major problem concerned the timing of the two resurrections clearly discernable in Rev. 20, and most notoriously, the millennial reign of the Saints with Christ that appeared to divide them. This led to understandable exegetical difficulties. Commentators agonised over how and when to date the start and end of the thousand years. The major problem concerned Satan's release "for a short time" before the final judgement. For Augustine, writing in the fourth century, this was simply not an issue – the millennium could easily refer to the first thousand years after Christ's birth without causing any real difficulties. When John Bale adopted the same position in the 1540s, he had to contend with the troubling fact that the "short time" of Satan's release had now extended to over 500 years. Some solved this problem by dating the binding of Satan to the conversion of Constantine. This was, after all, when open political persecution of the church ceased. The loosing of Satan could then be dated to somewhere in the mid-fourteenth century, usually centred on the protests of Wyclif and Hus against transubstantiation. This was Foxe's view.[82] The advantage of this position was that it reduced the time that Satan had been unbound to attack the true church. Yet it also generated a number of problems of its own. Dating the start of the millennium to the beginning of the fourth century, as Napier was forced to admit, meant that both Satan's binding and the rise of the papacy occurred at the same time. As the book of Revelation was primarily used as fuel for the fire of anti-Catholic polemic, it was hard to argue that the papacy had not "deceived the nations" during the supposed millennial period in which it seemed to have grown in strength. Napier was led to the paradoxical conclusion that the promise that the martyrs of the church would visibly reign with Christ for a thousand years (Rev. 20:4) referred to the invisible

[81] Napier, *Plaine*, p. 232.

[82] Foxe, *Actes and Monuments*, p. 1.

church "that lived privily as true Christians, triumphing and raigning over these papistical abuses, during all these thousand yeares".[83] These positions often made the millennial blessing look far from ideal. Arthur Dent, following the traditional Augustinian position, confessed that after 600 CE, "the cleere sincerity of the truth was much dimmed with errors and heresies". Without irony, he admitted that Satan's release lasted "for not much above 500 yeeres, which heere the holy Ghost for our comfort calleth a little season".[84] The fact that the millennium had included only 600 years of real blessing, followed by 900 of persecution to a greater or lesser degree served to undermine the claims for the scope of the promised reign of Christ in Revelation 20.

The interpretation of the millennium also had an impact on the way in which the two resurrections of Revelation 20 were understood. If a commentator followed Augustine in interpreting the millennium spiritually, then it was obvious that the first resurrection could not be interpreted literally. To do so led unavoidably toward premillennialism. There was therefore a clear differentiation between the blessing promised to those involved in the first resurrection who would reign with Christ for the thousand years (20:5-6) while "the rest of the dead" were not raised until the millennium's end for judgement (20:11-14). This first resurrection therefore signified salvation, with the second resurrection representing a literal rising of the dead that was seen as synonymous with that in Daniel 12.[85]

After dealing with the confusion of Rev. 20, there was near universal agreement on the interpretation of the final two chapters of the book. They were seen to offer a wonderful picture of "that most happy and blessed estate, which the faithfull shall dwell in for evermore".[86] The conclusion of the book of Revelation was therefore synonymous with the conclusion of history and the eternal reign of the God. If Genesis represented an opening of history, so Revelation represented its final closure and the conclusion of God's plan. John thus assured his readers "of infinite and eternall joy and rest, in that new world and heavenly habitation, which here he describes".[87] The desire to find the end of history and the final vindication of the godly in the apocalyptic text is unsurprising, given that it has remained as one of the key elements of apocalyptic thought throughout history. Yet it has also often been identified as a distinctive feature of puritan thought. Thomas Luxon, for example, argues that puritans desired an escape from time into a "timeless" world with God. History existed as a figure of eternity and the final judgement – only with its end could the world become really "real".[88] In some ways this echoes Paul Ricoeur's criticism of Protestant hermeneutics. Ricoeur described the puritan hermeneutical approach as guilty of reducing God to speaking in the prophetic/oracular mode.

[83]Napier, *Plaine*, p. 234.

[84]Dent, *Ruine*, p. 272.

[85]Bale, *Image,* III. p. 123; See also Dent, *Ruine*, p. 274.

[86]Dent, *Ruine*, p. 283.

[87]Napier, *Plaine,* p. 244.

[88]Luxon, *Literal Figures*, pp. 51–54.

The scriptures, once again, became a book of signs; a means of divination pointing towards the conclusion of history itself.[89] Similarly, Cathy Gutierrez has argued for a "narrative" reading of millenarian movements, suggesting that millenarian writers used "closure as the focusing lens of the present".[90]

In Thomas Brightman's work, however, there was no such desire for the end of history. Indeed, in line with his increased awareness of the importance of historical context in prophecy, Brightman's recognised the possibility of history without an end – indeed, a future that stretched beyond the end of the book of Revelation itself into an earthly, historical world as yet unseen. Partly, this was through his unique interpretation of the millennium. However, it was also part of his wider project in representing a more historically oriented interpretation.

Brightman was opposed to a broadly historicist reading which saw Revelation as describing the history of the church from Christ's birth until the Second Coming[91] – for the book explicitly noted that John wrote "what must take place after this" [i.e. After John's time] (Rev. 4:2).[92] This meant that Revelation could neither be a history of the whole church, nor a general allegorical summary of good versus evil. This was uncontroversial, and led to interpretations of the seal, trumpet and bowl judgements that gave each the historical antitypes discussed above. The unique nature of Brightman's exegesis, and indeed the key to his understanding of history, was in his interpretation of Revelation 20. Brightman's first reading of the millennium was entirely consistent with the standard English approach. The millennium of Rev 20:2 ran synchronous with the seven trumpets, from Constantine's accession until the rise of the Ottoman Empire in around 1300.[93] Brightman's innovation was to argue that the second mention of a thousand year period in Rev. 20:6 referred to an entirely separate *second* millennium. This ran from the end of the first thousand years until an unspecified point in the future. The first resurrection was the figurative rising of the church in the Reformation, while the second resurrection, universally seen as occurring at the last judgement, was reinterpreted as "no other thing but the full restoring of the Jewish nation".[94] This exegesis was unique and defies categorisation as pre-, post-, or a-millennial. Brightman's reading of Rev. 20 transcends these labels.

In interpreting the second resurrection as referring only to the Jews, the standard closure that it provided was ripped away. Yet this was far from Brightman's only reimagining of history in his commentaries. Take, for example, his interpretation of the "coming of Christ":

---

[89]Paul Ricoeur, *Essays on Biblical Interpretation* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980), p. 77.

[90]Cathy Guiterrez, "The Millennium and Narrative Closure" in *War in Heaven, Heaven on Earth: Theories of the Apocalyptic*, eds Stephen D. O'Leary and Glen S. McGhee (London: Equinox, 2005), p. 47.

[91]Brightman, *Revelation*, pp. 205–6.

[92]Brightman, *Revelation*, p. 163–164.

[93]Brightman, *Revelation*, pp. 816.

[94]Brightman, *Revelation*, pp. 832–833.

> But I finde no mention in this Booke of the time, into which this translation shall fall, that shall be finished perfectly in Christs second coming. This Prophecie proceeds no farther then to the finall and Universall slaughter of all the enemies, and the full restoring of the Jewish Nation, the estate whereof being thus restored.[95]

While Revelation *theoretically* included the time of Christ's return (in that it was alluded to, and would constitute the closing of history) the text did not explicitly refer to the event itself. Instead, the book of Revelation was the unfolding of history from John's time until the full restoration of the Jews as a nation. The Apocalypse was therefore no longer concerned with "the perpetuall Sabboth of the chyldren of God"[96]; "[the] dissolution of the heaven, the earth, and all the elements".[97] Instead, Brightman removed the end of history from both Revelation and Daniel. When confronting the question of *when* history itself would close, he could only respond with a metaphorical shrug: "he onely knoweth it, that knoweth all things. We finde nothing, whereby we can determine any thing certainly, touching this matter".[98] The end of history was an event that was constantly deferred. As his readers sought historical closure (even dissolution) through the Apocalypse, Brightman argued that God moved to frustrate that desire. "Where we expect the end of the world," he argued, "there we finde the beginning of a new Church; which is not like to be for a day or a week or a short time".[99] Indeed, the longed for coming of Christ was, in a way, a false hope. In his excursus against Bellarmine, Brightman discussed Mt. 24:29-31. This passage described the sun being darkened and stars falling before "the Son of Man coming on the clouds". This, concluded Brightman, was "applied with one consent of all men as I suppose, to the last judgement of our Lord". Nonetheless, he believed this to be a misreading:

> there is a double comming of the Lord yet to come, one Spirituall, and that in an excellencie, at the calling of the Jewes, another corporall, at the generall judgement. Now the coming spoken of in *Matthew* seemeth to be spirituall, which yet is described to be most glorious and powerfull with a bodily setting forth, both because it shall be a most evident resemblance thereof and a certaine pledge as it were.[100]

In other words, those who hoped for Christ's imminent second coming were basing their hope on a misreading of scripture. Even the clearest predictions of Christ's bodily return in scripture were not physical, but typological. They were promises meant only for the Jews. While other commentators mistakenly took Christ to be talking of a *literal* consummation of history, Brightman took the words to signify a *spiritual* restoration. The contrast could not be more marked. Brightman believed, as Joachim had before him, that there were three comings of Christ. While Gribben has claimed that this position was only articulated by "fringe radicals"

---

[95] Brightman, *Revelation*, p. 553.

[96] Bale, *Image*, III.77v.

[97] Napier, *Plaine Discoverie*, p. 242.

[98] Brightman, *Revelation*, p. 824.

[99] Brightman, *Song*, p. 1077.

[100] Brightman, *Revelation*, pp. 690–91.

such as John Archer,[101] it is clear that Brightman recognised (and admitted) that his theology required a "middle" coming of Christ. As Bozeman rightly notes, the "middle" coming Brightman identified was not "premillennialism in the modern acceptation".[102] Instead, Brightman equated this coming with the destruction of the Papacy and "Turk" (that is, the Ottoman Empire), and the greater Jewish conversion. The idea of a great "spiritual" coming of Christ was emphasised further through his interpretation of Dan. 12:45, where he saw the Turk defeated by "God's owne mightie arme, gloriously shewing itself from heaven".[103]

With this in mind, it is slightly ironic that Brightman has been accused of setting the date of the Second Coming.[104] This was never something he indulged in: to do so would be to long for the end of history itself. Rather than seeking any such dissolution of history, Brightman deliberately moved the end into an unknowable future – a future beyond the reach of even scripture. "That therefore which hath troubled many, as if that certain limiting of time which offereth it self in the Revelation and elsewhere, should bring us to the end of all," he noted, "may hence be delivered from this fear, for all those accounts end, either in the Jewes Conversion, or if they goe a little farther… they rather shew within what time the end shall not be, then at what moment it is to be expected".[105] This time was at least 600 years in the future. How long history would continue after that was an unanswerable question: "I can light upon no mark or token of time that may give even the least conjecture".[106] In Brightman's thought, scripture which had traditionally been interpreted as applying to Christ's return was thus re-applied to a Jewish national restoration. To find the Second Coming within such prophecies, which he saw as relating to a clearly defined period of time, was dangerous. As he believed that there were set dates for the fall of Rome and the return of the Jews clearly discernable in Revelation and Daniel, to find Christ's advent in these books would immediately suggest that it was a dateable event. This was never an option: "For this Book of the Revelation doth not lead us so far, because it is not expedient for us to know so much, neither is it to be imparted to any Creature, as the which the son himself, as he was man, was ignorant of, *Mark* 13.32".[107] In practice, then, Brightman never moved beyond suggesting the time of the return of the Jews. Christ's return remained a deeply mysterious event. The length of the second millennium was therefore left undefined.[108] As Brightman concluded in his work on the Song of Songs, "out of this interpretation it may be understood how

[101] Gribben, *Puritan Millennium*, p. 27.

[102] Bozeman, *To Live*, p. 208.

[103] Brightman, *Daniel*, p. 55.

[104] This is Murray's major criticism of Brightman. Murray, *Puritan Hope*, p. 270 n. 15.

[105] Brightman, *Song*, p. 1077.

[106] Brightman, *Song*, p. 1077.

[107] Brightman, *Revelation*, p. 339. See also Brightman, *Daniel*, p. 63.

[108] "… whether the Truth shall be Ecclipsed againe after those thousand yeares, by reason of security prevailing among men… he onely knoweth it, that knoweth all things. We finde nothing,

false they are, who set downe the end of the world at a certain yeer".[109] Gutierrez has commented on an inherent problem in millenarian movements – that although they promise historical closure, any such closure would render them moot as a "sense-making tool". She finds that these movements aim to constantly defer the very closure they seek in an effort to validate their own epistemological approaches.[110] Brightman avoided this problem by arguing that the millennium itself represented not the end of history, but its continuation – with history after the millennium rendered mysterious and unknowable. Where the reader expected closure, there was instead a new openness in history. This is the logical outworking of an increasing historical consciousness, and points towards the fact that even beliefs that might seem "millenarian" in nature are not necessarily negative in their approach to history.

3.4 Historicising Allegory: The Song of Songs and the Jewish Promises

In closing this chapter I want to move on to examine Brightman's historical consciousness in the context of his commentary on the Song of Songs. His focus on interpretations grounded in historicity led to an unusual interpretation of the book, but one that was central to his hermeneutic. The temptation when coming across Brightman's historicised reading of the Song is to resort to ridicule, to label him "slightly deranged".[111] As Elizabeth Clark's recent work on uses of the Song in England has shown, however, there were a wide range of readings of the text which had explicit political and theological currency in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.[112] Brightman's work on the Song might be unusual, but it was certainly not ridiculous. Indeed, in many ways it represents the flourishing of both his historical thought and the logical application of the *analogia fidei.*

To understand the unusual nature of Brightman's interpretation, it is important to consider the background to readings of the Song in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The text had always presented a major challenge to a "literal" interpretation of scripture.[113] It appeared, on the surface, to be a sexually explicit

whereby we can determine any thing certainly, touching this matter". Brightman, *Revelation*, p. 824.

[109]Brightman, *Song*, p. 1077.

[110]Gutierrez, "Narrative Closure", p. 54.

[111]David Lawton, *Faith, Text and History: The Bible in English* (London: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1990), p. 156. Lawton mistakenly labels him an "eighteenth century" commentator.

[112]Elizabeth Clarke, *Politics, Religion and the Song of Songs in Seventeenth-Century England* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2011). See especially Chaps. 2 (pp. 46–75) and 4 (pp. 105–33).

[113]For a good illustration of this see Richard W. Corney, "What does 'literal meaning' mean? Some commentaries on the Song of Songs", *Anglican Theological Review* 80:4 (Fall 1998), pp. 494–516.

love song lacking any spiritual content. Structured as a poem with love shared between the "Lover" and the "Beloved", with comment occasionally made by a group of the Beloved's "Friends", the text does not contain a single mention of God.[114] Commentators therefore sought to extract spiritual meaning from it. This meant a consistent denial of the Song's erotic sense.[115] Generally, the book had been read as an allegory of God's love towards Israel (for Jews) or the church (for Christians) since ancient times.[116] This reading lost none of its popularity in the early modern period. Thomas James, in the introduction to his 1598 translation of Antonio Brucioli's commentary, noted that "because all writers with one voyce consent that the Church is meant by the Spouse, he so taketh it without any further adoe", praising Brucioli for eschewing a "literal" reading.[117] As the commentary itself stated "this Treatise is not carnally and literally, but spiritually and mystically to be understood".[118] A similar theme was found in Beza's sermons on the Song, with the first sermon devoted to the hermeneutical difficulties the book presented. After describing the "allegoricall and enigmatical" style of the text, he moved to warn of the dangers of a carnal reading and defend the Spirit's use of allegory (the "obscurity and darknes" of the text sharpened the believer's desire to find the truth). He concluded that "our soule must with Salomon conceive this husband, this marriage, and whatsoever is sayd thereof, after a spirituall fashion, farre removed from all carnall and filthy cogitations".[119] This view was echoed by Dudley Fenner, writing at a time when Brightman was a fellow at Cambridge. If taken literally, then "we must make al the songs of holy scripture in simple comparison, to come behind a humane love-song, which is no lesse then blasphemie".[120] There was therefore a general consensus that the Song should not be read in its "literal" sense. The erotic nature of the text led commentators towards an allegorical reading nearly identical to

[114]For a discussion on the possible translation of "šalhebetyah" in Song 8:6 as "flame of Yahweh himself" see Zhang Longxi, "The Letter or the Spirit: The Song of Songs, Allegoresis, and the Book of Poetry", *Comparative Literature*, 39:3 (Summer 1987), p. 194.

[115]Historically, some such as Jovenian (c. 400 CE) and Theodore of Mopsuestia (350–428 CE) had read the Song as describing carnal love. Sebastian Castellio had argued this position in Calvin's Geneva. He claimed that the Song was a poem of fleshly love, and should be removed from the canon. This was one of the causes for his dispute with Calvin and expulsion from the city.

[116]For a more detailed exploration of this history, see Max Engammare, *Le Cantique des Cantiques à La Renaissance:Étude et Bibliographie* (Geneva : Librairie Droz S.A., 1993); Tremper Longman III, *Song of Songs* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001), pp. 1–40; J. Paul Tanner, "The History of Interpretation of the Song of Songs", *Bibliotheca Sacra* 154:1 (Jan.-Mar. 1997), pp. 23–46; Philip Alexander, "Introduction" in *The Targum of Canticles*: *Translated with a Critical Introduction, Apparatus and Notes*, Trans. Philip Alexander, (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 2003). Clarke's recent work is important here as well.

[117]Thomas James "Introduction" in Antonio Brucioli, *A Commentary upon the Canticle of Canticles* (London, 1598), f.4v.

[118]Brucioli, *Canticle*, sig. A2v.

[119]Theodore Beza, *Master Bezaes Sermons Upon the Three First Chapters of the Canticle of Canticles* (Oxford, 1587), pp. 1–8.

[120]Dudley Fenner, *The Song of Songs* (Middelburg: Richard Schilders, 1587), f.7r.

that found in earlier Catholic (and Jewish) commentaries. The Song, for the majority of writers, thus represented the union between Christ and his church. While this was not Luther's view,[121] the traditional opinion prevailed into the early modern period.

Brightman, however, interpreted the Song quite differently. He believed that it contained an allegorical history running from King David's day until the second millennium of Rev. 20. As a history, it complemented his commentary on Revelation: "This Prophesie following agreeth well neere in all things with that of Saint *John* in the *Revelation*".[122] Brightman saw the first chapter of the Song as describing Israel's history from David until the time of Manasseh and Amon, with the second chapter detailing the period from Nebuchadnezzar's conquest of Israel until Alexander the Great's final campaigns. The third chapter described Christ's life. The fourth detailed the formation of the early church from Christ's death until her decline after the Council of Nicea. This decline was further covered in the fifth chapter, whilst the sixth referred to the Reformation and European and English reform during Elizabeth's reign. From 6:9-8:24 the Song described the restoration of the Jews and their exalted position during the second millennium. This was divided into two periods – their first (minor) calling from 6:9-7:11 (echoing Rev 16:12), with the second (major) calling in 7:12-8:24.

It is immediately clear that Brightman's reading was unusual given the standard interpretations discussed above. As the editor of his commentary noted, it seemed as if Brightman "propounds to himself a new way, in which he walketh all alone". However, this was not actually the case: "for amongst the Hebrews *Aben Ezra* conceives the mysterie from Abraham to the messias".[123] In fact Brightman's historical reading was a return to an interpretation which predated Aben Ezra; a re-imagining of the interpretation found in the seventh-century Jewish Targum on the Song. The Targum read the text as an allegory of Jewish history from the Exodus to the reign of the Messiah. Thus 1:3-5:1 described the time from the Exodus to Solomon, 5:2-7:11 the period from the Babylonian exile to the Hasmonean Kingdom and 7:12-8:12 the time from the exile of Edom to the messianic reign.[124]

---

[121]Luther read the work as a guide for rulers on how to govern and enlarge their kingdom. He was dismissive of earlier attempts to read the Song: "[It does not] satisfy us to expound it of the union of God and the synagog, or like the tropologists, of the faithful soul. For what fruit, I ask, can be gathered from these opinions?" (Luther, *Works,* vol. 15 p. 94). Endel Kallas argues that Luther's view represented a shift towards the literal, and even towards modern Biblical criticism (Endel Kallas, "Martin Luther as Expositor of the Song of Songs", *Luther Quarterly* 2NS.3 (Autumn 1988), pp. 323–341). I am not fully convinced by this argument, and would instead affirm with Engammare – "Sur le plan herméneutique Luther reste en effet attaché à une méthode allégorique proche de la pratique médiévale". Luther simply changes "l'identification des images, non la méthode interprétative" (Engammare, *Le Cantique*, p. 311).

[122]Brightman, *Song*, p. 981.

[123]Brightman, *Song*, sig. Aaaaaaa2^{i}r-v. Aben-Ezra (c.1092–1167) was a Rabbinic commentator. His work post-dated the Targum.

[124]See Philip Alexander's structural analysis of the Targum. In this, 1:1–2 is taken as a brief prologue and 8:13–14 as a brief epilogue. See Alexander, "Introduction" in *Targum*, p. 15.

Brightman was clearly familiar with this work,[125] which was readily available at Cambridge,[126] and it seems highly likely that it acted as a catalyst for his new, historical reading of the text.

If the Song was accepted as an allegorical poem, it need not have any literal history. As Paul de Man has noted, allegorical readings appear to be the antithesis of historicism: "the furthest possible removed from historiography".[127] Allegory, in the biblical sense at least, is a reading in which figures, characters, or events come to represent not simply a future figure, but certain abstract concepts. An allegorical interpretation does not necessarily presume that a literal, historical meaning exists in a story. It *may* exist, but the historicity of the text is less important than the allegorical meaning it communicates. The literal story is only a conduit for the symbolic, with the underlying meaning and symbolism placed on a higher level than the "bare words". At times, this can lead to allegory appearing obscure; a vehicle for transmitting "the furthest reaching truths about ourselves . . . [in] a lopsided, referentially indirect mode".[128] Thus there is a crucial difference between typology and allegory. In allegory one thing *actually signifies* something else, while in a typological reading, two events or figures can be related whilst still retaining their own specific characteristics. While Brightman certainly adopted elements from previous commentaries, his reading of the Song was not allegorical. In fact, it represented the dissolution of allegory – a reaffirmation of the literal and historical sense that the Song's figurative language appeared to deny. In making this claim, I will examine two elements of Brightman's reading of the Song. Firstly, the shift initiated by Brightman in moving the text from the realm of allegory into the realm of history, and secondly, Brightman's use of the text in conjunction with Old Testament prophecy through the *analogia fidei*.

Brightman did not read the allegories of the Song in an arbitrary fashion, but instead structured a logical and historical framework through which they were to be interpreted. His reading of Song 4:2 ("Your teeth are like a flock of sheep just shorn") represents a clear example of this. Brightman argued that "teeth" should refer to "the disciples of Christ, whom he appointed as faithfull and wise disposers to give every one of his household their allowance in due season".[129] This initially appears to make little sense – it is unclear that the disciples were anything at all

[125]This is evident in his interpretation of "the mountain of Myrrh" (Song 4:6). He noted here that "The *Jewes* interpret this *mountain of myrrhe,* the *mountain of Moriah,* where *Isaac* was bound to be sacrificed" (Brightman, *Song*, p. 1022). This appears to be a direct reference to the Targum, where the commentator engages in wordplay by taking the word "mor" to refer to Moriah. This is evident in Brightman's reading of Song 1:13, 3:6, and 4:6. See *Targum*, pp. 91 n102, 136.

[126]The Targum was included in the Antwerp Polyglot. Whilst it was not available at Queens', it was available at both Corpus Christi and King's Colleges in the 1580s. I am indebted to Suzanne Paul, Librarian at Corpus Christi and Peter Jones, Fellow and Librarian at King's for this information.

[127]Paul de Man, "Pascal's Allegory of Persuasion" in *Allegory and Representation*, ed. Stephen Greenblatt (Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1981), p. 1.

[128]de Man, "Pascal", p. 2.

[129]Brightman, *Song*, p. 1018.

like teeth. Yet, as Brightman continued, the logical movement of his thought was apparent. He used the repetition of this figure once again in 6:6 [6:5][130] to show that there was a stable one-to-one correspondence between sign and thing-signified throughout the Song: "The teeth are alwayes taken for the Pastors and Ministers of the Word".[131] Thus, when he came to discuss other parts of the body referred to in the text, he reminded readers of the character of "teeth": "then let us behold the teeth, namely the doctors, like a flock of sheep, simple; harmlesse, not disdainfull, not luxurious, but content with a sparing diet: diligent in teaching".[132]

In the first instance, this application of the sign ("teeth") to the thing signified ("disciples/doctors") was based on resemblance logic. Behind this, however, there was a scriptural basis. Noting that "teeth" were compared to "sheep" in Song 6:6, Brightman used Christ's comparison of the disciples to a flock (Mt. 26:31, Lk. 12:32, Jn. 10) to build an argument for this attribution. He explicitly quoted Lk. 12:42 ("Who then is the faithful and wise manager, whom the Master puts in charge of his servants?")[133] as he found the disciples placed in charge of the flock. The remainder of Song 4:2, where he first suggested this application, was used as further support for his reading through an examination of the context of the verse. The disciples, like the teeth of 4:2, were sent out two by two (Mk. 6:7). Where the text talked of sheep coming "up from washing", so the disciples were cleansed by "the washing instructed by baptisme: cleansed from all filthines". Where the passage noted that "each bears twins", so Brightman informed his readers that this could be applied to "the fruit which followed their preaching: for the disciples having performed their message, returned with joy".[134] Brightman's interpretation unfolded allegory into historical reality. The scripture stated that the Beloved's teeth were *like* sheep. Sheep in scripture represented Christians, and in the gospels were particularly apt metaphors for the disciples. Brightman found simile piled upon simile as he strove to reduce the text to its literal meaning. Teeth *are like* sheep. The disciples *are like* sheep. *Ergo*, the teeth could be literally represented as the disciples. This is, of course, to simplify Brightman's logic in working to his conclusion. He never used such a straightforward syllogism to describe his reasoning, and such a dramatically redacted piece of logic does not accurately reflect the way he considered each text against the historical framework he had developed. The teeth could only signify the disciples due to the fact that 4:2 must (according to his historical schema) describe the time of Christ's life. This use of resemblance logic presumed that scripture was a unity. It supposed on a basic level that there was no difficulty in finding a sign in one book of the Bible and the thing-signified in an entirely different book. It was, in

[130]The verse structure in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century translations of the Song is slightly different to that found in modern editions (from the KJV onwards). When this differs, as here, I cite the more recent verse reference, with the original in square brackets.

[131]Brightman, *Song*, p. 1046.

[132]Brightman, *Song*, p. 1049.

[133]Brightman, *Song*, p. 1018. Misl. 12:41.

[134]Brightman, *Song*, p. 1019.

other words, the logical outworking of the *analogia fidei*. Yet it left the Bible as an allegorical repository. Scripture became a book of signs and referents, which could be cross-referenced and compared with one another. Brightman's examination of 7:1 ("How beautifull are thy feete with shooes") revealed this method:

> A shooe is applyed in the Scriptures to three significations. To Mirth, Speed, and Liberty. It was a signe of Mirth . . . As David ascended to the Mount of Oliver, his head covered and barefoot, 2 Sam. 15. 30. Or they were constrained against their wils as Captives to the victors, who led them naked and barefoote, Esa. 20. 4. Speede hath somewhat a more plain efficacy, for he that is shod, treadeth more boldly, and feareth not pibbles or thornes. Wherefore God when he assured a speedy returne to his people, he promiseth to bring it to passe, that they shall goe with shooes on their feete, Esa. 11, 15. It was also to the Israelites a signe of liberty or rather of obtaining their redeemed inheritance. Whereas putting off the shoe was for a reproach, Dent. [i.e. Deut] 25. 9, 10 . . . All the significations agree.[135]

Of course, it is important to ask whether Brightman's reading was still valid within the hermeneutical system suggested by Perkins and other English exegetes. In other words, was it simply an arbitrary construction – "according to his own whim or convenience"[136] – or a carefully reasoned exposition built upon stable Protestant foundations? While first appearances may tempt us to label Brightman as arbitrary, his reading of the Song actually served to re-enforce an interpretation more consistent with standard Protestant hermeneutics than any previous English reading of the book. The Song, it must be remembered, was *never* interpreted in its literal sense. The erotic language of the book was its "worst" sense; if taken literally it was reduced to "a vaine amorous ballade".[137] To "preserve" the text, an allegorical interpretation was thus adopted. The cost of this was that the "literal" sense of the text was left as an empty husk, in that the metaphors in the Song were, by implication, unreal signs. In and of themselves they were meaningless. They were transcendent markers without any historical existence – denied, in fact, any possibility of such an existence. While it was possible for Abraham and Moses to have lived out historical lives which were also typological in nature, for the Reformed exegete, the thought of Solomon's explicit love song being in any way historical opened the text to a number of deeply disturbing possibilities. As Beza argued, a historical reading reduced the text to a writing "compiled by Solomon in the middest of his wanton and licencious dissolutions".[138] In other words, typology guaranteed both a historical *and* a spiritual meaning within the literal sense. Since the historical sense of the Song was clearly unacceptable, it had to be reduced to pure allegory. For Beza this was designed "to represent unto us, that which it selfe is incomprehensible, & not to be conceived, I mean that most streit spirituall bond of Jesus Christ".[139] The confusion in Beza's thought at this

[135]Brightman, *Song*, p. 1057.

[136]Peterson, "Thomas Brightman", p. 94.

[137]Henoch Clapham, *The Song of Songs* ([London], 1602), sig. A4^{i}v.

[138]Beza, *Sermons*, p. 3.

[139]Beza, *Sermons*, p. 6.

point is symptomatic of the difficulties presented by the allegorical reading. The signs used in the allegory should, after all, point towards a firm spiritual reality, something which (when the veil of the figurative was removed) could be perceived as a concrete "thing", a concept which could be grasped clearly in the literal sense. However, the "thing" which the Spirit represented through the ahistorical allegory was in fact nothing at all, at least nothing which could be understood by the reader: "it selfe is incomprehensible". This reading served to destabilise the Song in a radical fashion. What appeared to be a historical/poetic narrative was in fact a collection of ahistorical signs pointing to ahistorical and incomprehensible things. Both "sign" and "thing" in this reading were denied historical existence, and (in fact) an existence in reality itself. Sign and thing-signified evaporated, as neither had any objective reality in the first place. The text became entirely artificial, until it eventually disintegrated into nothing. Brightman was not alone, then, in removing the erotic sense of the text. What *was* unique was the way he applied the text to history. Thus the allegory became historical narrative; the historical became the literal sense of the text. The text thus became like any other narrative history in the Bible. Far from being, as Lawton claims, "slightly deranged",[140] Brightman's work offered a logical application of a hermeneutical system built on the *analgoia fidei*, the continuation of the increasing historicity of Brightman's thought. The seemingly empty erotic metaphors were thus slowly opened to reveal a clear pattern of God's work within history. It was this historical interpretation that marked the key development in Brightman's reading of the Song. He aimed to tie down figurative language to a literal base – to re-literalise the symbolic by giving the allegory a meaning in history. While the Song initially seemed unreadable, it opened into understandable images of God's grace as history and scripture were revealed by the Spirit: "[no] thing [is] so concealed that it can lie hid, if this enlighten him".[141] By the end of the commentary, Brightman could describe his work as a "plain exposition".[142] The figures were made real through being given a clear historical basis.

"Unreal" figures thus signified "real" history. This meant that the narrative of the text became pliable and almost disposable, a frame on which to hang historical truth. This shift from an "allegorical" to a "historical" reading is clear in Brightman's exposition of Song 2:11 ("For behold, winter is past, the rain is changed and is gone away").[143] In a similar way to medieval exegetes, Brightman divided the text into two senses. "This Winter," he told readers, "is twofold, proper, and figurative". A surface reading of the text would suggest that, in context, the verse referred to the return of the Lover, and his promise of love to the beloved. Yet this is not what Brightman meant by a "proper" reading: "Properly it teacheth that about the end of Winter the people prepared for their return, stirred up thereunto by the

[140]Lawton, *Faith*, p. 156.

[141]Brightman, *Song*, p. 1050 misl. 5010.

[142]Brightman, *Song*, p. 1078.

[143]I use the translation of scripture from Brightman's text here.

Edict of *Cyrus . . . [at]* the Feast of *Tabernacle*". Thus, he reasoned, "The figurative Winter is the wrath of God, which (of late) fell upon the *Jewes*".[144] This passage is startling. The "literal" sense of the text was not the literal sense at all. Rather, it was the historical Edict of Cyrus allowing the Jews to return to their homeland. The figurative meaning was then a spiritual truth taken from the "literal-historical" sense Brightman found in the text. In other words, allegory had ceased to exist. Brightman treated the text as if it set forth a straightforward narrative history (and future history) of the Jews. Like any Old Testament book he could therefore find a "literal-historical" sense in the text and a typological/spiritual sense in which the text acted as a figure of God's judgement. It was a significant shift, in that it saw that allegory could be so ignored in the text as to completely evaporate. Only when it had been stripped from the text could exegesis begin.

Initially, this might seem like Brightman was ignoring the text itself. Yet unease at Brightman's reading, as we find in Lawton's work, is symptomatic of a wider problem within modern readings of the Song. When commentators claim that puritan readings of the Song ignore the text and reveal a latent sexual/emotional repression,[145] they fail to understand the complicated nature of hermeneutical thought at work in earlier commentaries. Their readings become deeply ironic as the supposedly literalistic puritans are accused of ignoring the "plain" sense of the text whilst the literary critic emerges as the champion of the "simple" sense of scripture. As E. Ann Matter suggested in her landmark *The Voice of My Beloved*, the equation of the literal sense of the Song with erotic narrative is more representative of twentieth-century attitudes towards sexual repression than the thoughts of earlier exegetes.[146] While Brightman may not, then, have moved towards a literal-erotic reading of the text, his re-historicising of the Song was an important shift towards an approach to the text entirely consistent with the broader puritan hermeneutic tradition. It was a reading which reaffirmed the historical and the physical (although not the sexual) above the allegorical readings advanced by previous exegetes.

---

[144]Brightman, *Song*, pp. 1001–2.

[145]We have already seen this in Lawton, *Faith*, p. 156. The classic example of this reading is William E. Phipps' article "The Plight of the Song of Songs", *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*, 42:1 (Mar., 1974), pp. 82–100. Phipps is convinced that the meaning of the Song is "obviously" about sexual passion, and finds it surprising that contemporary scholars still have any difficulty debating its meaning (pp. 82–83). He is incredulous as he approaches interpretations of the text throughout history; "[this] alleged exposition tells us nothing about the text, but rather exposes the turmoil of the mythic interpreter" (p. 90). Sexual repression is therefore a key theme (e.g. pp. 91, 95, 98–100). Allegorical readers "find little or no significance in natural beauty, emotional feeling, and physical relations" (p. 99). Clarke's recent work engages is a detailed exploration of the range of responses to the text and its uses in forming both religious and national identity in seventeenth-century England. As she points out "It is almost true to say that the [Song] was full of free-floating signifiers which did not mean what they appeared to say, and which therefore could be appropriated for any cause or opinion" (p. 12).

[146]E. Ann Matter, *The Voice of My Beloved: The Song of Songs in Western Medieval Christianity* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1990), pp. 122–44.

This increased focus on history was rooted in Old Testament prophecy. As this underpinned his reading of the Song, it was vital that these prophecies were read in the correct manner. For Brightman, this meant taking Old Testament prophecy in its "proper and naturall"[147] sense. The meaning of the prophets appeared clear and simple to understand. When they referred to a return of the Jews to Palestine, Brightman argued that they meant a return of the Jewish people (not the people as a type) to the historical land of Israel. These prophecies required no metaphorical/typological framework to understand them. Crucially, they should be understood in such a way as would have made sense to their original readers. The clear readings available in the prophets thus shed light on the obscure found in Song, helping Brightman to create a framework through which he could understand the allegorical text. This was apparent in Brightman's search for the meaning of "the roofe of thy mouthe like the best wine" in Song 7:9. Drawn to the prophets, he noted that "*Esay* expoundeth this riddle".[148] The use of the prophets to unlock these "riddles" continued throughout the commentary. Brightman's practice was to view the Song as the pinnacle of prophetic and historic texts in the Bible. The Song worked as a reference guide to which the prophets provided a literal key. In demonstrating exactly how Brightman's system worked, it is helpful to break down his reading into tabular form. The following example is taken from his work on Song 7[149]:

Song – allegorical description[150]	Brightman's referent	Prophecy "literally" fulfilled[151]
7:1: "How beautifull are thy goings with shooes, O Princes daughter! the joynts of thy thighs are like jewels: the worke of the hand of a cunning workeman"	Assured confidence of the Jews returning to Palestine	**Isa. 49:8**: "This is what the LORD says: In the time of my favour I will answer you, and in the day of salvation I will help you; I will keep you and will make you to be a covenant for the people, to restore the land and to reassign its desolate inheritances" **Isa. 52:12**: "But you will not leave in haste or go in flight; for the LORD will go before you, the God of Israel will be your rear guard"

(continued)

[147]Brightman, *Song*, p. 1053.

[148]Brightman, *Song*, p. 1064.

[149]Brightman, *Song*, pp. 1042–55.

[150]Scripture as quoted by Brightman.

[151]Scripture references taken from Brightman, quotes taken from NIV.

(continued)

Song – allegorical description	Brightman's referent	Prophecy "literally" fulfilled
7:2: "Thy navell is as a round cup that wanteth not liquor: thy belly is as an heap of wheat compassed about with lilies"	Fruitful increase of Israel	**Isa. 49:19-20**: "Though you were ruined and made desolate and your land laid waste, now you will be too small for your people, and those who devoured you will be far away. The children born during your bereavement will yet say in your hearing, 'This place is too small for us; give us more space to live in'"
7:3: "Thy two breasts are as two young roes that are twins"	Fruitful increase of Israel	**Isa. 49:19-20** **Jer. 31:14**: "'I will satisfy the priests with abundance, and my people will be filled with my bounty,' declares the LORD"
7:4: "Thy neck is like a Tower of Ivory: thine eyes are like the fish pooles in Heshbon by the gate of Beth-rabbim: thy nose is as the tower of Lebanon that looketh toward Damascus"	Power and victory of Israel over her enemies	**Isa. 41:14-16**: "Do not be afraid, O worm Jacob, O little Israel, for I myself will help you," declares the LORD, your Redeemer, the Holy One of Israel. "See, I will make you into a threshing sledge, new and sharp, with many teeth. You will thresh the mountains and crush them, and reduce the hills to chaff. You will winnow them, the wind will pick them up, and a gale will blow them away. But you will rejoice in the LORD and glory in the Holy One of Israel" **Isa. 46**: [God's triumph over idols and promise of salvation for Zion] **Ezk. 39:3-4**: [Prophecy against Gog] "Then I will strike your bow from your left hand and make your arrows drop from your right hand. On the mountains of Israel you will fall, you and all your troops and the nations with you. I will give you as food to all kinds of carrion birds and to the wild animals" **Ezk. 39:25**: "Therefore this is what the Sovereign LORD says: I will now bring Jacob back from captivity and will have compassion on all the people of Israel, and I will be zealous for my holy name" **Jer. 30-31**: [Prophecy of restoration of Israel, transformation of mourning into joy and the new covenant]

(continued)

(continued)

Song – allegorical description	Brightman's referent	Prophecy "literally" fulfilled
7:5-7: "Thine head upon thee is as scarlet: and the bush of thine head like purple: the King is tied in the rafters. How fair art thou, and how pleasant art thou, O my love in pleasures! This thy stature is like a Palme tree, and thy breast like clusters"	The "excellencie" of Israel	**Zec. 12:8**: "On that day the LORD will shield those who live in Jerusalem, so that the feeblest among them will be like David, and the house of David will be like God, like the Angel of the LORD going before them"
7:8: "I said, I will go up into the palme tree, I will take hold of her bowes: thy breast shall now be like the clusters of the vine: and the savour of thy nose like apples"	Desire of the Gentile church to learn from restored Israel	**Isa. 49:18**: "Lift up your eyes and look around; all your sons gather and come to you. As surely as I live," declares the LORD, "you will wear them all as ornaments; you will put them on, like a bride" **Zec. 8:23**: "This is what the LORD Almighty says: In those days ten men from all languages and nations will take firm hold of one Jew by the hem of his robe and say, 'Let us go with you, because we have heard that God is with you'"
7:9-10: "And the roof of thy mouth like good wine, which goeth straight to my welbeloved, and causeth the lips of the ancient to speak. I am my welbeloveds, and his desire is toward me"	Joy of restored Israel, like good wine inspiring men to joy	**Isa. 35:6a**: "Then will the lame leap like a deer, and the mute tongue shout for joy"
7:12: "Let us get up early to the vines, let us see if the vine flourish whether it hath budded the small grape, or whether the Pomegranates flourish there will I give thee my love"	Great glory and conversion of the nation of Jews	**Isa. 62:10**: "Pass through, pass through the gates! Prepare the way for the people. Build up, build up the highway! Remove the stones. Raise a banner for the nations"

When examined in such a form, Brightman's readings can initially appear rather arbitrary. It is not immediately clear, for example, what Isaiah 62:10 has to do with Song 7:12. The answer to this, and indeed to all the above verses, is that the prophecies and promises of the Old Testament provide the literal underpinning to the allegories they record. For Brightman, it was as if the Spirit had taken the promises contained in the prophets and woven them into an allegorical poem. Therefore, when searching for meaning in the Song, Brightman used the *analogia fidei* to look to the prophets to provide the "literal" explanation. Once again, Brightman's resemblance logic took hold. In Song 7:8, the bridegroom desired that his beloved was exalted. He desired to see her fruitfulness; to take hold of her body and experience her goodness. Therefore Brightman explained that as men see the Jews settled, "how desirous they shall be to dwell in her branches, and to gather her sweetest fruits".[152] Such a desire was given literal resonance in the prophets, as his references to Zechariah 8 and Isaiah 49 show. In a similar way, in Song 7:12 the bride urged a mutual visit to a vineyard to examine fruit. Within Brightman's historical framework this referred to the restoration of the Jews, the fruit being those who would be called into the restored Jewish kingdom. Once again, Brightman found himself vindicated by the prophets who predicted exactly so such a "going out" and "gathering in" in Isaiah 62.

Once read through the prophets, the Song became an intelligible history. While Brightman's use of the prophets was initially confusing, it became more understandable when viewed in the context of scripture as a whole. The *analogia fidei* helped unlock the allegories of the Song, revealing the "literal" sense. As Anne Kibbey has noted, the system Brightman constructed here was "a philosophy of resemblances govern[ing] the conjoining of verbal image and historical event".[153] More than this, however, this idea was strengthened and clarified through the Song, which acted as the centre point for the Bible's prophecies of Jewish restoration. Brightman imagined the Old Testament prophetic writings as a complicated matrix, with the Song acting as an allegorical key to make sense of them. As he concluded: "Many large and pleasant Prophesies do ayme at the calling of the Jewes, but here almost all set up their marke".[154]

Brightman's increasing focus on the historicised interpretation of prophecy therefore served an important function in aiding his understanding of the text. Reader identification and the fact that prophecies should have made sense to their original recipients were now at the forefront of his hermeneutic project. Nonetheless, there remained a serious problem with this interpretation. Did Old Testament promises which had traditionally been interpreted as referring to the spiritual Israel have to be returned to the physical Jews, as his interpretation of the Song implied? If so, then what did prophecy have to say to the church? What future could Gentile readers look forward to? The arguments for a return of Old

[152]Brightman, *Song*, p. 1063.

[153]Anne Kibbey, *The Interpretation of Material Shapes in Puritanism: A Study of Rhetoric, Prejudice, and Violence* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), p. 78.

[154]Brightman, *Song*, p. 1077.

Testament prophecy to the Jews and the way in which Brightman dealt with these problems are the focus of the next chapter. For historicisation and the opening of history, particularly when applied to areas formative of Christianity identity, do not always proceed smoothly.

References

Alexander, Philip. 2003. Introduction. In *The Targum of Canticles*: *Translated with a critical introduction, apparatus and notes*, Trans. Philip Alexander. Collegeville: The Liturgical Press.

Backus, Irena. 2000. *Reformation readings of the apocalypse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bale, John. 1580. *The image of both churches*. London.

Ball, Bryan W. 1975. *A great expectation: Eschatological thought in English protestantism to 1660*. Leiden: Brill.

Bauckham, Richard. 1978. *Tudor apocalypse*. Oxford: Sutton Courtenay Press.

Beza, Theodore. 1587. *Master Bezaes sermons upon the three first chapters of the canticle of canticles*. Oxford.

Bozeman, Theodore D. 1988. *To live ancient lives: The primitivist dimension in puritanism*. Chapel Hill/London: University of North Carolina Press.

Brett, Samuel. 1655. *A narrative of the proceedings of a great councel of Jewes*. London.

Brightman, Thomas. 1635. *A most comfortable exposition of the last and most difficult part of the prophecie of Daniel from the 26. verse of the 11. chap, to the end of the 12. chapter. Wherin the restoring of the Jewes and their callinge to the faith of Christ, after the utter overthrow of their three last enemies, is set forth in livelie coulours*. Amsterdam.

Brightman, Thomas. 1644a. *A commentary on the Canticles or the Song of Salomon wherein the text is analised, the native signification of the words declared, the allegories explained, and the order of the times whereunto they relate observed*. London.

Brightman, Thomas. 1644b. *The Revelation of St. Iohn illustrated with an analysis & scholions . . . The fourth edition, corrected & amended*. London.

Brocardo, Giacopo. 1582. *The revelation of S. Ihon reveled*. London.

Brucioli, Antonio. 1598. *A commentary upon the Canticle of Canticles*. London.

Bullinger, Heinrich. 1573. *A hundred sermons upon the apocalipse of Jesu Christ*. London.

Christianson, Paul. 1978. *Reformers and Babylon: English apocalyptic visions from the reformation to the eve of the civil war*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Clapham, Henoch. 1602. *The Song of Songs*. London.

Clarke, Elizabeth. 2011. *Politics, religion and the Song of Songs in seventeenth-century England*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Cogley, Richard W. 2003. The fall of the Ottoman Empire and the restoration of Israel in the "Judeo-Centric" strand of puritan millenarianism. *Church History* 72: 304–332.

Collins, Samuel. 1617. *Epphata to F.T., or, The defence of the right reuerend father in God, the Lord Bishop of Elie*. London.

de Man, Paul. 1981. Pascal's allegory of Persuasio. In *Allegory and representation*, ed. Stephen J. Greenblatt, 1–25. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Dent, Arthur. 1622. *The ruine of Rome, or, an exposition upon the whole revelation*. London.

Engammare, Max. 1993. *Le Cantique des Cantiques à La Renaissance: Étude et Bibliographie*. Geneva: Librairie Droz S.A.

Fenner, Dudley. 1587. *The Song of Songs*. Middelburg.

Firth, Katherine. 1979. *The apocalyptic tradition in reformation Britain 1530–1645*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fish, Stanley. 1972. *Self-consuming artifacts*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Foxe, John. 1597. *Actes and monuments*. London.

Froom, Le. Roy Edwin. 1948. *The prophetic faith of our Fathers: The historical development of prophetic interpretation*, Pre-reformation and reformation, restoration, and second departure, vol. II. Washington: Review and Herald.
Granger, Thomas. 1616. *The application of scripture, or the maner how to use the word to most edifying*. London.
Gribben, Crawford. 2008. *The puritan millennium: Literature and theology, 1550–1682* (Revised Edition). Milton Keynes: Paternoster.
Guiterrez, Cathy. 2005. The millennium and narrative closure. In *War in heaven, heaven on earth: Theories of the apocalyptic*, ed. Stephen D. O'Leary and Glen S. McGhee, 47–60. London: Equinox.
Hotson, Howard. 1996. The historiographical origins of Calvinist millenarianism. In *Protestant history and identity in sixteenth-century Europe*, vol. 1, ed. Bruce Gordon, 170–181. Aldershot: Scholar.
Junius, Franciscus. 1600. *The revelation of St. John*. London.
Kallas, Endel. 1988. Martin Luther as expositor of the Song of Songs. *Luther Quarterly* 2NS: 323–341.
Kibbey, Anne. 1986. *The interpretation of material shapes in puritanism: A study of rhetoric, prejudice, and violence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Lamont, William. 1969. *Godly rule: Politics and religion 1603–1660*. London: Macmillan.
Lawton, David. 1990. *Faith, text and history: The Bible in English*. London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
Longman III, Tremper. 2001. *Song of Songs*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
Longxi, Zhang. 1987. The letter or the spirit: The Song of Songs, allegoresis, and the book of poetry. *Comparative Literature* 39: 193–218.
Luxon, Thomas H. 1995. *Literal figures: Puritan allegory and the reformation crisis in representation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Matar, Nabil. 1998. *Islam in Britain 1558–1685*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Matter, E. Ann. 1990. *The voice of my beloved: The Song of Songs in western medieval Christianity*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
Milton, Anthony. 1995. *Catholic and reformed: Roman and protestant Churches in English protestant thought, 1600–1640*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Murray, Iain H. 1971. *The puritan hope: A study in revival and the interpretation of prophecy*. Edinburgh: Banner of Truth.
Napier, John. 1594. *A plaine discoverie of the whole revelation of Saint John*. Edinburgh.
Newport, Kenneth G.C. 2000. *Apocalypse and millennium: Studies in biblical eisegesis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Ong, Walter J. 1958. *Ramus, method and the decay of dialogue*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Peterson, Kenneth Troy. 1991. *Thomas Brightman: A transitional figure*. Fuller Theological Seminary, Unpublished ThM thesis.
Phipps, William E. 1974. The plight of the Song of Songs. *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 42: 82–100.
Reeves, Marjorie. 1999. *Joachim of Fiore and the prophetic future*. Stroud: Sutton Publishing.
Richey, Elizabeth Gilman. 1998. *The politics of revelation in the English renaissance*. Columbia: University of Missouri Press.
Ricoeur, Paul. 1980. *Essays on biblical interpretation*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
Smith, Anthony D. 2003. *Chosen peoples*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Surridge, Robert James. 2000. *The art of apocalyptic persuasion: The rhetorical dynamics and history of influence of the letter to Laodicea*. King's College London, Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis.
Surridge, Robert J. 2004. 'An English Laodicea': The influence of revelation 3:14–22 on mid-seventeenth-century England. In *Cross, crown and community: Religion, government and culture in early modern England, 1400–1800*, ed. D.J.B. Trim and P.J. Balderstone, 143–176. Bern: Peter Lang.

Tanner, J. Paul. 1997. The history of interpretation of the Song of Songs. *Bibliotheca Sacra* 154: 23–46.

Weemes, John. 1632. *Exercitations divine*. London.

West, Delno C., and Sandra Zimdars-Swartz. 1983. *Joachim of Fiore: A study in perception and history*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Wriedt, Markus. 1996. Luther's concept of history and the formation of an evangelical identity. In *Protestant history and identity in sixteenth-century Europe*, vol. 1, ed. Bruce Gordon, 31–45. Aldershot: Scolar.

Zakai, Avihu. 1992. *Exile and kingdom: History and apocalypse in the puritan migration to America*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Chapter 4
Consistent Literalism and the Restoration of the Jews

As the previous chapter showed, Brightman interpreted Bible prophecy in a manner consistent with Protestant hermeneutical norms. Primarily, he produced a reading rooted in history. Yet while his methods were conventional, his conclusions were not. None of the apocalyptic texts in the Bible, he argued, described the second coming. Instead, he allowed the physical restoration and conversion of the Jews to supercede the standard hope of Christ's return. This reading was both unusual and significant, as it emphasised a shift towards a "Jewish" reading of Old Testament prophecy. In other words, the "literal meaning" of these prophecies became the historical meaning of the text to its first recipients. This raises the crucial question of what this shift actually meant in practice. In what ways did a renewed emphasis on Jewish blessing impact Brightman's other readings? How should Brightman's hermeneutic be understood in the context of the "literal" in the early modern period? Most importantly, if being the "true Israel" was a vital part of Christian identity, what impact did the removal of this label have for Brightman's readers? Brightman's reading subtly undermined the continuity that puritans traditionally found between Old Testament Israel and the church. This destabilised one of the central pillars of Christian identity (the Christian as the true Jew) – and led to the need to construct identity around different concepts. For Brightman, this led to an emphasis on the importance of Englishness in identity formation. As we will see, the figure of the Jew played a crucial role in the formation of both this English identity, and the idea of Christian selfhood.

Parts of this chapter originally appeared in less developed form in 'The proper and naturall meaning of the Prophets': the hermeneutic roots of Judeo-centric eschatology', *Renaissance Studies* 24:5 (Nov. 2010), 725–741. I am grateful to Wiley-Blackwell and the editors of *Renaissance Studies* for permission to reprint here.

A. Crome, *The Restoration of the Jews: Early Modern Hermeneutics, Eschatology, and National Identity in the Works of Thomas Brightman*, International Archives of the History of Ideas Archives internationales d'histoire des idées 213,
DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-04762-1_4,

4.1 The Role of the Jews

The Jews were represented in a number of complex, and often contradictory ways in the early modern period. They could be seen as holy Israelites or murderers of Christ; as types fulfilled by Christian believers, or as a living race suffering God's punishment.[1] It is unsurprising, then, that Brightman used the term "Jew" in a number of different ways throughout his commentaries. The first mention of the Jews in the book of Revelation is the condemnation of the synagogue of Smyrna in 2:9: "those who say they are Jews but are not". Brightman's gloss on this verse mirrored the standard Augustinian/Calvinistic exegesis of his day that read Old Testament promises in a spiritual sense – a Jew was a Christian, now "accounted and reckoned among true *Israelites*".[2] Thus "a *Jew* is taken by a Metonimy for that only people of God".[3] Similarly, in his interpretation of the 144,000 Jews sealed in Revelation 7, Brightman asked:

> [are these] *Jewes* by birth, or else the *Gentiles*, *who were Israelites by adoption?* . . . The name therefore is common as well to the *Gentiles*, as the *Jewes*. And indeed the respect that must be had to the time, will not suffer it, that *naturall Jewes* should be meant in this place. This sealing was begun straightway after that *Diocletians* Tyrannie was stinted, as we have shewed.[4]

Katherine Firth has used these passages to argue that Brightman did not begin his commentary with any particular Jewish concern in mind, instead arguing that he was using the term "Jews" in a negative sense to refer to Catholics. She argues that Brightman's Jewish focus began only in his excursus against Bellarmine.[5] Firth's view cannot, however, be supported from Brightman's text. The term "Jew" is never used in a negative sense in his commentaries. While he used "Jew" to refer to "Israelites by adoption", he also used it to refer to "naturall Jewes" from as early as his discussion of Rev 1. This represented a conscious framing of Revelation in a Jewish context. For example, he took the "coming with the clouds" of Rev. 1:7 not as a reference to the second coming of Christ,[6] but rather as signalling a future Jewish conversion: "these words here seem, as if they could by no meaning be understood of the last judgement: even as neither can that *coming with clouds*, which he spake of right now, but rather of that exceeding glory, which shall be made manifest to the world in the calling of the *Jews*".[7] While his use of Jewish typology – the Christian as the *true* Israelite – was conventional, he was at pains to emphasise that this was a

[1] Glaser, *Judaism without Jews*, pp. 30–91; Katz, *Philo-Semitism*, pp. 10–41.

[2] Brightman, *Revelation*, p. 84.

[3] Brightman, *Revelation*, p. 60.

[4] Brightman, *Revelation*, p. 247–248.

[5] Firth, *Apocalyptic Tradition*, p. 171.

[6] See, for example, Bale who finds this as Christ "in his latter comminge appere[ing] in y^{e} cloudes of heaven, with majestie, power, and glorye" Bale, *Image*, sigs. Bv^{ii}v-Bv^{iii}r.

[7] Brightman, *Revelation*, p. 16.

temporary state of affairs. When the correct chronological framework was in place, the typology was reversed: "the respect for the time will not suffer it, that *naturall Jewes*, should be meant in this place".[8]

The historical structure Brightman constructed, particularly his dual-millennium, allowed for variant readings of the figure of the Jew. As early as his interpretation of the seven lampstands in Rev. 1:19, Brightman actively engaged in a typological reversal. That is, where Calvin and Luther had painted the Old Testament Jew as the type of the faithful Christian, Brightman portrayed the Christian as the type of the Jew. In this passage, seven lampstands symbolised a menorah, with the shaft (and therefore, substance) of the golden construction being based in the Jewish church. Far from the Christian being the true Israelite, the true Israelite became the complete Christian: "it seemeth, the Church of the *Jewes* is to be at length more abundantly filled with the gifts of the holy Ghost, then this of ours that be Gentiles".[9] The Jew moved from the type to the antitype – a figure framed as the final fulfilment of eschatological hope. Even as Brightman reaffirmed that "Jews" should be read in a traditional typological manner in his study of the seven churches, he felt the need to constantly restate the coming Jewish conversion. The "growing light" of truth was awaiting its consummation among the Jews:

> Now we must know, that which will be plain out of the exposition following, that the most bright light of the Truth, of all piety and religion, shall then shine upon the earth, when as our brethren of the *Jews* shall be converted unto *Christ*; seeing then at that time the *full day* shall be, the renued church which goeth before it, is the *light-bearing Lucifer* which being seen in the morning near the Horizon, sheweth that the Fountain, and head-spring of light, will by and by shew it selfe.[10]

A similar theme was apparent in his commentary on Daniel. This was seen clearly in the description of the Spirit's aim in imparting the final two chapters of that book:

> For it is the intent of the Spirit in a briefe Synopsis or abridgement to our view, to deliver what the estate of the Jewes should be, not onely to the first comming of Christ, which yet notwithstandinge Antiochus never attained to, but also to all ages succeding, till at lenght they shal bee gathered into one fould, & be made together with us Citizens of the same Kingdome.[11]

That this theme was picked up by his readers is clear from the anonymously written introduction to the Daniel commentary:

> Although the revealing of the Revelation and the song of songes doe yeeld cleere and notable arguments, sufficiently to make knowne the happie and longed for vocation of the Jewes, yet the due regard of such a divine mysterie doth require that we bring forth & laie to

[8] Brightman, *Revelation*, p. 248.

[9] Brightman, *Revelation*, p. 34.

[10] Brightman, *Revelation*, p. 86.

[11] Brightman, *Daniel*, p. 14. See also pp. 35–36 – "But I trow it shall evidently appeere to anie man embracing the truth without contention, that it is the purpose of the spirit in this place to comprise in a short abridgement the whole estate of the people of the Jewes in a continuall orderely succession even to the second coming of Christ".

> every little sparke, taken from the aultar of God, which maie yeeld more cleere and evident proofe of that truth which mortall men doe not yet sufficiently conceive & see into. Behold therefore how this truth is confirmed not of one or two, but of three such witnesses, as are beyond all exception.[12]

While the reader might be puzzled by the "newnes and strangenes of the matter", when the book of Daniel was brought in, it "giveth such cleere lighte to confirme the matter in hand, feare not to embrace the truth with thankfullnes to God: for here all these, not by mutuall conspiration but by divine inspiration, doe proclaime one and the same thinge".[13]

Brightman therefore argued that God used the apocalyptic text of Daniel to speak directly to the Jews in a time when they were (temporarily) rejected. "Neither is it likely," he wrote, "that there should be no remainder of comfort in the prophecies for the people of God, whom we know he hath determined at the length to joyne to his Church, when he hath gathered the remnants together".[14] Brightman suggested that unique Jewish identity – the fact that they had not been assimilated into European culture – was proof that God was keeping them distinct for a special purpose.[15] While their distinctiveness also served as a sign of their sin in killing Christ, their unique identity remained so "that [God] might make plaine his infinite and unmeasurable favour and truth at length, in restoring this people".[16] This evidenced an increased interest in the Jewish people as a contemporary race, their culture preserved not merely for judgement, but for renewal. This emphasis on Jewish restoration allowed Brightman to modify several elements of the traditional Protestant portrayal of the Jews. For instance, the judgement motif – the idea that the Jews were responsible for Christ's death– was reworked. The standard Elizabethan argument when discussing Jewish responsibility for Christ's death had been clearly stated by Foxe, who when addressing the "cursed Jewe" had noted that: "thou art duly charged with y^{e} guilt of innocent blood".[17] Yet the idea that the Jews were solely responsible for Christ's death was challenged by a desire to find ammunition for anti-Catholic polemic. This led to a re-reading of Rev. 11:8, where the "great city, which is figuratively called Sodom and Egypt, where also their Lord was crucified" had automatically suggested Jerusalem. Bale argued that this passage should be read

[12]Brightman, *Daniel*, p. 3. This letter to the reader is found in Latin in the first edition of the work, and translated for each subsequent publication.

[13]Brightman, *Daniel*, p. 4.

[14]Brightman, *Daniel,* p. 35. We can compare this directly to Calvin's views: "Daniel begins to offer instruction peculiar to the Church. For God had formerly appointed him an interpreter and instructor to profane kings. But he now appoints him a teacher to the Church . . . here Daniel's duty is restricted to the Church". John Calvin, *Commentaries on the Book of the Prophet Daniel* (Edinburgh: Calvin Translation Society, 1852–3). Trans. Thomas Meyers, p. 2.

[15]David Katz also identified this as a theme found in many commentaries of the period. Usually, he found, this was interpreted as a sign of judgement – they were separated from the world to witness to the truthfulness of Christianity. See Katz, *Philo-Semitism*, pp. 126–27.

[16]Brightman, *Song*, p. 1060.

[17]Foxe, *A Sermon*, sig. L. iiir-v.

"spiritually" as the "multitude or smered [i.e. smeared] sort" of Rome.[18] Napier took this a step further: "Christ is saide to bee crucified in this Antichristian citie of *Rome* . . . under the *Romane* Empire, and by *Pontius Pilate*, one of the magistrates thereof, was Christ crucified: Therefore, in this citie (which specifically meaneth *Rome*) is Christ figurativelie saide to be crucified".[19] The prophecy was therefore no longer taken to be a literal reference to Jerusalem, but an allegorical reference to Rome. In accepting this, however, it was still noted that the Jews chose to crucify Christ.[20] The Jews' guilt in the crucifixion acted as a symbol of Rome's later tyranny and disregard for the Bible. Brightman took Napier's idea further, as he downplayed the role of the Jews in the crucifixion:

> And let not any man think that he was crucified by the power of the Jews, for the Jews themselves acknowledged this, saying, *wee may not put any man to death*, John.18.31. Therefore *Pilate* the chief Deputy of the *Romans*, and one that exercised the Jurisdiction of the Romans over the Jews throughout Jewry, condemn[ed] Christ to be crucified, and [gave] him over to his Souldiers to be executed.[21]

While Napier had undermined the literal reading to develop a historical-symbolic dual fulfilment of the prophecy, Brightman moved a step beyond him. Brightman eschewed the literal reading to *protect* the Jews. Where previous commentators allowed for Rev. 11 to act as the basis for both anti-Semitic and anti-Catholic sentiment, Brightman carefully removed any possibility for Jewish demonization from the text. This shift was clearly perceived by Brightman's readers. Sir John Harrington, for example, was incredulous, asking "How Rome is come to bee the cytie where our Lord was crucified?".[22]

Brightman also showed a marked reluctance to apportion blame to the Jews elsewhere. While he noted that "the ancient *Jewes*" who "killed the *Lord of life*, and embrued their hand[s] with the blood of the *Apostles*" were punished for their sin, he quickly moved on to describe the blessings that would flow "when they shall come into favour again with God".[23] This was a theme which continued into his commentary on the Song. Any guilt remaining on the Jews for the crucifixion was reversed through their conversion. Where the Jews of old had offered Christ gall to drink, the future, redeemed nation: "shall tremble at such barbarous wickednesse,

---

[18] Bale, *Image*, II: f.18v.

[19] Napier, *Plaine Discoverie*, pp. 153–54.

[20] Bale, *Image*, II:18lr; Napier, *Plaine Discoverie*, p. 153. The comparisons between the Jews who crucified Christ and Catholics who attacked the church have been covered in depth by Deborah Shuger in *The Renaissance Bible: Scholarship, Sacrifice, and Subjectivity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994), pp. 89–127.

[21] Brightman, *Revelation*, pp. 370–71.

[22] John Harrington, "A Discourse shewing that Elyas must personally come before the Day of Judgement" in *Nugae Antiquae* (London: J. Wright, 1804), Vol. 2, p. 297. Harrington's "Discourse" was probably written in 1610–11.

[23] Brightman, *Revelation*, pp. 254–255.

and in stead of that most bitter cup shall invite him to most generous wine of Chast and fervent piety. Their excellent forme and beauty could not be better painted out, then by the opposite deformity of that old and degenerate *Synagogue*".[24]

Brightman's work evidenced a more positive attitude towards the Jewish people than that of his predecessors. While this should not downplay the anti-Semitic elements that clearly remained, Brightman's view nonetheless represented an increasingly complex picture of the Jewish people.[25] As the previously quoted passage implied, the future, redeemed Jewish nation would serve to reverse the sin and malice which had been found in their forefathers. With this in mind, the nature of the future Jewish church was set out in glowing terms. Brightman claimed to have first realised the significance of Jewish restoration when he appreciated that the removal of water to enable safe passage (as found in the drying of the Euphrates described in Rev. 16:12) was a miraculous event particular to Jewish history: "[which] God wrought for this Nation of the *Jewes* alone".[26] A likely influence on Brightman's reading of this passage was the Jewish apocryphal book of II Esdras, which described the fate of the ten lost tribes of Israel, exiled by the Assyrians in 722 BCE. After the exile the tribes crossed the "Euphrates by the narrow places of the river" while "the most High . . . held still the flood, till they were passed over". It is significant that this section of II Esdras concluded with a prophecy: "Then dwelt they there until the latter time; and now when they shall begin to come, The Highest shall stay the springs of the stream again, that they may go through".[27] This was all, of course, startlingly similar to the events Brightman found foretold in Revelation. Brightman had read II Esdras, but described it as a "Jewish fable". The author of the apocryphal book had seen "some small pieces of this truth" but he "overwhelmed [the truth] with so many and so great forgeries of his own".[28] Brightman reasoned that just as he had understood that the drying of the waters was a miracle unique to the Jewish people, so the author of II Esdras had come to the same conclusion.

This reading of the sixth vial as finding fulfilment in Jewish restoration was an essential element in Brightman's interpretation of Revelation. Only through understanding this vial, and the peculiarly Jewish nature of this miracle, was it possible to comprehend the scope of the text: "I do not rashly and on a sudden suppose, that this thing onely is treated of in this place, which must either finde a

[24]Brightman, *Song*, p. 1070.

[25]Over the past twenty years a revisionist attitude in reading medieval and early modern works referring to the Jews has developed, which aims to downplay anti-Semitic elements in these texts. Several examples have been highlighted by Colin Richmond ("Englishness and Medieval Anglo-Jewry" in *The Jewish Heritage in British History: Englishness and Jewishness*, ed. Tony Kushner (London: Frank Cass, 1992), pp. 42–59. See especially pp. 43–49). I do not wish to downplay any anti-Semitic overtones in Brightman's work here, but merely to suggest that his *general* attitude to the Jewish people was more positive than the majority of his contemporaries.

[26]Brightman, *Revelation*, p. 543.

[27]II Esdras 13:41–7.

[28]Brightman, *Revelation*, p. 544.

place here, or else it must be wholly concealed in this Book without once speaking of it".[29] The Kings of 16:12 were therefore Jews, blessed by the Spirit with "this magnificall name, because it shall be an honourable thing for them in a speciall manner, to return".[30]

This theme was backed up through Brightman's work on Daniel. This allowed him to describe both the nature of the restored Jewish kingdom in more detail and to offer a tentative date for its consummation. Brightman believed that the 1,290 and 1,335 days found in Daniel 12:11–12 started from the Emperor Julian's reconstruction of the Jerusalem temple in 360 CE. He used this to date two Jewish conversions: one in (or around) 1650 and another (greater) conversion in 1695[31] or 1700.[32] At these conversions the Ottomans would be destroyed: "what a terrour will it bee to see himselfe, in the midst of his enemies to be beset before and behinde, at one time".[33] This would be accomplished through Christ's power, when he would gather the Jews together in the Holy Land at "Armageddon". This, it appears, was Mount Zion in Jerusalem; [34] although Brightman also believed that there would be a Western counterpoint, possibly in Geneva.[35] The manner of the Jews' victory would be supernatural, linked with the "spiritual" coming of Christ: "it shalbee brought to passe not so much by mans power and forces as by Gods owne mightie arme, gloriously shewing it selfe from heaven ... fire shall come downe from God out of heaven to devoure [the Turks]".[36] A strong Jewish state would be established in Palestine, fulfilling the Abrahamic land covenant: "And [the Jews] shall have dominion from sea to sea, from the river unto the ends of the earth".[37] Local Gentile converts would submit to the Jewish church.[38] The Jews would provide succour and teaching to Gentiles, who "shall desire to be fed with these breasts [Jewish teaching],

[29]Brightman, *Revelation*, p. 545.

[30]Brightman, *Revelation*, p. 545.

[31]As in Brightman, *Revelation*, p. 784.

[32]1695/6 is the date most usually given in secondary works (e.g. Christianson, *Reformers* p. 105; Firth, *Apocalyptic Tradition*, p. 174). However, it is worth noting that Brightman gives another (less exact) date in his commentary on Song – "*Daniel,* Chap. 12. 12. appointeth the time thereof 45. yeers after the first, which will happen about the yeer 1700". He notes that "The exact time cannot be set downe, it is enough for us, if we come neer the truth". Brightman*, Song*, p. 1065.

[33]Brightman*, Daniel*, p. 52.

[34]Brightman, *Revelation*, p. 551, Brightman*, Daniel*, pp. 54–55. Brightman translates "Armageddon" as "Hill of Holy Delights" ("*Har*, that is a *Hill*, and *Megadhim*, that signifieth *delights*").

[35]Brightman, *Revelation*, pp. 551, 802. The "Hill of Delights" in the West is the place where God's word is followed most obediently, and is most opposed to the papacy. Since the Western Armageddon is brought about by the pope, he reasons that Geneva may be a possible target. This is merely a suggestion and not, as Christianson wrongly suggested, a prophecy (*Reformers*, p. 104).

[36]Brightman*, Daniel*, p. 55.

[37]Brightman*, Daniel*, p. 54 – Brightman alludes to, but does quote directly, the promise in Gen. 15 here.

[38]Brightman*, Song*, p. 1072.

and shall earnestly beseech the Lord, that they may never drie up".[39] Although this kingdom was guaranteed by scripture, it would not be that expected by the Jews themselves:

> What, shall they return to *Jerusalem* againe? There is nothing more certaine, the Prophets do every where directly confirme it and beat upon it. Yet they shall not come thither to have their ceremoniall worship restored, but to make the goodnesse of God shine forth to all the world; when they shall see him give to that nation (which is now, and hath been for many Ages scattered throughout the whole world, and inhabiteth no where but by leave & intreaty) their own habitations where their Fathers dweleth wherein they shal worship Christ purely, and sincerely, according to his wil & Commandement alone. Which is a matter that was commonly spoken of by the ancient *Jews*, which they understood out of the Prophets, but yet lightly, and as it were through a lattice glancingly, whence it came to passe, that it hath been defiled with many old wives fables, among the ancient *Jews*, as it is also now at this day.[40]

Brightman's position on this issue was highly unusual. Foxe had written that the Jews would never recover Jerusalem "unless God himselfe and all his prophets doe lie".[41] George Joye stated the same in equally blunt fashion in his 1545 exposition of Daniel: "nor shall their Levitin preisthed nor their kingdom of Juda/nor the policye and comon weall of Moses nor cytie of Jerusalem be restored. But as I say/Jeremei/O see sayd: Aftir that calamitose destruccion/shulde the gentils be called the peple of God".[42] Brightman's belief in a physical restoration of the Jews to Jerusalem was therefore a dramatic development. Despite this, the implications of Brightman's reading of Jewish restoration have not always been fully considered, with his Jewish focus receiving little direct attention.[43] As discussed in the second chapter of this book, the Christian was usually seen to act as the fulfilment of the Old Testament Jew. The Christian became the antitype, fulfilling the Jewish type in conversion: "we are the true seede of Abraham, and heires of the covenant"[44]; "he now calleth them the Israell of God, whome before he called the sonnes of Abraham by faith . . . of the Gentils as of the Jewes. On the contrary side Israell that is of the

[39]Brightman, *Song*, p. 1064.

[40]Brightman, *Revelation*, p. 544.

[41]Foxe, *Sermon*, f.87v. For more on Foxe's views towards the Jews see Sharon Achinstein, "John Foxe and the Jews", *Renaissance Quarterly* 54:1 (Spring 2001), pp. 86–120, esp. pp. 101–20.

[42]George Joye, *The Exposicion of Daniel the Prophete* (Geneva [i.e. Antwerp], 1545), p. 162.

[43]Firth, Bauckham, Ball and Christianson all refer to Brightman's scheme only in passing. Christianson, for example, misread Brightman as referring to a *Gentile* millennial reign (*Reformers*, p. 105). Almond, ("Thomas Brightman"), Cogley (see both "The Fall . . ." and "'The Most Vile' . . .") and Culver (*Albion and Ariel*) have engaged in the fullest discussions, while Bozeman's work has highlighted the importance of Jewish thought in a primitivist worldview (Bozeman, *To Live*, p. 218). Similarly, Jue has recently emphasised this aspect in his examination of Mede. See Jue, *Heaven*, pp. 191–195.

[44]John Calvin, *A Commentarie of M. Iohn Calvine Uppon the Epistle to the Philippians* (London, 1584), p. 58.

flesh boasteth his onlye kindred and name".[45] This was, as Barbara Lewalski has argued, more than just the relation of type and antitype, but an understanding of Christian identity in terms of a unity with "the Israelites of old in regard to the essence of their spiritual life".[46] The idea of the continuity between Old Testament Jew and contemporary Englishman, Achsah Guibbory has claimed, was essential in forming both personal and national identity through an emphasis on "sameness, not difference" between the elect Jews and Christians.[47] As Thomas Luxon notes, "The absolute distinction between Christian and Jew gives way to something like the Christian as a more real Jew". The old self became "the other of the present (as viewed from eternity), [that] is 'the Jew,' the Synagogue, the carnal Jerusalem, the whore, the flesh, the world, and the devil".[48] Luxon calls this figure the "Jew-self", arguing that puritans developed a conception of the Jewish people which kept them "a shadowy type . . . the place of displacement – the dehistoricised other . . . the unreal".[49]

In Brightman, however, this order was reversed. Far from being drawn as the type fulfilled by the Christian, the Jew became a figure to aspire to. The Jews would not walk in the light of the Gentiles, rather: "the *Gentiles* which shall be saved, shall walk *in the light of the Church of the Jews*, and that the Kings of the earth shall bring their glory and honour to this new *Jerusalem*".[50] The Jews would act as "teachers of the Christian Church",[51] enjoying everlasting security. Thus "this glory of the *Jewes* shall remain as well intire, and undefiled; as it shall be secure, and free from the fear of the enemies"[52]; "the Churches of the *Gentiles,* as it were, *the Moon and Sun* shal be ashamed, by reason of this greater light dazling them".[53] A more startling contrast was found when Brightman compared the coming Jewish restoration to the Old Testament story of Rachel and Leah. "*Leah*," he noted, "was the harder favoured, that is, we *Gentiles*, have crept first into his mariage Bed". However, "the People of the Jewes who are *Rahel*, of a more choyce and singular beauty, shall at length be given unto him, and brought into his Bed".[54] To readers familiar with the biblical story, the implication was surprising. Leah, the unloved wife who gained Jacob through Laban's trickery (Gen. 29:14–30), was equated with the Gentiles,

[45] John Calvin, *A Commentarie of M. I. Calvine Upon the Epistle to the Galathians* (London, 1581), p. 150.

[46] Barbara Lewalski, *Protestant Poetics and the Seventeenth-Century Religious Lyric* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1979), p. 129.

[47] Guibbory, *Christian Identity*, p. 112.

[48] Thomas H. Luxon, "'Not I, but Christ'": Allegory and the Puritan Self", *English Literary History* 60:4 (1993), pp. 920–21.

[49] Luxon, *Literal Figures*, pp. 54–62.

[50] Brightman, *Revelation*, p. 847.

[51] Brightman, *Revelation*, p. 867.

[52] Brightman, *Revelation*, p. 876.

[53] Brightman, *Revelation*, p. 545.

[54] Brightman, *Revelation*, p. 788.

while the dearly loved Rachel corresponded to the Jews. While Brightman no doubt did not intend a like-for-like typological reading of this story, his language subtly undermined the position of the Gentile believer. The contrast between the "creeping" of the "harder favoured" Leah, with the "given" and "singular beauty" of the beloved Rachel was clear. Thus the Jews became "the new Bride"[55]; God's joy in saving the Gentiles would be greater "when he shall take the Jewes into his especiall love and acquaintance againe, who were the first that he made love unto".[56]

Yet while Brightman's approach was symptomatic of an increased concern for the future of the Jews, this future was nonetheless marked by a conversion to Christianity. As Sherryll Mleynek has pointed out in her critique of modern Christian conversionist movements, a reading such as Brightman's presented the Jews as figures who only found meaning by becoming Christian. As a homogenous group in and of themselves, they played no role – they were essentially only realised as people when they turned to Christ. As Mleynek notes, "If they convert, they, themselves, become the 'ultimate' solution to the 'Jewish problem'—erasure".[57] It is easy to see how such criticism can be applied to Brightman's work, but to do so would be a mistake. At one level, of course, Mleynek's criticism is only possible from a liberal modernist position. As Donald Lewis noted in his work on nineteenth-century evangelical Christian Zionism it is pointless to criticise Christians for wanting to convert the Jews: they wanted to convert everybody.[58] The same is true of the seventeenth century: the world was divided into the saved and the damned; not converting (whether abandoning "false religion" such as Catholicism or Judaism; hypocrisy or preferring to remain in one's sin rather than repent) led to damnation, regardless of the racial or religious background of the individual. Yet even with this in mind, there was a genuine move forward in Brightman's interpretation. The Jews remained a distinct group *after* salvation, indeed, a group superior to the Gentiles. The distinction can be observed in the following passage:

> *Solomon* called his two *Pillars* which he erected by two notable names [Jakin and Boaz, 1 Kings 7:21] . . . these two names seem to note out besides the two *Churches* of the *Jews* and *Gentiles*. That of the *Jews*, by *Jachin* on the right hand, as which God would at length establish in his time, though as yet it had not attained to this stableness . . . this of the *Gentiles*, by *Boaz* on the left hand, because of the present strength that should be in her.[59]

The two churches, while a unity on a soteriological level, were conceived of as still maintaining a distinct character and place in God's plan. The pillars in Solomon's temple represented both the church of the Jews and the church of the Gentiles – separate, but still joined in Christ. The implication here was of a distinction between

[55]Brightman, *Revelation*, p. 785.

[56]Brightman, *Revelation*, p. 788.

[57]Sherryll Mleynek, "The Rhetoric of the 'Jewish Problem' in the *Left Behind* Novels" *Literature and Theology* 19:4 (Nov. 2005), p. 374.

[58]Donald Lewis, *The Origins of Christian Zionism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), pp. 13–15.

[59]Brightman, *Revelation,* pp. 120–121.

God's plans for the Jews and for the Gentiles. The Gentile church was promised "present strength" and continuance, but the Bible also revealed a plan for the Jewish church as an entity distinct from the Gentiles: "which God would at length establish in his time". This reading of the Jewish promises immediately undercut the idea that believing Gentiles and Jews formed the one people of God. The idea that the history of Israel and the church was "a continuum", which Lewalski has argued was central in both reformed and puritan readings,[60] was therefore denied by Brightman. His maintenance of the separation of Jew and Gentile, even *after* conversion, was unique. As Sharon Achinstein wrote on John Foxe's view, "the existence of the Jews came to be seen as identical to blasphemy; it was a denial of the primal truth of Christianity, and its eradication was in some sense a re-enactment of Christ's rejection of his own Jewishness".[61] Yet Jewishness was not now eradicated, erased, or destroyed through conversion. Instead, it was reaffirmed. Through conversion the Jews not only entered the community of Christ, but also maintained a distinct Jewish identity.

The Jews were therefore placed in a position far above anything that had been granted to them previously in English eschatological writings. By reversing one of the normal markers of Christian self-identification, Brightman demonstrated a changing attitude towards the Jews. No longer demonised as "Christ killers", in his theology they become instead the agents of God's blessing to the world. They become role-models, future teachers, those before whom kings would one day bow. The Gentile nations would come to learn at the feet of the Jews as they become the greatest and most fruitful nation on the planet.[62] Yet in making this move, Brightman made a marked hermeneutic shift. This was a return to what was, for him, the "plain" sense of the Old Testament.

4.2 The Jewish Promises: "Consistent" Literalism

In examining Brightman's reading of Jewish restoration there should be an awareness of a tension in his thought. This was focused, simultaneously, on a "literalising" of Old Testament promises, and a shift toward a typological reading of New Testament prophecy. Brightman argued that there had been a hermeneutical failure in the interpretation of Old Testament prophecies. Jewish restoration was:

> . . . not so well understood of the men in our times; whereby it cometh to passe, that those things which the Prophets foretell, as things to come, the common sort doth so interpret them, as if they were already past. *Moses* in his most renowned Song, celebrateth this *Mysterie* about the end of it, *Deut.* 32. So *David* commonly *in the Psalms*; So *Isay, Jeremy,*

[60] Lewalski, *Protestant Poetics*, pp. 110–144.

[61] Achinstein, "John Foxe", p. 116.

[62] "The nations shall desire to be exalted in the height of her prosperity", Brightman, *Song*, p. 1063 also p. 1058.

> *Ezekiel* and the rest: it were too long even to reckon up the places. Learned men will be content, even thus to have this matter pointed at, as whom it shall be enough even in one word to admonish, that we are to seek out another manner of interpretation of many places in the Prophets, then that which they have hitherto followed in their Expositions.[63]

The "other manner" that Brightman proposed was a re-literalising of prophecies formerly taken as allegorical, or as fulfilled by the church – a reading of the promises once again in their Jewish context. Thus:

> . . . the old Prophecies are not to be thought to receive accomplishment, either *in the first coming of Christ* or *in the calling of the Gentiles*; but that they do reach even unto the full consummation of the *Mysterie*. They therefore that thrust them up into the straits of the *calling of the Gentiles*, do shut up from themselves the passage into the understanding of them, and bereave the Church of a great part of her solace.[64]

The same argument was found in Brightman's commentary on the Song. Here, he went so far as to argue that those who "thrust up" the prophecies so as to deny any Jewish application were corrupting the text. "Time will teach many things to be in the Prophets, which we commonly interpret as though they were past whose event is yet to come", he wrote, continuing "and especially (as it seemeth to me) in the calling of the Jewes which verily little considered of ours, hath darkened (I will not say, perverted) the proper and naturall meaning of the Prophets in many places."[65]

The "proper and naturall" meaning of the prophets was, therefore, their literal sense. As the meaning of the prophets appeared clear and simple, they required no additional metaphorical/typological framework to understand them. Rather, they referred to what they appeared to refer to – the return of the Jews to their own land. As we saw in the previous chapter, the clear readings available in the prophets shed light on the obscure passages found in the Song ("*Esay* expoundeth this riddle"),[66] thus allowing a "literal" reading of the text. Of course, to describe Brightman's reading of the Old Testament as "literal" is too imprecise. Calvin and Foxe could use the "literal" sense to arrive at very different readings of the Jewish future to those found in Brightman. To be more exact, Brightman can be said to be using a more *consistently* literal reading of the Old Testament. Brightman broke down previously accepted typological or allegorical readings of Old Testament prophecy with the same hermeneutical tools that Perkins and other Elizabethans had used to defend them, particularly the *analogia fidei*. This allowed the exegete to leave the literal sense if the meaning "swarve[d] from the rule of faith" or "impugne[d] any principle of Religion".[67] This tradition had presumed a typological relationship between the elect Israelite and the elect believer, leaving the

[63] Brightman, *Revelation*, p. 339.

[64] Brightman, *Revelation*, p. 339.

[65] Brightman, *Song*, p. 1053.

[66] Brightman, *Song*, p. 1064.

[67] Willet, *Synopsis Papismi*, p. 50.

majority of Jewish people as reprobate: "The Jewes they had the generall calling, but not the particular election".[68] The idea of a national Jewish restoration was, in this tradition, impossible: "perfectly frivolous"[69]; a reduction of Christological or heavenly promises to earthly ideals.[70] To interpret these prophecies as having a literal fulfilment for the Jews was against the *analogia fidei*, "impunging" the "principles of religion". Brightman's reintroduction of a period of future earthly blessing, however, meant that such promises could again be found to have a fulfilment in history. For Brightman, there was now nothing ridiculous about these claims that went against standard Protestant beliefs. This, of course, meant they could be interpreted as written, as there was now no need to spiritualise them. As he argued:

> Many such places of Scripture might be brought to this purpose, and perhaps it would be profitable to bring them, at least for this end that our writers might have occasion thereby given them, to consider more diligently of these places, from the right interpretation whereof I feare me, that we wander, when as we make them to speake of things that be past, whereas they doe foretell of things yet to come.[71]

While on the surface this complaint appears to deal with a chronological error among interpreters, it in fact goes deeper than this. Commentators erred in taking literal sections of scripture as figurative, presuming that prophecies could be applied to either the distant Jewish past or to the present church, but never to the future of a restored Jewish nation. Brightman called for his readers to abandon their belief that the church inherited all of the promises of the Jewish nation; that national promises could be applied to individual souls. Scriptural prophecy should be taken at face-value and read in way that would have made sense to its original readers. If a prediction appeared to refer to a future blessing for Israel, then it must refer to the future. Thus Brightman found Isa. 43:6, 52:15, Dan. 11:44–5; 12:11 Ezk. 38–39, Jer. 30:19; 31:4–7; 31:13ff and Zach. 12:10 fulfilled in a literal return of the Jews to Palestine. Brightman's shift to a literal reading of Jewish restoration was one of the key developments in what Gribben describes as a collapse in the carefully delineated boundaries of "literal" and "figurative" found in the Elizabethan hermeneutical tradition.[72]

Yet while this suggests a logical "literalising" principle; indeed, the Ramist theory of one-to-one correspondence in action, Brightman's view was not in fact so straight forward. Brightman did not only call for a consistently literal rendering of the Old Testament, but also for a typological reading of certain parts of the New.

---

[68] William Perkins, *Lectures Upon the Three First Chapters of the Revelation* (London, 1604), p. 168.

[69] Calvin, *Daniel,* Vol. II, p. 256.

[70] "... [the Jews] hold the letter, yet they corrupt the sense, and where any thing is spoken of Christ, they seeke to overthrow it". Perkins, *Lectures Upon ... Revelation*, p. 169.

[71] Brightman, *Revelation*, p. 791.

[72] Gribben, *Puritan Millennium*, pp. 231–35.

This was seen most clearly in his interpretation of the second resurrection and judgement as the restoration of the Jewish nation. Here he appeared to ignore the literal sense in a passage where it had rarely been denied by previous exegetes. As he himself admitted, this was against "[that] which hath bin commonly held and believed of all men as far as I know".[73]

It is only possible to understand Brightman's hermeneutic here when we see how he reached his conclusions. What initially seemed an arbitrary reading of scripture, evidencing the very excesses so broadly condemned by Tyndale and Perkins, returned almost immediately to the literal sense. Having considered that the foundation of the holy city, laid in Revelation 21, could not come to pass in a literal heaven, Brightman was drawn to abandon the spiritual interpretation of the passage. He recorded that "I was carried with maine and speciall force unto that, which the proper nature of the words pointed out unto me". Indeed, it was the "whole order of matters and the marvellous consent of the rest of the Scriptures [which] compel me to follow this interpretation". A consideration of the historical structure of the text and the witness of scripture as a whole mingled with the "proper nature" of the words, and allowed Brightman to construct a new reading. He continued: "For I called to minde, that the calling of the Jews is manifestly, and frequently called a resurrection of the dead in the holy Scriptures; which was another maine motive in forcing me to expound this place thus as I do".[74] In other words, through a consistent application of a hermeneutical method governed by the *analogia fidei*, Brightman was able to argue that the second resurrection referred to the full restoration of the Jewish people.

The same idea governed his reading of the resurrection of Daniel 12:2 as the Jewish restoration. This was also a passage which had almost universally been referred to the final resurrection of believers.[75] Brightman believed, however, that such a reading represented a perversion of the Spirit's intention in Daniel; a failure to comprehend "the continuall course and order . . . the band of time" joining the 11th and 12th chapters of that book.[76] Brightman was aware that his readers might struggle with the way in which his reading of Daniel 12 undermined that text as a reference to the resurrection. He admitted that "all our expositours that I could see, doe refer it to the last resurrection of the body".[77] Despite this, he believed that such an interpretation was inconsistent with Protestant hermeneutical norms. The day of this resurrection appeared to be dated by the numbers given in Dan. 12:11–12.

---

[73] Brightman, *Revelation*, p. 832.

[74] Brightman, *Revelation*, pp. 833–834.

[75] Joye's reading of the resurrection in Daniel is instructive in this point. The term refers to "This daye of the resurreccion of our delyuerance into lyfe eternall/and the anticrystes into perpetuall dampnacion" Joye, *Daniel,* p. 236. See also Hugh Broughton, *Daniel His Chaldie Visions* (London, 1596), sig. O^{ii}v; Calvin, *Daniel*, Vol. II, p. 256.

[76] Brightman, *Daniel*, p. 63.

[77] Brightman, *Daniel*, p. 63.

Since the day of the final resurrection was unknown, even to the angels (Mt. 24:36), it could not apply to this passage. To take this as a reference to the final resurrection was, for Brightman, an explicit failure to consistently apply the literal sense:

> But we must not start from the naturall signification but where there is necessitie of the figurative here nothing inforceth to leave the proper: but contrariwise there is a necessitie to reteine it: for seing this resurrection is the same with the deliverance in the former verse, made indeed out of the book of life, after the manner of the resurrection, and being of one onely people of the Jewes, as was observed before, they are said well, Manie be awakened, when the men of one nation and not of all mankind do arise.[78]

It is clear that, for Brightman, the "naturall signification" served as the basis for his interpretation. History provided his first support. After all, the book of Daniel had been specifically written for the Jews – to deny that it spoke of a resurrection unique to them threatened to leave the text unintelligible to its original recipients. His approach to the text then proceeded with a standard Protestant device – the comparison of scripture with scripture – to help produce his radical reading. Brightman emphasised his exegetical findings here with the same vigour with which he defended his Laodicean reading in Revelation. He had not "discovered" a new interpretation, but was "forced" to it by the power of the Spirit working through the text. There were therefore three justifications for his reading – the "proper nature" of the words, his historical structure, and the witness of the canon of scripture. All of these worked against an arbitrary reading of the Old Testament. As Brightman proceeded, he provided proof text upon proof text to support his assertion that he was not leaving the literal sense. The first was Romans 11:15, which referred to a Jewish engrafting as "life from the dead", a text where: "The words of the Apostle are clear & plain enough of themselves". His second justification was built upon Isaiah 26:19 ("But your dead will live, their bodies shall rise"). He noted that the song of praise in Isa. 26 was followed in Isa. 27 with a prophecy of doom for "Leviathan the gliding serpent". This, he argued, was a reference to the Ottomans, whose empire he believed to be shaped like a snake. As in his reading of Rev. 2–3, geography and scripture combined to support his position. Similarly, Jewish resistance to the Ottomans was foretold in Zach. 9:13,[79] while the Islamic attack on Jerusalem (and the Jews' supernatural deliverance) was predicted in Ezk. 38:8.[80] His final proof was taken from Ezekiel 37, in which the prophet spoke life into a valley of dry bones. He argued here on the basis of a syllogism. The Jews were predicted to return to Jerusalem, this event has not already happened; therefore it must still be in the future. Since this return was not described in detail before Revelation 20–21, then it must be contained in the prophecy of the second resurrection – a like-for-like

[78] Brightman, *Daniel,* pp. 64–65.

[79] Brightman, *Daniel*, p. 52 – The verse clearly references an attack on the Greeks, though Brightman does not discuss this discrepancy. It may be that since the Ottomans occupied Hellenic territory in Brightman's day, this drove his thinking.

[80] Brightman, *Daniel*, p. 55.

comparison between Rev. 21, Dan. 12 and Ezk. 37. His argument proceeded on the literal sense:

> Besides, these bones are the whole house of *Israel, vers.*11. and now shall there be an uniting of *Judah* and *Ephraim* into one, which those two peeces of wood that are compact together in one doe declare. Now these things are proper to the *Israelites*, and those not already past, but to come.[81]

It is apparent that what at first glance appeared to be an allegorical reading of the second resurrection became a consistently literal reading. For Brightman, the literal did not exist merely at the level of "word on page", but as the outworking of a theme throughout the whole Bible. Ezekiel shed light on Daniel, which shed light on Revelation, and so forth. Only with an appreciation of the whole could the interpreter begin to comprehend the separate parts. The same hermeneutic Brightman employed in reading the Song was used to argue for the full restoration of the Jewish nation.

Nonetheless, Brightman's interpretation of the resurrection in Revelation and Daniel was problematic. He worried: "[lest] I shall seeme to any man to weaken the general Resurrection," reassuring readers that, "This Scripture hath still within it a most invincible and indefezible bulwark, for the upholding and confirming thereof". The second resurrection of Revelation 20, Brightman argued, was the type of a future Christian resurrection. This type, he claimed, was not a "counterfeit similitude" but the final typological disclosure of the Spirit. If the type hadn't been so clearly set forth, then "both the *Jewes* and the *Christians* would have thought themselves undone and past hope alike". It established "the calling of the Jewes out of doubt, and makes it to be past all controversie" and "openeth the manner, after which the *Resurrection* shall be at last accomplished".[82] He provided more support for this opinion in his work on Daniel:

> The Spirit of God would not so often and diligently use this allegoricall resemblance, if it did not therby declare the thing should most assuredly come to passe in his time. Otherwise it were an easie matter to avoid, all the promises confirmed by this type, as no whit more certaine then the resurrection wherof there is little or no hope at all.[83]

This defence, however, was unconvincing and did not solve the theological problems Brightman had created. While claiming that there remained a bulwark of scripture to back up the physical resurrection, he uncharacteristically failed to provide a single reference. In effect, Brightman had typologised the most literal part of scripture. In his reading, the Bible ended with a redeemed Jewish millennium. The end of history was removed to a time beyond scripture, a time entirely hidden from the interpreter's view. The far future received no mention in the Bible. Scripture had, in effect, little or nothing to say on events after the restoration of the Jews. God's revelation reached up to the end of the seventeenth century and then abruptly

[81] Brightman, *Revelation*, p. 836.

[82] Brightman, *Revelation*, p. 838.

[83] Brightman, *Daniel*, p. 66.

stopped. If Brightman had *not* defended a physical resurrection, then he would have been advocating (in effect) an entirely unknowable future: the end of Christian hope. Yet his typological reading of the Jewish resurrection is also interesting from an entirely different angle. Brightman laboured to promote the Jews and highlight their glorious future in his work. They received literal promises of restoration and were granted a future in which they became more than simply the type of the Gentile believer. After all this, however, when he came to describe the glory of the Jewish kingdom, Brightman abruptly moved back towards a more orthodox typological reading of the Jews. Brightman's consistently literal reading had emphasised the historicity and continuity of Jewish blessings, even into the millennial period. In this period, however, Jewish history once again became typological: existing primarily as a sign of the final resurrection. The converted Jews, enjoying the numerous literal blessings described in the Bible, became, finally, the type for believers at the last resurrection.

By reversing the figure of the Jew as the type of the believer. Brightman created a theological anomaly, in that the Gentile now appeared to be a type of the converted Jew. In his discussion of the second resurrection, he was attempting to reconstruct a typological reading in which the Gentile once again became the antitype of the converted Jew. This was not entirely successful, however. As he was unable to provide any scriptural support for this element of his argument, Brightman had no basis from which to argue. While the Gentile may have once more become the antitype, Brightman's reader was nonetheless left uncertain of the future. His reader became like the Old Testament saint – seeing only the shadows as the reality awaited a distant fulfilment. Brightman's consistently literal reading had therefore created a theological problem.

Before suggesting ways in which Brightman attempted to solve this problem, it is critical to ask *why* he moved to read Jewish promises in their literal sense. Nabil Matar has suggested that a focus on Jewish restoration was the result of an English desire for Empire. Through the Jews, the nation would have the opportunity to achieve what English soldiers had failed to do during the Crusades, in claiming Jerusalem for England.[84] However, as Cogley has pointed out, the crusades were never viewed nostalgically in Judeo-centric works. In fact, one of the earliest commentaries influenced by Brightman – Patrick Forbes's 1613 study on Revelation – described the crusades as "that tragicall and superstitious warre, for recovery of *Jerusalem*".[85] Matar also fails to see the privileging of the Jews presumed in the Judeo-centric tradition. England did not and could not rule over the Jews, but became subservient to them. In response to Matar's theories, Cogley has suggested that the Judeo-centric focus originated as an outworking of the primitivist impulse in history; a restoration of the *original* apostolic church "in all

[84]Matar, *Islam in Britain*, pp. 167–83.

[85]Patrick Forbes, *An Exquisite Commentarie Upon the Revelation of Saint John* (London, 1613), p. 229.

its grandeur".[86] While this was certainly one element of Brightman's reading, as argued previously, his thought was not primarily governed by primitivism. There were several other historical factors at work. In this book, I have emphasised the way in which Brightman's reading remained consistent with a broad Protestant hermeneutical tradition. It is clear that it was his attempt to apply this hermeneutic consistently to the Old Testament which led him towards his new reading. Part of the reason for this, as I have argued above, was his move to a more historically orientated interpretation. The text should have a meaning that would have made sense to its original readers. However, there was also a second reason for his focus on a more consistent literalism and the promises of Jewish restoration. Specifically, this was polemic reworking of Jesuit eschatology. Philip Almond has recently suggested a similar link, and while I broadly agree with his conclusions, he covers the point only briefly and fails to explain either Brightman's polemic intent, or suggest any *hermeneutical* influence from Jesuit works.[87] The following aims to expand the argument.

In making this claim, it is important to establish the way in which Brightman's opinion changed in the period 1590–1600. One of Brightman's four surviving sermons, unpublished until 1646/7, was an examination of Paul's allegory of Sarah and Hagar in Galatians 4:21–31. In the biblical text, Paul argued for an allegorical interpretation of Abraham's wives. Thus Sarah represented the heavenly Jerusalem and Hagar the "present city of Jerusalem . . . in slavery". Brightman's interpretation of this allegory was surprising given what we have seen in his commentaries. He argued that this seemingly allegorical interpretation wasn't an allegory at all ("it is a Type indeed").[88] This allowed him to express his distaste for those who suggested novel readings of scripture: "it belongs not to us to coin new and rash interpretations at our liking".[89] Most surprisingly of all, given his apocalyptic commentaries, was his interpretation of the dichotomy between the heavenly and earthly Jerusalem set up by the apostle:

> Here falls to the ground, the vain boasting and confidence of the *Jews* in their earthly *Jerusalem*: for those goodly and lofty Predictions of the Prophets of *Sion* and *Jerusalem* did not concern the flesh or earthly *Jerusalem*, but in a Type. God is not tied to any place.[90]

This claim was in stark contrast to those in Brightman's other works. His commentaries argued that the prophecies of Jerusalem's restoration were *not* types: "the proper and naturall meaning of the Prophets"[91] was instead to be followed. Where

---

[86] Cogley, "The Fall . . . ", p. 331.

[87] Almond's focus is on the "geo-political" utility of the Jews in their battle against the Turk, building on Matar's position. See Almond, "Thomas Brightman", pp. 17–19.

[88] Brightman, *Brightman Redivivus: or The Post-Humian Of-spring of Mr. Thomas Brightman, in IIII. Sermons* (London, 1647), p. 11.

[89] Brightman, *Brightman Redivivus*, p. 12.

[90] Brightman, *Brightman Redivivus*, p. 18.

[91] Brightman, *Song*, p. 1053.

in the sermon God was "not tied to any place", in Brightman's commentaries the Lord's promises were intimately concerned with Palestine.

There are two options to explain this discrepancy. Firstly, it is possible that the sermons were not composed by Brightman at all. The fact that they only appeared in 1646/7 and that their introduction was purposely vague on their origin adds weight to this theory. It is possible that Brightman's name may have been attached only in an attempt to increase sales. Yet unpublished works by Brightman were clearly circulating both on the continent and in England in the 1630s and 40s. As discussed in the introduction to this book, William Ames claimed to have "certayn papers of Mr. Brightman" in his possession.[92] We can also recall the entry in the Stationer's Register for 24th February 1640/41, which recorded the licensing of "Three sermons" to printer Richard Hearne, including one upon "Nehem. 9.38 by Master Brightman".[93] James Howell's 1656 critique of the Long Parliament, in discussing England's signing of the Solemn League and Covenant recalled that "Master Heron", a printer, had been approached by Lady Mary Vere when the proposal that England took the Covenant had become public knowledge. According to Howell, "she had a Sermon in a fair manuscript of that great light of the Church Master *Brightman*".[94] As there were clearly unpublished works from Brightman extant in the mid-seventeenth century there is some reason to accept the attribution of the sermons to Brightman. The difference in opinion between the sermons and commentaries must be explained in another way. The only sermon in the collection to be dated is the final composition on Jude 20–21, apparently preached on 4th December 1590. This suggests that the sermons were from early in Brightman's career. This implies a shift in Brightman's reading of Jewish restoration at some point in the period 1590–1600, as he came to write his apocalyptic commentaries.

In explaining both this shift and Brightman's increasing focus on the literal sense of Old Testament promises it is helpful to remember *why* he came to write on Revelation. In the introduction to his commentary he noted that "I had by chance light upon *Ribera*, who had made a Commentary upon this same holy Revelation; *Is it even so* (said I) *doe the Papists take heart again, so as that book which of a long time* before they would scarce suffer any man to touch, they dare now take in hand to *intreat fully upon it*?"[95] Brightman had also read Bellarmine's comments on the Antichrist, and in a long excursus, sought to attack the Cardinal's futurist eschatology. Bellarmine had argued that the Jews would play a central role in the drama of Revelation. He believed that the two witnesses described in Revelation 11:1–14 were literally Enoch and Elijah. They would bodily return and convert the Jews, before being slain by the Antichrist.[96] The Antichrist himself, Bellarmine

[92] Ames, *Fresh Suit*, p. 502.

[93] *A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London*, ed. Edward Arber (London: Privately Printed, 1874–8), Entry for 24th February 1640/1.

[94] Howell, *Some Sober Inspections Made into … the Late Long-Parliament*, pp. 148–50.

[95] Brightman, *Revelation*, sig. Br.

[96] See also the Douay-Rheims annotations on the New Testament.

claimed, would be of Jewish descent and accepted as the long-awaited Jewish messiah. He argued that "the Jews are they . . . that he [Antichrist] shall joyn himself to them specially; For they are ready to receive him".[97] The Antichrist would lead an army of Jews to conquer Jerusalem, rebuild the temple, and finally declare himself God there (2 Thes. 2:4).

While it is unsurprising that Brightman rejected Bellarmine's reading of the Antichrist theme, what is more startling is the way in which Brightman's own scheme resembled that suggested by the Cardinal. Both centred on the prominence of the Jews, a return to Jerusalem, and the creation of a Jewish empire in the East. The difference was one of focus. For Bellarmine, the Jews would serve as tools of Antichrist, accepting his offer of restoration before converting to Catholicism through the preaching of Enoch and Elijah. Brightman's reading of the Jewish restoration was a direct subversion of this premise. For Bellarmine, Jewish restoration preceded conversion and remained a theme associated with Antichrist. For Brightman, it was a positive event which followed conversion: "It is certaine that the Empire shall returne thither [Jerusalem] againe, but it shall not be that which *Antichrist* shall set up; but that which Christ himself shall reedifie".[98] Brightman's scheme mirrored Bellarmine's in such a way as to suggest an almost parodic undermining and re-imagining of the Catholic work. The Cardinal had inadvertently stumbled upon the importance of Jewish restoration, but had confused his chronology through a misreading of the Antichrist figure. Where Bellarmine expected the restoration to Palestine to be the mark of Antichrist, it would actually be Antichrist's doom: "At the calling of the Jewes . . . shall *Antichrist* utterly be destroyed".[99]

It is important to see that Bellarmine and Ribera's re-reading of Revelation focused specifically on the literal sense of the text. In seeing Revelation as representing a linear description of future history, they attempted to use standard Protestant hermeneutics against their opponents. In other words, the Jesuits aimed to read the text in its "literal" sense. This reading also meant a re-interpretation of Old Testament prophecy. This was particularly clear in the case of Malachi 4:5, which predicted the return of Elijah at the end of days. While this had been seemingly fulfilled in John the Baptist (Mt. 17:12), Bellarmine argued that this was only a part realisation: John remained "onely . . . an allegorie" of the literal Elijah.[100] Similarly, the prophetic days, weeks and months in Daniel and Revelation were to be interpreted strictly in their literal sense. The new Jesuit emphasis was on a consistently literal reading of New Testament prophecy. Revelation became narrative history, rather than a book of recapitulating signs. The method Brightman later applied to the Song of Songs and Old Testament prophecy was strikingly similar to this Jesuit approach to Revelation. With this in mind, it is possible

[97] Bellarmine, quoted in Brightman, *Revelation*, p. 710.

[98] Brightman, *Revelation*, p. 715.

[99] Brightman, *Revelation*, p. 692.

[100] Willet, *Synopsis*, p. 619.

to suggest that a root of Brightman's focus on a consistently literal reading of the Jewish promises was Jesuit exegesis. Indeed, in Brightman's diatribe against Bellarmine, it is clear that he found his opponent's arguments persuasive. While he was critical of Bellarmine's reading of Mal. 4:5, he eventually conceded: "And yet I will not deny, but there is a more full restoring to come then ever was yet seene, and that all things properly, that so all Israel may be saved . . . whereof that restoring by *John* was a shadow and Type, as is were, but it is not necessary that the Minister whom Christ will use in this restoring should be true *Elias* but such an one as is so called by similitude".[101] Brightman therefore suggested that Bellarmine's general hermeneutic on the passage was sound, even though his chronology was confused.

It appears, then, that a shift occurred in Brightman's thinking in the period 1590–1600. This was marked by an emphasis on the apocalyptic books of the Bible, a focus which only occurred when he "by chance" happened upon Jesuit exegesis. Given this, his use of the consistently literal reading of Old Testament promises makes increasing polemic sense, as it served to undermine the Jesuit claim of a literal reading of prophecy. Brightman thus moved a step beyond his opponents in his application of the "literal" sense. As Eliane Glaser has recently shown, an interest in the Jews in the seventeenth century was often primarily polemical. That is, the Jews served as a useful figure through which opponents could be critiqued.[102] Yet Glaser's work presumes a certain cynical intent amongst seventeenth-century writers and leaves the Judeo-centric theme almost entirely unexamined. Brightman's polemic was not motivated by any such cynicism, but rather by the absorption of Bellarmine's underlying "literal" hermeneutic. Brightman did not only use Bellarmine's eschatology to attack his opponents, but as the springboard for his own thought; as a hermeneutical key to unlock the mystery of Revelation, Daniel and Song of Songs. While Brightman's hermeneutic was based around a logical application of accepted Reformation methods, Bellarmine's reworking of these methods served as a key influence on the Englishman's thought.

As demonstrated above, Brightman's re-reading of Bible prophecy caused a number of problems. Without any intention of undermining orthodox Protestant thought he had removed standard eschatological hope from scripture. There was now no clear second coming, final resurrection, or final judgement in Revelation, and an earthly future under Jewish rule. It is unlikely that this picture would contain anything particularly appealing to the godly Englishman reading his work. Yet Brightman's reading proved to be particularly influential in his own country. The key reason for this can be found in his re-creation of the Christian self in a new, "national" mode.

---

[101] Brightman, *Revelation*, p. 664.

[102] For example, puritan works praising the Jewish people as the guardians of the Hebrew language were often written with the express intent of critiquing the Roman Church's ambivalence towards the language, rather than extolling any real virtue found to be inherent amongst the Jews themselves. At the same time, accusations of "Judaism" continued to be a useful charge in polemical attacks against Catholic or Laudian practices of worship: the idea of returning to an overly ceremonial (i.e. Jewish) form of devotion. See Glaser, *Judaism without Jews,* pp. 7–64.

4.3 The Re-created Self: Emphasising "Englishness"

The construction of identity in early modern England was complex and based around a number of factors. For puritans, this came primarily through an understanding of the "self" in Christ. The Christian life was often read in dichotomous terms, as a battle between the "old" self (what Luxon calls the "Jew-self") and Christ's nature living within the believer. This was often expressed in terms of a negation of the "self" – not the individual in Burckhardtian terms, but rather the believer's selfish desires.[103] As Brightman wrote: "we must abase and annihilate ourselves, that we may extol the grace and goodness of God".[104] This is symptomatic of what Sacvan Bercovitch terms puritan "Auto-Machia" – "self civil war" – an attempt to find *real* identity in Christ alone. This idea of "self denial" was particularly important amongst Cambridge puritans.[105] Yet while the central theme in puritan self-understanding was a relationship with Christ, as Charles Taylor has pointed out, it is wrong to claim that any one element was the *sole* influence on identity formation in the period: the idea of the early modern self was multifaceted.[106] Many of the tools used by puritans in identity construction have been examined above, with Luxon's identification of Jews as types of believers being one particularly important element of the formation of Christian (and thus puritan) identity. As Bercovitch argues, as puritans read the Old Testament in a typological/Christological manner, so they read events in their lives through a filter of Old Testament types. That is: "they demanded a precise spiritual correspondence between the history of the Hebrews and the life of the believer . . . the story of Israel had its *telos* in the Christ-event".[107] For puritans, Old Testament Israel thus acted as a mirror for the individual believer; a lens through which to understand their own lives. Yet for Brightman, Israel did not serve simply as a type of the church. Instead, it remained a distinct entity which (in time) would fulfil those promises which God had made to it in the Old Testament. By undermining the continuity of the church with ancient Israel, Brightman subtly undermined one of the central pillars of puritan identity. The traditional picture of the believer as the antitype of the Old Testament saint was replaced.

---

[103]" . . . selfhood appears as a state to be overcome, obliterated". Sacvan Bercovitch, *The Puritan Origins of the American Self* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1975), p. 13. For the negative connotations of selfhood see Jonathan Sawday, "Self and Selfhood in the Seventeenth Century" in *Rewriting the Self: Stories from the Renaissance to the Present*, ed. Roy Porter (London and New York: Routledge, 1997), pp. 29–41.

[104]Thomas Brightman, *The Art of Self-Deniall* (London, 1646), p. 18.

[105]As well as Brightman, Henry Burton, Theophilius Polwheile, Thomas Watson, Daniel Cawdrey and Edmund Calamy all had tracts of self-denial published in the period 1640–69. I am grateful to Frédéric Gabriel for this point, and for allowing me to have a copy of the unpublished paper he presented at the UCLA conference "Spaces of the Self" in March 2008: "*Loci Theologici*: Authority, Fall and Theology of the Puritan Self".

[106]Charles Taylor, *Sources of the Self: The Making of Modern Identity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), pp. 23–24. See also Shuger, *Renaissance Bible*, pp. 1–10.

[107]Bercovitch, *Puritan Origins*, p. 28.

Brightman's modification of puritan selfhood is an example of the phenomenon labelled by historian Cynthia Marshall as "self-shattering". Marshall sees a preoccupation with figures and readings which sought to undermine the reader's sense of self in early modern texts. In her examination of Foxe, for example, she discovers a move to subvert the reader's sense of individual certainty; to unsettle and (quite literally) bring the reader to the martyr's stake. In doing so, Foxe "sought to shatter readers by bringing them up against the Real in extreme form… by way of motivating their embrace of the protective identity of Christian faith".[108] Brightman's modification of traditional markers of Christian identity, along with his attack on the Church of England, reflects what Marshall describes as the "dimension of pleasure" in early modern deconstructions of the self; specifically a pleasure expressed through violence – either against the self, or the other.[109] This is similar to the theme Deborah Shuger identified in her examination of Calvinist passion narratives.[110] Brightman's readings clearly evidenced this pleasure in violence. In the first instance, this was at the expense of the Catholic other,[111] but it was also manifested in his Laodicean reading, particularly in the trauma Brightman experienced at his discovery of England's identity as Laodicea.[112] In actively calling for the reader to experience the same trauma themselves, he worked to undermine the reader's confidence in their national church and sense of assurance. In the same way, his undermining of the resurrection and position of the Gentile in God's plans aimed to unsettle his readers. Brightman, however, did not merely indulge in self-shattering here. While it is true that his reading was discomforting for his readers (as he undermined established categories of self-identification), he also actively worked to rebuild the self. Brightman's readers would gain pleasure not only through a process of self-shattering, but also through a process of self re-construction or re-creation. This theme of reconstruction is not brought out as forcefully as it could be by Marshall.[113]

---

[108]Cynthia Marshall, *The Shattering of the Self: Violence, Subjectivity, and Early Modern Texts* (Baltimore & London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002), p. 99.This examination of Foxe, pp. 85–105.

[109]Marshall, *Shattering*, pp. 47–53.

[110]Shuger, *Renaissance Bible*, pp. 89–127.

[111]"Burn up this whore, and turn her to ashes". Brightman, *Revelation*, pp. 606–7.

[112]"Truly he that gathereth the tears of his children into his bottle, knoweth right well that I have not with dry eyes taken a survey of this *Laodicea*. I could not but poure forth teares and sighes from the bottom of my heart, when I beheld in it, Christ himself loathing of us, and provoked extreamly to anger against us". Brightman, *Revelation*, p. 124.

[113]A problem which appears to be the result of her over-reliance on a psychoanalytical approach. Marshall reads the texts through the psychoanalytical category of "masochism" (and sometimes) "sadomasochism". Though Marshall recognises Foucault's assertion that it is dangerous to read dialogues of sexuality in an era before sexuality was an issue of discourse, it does not appear to be applied consistently in her analysis.

This idea of "self re-construction" can be furthered through an examination of one of the most controversial elements of Brightman's work: his Anglo-centric reading, often labelled the "elect nation" approach. The term was first brought to prominence in William Haller's 1963 study of John Foxe. Haller claimed that Foxe developed a view of England as a nation with a unique national mission, chosen by God as "a people set apart from all others by a peculiar destiny".[114] This theory, of course, does not imply that the English viewed themselves as the *sole* heirs of salvation (as in Christopher Hill's misreading),[115] but that they viewed their nation as playing a unique and providential role in God's plan. England thus saw itself as God's new Israel; a chosen land with a special, God appointed destiny. While the claim that some viewed England in these terms in the 1640s saw little dispute,[116] Haller's identification of Foxe as the originator of this theory has been firmly repudiated by commentators such as Helgerson and Bauckham,[117] although it still finds supporters today.[118] In response to Haller, it is often claimed that the true originator of the idea was Brightman.[119] This is true to some extent, but it is more accurate to define Brightman's role as that of popularisation as opposed to origination. It is certainly possible to find the root of such ideas long before Brightman. In particular, they are evident in the growth of national enthusiasm post-1588 – John Aylmer's famous (and much misconstrued) marginal notation that "God is English" being just one symptom of this developing thought.[120] Indeed, there are good arguments for considering an "elect" identity as central in the formation of nationhood itself.[121] Yet it is unwise to accept Haller's description of the "elect nation" uncritically. Recent work on ideas of nationhood in early modern England has done much to complicate his view. As Tony Claydon and Ian McBride have pointed out, Protestant writers never viewed their nation as merely a re-creation of Old Testament Israel. Protestantism, while often concerned with notions of nationhood, was always aware of a wider, international brotherhood

[114]William Haller, *Foxe's Book of Martyrs and the Elect Nation* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1963), p. 53.

[115]Hill, *English Bible,* p. 266.

[116]Hill is something of an exception here. See *English Bible*, pp. 265–76.

[117]Richard Helgerson, *Forms of Nationhood: The Elizabethan Writing of England* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992), pp. 263–264; Bauckham, *Tudor Apocalypse*, p. 13; Christianson, *Reformers*, p. 100; Firth, *Apocalyptic Tradition*, p. 108–109.

[118]For example, Carla Gardina Pestana, *Protestant Empire: Religion and the making of the British Atlantic World* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2009), p. 91; Glyn Parry, "Elect Church or Elect Nation? The Reception of the *Acts and Monuments*" in *John Foxe: An Historical Perspective*, ed. David Loades (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1999), pp. 167–181; Joy Gilsdorf, *The Puritan Apocalypse: New England Eschatology in the Seventeenth Century* (New York & London: Garland, 1989), p. 16; Achinstein, "John Foxe", p. 87.

[119]Helgerson, *Forms*, p. 263; Christianson, *Reformers*, p. 100; Firth, *Apocalyptic Tradition*, p. 108.

[120]For this and further examples see Gribben, *Puritan Millennium*, pp. 65–66.

[121]See Anthony D. Smith, *The Cultural Foundations of Nations: Hierarchy, Covenant and Republic* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2008) and his *Chosen Peoples*.

of the elect.[122] Nonetheless, ideas of national identity and the role that England would play within this international brotherhood were developing at the time. Work by Richard Helgerson and Cathy Shrank, for example, has served to illustrate the complex writing of a distinctive English identity in the early modern period.[123] All this suggests that sensitivity is needed when approaching the "elect nation" concept. The term itself is problematic, as it implies a one-to-one correspondence between Old Testament Israel and the contemporary nation, a notion recently revisited in Guibbory's work.[124] To avoid this danger in the following discussion the term "chosen" rather than "elect" nation will be used. At this stage it is also important to note the different ways in which the "chosen" nation can be described. Anthony D. Smith identified two different models which could be used. A nation could use the "covenant" approach, in which they "are marked off from the multitude . . . and they therefore play a unique role in the moral economy of global salvation, one that is determined for them by the deity, but to which they adhere voluntarily".[125] On the other hand, the "missional" model could be adopted, in which the role of the chosen nation was to bring blessing to the world.[126] It is therefore important to examine not only how Brightman found England described in the Bible, but also the way in which he created a distinct identity for the elect within England and how he saw this operating within the internationalist Protestant milieu.

Brightman developed a uniquely English reading of several events in Revelation. This was partially demonstrated in the identification of Cromwell and Cranmer as the angels of Revelation 14. A number of other figures in the book also found their fulfilment in an English context. For example, the seventh trumpet, in which "The kingdom of the world has become the kingdom of our Lord and of his Christ" (Rev. 11:15), was fulfilled primarily in England:

> The first entrance therefore of this Trumpet should be famous by this increase of new Kingdomes, even as it came to passe in our Kingdom of *England*: Unto which *Christ sent our most gracious* Elizabeth *to be Queen, at the first blast of the seventh Trumpet, in the*

[122]Tony Claydon and Ian McBride, "The Trials of the Chosen Peoples: Recent Interpretations of Protestantism and National Identity in Britain and Ireland" in *Protestantism and National Identity: Britain and Ireland, c.1650–c.1850*, ed. Tony Claydon and Ian McBride (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), pp. 12–13. See also Jason A. Nice, "'The Peculiar Place of God': Early Modern Representations of England and France", *English Historical Review* XCCI:493 (Sept. 2006), p. 1018.

[123]Cathy Shrank, *Writing the Nation in Reformation England, 1530–1580* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004); Helgerson, *Forms*, pp. 249–94. See also Jason Scott-Warren, *Early Modern English Literature* (Cambridge: Polity, 2005), pp. 155–82.

[124]Although complexified, in that Guibbory notes that the elect nation received both blessings and curses in taking the position of Israel, her work nonetheless traces the use of Jewish tropes "as if England were experiencing exactly what had been written so long before about Jewish Israel" (Guibbory, *Christian Identity*, p. 95; see also pp. 89–120).

[125]Smith, *Chosen Peoples*, pp. 48–49; See also pp. 66–94.

[126]Smith, *Chosen Peoples*, pp. 95–130.

> *yeer* 1558, and the againe gave her self, and her Kingdom to Christ by way of thankfulnesse, which she shewed by rotting out the *Romish superstitions* for the greater part of them.[127]

Brightman's work repeatedly traced England's role in fulfilling the events narrated in Revelation. The first vial judgement, for example (Rev. 16:1) was poured out in 1560, when: "our *most gracious Queen Elizabeth bidden by a voice out of the Temple, to pour out a Vial upon the Earth* . . . [was] admonished by the counsels of the Godly about the end of the first yeer of her Raigne, [to] cast out many [corrupt] men from their Bishopricks most worthily".[128] Similarly, the third vial had been poured in 1581 when Jesuit Edmund Campion was found guilty of high treason. At the same time, William Cecil published his *The Execution of Justice, in England, Not for Religion, but for Treason*. Brightman was aware of the scepticism that his thesis might generate, feeling it necessary to remind his readers that "I do not affirme [this] rashly, and without good reason".[129] Thus his picture of the blessing which God had bestowed upon England at Elizabeth's accession:

> What good things hath not flowed from thence? By means of that, Lawes are in force, Judgement is executed, every man enjoyeth his own, injuries are repressed all reproachfull dealing in word or deed is curbed in, the Nobilitie is honoured, the Comminaltie fall hard to their work, good learning flouriseth . . . From this Peace it is that this land hath been a Haven and a Harbour lying open to such as were exiled for Christs cause . . . Never had *England* so long and so quiet *Halcyon* days; which felicitie of ours, forrain countries are astonished at, our enemies gnash their teeth against it with envy . . . Thou [God] by heaping so many good things upon us, hast made the world to know that thy Gospel is not beggarly, or niggardly guest that cometh with little or no money at all to pay for his shot, but a very rich and bountifull one.[130]

The use of Elizabeth in Brightman's work is consistent with the "imperial" theme suggested by Francis Yates in her examination of representations of the queen in early modern England. Yates found a number of differing positive representations of Elizabeth. Modelled after Constantine, she became a figure around which an anti-papal national identity could be built.[131] Brightman clearly continued this tradition, emphasising Elizabeth as a symbol of the blessings that God had bestowed upon the nation. This persisted in his commentary on the Song. The transformation of the church of the Gentiles from rebellious Tirzah to beloved Jerusalem (Song 6:8) was linked to Elizabeth's accession. Thus, the church "began to be comely as *Jerusalem,* when the unpleasant name of *Tirzah* grew out of use, which hapned in the beginning of Queene *Elizabeths* Raign in *England,* in the yeere 1558".[132] Other English figures

---

[127] Brightman, *Revelation*, p. 381.

[128] Brightman, *Revelation*, p. 524.

[129] Brightman, *Revelation*, p. 532.

[130] Brightman, *Revelation*, pp. 126–127.

[131] Francis A. Yates, *Astraea: The Imperial Theme in the Sixteenth Century* (London and Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1975), pp. 29–86; See also Bauckham, *Tudor Apocalypse*, pp. 177–80.

[132] Brightman, *Song*, p. 1045.

introduced included Edward III (in his dispute with the pope)[133] and Edward VI, described as "that most holy King" for his rejection of the papacy.[134]

This emphasis upon England was both noted and critiqued by readers later in the seventeenth century. For example, Richard Baxter criticised Brightman as he "hath found *England* to be the thousand six hundred Furlongs, and *Cranmer* to be the Angel that had power over fire". He thus became the Father of those who argued "that almost half the *Revelation* spake of *England*".[135] In a similar way Thomas Fuller was incredulous at Brightman's interpretation: "as if *England,* half an Island in the Western corner, were more considerable than all the world besides, and the theater whereon so much should be performed".[136]

At this point, it is important to ask how Brightman's reading of England as Laodicea fitted into his scheme. Scholars such as Rodeny Petersen, Elizabeth Richey and Avihu Zakai have found it impossible to reconcile the two, seemingly contradictory, pictures of England advanced in Brightman's work. In their reading of Brightman "England could expect nothing but the righteous ire of God"[137]; an "inevitable"[138] judgement for their lukewarm attitude towards reform. Indeed, Brightman's reading of the English Church as Laodicea, and the possibility of a loss of privilege for the English nation appeared to hang continually over his reading of the chosen nation. As Brightman noted, "For howsoever that *Christ* hath now begun this eternall Kingdome, yet hath he not tied it to certain Countries. He will not want a Kingdome, although he should translate his Court and Palace to some other place, which he is able to do at his pleasure."[139]

This statement would at first glance appear to undermine Brightman's position on England's unique role. There were, however, two factors at work here. The first regards Brightman's view of the Church of England. While he was bitterly against separation from the established Church, Brightman was no Erastian.[140] The Church of England was not, for Brightman, an integral part of the state. The Church could therefore experience reform (and even judgement) without impacting upon the "chosen" role of the nation as a whole. Christ would, he believed, purify the Church of England by reforming it along Presbyterian lines: "It shall be therefore a punishment peculiar to the Ecclesiasticall men, without the destruction of the

[133]Brightman, *Song*, p. 1040.

[134]Brightman, *Song,* p. 1046.

[135]Richard Baxter, *Paraphrase on the New Testament* (London, 1691), f.292v.

[136]Fuller, *Church-History*, Book IX., p. 50.

[137]Zakai, *Exile*, pp. 51–52.

[138]Richey, *Politics of Revelation*, p. 40. See also Rodney L. Petersen, *Preaching in the Last Days: The Theme of 'Two Witnesses' in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), pp. 206–207.

[139]Brightman, *Revelation*, p. 382.

[140]". . . neither must we hold our selves contented with these corruptions, neither must they separate themselves from us for any blemishes". Brightman, *Revelation*, p. 159.

whole Church".[141] The second factor to consider is Brightman's rhetorical aim in his appeal to English readers. Brightman recognised that while Laodicea was in danger of destruction, the danger remained only theoretical. Laodicea was still the "*peerlesse Paragon*", promised a unique and providential destiny. As Claydon and McBride note, the concept of chosen nationhood was as much about aspiration as description. That is, writers who held that their nation was specially chosen by God did not hold that the nation was *entirely* made up of elect individuals, or that their churches currently represented the apex of reform.[142] Brightman therefore aimed to assert the primacy of England in God's plan without leading his countrymen into a presumptive security. This aspirational tension, between the current and future states of the English Church, explains the contrasting readings of Brightman's position found in scholars like Zakai and Richey, and those found in Firth and Christianson.[143] Brightman was therefore the first writer to combine two approaches to the question of nationhood described by Crawford Gribben. The concept of a "faithful remnant" envisioned the godly as a persecuted minority, unaided (or even attacked) by the state. The idea of the "reformed nation", however, was based around concepts of a godly prince, taking the lead to reform the nation and fight against papacy. As Gribben noted, both of these positions could be found in Foxe,[144] but it was Brightman who combined them to forge a new, aspirational reading of the chosen nation. Thus Brightman combined both the "covenant" *and* "missional" approaches discussed by Smith. Evidently Brightman's seventeenth-century readers were quite capable of seeing the parallel threads running together in his work. Fuller can be taken as an example. While he attacked Brightman's chosen nation motif, at the same time he was critical of his "resembling the Church of *England* to luke-warm *Laodicea,* praising, and preferring the purity of forrain Protestant-Churches".[145] Just as with the prophets of the Old Testament, Brightman was able to declare the dangers of disobedience whilst offering promises of future glory to his nation. As Patrick Collinson asked rhetorically: "Why was the Spirit so harsh in its criticism of Laodicea? 'As many as I love, I rebuke'".[146] Brightman therefore held out both the threat of a loss of "chosen" status and the promise of a glorious future for his nation.

Indeed, it seems that the passages promising distinct English blessings appear to have been placed quite deliberately. This is notable in Brightman's application of the "eternal Kingdom" to England. Having suggested that Christ's Kingdom (in England) was now "much the greater, because it should be eternall", he began to talk about an even greater glory when "[it] be increased infinitly by *the calling of the*

[141] Brightman, *Revelation*, p. 134.

[142] Claydon and McBride, "Trials", pp. 26–27.

[143] Zakai, *Exile and Kingdom*, pp. 51–52; Richey, *Politics of Revelation*, p. 40; .Firth, *Apocalyptic Tradition*, pp. 167–168; Christianson, *Reformers*, p. 100.

[144] Gribben, *Puritan Millennium*, pp. 63–64.

[145] Fuller, *Church-History*, Book IX, p. 50.

[146] Patrick Collinson, *The Birthpangs of Protestant England* (London: MacMillan, 1988), p. 16.

Jews". Immediately after this digression, he was brought back to reaffirm the nature of England as the chosen nation and the role Elizabeth played in this structure:

> And is there not a most evident proof given us of this eternall Kingdome, in that so great conspiracies and attempts, of so many and mighty enemies against *England* alone, *our most gracious Queen*, have vanished away like smoke, and come to nothing? He whose Scepter they strive to overthrow, laugheth at their foolish and vain enterprise.[147]

When Brightman mentioned Jewish restoration, he was led to emphasise the specifically English nature of that "eternal kingdom" being set up in his nation. Repeatedly, when Brightman applied a promise to the Jews, he was led to find a new hope and purpose for his English readers. This was done in two ways. Firstly, by highlighting the benefits of Jewish restoration for the reader. Thus his focus on the destruction of the Turks was emphasised by the epistle to the reader in his commentary on Daniel:

> Lo the very time of this deliveraunce [of the Jews] opened to thee, as well of it begun when tidings out of the East shall trouble the Turk . . . the Turkish name and empire both shall be utterly abolished, The greatnes of the Kingdomes under the whole heaven shalbee given to the people of the Saints of the most high.[148]

Secondly, he emphasised the role that his readers would play in bringing about end times events. In Revelation 16, for example, he described the "*Western Christians* . . . [pouring] forth their anger upon *Constantinople*" in tandem with the Jews.[149] That the English would have a role to play in the destruction of Rome and Constantinople was revealed in his diatribe against Bellarmine: "I hope that our Countrymen will never go more to visit *Rome*, unless perhaps it be to accompany this Angel to see, and help forward her destruction".[150] Here, Brightman was actively engaging in the re-creation of the Christian self in a national mould. As previously discussed, in re-literalising Old Testament promises of Jewish restoration, Brightman removed an important type of Christian identity. The Gentile church, Brightman implied, was destined to be inferior to the Jewish church (at least) until Christ's return; to be the Leah who had "crept in" to God's favour. This removed both a traditional model of Christian identity and the standard eschatological hope of the second coming. By introducing the "chosen" nation motif, however, Brightman emphasised a new pattern on which the elect could model their identity. His readers should now identify themselves not simply as antitypes of Old Testament believers, but as active members of a redeemed *English* community. Through their Englishness they entered into a unique heritage and took their place in the nation which would be at the forefront of God's plans for the destruction of Antichrist. This provided a new motivation towards godliness and reform in his readers, in calling them to live up to their chosen role, to move away

[147]Brightman, *Revelation*, pp. 381–382.

[148]Brightman, *Daniel*, p. 5.

[149]Brightman, *Revelation*, p. 555.

[150]Brightman, *Revelation*, pp. 766–767.

from their Laodicean luke-warmness and join with those who will "help forward [Rome's] destruction". Brightman did not merely indulge in self-shattering, but also in self-reconstruction; a rebuilding of the self in a national mode. As Helgerson notes, "every discourse of nationhood is also a discourse of self".[151] Of course, this does not discount the broad, protestant internationalism that Brightman presumed in his work.[152] His exegesis of the Philadelphian church praised Scotland and Geneva in particular.[153] He did not seek to discount the international brotherhood of believers, only to emphasise the lead role that England would play in destroying Rome, and the blessings which England was certain to inherit as she became a fully reformed nation and church.

James Shapiro's thoughts on seventeenth-century views of the Jew and the self are useful in the context of this discussion. Shapiro argues that a change occurred in conceptions of Jewishness over the seventeenth century. He traces a move away from the use of the Jew as a type of the Christian self, towards the use of the Jew as a figure for modelling national identity. The Jew, in his opinion, served as the other, providing a way for the Englishman to define his nationality: "the opposition of Christian and Jew was slowly overtaken by that of Englishman and Jew".[154] In other words, the Jews acted as a marker of alterity, by which Englishness could be developed. The desire for the Jews to be restored to Palestine was, in Shapiro's eyes, a chance to re-affirm Englishness, to mark one's national identity in clearly defined terms against radical difference. For the Jew could never become English. John Foxe's convert, after all, remained only "a certaine Jew"; even as a Christian he remained marked as inherently other. Shapiro goes so far as to suggest that the desire to readmit the Jews to England in the 1650s may have been caused by a desire to redefine Englishness after a period of instability. The Jews appeared to personify unchanging (and certainly un-English) characteristics against which "normality" could be defined.[155]

The pattern of self-identification noted above helps to sharpen Shapiro's theory. Brightman takes the first steps away from the traditional markers of puritan selfhood identified by Lewalski and Luxon. Brightman therefore moved to emphasise not only *religious* but also *national* differences between the Jew and the Christian. In Brightman, this distinction redrew and re-created the Christian self as a figure marked by Englishness. This self should not now be drawn through Old Testament characters, or based on promises which rightly belonged to the Jews. Future hopes should not look towards either the second coming, or the resurrection of the dead, as both were placed in an awkward position, and moved, as it were, almost beyond

[151] Helgerson, *Forms*, p. 294.

[152] A consistent theme in works in the 1590s was an emphasis on a Protestant brotherhood working together to destroy the papacy. See Bauckham, *Tudor Apocalypse*, pp. 177–80.

[153] See Crawford Gribben, "'Passionate Desires and Confident Hopes': Puritan Millenarianism and Anglo-Scottish Union, 1560–1644", *Reformation and Renaissance Review* 4:2 (2002), p. 250.

[154] Shapiro, *Shakespeare and the Jews*, p. 225.

[155] Shapiro, *Shakespeare and the Jews*, pp. 131–229.

the boundaries of scripture itself. The *true* Jews were not now Christians, but the Jews themselves. The Jew once again, became the other. While this was a positive other when compared to Catholics or Turks, it was an other none the less, even *after* conversion. The reader moved away from traditional self-identification in the model suggested by Guibbory, Bercovitch and Luxon and towards the increasingly nationalistic model suggested by Shapiro (although, as I will argue in the following chapters, Shapiro's work has problems of its own). The practical out-workings of Brightman's thought, however, would not become clear until the years following his death and the publication of his work. His positions on hermeneutics, Judaism and national identity were picked up and began to have consequences in the wider debates of the early seventeenth century. Indeed, Brightman became a separatist icon, a political prophet and one of the key influences on the eschatological thinking of the next 50 years. It is to his influence and impact that we can now turn.

References

Achinstein, Sharon. 2001. John Foxe and the Jews. *Renaissance Quarterly* 54: 86–120.

Almond, Philip. 2007. Thomas Brightman and the origins of philo-semitism: An Elizabethan theologian and the return of the Jews to Israel. *Reformation and Renaissance Review* 9: 3–25.

Ames, William. 1633. *A fresh suit against human ceremonies in God's worship*. Amsterdam.

Bale, John. 1580. *The image of both churches*.

Bercovitch, Sacvan. 1975. *The puritan origins of the American self*. New Haven/London: Yale University Press.

Brightman, Thomas. 1635. *A most comfortable exposition of the last and most difficult part of the prophecie of Daniel from the 26. verse of the 11. chap, to the end of the 12. chapter. Wherin the restoring of the Jewes and their callinge to the faith of Christ, after the utter overthrow of their three last enemies, is set forth in livelie coulours*. Amsterdam.

Brightman, Thomas. 1644a. *A commentary on the Canticles or the song of Salomon wherein the text is analised, the native signification of the words declared, the allegories explained, and the order of the times whereunto they relate observed*. London.

Brightman, Thomas. 1644b. *The revelation of St. Iohn illustrated with an analysis & scholions . . . The Fourth Edition, Corrected & Amended*. London.

Brightman, Thomas. 1646. *The art of self-deniall*. London.

Brightman, Thomas. 1647. *Brightman redivivus: or the post-humian of-spring of Mr. Thomas Brightman, in IIII. Sermons*. London.

Broughton, Hugh. 1596. *Daniel his chaldie visions*. London.

Calvin, John. 1581. *A commentarie of M. I. Calvine upon the epistle to the Galathians*. London.

Calvin, John. 1584. *A commentarie of M. Iohn Calvine uppon the epistle to the Philippians*. London.

Calvin, John. 1852–3. *Commentaries on the Book of the Prophet Daniel,* 2 vols. Trans. Thomas Meyers. Edinburgh: Calvin Translation Society.

Christianson, Paul. 1978. *Reformers and Babylon: English apocalyptic visions from the reformation to the eve of the civil war*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Claydon, Tony, and Ian McBride (eds.). 1998. *Protestantism and national identity: Britain and Ireland, c.1650–c.1850*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Cogley, Richard W. 2003. The fall of the Ottoman Empire and the restoration of Israel in the "Judeo-Centric" strand of puritan millenarianism. *Church History* 72: 304–332.

Cogley, Richard W. 2005. 'The most vile and barbarous nation of all the world': Giles Fletcher the Elder's *The Tartars or, Ten Tribes* (ca. 1610). *Renaissance Quarterly* 58: 781–814.
Collinson, Patrick. 1988. *The birthpangs of protestant England*. London: Macmillan.
Culver, Douglas. 1995. *Albion and Ariel*. New York: Peter Lang.
Edward, Arber (ed.). 1874–8. *A transcript of the registers of the company of stationers of London*. London: Privately Printed.
Firth, Katherine. 1979. *The apocalyptic tradition in reformation Britain 1530–1645*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Forbes, Patrick. 1613. *An exquisite commentarie upon the revelation of Saint John*. London.
Foxe, John. 1578. *A sermon preached at the christening of a certaine Jew.* London.
Fuller, Thomas. 1655. *The church-history of Britain from the birth of Jesus Christ until the year M.DC.XLVIII*. London.
Gilsdorf, Joy. 1989. *The puritan apocalypse: New England eschatology in the seventeenth century*. New York/London: Garland.
Glaser, Eliane. 2007. *Judaism without Jews: Philosemitism and Christian polemic in early modern England*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
Gribben, Crawford. 2002. 'Passionate desires and confident hopes': Puritan millenarianism and Anglo-Scottish Union, 1560–1644. *Reformation and Renaissance Review* 4: 241–258.
Gribben, Crawford. 2008. *The puritan millennium: Literature and theology, 1550–1682*, Revised ed. Milton Keynes: Paternoster.
Guibbory, Achsah. 2010. *Christian identity, Jews and Israel in seventeenth-century England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Haller, William. 1963. *Foxe's book of martyrs and the elect nation*. London: Jonathan Cape.
Harrington, John. 1804. A discourse shewing that Elyas must personally come before the day of judgement. In *Nugae antiquae.* London: J. Wright.
Helgerson, Richard. 1992. *Forms of nationhood: The Elizabethan writing of England*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Hill, Christopher. 1963. *The English Bible and the seventeenth-century revolution*. London: Allen Lane/The Penguin Press.
Howell, James. 1656. *Some sober inspections made into carriage and consults of the late long-parliament*. London.
Joye, George. 1545. *The exposicion of Daniel the prophete*. Geneva (i.e. Antwerp).
Jue, Jeffrey K. 2006. *Heaven upon Earth: Joseph Mede (1586–1638) and the legacy of millenarianism*. Dordrecht: Springer.
Katz, David S. 1982. *Philo-semitism and the readmission of the Jews to England 1603–1655*. Oxford: Clarendon.
Lewalski, Barbara. 1979. *Protestant poetics and the seventeenth-century religious lyric*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
Lewis, Donald. 2010. *The origins of Christian Zionism*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
Luxon, Thomas H. 1993. 'Not I, but Christ': Allegory and the puritan self. *English Literary History* 60: 899–937.
Luxon, Thomas H. 1995. *Literal figures: Puritan allegory and the reformation crisis in representation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Marshall, Cynthia. 2002. *The shattering of the self: Violence, subjectivity, and early modern texts*. Baltimore/London: Johns Hopkins University Press.
Matar, Nabil. 1998. *Islam in Britain 1558–1685*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
Mleynek, Sherryll. 2005. The rhetoric of the 'Jewish Problem' in the *Left Behind* novels. *Literature and Theology* 19: 367–383.
Napier, John. 1594. *A plaine discoverie of the whole revelation of Saint John*. Edinburgh.
Nice, Jason A. 2006. 'The peculiar place of God' : Early modern representations of England and France. *English Historical Review* XCCI: 1002–1018.
Parry, Glyn. 1999. Elect Church or elect nation? The reception of the *acts and monuments*. In *John Foxe: An historical perspective*, ed. David Loades, 167–181. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Perkins, William. 1604. *Lectures upon the three first chapters of the revelation*. London.
Pestana, Carla Gardina. 2009. *Protestant Empire: Religion and the making of the British Atlantic World*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
Petersen, Rodney L. 1993. *Preaching in the last days: The theme of 'Two Witnesses' in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Richmond, Colin. 1992. Englishness and medieval Anglo-Jewry. In *The Jewish heritage in British history: Englishness and Jewishness*, ed. Tony Kushner, 42–59. London: Frank Cass.
Sawday, Jonathan. 1997. Self and selfhood in the seventeenth century. In *Rewriting the self: Stories from the renaissance to the present*, ed. Roy Porter, 29–41. London/New York: Routledge.
Scott-Warren, Jason. 2005. *Early modern English literature*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.
Shapiro, James. 1996. *Shakespeare and the Jews*. New York: Columbia University Press.
Shrank, Cathy. 2004. *Writing the nation in reformation England, 1530–1580*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Shuger, Deborah. 1994. *The renaissance Bible: Scholarship, sacrifice, and subjectivity*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Smith, Anthony D. 2003. *Chosen peoples*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Smith, Anthony D. 2008. *The cultural foundations of nations: Hierarchy, covenant and republic*. Oxford: Blackwell.
Taylor, Charles. 1989. *Sources of the self: The making of modern identity*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
Willet, Andrew. 1600. *Synopsis papismi, that is a general view of papistire*. London.
Yates, Francis A. 1975. *Astraea: The imperial theme in the sixteenth century*. London/Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
Zakai, Avihu. 1992. *Exile and kingdom: History and apocalypse in the puritan migration to America*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Chapter 5
Thomas Brightman and Judeo-Centrism 1610–1640

Given the interest in puritan eschatology over the previous 40 years, it is surprising that no in-depth studies of Brightman's influence have been conducted. Although it has been claimed that knowledge of Brigthman's work was "limited" prior to 1640,[1] a number of key eschatological works were in fact heavily influenced by his writings in this earlier period. The general studies of puritan eschatology that have emerged over recent years, in particular Gribben's work, have done much to enhance our understanding of millennialism in general. Yet they have remained focused on the political and theological implications of the various understandings of Revelation 20. While this is understandable (as the passage is the key text for the millennial myth), by focusing on this subject too heavily many other areas of interest in millenarian thought remain under-examined. This is the case with the Judeo-centric focus that emerged in Brightman's work, a theme sorely in need of further study.[2] Of course, works by Douglas Culver and Richard W. Cogley have significantly expanded our understanding of Judeo-centric eschatology. Yet their approaches leave room for development. Culver's work, for example, was overly descriptive without providing detailed explanations of *why* and *how* the focus on the Jews changed over the course of the early seventeenth century. It is also representative of a much older historiographical tradition, citing no work published after the later 1960s. While Cogley's articles on the subjects remain the most meticulous works in the emerging study of Judeo-centric eschatology, his thematic approach described

---

Parts of this chapter originally appeared in an earlier form in '"The proper and naturall meaning of the Prophets': the hermeneutic roots of Judeo-centric eschatology", *Renaissance Studies* 24:5 (Nov. 2010), 725–741. I am grateful to Wiley-Blackwell and the editors of *Renaissance Studies* for permission to reprint here.

[1] Gibson, "Eschatology, Apocalypse, and Millenarianism", p. 247.

[2] Robert O. Smith's *More Desired Than Our Owne Salvation: The Roots of Christian Zionism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013) was forthcoming as this book went to press, and appears to offer some welcome examination of Judeo-centrism in the period.

A. Crome, *The Restoration of the Jews: Early Modern Hermeneutics, Eschatology, and National Identity in the Works of Thomas Brightman*, International Archives of the History of Ideas Archives internationales d'histoire des idées 213,
DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-04762-1_5,

the positions of Judeo-centric writers from 1600 to 1670 as if they remained constant throughout that period. This approach is in danger of ignoring the developments – political and eschatological – which occurred in the period leading up to the Civil Wars. The most recent examination of the theme – Achsah Guibbory's study of the English appropriations of Jewish identification in the early modern period – has cast Judeo-centrism as antithetical to the mainstream construction of national identity in the period.[3] Yet, as the previous chapter suggested, Brightman's Judeo-centrism had driven him towards a greater focus on England's role in apocalyptic events than his predecessors. While it would be easy to presume that by removing the possible identification of England with Israel Judeo-centrism automatically undermined the construction of national identity, those writers who promoted the concept were also active in promoting a biblically rooted "chosen" national identity. The following two chapters will therefore focus upon the impact of Brightman's hermeneutical approach and the Judeo-centrism that resulted from it, rather than the influence of his millennial scheme (which was not widely accepted, with the notable exception of James Ussher).[4] This chapter examines these themes up to 1640, while the next looks at the ways in which Brightman's work was received up until the Restoration in 1660.

Works influenced by Brightman can be divided into two groups. The first includes writers who primarily took up Brightman's identification of the Church of England as Laodicea. This includes a number of Brownist commentaries published on the continent. In the second group are works that accepted Brightman's eschatological scheme itself. In particular, the link I have traced between a "consistently" literal hermeneutic, Judeo-centric theology, and the idea of the "chosen" nation will be seen to be a consistent theme in these commentaries and tracts. We begin, however, with the responses of those outside the mainstream of English puritanism.

5.1 Separatist Readings of Brightman

There are two trends within studies of puritan millenarianism. One, reflective of recent revisionist approaches to early modern English history, emphasises the moderate nature of millenarian thought, with the most recent example of this being Jeffery K. Jue's study of Joseph Mede.[5] The other, often associated with Marxist historiography, equates millenarianism with radical movements of political unrest,

[3] Guibbory, *Christian Identity*, pp. 186–219.

[4] Gribben has identified the use of Brightman's dual-millennial scheme in the unpublished third part of James Ussher's *Gravissimae Quaestionis de Christianarum Ecclesiarum Successione et Statu*, written in 1613. Beyond this, there are few direct applications of Brightman's dual-millennial position (Gribben, *Puritan Millennium*, pp. 92–102).

[5] Jue, *Heaven*, pp. 3–7.

seeking to actively bring about the millennial kingdom through political means.[6] This has led to a tendency to stress one of these positions at the expense of the other in secondary examinations of the topic. While revisionists have rightly corrected the excesses of those who viewed religious interests as little more than a cipher for political activity, they have at times been too prone to stress the orthodoxy of millennial belief. This is sometimes due to the beliefs of the secondary critic, with studies on early modern millennialism often motivated by the personal religious concerns of the modern writer.[7] The difficulty with these approaches is that they tend to ignore the fact that those who actually held millenarian positions can rarely be slotted into neatly delineated categories. Millenarian thought was capable of being put to both moderate and radical uses.[8] While this study has suggested that Brightman was himself (broadly speaking) politically moderate, the fact remains that his work was often used for subversive political causes. This was most evident in the uses of his Laodicean reading. While the majority of this chapter will trace the reception of Brightman by readers who remained firmly within the Church of England, it is important to see the way in which Brightman was used by separatists in the period 1610–1640. By doing so, it is possible to trace a key distinction in the manner in which Brightman's work influenced later readers. That is, between the impact of his Laodicean reading and the impact of his Judeo-centric reading.

Brightman's work was not published in England until 1644. Nonetheless, his commentaries were clearly being read and debated in his homeland soon after their first publication on the continent. John Floyd's 1612 Catholic polemic against William Crashaw, *The Overthrow of the Protestants Pulpit*, made use of Brightman's attack on the papal antichrist in *Apocalypsis Apocalypseos* to mock its target,[9] while Samuel Purchas discussed the downfall of the Turks and etymology of the term "Caliphate" with references to Brightman's works in 1613.[10] At other times Brightman's Constantinian reading was used to portray Protestants as dedicated to

[6]For example, Hill, *Antichrist*, pp. 161–77; Liu, *Discord in Zion*, pp. 87–145; Lamont, *Godly Rule*, p. 164. See also Norman Cohn's classic *The Pursuit of the Millennium* (London: Secker & Warburg, 1957).

[7]For contrasting examples involving pre-millennialism and post-millennialism see Paul Wilkinson, *For Zion's Sake: Christian Zionism and the Role of John Nelson Darby* (Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2007), pp. 135–60 and Iain H. Murray, *The Puritan Hope*, pp. 1–78.

[8]Toon's edited volume divides millenarian positions between "Conservative" and "Extreme" (see Bernard Capp, "Extreme Millennarianism" in Toon (ed.), *Puritans, The Millennium* . . . , pp. 66–90), a reading which Gribben explicitly critiques as lacking theological nuance (*Puritan Millennium*, p. 10). On one level, the labels chosen here are open to the same criticism. However, "radical" and "conservative/moderate" are used primarily in an *ecclesiological* sense to describe those who remained (or did not remain) within the established church. Toon's categories (and Gribben's criticism) refer to the Interregnum period. I make no such claim for my categories.

[9]John Floyd, *The Overthrow of the Protestants Pulpit* (Saint Omer, 1612), p. 73.

[10]Samuel Purchas, *Purchas, his Pilgrimage. Or Relations of the World and Religions observed* (London, 1613), pp. 249, 285.

monarchical authority,[11] or his commentary used simply as a useful reference source in sermons.[12] In Ireland, Brightman's commentaries reached the library of Trinity College Dublin as early as 1609.[13] Brightman's attack on Bellarmine elicited an official Catholic response in 1611. Written by the Jesuit Andreas Eudaemon-Joannes (d. 1625) it described Brightman as "puritanorum", dismissing his commentary as being full of hallucinations.[14] Eudaemon-Joannes was particularly critical of the way in which Brightman enlarged the "synagoga iudeoru", concluding that Brightman's interpretation of the Jewish hope was suggestive either of insanity or drunkenness.[15] The work was a generally unsurprising piece of polemic, attacking Protestantism in general as well as Brightman's more unusual interpretations.

In 1612, French separatist Jean de l'Ecluse published an attack on Brightman's work. Apparently a translator on the first English edition of the Revelation commentary, his major complaint was Brightman's failure to argue for separation from the established church.[16] The debate was expanded in a reply by John Fowler, Clement Saunders and Robert Bulwarde in which they accused l'Ecluse of adding his own pro-separation glosses to the commentary and putting them through the presses. When discovered, he was forced to correct and reprint the work at his own expense.[17] Yet while l'Ecluse found Brightman's work too lenient on the Church of England, others quickly realised the potential dangers of the Laodicean reading. This was seen clearly in a series of John Boys's sermons published in 1612. Preaching on the theme of thankfulness from Philippians 1:3, Boys attacked "Ungratefull Schismatikes [who] affirme that the Church of England is like the Church of Laodicea, neither hot nor cold". A marginal note referred readers to Brightman's commentary on Revelation.[18] These sermons could have been preached no later than 1611, and show that Brightman's reading of the English

[11] Samuel Collins, *Epphata to F.T.*, pp. 532–535. The fact that Brightman was used in a work written as a defence of Lancelot Andrewes highlights the fact that his writings were well known outside of his immediate circle in puritan Bedfordshire.

[12] Thomas Adams, *The Black Devil* (London, 1615), p. 4. Adams was curate at Northill, six miles from Hawnes, until being dismissed in 1611. While theologically an episcopalian, he shared Brightman's enthusiasm for Calvinism and it is entirely possible that he knew and worked with Brightman during his lifetime.

[13] Gribben, *Puritan Millennium*, p. 98.

[14] Andreae Eudaemon-Joannes, *Castigatio Apocalypsis Apocalypseos Thomae Brightmanni Angli* (Cologne, 1611), pp. 1–6.

[15] Eudaemon-Joannes, *Castigatio*, p. 20.

[16] l'Ecluse, *Advertisement*, p. 3.

[17] Bulwarde, Fowler, and Saunders, *Shield of Defence*, p. 3. The claim that the writers had his misprinted proofs with them was not implausible – the printer of the tract was Henrick Laurenss, one of the printers of the 1611 edition of Brightman's *Revelation*. l'Ecluse's tract is cited in Ephraim Pagitt's *Heresiography, or, A discription of the hereticks and sectaries of these latter times* (London, 1645) as one of several which should be read to "know more of the Sectaries" (p. 74).

[18] John Boys, *The Autumn Part from the Twelfth Sunday after Trinitie* (London, 1612), pp. 175–176.

Church as Laodicea had made an impact in his home country soon after the first editions were published on the continent. For Boys to address the opinion publicly, the view must have gained at least some popular approval. Indeed, it was clearly recognised as a dangerous theme by printers of the time. In 1613, Scottish minister Patrick Forbes's commentary on Revelation was published in London. The work featured an uncontroversial reading of the seven churches as types of conditions experienced by all congregations throughout history.[19] When the book was published the following year at Middelburg, however, it revealed a very different interpretation of Revelation 2–3. In a sentence missing from the London edition, Forbes noted that "these seven (as appeereth) have a typical relation to the whole Church militant". Each church therefore had a historical antitype. Thus: "the Church of *Ephesus* hath relation to the first times of the Church . . . *Smirna* hath relation to these times when heretikes prevailing became proude, as in the *Arrians*".[20] As Arthur Williamson noted, the ideas Forbes expressed in the Middelburg edition were clearly those of Brightman. While Forbes's focus on the theme was brief and he did not name any national churches, it seems likely that his adoption of the reading came too close to reminding readers of Brightman's link between the Church of England and Laodicea to be included in the London edition.[21] As early as 1613 publishers were therefore aware of a link between the Laodicean reading and potential radicalism.

The popularity of the Laodicean trope continued to grow, however. In his 1617 commentary on Revelation, Richard Bernard bemoaned the fact "that men rest not satisfied, but desire to be informed in some particulars, and especially touching an opinion of Master *Brightmans*, which is this, that the seven Churches mentioned . . . *are so many types representing and containing the universal condition of the whole Church of the Gentiles*".[22] The idea that Bernard's readers were, as early as 1617, intrigued by Brightman's reading of the seven churches is suggestive of the particularly strong influence Brightman's work was having from a relatively early date.[23] This is further emphasised by the way in which Brightman was used by Brownists in defence of their separatist doctrine. On the continent, John Robinson used Brightman to prove that the Church of England was, effectively, a lost cause.[24] In roughly the same period, future bishop Richard Sanderson was

[19]Forbes, *Exquisite Commentarie*, sig. B3^{ii}v.

[20]Patrick Forbes, *An Learned Commentarie upon the Revelation of Saint John* (Middelburg, 1614), pp. 2–7.

[21]Arthur Williamson, *Scottish National Consciousness in the Age of James VI* (Edinburgh: John Donald, 1979), p. 177 n32.

[22]Richard Bernard, *A Key of Knowledge for the Opening of the Secret Mysteries of St Johns Mysticall Revelation* (London, 1617), sig. C4^{iii}r.

[23]Bernard's own reading was also unique: He believed that he was writing in the Philadelphian period, and that Laodicea represented a future state after the battle of Armageddon, at which the church would grow complacent and rich in her victory.

[24]John Robinson, *A Just and Necassarie Apologie Of Certain Christians, No Lesse Contumeliously Then Commonly Called Brownists or Barrowists* (Amsterdam, 1625), p. 71. A similar argument

criticising Brightman for the same reason. Sanderson explicitly linked Brightman to the separatists: "Their great admired *opener* of the Revelation, maketh our Church the *Linsey-Wolsey Laodicean* Church; neither *hot* nor *cold*" he noted. Sanderson believed that this reading was unpatriotic: "[they] compare our late gracious Soveraigne Queene *Elizabeth* . . . to a *sluttish housewife*; that having swept the house, yet left the *dust and durt* behinde the doores, meaning thereby the *Ceremonies*".[25] These texts evidence a failure to appreciate either the nuance of Brightman's position on Laodicea, or his use of the repentance motif, even in a relatively early period. Brightman had not attacked the *concept* of the national church, but rather the idea of episcopacy and the retention of the ceremonial in worship.[26] This distinction was increasingly lost over the 1620s and 1630s. Amidst growing controversy surrounding Laudian innovations in the church, it was unsurprising that the fierce threats of Brightman's Laodicean warning received more focus than the promises of future blessing he found for England. Brightman's views therefore became increasingly useful in a political context. For an episcopalian like Sanderson, Brightman served as a figure through which to attack the separatists. In a meditation of 1619, James I had similarly described Brightman as a "vain chiliast" who sought to "bring down that heavenly Jerusalem, and settle it in this world".[27] For Brownists like Robertson and John Canne, however, Brightman was more akin to a prophet. The church's sin "cannot be better shewed, then *Mr. Brightman* hath truly done it".[28] This (combined with the Thirty Years War)[29] helps to explain the number of claims made about Brightman during the political turmoil of the early 1640s, in which he was presented as a martyr, persecuted by the prelacy: "*banished by the Bishops, and this Commentary condemned by them to the fire*"[30]; "glad to flye out of the Land, because hee was persecuted by the Bishops".[31] While it is clear that Brightman's work began to be used for increasingly radical purposes in

---

is found in the John Canne's later, *A Necessitie of Separation from the Church of England* ([Amsterdam], 1634), p. 18.

[25]Robert Sanderson, *Two Sermons: Preached at Two Severall Visitations, at Boston* (London, 1622), pp. 43–44.

[26]See Brightman's attack on the Marprelate tracts (Brightman, *Revelation*, pp. 149–50) and his statement that "neither must we hold our selves contented with these corruptions, neither must they [separatists] separate themselves from us for any blemishes" (Brightman, *Revelation*, p. 159).

[27]James I and VI, "Meditation upon the Lord's Prayer" in *Workes* (London, 1620), p. 581.

[28]John Canne, *Necessitie*, p. 18.

[29]Brightman had identified the Church of Sardis with Lutheran churches in Germany, arguing that "some new, huge and sudden calamity will come upon you, unlesse ye will straight wayes obey the *Holy Ghost*" (Brightman, *Revelation*, p. 108). As the tract popularisations of his work noted, this "calamity" seemed to have been fulfilled in the cruelty of the war (see [Anon.], *Brightmans Predictions and Prophecies* (London, 1641a), pp. 3–4).

[30][Anon.], *Reverend Mr. Brightmans Judgement* (London, 1642), Title page.

[31][Anon.], *A Revelation of Mr. Brightmans Revelation*, (London, 1641b), p. 2.

the period leading up to the English Civil Wars,[32] the remainder of this chapter will focus on a second and usually ignored element of his reception – that is, the way his hermeneutic influenced the development of Judeo-centric readings.

5.2 The Early Reception of Brightman's Work

The first positive reading of Brightman appeared in Giles Fletcher's manuscript *The Tartars or the Ten Tribes*, a work which dealt with the restoration of the Jews. Fletcher, formerly ambassador to Russia during Elizabeth's reign, wrote the text at some point between 1610 and his death in March 1611. However, it was not published until given to Samuel Lee by Fletcher's grandson in 1677, who printed it with his own work as *Israel Redux*.[33] The text dealt with the question of whether the ten lost tribes of Israel, exiled to Assyria in 722 BCE, would be reunited and restored to Palestine before the return of Christ. The tribes were an important theme in Stuart apocalyptic speculation.[34] As early as 1606 a tract had been published warning of "Two mighty armies" made up of the ten tribes, marching on Turkish territories to "recover the land of promise".[35] Fletcher used this idea to sustain his argument for Jewish restoration. Locating the tribes was essential, so as to know where and when their return could be expected. If they were not returned, the promises of

[32]Bernard Capp has described those who popularised Brightman's work as "hacks". See Capp, "The Fifth Monarchists and Popular Millenarianism" in *Radical Religion in the English Revolution*, eds J.F. McGregor and B. Reay (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984), p. 177.

[33]See Samuel Lee "Epistle to the Reader" in Giles Fletcher, *Israel Redux, or, The Restauration of Israel* (London, 1677), sig. A2r. The manuscript was in circulation well before Lee's publication of it; Thomas Thorowgood read the work in manuscript in the late 1630s (see Thomas Thorowgood's *Jewes in America* (London, 1650), p. 39). For recent examinations of Fletcher's work see Culver, *Albion*, pp. 89–96; Richard W. Cogley, "Most Vile . . . ", pp. 781–814.

[34]This theme is seen most strikingly in the assertion that the tribes were resident amongst the Native American population. This was an idea popularised through Menasseh ben Israel's inclusion of Anthony Montezinos's account of finding a secretive Jewish tribe in Peru in his seminal *Hope of Israel* (London, 1651). See pp. 1–7 for Montezinos's account, and pp. 7–20 for Menasseh's support. The theme was also expounded in Thorowgood's *Jewes in America* and featured in an appendix by John Dury to Edward Winslow's *The Glorious Progress of the Gospel Amongst the Indians* (London, 1649), pp. 22–28. For more on this see particularly Katz, *Philo-Semitism*, pp. 144–156; Richard W. Cogley, "The Ancestry of the American Indians: Thomas Thorowgood's *Iewes in America* (1650) and *Jews in America* (1660)", *English Literary Renaissance* 35:2 (2005a), pp. 304–330 and "'Some other kinde of being and condition': The Controversy in Mid-Seventeenth-Century England over the peopling of ancient America", *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 68:1 (2007), pp. 35–56; Amy Sturgis, "Prophesies and Politics: Millenarians, Rabbis, and the Jewish Indian Theory", *Seventeenth Century* 14 (1999), pp. 15–23; Claire Jowitt, "Radical Identities? Native Americans, Jews, and the English Commonwealth", *Seventeenth Century,* 10:1 (Spring 1995), pp. 101–119 and Tudor Parfitt, *The Lost Tribes of Israel: The History of a Myth* (London: Weldenfeld & Nicholson, 2002).

[35]*A Jewes Prophesy, or, Newes from Rome* (London, 1607), p. 6.

restoration in the Old Testament would have been found to be false.[36] Fletcher's thought reflected an increasing desire to begin the *practical* process of restoring the Jews to Palestine. Although Brightman had believed the tribes to be somewhere east of the Euphrates, his work had shown no desire to locate them. Yet finding the tribes became a central part of Judeo-centric eschatology from Fletcher onwards, as it led to a clearer understanding of how and where God would bring about the Jewish conversion.[37]

Of course, attempts to identify the fate of the tribes were not new. What was novel in Fletcher was his emphasis on their return. While previous works had focused on the loss of the tribes as an expression of God's judgement on the Jews, Fletcher concentrated on their return to Palestine as the reversal of that punishment. Using his experience of Russia, Fletcher believed the tribes to be currently made up of the Tartar people living in the Crimea and other areas surrounding the Black Sea. Fletcher was aware that his opinion might appear distasteful, as the Tartars were a despised and savage people, often associated with the barbarians Alexander the Great had supposedly locked behind the Caspian Gates.[38] Nonetheless, he argued, their very barbarity was a fit punishment from God for Jewish sins.[39] It was this judgement which would be reversed through their conversion and restoration. This answers Richard Cogley's difficulty with Fletcher's position. As the eschatological claims of Judeo-centrism depended on the Jews maintaining their separate identity, to find them among a known people group suggested that their distinctiveness had been lost, a claim Cogley finds deeply inconsistent with that of the eschatological position as a whole.[40] Yet for Fletcher and later writers on the tribes, the Jews were not usually seen to have assimilated into another ethnic group. They had degenerated *into* the Tartars, not joined with them. The emphasis in both this and later works on the subject was on the tribes forgetting their calling as a result of judgement and being reminded of their true identity through the gospel.[41]

While Fletcher's theory partly rested upon the resemblance between Hebrew and Tartar language and customs (e.g. circumcision and tribal organisation), his main argument was based upon scripture. Using Revelation 16:12–14, he argued that the sixth vial referred to the "*Jews* calling from their dispersion among the *Gentiles*, to their ancient dwelling-place, and Native Country".[42] The key to understanding this verse was his interpretation of the "Kings of the East", whose identity he claimed had been over allegorised in the past. They should not be read figuratively, but

[36]Fletcher, *Israel*, p. 3.

[37]See Cogley, "The Controversy in Mid-Seventeenth-Century England", pp. 35–56.

[38]For the Caspian Gates legends see Margaret Meserve, *Empires of Islam in Renaissance Historical Thought* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2008), pp. 249–256.

[39]Specifically their idolatry – since the ten tribes were exiled before Christ's first advent, it was problematic to suggest they should suffer for the sin of his crucifixion. See Fletcher, *Israel*, p. 6.

[40]Cogley, "'Most Vile . . . '", pp. 796–802.

[41]John Dury, "An Appendix" in Winslow, *Glorious Progress*, p. 24 misl. p. 17.

[42]Fletcher, *Israel*, p. 22.

"literally understood of Kings indeed".[43] The existing tribes of Judah and Benjamin, who were currently without a monarch, were therefore not included among the "Kings". Rather, the term referred to a people made up of many tribal kings, such as the Tartars.[44] The inspiration for this reading was clearly Brightman. Indeed, in closing his treatise, Fletcher noted:

> . . . so this work of God, which shall be famous in all the World, even the restoring of this people [the Jews], may be observed by other Nations, with great reason and probability is affirmed by *Th. Brightman*, the last interpreter of that Book, whom God endued with special gifts, and great brightness after his name, for the full clearing and exposition of that Prophecy, above all that hitherto have written of it.[45]

Fletcher used two of Brightman's major themes – the consistently literal sense of Old Testament prophecy and the return of the Jews – as the starting point for his own commentary and apocalyptic speculation. In Fletcher's eyes, Brightman had unlocked the mystery of the sixth vial, which enabled the former ambassador to understand the Jews' calling. Fletcher therefore legitimated Brightman's hermeneutical method to such an extent that he focused on the practicalities of locating the ten tribes in anticipation of their restoration.

Many of these same themes were taken up and critically debated in Thomas Wilson's (1552/3-1622) *Christian Dictionarie*, first published in 1612.[46] Wilson's work is fascinating from a hermeneutical perspective, as he wrestled with the meaning of the literal sense and the dangerous possibility that words might mislead the reader. "The cheefe words of our Science," he noted, "being very hard and darkesome, sound in the eares of our weake Schollers, as Latine or Greeke words".[47] To this end his dictionary aimed to defend against misapplications of the spiritual senses of scripture. "Where any word is by the Holy-Ghost drawne from his proper sence, to an improper and figurative signification" the book enabled the reader to find the correct meaning. All of this revealed a deep sense of fear about the way in which the "literal" could deceive. Even in the vernacular the "simple" sense of the text could render the Bible as unapproachable as when it had been locked up in "Latine or Greeke". Perhaps unsurprisingly given their complexity, Wilson dedicated two separate appendices to the book of Revelation and the Song of Songs, which acted almost as independent commentaries on the biblical books.

---

[43] Fletcher, *Israel*, p. 23.

[44] Fletcher, *Israel*, pp. 22–26.

[45] Fletcher, *Israel*, pp. 27–28.

[46] Wilson is not to be confused with either the English logician of the same name (1523–1581) or the later Thomas Wilson (1601–1653), a puritan minister who employed Brightman's Laodicean image in a number of sermons. For information on the later Wilson's apocalyptic stance see Christianson, *Reformers*, pp. 186–87; Surridge, "Art", p. 250 n.13. I explore the eschatology and structural evolution of Wilson's work further in Andrew Crome, "Language and Millennialism in the Evolving Editions of Thomas Wilson's *Christian Dictionary* (1612–1678)", *Reformation and Renaissance Review* 13:3 (Dec. 2011), pp. 311–337.

[47] Thomas Wilson, *A Christian Dictionarie* (London, 1612), sig. A4^{i}v.

Commenting on the fact that many avoided Revelation due to its "darkness", Wilson hoped that his work would help Christians "more willingly assay to read and study this book when they shall have at hand a declaration of all mysticall wordes familiarly delivered".[48] What is remarkable is the extent to which his definitions were influenced by Brightman.[49] For example, when he defined "Blood", Wilson offered an exposition of the third vial judgement (Rev. 16:4): "*The Rivers & Fountains of Water becam blood*...which was done in this our Kingdome and Dominion, 1581, when an Acte was made, to make their [Jesuits] comming into the Realme, (to dissuade subjectes from their allegiance) to be treason".[50] This, of course, was the same as Brightman's reading of the passage.[51] An equally clear example was found in Wilson's interpretation of the "clusters of grapes" crushed in judgement (Rev. 14:20):

> Some very learned, restraine these Clusters, unto Popish religious buildings and persons, which did abound and flourish, even as a vine spread full of Clusters, and that in this our Kingdome, till the daies of *Henry* the eyght, when thorough the zeal and courage of *Cranmer* and *Crumwell* (two great men) this Popish Vine was lopped and cut.[52]

Wilson's use of Brightman was obvious in other places. The two witnesses, for example, were said to have been raised in 1550 at Magdeburg.[53] Yet the most interesting example of Wilson's appropriation of Brightman was in the way in which the earlier commentator influenced his readings of Jewish restoration. The *Dictionarie* adopted a number of Brightman's positions in this area. When Wilson expounded the "new heavens" of Rev. 21, he noted that while some believed the text to refer to the heavenly church, others saw it as describing "the Church which shall be on earth, a little afore the judgement, when the *Jewes* shall be restored to the Communion of Saints". At the Jews' conversion, the church would give "place to a purer [estate]".[54] The second resurrection described the calling of the Jews to faith, a view he admitted to having received from "Maister Brightman".[55] His interpretation of the "mystery of God . . . announced to his servants the prophets" (Rev. 10:7) shows how far he accepted Brightman's reading. This was:

---

[48]Wilson, "A Dictionarie, for that mysticall book, called the Revelation of Saint John" in *Dictionarie*, p. 1.

[49]He was mentioned by name in the *Dictionarie* (p. 160) and in the excursus on Revelation (pp. 2, 89).

[50]Wilson, "Revelation" in *Dictionarie*, p. 16.

[51]Brightman, *Revelation*, pp. 531–535.

[52]Wilson, "Revelation" in *Dictionarie*, pp. 28–29. See also p. 158.

[53]Wilson, "Revelation" in *Dictionarie*, pp. 45–46.

[54]Wilson, "Revelation" in *Dictionarie*, p. 49.

[55]Wilson, *Dictionarie,* pp. 159–160.

> The restoring of the Jewes, by their calling to Christ, which being a thing farre from all thought and hope of men, is therefore called a Mystery. *Revel*. 10.7. *The Mystery of God shall be finished*. Some, by this Mysterie, understand the Doctrine of the last Judgement . . . But I preferre the first [Brightman's] signification.[56]

Wilson had clearly identified two important points in Brightman's work. The first was the focus upon England and English concerns. Thus he noted the role of Cromwell, Cranmer, and Cecil in Brightman's exposition. The second was the restoration of the Jews, a focus which he found particularly important. This went as far as accepting Brightman's dating scheme. Commenting on the time of the Turks' defeat, he noted "[it] is thought wil be, when the yeare of our Lord shall bee 1696".[57] Wilson thus noted both the way in which the book of Revelation's prophecies were being fulfilled in England and the importance of a restored Jewish nation. Early readers were thus quick to note these threads running through Brightman's work.

5.3 The Development of Brightman's Hermeneutic, 1610–1620

Wilson and Fletcher were not alone in noticing the key themes in Brightman's commentaries. Throughout the 1610s Brightman's "chosen nation" motif became increasingly dominant in readings of his work. The link between Judeo-centrism and a renewed emphasis on national identity emerged as a key theme in these readings. This link is seen clearly in a sermon on Noah's blessing of Japheth (Gen. 9:27), preached by Thomas Cooper in 1615. As with separatist readings of Brightman, Cooper suggested the possibility that England was about to lose God's favour in Laodicean terms.[58] Yet while he warned of God's judgement, he also maintained that the Laodicean threat merely showed God's unique concern for England:

> Are not their chalenges unnaturall, and wicked, that denie us to have a Church of God in *England?* Hath not God wonderfully preserved this little Iland, this Angle of the worlde? That in former Ages was not knowne, or accounted to be any part of the world? Hath it not bene the Sanctuarie of all the Christian world? Have not all the neighbor-nations taken hold of the skirt of an Englishman? have they not joyned themselves to us, because the Lorde is with us?[59]

The high role Cooper ascribed to England is noteworthy. Indeed, Cooper discussed England's status and restoration of the Jews in the same sermon, structuring them as parallel themes in his reading. After describing the blessings available to Englishmen, Cooper explained the future hope of the Jews. "The Jewes shall

[56]Wilson, "Revelation" in *Dictionarie*, p. 99.

[57]Wilson, "Revelation" in *Dicionarie*, p. 73.

[58]Thomas Cooper, *The Blessing of Japheth Proving the Gathering in of the Gentiles, and Finall Conversion of the Jewes* (London, 1615) sig. A2^{i}r.

[59]Cooper, *Blessing*, p. 34.

then have a full and glorious conversion, before the second comming of the Lord *JESUS*," he concluded, "And why not principally at *Jerusalem*, the old place of their worship . . . .Shall not the Lord be as *able* to plant in the Jew againe, as he was *able* in his roome to plant in the Gentile for a time?"[60]

The root of Cooper's thought was unfulfilled Old Testament prophecy. In the passage already quoted, Cooper was happy to use Zech. 8:23 in an allegorical sense – the Protestant nations were taking hold of the "skirt of an Englishman", rather than the "skirt of a Jew" in the original text. However, Cooper argued that at the Jews' conversion the Gentiles would be "yet dispoyled of the outward beautie of their profession, [and] shall now take holde of the skirt of him that is a Jew, and bee provoked by his zeale, to joyne with him in the power of Religion".[61] The reversal Cooper found here is important. The Gentiles would be "dispoyled". After being planted in the Jews' "roome" for a time, they would, through the Jewish return, lose their primacy in God's plan. While Brightman was not named, his influence was clear in the theories which Cooper advanced. For example, he followed Brightman in holding that the second resurrection of Rev. 20 referred to the Jewish return to Palestine.[62] Further to this, Cooper's reading evidenced a consistently literal interpretation of Old Testament prophecy: "Thus shall the Redeemer come unto *Sion*, and unto them that turne from iniquitie in *Jacob*, saith the Lord. *Esay* 59. 20. Thus *Jacob* shall hereafter take roote, and *Israel* shall florish, and grow and the world shal be filled with fruit. *Esay* 27. 6. In those dayes will the Lord make a new covenant, with the house of *Israel*, and with the house of *Juda* . . . Though he have forsaken them for a season, yet in everlasting compassions will hee gather them againe".[63]

Cooper realised that his eschatology undermined the continuity usually presumed between Old Testament Israel and the church. As such, he was at pains to stress that faith in Christ still broke down the partition wall between Jew and Gentile.[64] Yet his conclusions appeared somewhat at odds with the earlier arguments in his sermon, in which the Gentile believer was clearly inferior to the Jew during the millennial period. The link between the Judeo-centric theme and an increasing emphasis on national identity found in Brightman's work therefore emerges forcefully here. While his English auditors had heard of the "despoyling" of their primacy in God's plan, at the same time they were reminded of God's miraculous blessings for the England, the "sanctuarie of all the Christian worlde".

This association between Judeo-centrism and "chosen" nationhood began to emerge forcefully throughout the second decade of the seventeenth century.

---

[60]Cooper, *Blessing*, p. 53.

[61]Cooper, *Blessing*, p. 53.

[62]Cooper, *Blessing*, p. 55.

[63]Cooper, *Blessing*, p. 54.

[64]"Behold now the Churches *UNITIE,* and consent: though differing in the flesh, yet still agreeing in Spirit, though divided for a time, yet at length againe so compact and knit together, as that as one man". Cooper, *Blessing*, p. 56.

The clearest example is found in Richard Bernard's *Key of Knowledge*. Bernard's commentary is of special interest to this discussion, as he was also responsible for one of the most influential early modern English sermon (and thus, hermeneutical) manuals, the 1607 *Faithfull Shepheard*.[65] Despite his disagreement with Brightman on Laodicea, Bernard described the earlier commentary as "Being the best of most before him that I have read of, a labour praise worthie".[66] Bernard was heavily influenced by Brightman's work. This can be seen in three areas – his hermeneutics, his hope of Jewish conversion, and his concept of a chosen nation. Bernard was particularly interested in the hermeneutical problems which the book of Revelation presented. He was also frustrated with those who ignored the text due to its complexity: "The types & figures are no more strange here . . . [than] in *Ezechiel, Daniel, and Zacharie* . . . this is no reason to force such an obscuritie upon this booke, as if it were not at all to be understood".[67] The text, however, was closed to papists and the reprobate and (significantly, given attitudes towards novelty) those who interpreted the book "without daring to attempt anything, beyond, besides, or any whit otherwise then other men write or speake before them".[68]

Bernard therefore set out his hermeneutical system. The reader was to engage in a "literall analysis" of the text. This could occur on two levels. The first involved understanding what the text prophesied, and was simple: "as to tell for example, that the 12. chapter speaketh of a woman thus and thus arrayed". The second level was "to know the fulfilling, and to bee able rightly to accommodate to the text, the truth of story, to declare the verity of it, according as in the words it is laid downe".[69] This was more complex, requiring a detailed understanding of history. Bernard argued that the text had been misinterpreted through an overly spiritualised reading. This led readers away from the true sense, which he described as: "not a spirituall or allegoricall, but an historicall sense which in this booke wee must attend unto . . . If we then doe loose the historicall sense, we loose the proper sense of this booke, what other spirituall use soever we make of it".[70] To understand these histories, Bernard built a basic structure around the seals, vials and trumpets. These were described as judgements on three different groups of people (the heathen, false Christians, and Antichrist) and were not simultaneous. After the reader had gained a broad understanding of history, they were to avoid the dangers of over-literalism:

> the words are figurative, the whole prophecie full of Metaphors, and almost altogether Allegorical; so as we must take heede, that we looke further then into the letter and naked relation of things, as they are set downe, otherwise the booke should be full of *absurdities, impossibilities, falsities and flat contradictions* unto other truthes of Scripture: all which are

[65]For Bernard's influence see Gordis, *Opening Scripture*, pp. 14–18.

[66]Bernard, *Key*, sig. D4r-v.

[67]Bernard, *Key*, pp. 87–88.

[68]Bernard, *Key*, pp. 102–103. Bernard expresses an interest in progressive revelation, as Ball argued. See *Great Expectation*, pp. 66–67.

[69]Bernard, *Key*, p. 121.

[70]Bernard, *Key*, p. 123.

> farre from the words of Gods holy spirit, which are ever holy and true. For who can beleeve a Lambe to have seven eyes . . . Therefore wee must not sticke in the letter, but search out an historicall sense, which is the truth intended, and so take the words typically, not literally. For propheticall descriptions much differ from common historicall narrations.[71]

This is a reading which seems immediately to depart from the method Bernard had previously suggested. "Literall" analysis was not literal at all; rather it was primarily metaphorical or allegorical. Bernard's ideas shifted again: the text was primarily "historicall" and "typical", readings which he seemed to suggest were the *same* as allegory: "full of Metaphors and almost altogether Allegorical". The tactic Bernard employed here was similar to Brightman's reading of the Song of Songs. The allegories and types were slowly stripped away to reveal the "true" sense of the text: historical narrative. While Bernard admitted that this differed greatly from standard "narrations" of history, the fact remained that when prophecy was cleared, it revealed an understandable historical structure. This structure rested on the *analogia fidei*: "for surely the Scripture are interpreters of the Scriptures, and the meaning of the spirit is to be found out by his owne words".[72] This simple rule was to be taken together with the general scope of the prophecy. The reader should remember that the prophecy only referred to events from John's time onwards, and that the types John provided did not have to have been extant in John's day (thus the papacy could be Antichrist). All of this, of course, was a reiteration of Brightman's hermeneutical method. The *analogia fidei* was used in conjunction with a historical framework to construct a consistent hermeneutic to understand the prophecies of Revelation. Bernard also argued that the reader should have an appreciation of the Old Testament root of the types found in the book of Revelation. "Also we must note, and this very carefully," he wrote, "that all this whole prophecie is framed after the state and condition of the ancient people of God, the Jewes, and after the words and visions of the ancient Prophets; as we may see by comparing the words and visions of this booke, to *Moses* and the Prophets, to which the Prophet *John* alludeth every where".[73]

For Bernard the theme of Jewish restoration ran deeply through Revelation. This led him to consider the book's original readers. He argued that one of the reasons why John wrote the work in a figurative style was for the Jewish people: "that they might see (as it were) a paraphrase of the Prophets, and a spirituall application of the Citie, Temple, Altar . . . that by this last booke, thus clothed in the Jewes habite, they might learne, and we might foresee, that at the last they shall come to us, and wee to them, to be one people to God in Jesus Christ".[74] The Jewish "habite" of the book convinced Bernard that it must contain a reference to the restoration of that people. He gave three reasons for this belief. Firstly, the extent of the persecution suffered by the Jews testified to their unique punishment. Such a punishment, he

[71] Bernard, *Key*, pp. 130–131.

[72] Bernard, *Key*, p. 141.

[73] Bernard, *Key*, p. 131.

[74] Bernard, *Key*, p. 89.

argued, suggested that God had kept them as a separate people for a special purpose. Secondly, he found evidence for their restoration in Romans 11:26. Finally, he noted that many Old Testament prophecies remained unfulfilled. Specifically, Bernard cited the restoration of Ezk. 37, the mourning over the "pierced one" of Zech. 12, and the prophecy of Jerusalem as a font of living water, found in Zech. 14. These were "not heretofore fulfilled upon that nation; and therefore herafter to be performed, for the word of the Lord is true, and standeth fast forever".[75]

This theme worked its way throughout Bernard's commentary. Like Brightman, his reading of the term "Jews" in Rev. 7 was consistent with the majority of Reformed commentators of the period. "An Israelite and Jew," he noted, "are now common names to Jewes and Israelites by nature and to *Gentiles*, Israelites and Jewes by grace". This definition of "Jew" was not constant throughout the book, however: "These heere are not to bee taken for Israelites properly, and naturall Jewes, *for the consideration of the time here to bee noted*, when the number was taken, will not permit that they should be so understood".[76] While in Rev. 7, then, "Jews" meant "Christians", at a later point in the text, the native Jews themselves would be dealt with. This point proved to be Bernard's interpretation of Rev. 20 and 21. His interpretation started in conventional fashion, with the millennium referred to the binding of Satan by Constantine and the first resurrection to the escape of true believers from Rome.[77] When Bernard reached the description of the New Jerusalem, however, he suggested that the heavenly city made specific reference to a Jewish church restored to Palestine: "Because some such like thing is promised to the Jewes, in the books of the Prophets; not hitherto, as may seeme, fulfilled".[78] The restored Jewish nation, he argued, would be marked by strength and continuance. The Gentiles would be in awe of the Jews, acknowledging their unique blessings. Thus he emphasised these blessings to his readers:

> . . . she shall eate the riches of the Gentiles, Esai 61.6, and sucke the milke of the Gentiles, and the breasts of Kings, Esai 60.16, who shal be her nursing fathers and the Queenes her nursing mothers, Esai 49.23, bringing her presents and gifts, Esai 60.6 and 45.14. They shall fall downe and make supplication, Esai 45.14: they shall worship with their faces to the earth, and licke the dust of her feete, Esa.49.23. Zach 14.16. Strangers shall be her servants . . . yea such as will not serve her shall be destroyed . . . She shall bee a crowne of glorie in the hand of the Lord, and a royall Diademe in the hand of her God, Esai 62.3. And this her excellencie shall never bee changed, her daies of mourning shall be ended . . . her joy everlasting . . . for ever shall her land be inherited.[79]

Bernard was therefore suggesting an essential separation of Jews and Gentiles. While the Gentiles acted as the "nursing mothers" of the Jewish nation, they nonetheless made supplication and "licke[d] the feet" of the Jewish converts.

[75] Bernard, *Key*, p. 90.

[76] Bernard, *Key*, pp. 168–69. Emphasis mine.

[77] Bernard, *Key*, p. 314.

[78] Bernard, *Key*, p. 337.

[79] Bernard, *Key*, pp. 339–340.

The Gentiles, it appeared, were to be placed in an inferior position in God's plan. Of course, this should not be overstated. We have seen already that Bernard expected Jews and Gentiles to become one in Christ at the Jewish conversion. As he noted, the Christian was now just as much an Israelite as the native-born Jew. Yet despite these statements, Bernard's reading of the New Jerusalem presupposed an essential difference between Jew and Gentile. It created a tension which divided the one people of God, and placed the Jews in a position of power over Gentile believers. In seeking to resolve this tension, Bernard was drawn to the same strategy used by Brightman, as he focused upon the importance of a chosen national identity. In an introduction dedicated to knights of the realm, Bernard thus focused on the way in which England would play a unique role in the fulfilment of Revelation. The passage deserves quoting at length:

> But it may be, you will say to me, that you perhaps shall not be employed herein. Well, for this, know for your comfort (you that desire this honor), that this most noble Iland shall not have the least hand in this glorious enterprise, when the time appointed shall come. For what kingdome in all Christendome, hath God made so renewed in the cause of religion, as this? Was it not our Constantine that made a world of Christians? Our Lucius, that was the first Christian Monarch? Who was so valiant and powerfull a Champion for Christ, in the time of darknesse, before him, as our John Wickliffe? You have heard, how the Lord hath set on worke, our valiant Henry, our noble Edward; our famous Elizabeth, and now, our most learned and renowned King. What nation gave ever the Popery, and Spanish power, such an overthrow, as this did in the yeere 88? Hath not the Lord hitherto, ever made us one, for his name, Church, and people, against that Antichrist? and can you thinke, he will passe us over in that last act of the tragicall end of Rome? Are not we one of the ten hornes, that gave our kingdome once to the Beast? For who went at the Popes command, to the holy Land, sooner than we? . . . What King yielded up his Crowne to the Popes Legate, but ours? Thus were wee for him, and so shall wee be against him.[80]

This level of blessing, Bernard suggested, had caused the pope and Spaniard to become particularly angry at England. Thus Satan had driven them to greater and greater fury to attack the nation and attempt to destroy it. This showed, he argued, "that the Divell their Lord, and our deadly foe, suggesteth to them, that wee are, and shall be, one of the greatest meanes, under God Almightie, to bring an utter overthrow and desolation to that Antichristian state". Elizabeth was therefore alluded to as the dispenser of the third vial, as per Brightman: "Her Majesties royall authoritie made these Rivers and fountains, bloud; by causing it (and that must justly) to be death for any Jesuits or Priests, to come with their heresies and treasonable purposes, into her dominions".[81] Bernard argued that "the Lord honour[ed] this little, but most noble Iland, above all other places in the Christian world, in the matter of Christianitie" through the monarchs he had given her. From Constantine, through to "*Our now learned Soveraigne James, our King*", England had been uniquely blessed and provided with the means to bring down the papacy. The nation acted as a sign to the Christian people of the world: "the instance for

[80] Bernard, *Key*, sigs. C4^{i}v-C4^{ii}r.

[81] Bernard, *Key*, sigs. C4r-v.

al Christs people, to behold Gods mercie and favour to his Church, to conclude the overthrow of the Popedome".[82]

Of course, some of these statements were likely the result of politically expedient flattery: the epistle that introduced the concept was aimed towards military men. Indeed, by placing James alongside Wyclif and Elizabeth as an English opponent of Antichrist, Bernard may have been aiming to encourage the king to sanction the military mission to Rome he hoped and believed would shortly follow. An early sermon written by James on Rev. 20:15–16, in which he had heralded Scotland's role in the campaign against Antichrist, had been published for the first time in 1616, the year before Bernard's commentary appeared. The sermon's theology was somewhat at odds with James's diplomatic focus in the mid-1610s, which included (relatively) friendly relations with Spain. It is certainly possible that by placing James as a key figure in the downfall of Rome, Bernard intended to remind the king of his earlier writings on the subject and encourage him to take action against the allies of Antichrist. Yet for all that Bernard may have had political motives, his underlying focus on the chosen nation was the same as that found in Brightman. Indeed, Bernard's work evidences a link between Brightman's reading and the myth of the English origins of Christianity.[83] By citing this long list of holy Englishmen, Bernard thus reminded his readers that they were part of a distinctly English community of the elect.

Bernard did not absorb Brightman's entire system – leaving the dual-millennial scheme, for example, entirely un-discussed. Yet he emphasised the three key threads found in Brightman's work – a consistent application of the literal sense of Old Testament prophecy, a high role for the Jews which undermined the Christian hope of the New Jerusalem, and a role for the (English) reader to play in lieu of this prophetic hope. Bernard therefore worked throughout the commentary to reassure his readers that they "shall be employed within" the apocalyptic drama of the Revelation. Indeed, the increasing emphasis placed on the role of England began to unnerve Scottish commentators. William Cowper (1568–1619), Bishop of Galloway, asked: "Shall the Angell comming out of the Temple, be *Thomas Cromwell* . . . Or shall the type of the Harvest and Vintage bee appropriate to *England*?"[84] As Williamson notes, the root of Cowper's criticism was the way in which Brightman and his successors had found England explicitly described in the book of Revelation.[85]

---

[82]Bernard, *Key*, pp. 127–129.

[83]Lucius (along with Lear and Arthur) was part of an attempt to develop a pre-Catholic (and, indeed, pre-Norman) vision of a flourishing, native Christian civilisation in England. See Scott Mandelbrote, "The Bible and National Identity in the British Isles, c.1650-c.1750" in *Protestantism and National Identity*, eds Claydon and McBride, pp. 157–181.

[84]William Cowper, *Pathmos, or, A Commentary on the Revelation of Saint John* (London, 1619), pp. 31–32.

[85]Williamson, *Scottish National Consciousness*, pp. 32–33. Cowper was also angered by Brightman's application of types of Christ to general figures, especially Brightman's reading of Constantine as the male child of Rev. 12. See Cowper, *Pathmos*, p. 23.

While the writings examined so far have shown the way in which Brightman's reading influenced a number of commentators, the example of Coventry clergyman Thomas Draxe (d. 1619) is unique, in that is displays a view that was actively modified through contact with Brightman's work. As well as composing a number of works attacking separatists,[86] Draxe produced several commentaries touching upon the question of Jewish restoration, beginning with his 1608 *Worldes Resurrection, or The Generall Calling of the Jewes*. Here Draxe showed a concern for Jewish toleration which was remarkable for the period, going so far as to suggest terms for Jewish readmission to England.[87] Draxe believed that the Jews would one day come to Christ, their conversion "in all probability . . . to follow the burning and destruction of Rome".[88] He denied, however, that they would have any earthly inheritance: "they are likely never to recover [their land], for they have no such promise, neither have they any possibility of meanes to compasse it".[89]

Draxe continued to touch on this theme in his later work. In both a sermon published later in 1608[90] and the 1612 *Earnest of Our Inheritance*, he again emphasised the importance of Jewish conversion and denied a physical restoration to the land.[91] By the time his 1615 *Alarum to the Last Judgement* was published, however, there had clearly been a shift in his thinking. In the opening stages of the work he again raised the possibility of an earthly Jewish Kingdom: "as some by extraordinary expositions, seeme to gather out of the Scriptures".[92] Draxe now argued that the Jews would be returned to Palestine ("all the Prophets seeme to speak of this returne")[93] where they would be immediately assaulted by the Turk, before being saved by a spiritual coming of Christ.[94] After this victory, the Jews "shall be a most famous, reformed, and *Exemplary Church* of all the world, and all Nations

[86]See for example Thomas Draxe, *Anterotemata, Thomae Draks Ten Counter-demaunds Propounded To Those of The Separation* (London, 1617), in which he argued that the separatists should reconcile with the English Church or set sail for Virginia. It is interesting that at the time of writing, Draxe was ministering in Harwich, home port of the *Mayflower*.

[87]Culver, *Albion*, pp. 76–79. Too much should not be made of this point. Draxe still had a number of difficulties with the Jews: "[we should] represse their vile and intolerable usuries . . . punish with al sharpnesse their horrible blasphemies against Christ and his gospell . . . cause them being under their authority & subjection to be by degrees instructed in Christian religion". (Thomas Draxe, *The Worldes Resurrection, or The Generall Calling of the Iewes* (London, 1608b), sig. ¶2^{ii}v).

[88]Thomas Draxe, *Worldes,* p. 88.

[89]Draxe, *Worldes*, p. 89. Culver (*Albion*, p. 77) fails to see that in *Worldes Resurrection* Draxe does not call for an *earthly* but only a *spiritual* restoration of the Jews.

[90]". . . the last signes such as are the ruine of *Romish Babilon,* [and] the conversion of the nation of the Jewes" – Thomas Draxe, *The Lambes Spouse* (London, 1608a), sig. C4^{iiii}r.

[91]". . . the second coming of our Lord Jesus (which shall not bee before Rome be ruinated, and the dispersed Jewes generally converted to Christianitie)" – Thomas Draxe, *The Earnest of Our Inheritance* (London, 1612), sig. A2v.

[92]Thomas Draxe, *An Alarum to the Last Judgement* (London, 1615), p. 22.

[93]Draxe, *Alarum*, p. 81.

[94]Draxe, *Alarum*, p. 76.

shall flow unto it, and it shall bee, as it were, a visible heaven upon earth".[95] While Draxe did not believe that the Jews would inhabit Palestine for a literal thousand years, he nonetheless argued that they would "continue glorious on the earth for one generation, that Gods mercy may more evidently appeare, and that all the world may take sufficient notice of their generall calling, and hereupon be either converted or (at least) convicted".[96]

The reason for the shift in Draxe's thought was clearly Brightman's influence. Draxe had read Brightman's work and though he cited him only once (on the interpretation of the 1,260 days)[97] he adopted a number of the older commentator's ideas. This was especially clear in his argument that the Jews would defeat the Ottoman Empire through supernatural help. The scriptures Draxe cited in support of this concept were Daniel 11:45 and 12:1, with his interpretation of these passages precisely mirroring that of Brightman. The Jewish victory in the Holy Land would occur exactly as Brightman had suggested.[98] This led Draxe to develop a view of the future built around the Jewish restoration, based upon an application of a consistently literal reading of Old Testament prophecy: "Then shall wee see (in earth) *The holy Citie new Jerusalem, comming downe from God out of heaven, prepared as a Bride adorned for her Husband:* whereof so many glorious things are spoken in Scripture, and literally to be understood in many points".[99]

The importance of Draxe's work is twofold. On the one hand, his writings demonstrate clearly the ways in which Brightman's commentaries could change a general conversionist reading of the Jewish promises into a Judeo-centric reading. Secondly, Draxe's work evidenced a new focus on the practical arrangements for Jewish restoration. The Jews, after all, were "to returne to their owne Country". Crucially, this was not to be a passive process, as suggested by Brightman's lack of comment on practical means for conversion: "it is (or ought to bee) the scope of our zeale and good example, to gaine them".[100] While Culver was wrong in presenting him as a proto-tolerationist, Draxe was nonetheless more interested in the *active* role Christians would play in the restoration then any previous commentator. This shift was related to a reading of Old Testament prophecy akin to Brightman's consistent literalism: "all the Prophets seeme to speak of this returne".[101] The move from theories to the practicalities of restoration was beginning to gain momentum.

---

[95]Draxe, *Alarum*, pp. 76–77.

[96]Draxe, *Alarum*, p. 110.

[97]He directly quotes both Brightman and Napier. See *Alarum*, pp. 107–108. Firth has commented briefly on Draxe's use of Brightman in *Apocalyptic Tradition*, pp. 228–229.

[98]That is, the return of the Jews across the Euphrates, and their supernatural deliverance at Armageddon.

[99]Draxe, *Alarum*, p. 75.

[100]Draxe, *Alarum*, p. 79.

[101]Draxe, *Alarum*, p. 81.

5.4 Controversy: Sir Henry Finch

The discussion of the politics of Jewish restoration was, however, something which neither Brightman nor Draxe had covered. When the subject was broached, it proved highly controversial. This was demonstrated in the case of Sir Henry Finch, who served at various times as a prominent lawyer, MP, and sergeant-at-arms in the government of James I.[102] While his best known work remains his commentary on common law, Finch also had a number of theological studies published anonymously by clergyman and fellow author William Gouge. These included a commentary on Song of Songs, which Gouge admitted to publishing against Finch's wishes in 1615. There, Finch's reading was relatively conventional, with the Song describing Christ's love for the church. Nonetheless, he expressed a hope for a future Jewish conversion with millenarian overtones: "When the heart of the Jewes shall turne unto the Lord, in the generall call of that whole nation, then come the daies of peace, joy, happinesse, and comfort, as much as can be upon earth".[103] A clearer examination of the Jewish theme was found in his most notorious work, the 1621 *The Worlds Great Restauration, or, The Calling of the Jewes*.[104] The book listed a number of Old Testament prophecies and the way in which these would be fulfilled by the Jewish nation restored to Palestine. "Thou shalt flourish as in the dayes of thy youth," Finch promised the Jews, "Nay, above and beyond thy youth".[105] The flourishing that was expected would see the promotion of the Jews to a position far above that currently enjoyed by the Gentile church: "The glory of the Kingdom shall be so great, that in comparison of it the Sunne and Moone shall cast no light... What if by the Sunne and Moone hee meane heere the Churches of the Gentiles, who shall blush to see their zeale and love of piety so eclipsed by a farre more excellent shining light?"[106] Following Brightman, Finch was suggesting that the Jews would be the primary recipients of God's blessing in the renewed world. As he concluded in his reading of the messianic banquet: "this sumptuous banquet heere prepared is specially for the Jewes. The same dishes and services have all his [God's] children: but heere more exquisite plenty and variety, a greater riches of Spirituall and heavenly treasures".[107]

---

[102]For a full biography of Finch see Wilfrid R. Prest, "The Art of Law and the Law of God: Sir Henry Finch (1558–1625)" in *Puritans and Revolutionaries*, eds Donald Pennington and Keith Thomas (Oxford: Clarendon, 1978), pp. 94–117.

[103][Finch], *An Exposition of the Song of Solomon* (London, 1615), p. 125.

[104]The book can be found listed as either *The Worlds Great Restauration or The Calling of the Jewes* (*STC* 10874.5) or as *The Calling of the Jewes. A Present to Judah and the Children of Israel* (*STC* 10874). Both are printed in 1621 by Edward Griffin for William Balden and differ only in the placing of a preface by William Gouge in *Worlds*, which is published as an epilogue in *Calling*. The edition quoted here is *The Calling of the Jewes* (London, 1621).

[105][Finch], *Calling*, sig. A3r.

[106][Finch], *Calling*, pp. 102–103.

[107][Finch], *Calling,* pp. 113.

The influence of Brightman's work over Finch was obvious in a number of areas.[108] His reading of the 1,260/1,335 days of Dan. 12:11–12 was directly based on the earlier commentator, leading Finch to date the conversion to between 1650 and 1695.[109] Similarly, the Jews would return across the Euphrates as the Kings of the East, after God miraculously dried its waters.[110] The foundation for this reading was a consistently literal reading of Old Testament prophecies. In a telling introduction, he set out his hermeneutical basis: "Where *Israel, Judah, Tsion, Jerusalem,* &c. are named in this argument, the Holy Ghost meaneth not the spirituall Israel, or Church of God collected of the Gentiles, no nor of the Jewes and Gentiles both (for each of these have their promises severally and apart) but Israel properly descended out of *Jacobs* loynes".[111] This allowed Finch to argue for the separation of promises for Jews and Gentiles. He could therefore adopt a hermeneutic which saw a physical fulfilment of Old Testament promises to the Jews. As he noted: "These and such like are not Allegories, setting forth in terrene similitudes or deliverance through Christ (whereof those were types and figures) but meant really and literally of the Jewes. It was not possible to devise more expresse or evident tearmes, then the Spirit of purpose useth to cut off all such construction".[112] The text was therefore returned to its "original" meaning as the unnecessary allegories were stripped away.

It is important to grasp the way in which Finch moved beyond Brightman here. Where the lawyer caused controversy was in the way he laid out not just the scriptural, but also the practical political consequences of the coming Jewish supremacy. Gentile subjection to the Jews was not to be a purely spiritual affair. Instead: "[the Gentiles] *shall bow downe to Jehovah in the holy mount at Jerusalem*. That is, such shall be the brightnes of the new Jerusalem, the Church of the Jewes wonne to Christ, that *the nations of those that are to be saved shall walke in her light; and the Kings of the earth shall bring their glory and honour in unto her*"[113]; "There shall be in them a sovereignty over other Nations: whom their arme and power shall master, and bring to yeeld obedience to Christ and his Gospell".[114] Kings would therefore pay homage to the Jews. While Finch was careful to note that this subjection would not be slavery, nonetheless: "the chiefe soveraigntie and stroke of keeping men within the lists of their subjection and obedience unto Christ, shall remaine among the Jewes".[115]

---

[108]Peter Toon briefly details Finch's major positions, holding Brightman as his primary influence. See Toon, "The Latter-day Glory" in *Puritans, the Millennium and the Future of Israel*, ed. Toon, pp. 32–34.

[109][Finch], *Calling*, p. 60.

[110][Finch], *Calling*, p. 77.

[111][Finch], *Calling*, p. 6.

[112][Finch], *Calling*, p. 6.

[113][Finch], *Calling*, pp. 148–149.

[114][Finch], *Calling*, p. 36.

[115][Finch], *Calling*, p. 8.

This focus led to considerable controversy. Since Finch had cross-referenced another of his works in the text (though also anonymous)[116] it was not long before he was identified. The implication that monarchs would be subservient to the Jews did not resonate well with the political establishment. Theologically, it implied a return to the worst chiliastic excesses. Both Finch and Gouge were promptly imprisoned, with the book condemned by convocation. The High Commission at Westminster later attacked it for being "too servilely addicted to the letter".[117] There were a number of background issues which influenced the firm response to Finch's work. Guibbory has recently suggested that the root cause for the reaction against the book was Finch's claim that the Jews were the true Israel. This claim clashed with James's aim of projecting himself as a new Solomon ruling over a new Israel – in other words, with the vision of England as the elect nation. Both England and the Jews could not be the true Israel – so James reacted harshly against this attack on his Judaising project.[118] There is undoubtedly something to this. However, it is important to realise that there were further religious and political factors at the time that helped generate a fierce response from the government. As Christopher Hill noted, Finch's book emerged at a time of heightened fear over religious "Judaising". This was partly due to the still recent memories of John Traske's 1618 prosecution, and the fear of renewed religious subversion.[119] Indeed, the dangers of focusing on an earthly Kingdom had been explicitly condemned by James I as recently as 1619, in an attack on Brightman in particular.[120] Further political danger was evident in the controversy surrounding the Sabbath law debates in the May 1621 session of parliament. A bill, designed to protect the legal status of Sunday worship, was criticised for its use of the term "Sabbath". John Pym felt that the word brought to

[116]Finch provided a brief exposition of Matthew 24, before directing the curious reader to his *Sacred Doctrine of Divinitie*. This was first published as a brief tract in 1590, before being expanded into a two volume collection in 1613. Michael McGiffert suggests that the 1613 edition served as the basis for a similar project by John Downame, his *Summe of Sacred Divinitie* ("Who Wrote the Preface and Notes for Henry Finch's 'The Sacred Doctrine of Divinitie,' 1590?", *Albion* 18:2 (Summer, 1986), pp. 247–51). However, it seems possible that the author was Finch himself. See Wilfrid R. Prest, "The Published Writings of Sir Henry Finch" (*Notes and Queries* CCXXII: 5 (Dec 1977)), pp. 501–503.

[117]Quoted in Prest, "Art of Law", p. 114. See also "Letter from Joseph Mead to Sir Martin Stuteville, March 31st 1621" in *The Court and Times of James the First: Illustrated by Authentic and Confidential Letters* ed. Robert Folkestone Williams (London: Henry Colburn, 1849), Vol. II, p. 244.

[118]Guibbory, *Christian Identity*, pp. 43–45.

[119]Christopher Hill, *Society & Puritanism in Pre-Revolutionary England* (London: Secker & Warburg, 1964), pp. 202–205. Traske had practiced a Saturday Sabbath, kept the Jewish dietary regulations, and argued that the law was still in force for Christians. He was condemned by the Star Chamber, though he eventually recanted and ended his life a Baptist in Henry Jessey's congregation. His recantation is notable for the way in which he affirmed that "the Jewes prerogative, above all other nations [is] abolished". See Traske, *A Treatise of Libertie from Judaisme* (London, 1620), p. 21; also pp. 21–32. For more on Traske see Katz, *Philo-Semitism*, pp. 10–32.

[120]James I, "Meditation" in *Workes* (London, 1620), p. 581.

mind the abuses of the Traskites, while Sir Thomas Barrington linked it to Finch's work.[121] The House of Lords was blunter still: "[we] would have the word Sabbath put out, because many were inclined to Judaism and dream that the Jews shall have regiment and kings must lay down their crowns to their feet".[122]

That William Laud felt led to use criticism of Finch's work as the basis for a sermon preached before James I in June 1621 goes someway to suggest the popular appeal of the book. The Jews, argued Laud, had sufficient promises already: "So it is not now sufficient that the Jews shall be (in Gods good time) converted to the faith of Christ, as the Apostle delivers it, Rom. 11. *But these converted Jews must meet out of all Nations: the ten Tribes, as well as the rest, and become a distinct, and a most flourishing Nation again in Jerusalem* . . . Good God, what a fine people have we here? *Men in the Moone*!".[123] Finch, he argued, was infected with "the error of the chiliasts" and was guilty of removing hope from the Christian church: "many places of the old Testament, which concern the *Resurrection* from the dead, & which look upon *Christ* in his first or second coming, are impiously applied to this return of the Jews". Laud noted that this Judeo-centric position required three comings of Christ; a special coming between the first and second advents: "namely, his comming to this conversion of the Jewes".[124] The danger of Finch's theology, for Laud, was that the hope of the church was removed from the faithful Christian and given to the Jews instead. In other words, the Jews were privileged above the Gentiles in Finch's theology. While Laud had no time for this opinion, it was clear that he felt that the issue needed addressing. Politically, Laud reassured the King: "As for the Kings of the Gentiles, that they shall serve this King of Jerusalem, you need not believe that till you see it".[125] While Guibbory is certainly right to highlight the fact that Laud's concern was tied to the idea of both England and its national Church as direct continuations of Old Testament institutions, Laud's criticism is primarily internationalist in focus. Finch removed hope from the wider church, rather than a marker of national identity from the English. The sermon was later printed by Royal Command, including marginal notes pointing to Finch's work.

Finch and Gouge's imprisonment lasted 9 weeks, at which point they recanted. Gouge's apology was later printed in his "Life" and was notable for its reversion to a reading of Jewish conversion more in accord with Calvin than Brightman. The Jews were being converted throughout the entire gospel period, and while there would be some kind of conversion towards the end of the world, "To give them a soveraigntie over all the whole Church, seemeth to me to be derogatory to that absolute soveraignty which Christ the head of his Church hath". Archbishop Abbott

[121]" . . . a book or two . . . lately set forth the Jews ruling over the world". Quoted in Culver, *Albion*, p. 125.

[122]Quoted in Hill, *Society*, p. 202.

[123]William Laud, *A Sermon Preached before his Majesty, on Tuesday the Nineteenth of June, at Wansted* (London, 1621), pp. 23–24.

[124]Laud, *Sermon*, pp. 24–25.

[125]Laud, *Sermon*, p. 27.

was pleased with the apology and ordered Gouge released.[126] Finch was also freed. Culver's claim that Finch's time in prison led to a sudden fall from James's favour is exaggerated.[127] He was restored to his position and had his patent renewed by Charles I. While Culver is correct in stating that Finch struggled with debt until his death in 1625, this had been an issue long before he wrote his controversial commentary.[128]

It is important to see the way in which Finch used the consistently literal sense of Old Testament promises as the sole support for his position. Indeed, Mel Scult has gone so far to claim that Finch took the first step "toward returning the text to the Jews".[129] This is an exaggeration, but it cannot be disputed that Finch, through an application of Brightman's central hermeneutic, was drawn to a Judeo-centric position. While Williamson claims that Finch showed less of an influence from Brightman than writers such as Forbes,[130] it seems clear that the Stuart lawyer had in fact taken Brightman's position and developed it in a more practical political direction. While Fletcher and Draxe had each made suggestions on the practicalities of a Jewish return to Palestine, neither of those commentators had emphasised the changes that would occur in the political economy at the Jews' conversion. While Finch's primary aim had not been to highlight this, his focus on what a restored Jewish commonwealth would look like in practice, and what it would mean for the Gentiles, sounded uncomfortably like Traske's radical conclusions to the authorities. This would appear to suggest that the Judeo-centric movement was moving towards the radicalism identified in the "Laodicean" readings earlier in this chapter. But as we have seen, Finch remained within the political establishment, even after his imprisonment. Indeed, the moderate nature of the movement can be identified by perhaps its most influential patron after Brightman: Cambridge scholar Joseph Mede.

5.5 The Influence of Brightman on Joseph Mede

Perhaps the most important writer to have been influenced by Brightman remains theologian Joseph Mede/Mead (1586–1638), fellow at Christ's College, Cambridge.[131] While Mede was fiercely anti-Catholic, his theology cannot be

[126]"A Narrative of the Life and Death of Doctor Gouge" in William Gouge, *A Learned and Very Useful Commentary on the Whole Epistle to the Hebrews* (London, 1655), sig. B1r.

[127]Culver, *Albion*, p. 125.

[128]Wilfrid Prest, 'Finch, Sir Henry (*c.*1558–1625)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford University Press, 2004).

[129]Mel Scult, *Millennial Expectations and Jewish Liberties* (Leiden: Brill, 1978), p. 20.

[130]Williamson, "Jewish Dimension", p. 24.

[131]For a biography of Mede see the "Life" in Joseph Mede, *The Works of the Pious and Profoundly-learned Joseph Mede, B.D.* (London, 1672), pp. I–XXXIV. The following include biographies and

described as puritan, as it contained a number of elements more in line with Laudian interests.[132] Mede's studies show both Brightman's influence and a development of his views. His most influential work was the 1627 *Clavis Apocalyptica*. This was a short Latin study on his method of apocalyptic exegesis, and was republished in 1632 with a full commentary on the book of Revelation. While it was available from the 1630s onwards, *Clavis* received renewed attention during the Civil War. It was translated and published by order of Parliament in 1643, with an introduction by William Twisse highlighting Mede's prescience in predicting war "by the Antichristian generation, with so manifest opposition unto truth and holiness under a Protestant Prince, as I thinke the like was never known since the beginning of the world".[133] Yet while the book may have been useful in encouraging the godly in the Civil War period, it was anything but a manifesto for political disorder. Rather, it remained the most moderate of millenarian works.

As its name suggested, *Clavis* was a hermeneutical key, unlocking the mysteries of the book of Revelation.[134] The work contained Mede's major contribution to apocalyptic exegesis, the system of "synchronisms". "By a *Synchronisme* of prophecies," Mede noted, "I meane, when the things therein designed run along in the same time, as if thou should call it an *agreement in time or age*: because prophecies of things falling out in the same time run on in time together, or Synchronize".[135] The synchronisms allowed Mede to understand the correct order in which to interpret the text. Those who read Revelation chronologically "labour[ed] in vain". Only by understanding that the text was a prophecy "involved with mysticall allegories, and types"[136] could the reader come to a correct understanding of it. Mede denied that the first three chapters of Revelation had any prophetic relevance. Starting at the fourth, he divided the remaining text into two prophecies "which proceedeth from the same time, and endeth in the same period". The first was

---

evaluations of Mede: Bryan W. Ball, 'Mede, Joseph (1586–1638)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford University Press, 2004).; Christianson, *Reformers,* pp. 124–31;.Culver, *Albion*, pp. 135–146; Jue, *Heaven,* pp. 7–16; Firth, *Apocalyptic Tradition*, pp. 216–227.

[132]See Jue, *Heaven*, pp. 19–85. Jue shows that Mede was not only a firm supporter of episcopal interests, but also believed in the necessity of outward forms in worship. Mede was neither fully Calvinist nor Arminian in his stance on predestination, and did not associate with radical political or religious elements. Indeed, Laud invited Mede to become his personal chaplain, and the scholar was generally positive in his view of the Archbishop (see Charles Carlton, *Archbishop William Laud* (London & New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1987), p. 80). Nonetheless, Jue identifies Mede's anti-Catholicism as the reason why he did not rise further within the church. Mede was never in doubt that the papacy was the Antichrist.

[133]William Twisse, "Preface" in Joseph Mede, *The Key of the Revelation* (London, 1643), sig. b2v.

[134]A Ramist concern may be detected here. As Ong noted, "Ramus had insisted that analysis opened ideas like boxes, and it is certainly significant that the post-Ramist age produced so much more than its share of books identified by their titles as "keys" to one thing or another" (Ong, *Ramus*, p. 315). Christianson also notes that Ramist logic was at the centre of Mede's thought (Christianson, *Reformers*, p. 125).

[135]Mede, *Key,* Part I, p. 1.

[136]Mede, *Key*, Part I, p. 27.

the prophecy of the seven seals and seven trumpets. The second began at Revelation 10:8, where John was commanded to eat the "little book" contained in the right hand of the angel. This prophecy of the "little book opened" ran until the end of the biblical text and "repeateth the time of the former prophecie which is of the seales".[137]

The "synchronisms" Mede found in Revelation allowed him to group together seemingly disparate prophecies around stable temporal referents. As Jue explains, "symbols must be matched with like symbols" which could each then be applied to the same referent.[138] Mede had first explored this system in *The Apostasy of the Latter Time*, when he had noted the correspondence between the beast with ten horns found in Daniel 7:7 and the beast with ten horns found in Revelation 17:3. There, the beast reigns for a "short time", while in Daniel the time of the beast's reign is said to be a "time, times and half a time" – traditionally three and a half years, or 1,260 days. Using the standard device of reading a prophetic day as a year, Mede argued that both of these visions described the same thing, and also corresponded with the "Apostasy" mentioned in 1 Tim. 4:1–3.[139] This system of synchronisation was expanded and applied to the book of Revelation, with chapter 17 as its centre point. Thus the vision of the harlot of Rev. 17 was synchronised with the vision of her destruction in Chap. 18. This, in turn, could be joined with the 144,000 sealed in Rev. 14. The link between these chapters was the pronouncement of an angel that Babylon had fallen (Rev. 14:8; 18:2). This allowed both chapters to be contemporised with the description of the 144,000 sealed in Rev. 7. The sealed were those who would bring about the beast's destruction, and therefore were said to exist throughout the 1,260 years.[140] This period was further synchronised with the two witnesses prophesying for 1,260 days (Rev. 11:2), the woman fleeing into the desert for 1,260 days (Rev. 12:6) and the beast from the sea blaspheming for 42 months (Rev. 13:5). Through the synchronisms, Mede was able to show how apparently unrelated prophecies could apply to the same time. This could all be synchronised with Daniel 7 to build a stable structure and chronology.[141]

Using this structure he built his argument. The first six seals dealt with events up until the death of Constantine,[142] while the trumpets (which sprung from the seventh seal) represented God's judgement on Rome (both pagan and papal). Each of the vials was poured during the sixth trumpet and marked a stage in Antichrist's defeat. The first three vials described the rising of proto-Protestant sects such as the Lollards and Waldensians; Luther and the Reformation; and legal judgements on papists respectively. This third vial was poured out by Elizabeth's reforms in England. The final four vials remained in the future. Mede believed these to

[137]Mede, *Key*, Part I, pp. 11–13.

[138]Jue, *Heaven*, p. 101.

[139]Mede, *Apostasy of the Latter Times* (London, 1641), pp. 71–75.

[140]Mede, *Key*, Part I, pp. 7–9.

[141]Mede, *Key*, Part II, p. 46.

[142]Mede, *Key*, Part I, pp. 46–64.

describe the defeat of kingdoms loyal to Rome, the crushing of Rome itself, and the destruction of the Turks. While he did not decisively conclude that the Jews would be the "Kings of the East", he nonetheless believed it likely ("which happily Ezechiel intimateth, *Chap* 38. and 39").[143] The seventh vial described the "*consummation of the mystery of God*".[144] When this was poured out, the seventh trumpet would be blown.

Mede's most radical shift was his reading of the "consummation" of this mystery as a literal thousand year period of blessing on earth. While he was influenced by continental millenarian Johann Heinrich Alsted, Mede was nonetheless unique in the way he developed his theories.[145] The thousand years, he argued, synchronised with the seventh trumpet. This millennial period was bookended by the first and second resurrections, both of which were to be read literally, with the millennium itself *being* (rather than predating) the day of judgement.[146] The millennium was to be a period of earthly blessing. In describing this, Mede cited several Jewish authorities. These included medieval rabbinic sources such as Saadia Gaon and David Kimchi, as well as various Targums and the Mishnah.[147] Quoting Jerome's objection that millenarianism was primarily a Jewish position, Mede concluded that "to be of the same mind with the Jews is not always culpable".[148]

Mede's interpretation relied on a number of assumptions within the wider system of Protestant hermeneutics. Scripture became, in effect, a hall of mirrors, as key prophetic events were reflected in different ways by different prophets. The book of Revelation was the defining example of this in Mede's thought: "by the characters of Synchronismes is every interpretation to be tried as it were by a square and plumb rule".[149] As Michael Murrin has pointed out, the synchronisms were more than a hermeneutical tool for Mede: "The synchronisms are the

[143] Mede, *Key*, Part II, p. 120.

[144] Mede, *Key*, Part I, p. 121.

[145] Alsted's influence on Mede is covered in Clouse, "The Influence of John Henry Alsted", pp. 207–233. For arguments against Alsted's influence see Ball, *Great Expectation*, pp. 173–4. For more on Alsted see Howard Hotson's studies *Paradise Postponed: Johann Heinrich Alsted and the Birth of Calvinist Millenarianism* (Dordrecht: Kluwer, 2000a) and *Johann Heinrich Alsted 1588–1638: Between Renaissance, Reformation and Universal Reform* (Oxford: Clarendon, 2000b). Alsted's *Trifolium Propheticum* was particularly influenced by Brightman's reading of the Song, Hotson noting that Alsted "followed Brightman wherever possible" (see Hotson, *Paradise Postponed*, pp. 70, 87–90).

[146] The day of judgement "is neither before nor after, but *ipsa Dies Iudicii, ipsum tempus Secundae apparitionis Christi*". See Mede, *The Works of the Pious and Profoundly-Learned Joseph Mede* (London, 1672), p. 772. Mede's reading of the day of judgement seems to have influenced Milton's interpretation in *Paradise Lost*. See Sarah Hutton, "Mede, Milton, and More: Christ's College Millenarians" in *Milton and the Ends of Time*, ed. Juliet Cummins (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), p. 37.

[147] Mede, *Key*, Part II, pp. 122–135.

[148] Mede, *Key*, Part II, p. 134.

[149] Mede, *Key*, Part I, p. 27.

literal structure of Revelation".[150] Building on Murrin's examination of Mede's hermeneutic Jue has suggested that the key exegetical influence behind the synchronistic method was the *analogia fidei*. In Jue's reading, Mede's contribution to apocalyptic hermeneutics was his attempt to construct a "consistent" hermeneutical structure through which to read Revelation.[151] While their conclusions are valuable, it is questionable whether Mede's hermeneutic was as much of a development as Jue and Murrin have suggested. Instead, I would argue that Mede's work represents the evolution of Brightman's own hermeneutical position. While Brightman has always been recognised as an important interpretative influence on Mede, the significance of this influence has not always been appreciated.

Brightman had aimed to build a consistent historical structure through which to understand Revelation. Rather than reading the text chronologically, his framework led him to synchronise different parts of Revelation and Daniel. Thus he concluded that Revelation 7, 12, 14 and 20 each (in part) described the same thing. Similarly, elements of trumpet judgements were expounded further in Revelation 11 and 14, while Revelation 12 and 13 were synchronised with Revelation 17 and parts of Revelation 20. These events were then linked with descriptions in Daniel. This was not mere recapitulation, but a synchronisation of seemingly disparate events and prophecies. This is noteworthy, as it is clear that the synchronistic method, which Jue claims was new in Mede, was actually prefigured in Brightman. The basic idea of the synchronism, while not given the prominence or development found in Mede, was found in embryonic form in Brightman's work.[152] Needless to say, Brightman did not develop a synchronous method to either the same extent or detail as Mede. Neither did he believe that the 1,260 days of Daniel 7, the 1,260 days of Rev. 12 nor the 42 months of Rev 13 were the same period of time, an argument central to Mede's thesis. Their reading of the millennium also differed hugely.[153] The important point, however, is that Mede built on Brightman's hermeneutic to develop a consistent reading of Revelation. While there were numerous signs in the apocalyptic text, they always pointed to a fixed, temporal referent. The consistency and structural integrity in Mede mirrored Brightman's method and enabled exegetes

[150]Michael Murrin, "Revelation and Two Seventeenth Century Commentators" in *The Apocalypse in English Renaissance Thought and Literature*, eds C.A. Patrides and Joseph Wittreich (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1984), p. 137.

[151]Jue, *Heaven*, pp. 101–107.

[152]Kai Arasola has identified Mede as the forerunner of what he described as the "Historicist" tradition dominant in eighteenth and nineteenth-century American eschatology; the hermeneutic which governed William Miller's ill-fated prophecies in the mid-nineteenth century. The four marks of "historicism" he finds are (1) Equating a prophetic day with a year, (2) Harmonisation of prophecy with history, (3) Identification of the Papacy (or Islam) with Antichrist, and (4) A system of "interdependent sychronizations between prophecies". (Kai Arasola, *The End of Historicism: Millerite Hermeneutic of Time Prophecies in the Old Testament* (Sigtuna: Datem Publishing, 1990), p. 29). However, each of these positions is present in Brightman's thought; indeed, prior to Brightman in the Elizabethan tradition.

[153]As Mede notes. See *Works*, p. 880.

to build a more confident and nuanced reading of the book. This "consistent" reading was also found in Mede's interpretation of the promises to the Jews.

While several commentators identify Mede as the chief cause of a new pre-millennial emphasis, what has often been overlooked is the way in which his millenarianism rested on his reading of Jewish restoration.[154] In correspondence on Revelation 20, Mede argued that while Christ's kingdom was heavenly, Christ nonetheless had to reveal himself on earth, "especially for the *Calling* and gathering of his ancient People". Following Brightman, he then examined Revelation 1:7. He broke the verse down into two prophecies: one based around the vision of the Son of Man in Daniel 7:13, with the other taken from Zechariah 12:10. Both of these passages were then synchronised with Jesus' use of them in Matthew 24. Using a consistently literal basis, Mede was able to argue that they must, therefore, refer to the same thing: "Now I cannot understand how these two Prophetical passages should not have the same meaning when our Saviour and his Apostle alledge them joyned, which they have in their own Authors expressed apart? or being expressed together as one, should not be fulfilled at once?". Christ would therefore appear as a sign to the Jews, miraculously converting them in one moment.[155] This reading allowed Mede to use Paul's Damascus Road experience as a type of Jewish conversion. As Paul became "zealous" after his vision, so Mede believed that the Jews would become "the most zealous and fervent of the Nations".[156] Mede was sympathetic to the idea of a restored Jewish kingdom, although he remained more cautious than Brightman. In one letter, he admitted to having read Finch's *Calling of the Jews* and coming close to accepting it. The idea that the Gentiles would eventually serve the Jews, however, left him uncomfortable.[157] Nonetheless, Mede did find a high role for the Jews in his apocalyptic scheme. For example, the "great mountain" responsible for destroying the earthly monarchies in Nebuchadnezzar's dream (Daniel 2) was read as resulting from the restored Jewish nation, who would play an important role in the fall of Antichrist.[158]

Some of Mede's most striking comments on this subject came in his voluminous correspondence with Twisse, who was initially sceptical of Mede's premillennialism. In answering Twisse's concerns on his interpretation of the New Jerusalem, Mede used a consistently literal interpretation of Old Testament prophecies to build an argument for the return of the Jews to Palestine, believing this to be one of the central purposes of a literal millennium:

---

[154]Kroeze, "Variety", pp. 209–249; Christianson, *Reformers*, pp. 124–29.

[155]Mede, *Works*, pp. 603–6. Mede further expounds this hypothesis in his second letter to William Twisse, dated December 2nd 1629. See *Works*, pp. 765–768. This idea became particularly influential, and was discussed at the Whitehall Conference on the readmission of the Jews (see Henry Jessey, *A Narrative of the Late Proceeds at Whitehall* (London, 1656), p. 8).

[156]Mede, *Works,* pp. 891–892.

[157]"Rev Joseph Mead to Sir Martin Stuteville, April 17th 1621" in *Court . . . of James I*, Vol. II, pp. 249–251.

[158]Brightman, *Revelation*, p. 382; Mede, *Works*, pp. 139–40, 655, 747.

> God covenanted to give to *Abraham, Isaac* and *Jacob,* in their own persons, (as well as to their seed) the *Land wherein they were strangers* (that is, the Land of *Canaan) for an inheritance*. But this was not performed to them while they lived; therefore must they one day live again, that they may be partakers of this Promise; and consequently the Saints shall live on earth after their Resurrection.[159]

For Mede, a physical restoration of the Jews was a certainty. It had been predicted in the Old Testament and remained unfulfilled; it could not therefore be reduced to a spiritual promise, but must have a literal fulfilment.[160] Mede was equally aware of the importance of understanding these promises in a way which would have made sense to their original recipients. Like Brightman, he therefore pioneered a more historicised reading of the Old Testament promises, warning readers that "whilest that we wrest the plaine prophesies touching things which shall be at his second coming of Christ to his first, the Iewes laugh at us, and they are hardened in their infidelitie".[161] This idea of restoration was most clearly brought out in a passage in *Clavis*. Commenting on the 144,000 sealed in Revelation 7, Mede focused on the nature of Israel itself:

> . . . so here the Catholique Church of the Gentiles, to be fenced with the Seale of God, is figured by the Type of *Israel* . . . And it is so done not without good cause, as well for other causes, as specially because the Church, even from the first rejection of the Jewes, hitherto, is gathered out of the Gentiles, succeeded in the room of *Israel*, and is, as I may so call it, surrogated *Israel*; and in that place for a little while estemed by God, untill, his old people againe obtaining mercy, *the fulnesse of the Gentiles shall come in*.[162]

The passage, continuing the Judeo-centric theme identified in Brightman, is important for several reasons. Most notably, Mede's thinking presumed a degree of instability and separation between Israel and the church. The Gentiles were to remain in Israel's place *until* the Jews were restored, at which point they would experience their own "fullness" as per Romans 11. It is notable that this fullness was to be experienced in separation from ethnic Israel; a firm line of division was drawn between the two bodies of believers. The identification of believers with "Israel" could therefore only be temporary: "a little while estemed by God". When the Jews experienced God's mercy, they would re-take their rightful place as God's *true* Israel. With this in mind, it is interesting that there were also hints of Brightman's more nationalistic approach in Mede's reading of Revelation. This was particularly clear in his interpretation of the third vial judgement, which "was fulfilled . . . in our ENGLAND, in the reigne of ELIZABETH". This was especially seen in God's providential dealings with the English people through the defeat of the Spanish

[159]Mede, *Works*, p. 802.

[160]However, Mede still made ample use of Canaan as a type of the Christian's heavenly hope. See *Works*, pp. 247, 253, 258, 810.

[161]Mede, *Key*, Part II, p. 135.

[162]Mede, *Key*, Part I, p. 72.

armada.[163] While his nationalistic focus was not as strong as Brightman's, and Mede did not expound the chosen nation theme in detail, it is nonetheless noteworthy that he saw particular vials as fulfilled in England through Elizabeth's actions. Yet the need to emphasise the "chosen" role of England was not as pressing for Mede as it was for Brightman. In allegorising the second resurrection, Brightman had removed the Christian's standard hope for eschatological fulfilment, leaving scriptural history essentially open. His "chosen nation" reading was necessary to return both the basis of Christian hope and to root this hope in history. Mede, however, recast both the first and second resurrection as a literal rising from the dead. This, combined with his literal reading of the millennium, enabled him to maintain both a Jewish restoration and establish eschatological hope for the believer in history. By shying away from some of the more detailed imaginings of a Jewish reign on earth, such as those suggested by Finch, Mede could downplay ideas of Jewish sovereignty over the world. While the Jews were to experience a restoration to their land, the Christian reader gained the promise of two literal resurrections and an earthly reign with Christ.

At this point we can return to Jue's reading of Mede. Jue approaches Mede's hermeneutic on Israel with the aim of arguing against the typological conception advanced by Perry Miller and Sacvan Bercovitch, who claimed that New England colonists in the later seventeenth century viewed themselves as the like-for-like replacement of Israel.[164] Opposing this thesis, Jue argues that Mede (and the later American emigrants) actually viewed themselves as radically divorced from Old Testament Israel. Mede's exegetical theories led to "a hermeneutic which distinguished the typological relationship between Israel and the church – never confusing God's intentions for either".[165] Jue claims that this hermeneutic evolved out of the difficulties of millenarianism. Whereas Calvin had believed that the majority of Old Testament prophecies were fulfilled in Christ's first coming, Mede's millenarianism required that these prophecies were placed within a future dispensation. Thus, Mede developed a "double-literal sense" in which Israel were both a typological representation of the Gentile church, and the restored, future Jewish nation.[166] While Jue's argument is generally convincing,[167] he fails to see

[163]He continues: "especially in that memorable overthrow of the yeere 1588 and some years following; the *English* and the *Dutch*, by Sea and Land, abundantly pouring out the Cup of the mightie hand of God". Mede, *Key*, Part II, p. 116.

[164]Bercovitch, *Puritan Origins*, pp. 136–186.

[165]Jue, *Heaven*, p. 209.

[166]Jue, *Heaven,* pp. 195–209.

[167]Two reservations can be expressed on Jue's position. Firstly, the difference between New England as a "reflection" of Israel and New England *as* the "New" Israel is not expressed clearly enough in Jue's work. It is to push Bercovitch et al. too far to suggest that the New Englanders viewed themselves as the *only* manifestation of God's people, and that "Israel" as a term did not include the wider Gentile church. Mary Morrissey's recent work on Paul's Cross jeremiads better recognises the different ways in which Israel was used as an exemplum of England (see Mary Morrissey, "Elect Nation and Prophetic Preaching: Types and Examples in the Paul's Cross Jeremiad" in *The English Sermon Revised: Religion, Literature and History 1600–1750*, eds Lori

the implications that Mede's position on the discontinuity between Israel and the church presumes for readings of the self in the period. More seriously, Jue suggests that it was Mede's millenarianism which led him to draw a firm division between Israel and the church. This is to approach the question from the wrong angle. It was not Mede's millenarianism which led him to a literal hermeneutic, but a literal hermeneutic which led Mede to his millenarianism. For Mede, Revelation 20 became the clearest passage of scripture, as allegory and figurative language dissolved: "[It] seems to be the most plain and simple, most free of Allegory and of the involution of Prophetical figures . . . How can a man then in so plain and simple a narration take a passage of so plain and ordinarily-expressed words (as those about the *First Resurrection* are) in any other sense than the usual and literal?"[168] A consistently literal approach to the text led Mede to his millenarianism – not the other way around.

It is therefore clear that Mede's millenarianism and reading of Israel resulted from his application of a consistently literal reading of Old Testament promises to the Jews. That his hermeneutical system mirrored Brightman's in many respects is noteworthy. Mede followed Brightman in developing a consistent system of signs and referents, and a method of prophetic synchronisations. While Mede certainly moved beyond Brightman in the detailed hermeneutic of his "synchronisms" (and his conception of the millennium),[169] he was nonetheless indebted to the older commentator for the roots of his hermeneutical system. While Mede did not focus on the Judeo-centric theme to the extent of Brightman, he divided God's promises for the church and Israel and privileged the Jews to an extent which some later readers found disquieting.[170] As a developer of Brightman's thought, and a further

---

Anne Ferrell and Peter McCullough (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000) pp. 43–58). Secondly, the term "double literal sense" is too general, as it can be used to describe any reading in which the literal-historical sense and the typological sense were both taken into account. It was most famously used by Nicholas of Lyra (see Lesley Smith, "The Gospel Truth: Nicholas of Lyra on John", in *Nicholas of Lyra: The Senses of Scripture*, eds Philip D.W. Krey and Lesley Smith (Leiden: Brill, 2000), pp. 223–224). However, a similar conception is found in Calvin himself.

[168]Mede, *Works*, p. 770.

[169]A number of works trace the "two paths" taken by Brightman and Mede. George Kroeze's thesis claims that there was a three-stage development of millenarian thought in England, with Brightman representing a transitory "postmillennial" stage ("Variety", pp. 108–51). Similar arguments are found in Robert Clouse's essay "The Apocalyptic Interpretation of Thomas Brightman and Joseph Mede" (*Bulletin of the Evangelical Theological Society* 11:4 (1968), 181–190). Clouse is markedly negative towards Brightman, arguing that Mede's development of a literal reading of the first and second resurrection was the central shift in English interpretations of Rev. 20. Against both of these views, I believe that Mede's work must be read in the context of (rather than against) Brightman's.

[170]A notable example is the republication of an anti-Semitic tract by Thomas Calvert (*The Blessed Jew of Marocco* (York, 1648)). Calvert believed that the treatise's anti-Jewish conclusions were vital at a time when "the Hearts of men are much erected to looke after and beleeve a Chiliasme . . . which is much applauded and expected, and that upon too many Jewish Grounds and Arguments". Calvert highlighted Mede as responsible for these opinions, as one of those who "think[s] of a re-edification of the long-ruined Jerusalem, and judge[s] it were none of the worst enterprizes, to go to that unholy Land, and be taken up into Heaven there", pp. 1–2.

representative of the "moderate" millenarianism found in Brightman, Mede was an important figure.[171] Indeed, both Mede and Brightman remained key figures into the 1640s and 1650s as their works were reprinted and the collapse of censorship brought them to a new readership. Brightman's chosen nation reading, Judeocentrism and hermeneutic proved particularly influential in this period and began to be put to a range of uses. The new political realities of the chaotic decades allowed Brightman to become both a new Merlin – a radical prophet who had correctly proclaimed the downfall of episcopacy – and a central figure in newly politicised debates on the return of the Jews to England. In the final chapter we can turn to the diverse and fascinating ways in which Brightman's ideas were received in the Civil Wars and beyond.

References

Adams, Thomas. 1615. *The black devil*. London.
Anon. 1641a. *Brightmans predictions and prophecies*. London.
Anon. 1641b. *A revelation of Mr. Brightmans revelation*. London.
Anon. 1642. *Reverend Mr. Brightmans judgement*. London.
A Jewes prophesy, or, newes from Rome. London, 1607.
Arasola, Kai. 1990. *The end of historicism: Millerite hermeneutic of time prophecies in the Old Testament*. Sigtuna: Datem Publishing.
Ball, Bryan W., and Joseph Mede. 1586–1638. *Oxford dictionary of national biography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. doi:10.1093/ref:odnb/18465.
Bernard, Richard. 1617. *A key of knowledge for the opening of the secret mysteries of St Johns mysticall revelation*. London.
Boys, John. 1612. *The autumn part from the twelfth Sunday after trinitie*. London.
Brightman, Thomas. 1644. *The revelation of St. Iohn illustrated with an analysis & scholions . . . The Fourth Edition, Corrected & Amended*. London.
Bulwarde, Robert, John Fowler, and Clement Saunders. 1612. *A shield of defence against the arrowes of schisme shot abroad by Iean de L'escluse in his advertisment against Mr. Brightman*. Amsterdam.
Calvert, Thomas. 1648. *The blessed Jew of Marocco*. York.
Capp, Bernard. 1984. The fifth monarchists and popular millenarianism. In *Radical religion in the English revolution*, ed. J.F. McGregor and B. Reay, 165–190. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Capp, Bernard. 2002 [1970]. Extreme millenarianism. In *The puritans, the millennium, and the future of Israel*, ed. Peter Toon, 66–90. Cambridge: James Clark & Co.
Carlton, Charles. 1987. *Archbishop William Laud*. London/New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
Christianson, Paul. 1978. *Reformers and Babylon: English apocalyptic visions from the reformation to the eve of the civil war*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
Clouse, Robert Gordon. 1963. *The influence of John Henry Alsted on English millenarian thought in the seventeenth century*. University of Iowa, Unpublished PhD Thesis.
Clouse, Robert Gordon. 1968. The apocalyptic interpretation of Thomas Brightman and Joseph Mede. *Bulletin of the Evangelical Theological Society* 11: 181–190.
Cogley, Richard W. 2005a. The ancestry of the American Indians: Thomas Thorowgood's *Iewes in America* (1650) and *Jews in America* (1660). *English Literary Renaissance* 35: 304–330.

[171] Opposed to this, Kroeze writes that "We must think of Mede as a scholar who opened the door to a more extreme millenarianism" (Kroeze, "Variety", p. 249, also Christianson, *Reformers*, p. 124).

Cogley, Richard W. 2005b. 'The most vile and barbarous nation of all the world': Giles Fletcher the Elder's *The Tartars or, Ten Tribes* (ca. 1610). *Renaissance Quarterly* 58: 781–814.
Cogley, Richard W. 2007. Some other kinde of being and condition': The controversy in mid-seventeenth-century England over the peopling of ancient America. *Journal of the History of Ideas* 68: 35–56.
Cohn, Norman. 1957. *The pursuit of the millennium*. London: Secker & Warburg.
Collins, Samuel. 1617. *Epphata to F.T., or, the defence of the right reuerend father in god, the Lord Bishop of Elie*. London.
Cooper, Thomas. 1615. *The blessing of Japheth proving the gathering in of the Gentiles, and finall conversion of the Jewes*. London.
Cowper, William. 1619. *Pathmos, or, a commentary on the revelation of Saint John*. London.
Crome, Andrew. 2011. Language and millennialism in the evolving editions of Thomas Wilson's *Christian Dictionary* (1612–1678). *Reformation and Renaissance Review* 13: 311–337.
Culver, Douglas. 1995. *Albion and Ariel*. New York: Peter Lang.
de l'Ecluse, Jean. 1612. *An advertisement to everie godly reader of Mr. Thomas Brightman his book*. Amsterdam.
Draxe, Thomas. 1608a. *The lambes spouse*. London.
Draxe, Thomas. 1608b. *The worldes resurrection, or the generall calling of the iewes*. London.
Draxe, Thomas. 1612. *The earnest of our inheritance*. London.
Draxe, Thomas. 1615. *An alarum to the last judgement*. London.
Draxe, Thomas. 1617. *Anterotemata, Thomae Draks ten counter-demaunds propounded to those of the separation*. London.
Eudaemon-Joannes, Andreae. 1611. *Castigatio apocalypsis apocalypseos Thomae Brightmanni Angli*. Cologne.
Finch, Henry. 1615. *An exposition of the song of Solomon*. London.
Finch, Henry. 1621. *The calling of the jewes. A present to Judah and the children of Israel*. London.
Firth, Katherine. 1979. *The apocalyptic tradition in reformation Britain 1530–1645*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Fletcher, Giles. 1677. *Israel redux, or, the restauration of Israel*. London.
Floyd, John. 1612. *The overthrow of the protestants pulpit*. Saint Omer.
Forbes, Patrick. 1613. *An exquisite commentarie upon the revelation of Saint John*. London.
Forbes, Patrick. 1614. *An learned commentarie upon the revelation of Saint John*. Middelburg.
Gibson, Kenneth. 1999. *Eschatology, apocalypse and millenarianism in seventeenth century Protestant thought*. Nottingham Trent University, Unpublished PhD Thesis.
Gouge, William. 1655. *A learned and very useful commentary on the whole Epistle to the Hebrews*. London.
Gribben, Crawford. 2008. *The puritan millennium: Literature and theology, 1550–1682*, Revised ed. Milton Keynes: Paternoster.
Guibbory, Achsah. 2010. *Christian identity, Jews, and Israel in seventeenth-century England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Hill, Christopher. 1964. *Society & puritanism in pre-revolutionary England*. London: Secker & Warburg.
Hill, Christopher. 1971. *Antichrist in seventeenth century England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Hotson, Howard. 2000a. *Paradise postponed: Johann Heinrich Alsted and the birth of Calvinist millenarianism*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
Hotson, Howard. 2000b. *Johann Heinrich Alsted 1588–1638: Between renaissance, reformation and universal reform*. Oxford: Clarendon.
James I and VI. 1620. Meditation upon the Lord's prayer. In *Workes*. London.
Jowitt, Claire. 1995. Radical identities? Native Americans, Jews, and the English Commonwealth. *Seventeenth Century* 10: 101–119.
Jue, Jeffrey K. 2006. *Heaven upon earth: Joseph Mede (1586–1638) and the legacy of millenarianism*. Dordrecht: Springer.
Katz, David S. 1982. *Philo-semitism and the readmission of the Jews to England 1603–1655*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Kroeze, George. 1985. *The variety of millennial hopes in the English reformation 1560–1660*. Fuller Theological Seminary, Unpublished PhD Thesis.
Laud, William. 1621. *A sermon preached before his Majesty, on Tuesday the nineteenth of June, at Wansted*. London.
Liu, Tai. 1973. *Discord in Zion: The puritan divines and the puritan revolution 1640–1660*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.
Mandelbrote, Scott. 1998. The Bible and national identity in the British Isles, c.1650–c.1750. In *Protestantism and national identity*, ed. Tony Claydon and Ian McBride, 157–181. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
McGiffert, Michael. 1986. Who wrote the preface and notes for Henry Finch's 'The Sacred Doctrine of Divinitie', 1590? *Albion* 18: 247–251.
Mede, Joseph. 1641. *Apostasy of the latter times*. London.
Mede, Joseph. 1643. *The key of the revelation*. London.
Mede, Joseph. 1672. *The works of the pious and profoundly-learned Joseph Mede, B.D*. London.
Meserve, Margaret. 2008. *Empires of Islam in renaissance historical thought*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Morrissey, Mary. 2000. Elect nation and prophetic preaching: Types and examples in the Paul's Cross Jeremiad. In *Sermon revised: Religion, literature and history 1600–1750*, ed. Lori Anne Ferrell and Peter McCullough, 43–58. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
Murray, Iain H. 1971. *The puritan hope: A study in revival and the interpretation of prophecy*. Edinburgh: Banner of Truth.
Murrin, Michael. 1984. Revelation and two seventeenth century commentators. In *The Apocalypse in English Renaissance thought and literature*, ed. C.A. Patrides and Joseph Wittreich, 125–146. Manchester: University of Manchester Press.
Ong, Walter J. 1958. *Ramus, method and the decay of dialogue*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Pagitt, Ephraim. 1645. *Heresiography, or, a discription of the hereticks and sectaries of these latter times*. London.
Parfitt, Tudor. 2002. *The lost tribes of Israel: The history of a myth*. London: Weldenfeld & Nicholson.
Prest, Wilfred R., and Sir Henry Finch. c.1558-1625. *Oxford dictionary of national biography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. doi:10.1093/ref:odnb/9436.
Prest, Wilfrid R. 1978. The art of law and the law of God: Sir Henry Finch (1558–1625). In *Puritans and revolutionaries*, ed. Donald Pennington and Keith Thomas, 94–117. Oxford: Clarendon.
Purchas, Samuel. 1613. *Purchas, his pilgrimage. Or relations of the world and religions observed*. London.
Robinson, John. 1625. *A just and necassarie apologie of certain Christians, no Lesse contumeliously then commonly called Brownists or Barrowists*. Amsterdam.
Sanderson, Robert. 1622. *Two sermons: Preached at two severall visitations, at Boston*. London.
Scult, Mel. 1978. *Millennial expectations and Jewish liberties*. Leiden: Brill.
Smith, Lesley. 2000. The gospel truth: Nicholas of Lyra on John. In *Nicholas of Lyra: The senses of scripture*, ed. Philip D.W. Krey and Lesley Smith, 223–250. Leiden: Brill.
Sturgis, Amy. 1999. Prophesies and politics: Millenarians, Rabbis, and the Jewish Indian theory. *Seventeenth Century* 14: 15–23.
Toon, Peter. 2002 [1970]. The latter day glory. In *The puritans, the millennium & the future of Israel: Puritan eschatology 1600–1660*, ed. Peter Toon, 23–41. Cambridge: James Clarke & Co.
Traske, John. 1620. *A treatise of libertie from judaisme*. London.
Wilkinson, Paul. 2007. *For Zion's sake: Christian Zionism and the role of John Nelson Darby*. Milton Keynes: Paternoster.
Williamson, Arthur. 1979. *Scottish national consciousness in the age of James VI*. Edinburgh: John Donald.
Wilson, Thomas. 1612. *A Christian dictionarie*. London.

Chapter 6
Tracing Brightman's Influence: Judeo-Centrism, 1640–60

If the period leading up to 1640 was marked by the banning of publications favouring millennialism and firm control over the presses, the breakdown of censorship in the early 1640s, followed by the tumult of the Civil Wars and the unique atmosphere of the Protectorate, proved the ideal breeding ground for apocalyptic beliefs. As these beliefs have been examined in a variety of forms over the previous 30 years, the danger is that this chapter merely restates the various millennial positions which have already been discussed in depth in a range of comprehensive studies, trying the reader's patience in the process.[1] To avoid this potential pitfall, I do not aim to provide an exhaustive overview of millennialism during the Civil Wars and interregnum here – rather I endeavour to trace the range of responses to Brightman's position that were exhibited throughout the period. In particular, this chapter will look at the way in which Brightman's division between Israel and the church and focus on the chosen nation theme was picked up and developed. The key event for any examination of Christian interest in Judaism in the period was the Whitehall Conference on Jewish readmission, held in December 1655. Again, this has received a number of examinations in the past 20 years,[2] but the link between a consistently literal interpretation of Old Testament prophecy and a focus on the importance of national identity has often been missed in these discussions. This final chapter therefore aims to provide an overview of some of the

---

Parts of the final section of this chapter previously appeared as 'Friendship and Enmity to God and Nation: The Complexities of Jewish-Gentile Relations in the Whitehall Conference of 1655' in *Friendship in the Middle Ages and Early Modern Age*, eds. Albrecht Classen and Marilyn Sandidge (Berlin: de Gruyter Press, 2011), pp. 749–777. I am grateful to de Gruyter Press and the editors for their permission to reprint them here.

[1]For example, Gribben, *Puritan Millennium*; Jue, *Heaven*; Firth, *Apocalyptic Tradition*; Christianson, *Reformers and Babylon*.

[2]Katz, *Jews in England*, pp. 107–144; Shapiro, *Shakespeare and the Jews*, pp. 44–88; Guibbory, *Christian Identity*, pp. 220–251.

A. Crome, *The Restoration of the Jews: Early Modern Hermeneutics, Eschatology, and National Identity in the Works of Thomas Brightman*, International Archives of the History of Ideas Archives internationales d'histoire des idées 213,
DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-04762-1_6,

ways in which Brightman's work was appropriated and re-imagined in the period, and how this practically impacted upon Anglo-Jewish relations in early modern England.

6.1 Brightman as Radical Prophet

As the previous chapter began with a discussion of Brightman's use in more radical works, it is useful to briefly trace this stream of thought into the tumult of the Civil Wars. As we saw, Brightman's work was used by more radical writers to justify their split from the Church of England. This was particularly true in the case of the Laodicean trope, in which the Church appeared to be on the edge of rejection by Christ. Obviously, this sort of rhetoric had a useful application for the reforming preacher. It enabled him to place his hearers at the moment of promise; the key fork of the road at which the Church of England would become either the "peerless paragon" that Brightman had imagined, or be vomited up to moulder with the dregs of popery.

The chaotic events of the early 1640s, with the fall of Laud and the resultant collapse of censorship, opened up new spaces in which radical writers were free to operate. With debates on church reform raging at the time, coupled with the undoubted excitement at the downfall of what had seemed to many to be a tyrannous church polity, it is perhaps unsurprising that Brightman's Laodicean trope returned with such force. It was, as Robert Surridge has noted, a popular theme in sermons, often employed when political events seemed to be turning against the "godly". Henry Wilkinson's 1641 sermon on lukewarmness in religion, preached as the Scots occupied Newcastle, therefore came close to despair as it addressed the situation of Laodicea: "I should in the next place come to speak of the judgement but I fear that this part of my text is taken out of my hands and is already begun to be put into execution".[3] John Eachard was even more forceful in 1645, condemning both Presbyterians and Independents for arguing over church polity when judgement was coming on the Church of England. "So Christ is now come, as a theefe upon our lukewarme Church of *Laodicea,* in *England*," he warned, "with the judgement of a plundering, robbing, spoyling, stealing, civill warre . . . to fulfill his promise, or threat, against the lukewarme Angels, of our Church of *Laodicea,* in *England* . . . Rev. 3. 16. Is not this Scripture fulfilling in your eares, this day?".[4] Yet perhaps more striking than its usage by preachers, Brightman's Laodicean trope was also publicised through cheap print. His commentaries were reduced to pithy prose popularisations and he became (for many) a popular prophetic figurehead.

[3] Henry Wilkinson, *A Sermon Against Lukewarmnesse in Religion* (London, 1641), p. 3.

[4] John Eachard, *Good Newes for All Christian Soldiers* (London, 1645) sig. A2^{i}r.

The precise details regarding the ending of censorship are unclear.[5] What is certain is that the quantity of printed material enjoyed a sudden increase. On average the presses had produced around 600–700 items a year in the 1630s. In 1640 this rose to 900 items. This jumped again to 2,000 in 1641 and more than 4,000 items in 1642.[6] Among the texts produced were a series of tracts bearing Brightman's name. However, these were not his voluminous commentaries, but rather a number of popularisations of his reading of the churches of Revelation 2–3, and in particular his interpretation of Laodicea. The first pamphlet appeared in 1641, printed by Ralph Harford. *Reverend Mr. Brightmans Iudgement, or prophesies what shall befall Germany, Scotland, Holland, and the churches adhering to them* was a simplified version of the first three chapters of Brightman's commentary, presumably written by Harford himself. The pamphlet was re-published the following year and enjoyed significant popularity, being printed twice in both 1642 and 1643, before receiving both a London and Edinburgh edition in 1644. For those readers who preferred something livelier than Harford's summary, there were two additional tracts available, both published in 1641 and using radically different forms. *Brightmans Predictions and Prophecies: written 46. yeares since; concerning the three churches of Germanie, England and Scotland* employed pithy popular verse to share its own summary of Brightman's interpretation of Revelation 2–3. *A Revelation of Mr. Brightmans Revelation*, meanwhile, was a dialogue work in which a godly 'Minister' discoursed with a 'Citizen' who had been left somewhat bemused by the radical political upheavals then shaking the nation.

These works had a number of functions. Such tract popularisations were cheap and thus helped to acquaint those who otherwise would only have gotten their theology through sermons or weekday lectures with the key religious thinkers of the day. This was a key selling point – *Reverand Mr. Brightman's Judgement* noted on its title page that it was "collected for the good of those who want time or coine, to purchase so large a volume". Indeed, *Reverand Mr. Brightman* set out Brightman's view clearly on a number of issues outside of the Laodicean identification of the Church of England (which was the main focus of the work). These included Elizabeth's role in bringing in the Kingdom of God in 1558, the calling of the Jews, and a period of earthly blessing.[7] Likewise, *Brightmans Predictions* was accurate, although perhaps not altogether artful, in its translation of Brightman's prose into verse. Thus Brightman's gloss on Philadelphia's role: "Hitherto they have fought against them with quills & incke but the time shall come ere long, when they

[5] In Michael Mendle's words, "nobody seems to know how, even exactly when" censorship collapsed (Michael Mendle, 'De Facto Freedom, De Facto Authority: Press and Parliament, 1640–1643', *The Historical Journal* 38:2 (1995), p. 313). The Star Chamber was abolished in July 1641, but it had not functioned since the end of 1640.

[6] David Cressy, 'Revolutionary England 1640–2', *Past & Present* 181 (2003), 59–61. See also F.S. Siebert, *Freedom of the Press in England 1476–1776: The Rise and Decline of Government Controls* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1952), p. 191.

[7] [Anon.], *Reverend Mr. Brightmans iudgement or prophesies*, p. 6.

shalbe quite rooted out with weapons, & that by the helpe of this Church"[8] became: "And the Prelatick pomp: the time was when/You warr'd against it but with inke and pen/(And then prevaild) but after shall doe more/Chase with the sword the Babylonish whore'.[9]

Despite these conservative summaries of Brightman's views, it was the image of Brightman as a prophet that caught the imagination of many of those purchasing the tracts.[10] This was something that was consciously emphasised by the works themselves. *Brightmans Predictions* therefore claimed on its title page that it contained "*All which should happen* (*as he foretold*) *between the yeares of 36. and 41*". Similarly, *Reverand Mr. Brightman's* title sheet advertised Brightman as "*This faithfull Watchman or our English Prophet (as he is cald)*". Readers were reminded that if they needed any proof of Brightman's prophetic ability, they need only glance at a news sheet: "Wonderfull to see how [his predictions] are fulfilled, and in fulfilling, foreseeing and foretelling what our eyes have seen, and may see, both in the past, present and future State of our times". The title page of *A Revelation of Mr Brightman* was even clearer when it informed readers that by: "*comparing his writings, and our times together . . . it is manifest, that Mr. Brightman was a true prophet*". That tract then reinforced its message through printing a copy of print seller Peter Strent's woodcut of Brightman along with a poem proclaiming his prophetic ability. The picture, as I noted in the introduction to this book, is interesting – it features a heavenly city and clouds are visible emerging, as if in a vision, behind Brightman's head.[11]

This was not the only technique the pamphlet writers used to enhance Brightman's reputation as a prophet. The pamphlets developed a particularly close relationship with a publication proclaiming judgement on apostate Germany and detailing the horrors of the Thirty Years War – Philip Vincent's *Lamentations of Germany* (1638). Containing several horrific woodcuts portraying the torture of the unfortunate Germans, *Lamentations* was a prose work providing information for those who wanted detailed descriptions of the horrors of the conflict. It clearly owed a debt to Foxe's work, although neither the woodcuts nor Vincent's breathless text were likely to match *Actes and Monuments* for influence. Where the work is important is in its relationship to Brightman. When *Brightmans Prophecies* detailed the punishments that had been predicted for the German church, the pamphlet's editor moved away from the rather general judgements that Brightman had included

[8] Brightman, *Revelation*, p. 116.

[9] [Anon.], *Brightmans Predictions and Prophecies: written 46. yeares since; concerning the three churches of Germanie, England and Scotland* (London, 1641), p. 6.

[10] For more on this see Andrew Crome, 'Constructing the Political Prophet in 1640s England', *The Seventeenth Century* 26:2 (Oct. 2011), pp. 279–298. In particular, I analyse the role of Vincent's work in much greater detail then in what follows here.

[11] On the importance of visual media in pamphlets, see Helen Pierce, 'Anti-Episcopacy and Graphic Satire in England, 1640–1645', *The Historical Journal* 47:4 (2004), pp. 809–848.

in his original commentary. In their place, he felt able to insert examples from Vincent. The examples he used, however, were presented not as Vincent's reports, but rather as Brightman's own predictions. The borrowing is clear when the two texts are compared. For example, Vincent notes a particularly unpleasant torture: "The mouthes of some have they opened with gags, and then poured downe their throats, water, stinking puddle, filthy liquids, and pisse it selfe, saying, 'This is a *Swedish* draught'. So growing sicke, and their bellies swelling like a Tun, they have dyed by leysure with the greater torment".[12] This can be compared to *Brightmans Predictions*, which summarises one section of "Brightman" as follows: "Other being gag'd they downe their throats will poure/All puddle trash, with urine stale and sower/Till their guts break, their miseries transcens/Of which for many yeares shall be no end".[13] This would be a rather inconsequential case of sensationalising the original prophecies, if it were not for what the tract editor did next. Immediately after quoting Vincent under the guise of Brightman, he referred any readers who might doubt Brightman's prophetic skill to read "divers letters sent out of *Germanie,* bewayling their sad and lamentable estate, and are to be read in print . . . all which you may find in a book called the *Lamentations of Germanie*".[14] Any reader who did so would obviously be struck by the similarity between the predictions made by "Brightman" and the content of Vincent's work.

The connection is made again and again in the tracts, as Vincent's text served as an independent source to legitimise Brightman's prophetic authority.[15] Of course, current affairs at the time of publication also helped to promote this image. Izaak Walton's *Life of Dr.* [Robert] *Sanderson* therefore linked the pamphlet popularisation of Brightman's work to the downfall of the episcopacy. These publications apparently appeared on the same day that Bishops were barred from sitting in parliament.[16] Walton recalled that Brightman "had made the Churches of *Geneva* and *Scotland*, which had no Bishops, to be *Philadelphia* in the *Apocalyps, the Angel that God loved*; and the power of Prelacy to be Antichrist, the evil Angel, which the House of Commons had now so spued up, as never to recover their dignity: Therefore did those Covenanters approve and applaud Mr. *Brightman* for discovering and foretelling the Bishops downfall".[17] That Hamon l'Estrange

[12]Philip Vincent, *Lamentations of Germany* (London, 1638), p. 13.

[13]*Brightmans Predictions*, p. 4.

[14]*Brightmans Predictions*, pp. 4–5.

[15]See *A Revelation of Mr. Brightman's Revelation*, pp. 7–8. In the dialogue, "Minister" asks "Citizen" if he had read *Lamentations of Germany*. After "Citizen" replies that he had not, "Minister" notes that: "If you had read that Booke, you should plainely see all that fulfilled to the utmost that Mr. *Brightman* foretold". For more on this see Crome, "Political Prophet".

[16]It seems likely that he intends to describe the success of the mob in barring the Bishops from the House in late December 1641, rather than the passing of the Bishops Exclusion Bill by the Commons in March 1641, or its eventual successful passage through the Lords in early 1642.

[17]Izaak Walton, *The Life of Dr. Sanderson* (London, 1678), sigs. f4^{ii}r-f4^{iii}r. It is unclear which tract Walton is referring to – he notes that it was titled *Mr. Brightman's Revelation of the Revelation*. It is

later described Brightman as "the Oracle of them of the Revolt"[18] is perhaps no surprise. Indeed, a more recent commentator has described him as "perhaps the most politically influential biblical commentator of the 1640s".[19]

Certainly, the image of Brightman as a popular prophet was enduring. From 1642 onwards his name appeared alongside Mother Shipton and "Old Otwell Bins" in a series of collections of popular prophecy which remained in print into the eighteenth century.[20] As with any such folk prophet, he proved a malleable figure, useful far beyond the radical puritanism he has often been associated with. The 1649 ballad *A Crown a Crime or, the Monarch martyr* thus reapplied the Laodicean trope to England after Charles's execution. Yet it was now too late to hope that England would have any blessing after their treatment of the king:

> Nor can we lesse expect, judgement's at hand
> To scourge the follies of a sinfull Land:
> What Brightman wrote we would not understand.[21]

The image of Brightman as a visionary, almost mystical, prophet is (as we have seen in previous chapters) not accurate. Nonetheless, this populist presentation of Brightman was important as it was the image of Brightman that remained for many of those who were unable (or, like l'Estrange, unwilling) to engage in depth with his work. It is an image that survives in much secondary literature.[22] The failure to divorce the Brightman of the tracts – a figure cleverly constructed by those writing pamphlets – and the Brightman of the commentaries who remained influential among divines, is a key failing in many examinations of eschatological developments in the 1640s and 1650s. Brightman's interpretation of Rev. 2–3 was important and cited with regularity. Yet Brightman was used just as often by Presbyterians (particularly within the Church of Scotland) to justify their approach

---

likely that he was referring to *A Revelation of Mr. Brightman's Revelation*, but it is also possible that another tract in the tradition, which has not survived, was being referred to.

[18]Hamon l'Estrange, *The Alliance of Divine Offices* (London, 1659), p. 73.

[19]Clarke, *Song of Songs*, p. 124.

[20]The first of these was *Five Strange and Wonderfull Prophesies and Predictions of Severall Men Fore-told Long Since. All which are likely to come to passe in these our distracted times* (1642). These were followed by *Sixe Strange Prophecies* (1642); *Seven Severall Strange Prophecies* (1642); *Nine Notable Prophesies* (1644); *Twelve Strange Proehesies* (1648); *Thirteen Strange* . . . (1648); *Fourteen Strange* . . . (1648); *Shipton's Prophesie with Seventeene More* (1651) and *[Mother] Shipton's Prophesie: with Three and XX More* (1659). The final pamphlet was reprinted in 1679 and 1685. In the same year a reprint of *Sixe Strange* . . . appeared in Edinburgh as *The Wonderful Prophesies of Old Mother Shipton* which was itself reprinted in 1700. Brightman's "prophecy" also appeared in the astrologer William Lilly's popular *Collection of Ancient and Modern Prophesies, Concerning these present times* (London, 1645), p. 43.

[21][Anon.], *A Crown a Crime or, a Monarch martyr* (London, 1649).

[22]For example, Richey, *Politics of Revelation*, pp. 60–62; Cohn-Sherbok, *Politics of Apocalypse*, p. 3; Wagner, *Anxious,* p. 85.

to church government. This began as early as 1619, but continued throughout the century.[23] Yet it was his hermeneutic approach and findings on the Jews' restoration to Palestine that would prove his most telling influence.

6.2 Consistent Literalism and the Jews

A belief that the Jews would be restored to their own land could prove, as we saw in the previous chapter, to be a controversial one. For those opposed to Judeo-centrism, the idea of separating God's promises for Israel and God's promises for the church was inherently dangerous, in that it called into question the standard view of the Christian as the true Israelite. In returning to a consistently literal – that is, a more firmly historicised – reading of the Old Testament promises, Judeo-centrists appeared to destroy both the Gentiles' primacy in God's plan and their hope for the future. Beyond this, the claim that the Jews would rule over Gentile nations could prove particularly controversial, as Henry Finch's experience had shown. In Thomas Fuller's *A Pisgah Sight of Palestine* the historian could therefore joke at Finch's expense that he "so enlargeth the future amplitude of the Jewish state that thereby he occasioned a confining of himself".[24] Those hoping to avoid a future "confining" were of course given considerably greater leeway to express their opinions in the religious and political turmoil of the 1640s and 1650s. Those millenarians who had been consciously influenced by Brightman and Mede were no longer a downtrodden remnant, instead finding themselves in the political ascendancy. The reception of Brightman's Laodicean trope was just one of many symptoms of this; the political evolution of Brightman's Judeo-centrism, already hinted at in Thomas Draxe's calls for Jewish readmission, would be another. Where Draxe had been almost a lone voice calling for readmission in the 1620s, by mid-century others joined what eventually became a chorus of appeals for the official return of the Jews to England. Taking their cue from Brightman's emphasis on a chosen English identity, many Judeo-centrists began to view Jewish restoration – and positive relations towards the Jewish people – as essential both for the individual Christian and for the well-being of the nation as a whole. If England wanted to continue to enjoy God's blessings (and her role as the chosen nation) then she would have to show practical concern for the Jewish people.

---

[23]These include David Calderwood, *Perth Assembly* (Edinburgh, 1619); Paul Baynes, *The Diocesseans Tryall* (London, 1641); Thomas Edwards, *Reasons against the Independent government of particular congregations* (London, 1641); Alexander Henderson, *The Government and Order of the Church of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1641); Samuel Rutherford, *A Peaceable and Temperate plea for Pauls Presbytery* (Edinburgh, 1642); Commissioners of the Church of Scotland, *Reformation of Church Government in Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1643).

[24]Thomas Fuller, *A Pisgah- Sight of Palestine and the confines thereof, with the historie of the Old and New Testament acred thereon* (London, 1650), Part II, p. 196.

It was only in the 1640s and 1650s that practical support for the Jews, driven by millenarian aims, could become a feature of government policy. The Laudian conformity of the 1630s was opposed to any major projects promoted by the puritan wing of the Church of England. Since most Judeo-centrists combined their eschatology with a thorough-going "Calvinist" anti-sacramental theology (the exception being Mede)[25] those liable to have sympathy for, and an eschatologically motivated interest in, the Jews were also likely to be out of step with the powerbrokers of the decade. Works expounding the theme, as the fate suffered by both Brightman and Mede's tomes demonstrates, were therefore unlikely to reach the press.[26] While criticisms of Brightman's Judeo-centrism revealed that his work was still being discussed in the period, it remained an idea that was difficult to print in England.[27]

There were further reasons why Laudians might find Judeo-centrism uncomfortable beyond the standard theological problem of undermining the continuity between Israel and the church. Guibbory's recent work has argued that the Laudian focus on the "beauty of holiness" was an attempt to construct and beautify churches as continuations of (or as architecture surpassing) the Old Testament Temple in Jerusalem. Each church and cathedral therefore served as the unique locus of God's presence and power, offering the worshipper a chance for a changed spiritual state and a direct encounter with God of a type not available in the unsanctified world.[28] This sort of thinking was obviously anathema to those who held to the type of continental, reformed theology promoted by the majority of Judeo-centrists. On the whole, Judeo-centrist thought displayed an antipathy toward the idea of sacramental worship for both Jews and Christians. Brightman had been clear in arguing that the restored Jewish nation would not "have their ceremoniall worship restored . . . [but] shal worship Christ purely, and sincerely, according to his wil & Commandement alone".[29] The converted Jews would always worship Christ according to the model of the best reformed churches. Given this, for Laudians Judeo-centric thought appeared dangerous on a number of levels: political, sacramental and theological.

For Judeo-centrists, however, the real danger lay in a failure to appreciate the importance of a correct division of God's promises. Thus Robert Maton's 1642 *Israels Redemption, or the Propheticall History of our Saviours Kingdome on Earth, That is, Of the Church Catholicke and Triumphant* claimed that this theological error had led to Antichrist's entrance into the English church, and continued to be at the root of Rome's corruption. "That which was a first a good advantage to

[25] Jue, *Heaven upon Earth*, pp. 25–29.

[26] For the changes in millennial positions as a result of this shift see Gribben, *Puritan Millennium*, pp. 87–113.

[27] See for example, John Weemes, *A Treatise of the Foure Degenerate Sonnes* (London, 1636) in which he criticised "some of our writers" who "apply those places of the prophets more literally than mystically; and they hold that the Jewes shall be restored againe to the land of Canaan, and that they shall all live under a visible monarchy there" (pp. 375–377).

[28] Guibbory, *Christian Identity*, pp. 57–88.

[29] Brightman, *Revelation*, p. 544.

him in his rising, and which is now his best plea for the upholding of his pompous Clergy, of his Princely and Magistracy-mastering Pontiffes," he argued, "was and is, the renouncing of the foresaid truth, and thereupon the misapplication of all those revelations which properly and naturally concerne the Redemption and Restauration of the Jewes posterity and Principality".[30] If Laud's supporters had correctly divided the promises for Israel and the church, then there would never have been the danger of a Jewish priestly mentality developing. A break between Israel and the church did not simply remove one of the central tools for Christian self-fashioning, but also served to undermine the entire Laudian sacramental and theological project.

After the changing fortunes of 1640 had led to Laud's downfall, the religious power base in England shifted towards those of a reformed constituency. This also opened up the possibility of Judeo-centric thought receiving a more widespread publication. The appearance of works by Brightman and Mede (the latter at the command of parliament), along with the republication of firmly anti-Romanist commentaries such as Arthur Dent's *Ruine of Rome* was therefore only to be expected. They were joined by a number of other Judeo-centric commentaries, sermons and appeals that displayed a remarkable influence from Brightman. These influences can be broken down along the three related lines that have been traced throughout this study: a focus on a consistently literal hermeneutic, leading to a Judeo-centric position, combined with a focus on national identity formation.

An increasingly literalistic hermeneutic in the 1640s and 1650s has often been linked to the rise of radical religious movements.[31] Yet the use of Brightman's consistent literalism was varied, influencing a range of writers across the religious spectrum. The literal sense of prophecy, complained John Fenwicke in 1643 had been "rejected of most interpreters" when examining Old Testament promises which might have both a literal application to the Jews and a spiritual application to Christians. Worse, these same commentators ignored those prophecies which "have a literall sense onely, and yet taken mystically of many, as most of the prophecies concerning the Jewes returne to their owne country".[32] Jeremiah Burroughs' *Exposition of the Prophecie of Hosea* defended its similar hermeneutic position: when examining Hosea's promises of Jewish restoration he reminded readers that "I desire not to fall upon allegories but when there is a necessity, therefore take the words literally".[33] Commenting on Old Testament promises of Jewish restoration, Maton similarly noted that: "It is a currant axiom in our schools that wee must not forsake the literall and proper sense of the Scripture, unlesse an evident necessity doth require it, or the truth thereof would be endangered by it: and I am sure, here is no such cause for which we could leave the naturall interpretation of the place: yea,

[30]Robert Maton, *Israels Redemption, or the Propheticall History of our Saviours Kingdome on Earth, That is, Of the Church Catholicke and Triumphant* (London, 1642), sig. A4^{ii}v.

[31]Lamont, *Puritanism and Historical Controversy*, pp. 129–160.

[32]Finens Canus Vove [John Fenwicke], *Zions Joy in her King, Comming in his Glory* (London, 1643), sigs. A2r-v.

[33]Jeremiah Burroughs, *An Exposition of the Prophesie of Hosea* (London, 1643), p. 575.

we are by many other passages in the Scriptures compel'd to sticke to it".[34] William Gouge, in a fast sermon that David Katz described as the "official platform" of Long Parliament philosemitism[35] reminded his audience that:

> Among other better things to come, *the recalling of the Jewes* is most literally and plentifully fore-told by the prophets. Many apply sundry prophecies that tend that way to the delivery of the Jews from the *Babylonish* captivity; and others to the spirituall *Israel*, consisting of *Gentiles*. But assuredly, such prophecies as foretell the re-uniting of *Judah* and *Ephraim* together, have especiall reference to the fore-said *recalling of the Jews*.[36]

When addressing the Old Testament promises of restoration to the land, this hermeneutic led to the Judeo-centric positions that have been traced throughout this book. Brightman's name was often invoked in arguments in their favour. Burroughs thus repeatedly recalled both Brightman's Laodicean identification of the Church of England and his focus on Jewish restoration. More particularly, he developed Brightman's Judeo-centric arguments: both Daniel's resurrection and the "new heavens and new earth" of Rev. 21 were therefore taken to be references to the resurrection of Jews to Palestine. As with Brightman, Burroughs linked these events to the "day of Jezreel" predicted in Hosea 1:5–11 and Paul's statement in Romans 11:15 that Jewish conversion would be "life from the dead".[37] Burroughs did not openly embrace premillennialism (although Christ will reign in a special way: "let it be personal or what it will, we determine not").[38] His enthusiastic expectations of the changes to the earth when the Jews would be converted nonetheless implied such a position. Creation would be transformed: "I make no question but the Holy Ghost here aymeth at the time of the call of the Jews, and then I verily believe that this promise shall be literally fulfilled, and these other promises in *Esay* and other places, where God says he will make *the Lion to eate straw with the Oxe* . . . And at the calling of the Jews it is very like there shall be such a *restitution of all things* (as it is called Acts.3.21.) the creature shall be restored to such a kinde of excellency as it had at the first in creation".[39]

Thomas Goodwin was equally animated about the blessings that would fall out at the Jews' restoration. Their land, he wrote, would be "the chief Seat of that Fifth Monarchy; then surely, these Nations that are nearest them, are like most to partake the Benefit and Light of it; which also the Prophets have foretold, that the Gentiles

[34]Maton, *Israels Redemption*, pp. 47–48.

[35]Katz, *Philo-semitism*, p. 101.

[36]William Gouge, *The Promises of Divine Providence* (London, 1645), p. 29. Gouge had clearly experienced another change of heart following his 1621 recantation of Judeo-centrism before Archbishop Abbott.

[37]Brightman is cited by name a number of times, particularly on his interpretation of Philadelphia as the Church of Scotland (see *Exposition*, pp. 196, 310, 510, 531–2).

[38]Burroughs, *Exposition*, pp. 190, 607.

[39]Burroughs, *Exposition*, p. 578.

(yea, and these Gentiles) should walk in".[40] Fenwicke likewise enthusiastically cited the manifestation of grace that would be visible when the Jews regained the Holy Land. Christ would first appear "in the east among his ancient people the Jewes newly converted" where he would set up his kingdom.[41] This would include the return and reunification of the ten lost tribes. At this joyful restoration, they "shall obtaine the kingdome and dominion in preheminence above all other nations in the world".[42] Readers who were curious of the great blessings that would be bestowed upon the Jews were advised "[for] a more full view of her beauty and glory, read Master *Brightman* upon *Apoc.* 21."[43]

Fenwicke also followed Brightman in holding to an additional coming of Christ between his first and second comings of Christ: "a middle or second appearing of his".[44] So did William Strong, for whom "the conversion of the Jewes at first, shall be by the sight and by appearance of the Lord Jesus Christ visibly in the clouds of heaven".[45] This was also the position held by the millenarian writer John Archer: "for Christ [has] three commings".[46] While adopting a firmly premillennial stance, Archer was also influenced by Brightman's image of Jewish regiment over the Gentiles. At Christ's spiritual coming "all believers shall rule the world, in which the twelve tribes shall be chiefe, and they shall not only rule as kings, but as priests". The physical location of the kingdom was equally important: "the cities of the tribes shall be built againe, and inhabited by naturall Israelites, especially *Jerusalem* which shall bee the most eminent city in the world".[47] Maton argued along similar lines. Following Brightman, he argued that the Jews would return across the Euphrates, which would be miraculously dried for their passing. They would then do battle with "the Dragon, Beast, and false Prophet, the Kings of the earth, and of the whole world, [who] shall be all confederate against the Jewes onely".[48] According to Maton, the prophecies of Christ's Davidic kingship had yet to be fulfilled (Lk. 1:32, 22:30), thus necessitating the literal reign. As with Brightman's hermeneutic strategy, Maton based his reading upon a consistent application of the *analogia fidei*. The literal reading of prophecies of Jewish restoration did not lead to absurdities or the abandonment of key Christian positions. Indeed, for Maton it was his opponents' readings which led to such difficulties. Taking the prophecy of Jerusalem becoming

[40]Thomas Goodwin, *The Works of Thomas Goodwin, D.D. Sometime President of Magdalen Colledg in Oxford*, Vol. II (London, 1683), p. 59.

[41][Fenwicke], *Zions Joy*, p. 37.

[42][Fenwicke], *Zions Joy*, p.80.

[43][Fenwicke], *Zions Joy*, p. 108.

[44][Fenwicke], *Zions Joy*, sig. A3r.

[45]William Strong, *XXXI Select Sermons, Preached on Special Occasions* (London, 1656), p. 280.

[46]John Archer, *The Personall Reigne of Christ upon Earth* (London, 1642), pp. 16–18.

[47]Archer, *Personall Reigne*, pp. 22, 26.

[48]Maton, *Israels Redemption*, p. 111.

a burdensome stone to the nations (Zech. 3), Maton argued that any figurative construction endangered not only the clear meaning of the text but the essential distinction between Jew and Gentile:

> Now how can wee forsake the literall interpretation of these prophecies, if wee do but consider, that the Jewes are here distinguished from all other Nations, of which wee Gentiles, who are now converted, were then a part; and are by this name in the writings of the Evangelists and Apostles still distinguished from them, if wee consider what grosse absurdities would follow from the Tropicall construction of these or the like propheticall revelations, wherein the event of things is so plainly and distinctly attributed to the Jewes.[49]

The key in interpreting prophecy was therefore maintaining this clear distinction; in drawing apart the prophecies intended for Jews and those intended for Gentiles the commentator could ensure a correct division of prophecy.

Both Maton and Archer differed from Brightman in their premillennialism. The reason for the increasing popularity of this theological approach has often been commented upon, and equally often obscured by an incorrect application of theological terminology.[50] Recognising the difference between the millennial positions (pre-, post- and a-) is sometimes difficult, as the exact understanding of Revelation 20 was not always spelled out clearly when a writer or preacher was not directly addressing the theme. Indeed, seventeenth-century writers often confused those who held that a general blessing was promised to God's church with those who saw a literal thousand year reign of Christ on earth.[51] This confusion between a general blessing promised to the elect and an earthly millennium perhaps explains Fenwick's rather duplicitous use of Calvin and Beza to defend his own premillennialism.[52] Nonetheless, an increasing focus on consistent literalism helps to explain why the premillennial position gained in popularity in the 1640s. If Revelation 20 could be read without the negative aspersions that had traditionally been cast upon a belief in an earthly reign of Christ, then there was no reason not to take it in its literal sense. The historicist eschatology that had prevailed in the Elizabethan and early Stuart eras no longer proved as credible as it had done in the earlier period; it was easier to believe that Satan had already been bound when the Church of England experienced at least an outward peace. When Antichrist appeared to have ruled within the Church in the 1630s, this belief became increasingly difficult to hold.[53] Those who "will have a part of Antichrists reigne included within the compasse of the thousand yeares reigne"[54] could therefore be rightly criticised. Of course, this should not discount the vital influence of Joseph Mede and his own justification of a conservative form of millennialism (who had employed consistent literalism himself) or the effect of Johann Heinrich

[49]Maton, *Israels Redemption*, p. 14.

[50]For example, Wagner, *Anxious*, p. 87.

[51]For example James I's description of Brightman as a "vain chiliast". See James I and VI, "Meditation upon the Lord's Prayer" in *Workes*, p. 581.

[52][Fenwicke], *Zions Joy*, p. 138.

[53]See Gribben, *Puritan Millennium*, pp. 87–113.

[54]Maton, *Israels Redemption*, p. 121.

Alsted's defence of the position.[55] Yet to view the growth of premillennialism in England without an appreciation of its home grown hermeneutic roots is to seriously underestimate an important factor in a growth of the belief.

Brightman's work also proved influential in New England. This was particularly true in the case of John Cotton, who followed the earlier preacher to an almost unprecedented degree. Cotton accepted not just the underlying hermeneutic of Brightman's work, or his Judeo-centrism, but went so far as to follow Brightman in both his reading of Song of Songs as narrative history and general timing for the coming of the Jews.[56] Cotton built his apocalyptic anticipation around "Holy Brightman's"[57] exegesis. Repeating Brightman's use of the comparison between the Gentile church and Leah, and the Jewish church and Israel, Cotton wrote that "the Church of the Jewes, as beautifull as *Rachel*, shall in the end finde fellowship with Christ".[58] Cotton thus agreed with Brightman that the Jews were the Kings of the East of Revelation 16:12, although unlike Brightman he read the drying of the Euphrates as withering of Roman Catholic wealth and power, reasoning that Catholic idolatry currently prevented the Jews from converting.[59] Discussing the future of the Jews, he thus argued that "they shall have great power, and place, when God shall bring them in".[60] Nonetheless, while accepting Brightman's general timetable of these events, Cotton felt able to modify elements of his timing ("I cannot with so full assurance go so clearly with him in that, as usually I do")[61] moving the downfall of the Catholic Church from 1650 to 1655.[62] Other New England writers followed Cotton's use of Brightman, although none went so far as the Boston minister. Peter Bulkeley, whose father Edward had preached Brightman's funeral sermon, thus began his magisterial summary of covenant theology by affirming his faith in a physical restoration of the Jews to the Holy Land. Commenting on Zechariah 12, he noted:

> But some may say, that this is spoken of building *Jerusalem* againe may seeme to import, that the *Jewes* shall againe repossesse their own land, which is but a vaine conceit. But let those scriptures be examined which speake of their conversion, and it will appeare, that they speake as punctually concerning their inhabiting owne land, and their building and dwelling in their own cities.[63]

---

[55] See Jue, *Heaven upon Earth*; Hotson, *Paradise Postponed*; Clouse, "Apocalyptic Interpretation", pp. 181–190.

[56] Clark, *Politics, Religion and the Song of Songs*, p. 129.

[57] John Cotton, *An Exposition Upon the Thirteenth Chapter of the Revelation* (London, 1656), p. 87.

[58] John Cotton, *A Briefe Exposition of the Whole Booke of Canticles* (London, 1642), p. 202.

[59] John Cotton, *The Powring Out of the Seven Vials, or an exposition, of the 16. Chapter of the Revelation* (London, 1642), "Sixth Vial", p. 22. This is a pirated edition of Cotton's work – the pagination is confused throughout and usually resets after each vial has been discussed.

[60] Cotton, *Powring Out*, "Sixth Vial", p. 21.

[61] John Cotton, *An Exposition*, p. 89.

[62] Cotton, *An Exposition*, p. 93.

[63] Peter Bulkeley, *The Gospel Covenant or Covenant of Grace Opened* (London, 1646), p. 16.

For Bulkeley, the key to understanding these prophecies was a consistent literalism combined with a historical awareness of the meaning of the text for its original readers. Prophecies were to be expounded "as they respect the Jewes in particular, to whom they were first spoken".[64] Maton adopted the same position. The intention of the scriptural writers had to be understood according to the way in which the text would have been understood by its original recipients. To deny that there was to be a literal restoration to the land was thus to make God a duplicitous "lier" for "hee, I say, by many Prophets, and for many yeares together, repeated all these things to his people".[65] The Royalist Edmund Hall therefore criticised those who denied a Jewish restoration for their inability to consider the historical context of Old Testament prophecies:

> If these prophecies do nothing concern the restauration of the Jewes in these latter dayes, then to what purpose did God send his prophets to sing songs in their ears, if it nothing concerned them? Certainly these prophecies were prophesied amongst them to no purpose; if all those prophecies belong to the Gentiles, then certainly God would have sent his prophets amongst them, but they principally concerned the Jewes, and therefore they were prophesied amongst them, and to them, to whom they belonged".[66]

These writers followed Brightman in arguing that there was, to some extent, a separation between Jewish and Gentile believers when it came to God's promises. Jews would therefore ultimately be privileged over Gentiles in God's plan. For Burroughs, even though the Jews had become like prostitutes in refusing God's love through Christ, they still enjoyed special protection from the Lord: "For God is not now fully marryed unto the Jews, neither will that marriage be until the glorious time of their calling comes; but yet God is a friend to them to this day, God takes this people yet under his protection".[67] The Jews, while separated from God temporarily, had an essential covenantal link to him. Their status and place in God's eschatological plan was unique, and their role in its fulfilment merely suspended. "God never hath taken, nor never will take to himselfe any nation upon the earth to bee a Nationall Church as the Jews were . . . there is no such national Church, nor never will be till the calling in of the Jewes again".[68] According to Strong, God's promised blessings were made solely to the Jews "who are every where called the holy people, not of the Gentiles, *Dan* 8.24 and 12.7 and therfore it is they must take the Kingdome and possesse it, and it shall be given to them".[69] When restored to their own land, the Jews would be "exceeding eminent and glorious, unto the admiration of all nations . . . such as no people ever had, and this shall make them *to be the desire of all people*".[70] Indeed, Christ was to rule over the Jews in a

[64] Bulkeley, *Gospel Covenant*, p. 22.

[65] Maton, *Israels Redemption*, p. 99.

[66] [Edmund Hall], *Lingua Testium* (London, 1651), pp. 6–7.

[67] Burroughs, *Exposition*, p. 681.

[68] Burroughs, *Exposition*, pp. 697–698.

[69] Strong, *XXXI Sermons*, p. 288.

[70] Strong, *XXXI Sermons*, p. 281.

way that demonstrated their superiority: "Jesus Christ shall in a glorious manner reign, and that in a more eminent manner then he hath done over the churches of the gentiles . . . and therefore he shall in more special manner be *King of the Jews*, as being his own people".[71] For Fenwicke, the Jews were Christ's "portion or speciall inheritance above all others"[72] while Gouge noted that their calling would be not be limited but "conspicuous . . . of a whole nation".[73] Cotton argued that "the truth is God doth by covenant, account the whole nation to be a royall nation, and promiseth the kingdomes of the world to be their dominion".[74] Maton similarly claimed that this separation was essential and unchanging: "there is not one text in all the Scripture, wherein a Gentile is cal'd a Jew, or an Israelite; or wherein the Church of the Gentiles is cal'd Israel, Sion or Jerusalem".[75] Whereas Guibbory uses this statement to suggest that Maton made a move "as radical as Gerrard Winstanley's [attack] on property" in making this claim,[76] in fact he was merely restating a position which had developed out of Brightman's work – one that was shared by a wide variety of divines from across the spectrum of Christian belief.

The debate on the Jews therefore turned on hermeneutics. In a 1643 dialogue work, John Graunt thus criticised the hermeneutic approach adopted by Judeo-centrists. The deluded Hymeneus (who had, ominously, just returned from New England) notes that "most all with one consent hold the nationall calling of the Jews, and that there shall be a great and glorious estate of the Church both of Jews and Gentils, alleadging all the Prophets that speak of the deliverance of *Syon* from all her Captivities, and bring the Jews into their own Land out of all Countries whither they have been disperst and scattered." In answering this, Silvanus laments that "It greives me to see the Ignorance, and yet boldnesse of many Ministers amongst us, who erre for want of reading the Scriptures", systematically debunking the uses of the prophets (who refer to the restoration from the Babylonian captivity) and Romans 11 (a reference to the true Israel of the elect, not ethnic Israel). Significantly, Hymeneus appeals to Brightman and Cotton, only to be told that "Master Brightman is very corrupt and so is Master Cotton much to be blamed".[77]

A similar attack on the hermeneutic roots of Judeo-centrism came from Alexander Petrie, pastor of the Scottish Kirk in Rotterdam. In a direct rejoinder to Maton, he set down a number of hermeneutical rules which could be applied to correctly interpret prophecy. These can be reduced to three major points. Firstly, he argued that Judeo-centrists held to an overly simplistic idea of prophetic

---

[71] Strong, *XXXI Sermons*, p. 284.

[72] Fenwicke, *Zions Joy*, pp. 139–140.

[73] Gouge, *Divine Providence*, p. 31.

[74] Cotton, *Powring,* "Sixth Vial", p. 21.

[75] Robert Maton, *Israel's redemption redeemed. Or, The Jewes generall and miraculous conversion to the faith of the Gospel and returne into their owne Land* (London, 1646), sig. D^{ii}r.

[76] Guibbory, *Christian Identity*, p. 191.

[77] John Graunt, *A True Reformation and Perfect Restitution* (London, 1643), pp. 21–24. See also his *Truths Victory against Heresie* (London, 1645), pp. 40–48.

fulfilment. It was not the case that a prophecy only had one accomplishment. Instead, the promises of a rebuilt Jerusalem and restored nation could be applied firstly to the Jewish restoration under Cyrus and secondly to either Christ or the blessings that he won for the Gentiles.[78] Petrie's second major point argued that the Judeo-centric claim to promote a consistently literal sense of Old Testament prophecies was flawed, for while land promises were always taken in their literal sense, promises of restored sacrifices were restricted to a spiritual interpretation.[79] Maton was therefore guilty, in Petrie's mind, of abusing the expected standards of Protestant hermeneutics. These were reiterated in terms which could have been taken directly from William Perkins: "When the words of Scripture being properly taken, teach any thing contrarie to the analogie of faith or honestie of maners, or any thing frivolous that belongeth nothing to godlynesse . . . these words must be exponed figuratively, and a figurative sense is the literal or primarily intended sense of these wordes".[80] Where it might seem that the literal sense was being denied by applying the land promises to the spiritual blessings enjoyed by Christians, this was in fact fully in line with the literal sense: "wee forsake not the literal interpretation, which is principally intended, whither it be proper or figurative: but we forsake that restricted interpretation, as only belonging to a temporal monarchie of the Jewes".[81] The focus on intentionality recalled Calvin, but also moved away from the historicised assumptions that Maton had made in his analysis. Maton had emphasised that the Old Testament promises to the Jews had to be understood in a way that would have made sense for their first readers. For Petrie, however, intentionality was not tied to the historical situation of the original readers to the same extent. Instead, continuing in the continental reformed tradition, the Old Testament was to be read from the perspective of salvation history. Whereas Maton had emphasised the importance of reading the Old Testament without automatically applying a filter of New Testament texts, for Petrie there could be no interpretation of the Hebrew Bible without reference to the New Testament. The correct reading of history therefore lay at the roots of the dispute between Judeo-centrists and their opponents.

Even worse than this misreading of history for Petrie was the fact that Judeo-centrism sought to maintain a distinction between Jew and Gentile. This was his third, and most passionately argued, major point. "And therfor it is a great mistaking of the prophecies," he lamented "if we shall still make an opposition twixt Jewes and gentiles: believing gentiles ar true Jewes (as we see, they ar called in the New Testament) and unbelieving Jewes ar gentiles".[82] Petrie thus sought to break

[78] Alexander Petrie, *Chiliasto-mastix. Or, The prophecies in the Old and Nevv Testament concerning the kingdome of our savior Iesus Christ* (Rotterdam, 1644), sig. *2r.

[79] Petrie, *Chilasto-mastix*, sig 3v.

[80] Petrie, *Chilasto-mastix*, p. 10.

[81] Petrie, *Chilasto-mastix*, p. 15.

[82] Petrie, *Chilasto-mastix*, pp. 9–10.

down both the soteriological and the racial distinction that he felt Judeo-centrists re-constructed. Whereas Maton claimed that Judeo-centric thought helped to right centuries of unjustified attacks on Jews by Christians, Petrie held that his more traditional reading of the Old Testament land promises was in fact more pro-Jewish: "Whither serveth more for to move us to love the Jewes, to knowe that the Jewes and gentiles ar one in Christ, whensoever they shalt [b]e converted; or to think, that the Jewes shall not be converted, till Christ come again, and then they shalbe Lordes over the gentiles 1000 years?"[83]

In response, Maton gave perhaps the clearest defence of Judeo-centrist hermeneutics. His aptly titled *Israels Redemption Redeemed* attacked both the hermeneutical basis of his opponent's critique and his failure to adequately consider the historical scope of the correct application of the literal sense. Firstly, Petrie's arguments served to make this sense meaningless. The allegorical reading of prophecy could be used to make it mean anything at all, and in Maton's opinion served to make clear prophecies nonsensical. Petrie had suggested that certain prophecies and scriptural phrases should be taken as referring to spiritual blessings; the building of a house, for example, could be used to refer to the building of virtues. Maton's scorn is obvious: "Yea you might have said as well . . . that where we reade of our Saviour, *Luk 14. verse 1*. That he went into the house of one of the chiefe Pharisees, it is to be understood, that he went into the *vertues* of one of the chiefe *Pharisees*".[84] While this may be a *reductio ad absurdum* employed for humorous intent, Maton was making a serious point. Like Brightman, he found a stable correspondence between type and anti-type throughout scripture, in which a reading of a physical entity as symbolic could threaten to destabilise the entire Bible. Thus Petrie's claim that the words "Jew" and "Israelite" could be used both literally (as in the gospels) and spiritually (when applied in Romans 11) was automatically false: "I pray tell us how we shall know, when and where, [these terms] are to be taken properly, and literally, and when, and where improperly, and figuratively?".[85]

The hermeneutical key was once again historical; the interpretation of scripture in such a way that it would have made sense to its original readers. Petrie's attack was not simply an assault on the literal sense but also on a thorough-going historical reading: "you make the word of God to be nothing, by such faithlesse interpretations; I say, faithlesse, because they teach men to destroy the very object of faith (the plaine history of God's word) by turning it into a mere poeticall fiction".[86] Such interpretation served only to insult God. Where Petrie had claimed that there might be a double fulfilment of prophecy in which Zechariah's prediction of a

[83]Petrie, *Chilasto-mastix*, p. 69.

[84]Maton, *Israels Redemption Redeemed*, sig. A2v.

[85]Maton, *Israels Redemption Redeemed*, p. 41.

[86]Maton, *Israels Redemption Redeemed*, sig.D2r.

restored Jerusalem could hold hope for both Jews and Gentiles, Maton held that it could only have one application – that which would have been understood by those who first read it:

> How then can you say here, that this Prophecie is chiefly meant of the *Jewes* in a proper sense; and yet meant also of the *Gentiles* in a figurative sense? Is not this to give another sense beside that which is chiefly intended? And doe you thinke that both these senses are intended? If so, how shall we know certainly which is chiefly intended? Surely to affirme that the Holy Ghost doth intend a double sense in these Prophecies, is no small errour; seeing it makes God to have, as it were a heart and a heart; to be I say, as a double dealer, who speakes one thing and meanes another: and shall we conceit thus of God? God forbid. *Yea, let God be true, and everyman a lyar*: as truth then is but one, so doubtlesse there can be but one true sense of any place in the Scripture, but one sense intended by God; and thefore to make the Scripture *Janus*-like to looke two wayes, is from man and not from God, and it is the readiest way that I know to foment division amongst men.[87]

The interpreter should be aware of the fact that there should be "a just distribution" of the promises of the Bible: "we give unto the *Jew*, whatsoever belongs unto the *Jew*; and to the *Gentile*, whatsoever belongs unto the *Gentile*".[88] While Petrie had objected that this placed the Gentiles in a place of subjugation beneath the Jews, this did not represent a major problem for Maton. He freely admitted that Gentiles would serve as "tributaries to the *Jewes*" who would act as their "Lords". Yet this would be a cheerful state for the Gentiles – for they would live under the direct and personal kingship of Christ making them "more happy in their subjection . . . then ever they were in their former liberty".[89]

These sorts of statements serve to show that Judeo-centric eschatology was not only popular enough to be perceived as a threat in the period, but also that its opponents were well aware of the hermeneutical roots of the debate it generated. They also go to show that opponents of Judeo-centrism were equally aware of the danger that it presented to established Christian presentations of the self and a sense of the church as the "new Israel". It is important to appreciate that this division was not always taken to its logical conclusions, as it was by those such as Maton who argued "that there is not one text in all the Scripture, wherein a Gentile is cal'd a Jew, or an Israelite".[90] Indeed, many writers appeared aware of the potential problems that a consistently literal position presumed when it came to the identification of the true Israel. Bulkeley's work therefore strongly reiterated the standard Reformed position: "You are not aliens from the covenant, all the good which God hath promised to his Israel belongs to you".[91] Burroughs also attempted to present a forceful defence of the position that Israel's promises had now been inherited by the church. "All beleevers", he wrote, "though of the Gentiles, are of the seed of *Abraham*, they are of Israel, and therefore have the same priviledges with

[87] Maton, *Israels Redemption Redeemed*, pp. 126–127.

[88] Maton, *Israels Redemption Redeemed*, sig. Fr.

[89] Maton, *Israels Redemption Redeemed*, p. 312.

[90] Maton, *Israels Redemption Redeemed*, sig. Av.

[91] Bulkeley, *Gospel Covenant*, p. 341.

Israel . . . Whatsoever you reade of Israel, of excellent titles and appellations about Israel, they belong now to all beleevers".[92] Yet these positions were not consistent, although Bulkeley did attempt to deal with this problem in detail. Based on a careful reading of the Abrahamic promises, he cautioned that readers should not confuse the land covenant that God had made with his people with either the covenant of works (which had been made with all men through Adam) or the covenant of grace (which had been made with Jews and Gentiles alike). The land covenant was "made with Israel, was made with them, as with a select, chosen, and peculiar people"[93]; "by this covenant one people becomes a more peculiar people then another".[94] By opening his work with a long discussion of the certainty of the Jews' restoration to their own land, Bulkeley was able to focus upon the secure foundations and certain fulfilments on which God's promises rested. Yet at the same time, the rhetorical slippages between the different "covenants" sometimes served to undermine Bulkeley's own attempt to dress his belief in Jewish restoration in the clothing of conservative covenant theology. He provided no rules as to how his readers were to differentiate between the various applications of the covenant within the Old Testament promises. If the land promises could be said to belong to Israel as "a peculiar people", this is a difficult claim to reconcile with Bulkeley's assertion that "all" of God's promises to Israel "now belonged to you". Burroughs also proved unable to maintain his position consistently. There were some promises, he argued, that the Gentiles had not been able to gain access to. Speaking on Hosea 1:10, Burroughs noted that "some" made the scripture refer "to the very land of Canaan it selfe, that God will have a very glorious church there, specially in Jerualsem before the end of the world come". He agreed with this interpretation – whereas the verse was often referred to the return from Babylonian captivity, Hosea clearly predicted a "glorious" return quite unlike that historical event.[95] The literal fulfilment that Burroughs suggested for these prophecies of Jewish excellency could only undermine his claim that "whatever" was written of Israel was also true of the Gentile church. It is therefore unsurprising that when discussing the restoration of the Jews to Palestine, both Bulkeley and Burroughs used exactly the same rhetorical strategy as Brightman; emphasising a "chosen" identity for England.

Of course, the context in which Burroughs wrote, in the midst of Civil War, was far removed from the political setting in which Brightman had composed his commentary. This allowed Burroughs to use his lectures to make a number of pointed political comments urging financial support for parliament's cause and willingness to pull down Antichrist no matter what the personal cost. The context also presented him with the opportunity to use his sermons to emphasise the importance of a strong, godly English identity. Like Brightman, such passages often appeared in conjunction with discussions of the future blessings that would

[92]Jeremiah Burroughs, *Exposition*, p. 106.

[93]Bulkeley, *Gospel Covenant*, p. 60.

[94]Bulkeley, *Gospel Covenant*, p. 99.

[95]Burroughs, *Exposition*, pp. 116–117.

be enjoyed by Israel. The glorification of the Jews would thus also lead to the conversion of most nations, but particularly to blessings for England: "the greatest day that ever England had".[96] While not setting any dates, Burroughs implied that this day would be quick in arriving. Although descended from barbarians, the English has been blessed with the chance to play the role of redeemer nation ("no nation more renowned then we have been, our renown hath gone through all the earth").[97] Yet to fulfil this promise, Burroughs' hearers must be prepared to play the role that God has prepared for them. They were called to fight against those who "are become Atheists . . . have put off all kind of humanity, and are rather turned monstrous beasts". In presenting this picture of hope waiting to be fulfilled, Burroughs turned to Brightman's use of the Laodicean trope to give further encouragement to his audience: "If any Church be or ever was like to that of *Laodicea*, we have been . . . yet let the Saints who are willing that Christ should rule over them, hold on to the end, the promise is even to *Laodicea*, to him that overcometh I grant to sit with me in my throne, even as I overcome".[98] Indeed, the positive application of the Laodicean trope is apparent in both old and New England. When Hertfordshire minister John Bewick preached on England's trials in 1644 he therefore noted:

> That if the English Church be the Laodicean Church, then if it will but heare the voyce of Christ, and open the doore to him, if it will become an obedient Church, and repent of its sinnes; and if its children would once cordially and seriously reforme their lives, then Christ will come in and suppe with it. And we are told what the supper is, which the great God hath provided; It is in breife, what may be tread at large; the utter destruction in it of the beast and false Prophet, and of such who combine with them to set up the tyranny of the Roman Papacy. So terrible God will be to such, that the very fore-thoughts of it, should cheere up our spirits, and fill us full of thankefull expectations of helpe from on high, that though all nations should compasse us about (and it may be they will before all be done attempt it;) yet repentant England, shall in the name of the Lord destroy them all. Christ will come and suppe in it, and it shall suppe with him; Him rejoycing at Englands amendment, and new obedience, and it enjoying his comforts and deliverances.[99]

The same ideas were applied by Bulkeley in a New England context. In the same sermon in which he discussed the "peculiar" nation of the Jews, Bulkeley also moved to comment on the unique blessings available to the Bay Colony: "And thou *New England* which art exalted in priviledges of the gospel above many other people . . . consider the great things the Lord hath done for thee. The gospel hath free passage in all places where thou dwellest . . . thou enjoyest many faithfull witnesses . . . thou hast many bright stares shining in thy firmament . . . the Lord looks for more from thee, then from any other people . . . thou shouldst be a special

[96]Burroughs, *Exposition*, p. 192.

[97]Burroughs, *Exposition*, p. 246.

[98]Burroughs, *Exposition*, p. 514.

[99]John Bewicke, *Confiding England Under Conflicts, Triumphing in the Middest of Her Terrors* (London, 1644), p. 15.

people, an onely people, none like thee in all the earth".[100] In presenting this image Bulkeley did not suggest that the New Englanders replaced Israel, but that they were a "peculiar people" who could parallel and even assist the Jews.[101] Readers were therefore immediately reminded that they must be active in seeking the welfare of the Jews: "If it were but our enemies beast, we were bound to helpe it out, how much more these that have been the people of God, and have such promises made unto them?".[102] In emphasising the continued role of the Jewish people in God's eschatological plan, both Burroughs and Bulkeley were therefore moved to turn to emphasise the importance of an active national identity. Rather than identifying themselves as the "true" people of God, readers were encouraged to reconstruct their self-identity along national lines.

This was not an isolated pattern, and it was not something limited to the more extreme Fifth Monarchists.[103] Even as Fenwicke emphasised the physical restoration of the Jews, he reiterated the chosen role of England. The first signs of Christ's coming were therefore visible in Antichrist's anger against the English. The nation's enemies (in particular the Spanish) desired to "root out the remembrance of the *English* and of England, that hath become Gods fruitfull hill, as *Carmell* and *Bashan*, and brought forth many famous lights of the Gospell , as any nation since the apostles times".[104] For Fenwicke, it was thus apparent that the events that would culminate with the restoration of the Jews would depend on the course of proceedings in England: "The well-fare of all the Christian churches at this day, lies folded in the clew of this worke now the Lord Jesus is going in this island, and especially in *England*".[105] At the restoration of the Jews the English, while subservient to the new Jewish empire, would therefore continue to be blessed. The glory of this time "reaches further, even to the commonweale too, wherein the saints shall shine in Godly government, when the seed of the Church shall be princes in all the earth".[106]

John Cotton was similarly focused on emphasising the role that England would play in apocalyptic events at the same time that he was focusing on the importance of the restoration of the Jews. Part of the reason for this was that he followed Brightman especially closely when it came to his nationalistic reading of the seven vials in Revelation 13. The third vial was thus poured out by the 1581 decree against Jesuits operating in England and William Cecil's *Justitia Britannica*.[107] The fourth

[100] Bulkeley, *Gospel Covenant*, pp. 14–15.

[101] On the danger of reading a one to one correspondence between Israel and England\New England see the previous chapter, and Morrissey, "Elect Nation" in *Religion, Literature and History*, eds Farrell and McCullough, pp. 34–58.

[102] Bulkely, *Gospel Covenant*, p. 19.

[103] Capp, *Fifth Monarchy Men*, pp. 193–194.

[104] [Fenwicke], *Zions Joy*, p. 45.

[105] [Fenwicke], *Zions Joy*, p. 47.

[106] [Fenwicke], *Zions Joy*, p. 122.

[107] Cotton, *Powring Out*, "Third Vial", p. 6.

vial, poured on the sun was the scorching of "the antichristian state with fiery indignation" by Queen Elizabeth,[108] while the fifth represented the then current attack on antichristian forces by parliament: "I doe conceive that this *vial* will goe on from our native country to all the Catholickes countires round about them, until it come unto the very gates of *Rome* it selfe".[109] Cotton also allowed himself to speculate on the importance of England in his Judeo-centric commentary on Song of Songs. After discussing Constantine's birth in England and subsequent conversion of the Roman Empire, he therefore argued for a similar influence emerging in the future: "a wholesome north winde to blow favourably upon the Churches beyond the seas and strongly against their enemies".[110] Like Bulkeley, Cotton placed his readers on the cusp of prophetic fulfilment. Events in England suggested that this was a key time for their home nation, in which it would either live up to its chosen role or see that role lost forever. In other words, England found itself at the essential Laodicean moment. The role of New England was not to proclaim its own "chosen" position as an alternative to the old world, but rather to look back and prayerfully appeal for England to remain as the key locus of God's blessing.[111] This was therefore no time for complacency. While it was certain that Rome would fall and the Jews be restored to their own land, it was far less clear whether the colony would be involved: "let not New England be secure, and blesse our selves, in our resurrection, because we have our part in this reformation. I can not say, here is a resurrection of churches such as that text [Rev 20:5–6] speaks of".[112] The pattern that Brightman had established – emphasising the importance of the "chosen" nation theme as an alternative to viewing the church as the "true Israel" – was therefore expressed repeatedly in Judeo-centric writers in the 1640s. This idea would become increasingly important politically as the decade wore on, feeding directly into the complex debates surrounding the central political scheme involving Jewish restoration in the period – the Whitehall Conference on Jewish readmission.

6.3 The Whitehall Conference

The Whitehall Conference of 1655 has been a favourite subject in the literature surrounding philosemitism. For a long time viewed as an idealised, even romanticised, moment of Anglo-Jewish union, work over the last 50 years has

[108]Cotton, *Powring Out*, "Fourth Vial", p. 9.

[109]Cotton, *Powring Out*, "Fifth Vial", p. 7.

[110]Cotton, *Canticles*, p. 141.

[111]As Jeffrey Jue notes, the "millennial" role for New England as a "city on the hill" has been greatly exaggerated. See Jue, "Millenarianism in Old and New England", in *Cambridge Companion to Puritanism*, eds. Coffey and Lim, pp. 259–276.

[112]John Cotton, *The Churches Resurrection or the Opening of the Fift and Sixt Verses of the 20th Chapter of the Revelation* (London, 1642), p. 22.

done much to complicate the once simple picture of the affair.[113] David Katz's masterful exploration of the central themes of the conference has long been the key account of proceedings, highlighting the important role of philosemitic (although not Judeo-centric) thought in the controversy.[114] Mel Scult, meanwhile, suggested that millennial thought and an emergent liberalism worked together to achieve readmission.[115] Achsah Guibbory's recent study of the events, while not denying the picture Katz presented, has suggested that Jewish readmission posed particular problems to a nation that identified itself as the new Israel.[116] This is in itself a revision of Shapiro's position, in which he claimed that the scheme to readmit Jews to England was focused on reaffirming a strong national identity, as the Jews served as an "other" through which to define Englishness.[117] While the following analysis of the conference will not unreservedly endorse any of these views, there are points within each of them which are useful. Unsurprisingly, given the central argument of this book, I am in broad agreement with both Katz's emphasis on the important role of philosemitism and Guibbory's assertion of the problematic nature of Jewish readmission for seventeenth-century believers. What Guibbory's work has failed to emphasise, however, is that works produced around the Whitehall Conference do not only evidence an uneasiness with the potential conflict between a vibrant Judaism that saw itself as God's true Israel and a Christian nation that claimed the same mantle for itself. On the contrary, many of those most involved in highlighting the special, chosen role of England embraced the identification of the Jews as the true Israel. This did not simply involve the use of the Jews as an "other" through which the true marks of English identity could be highlighted, as Shapiro's work has suggested. Instead, those who favoured them often happily admitted that the Jews were a superior group, with whom the "chosen" nation shared some characteristics, while contrasting in other areas. These ideas were not necessarily in conflict, instead serving as two sides of the same coin. It is essential to see that a key element of national concern in these debates was based around the correct interpretation of the Abrahamic promises – for if the Jews remained as the first concern of God, then the nation's reaction to Jewish appeals was crucial. The Conference thus evidenced a thorough going application of a historically oriented consistently literal hermeneutic that had emerged through Brightman, as well as an emphasis on England's special role in the fulfilment of end times prophecy.

The practical application of this hermeneutic ran into two difficulties in the course of the discussions surrounding end times prophecy. In arguing that Old Testament scriptures should be read in such a way that they would have been comprehensible to their original readers, Judeo-centrists had been to all extents

[113]This sort of historiography is most notable in Lucien Wolf, *Menasseh ben Israel's Mission to Oliver Cromwell* (London: MacMillan, 1901).

[114]Katz, *Philo-semitism*, pp. 190–231.

[115]Scult, *Millennial Expectations*, p. 34.

[116]Guibbory, *Christian Identity*, pp. 220–251.

[117]Shapiro, *Shakespeare and the Jews*, pp. 55–61.

and purposes ignorant of contemporary Jewry. While the use of rabbinic helps was commonplace, the majority lacked first-hand experience of the prophetic hopes held by the Jewish people. Through the Whitehall Conference, Judeo-centrists had to come to terms with both the areas in which these hopes converged, and those areas in which they contradicted their own hopes for the future. Secondly, the Conference moved Judeo-centrism out of the realm of eschatological speculation, offering for the first time an opportunity to be involved with the *realpolitik* of Commonwealth social and economic policy. Facing such difficulties resulted in some re-evaluating the way in which they tied together the practicalities of prophecy and political realities.

The call for Jewish readmission had been broached only occasionally by writers before the interregnum. Thomas Draxe, for example, issued a circumspect plea for toleration of the Jews (under heavy restrictions) in the dedication of *The Worldes Resurrection* to Lucy Russell, Countess of Bedford in 1608.[118] John Weemes was considering similar schemes in 1636.[119] Such appeals were rare, however, until the 1640s and 1650s. The most influential of these was sent on January 5th 1649, when Johanna Cartenright and her son Ebenezer Cartwright, two English Baptists living in Amsterdam, directed a petition to Thomas Fairfax and the Council of War asking for the readmission of the Jews to England. The petition serves as a useful signpost for the way in which the Jewish debate was influenced by both national interest and a consistently literal interpretation of prophecy. England was, firstly, held responsible for her sins against the Jewish people: the "heavy out cryes and clamours against the intolerable cruelty of this our English nation".[120] The petition's authors were haunted by the knowledge that England had committed terrible sins against the Jewish people through past massacres and expulsions. Readmission, they argued, would serve two purposes. Firstly, it would remove God's anger: "[we] are assured of the wrath of God, will be much appeased towards you, for their innocent blood shed."[121] On a more positive note, the petitioners applied a literal interpretation of the Old Testament land promises to argue for the importance of England's role in restoring the Jewish people. Through readmission the Jews would be enabled to convert to Christ and return to the Holy Land: "this Nation of ENGLAND, with the inhabitants of the Nether-lands, shall be the first and readiest to transport IZRAELLS Sons & Daughters in their Ships to that Land promised to their forefathers."[122] The petition was received positively by Fairfax, who nonetheless set it aside until more pressing political matters (such as the execution of Charles) had been dealt with.

The same themes visible in the Cartwright petition were taken up in a remarkable book published later in the same year by Edward Nicholas. An unknown figure aside

[118] Draxe, *The Worldes Resurrection*, sig. 2^{ii}r.

[119] Weemes, *A Treatise of the Foure Degenerate Sonnes*, pp. 337–345.

[120] Johanna Cartenright and Ebenezer Cartwright, *The Petition of the Jewes* (London, 1648), p. 2.

[121] Cartenwright and Cartwright, *Petition*, p. 3.

[122] Cartenwright and Cartwright, *Petition*, p. 2.

from this publication, Nicholas's *Apology for the Honorable Nation of the Jews* catalogued a damning list of indictments against England for her sins in the Civil War. These paled in comparison, however, to the nation's major trespass: "the sin principally intended here is the strict and cruel Laws now in force against the most honourable Nation of the world, the Nation of the Jews."[123] Nicholas argued that England should therefore seek God's forgiveness for its sins against that nation. This should be achieved, primarily, through the passing of new laws favouring their readmission. This would be of as much benefit to the English as it would to the Jews: "Now weighing well with our selves both these threats and promises, were it not a strange negligence (I conceive it a madness) in us to forego so great privileges, as by those honourable people of the Jews may accrue unto us, and as great wilfulness to lay ourselves open to those judgements threatened."[124] The reason for Nicholas's belief that the Jews were "of the highest and most honourable descent of any Nobility in the world" was a consistently literal and historically rooted interpretation of the Old Testament. Why, he asked rhetorically, should readers spiritualise promises that were both clear and would not have made any sense to their original readers in such a state? He therefore presented his readers with "the many promises made by God by the mouths of his prophets for the reduction of them to their own country". To "wrest those Scriptures to a spiritual sense" ignored God's aim in communicating them. As God intended them to be read and understood and had granted readers the ability to interpret, it would be strange for them *not* to have a literal interpretation: "which are so adapted to the understanding of even the simplest, that nothing can be more clear".[125]

At this stage the discussion on readmission remained academic. Yet a number of events over the next two years served to move towards a more active debate on Jewish readmission. The first of these was Oliver St. John's diplomatic mission

[123]Edward Nicholas, *An Apology for the Honorable Nation of the Jews* (London, 1649), p. 4. Printer John Field also printed a Spanish version of the pamphlet later in the same year, published as *Apologia por la noble nacion de los Iudios* (London, 1649). This was either for circulation on the continent or amongst Spanish immigrants. The Spanish translation and lack of overt Christian focus, combined with the fact that Nicholas is otherwise unknown, have led to the occasional suggestion that the author was actually Menasseh ben Israel posing as an Englishmen. This seems unlikely to me, given that (a) Menasseh addressed an English audience directly and without downplaying his Judaism in later works (thus making it unlikely he would pose as a Christian) and that (b) The supposed lack of Christian content in the tract ignores the discussion of guilt over the crucifixion, where Nicholas concludes "that action was done by the Elders, chief Priest and Scribes, his Doctrine reproving their Hypocrisy, and laziness and pride" (*Apology*, p. 6). This is followed by quotations from Romans and Hebrews to support the idea that the Jews are still the chosen people of God. Nicholas's conclusions are focused on the superiority of the Jews, but as this chapter discusses, this was a recurrent theme in English Christian writing on the subject, and need not be ascribed to a covert Jewish author. If anything, the ideas resemble those expressed by Henry Jessey more than Menasseh, although I would suggest that Nicholas is who he appears to be: an otherwise unknown writer who published nothing else.

[124]Nicholas, *Apology*, p. 7.

[125]Nicholas, *Apology*, pp. 9–11.

to Amsterdam. While there, St. John was given the opportunity of meeting the city's Jewish community, attending the synagogue of rabbi Menasseh ben Israel. During his visit the diplomat was entertained "with musick, and all expressions of joy and gladnesse" with the congregation taking the opportunity of pronouncing "a blessing … upon the whole Common-wealth of *England*."[126] Menasseh was to become a central figure in later debates on Jewish readmission. Earlier in the same year he had published *Spes Israelis*, a work he had dedicated to the English parliament. This was quickly translated into English and published as *The Hope of Israel* by Moses Wall, a fervent millenarian and friend of John Milton.[127] The book set forth Menasseh's hope that the ten lost tribes were currently resident in America. This line of thought had evolved from the recollections of Antony Montezinos, a Spanish Jew who claimed that he had stumbled across a tribe of Indians who recited the *shema* and kept Hebrew customs in Peru.[128] Unsurprisingly, this was of special interest to those English millenarians who had long sought the location of the elusive tribes, in hope of their eventual restoration to Palestine.[129] Some had gone so far as to suggest that the tribes were now present in America, although this was a position favoured almost entirely by English writers who had never crossed the Atlantic, rather than by New England divines themselves.[130] John Dury wrote to the rabbi twice in late 1648 requesting the confirmation of Montezinos's reports. Where Dury had requested only a letter on Menasseh's view of Montezinos's claims, the rabbi, "to give me satisfaction, had written insteed of a Letter, a Treatise, which hee shortly would publish, and whereof I should receive so many Copies as I should desire."[131]

---

[126]ben Israel, *Vindiciae Judaeorum*, p. 5.

[127]Wall's complaints about the terminology surrounding eschatological debate, particularly the use of the term "millenarian", would generate sympathy among scholars today: "After this you are pleased to put the term *Millenarian* upon me; which, though for what I have writ, I need not own, yet I will not disclaim; they are not Names that affright me, but real falsities. The term *Chiliast,* as it congregates the many odd and false opinions of them of old, I explode; though to believe those thousand years in *Apoc. 20.* to be yet unfulfilled, that I willingly own" (Moses Wall, "Considerations Upon the Point of the Conversion of the Jews" in Menasseh ben Israel, *The Hope of Israel* (London, 1651), p. 60).

[128]For more on this belief see the discussion on pp. 137–139 above. See particularly Claire Jowitt, "Radical Identities? Native Americans, Jews, and the English Commonwealth," *Seventeenth Century,* 10.1 (1995), pp. 101–19.

[129]See the previous chapter and Cogley, "'The Most Vile and Barbarous Nation,'" pp. 781–814.

[130]The exception to this was Edward Winslow, who as a former governor of Plymouth claimed to have witnessed natives who showed Jewish characteristics. John Eliot was initially hopeful of the theory (see his letter requesting further information in Henry Whitfield, *The Light Appearing more and more towards the perfect day*, p. 14) but later rejected it (see his letter in Thomas Thorowgood, *Jews in America* (London, 1660), sigs.dr-[e4]v; confusingly, despite having the same title, this book is a different work from Thorowgood's 1650 *Iewes in America*).

[131]John Dury, "An Epistolicall Discourse Of Mr. *IOHN DURY,* TO Mr. *THOROWGOOD*" in Thomas Thorowgood, *Iewes in America* (London,1650) sig. e2r. Thorowgood's work was the first to print a translation of Montezinos's report, taken from Menasseh's French copy and translated by Dury. See "The Relation of Master Antonie Monterinos, translated out of the French copie sent by MANASEH BEN ISRAEL" in Thorowgood, *Iewes in America*, pp. 129–139.

Menasseh's text recorded Montezinos's reports and expressed the firm conviction that "the prophecies concerning [the Jews'] returne to their Country, are of necessity to be fulfilled."[132] In *Hope* Menasseh was also keen to emphasise his kinship with parliament, in the hope that the Jews might receive a positive hearing in England. Yet he was quick to deny that he was motivated by any financial motives; he was driven only by "meere and pure friendship" to England.[133] This led Menasseh to suggest that there was an inherent link between the Jewish and English peoples. While he admitted that this had been challenged since the expulsion of the Jews in 1290, he nonetheless felt that there was a fundamental (and unbreakable) connection between them: "ye love our nation, and as part of it, the Author of this Discourse."[134] His hope in England's response was, of course, based around his eschatology, and in particular an orthodox reading of those prophecies of the Hebrew Bible which predicted the return of the Jews to Palestine in the Messianic age. "The eies of all are turned upon you," he reminded parliament, "that they may see whither all these things do tend . . . [to] all those things which God is pleased to have foretold by the Prophets . . . and shall obtain their accomplishment."[135] Such ideas were supported by Wall, who saw Brightman as one of the key figures who had led to a rediscovery of the doctrine of the Jewish restoration,[136] and backed up the rabbi by emphasising Judeo-centric arguments typical of those we saw emerge in the works of the Bedfordshire writer. For Wall, opponents of the Jews dishonoured the Old Testament by failing to interpret it "in the literal sense". There should therefore be an awareness that the Jews would soon be returned to the forefront of God's plan: "God's covenant with the *Jews* is not nulled, or broken; but only suspended". Indeed, "It is with them as it was with *Nebuchadnezzar's* tree, the leaves, fruits and boughs were all scattered and broken, yet there was a chain of brass upon the root, to reserve them for future hopes."[137]

Menasseh was granted a passport for entrance into England in 1650. When the Anglo-Dutch war intervened, making travel impossible, Menasseh's documents were renewed annually.[138] In the meantime, the *Hope of Israel* sparked something of a debate in England. MP Edward Spencer responded to Menasseh in Latin, and published an English translation of the letter soon after the original publication of *Hope*. Spencer agreed that there was a special link between England and the Hebrew nation. In his thinking the English would probably be the cause of Jewish redemption, based around a shared antipathy towards Roman Catholic excess: "we

[132]Menasseh ben Israel, *The Hope of Israel* (London, 1651), p. 42.

[133]ben Israel, *Hope*, sig. A3v.

[134]ben Israel, *Hope*, sig. A4^{i}r.

[135]ben Israel, *Hope*, sig. A2v-A3r.

[136]Wall, "Considerations", p. 48.

[137]Wall, "Considerations", p. 52; For more on Wall see Toon, "Questions of Jewish Immigration", pp. 117–119.

[138]David S. Katz, *The Jews in the History of England 1485–1850* (Oxford and New York: Clarendon/Oxford University Press, 1994), p. 115.

are the likeliest Nation under Heaven to doe it. For wee hate Idolatry as much as you."[139] Yet Spencer was cautious of a purely eschatological interest in the Jews, warning Menasseh that both he and the millenarians were deeply deceived to expect a sudden and miraculous redemption.[140] This negativity towards millenarian interests facilitated a lively exchange between Spencer and Wall, which the latter reprinted as an appendix to later editions of *Hope of Israel*. Their correspondence highlights the inherent differences between the general conversionist position taken by Spencer, and the Judeo-centric millenarianism of Wall. The MP was critical of Wall's belief that the Jews would be called en-masse and remain as a separate group even after their conversion: "they must not exalt themselves as a Nation, for they must be ingrafted againe upon that branch, or vine, Christ Jesus."[141] Wall's courteous reply reaffirmed his belief in a temporal Jewish kingdom based in Jerusalem and argued that while both he and Spencer strongly disagreed on how the Jews would be converted, this should be no bar to co-operation for their common purpose. In early 1651 Spencer responded, suggesting that he and Wall work together to promote Jewish conversion, regardless of how or when it would ultimately be achieved. They arranged to meet and discuss the matter at a later date, showing that both Judeo-centrists and those with very different eschatological views were prepared to cooperate to achieve common ends.[142]

The correspondence between Wall and Spencer serves to show something of the complex system of alliances that began to form around the question of Jewish readmission to England. Those in favour approached the subject from a number of angles, many of which served only to conflict with one another. These represented a conscious development of the positions which had been articulated by Brightman and Mede, although based upon their exegetical labours. Where earlier commentators had presumed a miraculous conversion of the Jews (Mede, for example, modelling it on Paul's Damascus Road experience), many of those pushing for readmission believed that England could convert them through largely natural means.[143] The conversionist approach of Spencer was therefore candid regarding the motive of readmission – the Jews were to be allowed to enter the country so that they could come to Christianity. This conversion would break down barriers between Jew and Gentile, acting out the promise in Galatians 3:28 that in Christ there was neither "Jew nor Greek." This made certain assumptions about the malleability of the division between Jew and Gentile, positioning these boundaries as primarily religious rather than racial. It also assumed that converted Jews would lose all distinctive markers of their Judaism. The Judeo-centric approach

[139]Edward Spencer, *A Brief Epistle to the Learned Manasseh ben Israel* (London, 1650), p. 2.

[140]Spencer, *Brief Epistle*, pp. 6–9.

[141]Quoted in Wall, "Considerations", p. 57. Spencer initially believed John Dury to have been the translator.

[142]Wall, "Considerations", p. 60.

[143]J.A. de Jong, *As the Waters Cover the Sea: Millennial Expectations in the Rise of Anglo-American Missions 1640–1810* (Kampen: Kok, 1970), pp. 20–26.

of Wall, however, presumed that the Jews should be readmitted both to abrogate English guilt for previous sins towards them and to hasten their return to Palestine. The Jews were therefore theoretically returning to England only to leave again once the messianic moment was reached. This led to two seemingly contradictory arguments. On the one hand, the Judeo-centric position presumed some shared purpose with more messianically minded Jews, such as Menasseh, and allowed a fruitful dialogue between Jew and Gentile. Yet while the Judeo-centric position presumed a conversion to Christ, it also imagined an essential division between Jew and Gentile. This distinction went deeper than merely that of outward religious conviction, or even inherent racial traits. Rather, there was a fundamental difference presumed between Jew and Gentile which rendered the Jew a *constant* other, whether converted or not. Thus it was possible for Judeo-centrists to suggest that Jews should lose their religious identity through conversion, yet still remain a distinct and visibly "Jewish" group, even as "Christians".

Menasseh arrived in London in 1655, a year after his son Samuel had tested the waters by seeking the Protector's help in regaining the property of his friend Manuel Martinez Dormido, (also known as David Abrabanel) and had successfully forged an honorary doctorate from Oxford.[144] The rabbi's arrival coincided with the fulfilment of a number of numerical calculations taken from Brightman and later apocalyptic commentaries. For some years Judeo-centric millenarians had focused upon the mid-1650s as a time of remarkable prophetic activity.[145] Brightman had believed that the first stirrings of Jewish conversion would occur in 1650, an interpretation based around his reading of the 1,290 days following the setting up of the "abomination" of Daniel 12. Of course, like any apocalyptic dating system, the timings suggested by Brightman were malleable. Archer thus suggested that Julian began construction of the temple in 366 – pointing to 1656 as the year of Jewish calling.[146] While Brightman's dating scheme was clearly influential here, it was not the only numerological system pointing towards 1656 as a particularly prodigious year. It was widely believed that there had been 1656 years from creation until Noah's flood. Similarly momentous events were therefore expected by some to occur 1656 years after Christ's birth. As the year approached, so the millennial speculation increased.

[144] See Katz, *Philo-Semitism*, pp. 197–199.

[145] For more detail on this speculation see David S. Katz, "English Redemption and Jewish Readmission in 1656," *Journal of Jewish Studies* 34:1 (1983), pp. 73–76. There is an important distinction to be made here – where Katz claims that millenarians were expecting the "second coming" in 1656, it is more accurate to say that they were actually hoping only for Jewish conversion. While many held that Christ would appear spiritually to the Jews, his final return was inevitably delayed. The majority of commentators saw the Jews as causing the downfall of the papacy and Turk, and thus leading to a period of earthly blessing based on the thousand years of Rev. 20:1–6. In broad terms, millenarians were split between those who saw Christ's reigning *on earth* for the millennium, and those who saw Christ's reign as spiritual. In this respect, Katz's use of astrological dating which saw 1656 as the start of God's final judgment is not relevant to the millenarian argument.

[146] Archer, *Personall Reign*, pp. 52–53.

Samuel Hartlib's *Revelation Revealed*, for example, emphasised its findings on the title page: "It being clear that the prophetical numbers com to an end with the Year of our LORD 1656."[147] In 1653, John Tillinghast had agreed with Hartlib's assessment: "the Jews delivery being to begin . . . in, or about the yeer 56."[148]

It was unsurprising, given the level of millenarian hope attached to the following year that Menasseh's arrival would be interpreted as an important fore-runner to this redemption. As has often been noted, Menasseh's mission to England was enthusiastically supported by Oliver Cromwell, who also entertained him on at least one occasion.[149] Menasseh quickly printed a petition which reminded Cromwell that the Jews held a special position as God's people. The way in which he treated them would be the making or breaking of his regime: "For none hath ever afflicted them, who hath not been by some ominous *Exit*, most heavily punished . . . [while] none ever was a Benefactor to that people, and cherished them in their Countries, who thereupon hath not present begun very much to flourish."[150] The roots of this belief were a literal reading of the Abrahamic promise in Genesis 12:3. Those who blessed Abraham's people would be blessed, while those who cursed them would be cursed. The basic requests of the petition itself were simple. Menasseh asked for readmission, the establishing of a public synagogue, and the free exercise of the Jewish religion. In addition to this, he desired a public cemetery and the right to trade in both England and her dominions.[151]

There is little doubt that Cromwell was sympathetic to Menasseh's appeals. The Council of State were, nonetheless, reluctant to accept such conditions. Instead of giving a firm answer, it was therefore decided to call a general conference to discuss Menasseh's requests. The conference, which was to meet at Whitehall on 4th December 1655, was to consist of politicians, lawyers, divines and merchants – all those, in other words, who had an interest in whether or not the Jews were to be readmitted. Five members of the Council of State were chosen as delegates: Lord President Henry Lawrence, Sir Gilbert Pickering, Sir Charles Wolsely, Francis Rous and John Lisle. Walter Strickland, a member of St. John's diplomatic mission in 1651 was asked to attend (as was St. John, who declined) along with William Sydenham and John Lambert. Representing the legal profession were Sir John Glynne, Chief Justice of the Upper Bench, and William Steele, Chief Baron of the Exchequer. Among six representatives of the London merchants were the current Lord Mayor, John Dethick, and his predecessor Christopher Pack. The merchant-minister William Kiffin, and Deputy Governor of the Bermuda Company, Owen Rowe, also attended. It was the religious aspect of the conference, however, that was of paramount importance, as shown by the number of divines who were invited.

---

[147] Samuel Hartlib, *Clavis Apocalyptica, or, The Revelation Revealed* (London, 1651), Frontispiece.

[148] John Tillinghast, *Generation-work* (London,1654), p. 51.

[149] David S. Katz, "Menasseh ben Israel's Christian Connection," in *Menasseh ben Israel and His World* (Leiden: Brill, 1989), eds. Kaplan, Méchoulan and Popkin, pp. 118–119.

[150] Menasseh ben Israel, *To His Highnesse the Lord Protector* (London, 1655), sig. A2v.

[151] For a reprint of the petition see *Publick Intelligencer* 12 (18th Dec–24th Dec 1655).

The list included some of England's foremost religious minds: John Owen, Thomas Goodwin, Thomas Manton, Joseph Caryl, Henry Jessey, Matthew Newcomen, Walter Craddock and William Bridge were all in attendance. Ralph Cudworth, Regius Professor of Hebrew at Cambridge, Daniel Dyke, Chaplain to Cromwell, and Anthony Tuckney, Master of St. John's, Cambridge were all also involved. While there were a variety of eschatological opinions represented among the ministers, it was no accident that the majority of the preachers in attendance were Judeo-centrists.

At this point, it is important to note Baptist minister Henry Jessey's vital role in the conference. Although a Fifth Monarchist, Jessey was nonetheless pragmatic and well thought of even by his opponents. An able Hebraist (he carried a copy of the Hebrew Bible with him wherever he went), he also embraced many elements of Judaism itself. Not least among these were his views on the Sabbath, which he not only believed started (in the Jewish fashion) on the evening of the previous day, but also celebrated on a Saturday.[152] Aside from this academic openness to Judaism, Jessey was one of the first to offer not just prayer for the Jews, but also practical action in their favour. "Touching the Jews," notes Jessey's biographer, "his charity was famous beyond president and many ways exprest".[153] It is therefore no surprise that Jessey enthusiastically supported the readmission of the Jews to England. He had corresponded with Menasseh since at least 1649 and had made a deep impression on the rabbi in a short book entitled *The Glory and Salvation of Jehudah and Israel*. Menasseh was so taken with the work that he referred to it (along with Nicholas's *Apology*) in his petition to Cromwell. The nobility of the Jews, Menasseh wrote, was "known amongst all Christians, as lately it hath been most worthily and excellently shewed and described in a certain book, called, *The Glory of Jehudah and Israel*, dedicated to our Nation by that worthy Christian Minister Mr *Henry Jessey*."[154] While both the original English version and its Hebrew translation are now lost, one Dutch copy has survived, showing evidence of the extent to which Jessey adopted the consistently literal Judeo-centrism that this book has been charting.[155] *The Glory of Jehudah* aimed primarily to speak to Jews and show them that Christ was the true messiah predicted in the Old Testament. However, Jessey was firstly at pains to show the natural superiority of the Jews above other peoples. They were uniquely favoured in God's plan with privileges and nobility which exceeded any other nation. The promises made to them in the Old

[152]Jessey's biographer Edward Whiston notes that Jessey "kept his opinion much to himself… [observing] the day in his own chamber with only 4 or 5 more of the same mind". Edward Whiston, *The Life and Death of Mr Henry Jessy* (London, 1671), p. 87.

[153]Whiston, *Life and Death*, p. 67.

[154]Menasseh ben Israel, *Humble Petition*, p. 23.

[155]I am indebted to Ernestine G.E. Van der Wall's examination of the tract, which she also discovered in the Herzog August Bibliothek. Her full examination is found in "A Philo-Semitic Millenarian on the Reconciliation of the Jews and Christians: Henry Jessey and his 'Glory and Salvation of Jehudah and Israel' (1650)," in *Sceptics, Millenarians and Jews*, eds. David S. Katz, Jonathan Israel and Richard Popkin (Leiden: Brill, 1990), pp. 161–184.

Testament were to be interpreted in their literal sense, ensuring them a wonderful future on earth. Their ultimate privilege was, of course, to provide the messiah for the world – which for Jessey, meant Jesus. Although Menasseh could not fully agree with the conclusions the Englishman had reached, the central theme of Jessey's book proved especially pleasing to him.[156]

Jessey was also responsible for the most influential commentary on the conference, his anonymously published *A Narrative of the Late Proceedings at White-Hall Concerning the Jews*. Jessey's sympathetic narrative remained the only account of the event until the more detailed report of Nathaniel Crouch which first appeared in the 1719 edition of his *Two Journeys to Jerusalem*.[157] Crouch's work differs from Jessey's in two important respects. Firstly, where Jessey had kept the speakers' names anonymous, Crouch named those who spoke for and against each position – a useful feature for identifying the attitudes and responses of those at the conference. Secondly, it was also tainted by the addition of anti-Semitic glosses to Whitehall's conclusions. As Katz has noted, it was unsurprising that certain "fantastic" elements would emerge around the discussions at Whitehall. At the time of the conference wild rumours swept London that the Jews had purchased the Bodleian Library and were also attempting to convert St. Paul's Cathedral into a synagogue – some went so far as to claim that they were attempting to buy the entire town of Brentford.[158] The actual discussions on readmission were, however, far more sober, and saw a re-iteration of many of the themes that emerged in the pre-conference literature. Unsurprisingly, it was religious discourse which dominated these discussions.

The exact schedule of the conference remains unclear due to the nature of Jessey and Crouch's descriptions, which were arranged around thematic rather than chronological reports.[159] These descriptions are further complicated by the fact that the conference did not come to a quick conclusion. Instead it dragged on indeterminately. It reconvened on December 12th, again closing without resolution. At the next session on December 14th Cromwell added three further preachers to the committee: Hugh Peter, Philip Nye, and John Bulkeley, Provost of Eton.[160] Cromwell's motivation in these additions was clear – Nye and Peter in particular were well known as Judeo-centrists. According to Crouch's description of the conference they played their part well, as Nye allied with Goodwin in a forceful plea for readmission.[161] Nonetheless, their addition could not effect a final decision. Discussions appear to have stagnated at each of the sessions. A final meeting

[156] Van der Wall, "Philo-Semitic Millenarian", p. 169.

[157] Published under Crouch's pseudonym, R.B. See "The Proceedings of the Jews in England in the Year 1655," R.B. [=Nathaniel Crouch], *Two Journeys to Jerusalem* (London, 1719), pp. 167–174.

[158] Katz, *Philo-Semitism*, pp. 180–182.

[159] A good general overview of the conference can be found in Peter Toon, "The Question of Jewish Immigration," *Puritans, the Millennium and the Future of Israel* ed. Peter Toon, pp. 115–125; Katz, *Philo-Semitism*, pp. 201–231.

[160] Probably also known as John Boncle. See Katz, *Jews in the History of England*, pp. 123–124.

[161] Crouch, "Proceedings", pp. 172.

on 18th December, with Cromwell himself present at a public session of the conference, ended with the Lord Protector exasperated. As the *Publick Intelligencer* summarised, "nothing at all hath been concluded touching the point of their admission."[162] Despite this, one major question was settled by those present – that of the legal status of the Jews in England. This was resolved without much apparent issue: "the *Lawyers* said, *That there is no Law that forbids the Jews return to England*."[163] Since the Jews had initially been expelled by Royal decree rather than by an Act of Parliament, the statute was deemed to be no longer valid.

Those who recognised that the Jews were still God's chosen people were therefore well represented in the proceedings of the conference. Arguments for the readmission of the Jews were thus based on both a consistently literal reading of prophecy and national interest. The conference represented an opportunity for the nation to fully embrace its role as a "chosen" state by helping to fulfil prophecy, or to reject this role and call down judgement upon itself. While such a fear might appear contradictory, the debate revolved around the same axis as the concern over the Laodicean position of the Church of England in Brightman's work. England was at a moment of decision in which she could either embrace or reject her prophetic destiny. For those who believed, firmly, that the Jews would be restored, England could not and would not fail in her duty. Yet the option of failure needed to be presented, just as Brightman had held out the danger of being spewed from Christ's mouth. At Whitehall some divines therefore feared: "it may offend the Lord, if we yield not to the Jews this courtesie which they desire."[164] Indeed, it was entirely possible that England was already making an enemy of God for their previous treatment of the Hebrew people. Discussing Jewish expulsion from the nation, the theologians at Whitehall concluded that "for such grosse injuries the Lord may *be very sore displeased with England*... . Now if the favour of harbouring the afflicted Jews, which now they intreat, be granted to the surviving Jews, it may be accounted as some kinde of *satisfaction*. But if this be denyed them, it is feared the Lord may shew his displeasure to be great against England."[165] Joseph Caryl was apparently the most vociferous proponent of this line of argumentation. For Caryl, echoing Wall's earlier statements, the openness of Englishmen to Judeo-centric principles boded well: "the good people of England did generally more believe the promises of the calling of the Jews, and more earnestly pray for it than any other Nation." Readmission was a chance for England to atone for their previous mistreatment of the Hebrews: "The cruel injuries and inhumanities" that the Jews suffered at English hands "might still lye as a sin upon these Kingdoms" and should be remitted by a show of love to the Jews.[166] This was a claim echoed time and

[162] *Publick Intelligencer*, 12 (18–24 Dec. 1655).

[163] [Jessey], *Narrative*, p. 9. Crouch notes that Glyn and Steel were largely responsible for this judgement. Crouch, "Proceedings", p. 172.

[164] [Jessey], *Narrative*, p. 4.

[165] [Jessey], *Narrative*, p. 7.

[166] Crouch, "Proceedings", p. 173.

again by Judeo-centric writers, as the idea of Jewish readmission to England was linked both with unfulfilled Old Testament prophecy and with national concerns. In 1655 Thomas Collier thus appealed readmission to England as an impetus to Jewish conversion and return to Palestine for a millennial reign under Christ's kingship. God would restore both the two existing and the ten lost tribes and "bring them to their own land".[167] Answering possible objections to this doctrine from fellow Christians, Collier presented a long list of unfulfilled Old Testament prophecies and argued that "the scripture will be fulfilled in the letter as well as in the spirit . . . it hath been the policy of Satan, and the weakness and pride of men, in turning scriptures into alegories and mysteries so much".[168] In the debate surrounding Whitehall, he was therefore moved to argue for readmission along patriotic lines. God, he warned, "hath a special eye over them . . . and will take vengance to the full on all the nations that have afflicted them."[169] In a similar vein William Tomlinson, whose broadside *Bosome Opened to the Jewes* appeared in early 1656, claimed that both theological and patriotic reasons motivated his work, produced "as out of love to the Nation of the Jewes; so also out of love to my owne Country".[170] The same theme was visible in an anonymous tract by "J.J. Philo-Judaeus". The author lamented that "the name of an *English* man makes [the Jews] afraid. The Lord Christ would not scorn the smallest reed; but our Nation hath despised the Lords day of small things". The beastly treatment which England had afforded to the Jews was further emphasised as the tract applied biblical allusions to highlight the nation's cruelty: "[God] came to give life to dry bones, but we beat them to powder: He came to look after that which had been so many years lost; but our Ancestors caused [the Jews] to flie into the secret holes in the rock".[171] As Collier warned England "[God] will cause the world to know that he hath yet a respect to them".[172] Indeed, it was unsurprising to find that Menasseh himself played on the same ideas in his petition to Cromwell: "'tis said by the Prophets, that they who shall wrong [the Jews] shall be most severely punished: and that he that toucheth them, toucheth the apple of God's eye".[173] In showing love towards the Jews and enabling them to return first to England (and then, for some, to Palestine) it was possible for one to be a true servant of their nation.

Those works that sought to return to a literal reading of prophecy therefore also aimed to emphasise the importance of England's duty in playing a prophetic role in the Jews' restoration – a role that would reverse their previous sin against the

[167] See Thomas Collier, *The Day-Dawning and the Day-Star Arising to the Dispersed of Judah & Israel* (London, 1655), p. 60.

[168] Collier, *Day-Dawning*, pp. 78, 80.

[169] Thomas Collier, *A Brief Answer to Some Objections . . . Against the Coming in and Inhabiting of the Jews* (London, 1656), sig. A2r.

[170] William Tomlinson, *A Bosome Opened to the Jewes* (London, 1656).

[171] J.J. Philo-Judaeus, *The Resurrection of the Dead Bones* (London, 1655), p. 103.

[172] Collier, *Brief Answer*, sig. A2r.

[173] Menasseh, *Petition*, p. 23.

Jewish people. If Christians were not the "true Israel" then English readers could nonetheless play a key role in helping the nation fulfil its "chosen" destiny by aiding God's people. Judeo-centric writers thus saw an opportunity both to push the prophetic role of England forward and to atone for the nation's sin. While there were certainly economic factors considered in the debate on readmission[174] the primary argument in its favour was based on religion. As Cromwell informed the conference on the 18th December, "he had not engagement to the Jews, but only what the Scripture holds forth".[175] As suggested above, it was this focus on scripture (and particularly its prophetic portions) that went hand-in-hand with an emphasis on England's chosen eschatological role. The fact that those who adopted a consistently literal interpretation of the Old Testament promises tied the idea of readmission to their sense of national duty is telling. James Shapiro's argument that the Jews represented an "other" through which Englishness could be defined is valuable here, and easily visible in William Hughes's concern that Jews could either turn "Englishmen" to their religion or rule over the nation.[176] Thus, for some, the Jew becomes the antithesis of the true Englishman.[177] Yet for Judeo-centrists, the role of England as the chosen nation was always defined alongside with, rather than in opposition to, the Jewish people. At the conversion of the Jews and their restoration to Palestine, England would play a special role in either bringing down the Roman whore or restoring the Jewish people to the Promised Land. Reading the Old Testament promises of restoration literally, and thus abandoning the central claims to those promises as a tool for self-understanding, writers instead understood their national eschatological hope and personal Christian experience through their role as godly Englishmen. The Englishman was not in opposition to the Jew. Rather, both had their own stream of eschatological promise and could find mutual support for one another in God's plan for the world. This form of thinking manifested itself amongst Judeo-centrists in the period surrounding the Whitehall Conference – a consistent recognition of the nobility of the Jews, their essential difference, and the key eschatological role that Englishmen could enjoy as Englishmen. It would be foolish to claim that this was the only impulse behind the desire to call the conference. A range of disparate interests were evident in the discussions – financial, political, eschatological – but the Judeo-centric response was nonetheless an important marker of the way in which England's practical role in Jewish restoration was being understood in the 1650s.

The conclusion of the Whitehall Conference remained uncertain. Cromwell's closing speech on 18th December could serve as a useful description of the debate as

[174]For this view see Lucien Wolf, *Menasseh ben Israel's Mission to Oliver Cromwell* (London: MacMillan, 1901), pp. xxx–xxxvi.; [Jessey], *Narrative*, pp. 8–9.

[175][Jessey], *Narrative*, p. 9.

[176]Shapiro, *Shakespeare and the Jews*, pp. 255–257.

[177]See William Hughes, *Anglo-Judaeus, or The History of the Jews, Whilst Here in England* (London, 1656), p. 52; William Prynne, *The Second Part of a Short Demurrer to the Jewes Long Discontinued Remitter into England* (London, 1656), p. 132.

a whole. Far from clearing the issue of the Jews, it had only served to complicate it: "he [had] hoped by these preachers to have had some clearing the case [of the Jews] as to conscience. But seeing these agreed not but were of two or three opinions, it was left the more doubtfull to him and the Councel" how to proceed. Menasseh was therefore left disappointed – as Jessey recorded in the postscript to his summary of the conference, "[Menasseh] still remains in London, desiring a favourable answer to his proposals". With obvious regret, Jessey reminded his readers that "several Jewish merchants" had come to London, but seeing their case as hopeless, now "removed hence again to beyond the seas, with much grief of heart".[178] Menasseh was to remain in London until September 1657, by which point he had run out of money and lost both the patience and support of his Amsterdam congregation. He left England a broken man and died at Middelburg on his journey back to the Netherlands. It is possible to think that he left the hopes of Judeo-centrists shattered behind him; that the prophetic moment seemed to have passed without the glorious promises of that great prophetic year, 1656, coming to anything. It would be tempting to see the disappointed hopes of restoration here as the end of conservative Judeo-centrism; a symptom of the increasing marginalisation and radicalisation that some have argued marked millennialism into the Restoration.[179]

Yet Judeo-centrism was by no means dead. Hope for both official readmission, and (more importantly) the return of the Jews to Palestine remained strong. Menasseh's presence in England had been one propitious moment, but there would be others in the following years. For Fifth Monarchist Arise Evans, the Restoration was just such a time. Although his belief that Charles II would prove to be the Jews' messiah was clearly misplaced (not to mention something of a surprise to Charles), his enthusiasm was undimmed from the 1650s. Similarly, news about messianic pretender Sabbati Sevi proved to encourage a number of Judeo-centric divines, of both conforming and non-conforming stripes, to emphasise once again the importance of the physical return of the Jews to Palestine. Despite the political and religious changes of the 1660s, Judeo-centric belief remained strong; a vibrant tradition well into the eighteenth century.[180] Although commentators moved away from Brightman's dating system, his central hermeneutical conceptions – a consistently literal approach to Old Testament prophecy, a focus on the historical meaning of the text under examination, and a reconstruction of the Christian self through a focus on national identity – remained key components of later eschatological thought. As for Brightman, he would continue to be cited; continue to be read; continue (in some quarters) to be ridiculed. In 1658, years after the date

[178][Jessey], *Narrative*, p. 10.

[179]Liu, *Discord in Zion*, p. 145.

[180]See Warren Johnston, *Revelation Restored: The Apocalypse in Later Seventeenth-Century England* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2011); Adam Shear, "William Whiston's Judeo-Christianity: Millenarianism and Christian Zionism in Early Enlightenment England" in *Philosemitism in History*, eds. Jonathan Karp and Adam Sutcliffe (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), pp. 93–110.

he had set for the first Jewish resurrection, Brightman's works were still on the list of the "most vendible books in England".[181] Eschatology was, in the end, read more for the concepts it contained than for the dates it predicted. When John Aubury received a report of Brightman's grave in 1681, he discovered the legend inscribed on a plaque: "specially to Brightman's recommendacion/[Here] bee entomed a light to th' revelation".[182] Regardless of what light Brightman did or did not shed on the apocalyptic text, the fact that his central concepts would continue to be important well into the next century serves as his most impressive epitaph.

References

Anon. 1641a. *A revelation of Mr. Brightmans revelation*. London.
Anon. 1641b. *Brightmans predictions and prophecies*. London.
Anon. 1642. *Reverend Mr. Brightmans judgement*. London.
Archer, John. 1642. *The personall reigne of Christ upon earth*. London.
Aubrey, John. 1898. *Brief lives, chiefly of contemporaries, set down by John Aubrey, between the years 1669 & 1696*. Oxford: Clarendon.
Baynes, Paul. 1641. *The diocesans tryall*. London.
ben Israel, Menasseh. 1651. *The hope of Israel*. London.
ben Israel, Menasseh. 1655. *To his highnesse the Lord Protector*. London.
Bewicke, John. 1644. *Confiding England under conflicts, triumphing in the middest of her terrors*. London.
Brightman, Thomas. 1644. *The revelation of St. Iohn illustrated with an analysis & scholions . . . the fourth edition, corrected & amended*. London.
Bulkeley, Peter. 1646. *The gospel covenant or covenant of grace opened*. London.
Burroughs, Jeremiah. 1643. *An exposition of the prophesie of Hosea*. London.
Calderwood, David. 1619. *Perth assembly*. Edinburgh.
Capp, Bernard. 1972. *The fifth monarchy men*. London: Faber and Faber.
Cartenright, Johanna, and Ebenezer Cartwright. 1648. *The petition of the Jewes*. London.
Christianson, Paul. 1978. *Reformers and Babylon: English apocalyptic visions from the reformation to the eve of the civil war*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
Clarke, Elizabeth. 2011. *Politics, religion and the song of songs in seventeenth-century England*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
Clouse, Robert Gordon. 1968. The apocalyptic interpretation of Thomas Brightman and Joseph Mede. *Bulletin of the Evangelical Theological Society* 11: 181–190.
Cogley, Richard W. 2005. 'The Most Vile and Barbarous Nation of all the World': Giles Fletcher the Elder's *The Tartars Or, Ten Tribes* (ca. 1610). *Renaissance Quarterly* 58: 781–814.
Cohn-Sherbok, Dan. 2005. *The politics of apocalypse: The history and influence of Christian Zionism*. Oxford: Oneworld.
Collier, Thomas. 1655. *The day-dawning and the day-star arising to the dispersed of Judah & Israel*. London.
Collier, Thomas. 1656. *A brief answer to some objections . . . against the coming in and inhabiting of the Jews*. London.

[181] William London, *A Catalogue of the Most Vendible Books in England* (London, 1658), f.39v.

[182] Aubury, *Brief Lives*, p. 125. This was destroyed or built over during the extensive Victorian renovation of the church at Hawnes.

Commissioners of the Church of Scotland. 1643. *Reformation of church government in Scotland*. Edinburgh.
Cotton, John. 1642a. *A briefe exposition of the whole booke of canticles*. London.
Cotton, John. 1642b. *The churches resurrection or the opening of the fift and sixt verses of the 20th chapter of the revelation*. London.
Cotton, John. 1642c. *The powring out of the seven vials, or an exposition, of the 16. Chapter of the revelation*. London.
Cotton, John. 1656. *An exposition upon the thirteenth chapter of the revelation*. London.
Cressy, David. 2003. Revolutionary England 1640–2. *Past & Present* 181: 35–71.
Crome, Andrew. 2011. Constructing the political prophet in 1640s England. *The Seventeenth Century* 26: 279–298.
de Jong, J.A. 1970. *As the waters cover the sea: Millennial expectations in the rise of Anglo-American missions 1640–1810*. Kampen: Kok.
Eachard, John. 1645. *Good newes for all Christian soldiers*. London.
Edwards, Thomas. 1641. *Reasons against the independent government of particular congregations*. London.
Firth, Katherine. 1979. *The apocalyptic tradition in reformation Britain 1530–1645*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Fuller, Thomas. 1650. *A Pisgah-sight of Palestine and the confines thereof, with the historie of the Old and New Testament acred thereon*. London.
Goodwin, Thomas. 1683. *The works of Thomas Goodwin, D.D. sometime president of Magdalen Colledg in Oxford*, Vol II, London.
Gouge, William. 1645. *The promises of divine providence*. London.
Graunt, John. 1645. *A true reformation and perfect restitution*. London.
Gribben, Crawford. 2008. *The puritan millennium: Literature and theology, 1550–1682*, Revised ed. Milton Keynes: Paternoster.
Guibbory, Achsah. 2010. *Christian identity, Jews, and Israel in seventeenth-century England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Hall, Edmund. 1651. *Lingua testium*. London.
Henderson, Alexander. 1641. *The government and order of the church of Scotland*. Edinburgh.
Hotson, Howard. 2000. *Paradise postponed: Johann Heinrich Alsted and the birth of Calvinist millenarianism*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
James I and VI. 1620. Meditation upon the Lord's prayer. In *Workes*. London.
Johnston, Warren. 2011. *Revelation restored: The apocalypse in later seventeenth-century England*. Woodbridge: Boydell.
Jowitt, Claire. 1995. Radical identities? Native Americans, Jews, and the English Commonwealth. *Seventeenth Century* 10: 101–119.
Jue, Jeffrey K. 2006. *Heaven upon earth: Joseph Mede (1586–1638) and the legacy of millenarianism*. Dordrecht: Springer.
Jue, Jeffrey K. 2008. Puritan millenarianism in Old and New England. In *The Cambridge companion to puritanism*, ed. John Coffey and Paul C.H. Lim, 259–276. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Katz, David S. 1982. *Philo-semitism and the readmission of the Jews to England 1603–1655*. Oxford: Clarendon.
Katz, David S. 1983. English redemption and Jewish readmission in 1656. *Journal of Jewish Studies* 34: 73–91.
Katz, David S. 1989. Menasseh ben Israel's Christian connection. In *Menasseh ben Israel and his world*, ed. Yosef Kaplan, Henry Méchoulan, and Richard H. Popkin, 117–138. Leiden: Brill.
Katz, David S. 1994. *The Jews in the history of England 1485–1850*. Oxford/New York: Clarendon/Oxford University Press.
l'Estrange, Hamon. 1659. *The alliance of divine offices*. London.
Lamont, William. 1996. *Puritanism and historical controversy*. London: U.C.L. Press.
Liu, Tai. 1973. *Discord in Zion: The puritan divines and the puritan revolution 1640–1660*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.

Maton, Robert. 1642. *Israels redemption, or the propheticall history of our Saviours kingdome on earth, that is, of the church Catholicke and triumphant*. London.
Maton, Robert. 1646. *Israel's redemption redeemed. Or, the Jewes generall and miraculous conversion to the faith of the Gospel and returne into their owne land*. London.
Mendle, Michael. 1995. De facto freedom, de facto authority: Press and parliament, 1640–1643. *The Historical Journal* 38: 307–332.
Morrissey, Mary. 2000. Elect nation and prophetic preaching: Types and examples in the Paul's Cross Jeremiad. In *The English sermon revised: Religion, literature and history 1600–1750*, ed. Lori Anne Ferrell and Peter McCullough, 43–58. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
Nicholas, Edward. 1649. *An apology for the honorable nation of the Jews*. London.
Petrie, Alexander. 1644. *Chiliasto-mastix. Or, the prophecies in the Old and Nevv Testament concerning the kingdome of our savior Iesus Christ*. Rotterdam.
Philo-Judaeus, J.J. 1655. *The resurrection of the dead bones*. London.
Pierce, Helen. 2004. Anti-episcopacy and graphic satire in England, 1640–1645. *The Historical Journal* 47: 809–848.
Prynne, William. 1656. *The second part of a short demurrer to the Jewes long discontinued remitter into England*. London.
R.B. [=Nathaniel Crouch]. 1719. *Two journeys to Jerusalem*. London.
Richey, Elizabeth Gilman. 1998. *The politics of revelation in the English renaissance*. Columbia: University of Missouri Press.
Rutherford, Samuel. 1642. *A peaceable and temperate plea for Pauls presbytery*. Edinburgh.
Scult, Mel. 1978. *Millennial expectations and Jewish liberties*. Leiden: Brill.
Shapiro, James. 1996. *Shakespeare and the Jews*. New York: Columbia University Press.
Shear, Adam. 2010. William Whiston's Judeo-Christianity: Millenarianism and Christian Zionism in early enlightenment England. In *Philosemitism in history*, ed. Jonathan Karp and Adam Sutcliffe, 93–110. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Siebert, F.S. 1952. *Freedom of the press in England 1476–1776: The rise and decline of government controls*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
Spencer, Edward. 1650. *A brief epistle to the learned Manasseh ben Israel*. London.
Strong, William. 1656. *XXXI select sermons, preached on special occasions*. London.
Thorowgood, Thomas. 1660. *Jews in America*. London.
Tillinghast, John. 1654. *Generation-work*. London.
Tomlinson, William. 1656. *A bosome opened to the Jewes*. London.
Toon, Peter. 2002 [1970]. The question of Jewish immigration. In *Puritans, the millennium and the future of Israel*, ed. Peter Toon, 115–125. Cambridge: James Clark & Co.
Van der Wall, Ernestine G.E. 1989. A philo-semitic millenarian on the reconciliation of the Jews and Christians: Henry Jessey and his 'glory and salvation of Jehudah and Israel' (1650). In *Sceptics, millenarians and Jews*, eds. David S. Katz, Jonathan Israel, and Richard Popkin, 161–184. Leiden: Brill.
Vincent, Philip. 1638. *Lamentations of Germany*. London.
Vove, Finens Canus [John Fenwicke]. 1643. *Zions joy in her king, comming in his glory*. London.
Wagner, Donald E. 1995. *Anxious for Armageddon*. Scottdale: Herald Press.
Walton, Izaak. 1678. *The life of Dr. Sanderson*. London.
Weemes, John. 1636. *A treatise of the foure degenerate sonnes*. London.
Whiston, Edward. 1671. *The life and death of Mr Henry Jessy*. London.
Wilkinson, Henry. 1641. *A sermon against lukewarmnesse in religion*. London.
Wolf, Lucien. 1901. *Menasseh ben Israel's mission to Oliver Cromwell*. London: Macmillan.

Chapter 7
Conclusion

This book finishes its examination at the Restoration. To some extent this is an arbitrary point at which to end. While it has not always been sufficiently recognised, eschatological speculation continued well into the later seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. As Warren Johnston has recently shown, the prophetic positions of the interregnum did not simply disappear with Charles II. Instead they evolved and adapted themselves to new political realities, being used as much by Royalist Anglicans as by non-conformists.[1] Indeed, the links between consistent literalism, historicised reading and national identity could be traced even further into the eighteenth century; through the eschatological positions of the Evangelical revival and the Wesley brothers' interest in the Jews; through the "Jew Bill" controversy of 1753 and into the more formalised "Christian Zionism" of the nineteenth century and the hermeneutical controversies which surrounded it. This book has aimed to present a more focused view of a particular moment of hermeneutical development. By breaking down the eschatological hermeneutics employed by one highly influential writer and by examining the way in which his positions came to have political, religious, and practical effects, it has highlighted the way in which a particular approach to scripture could come to exert a powerful influence on both later theologians and politicians.

In doing so, I have aimed to highlight the complex nature of puritan hermeneutical thought. As Kevin Killeen has shown, scholars have been too quick to interpret this in an overly simplistic manner.[2] Rather than a straightforward literal/allegorical dichotomy, puritan commentators used a number of differing approaches to scripture. While this has been increasingly recognised, a simplistic approach to the hermeneutical question has often remained in studies of puritan eschatology. Scholars such as Culver, Wagner, and Zakai have argued that the emergence of the puritan

[1] See Johnston, *Revelation Restored.*

[2] Killeen, *Biblical Scholarship*, pp. 1–42.

A. Crome, *The Restoration of the Jews: Early Modern Hermeneutics, Eschatology, and National Identity in the Works of Thomas Brightman*, International Archives of the History of Ideas Archives internationales d'histoire des idées 213,
DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-04762-1_7,

interest in the millennium was the result of an increasingly literal hermeneutic. In one sense, this is demonstrated quite clearly in Brightman's work. As we have seen, the prophecies relating to a Jewish restoration to Palestine were returned to their literal sense. By using the standard topoi of Protestant hermeneutics, such as the *analogia fidei*, Brightman argued for a *consistently* literal reading of the Old Testament. His concern throughout his commentaries was to provide a stable, historical structure through which he could interpret the biblical text. The "conflation of sign and thing signified"[3] that Gribben suggested as developing in this period is clearly evidenced in Brightman's writings.

Yet this is not quite the full picture. We need to have an appreciation of the variety of positions that could be adopted within a "literal" hermeneutic. To presume a simplistic development of the literal sense in Brightman ignores the fact that his work also used a number of typological and allegorical readings of prophecy. This is most pointedly seen in Brightman's historicisation of scripture. The prophecies of the Old Testament were to be read so as that they were understood in the manner in which their Old Testament readers would have understood them. This seems, on the surface, like a surprisingly "modern" move; indeed, it parallels Killeen's recognition that the "critical" approach to scripture, which we often presume developed only in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, found clear antecedents in the seventeenth.[4] This is not to argue that Brightman was promoting a form-critical method, an idea which would be both anachronistic and incorrect. Rather, it is important to recognise the extreme historical consciousness that both he and many who followed his lead possessed. This can be seen most clearly in his unique reading of the Song of Songs. Here, Brightman dissolved allegory into history. The erotic metaphors in the text were not applied to a Christian's relationship with Christ, but instead were converted into historical narrative. At one level, this was converting the allegorical sense into a literal/historical sense. At another, however, it showed great hermeneutical dexterity; a re-imagining of what was meant by the allegorical sense of scripture. One of the effects of this historicisation was that Brightman's work (and the works of those who followed) served to open up history. The end was postponed, perhaps indefinitely, while the calling of the Jews became the highest eschatological blessing that could be hoped for on earth. On the surface this might appear to be a post-millennial position, but in reality it was a far more complex and unique view, which incorporated Brightman's distinct dual-millennial scheme. While (Ussher aside) his reading of Rev. 20 was not followed by many, by finding all scriptural promises fulfilled in history he presented the template for what could become a less spiritualised reading of the Bible's promises. Thus the resurrection of Rev. 21 and Christ's return in Mt. 24 were read in a typological sense; the New Testament became a book primarily concerned with Jewish restoration and salvation. Christ's Second Advent and the resurrection of the dead were deferred to the far future. Indeed, these events were described in scripture

[3] Gribben, *Puritan Millennium*, p. 233.

[4] Killeen, *Biblical Scholarship*, pp. 43–102.

only in typological form. The antitype was forever delayed; moving beyond the boundaries of scripture into an undefined period. Again, it should be emphasised that I am not attempting to portray Brightman as a precursor to a "critical" reading of the Bible, or as Ernest Lee Tuveson would have him, a forerunner of modernity and rationalism.[5] Brightman was a man of his time and he used established Protestant hermeneutical thought in a creative way. His readings were protected from claims of arbitrariness by his focus on the Spirit's intention and the Ramist logic he used to defend them. Nonetheless, he felt himself free to embrace novelty, a highly unusual step for a puritan exegete. Brightman's work should, then, serve to complicate our ideas of what the literal sense was, leading us to a richer understanding both of puritanism itself, and its eschatology in particular.

Brightman's re-reading of prophecy had another effect. Where Old Testament prophecies had previously been applied to the church glorified, they were now applied to the Jewish nation. In standard Protestant interpretations, Old Testament promises emphasised the unity of the church throughout history: the fact that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob belonged to the same elect body as the seventeenth-century believer. Brightman's reading, however, presumed a radical division of Jew and Gentile, even after conversion. His position presupposed that God did not have a unity of purpose for his people. Instead, he had separate plans for Jews and Gentiles, plans which placed the Jew in a superior earthly position to that of the Gentile believer. The eschatological separation presumed in Brightman's work was a genuinely new development, and has received surprisingly little comment in secondary works. It was an element of his thought which was picked up by several of his later readers, most notably Finch and Mede, and came to increased prominence during the interregnum. Why this new reading suddenly appeared in Brightman is difficult to pinpoint. Richard Cogley's suggestion of historical primitivism as a motive, and David Katz's focus upon the link between Hebraic studies and growing interest in the Jews as a living community are both correct in identifying influences on Judeo-centrism. However, this study has suggested a further root of this thought – the influence of Jesuit hermeneutics. As Philip Almond has noted, it appears to be no coincidence that Brightman argued for a future Jewish state in Palestine shortly after he encountered Bellarmine's work. Yet it was not merely the restating of the Jewish Antichrist legend in Bellarmine which motivated Brightman. The Cardinal's focus on a literal hermeneutic in New Testament prophecy seems to have had a direct effect on Brightman's exegesis. His use of the theme was, however, a reworking and parody of that suggested by the Jesuits. For Bellarmine and Ribera Jewish restoration was the sign that the Antichrist had come; for Brightman, it was the sign that Antichrist was soon to be vanquished. By applying a consistently literal reading to the promises of Jewish restoration, much as Bellarmine had applied a literal reading to the book of Revelation, Brightman could argue against the Jesuits using their own hermeneutical system.

[5]Ernest Lee Tuveson, *Millennium and Utopia: A Study in the Background of the Idea of Progress* (Gloucester, MA.: Peter Smith, 1972), pp. 71–112.

The firm distinction Brightman made between the future hopes of the Jews and future hopes of the Gentiles also undermined a conventional Protestant reading of the self. As Luxon and Lewalski have shown, a sense of Christian identity was often based around a typological reading of the Old Testament Jew. By removing this, and by deferring Christ's second coming and the resurrection of the dead, Brightman undermined both traditional Christian eschatological hope and a standard pillar of Christian identity. Brightman was aware that his schema cut away one of the foundations of the Christian self. He therefore aimed to give his readers a new sense of hope, selfhood, and identity. He achieved this by emphasising the role that England would play in bringing about the downfall of Rome predicted in Daniel and Revelation. While his Laodicean reading of England has caused commentators such as Richey to deny that Brightman viewed his nation in a positive light,[6] Brightman's attack on the Church of England was motivated by a desire for reform, rather than destruction. While Brightman initially emphasised the lukewarm state of his national church, he believed that it was destined to become the purest of all Reformed churches. Not only did several events in the book of Revelation find their fulfilment in the country, but the English would be at the head of an international Protestant alliance that would destroy Rome. This study has demonstrated Brightman's English focus and the reasons for it. It was Brightman's Judeo-centrism, with its unintentional minimisation of promises for the church that led him to emphasise an alternative, national hope. This is not quite the same thing as the idea of an "elect nation". Brightman did not see England as the "successor" of Old Testament Israel: his hermeneutic prevented any such reading. Rather, he saw England as becoming the purest of the Reformed nations, operating firmly within a pan-European Protestant context.

These key threads identified in Brightman's thought were influential from soon after his work was first published in 1609. While previous studies, such as those by Christianson and Gibson,[7] have suggested that Brightman was not widely read until the 1640s, this book has shown the extent to which Brightman influenced English eschatological thought from as early as 1609. This places him as the key developer of Judeo-centrism. Brightman's emphasis on a consistently literal reading of the Old Testament, shorn of its polemic background, became the basis for a number of readings which presumed a separation of Jew and Gentile, even after conversion. In these works, a focus on a new English identity began to emerge, seen particularly clearly in Richard Bernard's writing. Of course, these assertions of national identity were by their very nature political. Brightman's conclusions had the potential to be seen as subversive by the authorities, as Finch found to his cost. Indeed, Brightman's work inspired a number of writers to begin actively attempting to locate the lost tribes of Israel in anticipation of their return. While Brightman's commentaries were used by separatists to justify their positions, the majority of those influenced by his ideas up until the 1640s were firmly within the established

[6]Richey, *Politics of Revelation*, p. 40.

[7]Christianson, *Reformers,* p. 106; Gibson, "Eschatology, Apocalypse and Millenarianism", p. 247.

church. Brightman should therefore be seen as the first member of the "moderate" millenarian movement which Jeffrey Jue has identified.[8] While Brightman was not a premillennialist in the sense of Mede and Alsted, he nonetheless broke down standard interpretations of Revelation 20. His hermeneutical approaches, especially his early development of the synchronous method used in Mede, proved particularly influential. That these influences came to fruition in the interregnum is no surprise. What is perhaps more noteworthy is the way in which divines from a variety of traditions made use of Brightman and his work to justify their positions. In the early 1640s, he was viewed as a "Presbyterian prophet", becoming something of a publishing phenomenon. But it is the reception of Brightman's ideas about the fundamental separation of Jew and Gentile that is more important, emerging in a large number of works in the period, covering a range of ecclesiastical traditions – including Congregationalists such as Cotton, Fifth Monarchists such as Jessey and Royalist Presbyterians such as Hall. The key ideas of consistent literalism and the fundamental break between God's promises for the Jews and God's promises for Gentiles proved vitally important for a large number of writers in the period. That these positions proved politically important, particularly in the Whitehall Conference, is unsurprising. Neither, given the emphasis on self-reconstruction, is it strange to find such a focus on the importance of national identity in the debates of the time. For Shapiro these debates focus on the Jew as "Other" to define national identity; for Guibbory, the Jew is instead an extension of a figure through which to portray oneself and one's nation. While both viewpoints have elements of truth, an awareness of God's distinct promises for the Jews allowed the construction of national identity with the Jew viewed as a brother and the marker of God's blessing on earth. It was not simply the case of defining one's Englishness against the Jews; rather, it was important to return to biblical principles, identifying the apocalyptic role of one's own nation in tandem with the understanding that this role would, ultimately, involve submission to a new Hebrew empire.

Of course, the central themes that have been traced in this book should provide new ways of looking at other historical situations. This work has concentrated on England alone. In future, an examination of the reception of Judeo-centrism in New England would prove fruitful. Although I have touched briefly on John Cotton and Peter Bulkeley here, the use of Judeo-centrism by later generations of settlers would prove useful, especially if read alongside developments in England. The increased focus on covenant theology in New England raises additional problems for a consistently literal interpretation of the Old Testament, especially as both land claims and the central claim to the covenant of grace can be located in the covenant set forth in Genesis 17. The ways in which this seeming inconsistency was dealt with would no doubt provide new answers to the question of how hermeneutics developed in both New and old England.[9]

---

[8] Jue, *Heaven*, pp. 3–7.

[9] As mentioned above, Robert O. Smith's forthcoming *More Desired than Our Owne Salvation: The Roots of Christian Zionism* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2013) appears to pick up some of these themes.

Returning to England, as Johnston has rightly suggested, apocalyptic interest remained high after the Restoration. This continued through the end of the seventeenth century, with Judeo-centrism often an essential part of it. Writing in 1691, Richard Baxter attacked the idea of Jewish restoration due to its separation of Jew and Gentile. That the Jews "should continue then in a Jewish Line and Peculiarity, distinct from the Catholick mixed Church, is a *wickedness,*" he argued, "contrary to the very nature of Christianity . . . For Christ came to take down the Partition Wall".[10] Judeo-centrism, for Baxter, was marked by a firm division between God's promises for the Jews and his promises for the church. This was not simply a rhetorical attack on a long forgotten position: "I find it [Jewish restoration] in many Books of Men, and I hear of it in the Prayers and Sermons of many Men, so good, and of so good repute, that divers of my Friends dissuade me from so much as giving my Reasons against it, lest I lose my Reputation with such men".[11] Henry More therefore responded to Baxter's earlier attacks on Judeo-centrism with the accusation that he had not only "a *Wooden Soul,* but a *Stony Heart*" to reject the belief. More freely admitted the division in God's promises between Israel and the Gentile church. Nobody could deny, he argued, "Gods Providence towards his own *peculiar* People the *Jews,* who have suffered so great and durable Calamities and Severities of Affliction from Him, who yet is stiled the God of *Abraham, Isaac,* and *Jacob,* and is said to have an *everlasting* Covenant with that People".[12] That such debates were still current in the 1680s and 90s suggests that future work, particularly focusing on the Judeo-centric theme, would yield valuable information on the development of English eschatology and attitudes towards the Jews. A focus on how English writers read the theme of Jewish restoration from 1660 until the passing of the Jewish Naturalization Act of 1753 would undoubtedly prove a useful endeavour. This would build explicitly upon Shapiro's work in this area,[13] providing an analysis of the *theological* underpinnings of views on the Jewish people in the period, as opposed to his literary-historical analysis. The point here is that the story of Judeo-centrism does not end in 1660, and it should not be seen to.

This book opened by quoting writers who presume there to be a direct link between contemporary Christian Zionism and puritan eschatology. Such links make me keenly aware that the findings of this book have the potential to be used as a defence for the historical legitimacy of the theological and political positions held by Christian Zionists today. Those tempted to do so would do well to remember that alongside the hermeneutic tools of orthodox Protestantism, the influence of Bellarmine's eschatology was a key factor in the formation of Brightman's Judeo-centrism. In tracing the theme here I have not claimed that it was the

[10]Richard Baxter, *The Glorious Kingdom of Christ* (London, 1691), p. 62.

[11]Baxter, *Glorious*, p. 56.

[12]Phililicrines Parrhesiastes, [Henry More], *Some Cursory Reflexions Impartially made upon Mr. Richard Baxter His Way of Writing Notes on the Apocalypse* (London, 1685), pp. 10–11 Emphasis in original.

[13]Shapiro, *Shakespeare and the Jews*, pp. 195–224.

dominant eschatological position; just one important stream among many others. The awareness of the potential political uses of seventeenth-century history should not, however, prevent us from honestly examining that history. Neither should it stop historians tracing antecedents to contemporary eschatological positions in historical texts. This should be seen neither as a legitimation of, or an attack upon, any particular contemporary prophetic movement. Too many studies of the history of Christian Zionism has been launched as an explicit critique (or an explicit defence) of this form of eschatology. This book has argued that the essential division found in the thought of those Judeo-centrists who followed Brightman was the division of God's promises for Israel and for the church. This is the same division that is the hallmark of contemporary dispensational eschatology.[14] It has usually been stressed, especially by critics such Stephen Sizer, that the dispensational distinction between Israel and the church developed in the nineteenth century through John Nelson Darby.[15] However, in this area at least, there is an antecedent to dispensational thinking on this subject in Brightman's work. Of course, Brightman's theology is not dispensational in a contemporary sense. Neither is this to argue that the antecedents found here should be used to justify contemporary theological or political positions regarding Israel. Yet the findings of this study should alert us to the fact that Darby's theology neither appeared overnight, nor developed in a vacuum. Certainly the links between national identity construction and the break between God's promises for the Jews and the Gentiles are suggestive of some contemporary eschatological positions that remain popular today.[16]

The danger, given all that I have said above, is that this book ends with a neat, quotable sentence suggesting a direct line between Brightman's eschatology and the restoration of Israel as nation. After all, writing in 1640 parliamentarian leader Robert Greville, Lord Brook, penned the following, seemingly prescient, sentence on Brightman: "I honour his very Urne, and do beleeve that one day I shall see the Jews very zealous in raising to him some stately *Mausoleum*, who hath been the first meanes of quickning the affections of Christians to pray for their returne".[17] Yet whatever line there may be between Brightman and the contemporary world of eschatology and geo-politics, it is certainly not straight or without interruption at several key theological points. What can be said is that Brightman's hermeneutic and his unique, Jewish privileging eschatology were an important influence on the way in which Protestant eschatology has developed over the last 400 years. His beliefs were certainly not the "first meanes" of Jewish restoration, but they

[14]Charles Ryrie, *Dispensationalism* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1995), pp. 38–41.

[15]Stephen Sizer, *Christian Zionism: Road-map to Armageddon?* (Leicester: IVP, 2004), pp. 26–30.

[16]The use of contemporary historical scholarship to justify particular eschatological positions in a problem I address elsewhere. See Andrew Crome, "Historical Understandings in Millennial Studies: A Case Study of Christian Zionism" in *Beyond the End: The Future of Millennial Studies*, eds Joshua Searle and Kenneth Newport (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2012), pp. 20–46.

[17]Robert Greville, *The Nature of Truth, Its Union and Unity with the Soule* (London, 1641), pp. 178–79.

pointed to a continued fascination among Protestants surrounding prophecies of Jewish restoration and the formation of national identity linked to faith. For this reason alone, he remains a key figure who should not be forgotten by eschatological historians.

Brightman's grave was built over in the renovation of the Church in Hawnes in the nineteenth century, as the austere interior was transformed by the ideas of Tractarian high churchmanship. As ironic as this fate is, it is perhaps symbolic of the way that Brightman has been treated in the secondary literature; passed over as a minor or eccentric figure. If this book has achieved anything, hopefully it has served to highlight just how important Brightman was for the development of eschatological hermeneutics, attitudes towards Judaism and national identity formation in early modern England. Too often dismissed by scholars as an eccentric or a crank, Brightman should be recognised as figure well within the established tradition. In taking accepted hermeneutical positions to their logical conclusions he was driven to take new and influential positions on the questions of Jewish restoration and national identity. For Brightman himself, adherence to the truth of scripture – a desire to stay true to God's word – was placed above everything else. To forget this is to forget both the essence of puritanism itself, and that Brightman approached the text as both a pastor and a biblical scholar. John Spencer's 1641 poem on Brightman's sudden death serves to remind us of the importance of this to his appeal:

> No marvell though so bright a man,
> His glorious life in Heaven so soone began:
> For long his soule had languish'd in great griefe,
> To see Gods chosen Flocke to want their best reliefe:
> And cruell Wolves, dumbe dogs, and lordly Masters;
> Set in the roome of Christ faithfull Pastors.
> Therefore his deare Lord seeing his servant thus distrest,
> Took him away unto his everlasting rest.[18]

Where the legend above his grave proclaimed him "a light to th' revelation", Spencer instead focused on his Brightman's love of the church. It is impossible to truly appreciate either Brightman as a man, or his commentaries, without realising that his work as an exegete was driven by this love. He could not have been such a "light to th' revelation" had it not been for his heartfelt desire to see both his church and country truly reformed. This remained his passion throughout his life and abiding hope in death. For those who followed him, he remained an inspiration in this area. It is perhaps fitting, then, to conclude this study by quoting from Richard Baxter's famous *Saints Everlasting Rest*. For Baxter one of the appeals of heaven was the opportunity to join a personal community of the saints praising God:

> It cannot chuse but be comfortable to me to think of that day, when I shall joyn with *Moses* in his song, with *David* in his Psalms of praise; and with all the redeemed in the song of the Lamb for ever . . . Will it be nothing conducible to the compleating of our comforts, to live eternally with *Peter, Paul, Austin, Chrysostom, Jerome, Wickliffe, Luther . . . with Hooper,*

[18] John Spencer, *A Discourse of Divers Petitions of High Concernment* (London, 1641), p. 14.

> *Bradford, Latimer . . . with Reignolds, Whitaker, Cartwright, Brightman . . . ?* O happy day when I shall depart out of this crown and sink, and go to that same counsell of soules![19]

Despite his disagreement with Brightman's central hermeneutic and attempts to date the restoration of the Jews, Baxter nonetheless looked forward to meeting him as one of the eminent Saints of his age. In heaven all such errors would be forgotten. The hermeneutical barrier, which led to such difficulties in understanding both fellow men and God himself, would no longer exist. Comprehension would be instant and total; misunderstanding a thing of the past. Is it any wonder that this prospect led Baxter to be overcome with joy?

References

Baxter, Richard. 1650. *The saints everlasting rest*. London.

Baxter, Richard. 1691. *The glorious kingdom of Christ*. London.

Christianson, Paul. 1978. *Reformers and Babylon: English apocalyptic visions from the reformation to the eve of the civil war*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Crome, Andrew. 2012. Historical understandings in millennial studies: A case study of Christian Zionism. In *Beyond the end: The future of millennial studies*, ed. Joshua Searle and Kenneth Newport, 20–46. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press.

Gibson, Kenneth. 1999. *Eschatology, apocalypse and millenarianism in seventeenth century protestant thought*. Nottingham Trent University Unpublished PhD thesis.

Greville, Robert. 1641. *The nature of truth, its union and unity with the soule*. London.

Gribben, Crawford. 2008. *The puritan millennium: Literature and theology, 1550–1682*, Revised ed. Milton Keynes: Paternoster.

Johnston, Warren. 2011. *Revelation restored: The apocalypse in later seventeenth-century England*. Woodbridge: Boydell.

Jue, Jeffrey K. 2006. *Heaven upon Earth: Joseph Mede (1586–1638) and the legacy of millenarianism*. Dordrecht: Springer.

Killeen, Kevin. 2009. *Biblical scholarship, science and politics in early modern England*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

More, Henry. 1685. *Some cursory reflexions impartially made upon Mr. Richard Baxter his way of writing notes on the apocalypse*. London.

Richey, Elizabeth Gilman. 1998. *The politics of revelation in the English renaissance*. Columbia: University of Missouri Press.

Ryrie, Charles. 1995. *Dispensationalism*. Chicago: Moody Press.

Shapiro, James. 1996. *Shakespeare and the Jews*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Sizer, Stephen. 2004. *Christian Zionism: Road-map to Armageddon?* Leicester: IVP.

Spencer, John. 1641. *A discourse of divers petitions of high concernment*. London.

Tuveson, Ernest Lee. 1972. *Millennium and Utopia: A study in the background of the idea of progress*. Gloucester: Peter Smith.

[19]Richard Baxter, *The Saints Everlasting Rest* (London, 1650), p. 85.

Appendix: A Comparison of Editions of Brightman's *Revelation of the Revelation*

As Brightman's commentary on Revelation was originally published in Latin, a brief comparison of the various English translations of his work with the first Latin edition (Frankfurt, 1609) will prove useful in highlighting what changes (if any) occurred between editions in the period 1609–1644. In the following, I will compare key passages from the first English translation (1611), and the widely circulated 1644 edition (used throughout the present study), with the 1609 Frankfurt Latin edition.

The first English version of Brightman's text, produced in 1611, was an accurate translation of the original text. Versions which followed added stylistic flourishes and occasional light glosses, but did not alter Brightman's meaning. This can be seen in the following table:

1609 Frankfurt Edition	1611 Amsterdam Edition	1644 London Edition
"Quoniam, ut videtur, Iudaeorum ecclesia, cumulatior tandem futura est donis spiritus, quam haec nostra Gentium". (p. 28).	"it seemeth, *the Jewes* Church at length shall become more aboundant in the gifts of the spirit, then this ours of the Gentiles". (p. 29).	"it seemeth, the Church of the *Jewes* is to be at length more abundantly filled with the gifts of the holy Ghost, then this of ours that be Gentiles". (p. 34).
"Caeterum hinc dicimus veteres prophetias non finiendas esse, vel in prima adventu *Christi*, vel in vocatione *Gentium*, sed eas ad plenam usque mysterii consummationem pertingere". (p. 274).	"But from hence wee learne that the old prophecies are not to be finished, either in the first comming of *Christ*, or in the calling of the *Gentiles*, but that they reach even unto the perfit accomplishing of the mistery". (p. 284).	"But now hence we may learn, that the old Prophecies are not to be thought to receive accomplishment, either *in the first coming of Christ* or *in the calling of the Gentiles*; but that they do reach even unto the full consummation of the *Mysterie*". (p. 339).

(continued)

A. Crome, *The Restoration of the Jews: Early Modern Hermeneutics, Eschatology, and National Identity in the Works of Thomas Brightman*, International Archives of the History of Ideas Archives internationales d'histoire des idées 213,
DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-04762-1, © Springer International Publishing Switzerland 2014

(continued)

1609 Frankfurt Edition	1611 Amsterdam Edition	1644 London Edition
"Primus igitur, aditus huius tubae insignis fesset accesuire novorum reegenorum; Quemadmodum factum in nostra Anglia, cui Christus ad septimae tubae clangorem, anno millesimo quinquagesimo ocatvio serenissimam reginam Elizabetham, dedit, quae regnum suum vicissim, Christo dedit, extir pano pro Majori parte per oes suas ditiones superstitiones Romanas". (p. 309).	"Therefore the first entrance of this *Trumpet* should be famous for the accesse of newe Kingdoms: as it came to passe in our England, to which Christ at *the sound of the seventh trumpet* in the yeere one thousand, five hundred fiftieth eight, gave the most gracious Queene Elizabeth, who againe gave her Kingdome to Christ in rooting out through all her dominions, the most part of the Romish superstitions". (p. 318).	"The first entrance therefore of this Trumpet should be famous by this increase of new Kingdomes, even as it came to passe in our Kingdom of *England*: Unto which *Christ sent our most gracious* Elizabeth *to be Queen, at the first blast of the seventh Trumpet, in the yeer* 1558, and the againe gave her self, and her Kingdom to Christ by way of thankfulnesse, which she shewed by rooting out the *Romish superstitions* for the greater part of them". (p. 382).
"Scriptorum vanitas multa singere possit: seo scripturae vendicant huic uni genti hoc tanquam peculiare". (p. 433).	"The vanity of writers may feign many things: but the Scriptures doo challenge this, as peculiar to this nation onely". (p. 440).	"The vanity of writers may invent many things, but the *Holy Scriptures* do challenge this, as a peculiar miracle that God wrought for this Nation of the *Jewes* alone". (p. 543).
"An tursum revertentur Hierosolymam? Nihil certius, diserte Prophetae confirmant & inculcant passim. Non eo tamen ut restauretur cktus ceremoniatum: Sed ut Dei ben ignitas elucescat tot, mundo tribuentis gent per totum terrarum orbum nunc dissipatae, nec usquam habitanti nisi percario paternas suas sedes, in quibus Christum pure sincereque colent, ex eius unius instituto". (p. 433).	"Shal thy returne agayn to Jerusalem? Ther is nothing more sure: the Prophets playnly confirme it, and beat often upon it. Yet not to the end that the ceremonial worship should be restored: but that the mercy of God may shine unto al the world, in giving to a nation now scatered over the face of the earth, & dwelling no where but by leave; their fathers habitations wherein they shal serve Christ purely and sincerely, according to his owne ordinance onely". (p. 440).	"What, shall they return to *Jerusalem* againe? There is nothing more certaine, the Prophets do every where directly confirme it and beat upon it. Yet they shall not come thither to have their ceremoniall worship restored, but to make the goodnesse of God shine forth to all the world; when they shall see him give to that nation (which is now, and hath been for many Ages scattered throughout the whole world, and inhabiteth no where but by leave & intreaty) their own habitations where their Fathers dweleth wherein they shal worship Christ purely, and sincerely, according to his wil & Commandement alone". (p. 544).

Nonetheless, there was one notable change between the 1611 and 1644 editions which gave the text a more immediate political application. Brightman's comments on Revelation 17:16, which predicted the destruction of the "whore", allowed him to attack the abuses of the Roman church. One of Brightman's targets was the internal strife he felt that the papacy encouraged amongst Protestant nations. The Latin, addressed to princes and rulers of the people, exhorts them:

> . . . post diligentem probationem, id quod assertur verum ac certum comperetitis, libertate tandem, per Deum, afflicissimam Europam, tum intestini belli face, uam circumsert haec meretrix etiam justissima materia.[1]

The 1611 edition translates this clearly:

> Wherefore if after diligent tryall, ye shall find out that which is brought, to be true & certen, deliver at length, by the name of God the most afflicted Europe, both from the firebrand of civil warre, which this *whore* carrieth about, and also from the most just matter of external war.[2]

The 1644 edition, however, adds an additional gloss to the translation:

> Wherefore if you shall certainly finde, after diligent examination, that that which I bring is true and certain, then I beseech you in Gods name, do your uttermost, to deliver *Europe* at length, this is so miserably plagued and distressed, both from that *firebrand of Civil War*, within our own bowels, which this Whore carrieth about with her.[3]

The addition of "within our own bowels" was clearly intended as a reference to the Civil War then current in England. While this was the only such addition to the commentary, it was an important one. It evidenced a desire to grant Brightman's words a more immediate *political* impact. The section of the commentary which included the plea was specifically directed by Brightman towards Protestant rulers, "*the most mighty and renowned Princes*". The earlier versions of Brightman's work had emphasised Jesuit agitation as a cause of civil war. The addition to the commentary in 1644 aimed to highlight the way in which the Roman Church had *specifically* played a part in causing England's own internal troubles. Placed, as it was, as an appeal to the monarch, this section took on special significance during the 1640s. The addition allowed Brightman's text to become a specific plea towards Charles, encouraging the king to identify the true cause of the Civil War – the Roman Church, rather than parliament. It became, in other words, a plea for the king to fulfil the duty of the godly monarch, and take the lead in fighting, once again, against Antichrist. This provides further evidence against Lamont's thesis, discussed previously, which suggested that Brightman's work was used to encourage a reform by a "Godly" people. Instead, even in 1644, the commentary was deliberately styled as an appeal for a reform led by the monarchy.[4] The one modification to Brightman's commentary in the Civil War, then, was not an appeal for radical reform, but rather for the restoration and continuation of the godly kingship.

---

[1] Brightman, *Revelation* (1609), p. 482.

[2] Brightman, *Revelation* (1609), p. 489.

[3] Brightman, *Revelation* (1611), p. 607.

[4] See Lamont, *Godly Rule*, pp. 94–95.

References

Brightman, Thomas. 1609. *Apocalypsis Apocalypseos. Id est, Apocalypsis d. Ioannis analysi et scholiis illustr. Refutatio R. Bellarmini de Antichristo libro tertio.* Frankfurt.

Brightman, Thomas. 1611. *A revelation of the Apocalyps, that is, the Apocalyps of S. Iohn illustrated with analysis and scolions.* Amsterdam.

Brightman, Thomas. 1644. *The revelation of St. Iohn illustrated with an analysis & scholions . . . The fourth edition, corrected & amended.* London.

Lamont, William. 1969. *Godly rule: Politics and religion 1603–1660*. London: Macmillan.

Select Bibliography

Primary Sources: Manuscripts

British Library Harleain Ms. 593.
British Library Lansdowne Ms. 721, ff.89–156.
British Library Lansdowne Ms. 353 ff.192–230.
Diocese of Lincoln Ms. Misc. 1603/105 in C.W. Foster (ed), *Volume 23: The State of the Church in the Reigns of Elizabeth and James I as illustrated by documents relating to the Diocese of Lincoln*, vol. 1, cxvi–cxvii. Lincoln: Lincoln Record Society, 1926.
Lambeth Palace Ms. 2550 ff.176r–179v.
Salisbury Ms., 330 in *Calendar of the manuscripts of the Most Hon. the Marquess of Salisbury Pt. 16*, 379–380. London: H.M.S.O., 1933.

Primary Sources: Printed Works

Alexander, Philip S. (ed.). 2003. *The Targum of Canticles: Translated with a critical introduction, apparatus and notes*. Collegeville: The Liturgical Press.
Alsted, Johann Heinrich. 1643. *The beloved city, or, The saints reign on earth.* London.
Ames, William. 1633. *A fresh suit against human ceremonies in God's worship.* Amsterdam.
[Anon.]. 1607. *A Jewes prophesy, or, newes from Rome.* London.
[Anon.]. 1641a. *Brightmans predictions and prophecies written 46 yeares since: Concerning the three churches of Germanie, England, and Scotland.* [London?].
[Anon.]. 1641b. *A revelation of Mr. Brightmans revelation.* [London?].
[Anon.]. 1641c. *Reverend Mr. Brightmans judgement or prophesies.* London.
[Anon.]. 1642. *Five strange and wonderfull prophesies and predictions of severall men.* [London?].
[Anon.]. 1649. *A crown a crime or, a Monarch martyr.* London.
[Anon.]. 1650. *A brief description of the future history of Europe, from Anno 1650 to An. 1710.* London.
[Anon.]. 1685. *The wonderful prophesies of old Mother Shipton.* Edinburgh.
Aquinas, Thomas. 1964–1973. *Summa Theologiae*, 60 vols. London: Blackfriars.
Arber, Edward (ed.). 1874–1888. *A transcript of the registers of the Company of Stationers of London.* London: Privately Printed.

A. Crome, *The Restoration of the Jews: Early Modern Hermeneutics, Eschatology, and National Identity in the Works of Thomas Brightman*, International Archives of the History of Ideas Archives internationales d'histoire des idées 213,
DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-04762-1,

Archer, John. 1642. *The personall reign of Christ upon earth.* London.
Atwell, George. 1660. *An apology, or, Defence of the divine art of natural astrologie.* London.
Aubrey, John. 1898. *'Brief lives', chiefly of contemporaries, set down by John Aubrey, between the years 1669 & 1696*. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press.
Augustine. 1955. *Later Works.* Trans. John Burnaby. London: SCM Press.
Augustine. 1996. *De Doctrina Christiana.* Trans. R.P.H. Green. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Augustine. 1998. *The City of God Against the Pagans.* Trans. R.W. Dyson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Bale, John. 1580. *The image of both Churches.* London.
Baxter, Richard. 1691a. *Paraphrase on the New Testament.* London.
Baxter, Richard. 1691b. *The glorious kingdom of Christ.* London.
Becon, Thomas. 1577. *The demaundes of holy scripture.* London.
ben Israel, Menasseh. 1651. *The hope of Israel.* London.
ben Israel, Menasseh. 1655. *To His Highnesse the Lord Protector.* London.
Bernard, Richard. 1607. *The faithfull Shepheard or the Shepheards faithfullnesse.* London.
Bernard, Richard. 1617. *A key of knowledge for the opening of the secret mysteries of St Iohns mysticall revelation.* London.
Berry, Lloyd E. (ed.). 1969. *The Geneva Bible: A facsimilie of the 1560 edition*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
Bewicke, John. 1644. *Confiding England under conflicts, triumphing in the middest of her terrors.* London.
Beza, Theodore. 1587. *Master Bezaes Sermons upon the three first chapters of the Canticle of Canticles.* Oxford.
Blaydes, Frederick Augustus (ed.). 1890. *Genealogia Bedfordiensis: Being a collection of evidences relating chiefly to the landed gentry of Bedfordshire A.D. 1538–1700*. London: Privately Printed for the Editor at the Chiswick Press.
Bolton, Robert. 1635. *Mr. Boltons last and learned worke of the foure last things.* London.
Boys, John. 1612. *The autumn part from the twelfth Sunday after Trinitie.* London.
Bradshaw, William. 1605. *English Puritanisme containening the maine opinions of the rigidest sort of those that are called Puritanes in the realme of England.* London.
Brett, Samuel. 1655. *A narrative of the proceedings of a great councel of Jewes.* London.
Brightman, Thomas. 1609. *Apocalypsis Apocalypseos. Id est, Apocalypsis d. Ioannis Analysi et Scholiis Illustr.* Frankfurt.
Brightman, Thomas. 1611. *A revelation of the Apocalyps, that is, the Apocalyps of S. Iohn.* Amsterdam.
Brightman, Thomas. 1635. *A most comfortable exposition of the last and most difficult part of the prophecie of Daniel.* Amsterdam.
Brightman, Thomas. 1644a. *A commentary on the Canticles or the Song of Salomon.* London.
Brightman, Thomas. 1644b. *The revelation of St. Iohn illustrated with an analysis & scholions . . . The fourth edition, corrected & amended.* London.
Brightman, Thomas. 1646. *The art of self-deniall: Or, a Christian's first lesson.* London.
Brightman, Thomas. 1647. *Brightman redivivus: Or The post-humian of-spring of Mr. Thomas Brightman, in IIII. sermons.* London.
Brocardo, Giacopo. 1582. *The revelation of S. Ihon Reveled.* London.
Broughton, Hugh. 1590. *A concent of scripture.* London.
Brucioli, Antonio. 1598. *A commentary upon the Canticle of Canticles.* London.
Bulkeley, Peter. 1646. *The gospel covenant or covenant of grace opened.* London.
Bullinger, Heinrich. 1573. *A hundred sermons vpon the Apocalipse of Iesu Christ.* London.
Bulwarde, Robert, John Fowler, and Clement Saunders. 1612. *A shield of defence against the arrovves of schisme shot abroad by Iean de L'escluse in his advertisment against Mr. Brightman.* Amsterdam.
Burroughs, Jeremiah. 1643. *An exposition of the prophesie of Hosea.* London.
Burton, Henry. 1628. *The seven vials.* London.
Byfield, Nicholas. 1618a. *Directions for the private reading of the Scriptures.* London.

Byfield, Nicholas. 1618b. *The patterne of wholesome words.* London.
Calvert, Thomas. 1648. *The blessed Jew of Marocco: Or, a Blackmoor made white.* York.
Calvin, John. 1581. *A commentarie of M. I. Calvine upon the Epistle to the Galathians.* London.
Calvin, John. 1583. *A commentarie upon the Epistle of Saint Paul to the Romanes.* London.
Calvin, John. 1584. *A commentarie of M. Iohn Calvine uppon the Epistle to the Philippians.* London.
Calvin, John. 1634. *A necessitie of separation from the Church of England.* [Amsterdam].
Calvin, John. 1852–1853. *Commentaries on the Book of the Prophet Daniel*, 2 vols. Trans. Thomas Meyers. Edinburgh: Calvin Translation Society.
Calvin, John. 1960. *Institutes of the Christian Religion.* Trans. Ford Lewis Battles. Philadelphia: Westminster.
Cartenright, Johanna, and Ebenezer Cartwright. 1648. *The petition of the Jewes.* London.
Clapham, Henoch. 1602. *The Song of Songs.* [London].
Collier, Thomas. 1655. *The day-dawning and the day-star arising to the dispersed of Judah & Israel.* London.
Collier, Thomas. 1656. *A brief answer to some objections . . . Against the coming in and inhabiting of the Jews.* London.
Collop, John. 1656. *Poesis rediviva, or, Poesie reviv'd.* London.
Cooper, Thomas. 1615. *The blessing of Japheth, proving the gathering of the gentiles and finall conversion of the Jewes.* London.
Cotton, John. 1642a. *A brief exposition of the whole book of Canticles.* London.
Cotton, John. 1642b. *The churches resurrection or the opening of the fift and sixt verses of the 20th chapter of the Revelation.* London.
Cotton, John. 1642c. *The powring out of the seven vials, or an exposition, of the 16. Chapter of the Revelation.* London.
Cotton, John. 1656. *An exposition upon the thirteenth chapter of the Revelation.* London.
Cowper, William. 1619. *Pathmos, or, A commentary on the Revelation of Saint John.* London.
Dedham Classis. 1905. *The Presbyterian movement in the reign of Queen Elizabeth as illustrated by the minute book of the Dedham Classis 1582–1589*. London: Offices of the Royal Historical Society.
Dent, Arthur. 1622. *The ruine of Rome, or, An exposition upon the whole Revelation.* London.
Draxe, Thomas. 1608a. *The lambes spouse.* London.
Draxe, Thomas. 1608b. *The worldes resurrection, or The generall calling of the Iewes.* London.
Draxe, Thomas. 1613. *The Earnest of our inheritance together with a description of the New heauen and the New earth*. London.
Draxe, Thomas. 1615. *An alarum to the last judgement.* London.
Draxe, Thomas. 1617. *Anterotemata, Thomae Draks ten counter-demaunds propounded to those of the separation.* London.
Eachard, John. 1645. *Good newes for all Christian soldiers.* London.
Eudaemon-Joannes, Andreae. 1611. *Castigatio Apocalypsis Apocalypseos Thomae Brightmanni Angli.* Cologne.
Fenner, Dudley. 1587. *The Song of Songs.* Middleburg.
Finch, Henry. 1613. *The sacred doctrine of diuinitie.* London.
Finch, Henry. 1615. *An exposition of the Song of Solomon.* London.
Finch, Henry. 1621. *The calling of the Iewes: A present to Iudah and the children of Israel.* London.
Fletcher, Giles, and Samuel Lee. 1677. *Israel redux, or, The restauration of Israel, exhibited in two short treatises.* London.
Forbes, Patrick. 1613. *An exquisite commentarie upon the Revelation of Saint John.* London.
Forbes, Patrick. 1614. *An learned commentarie upon the Reuelation of Saint John.* Middelburg.
Foxe, John. 1578. *A sermon preached at the christening of a certaine Iew.* London.
Foxe, John. 1596. *Actes and monuments.* London.
Fulke, William. 1583. *A defense of the sincere and true translations of the Holie Scripturee into the English Tong.* London.
Fuller, Thomas. 1650. *A Pisgah- sight of Palestine and the confines thereof, with the historie of the Old and New Testament acred thereon.* London.

Fuller, Thomas. 1655. *The church-history of Britain from the birth of Jesus Christ until the year M.DC.XLVIII.* London.
Fuller, Thomas. 1662. *The history of the worthies of England.* London.
Gibbons, Nicholas. 1601. *Questions and disputations concerning the holy scripture.* London.
Goodwin, Thomas. 1641. *A glimpse of Sions glory.* London.
Goodwin, Thomas. 1683. *The works of Thomas Goodwin*, vol II. London.
Gouge, William. 1645. *The promises of Divine Providence.* London.
Gouge, William. 1655. *A learned and very useful commentary on the whole epistle to the Hebrews.* London.
Graunt, John. 1643. *A true reformation and perfect restitution.* London.
Graunt, John. 1645. *Truths victory against heresie.* London.
Greville, Robert. 1641. *The nature of truth, its union and unity with the soule.* London.
Hall, Edmund. 1651. *Lingua testium.* London.
Hammond, Henry. 1659. *A paraphrase and annotations upon all the books of the New Testament.* London.
Hayne, Thomas. 1645. *Christs kingdome on earth.* London.
Hayter, Richard. 1675. *The meaning of the Revelation.* London.
Homes, Nathanael. 1641. *The new world, or, the new reformed church.* London.
Howell, James. 1656. *Some sober inspections made into the carriage and consults of the late Long-Parliament.* London.
Hyperius, Andreas. 1577. *The practis of preaching.* London.
Irenaeus. 1969. *Against Heresies*, Trans. James Donaldson and Alexander Roberts. In *The Anti-Nicene Fathers*, vol. I, ed. James Donaldson and Alexander Roberts. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
James I of England, VI of Scotland. 1620. *Workes.* London.
Jeake, Samuel. 1988. *An astrological diary of the seventeenth century: Samuel Jeake of Rye, 1652–1699.* Oxford: Clarendon.
Jessey, Henry. 1656. *A narrative of the late proceeds at Whitehall, concerning the Jews.* London.
Joye, George. 1545. *The exposicion of Daniel the prophete.* Geneva [i.e. Antwerp].
Junius, Franciscus. 1596. *The Apocalyps, or, Revelation of S. John the Apostle and Evangelist of our Lord Jesus Christ.* Cambridge.
Kett, Francis. 1585. *The glorious and beautifull garland of mans glorification.* London.
L'Écluse, Jean de. 1612. *An advertisement to everie Godly reader of Mr. Thomas Brightman his book.* [Amsterdam].
L'Estrange, Hamon. 1659. *The alliance of divine offices.* London.
Laud, William. 1621. *A sermon preached before his Maiesty, on Tuesday the nineteenth of June.* London.
London, William. 1658. *A Catalogue of the most vendible books in England.* London.
Luther, Martin. 1955–1986. *Luther's works*, American edition, 55 vols. St Louis/Philadelphia: Concordia/Fortress.
Luther, Martin. 1957. *The Bondage of the Will.* Trans. J.I. Packer and O.R. Johnston. Cambridge: James Clarke & Co.
Martyr, Justin. 1969. *Dialogue with Trypho.* Trans. James Donaldson and Alexander Roberts. In *The Anti-Nicene fathers, vol. I*, ed. James Donaldson and Alexander Roberts. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
Maton, Robert. 1642. *Israels redemption, or the propheticall history of our Saviours kingdome on earth, that is, of the church Catholicke and triumphant.* London.
Maton, Robert. 1646. *Israel's redemption redeemed. Or, The Jewes generall and miraculous conversion to the faith of the Gospel and returne into their owne Land.* London.
Mede, Joseph. 1641. *The apostasy of the latter times.* London.
Mede, Joseph. 1642. *A paraphrase and exposition of the prophesie of Saint Peter, concerning the day of Christ's second coming.* London.
Mede, Joseph. 1643a. *Daniel's weekes: An interpretation of part of the prophecy of Daniel.* London.
Mede, Joseph. 1643b. *The key of Revelation.* London.

Mede, Joseph. 1672. *The works of the pious and profoundly-learned Joseph Mede.* London.
Napier, John. 1594. *A plaine discoverie of the whole Revelation of Saint Iohn.* [Edinburgh].
Nicholas, Edward. 1649. *An apology for the honorable nation of the Jews*. London.
Osborne, Francis. 1700. *Works.* London.
Parker, Henry. 1641. *A discourse concerning Puritans.* [London].
Parrhesiastes, Phililicrines [i.e. More, Henry]. 1685. *Some cursory reflexions impartially made upon Mr. Richard Baxter his way of writing notes on the Apocalypse.* London.
Peacham, Henry. 1577. *The garden of eloquence, conteyning the figures of grammar and rhetorick.* London.
Perkins, William. 1604. *Lectures upon the three first chapters of the Revelation.* London.
Perkins, William. 1606. *The whole treatise of the cases of conscience.* Cambridge.
Perkins, William. 1607. *The arte of prophecying.* London.
Perkins, William. 1631. *Workes.* London.
Petrie, Alexander. 1644. *Chiliasto-mastix. Or, The prophecies in the Old and Nevv Testament concerning the kingdome of our savior Iesus Christ.* Rotterdam.
Philo-Judaeus, J.J. 1655. *The resurrection of the dead bones.* London.
Price, Sampson. 1613. *Londons warning by Laodicea's Luke-warmnesse.* London.
Prynne, William. 1656. *The second part of a short demurrer to the Jewes long discontinued remitter into England.* London.
Rainolds, John. 1584. *The summe of the conference betweene John Rainoldes and John Hart: Touching the Head and the faith of the Church.* London.
Robinson, John. 1625. *A just and necassarie Apologie of certain Christians . . . called Brownists or Barrowists.* Amsterdam.
Sanderson, Robert. 1622. *Two sermons: Preached at two severall visitations, at Boston, in the diocesse and country of Lincolne.* London.
Sterry, Richard. 1550. *A treatise of schemes of tropes.* [London].
Strong, William. 1656. *XXXI select sermons, preached on special occasions.* London.
Tertullian. 1968. *On the Resurrection of the Flesh.* Trans. Peter Holmes. In *The Anti-Nicene fathers Vol. II,* ed. James Donaldson and Alexander Roberts. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
Thorowgood, Thomas. 1649. *Iewes in America.* London.
Thorowgood, Thomas. 1660. *Jews in America.* London.
Traske, John. 1620. *A treatise of libertie from Judaisme.* London.
Tyndale, William. 1848. *Doctrinal treatises and introductions to different portions of the Holy Scriptures*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Vincent, Philip. 1638. *Lamentations of Germany.* London.
Vove, Finens Canus [i.e. John Fenwicke]. 1643. *Zions Joy in her king, comming in his glory.* London.
Wall, Moses. 1651. Considerations upon the point of the conversion of the Jews. In Menassh ben Israel, *Hope of Israel*, 47–62.
Walton, Izaak. 1678. *The life of Dr. Sanderson.* London.
Weemse, John. 1630. *The Christian synagogue.* London.
Weemse, John. 1636. *A treatise of the foure degenerate sonnes.* London.
Wilkinson, Henry. 1641. *A sermon against lukewarmnesse in religion.* London.
Willet, Andrew. 1590. *De Universali et Novissima Iudaeorum Vocatione Secundum Apertissimam Divi Pauli Prophetiam.* Cambridge.
Willet, Andrew. 1614. *Synopsis papismi, that is A generall view of papistrie.* London.
Williams, Robert Folkestone (ed.). 1849. *The court and times of James the First: Illustrated by authentic and confidential letters*, 2 vols. London: Henry Colburn.
Wilson, Thomas. 1612. *A Christian Dictionarie.* London.
Wilson, John. 1664. *The cheats: A comedy.* London.
Winslow, Edward. 1649. *The glorious progress of the Gospel amongst the Indians in New England.* London.

Secondary Sources: General Reference Works

Pollard, A.W., and G.R. Redgrave. 1986–91. *A short-title catalogue of books printed in England, Scotland, & Ireland, and of English books printed abroad 1475–1640*, 2nd ed., revised and enlarged, 3 vols. London: The Bibliographical Society.
Stelten, Leo F. 1995. *Dictionary of ecclesiastical Latin*. Peabody: Hendrickson.
The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography. 2004. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Zalta, Edward N. (ed.). *The Stanford encyclopedia of philosophy (Summer 2006 Edition)*, http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2006.

Secondary Sources: Unpublished Theses

Clouse, Robert Gordon. 1963. The influence of John Henry Alsted on English millenarian thought in the seventeenth century. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Iowa.
Gibson, Kenneth. 1999. Eschatology, apocalypse and millenarianism in seventeenth century Protestant thought. Unpublished PhD thesis, Nottingham Trent University.
Kroeze, George. 1985. The variety of millennial hopes in the English Reformation 1560–1660. Unpublished PhD thesis, Fuller Theological Seminary.
Peterson, Kenneth Troy. 1991. Thomas Brightman: A transitional figure. Unpublished ThM thesis, Reformed Theological Seminary.
Surridge, Robert James. 2000. The art of apocalyptic persuasion: The rhetorical dynamics and history of influence of the letter to Laodicea (Rev 3:14–22). Unpublished PhD thesis, King's College London.
Wilkinson, Paul R. 2006. John Nelson Darby and the origins of Christian Zionism. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Manchester.

Secondary Sources: Books

Arasola, Kai. 1990. *The end of historicism: Millerite hermeneutic of time prophecies in the Old Testament*. Sigtuna: Datem Publishing.
Backus, Irena. 2000. *Reformation readings of the Apocalypse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Ball, Bryan W. 1975. *A great expectation: Eschatological thought in English Protestantism to 1660*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
Bauckham, Richard. 1978. *Tudor Apocalypse*. Oxford: Sutton Courtenay Press.
Bercovitch, Sacvan (ed.). 1972. *Typology and early American literature*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.
Bercovitch, Sacvan. 1975. *The Puritan origins of the American self*. New Haven/London: Yale University Press.
Bostock, Curtis V. 1998. *The Antichrist and the Lollards: Apocalypticism in late medieval and Reformation England*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
Bozeman, Theodore Dwight. 1988. *To live ancient lives: The primitivist dimension in Puritanism*. Chapel Hill/London: University of North Carolina Press.
Brachlow, Stephen. 1988. *The communion of saints: Radical Puritan and separatist ecclesiology 1570–1625*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Brady, David. 1983. *The contribution of British writers between 1560 and 1830 to the interpretation of Revelation 13:16–18*. Tubingen: J.C.B. Mohr.

Bremer, Francis J. (ed.). 1993. *Puritanism: Transatlantic perspectives on a seventeenth-century Anglo-American faith*. Boston: Massachusetts Historical Society.
Bull, Malcolm (ed.). 1995. *Apocalypse theory and the ends of the world*. Oxford: Blackwell.
Capp, Bernard. 1972. *The fifth monarchy men*. London: Faber and Faber.
Capp, Bernard. 1979. *Astrology and the Popular Press*. London/Boston: Faber and Faber.
Carlton, Charles. 1987. *Archbishop William Laud*. London/New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
Christianson, Paul. 1978. *Reformers and Babylon: English apocalyptic visions from the Reformation to the eve of the Civil War*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
Clarke, Elizabeth. 2011. *Politics, religion and the Song of Songs in seventeenth-century England*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
Claydon, Tony, and Ian McBride (eds.). 1998. *Protestantism and national identity: Britain and Ireland, c.1650–c.1850*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Cliffe, J.T. 1984. *The Puritan gentry*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
Coffey, John, and Paul C.H. Lim (eds.). 2008. *The Cambridge companion to Puritanism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Cohn, Norman. 1957. *The pursuit of the millennium*. London: Secker & Warburg.
Cohn-Sherbok, Dan. 2005. *The politics of apocalypse: The history and influence of Christian Zionism*. Oxford: Oneworld.
Collingwood, R.G. 1993. *The idea of history*, Revised ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Collinson, Patrick. 1967. *The Elizabethan Puritan movement*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Collinson, Patrick. 1988. *The birthpangs of protestant England*. London: MacMillan.
Cooper, Charles Henry, and Thompson Cooper. 1861. *Athenae Cantabrigienses Volume II: 1586–1609*. Cambridge: Deighton, Bell, and Co./Macmillan and Co.
Copeland, Rita (ed.). 1996. *Criticism and dissent in the middle ages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Culver, Douglas. 1995. *Albion and Ariel*. New York: Peter Lang.
Cunningham, David S. 1991. *Faithful persuasion: In aid of a rhetoric of Christian theology*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.
Daniell, David. 1994. *William Tyndale: A biography*. New Haven/London: Yale University Press.
de Certeau, Michel. 1992. *The mystic fable: Volume one, The sixteenth and seventeenth centuries*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
de Jong, J.A. 1970. *As the waters cover the sea: Millennial expectations in the rise of Anglo-American missions 1640–1810*. Kampen: J.H. Kok.
de Lubac, Henri. 1998. *Medieval exegesis, volume 1: The four senses of scripture*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
de Lubac, Henri. 2000. *Medieval exegesis, volume 2: The four senses of scripture*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
Dow, F.D. 1985. *Radicalism in the English Revolution 1640–1660*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
Ebeling, Gerhard. 1963. *Word and faith*. London: SCM.
Ebeling, Gerhard. 1968. *The word of God and tradition: Historical studies interpreting the divisions of Christianity*. Trans. S.H. Hooke. London: Collins.
Ebeling, Gerhard. 1970. *Luther: An Introduction to his thought.* Trans. R.A. Wilson. London: Collins.
Emmerson, Richard K., and Bernard McGinn (eds.). 1992. *The Apocalypse in the middle ages*. Ithaca/London: Cornell.
Engammare, Max. 1993. *Le Cantique Des Cantiques à La Renaissance: Étude et Bibliographie*. Geneva: Librairie Droz S.A.
Fanlo, Jean Raymond, and André Tournon (eds.). 2001. *Formes du Millénarisme en Europe à L'aube des Temps Modernes*. Paris: Honoré Champion.
Farrar, Frederic W. 1961. *History of interpretation*. Grand Rapids: Baker.
Ferrell, Lori Anne, and Peter McCullough (eds.). 2000. *The English sermon revised: Religion, literature and history 1600–1750*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
Firth, Katharine R. 1979. *The apocalyptic tradition in reformation Britain 1530–1645*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fisch, Harold. 1964. *Jerusalem and Albion: The Hebraic factor in seventeenth-century literature*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
Fish, Stanley E. 1972. *Self-consuming artifacts*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Frei, Hans W. 1974. *The eclipse of biblical narrative*. New Haven/London: Yale University Press.
Froom, Le Roy Edwin. 1946–1954. *The prophetic faith of our fathers: The historical development of prophetic interpretation*, 4 vols. Washington: Review and Herald.
Fussner, F. Smith. 1962. *The historical revolution: English historical writing and thought 1580–1640*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
Gadamer, Hans-Georg. 2006. *Truth and method*. London: Continuum.
Gamble, Richard C. (ed.). 1992a. *Articles on Calvin and Calvinism: Calvin and Hermeneutics*. New York/London: Garland.
Gamble, Richard C. (ed.). 1992b. *Articles on Calvin and Calvinism: Calvin's theology, theology proper, eschatology*. New York/London: Garland.
Ganoczy, Alexander. 1988. *The young Calvin*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
Ghosh, Kantik. 2002. *The Wycliffite Heresy: Authority and the interpretation of texts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Gilsdorf, Joy. 1989. *The Puritan apocalypse: New England eschatology in the seventeenth century*. New York/London: Garland.
Glaser, Eliane. 2007. *Judaism without Jews: Philosemitism and Christian Polemic in early modern England*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
Gordis, Lisa M. 2003. *Opening Scripture: Bible reading and interpretive authority in Puritan New England*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Gordon, Bruce (ed.). 1996. *Protestant history and identity in sixteenth century Europe*, 2 vols. Aldershot: Scholar Press.
Gray, Joseph Henry. 1926. *The Queens' College of St. Margaret and St. Bernard in the University of Cambridge*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Greenblatt, Stephen. 1980. *Renaissance self-fashioning: From More to Shakespeare*. Chicago/London: University of Chicago Press.
Greenblatt, Stephen J. (ed.). 1981. *Allegory and representation*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
Gribben, Crawford. 2008. *The Puritan millennium: Literature & theology 1550–1682*, Revised ed. Milton Keynes: Paternoster.
Gribben, Crawford. 2011. *Evangelical millennialism in the transatlantic world, 1500–2000*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
Guibbory, Achsah. 2010. *Christian identity, Jews, and Israel in seventeenth-century England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Gura, Philip F. 1984. *A glimpse of Sion's glory: Puritan radicalism in New England 1620–1660*. Middletown: Wesleyan University Press.
Haller, William. 1955. *Liberty and reformation in the Puritan Revolution*. New York: Columbian University Press.
Haller, William. 1963. *Foxe's Book of martyrs and the elect nation*. London: Jonathan Cape.
Hanson, R.P.C. 1959. *Allegory and event: A study of the sources and significance of Origen's interpretation of scripture*. London: SCM.
Helgerson, Richard. 1992. *Forms of nationhood: The Elizabethan writing of England*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Helm, Paul. 2004. *John Calvin's ideas*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Hibbs, Thomas S. 1995. *Dialectic and narrative in Aquinas: An interpretation of the Summa contra gentiles*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.
Hill, Christopher. 1964. *Society & Puritanism in pre-Revolutionary England*. London: Secker & Warburg.
Hill, Christopher. 1971. *Antichrist in seventeenth-century England*. London: Oxford University Press.
Hill, Christopher. 1993. *The English Bible and the seventeenth-century revolution*. London: Allen Lane/The Penguin Press.

Hotson, Howard. 2000a. *Johann Heinrich Alsted 1588–1638: Between Renaissance, Reformation and universal reform*. Oxford: Clarendon.
Hotson, Howard. 2000b. *Paradise postponed: Johann Heinrich Alsted and the birth of Calvinist millenarianism*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
Howell, Wilbur Samuel. 1956. *Logic and rhetoric in England, 1500–1700*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
Iser, Wolfgang. 1974. *The implied reader: Patterns of communication in prose fiction from Bunyan to Beckett*. London: John Hopkins University Press.
Jeanrond, Werner G. 1997. *Theological hermeneutics: Development and significance*. London: SCM.
Johnston, Warren. 2011. *Revelation restored: The apocalypse in later seventeenth-century England*. Woodbridge: Boydell.
Jordan, Mark D., and Kent Emery Jr. (eds.). 1992. *Ad litteram: Authoritative texts and their medieval readers*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.
Jue, Jeffrey K. 2006. *Heaven upon earth: Joseph Mede (1586–1638) and the legacy of millenarianism*. Dordrecht: Springer.
Kaplan, Yosef, Henry Méchoulan, and Richard H. Popkin (eds.). 1989. *Menasseh ben Israel and his world*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
Karp, Jonathan, and Adam Sutcliffe (eds.). 2010. *Philosemitism in history*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Katz, David S. 1982. *Philo-semitism and the readmission of the Jews to England 1603–1655*. Oxford: Clarendon.
Katz, David S. 1994. *The Jews in the history of England 1485–1850*. Oxford: Clarendon.
Katz, David S., Jonathan Israel, and Richard H. Popkin (eds.). 1990. *Sceptics, millenarians and Jews*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
Keating, D.A., T.G. Weinandy, and J.P. Yocum (eds.). 2005. *Aquinas on scripture: An introduction to his biblical commentaries*. London: T&T Clark.
Kemp, Jonathan, and Adam Sutcliffe (eds.). 2011. *Philosemitism in history*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Kenny, Anthony. 2005. *Medieval philosophy*. Oxford: Clarendon.
Kibbey, Ann. 1986. *The interpretation of material shapes in Puritanism: A study of rhetoric, prejudice, and violence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Killeen, Kevin. 2009. *Biblical scholarship, science and politics in early modern England*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
Killeen, Kevin, and Peter J. Forshaw (eds.). 2007. *The word and the world: Biblical exegesis and early modern science*. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.
Klug, E.F. 1971. *From Luther to Chemnitz: On scripture and the word*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
Knappen, Marshall M. 1963. *Tudor Puritanism: A chapter in the history of idealism*. Gloucester: Peter Smith.
Knott Jr., John R. 1980. *The sword of the spirit: Puritan responses to the Bible*. Chicago/London: Chicago University Press.
Knowles, David. 1988. *The evolution of medieval thought*. London: Longman.
Kobler, Franz. 1956. *The vision was there*. London: Lincolns-Prager.
Korshin, Paul J. 1982. *Typologies in England 1650–1820*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
Krey, Philip D.W. 1997. *Nicholas of Lyra's Apocalypse commentary*. Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications.
Kushner, Tony (ed.). 1992. *The Jewish heritage in British history: Englishness and Jewishness*. London: Frank Cass.
Lake, Peter. 1982. *Moderate Puritans and the Elizabethan church*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Lamont, William. 1969. *Godly rule: Politics and religion 1603–1660*. London: Macmillan.
Lamont, William. 1996. *Puritanism and historical controversy*. London: U.C.L. Press.
Lampe, G.W.H., and K.J. Woollcombe. 1957. *Essays on typology*. London: SCM.
Lawton, David. 1990. *Faith, text and history: The Bible in English*. London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Lerner, Robert E. 2001. *The feast of Saint Abraham: Medieval millenarians and the Jews*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
Lewalski, Barbara. 1979. *Protestant poetics and the seventeenth-century religious lyric*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
Liu, Tai. 1973. *Discord in Zion: The Puritan divines and the Puritan revolution 1640–1660*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.
Loades, David (ed.). 1997. *John Foxe and the English reformation*. Aldershot: Scolar.
Loades, David (ed.). 1999. *John Foxe: An historical perspective*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
Loades, A., and M. McLain (eds.). 1992. *Hermeneutics, the Bible and literary criticism*. New York: St Martin's Press.
Longman III, Tremper. 2001. *Song of Songs*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
Luxon, Thomas H. 1995. *Literal figures: Puritan allegory and the Reformation crisis in representation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Marshall, Cynthia. 2002. *The shattering of the self: Violence, subjectivity, and early modern texts*. Baltimore/London: John Hopkins University Press.
Matar, Nabil. 1998. *Islam in Britain 1558–1685*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Matter, E. Ann. 1990. *The voice of my beloved: The Song of Songs in western medieval Christianity*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
McGregor, J.F., and B. Reay (eds.). 1984. *Radical religion in the English revolution*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
McKim, Donald K. 1987. *Ramism in William Perkins' theology*. New York: Peter Lang.
McKim, Donald K., and Jack B. Rogers. 1979. *The authority and interpretation of the Bible: An historical approach*. San Francisco: Harper & Row.
Merrill, Thomas (ed.). 1966. *William Perkins 1558–1602: English Puritanist*. Nieuwkoop: B. De Graaf.
Meserve, Margaret. 2008. *Empires of Islam in Renaissance historical thought*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Miller, Perry. 1954. *The New England mind: The seventeenth century*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Milton, Anthony. 1995. *Catholic and reformed: Roman and Protestant churches in English Protestant thought, 1600–40*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Milward, Peter. 1978. *Religious controversies of the Jacobean Age: A survey of printed sources*. London: Scolar Press.
Miner, Earl (ed.). 1977. *Literary uses of typology*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
Morgan, John. 1986. *Godly learning: Puritan attitudes towards reason, learning, and education, 1560–1640*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Muller, Richard A. 2000. *The unaccommodated Calvin*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Murray, Iain H. 1971. *The Puritan hope: A study in revival and the interpretation of prophecy*. Edinburgh: Banner of Truth.
Nahm, Milton C. 1935. *John Wilson's "The Cheats"*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
Newman, Louis Israel. 1925. *Jewish influence on Christian reform movements*. New York: Columbia University Press.
Newport, Kenneth G.C. 2000. *Apocalypse and millennium: Studies in biblical eisegesis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Nuttall, Geoffrey. 1946. *The Holy Spirit in Puritan faith and experience*. Oxford: Blackwell.
O'Leary, Stephen D. 1994. *Arguing the Apocalypse: A theory of millennial rhetoric*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
O'Leary, Stephen D., and Glen S. McGhee (eds.). 2005. *War in heaven, heaven on earth: Theories of the apocalyptic*. London: Equinox.
O'Meara, Thomas Franklin. 1997. *Thomas Aquinas Theologian*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.
Oberman, Heiko A. (ed.). 1974. *Luther and the dawn of the modern era*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
Ong, Walter J. 1958. *Ramus, method and the decay of dialogue*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Parker, T.H.L. 1971. *Calvin's New Testament commentaries*. London: SCM Press.
Parker, T.H.L. 1986. *Calvin's Old Testament commentaries*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
Patrides, C.A., and Jospeh Wittreich (eds.). 1984. *The Apocalypse in English Renaissance thought and literature*. Manchester: University of Manchester Press.
Patterson, Annabel. 1984. *Censorship and interpretation: The conditions of writing and reading in early modern England*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
Pennington, Donald, and Keith Thomas (eds.). 1978. *Puritans and revolutionaries*. Oxford: Clarendon.
Petersen, Rodney L. 1993. *Preaching in the last days: The theme of 'two witnesses' in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Popkin, R.H. (ed.). 1988. *Millenarianism and messianism in English literature and thought 1650–1800: Clark Library lectures 1981–1982*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
Popkin, Richard H., and Gordon M. Weiner (eds.). 1994. *Jewish Christians and Christian Jews*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
Porter, H.C. 1958. *Reformation and reaction in Tudor Cambridge*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Porter, Roy (ed.). 1997. *Rewriting the self: Stories from the Renaissance to the present*. London/New York: Routledge.
Pragai, Michael J. 1985. *Faith and fulfilment: Christians and the return to the Promised Land*. London: Vallentine, Mitchell and Company.
Preus, James Samuel. 1969. *From shadow to promise: Old Testament Interpretation from Augustine to the young Luther*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
Ramm, Bernard. 1970. *Protestant Biblical interpretation: A textbook of hermeneutics*. Grand Rapids: Baker.
Raymond, Joad. 2003. *Pamphlets and pamphleteering in early modern Britain*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Reeves, Marjorie. 1969. *Prophecy in the later Middle Ages: A study in Joachimism*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Reeves, Marjorie. 1999a. *Joachim of Fiore and the prophetic future*. Stroud: Sutton Publishing.
Reeves, Marjorie. 1999b. *The prophetic sense of history in medieval and Renaissance Europe*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
Richey, Esther Gilman. 1998. *The politics of Revelation in the English Renaissance*. Columbia: University of Missouri Press.
Ricoeur, Paul. 1980. *Essays on Biblical interpretation*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
Rusconi, Roberto (ed.). 1996. *Storia e figure dell'Apocalisse fra '500 e '600*. Rome: Viella.
Ryrie, Charles. 1995. *Dispensationalism*. Chicago: Moody Press.
Scott-Warren, Jason. 2005. *Early modern English literature*. Cambridge: Polity.
Scult, Mel. 1978. *Millennial expectations and Jewish liberties*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
Shapiro, James. 1996. *Shakespeare and the Jews*. New York: Columbia University Press.
Sharif, Regina S. 1983. *Non-Jewish Zionism*. London: Zed Press.
Shuger, Debora. 1994. *The Renaissance Bible: Scholarship, sacrifice, and subjectivity*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Siebert, Fredrick Seaton. 1952. *Freedom of the press in England 1476–1776: The rise and decline of government controls*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
Sizer, Stephen. 2004. *Christian Zionism: Road-map to Armageddon?* Leicester: IVP.
Smalley, Beryl. 1964. *The study of the Bible in the Middle Ages*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.
Smalley, Beryl. 1981. *Studies in medieval thought and learning: From Abelard to Wyclif*. London: The Hambledon Press.
Smith, Nigel. 1989. *Perfection proclaimed: Language and literature in English radical religion 1640–1660*. Oxford: Clarendon.
Smith, Anthony D. 2003. *Chosen peoples*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Sprunger, Keith L. 1994. *Trumpets from the tower: English Puritan preaching in the Netherlands 1600–1640*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.

Steinmetz, David (ed.). 1990. *The Bible in the sixteenth century*. London: Duke University Press.
Steinmetz, David. 1995. *Calvin in context*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Taylor, Charles. 1989. *Sources of the self: The making of modern identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Thomas, Keith. 1971. *Religion and the decline of magic*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
Thornton, Tim. 2006. *Prophecy, politics and the people in early modern England*. Woodbridge: Boydell.
Toon, P. (ed.). 1970. *The Puritans, the millennium, and the future of Israel*. Cambridge: James Clark & Co., rpt. 2002.
Torrance, Thomas F. 1988. *The hermeneutics of John Calvin*. Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press.
Torrell, Jean-Pierre. 1996. *Saint Thomas Aquinas, volume 1: The person and his work*. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press.
Tuchmann, Barbara. 2001. *Bible and sword*. London: Phoenix Press.
Tuveson, Ernest Lee. 1972. *Millennium and Utopia: A Study in the background of the idea of progress*. Gloucester: Peter Smith.
Wagner, Donald E. 1995. *Anxious for Armageddon*. Scottdale: Herald Press.
Walsh, Katherine, and Diana Wood (eds). 1985. *The Bible in the medieval world: Essays in memory of Beryl Smalley*. Oxford: Blackwell.
Watson, Andrew G. 1966. *The library of Sir Simonds D'Ewes*. London: Trustees of the British Museum.
Weinrich, William C. (ed.). 2005. *Ancient Christian commentary on Scripture: Revelation*. Leicester: IVP.
Weisheipl, James A. 1974. *Friar Thomas D'Aquino*. New York: Doubleday.
West, Delno C., and Sandra Zimdars-Swartz. 1983. *Joachim of Fiore: A study in perception and history*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
Williamson, Arthur. 1979. *Scottish national consciousness in the age of James VI*. Edinburgh: John Donald.
Wilson, John F. 1969. *Pulpit in Parliament: Puritanism during the English Civil Wars 1640–1648*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
Yates, Francis A. 1975. *Astraea: The imperial theme in the sixteenth century*. London/Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
Zakai, Avihu. 1992. *Exile and kingdom: History and apocalypse in the Puritan migration to America*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Zöllig, August. 1902. *Die Inspirationslehre des Origenes*. Freiberg: Herder.

Secondary Sources: Articles and Essays

Achinstein, Sharon. 2001. John Foxe and the Jews. *Renaissance Quarterly* 54(1): 86–120.
Almond, Philip. 2007. Thomas Brightman and the origins of philo-semitism: An Elizabethan theologian and the return of the Jews to Israel. *Reformation and Renaissance Review* 9(1): 3–25.
Ayers, Robert H. 1992. The view of medieval biblical exegesis in Calvin's Institutes. In *Articles on Calvin and Calvinism: Calvin and Hermeneutics*, ed. Richard C. Gamble, 410–415. New York/London: Garland.
Battles, Ford Lewis. 1992. God was accommodating himself to human capacity. In *Articles on Calvin and Calvinism: Calvin and Hermeneutics*, ed. Richard C. Gamble, 13–32. New York/London: Garland.
Brady, David. 1973. The number of the beast in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century England. *Evangelical Quarterly* 45(3): 219–240.
Bull, Malcolm. 1995. On making ends meet. In *Apocalypse theory and the ends of the world*, ed. Malcolm Bull, 1–17. Oxford: Blackwell.

Burke, Peter. 1993. The rise of literal-mindedness (An essay). *Common Knowledge* 2(2): 108–121.
Burnett, Richard. 2004. John Calvin and the *Sensus Literalis. Scottish Journal of Theology* 57(1): 1–13.
Capp, Bernard. 1970. Extreme millenarianism. In *The Puritans, the millennium, and the future of Israel*, ed. P. Toon, 66–90. Cambridge: James Clark & Co., Reprinted: 2002.
Capp, Bernard. 1984a. The fifth monarchists and popular millenarianism. In *Radical religion in the English Revolution*, ed. J.F. McGregor and B. Reay, 165–190. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Capp, Bernard. 1984b. The political dimension of apocalyptic thought. In *The Apocalypse in English Renaissance thought and literature*, ed. C.A. Patrides and Jospeh Wittreich, 93–124. Manchester: University of Manchester Press.
Clouse, Robert G. 1970. The rebirth of millenarianism. In *The Puritans, the millennium, and the future of Israel*, ed. P. Toon, 42–65. Cambridge: James Clark & Co., Reprinted: 2002.
Coffey, John, and Paul C.H. Lim. 2008. Introduction. In *The Cambridge companion to Puritanism*, ed. John Coffey and Paul C.H. Lim, 1–15. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Cogley, Richard W. 2003. The Fall of the Ottoman empire and the restoration of Israel in the "Judeo-Centric" strand of Puritan Millenarianism. *Church History* 72(2): 304–332.
Cogley, Richard W. 2005. 'The Most Vile and Barbarous Nation of all the World': Giles Fletcher the Elder's *The Tartars Or, Ten Tribes* (ca. 1610). *Renaissance Quarterly* 58(3): 781–814.
Cohen, Charles L. 1989. Two biblical models of conversion: An example of Puritan Hermeneutics. *Church History* 58(2): 182–196.
Cohen, Jeremy. 2005. The Mystery of Israel's Salvation: Romans 11:25–26 in Patristic and Medieval Exegesis. *Harvard Theological Review* 98(3): 247–281.
Corney, Richard W. 1998. What does "literal meaning" mean? Some commentaries on the Song of Songs. *Anglican Theological Review* 80(4): 494–516.
Crome, Andrew. 2010. 'The proper and naturall meaning of the prophets': The hermeneutic roots of Judeo-centrism in Puritan eschatology. *Renaissance Studies* 24(5): 725–741.
Dallision, A.R. 1970. Contemporary criticism of millenarianism. In *The Puritans, the millennium, and the future of Israel*, ed. P. Toon, 104–114. Cambridge: James Clark & Co., Reprinted: 2002.
Daniel, Randolph E. 1992. Joachim of Fiore: Patterns of history in the Apocalypse. In *The Apocalypse in the Middle Ages*, ed. Richard K. Emmerson and Bernard McGinn, 72–88. Ithaca/London: Cornell.
Davis, Thomas M. 1972. The traditions of Puritan typology. In *Typology and early American literature*, ed. Sacvan Bercovitch, 11–45. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.
de Man, Paul. 1981. Pascal's allegory of persuasion. In *Allegory and representation*, ed. Stephen J. Greenblatt, 1–25. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
Derrida, Jacques. 1982. Of an Apocalyptic tone recently adopted in philosophy. *Semeia* 23(1): 63–97.
Dove, Mary. 2004. Love *ad litteram*: The Lollard translations of the Song of Songs. *Reformation* 9: 1–23.
Elliot, Emory. 1977. From father to Son: The evolution of typology in Puritan New England. In *Literary uses of typology*, ed. Earl Miner, 204–227. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
Evans, G.R. 1992. Exegesis and authority in the thirteenth century. In *Ad litteram: Authoritative texts and their medieval readers*, ed. Mark D. Jordan and Kent Emery Jr., 93–111. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.
Fines, John. 1968. 'Judaising' in the period of the English Reformation. *Transactions of the Jewish Historical Society of England* 21: 323–326.
Fowler, Robert M. 1985. Who is "the reader" in reader response criticism? *Semeia* 31: 5–26.
Fredriksen, Paula. 1992. Tyconius and Augustine on Apocalypse. In *The Apocalypse in the Middle Ages*, ed. Richard K. Emmerson and Bernard McGinn, 20–37. Ithaca/London: Cornell.
Frison, Danielle. 2001. Millénarisme et Judaïsme dans l'Angleterre du XVIIe Siècle. In *Formes du Millénarisme en Europe à L'aube des Temps Modernes*, ed. Jean-Raymond Fanlo and André Tournon, 285–306. Paris: Honoré Champion.

Froehlich, Karlfried. 1977. 'Always to keep the literal sense in holy scripture means to kill one's soul': The state of biblical hermeneutics at the beginning of the fifteenth century. In *Literary uses of typology*, ed. Earl Miner, 20–48. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Gabriel, Frédéric. 2008. *Loci Theologici*: Authority, Fall and Theology of the Puritan Self. Unpublished paper presented to "Spaces of the self in early modern culture", UCLA.

Gamble, Richard C. 1992. *Brevitas et Facilitas*: Toward an understanding of Calvin's Hermeneutic. In *Articles on Calvin and Calvinism: Calvin and Hermeneutics*, ed. Richard C. Gamble, 33–49. New York/London: Garland.

Gates, David. Religion: The Pop Prophets. *Newsweek*, 24/05/06. http://www.newsweek.com/id/105396. Accessed 26 Sept 2006.

Giblin, Charles Homer. 1994. Recapitulation and the literary coherence of John's Apocalypse. *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 56(1): 81–95.

Gribben, Crawford. 2002a. The eschatology of the Puritan confessions. *Scottish Bulletin of Evangelical Theology* 20(1): 51–78.

Gribben, Crawford. 2002b. 'Passionate desires and confident hopes': Puritan millenarianism and Anglo-Scottish union, 1560–1644. *Reformation and Renaissance Review* 4(2): 241–258.

Gribben, Crawford. 2006. John Knox, reformation history, and national self-fashioning. *Reformation and Renaissance Review* 8(1): 48–66.

Guiterrez, Cathy. 2005. The millennium and narrative closure. In *War in heaven, heaven on earth: Theories of the apocalyptic*, ed. Stephen D. O'Leary and Glen S. McGhee, 47–60. London: Equinox.

Hanna, Ralph. 1996. 'Vae octuplex', Lollard socio-textual ideology, and Ricardian-Lancastrian prose translation. In *Criticism and dissent in the Middle Ages*, ed. Rita Copeland, 244–263. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hedding, Malcolm. Position statements: The ICEJ's core beliefs. http://int.icej.org/about/position-statements. Accessed online 15 Oct 2011.

Hill, Christopher. 1988. Till the conversion of the Jews. In *Millenarianism and messianism in English literature and thought 1650–1800*, ed. R.H. Popkin, 37–64. Leiden: E.J. Brill.

Holwerda, David E. 1992. Eschatology and history: A look at Calvin's eschatological vision. In *Articles on Calvin and Calvinism: Calvin's theology, theology proper, eschatology*, ed. Richard C. Gamble, 130–160. New York/London: Garland.

Hotson, Howard. 1996. The historiographical origins of Calvinist millenarianism. In *Protestant history and identity in sixteenth-century Europe*, vol. 2, ed. Bruce Gordon, 159–181. Aldershot: Scholar Press.

Howson, Barry H. 1998. Eschatology in sixteenth and seventeenth-century England. *Evangelical Quarterly* 70(4): 325–350.

Howson, Barry H. 2001. The Puritan hermeneutics of John Owen. *Westminster Theological Journal* 63(2): 351–375.

Hutton, Sarah. 2003. Mede, Milton, and More: Christ's College millenarians. In *Milton and the ends of time*, ed. Juliet Cummins, 29–41. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ice, Thomas. 2004. Lovers of Zion: A history of Christian Zionism. http://www.pre-trib.org/data/pdf/Ice-LoversofZionAHistory.pdf. Accessed online 26 Aug 2010.

Johnston, Warren. 2004. The Anglican Apocalypse in Restoration England. *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 55(3): 467–501.

Jordan, Mark D. 1992. Aquinas reading Aristotle's *Ethics*. In *Ad litteram: Authoritative texts and their medieval readers*, ed. Mark D. Jordan and Kent Emery Jr., 229–249. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.

Jowitt, Claire. 1995. Radical identities? Native Americans, Jews, and the English commonwealth. *The Seventeenth Century* 10(1): 101–119.

Jue, Jeffrey K. 2008. Puritan millenarianism in old and New England. In *The Cambridge companion to Puritanism*, ed. John Coffey and Paul C.H. Lim, 259–276. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kallas, Endel. 1988. Martin Luther as expositor of the Song of Songs. *Luther Quarterly* 2NS.3: 323–341.

Katz, David S. 1983. English redemption and Jewish readmission in 1656. *Journal of Jewish Studies* 34(1): 72–91.

Katz, David S. 1989. Menasseh ben Israel's Christian connection: Henry Jessey and the Jews. In *Menasseh ben Israel and his world*, ed. Yosef Kaplan, Henry Méchoulan, and Richard H. Popkin, 117–138. Leiden: E.J. Brill.

Katz, David S. 1992. The marginalization of early modern Anglo-Jewish history. In *The Jewish heritage in British History: Englishness and Jewishness*, ed. Tony Kushner, 60–77. London: Frank Cass.

Killeen, Kevin. 2010. Chastising with Scorpions: Reading the Old Testament in early modern England. *Huntington Library Quarterly* 73(3): 491–506.

Klemm, David. 1992. The autonomous text, the hermeneutical self, and divine rhetoric. In *Hermeneutics, the Bible and literary criticism*, ed. A. Loades and M. McLain, 5–19. New York: St Martin's Press.

Lake, Peter. 1993. Defining Puritanism—again? In *Puritanism: Transatlantic perspectives on a seventeenth-century Anglo-American faith*, ed. Francis J. Bremer, 3–29. Boston: Massachusetts Historical Society.

Lamont, William M. 1969. Puritanism as history and historiography: Some further thoughts. *Past and Present* 44: 133–146.

Lampe, G.W.H. 1965. Hermeneutics and Typology. *The London Quarterly and Holborn Review* 34: 17–25.

Lerner, Robert E. 1992. The medieval return to the thousand-year Sabbath. In *The Apocalypse in the Middle Ages*, ed. Richard K. Emmerson and Bernard McGinn, 51–71. Ithaca/London: Cornell.

Lock, Julian. 1996. Plantagenets against the Papacy: Protestant England's search for Royal Heroes. In *Protestant history and identity in sixteenth century Europe*, vol. 1, ed. Bruce Gordon, 153–173. Aldershot: Scholar Press.

Longxi, Zhang. 1987. The letter or the spirit: The Song of Songs, allegoresis, and the Book of poetry. *Comparative Literature* 39(3): 193–218.

Luxon, Thomas H. 1993. "Not I, but Christ": Allegory and the Puritan self. *English Literary History* 60(4): 899–937.

Mandelbrote, Scott. 1998. The Bible and national identity in the British Isles, c.1650-c.1750. In *Protestantism and national identity: Britain and Ireland, c.1650–c.1850*, ed. Tony Claydon and Ian Mcbride, 157–181. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Manning, Stephen. 1972. Scriptural exegesis and the literary critic. In *Typology and early American literature*, ed. Sacvan Bercovitch, 45–66. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.

Margolin, Jean-Claude. 1990. The Epistle to the Romans (Chapter 11) according to the versions and/or commentaries of Valla, Colet, Lefèvre, and Erasmus. In *The Bible in the sixteenth century*, ed. David Steinmetz, 136–166. London: Duke University Press.

Marsden, R.G. 1906. A Virginian Minister's Library, 1635. *The American Historical Review* 11(2): 328–332.

Matar, Nabil. 1990. George Herbert, Henry Vaughan, and the conversion of the Jews. *Studies in English Literature, 1500–1900* 30(1): 79–92.

McGiffert, Michael. 1986. Who wrote the preface and notes for Henry Finch's 'The Sacred Doctrine of Divinitie', 1590? *Albion* 18(2): 247–251.

McGinn, Bernard. 1992. John's Apocalypse and the apocalyptic mentality. In *The Apocalypse in the Middle Ages*, ed. Richard K. Emmerson and Bernard McGinn, 3–19. Ithaca/London: Cornell.

McKim, Donald K. 1985. The functions of Ramism in William Perkins' theology. *The Sixteenth Century Journal* XVI(4): 503–517.

Mleynek, Sherryll. 2005. The Rhetoric of the 'Jewish Problem' in the *Left Behind* Novels. *Literature and Theology* 19(4): 367–383.

Morrissey, Mary. 2000. Elect nation and prophetic preaching: Types and examples in the Paul's Cross Jeremiad. In *The English sermon revised: Religion, literature and history 1600–1750*, ed. Lori Anne Ferrell and Peter McCullough, 43–58. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Muller, Richard A. 1990. The hermeneutic of promise and fulfilment in Calvin's exegesis of the Old Testament prophecies of the kingdom. In *The Bible in the sixteenth century*, ed. D. Steinmetz, 68–82. Durham: Duke University Press.

Murrin, Michael. 1984. Revelation and two seventeenth-century commentators. In *The Apocalypse in English Renaissance thought and literature*, ed. C.A. Patrides and Jospeh Wittreich, 125–146. Manchester: University of Manchester Press.

Nelles, William. 1993. Historical and implied authors and readers. *Comparative Literature* 45(1): 22–32.

Nice, Jason A. 2006. 'The peculiar place of god': Early modern representations of England and France. *English Historical Review* XCCI(493): 1002–1018.

Parry, Glyn. 1999. Elect Church or Elect Nation? The reception of the *Acts and Monuments*. In *John Foxe: An historical perspective*, ed. David Loades, 167–181. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Patrides, C.A. 1984. 'Something like Prophetick Strain': Apocalyptic configuration in Milton. In *The Apocalypse in English Renaissance thought and literature*, ed. C.A. Patrides and Jospeh Wittreich, 207–239. Manchester: University of Manchester Press.

Phipps, William E. 1974. The plight of the Song of Songs. *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 42(1): 82–100.

Pierce, Helen. 2004. Anti-Episcopacy and Graphic Satire in England, 1640–1645. *The Historical Journal* 47(4): 809–848.

Popkin, Richard H. 1989. The rise and fall of the Jewish Indian theory. In *Menasseh ben Israel and his world*, ed. Yosef Kaplan, Henry Méchoulan, and Richard H. Popkin, 63–82. Leiden: E.J. Brill.

Popkin, Richard H. 1994. Christian Jews and Jewish Christians in the 17th century. In *Jewish Christians and Christian Jews*, ed. Richard H. Popkin and Gordon M. Weiner, 57–72. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Popkin, Richard H. 1995. Seventeenth-century millenarianism. In *Apocalypse theory and the ends of the world*, ed. Malcolm Bull, 112–134. Oxford: Blackwell.

Prest, Wilfrid R. 1977. The published writings of Sir Henry Finch. *Notes and Queries* CCXXII(5): 501–503.

Prest, Wilfrid R. 1978. The art of law and the law of God: Sir Henry Finch (1558–1625). In *Puritans and revolutionaries*, ed. Donald Pennington and Keith Thomas, 95–117. Oxford: Clarendon.

Prince, Gerald. 1973. Introduction à l'étude du narrataire. *Poétique* 14: 178–196.

Prust, Richard C. 1992. Was Calvin a biblical literalist? In *Articles on Calvin and Calvinism: Calvin and hermeneutics*, ed. Richard C. Gamble. New York/London: Garland.

Räisänen, Heikki. 1992. The effective 'history' of the Bible: A challenge to Biblical scholarship. *Scottish Journal of Theology* 45: 303–324.

Rechtien, John G. 1977. Antithetical literary structures in the reformation theology of Walter Travers. *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 8(1): 51–60.

Rechtien, John G. 1979. Logic in Puritan sermons in the late sixteenth century and plain style. *Style* 13(3): 237–258.

Reeves, Majorie. 1973. History and eschatology: Medieval and early protestant thought in some English and Scottish writings. *Medievalia et Humanistica: Studies in Medieval and Renaissance Culture* 4: 99–123.

Reeves, Majorie. 1996. English apocalyptic thinkers (c.1540–1620). In *Storia e figure dell'Apocalisse fra '500 e '600*, ed. Roberto Rusconi, 259–274. Rome: Viella.

Richmond, Colin. 1992. Englishness and medieval Anglo-Jewry. In *The Jewish heritage in British history: Englishness and Jewishness*, ed. Tony Kushner, 42–59. London: Frank Cass.

Rowland, Christopher. 1995. 'Upon whom the ends of the ages have come': Apocalyptic and the interpretation of the New Testament. In *Apocalypse theory and the ends of the world*, ed. Malcolm Bull, 38–57. Oxford: Blackwell.

Rusche, Harry. 1969. Prophecies and Propaganda, 1641 to 1651. *English Historical Review* 84(333): 752–770.

Sawday, Jonathan. 1997. Self and selfhood in the seventeenth century. In *Rewriting the self: Stories from the Renaissance to the present*, ed. Roy Porter, 29–41. London/New York: Routledge.

Scheper, George L. 1974. Reformation attitudes towards Allegory and Song of Songs. *PMLA* 89(3): 551–562.

Shear, Adam. 2010. William Whiston's Judeo-Christianity: Millenarianism and Christian Zionism in early enlightenment England. In *Philosemitism in history*, ed. Jonathan Karp and Adam Sutcliffe, 93–110. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Smith, Lesley. 2000. The gospel truth: Nicholas of Lyra on John. In *Nicholas of Lyra: The senses of Scripture*, ed. Philip D.W. Krey and Lesley Smith, 223–249. Leiden: E.J. Brill.

Smolinski, Reiner. 1990. *Israel redivivus*: The eschatological limits of Puritan typology in New England. *The New England Quarterly* 63(3): 357–390.

Spitz, Lewis W. 1974. Headwaters of the reformation: Studia Humanitatis, Luther Senior, et Initia Reformationis. In *Luther and the dawn of the modern era*, ed. Heiko A. Oberman, 89–126. Leiden: E.J. Brill.

Sprunger, Keith L. 1966. Ames, Ramus, and the method of Puritan Theology. *Harvard Theological Review* 59(2): 133–151.

Sprunger, Keith L. 1997. Puritan Church architecture and worship in a Dutch context. *Church History* 66(1): 36–53.

Surridge, Robert J. 2004. 'An English Laodicea': The influence of Revelation 3:14–22 on mid-seventeenth-century England. In *Cross, crown and community: Religion, government and culture in early modern England, 1400–1800*, ed. D.J.B. Trim and P.J. Balderstone, 143–176. Bern.

Tanner, J. Paul. 1997. The history of interpretation of the Song of Songs. *Blbliotheca Sacra* 154: 23–46.

Toon, Peter. 1970a. The latter day glory. In *The Puritans, the millennium, and the future of Israel*, ed. P. Toon, 23–41. Cambridge: James Clark & Co., Reprinted: 2002.

Toon, Peter. 1970b. The question of Jewish immigration. In *The Puritans, the millennium, and the future of Israel*, ed. P. Toon, 115–125. Cambridge: James Clark & Co., Reprinted: 2002.

Van der Wall, Ernestine G. 1990. A Philo-Semitic Millenarian on the Reconciliation of the Jews and Christians: Henry Jessey and his 'Glory and Salvation of Jehudah and Israel' (1650). In *Sceptics, millenarians and Jews*, ed. David S. Katz, Jonathan Israel, and Richard H. Popkin, 161–184. Leiden: E.J. Brill.

van Liere, Frans. 2000. The literal sense of the books of Samuel and Kings; From Andrew of St Victor to Nicholas of Lyra. In *Nicholas of Lyra: The senses of Scripture*, ed. Philip D.W. Krey and Lesley Smith, 59–81. Leiden: E.J. Brill.

Vance, Norman. 2010. More light? Biblical criticism and enlightenment attitudes. *Religion in the Age of Enlightenment* 2: 131–152.

Vénuat, Monique. 2001. Tentations Millénaristes et Eglise Militante chez les Premiers Réformateurs Anglais. In *Formes du Millénarisme en Europe à L'aube des Temps Modernes*, ed. Jean-Raymond Fanlo and André Tournon, 249–266. Paris: Honoré Champion.

Vreté, Mayir. 1972. The restoration of the Jews in English Protestant thought 1790–1840. *Middle Eastern Studies* 8(1): 3–50.

Wagner, Donald. 1998. Reagan and Begin, Bibi and Jerry: The theopolitical alliance of the Likud party with the American Christian "right". *Arab Studies Quarterly* 20(4): 33–52.

Wallace Jr., Dewey D. 1974. From eschatology to Arian heresy: The case of Francis Kett (d.1589). *Harvard Theological Review* 67: 459–473.

Walsh, Marcus. 1999. Profession and authority: The interpretation of the Bible in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. *Literature and Theology* 9(4): 383–398.

Ward, Graham. 1990. To be a reader: Bunyan's struggle with the language of scripture in the *Grace Abounding to the Chief of Sinners. Literature and Theology* 4(1): 29–49.

Wawrykow, Joseph. 2005. Aquinas on Isaiah. In *Aquinas on scripture: An introduction to his biblical commentaries*, ed. D.A. Keating, T.G. Weinandy, and J.P. Yocum, 43–71. London: T&T Clark.

Williamson, Arthur H. 1989. The Jewish dimension of the Scottish Apocalypse: Climate, covenant and world renewal. In *Menasseh ben Israel and his world*, ed. Yosef Kaplan, Henry Méchoulan, and Richard H. Popkin, 7–30. Leiden: E.J. Brill.

Williamson, Arthur H. 1994. British Israel and Roman Britain: The Jews and Scottish models of polity from George Buchanan to Samuel Rutherford. In *Jewish Christians and Christian Jews*, ed. Richard H. Popkin and Gordon M. Weiner, 97–117. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Wriedt, Markus. 1996. Luther's concept of history and the formation of an evangelical identity. In *Protestant history and identity in sixteenth-century Europe Volume 1*, ed. Bruce Gordon, 31–45. Aldershot: Scolar.

Yocum, John. 2005. Aquinas' literal exposition on job. In *Aquinas on scripture: An introduction to his biblical commentaries*, ed. D.A. Keating, T.G. Weinandy, and J.P. Yocum, 21–42. London: T&T Clark.

Zakai, Avihu. 1987. Reformation, history, and eschatology in English Protestantism. *History and Theory* 26(3): 300–318.

Zakai, Avihu. 1989. Thomas Brightman and English Apocalyptic tradition. In *Menasseh ben Israel and his world*, ed. Yosef Kaplan, Henry Méchoulan, and Richard H. Popkin, 31–44. Leiden: E.J. Brill.

Zwicker, S.N. 1988. England, Israel and the Triumph of Roman Virtue. In *Millenarianism and messianism in English literature and thought 1650–1800*, ed. R.H. Popkin, 37–64. Leiden: E.J. Brill.

Index

A
Aben Ezra, 83
Allegory, 37
  in Augustine, 33–35
  in Brightman, 81–93
  in Luther, 39–40
Alsted, Johann Heinrich, 157, 178–179, 211
Ames, William, 23, 115
Analogia Fidei. *See* Analogy of faith
Analogy of faith, 52, 108, 144, 157, 177, 208
  in Brightman, 81–93
  in the early church, 34
  in England, 43–47
  in reformation hermeneutics, 39–42
Antichrist
  in Jesuit thought, 115–117
  medieval concept of, 38
  as Rome, 52–55, 60
Aquinas, Thomas, 36
Archer, John, 195
Aubrey, John, 16, 203
Augustine
  on allegory, 33–35
  on analogy of faith, 34
  attitude to millennium, 35
  hermeneutical position, 33–36

B
Bale, John, 51–53, 63, 76
Baxter, Richard, 123, 212, 214
Bellarmine, Roberto, 14, 21, 60, 115–117, 125, 209
ben Israel, Menasseh, 192–203
Bernard, Richard, 135, 142–147, 210
Bewick, John, 186
Beza, Theodore, 53, 82
Boys, John, 134
Brightman, Thomas
  allegory in, 81
  apocalyptic rhetoric, 74
  attitude towards history, 77–93
  biography, 16–24
  consistent literalism, 107–117, 208–214
  double millennium, 78–81
  and English identity, 72–74, 120–127
  interpretation of Song of Songs, 81–93
  Jesuit influence on, 115–117
  novelty in interpretation, 62–64
  and primitivism, 68–69
  radical interpretation of, 168–173
  and Ramism, 70–71
  reception in New England, 179
  reception in Scotland, 172
  reception post 1660, 202
  and restoration of the Jews, 98–117
  resurrection of the dead, 111–113
  and separatists, 132–137
  and the seven churches, 69
  use of analogy of faith, 81–93
  views on monarchy, 66–68, 217–219
  works of, 21, 217–219
Brocardo, Giacopo, 70
Broughton, Hugh, 48, 54
Brownist. *See* Separatists
Brucioli, Antonio, 82
Bulkeley, Edward, 19

A. Crome, *The Restoration of the Jews: Early Modern Hermeneutics, Eschatology, and National Identity in the Works of Thomas Brightman*, International Archives of the History of Ideas Archives internationales d'histoire des idées 213,
DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-04762-1,

Bulkeley, Peter, 179, 184–188
Bullinger, Heinrich, 51, 59, 61, 69
Bulwarde, Robert, 134
Burroughs, Jeremiah, 176, 184–187

C
Calvin, John, 68, 99, 108, 161, 178, 182
  hermeneutical position, 40–42
  on millennialism, 42
Canne, John, 136
Cartwright petition, 190
Caryl, Joseph, 199
Cecil, William, 73, 122, 141, 187
Chaderton, Laurence, 18, 20
Chaderton, William, 17
Charles I, 154
Charles II, 202, 207
Christian Zionism, 1, 15, 207, 212
Collier, Thomas, 200
Collins, Samuel, 68
Constantine, 66–68
Cooper, Thomas, 141
Cotton, John, 179, 181, 187–188, 211
Cowper, William, 147
Cranmer, Thomas, 73, 121, 123, 141
Cromwell, Oliver, 196, 198, 201–202
Cromwell, Thomas, 73, 121, 141, 147
Crouch, Nathaniel, 198

D
Daniel (Biblical book), 54, 65–67, 99, 103, 104, 111–113, 149
Darby, John Nelson, 213
de l'Ecluse, Jean, 134
Dent, Arthur, 77, 175
Draxe, Thomas, 148–149, 190
Dury, John, 192

E
Edward VI, 123
Elect nation. *See* England, apocalyptic role
Elizabeth I, 65, 66, 122, 124–125, 146, 156, 160, 188
England
  apocalyptic role, 73, 120–127, 143, 145–147, 160–161, 185–187, 200–203
  as Laodicea, 69–76, 119, 123, 134–137, 143, 168–173, 185–188, 199
  readmission of Jews to, 179–203
Eudaemon-Joannes, Andreas, 134
Evans, Arise, 202

F
Fenner, Dudley, 82
Fenton, Roger, 44
Fenwicke, John, 177
Finch, Henry, 150–154, 159
Fletcher, Giles, 137–141
Floyd, John, 133
Forbes, Patrick, 113, 135
Fowler, John, 134
Foxe, John, 50, 53, 66, 76, 108, 119, 120
  on Jewish restoration, 50
Fraunce, Abraham, 46
Fulke, William, 43, 48
Fuller, Thomas, 17, 19, 20, 123, 124, 173

G
Geneva Bible, 51, 53–54
Gibbons, Nicholas, 29
Goodwin, Thomas, 176
Gouge, William, 150–154
Graunt, John, 181
Greville, Robert, 213

H
Hall, Edmund, 179
Harford, Ralph, 169
Harrington, John, 101
Hartlib, Samuel, 196
Hawnes, 13, 17, 214
Hayter, Richard, 4
Hearne, Richard, 23, 115
Hebraism, 48–49
Hermeneutics. *See* Allegory; Analogy of faith; Literal sense
Historical closure, 77–81
Howell, James, 23
Hyperius, Andreas, 50

I
II Esdras, 102

J
James I and VI, 136, 146, 152, 157
Jerusalem, 104
Jessey, Henry, 197, 202, 211
Jewish conversion to Christianity, 35, 37, 74, 99, 106–107, 142, 153, 159–161
  belief in sixteenth century, 51–55
Jewish restoration to Palestine
  biblical basis, 29–30

in Brightman's work, 98–117
controversy in 1620s, 150–154
in the early church, 30–32
in Joseph Mede, 159
rejected in England, 49–51
in 1610s, 144
in 1640s, 173–187
in 1650s England, 179–203
Jews
and Christian selfhood, 49–51, 104–106, 118–127
in the early church, 30–32
in early modern England, 98
English attitudes towards, 49–51
Kings of the East, 102–103, 138, 151–154, 179
readmission to England, 179–203
Joachim of Fiore, 37
influence on Brightman, 64
Joye, George, 104
Judeo-centrism, 132, 138, 142, 163
historiography of, 2–3
Junius, Franciscus, 48, 53

L
Laodicea. *See* England
Laud, William, 153
Lee, Samuel, 137
Lincolnshire abridgement, 18
Literal sense, 143–147
in Brightman, 107–117, 208–214
in the early church, 32–36
historiography of, 5–9
and history, 81–93
in interpreting, 151
in middle ages, 36
prominence in reformation, 39
in 1640s and 50s, 173–187
Lollards, 38
Lost tribes. *See* Ten tribes of Israel
Luther, Martin, 40, 83, 99, 156
on allegory, 39–40
hermeneutical position, 39–40
on revelation, 40

M
Martyr, Justin, 31, 32
Maton, Robert, 177, 181–184
Mede, Joseph, 154–163, 194, 211
Middle coming of Christ, 80, 177
Millenarianism. *See* Millennialism
Millennialism, 35, 42, 131, 157, 212
in early seventeenth-century England, 76–78
historiography of, 9–13
in 1640s and 50s England, 167–168
Montezinos, Antony, 192
More, Henry, 212
Münster, 42

N
Napier, John, 54–55, 76, 101
National identity, 72–74, 120–127
Nicholas, Edward, 190–191

O
Osborne, Francis, 19
Osborne, John, 17, 19
Ottoman Empire, 65, 78, 80, 103, 111, 113, 125, 137, 149, 156

P
Peacham, Henry, 45
Perkins, William, 44, 46
Petrie, Alexander, 181–184
Premillennialism. *See* Millennialism
Primitivism, 63–69
Progressive revelation, 61–64
Purchas, Samuel, 133

Q
Quadriga, 36
Queens' College, 16

R
Ramism, 45–47, 70–71, 109
Restoration of the Jews. *See* Jewish restoration to Palestine
Resurrection of the dead, 111–113
Revelation (Biblical book)
and closure, 77–81
in early church, 31–33
in England, 52–55
Jesuit interpretations, 60–61
in reformation, 40, 42
Thomas Brightman's reading, 64–66
Ribera, Francisco, 60, 115–117
Robinson, John, 135

S
Saunders, Clement, 134
Selfhood, 49–51, 118–121
Separatists, 132–137
Sevi, Sabbati, 202
Sherry, Richard, 45
Song of Songs
  Brightman's interpretation of, 81–93
  interpretation in early modern England, 81–83
Spanish Armada, 54
Spencer, Edward, 193
Spencer, John, 214
Strent, Peter, 20
Strong, William, 177

T
Ten tribes of Israel, 102, 137–141
Tertullian, 31
Tillinghast, John, 196
Tomlinson, William, 200
Turks. *See* Ottoman Empire
Twisse, William, 155, 159
Tyconius, 33
Tyndale, William, 43, 49, 52

U
Ussher, James, 132

V
Vere, Mary, 23
Victorinus, 32
Vincent, Philip, 170

W
Wall, Moses, 193–195
Walton, Izaak, 171
Weemes, John, 44, 48, 190
Whitaker, William, 17
Whitehall Conference, 188–203
Willet, Andrew, 43, 44, 49
Wilson, Thomas, 139–141