

**TWO CONFESSIONS, ONE JERUSALEM: CONCEPTIONS OF JEWS
AND JERUSALEM IN THE EARLY MODERN ENGLISH SERMON**

by

Mitchell Louis Gould

A thesis submitted to the Department of History

In conformity with the requirements for

the degree of Master of Arts

Queen's University

Kingston, Ontario, Canada

(April, 2018)

Copyright © Mitchell Louis Gould, 2018

Abstract

Jews and their city of Jerusalem have been a perpetual source of discussion within Christendom. The English Reformation became more established under the Elizabethan settlement of 1559. This fundamental change in religious practice and belief also reflected a difference in how Jewish people and their holy city of Jerusalem were portrayed within sermons and other tracts written by preachers. This project explores the place of Jews and Jerusalem in the sermons of early modern English preachers. It examines questions relating to the how Jews and Jerusalem factor into the content of English sermons written between 1558-1630, focusing on four distinct themes. The first section examines the heavenly versus the earthly Jerusalem, tracing the division of the city between an earthly and heavenly place from early Church figures through to English preachers. The next section follows the usage of Jewish figures and Hebrew texts, primarily pursuing inquiry relating to two major figures, Josephus and Maimonides. Further, this project contributes to scholarship that has recognized the antisemitism prevalent throughout early modern Europe. It examines how Jews were made other and insulted in sermons, as well as compared to Catholics. It pays particular attention to how attributes assigned to biblical Jews continued to impact their early modern descendants. Finally, this project considers the replies from Catholic English Jesuits to the English Protestant settlement. It investigates how Catholics reacted and responded to Protestant claims to Jerusalem by bolstering their own associations with the city. Further, it studies how Catholics in turn would associate Protestants with Jews and “Judaizing” practices. Above all, this project’s aim is to place further attention upon the uses of Jews and Jerusalem within this turbulent and formative period within English Reformation history.

Acknowledgements

There are many people to whom I owe a great amount of gratitude for allowing this thesis to have come together in the way it did. First and foremost, I thank my parents Randi and Jordan for their limitless love and support. I quite literally would not have made it to this point without their unconditional support and understanding. Alongside them, thanks to the rest of my family as well. I am lucky to have a number of brothers, cousins, aunt, uncles and two grandmothers whose continued interest and support have provided me the motivation to keep going on with this project. I also remember my family who are no longer with me, specifically my grandfathers (may their memories be a blessing), who provided inspiration despite no longer being here.

I am also grateful to the supportive staff at Queen's University who have made my experience here memorable. First, I extend a hearty amount of gratitude to my supervisor Jeffrey Collins for his patience, his knowledge, his constructive support, and his continued enthusiasm for my project. Further, to my professors Andrew Jainchill, Anthony D'Elia, Daniel Woolf, and Amitava Chowdhury who challenged me, inspired me, and encouraged me to think about my project in profoundly different ways. Thank you as well to the administrative staff, especially Cathy Dickison for her knowledge and assistance in wading through administrative woes.

Finally, I would like to acknowledge my colleagues and friends at Queen's University. The amount of camaraderie, support, and friendship that I have received from my cohort and beyond are unmatched by any other previous academic experience. I am so thankful for the friends, and colleagues that I have made and found throughout this experience and my time at Queen's University would not have been the same without their friendship and companionship.

Finally, my most gracious thanks to coffee and wine for their oscillating utility throughout the writing process, as well as for always being there for me, rain or shine.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	ii
Acknowledgements	iii
Chapter 1 Introduction.....	1
Chapter 2 Literature Review.....	11
Chapter 3 Jerusalem on Earth, Jerusalem in Heaven.....	15
Chapter 4 Jews as Source, and Hebrew as a Resource: The Soldier and the Sage.....	40
Chapter 5 "Those Miserable Devilish Hebrews: Descriptions of biblical and contemporaneous Jews	61
Chapter 6 "You and I, We are Not of One Religion": Catholic Responses to English Protestantism through the Use of Jews and Jerusalem.....	85
Chapter 7 Conclusion.....	113

Chapter 1

Introduction

Queen Elizabeth I did not have much time or patience for sermons. They had to be short. She had to like the preacher's personality. If it became too long or she got bored, she would stop the sermon entirely.¹ Despite Elizabeth's own mixed feelings concerning sermons, the sermon was integral to English religious culture. In the words of Susan Wabuda, "The sermon and the public reading of scriptures were the sacred meeting-place between an imperfect humanity and the spirit of God."² In the Elizabethan and Jacobean periods, ranging from 1558 at the beginning of Elizabeth's reign (r. 1558-1603) to 1625 at the death of James I (r. 1603-1625) the impact of the Reformation started by Henry VIII continued to challenge and invoke questions concerning England's relationship with God. Beginning with Henry VIII severing ties with the Catholic church in the 1530s, England changed its relationship with God by removing its connection to the pope as the religious middleman and looking to a biblical past and the primitive church for religious meaning. This project will examine how sermons written and performed during the Elizabethan and Jacobean periods applied the biblical past and its central city of Jerusalem, as well as the Jewish people and Hebrew language, to negotiate and reflect England's revised role in Christendom by connecting to the primitive Church rather than the one corrupted by the Pope and Rome.

Upon taking the throne in 1558, Elizabeth welcomed back Protestant and Calvinist Englishmen who had exiled themselves to the European continent until the death of the Catholic

¹ Peter E. McCullough, *Sermons at the Court: Politics and Religion in Elizabethan and Jacobean Preaching* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 77-78.

² Susan Wabuda, *Preaching During the English Reformation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 13.

Mary I. These men, including prominent Elizabethan churchmen such as Richard Cox, Matthew Parker, and Edmund Grindal, held more radical views than their Queen, preaching against Catholics of any kind as well as any Catholic remnants in English religious ritual (such as priestly vestments).³ Alongside these reformers were preachers loyal to the Elizabethan settlement and the Queen's religious supremacy. Much of Elizabeth's reign was spent attempting to manage and silence nonconformists, both Puritan and Papist. While many Catholics either went underground or moved to the continent to practice Catholicism in the open, they continued to produce their own works in response to the anti-Catholic polemic produced in English sermons and tracts. Meanwhile, Puritans and nonconformists upset with the lack of further Reformation under Elizabeth departed to Europe to live with in territories that had enacted stricter reforms within German, Swiss, Dutch, and Belgian territories.

After the death of Elizabeth and the accession of James as the first Stuart monarch, there were hopes from both English Catholics and English Puritans that he would change the ecclesial status quo of the Elizabethan era. Unlike Elizabeth, James was fond of sermons, and his reign was associated with the peak of Paul's Cross Sermons, Paul's Cross being central to the sermon culture of English royal and religious power.⁴ Early into his reign James convened the Hampton Court Conference in 1604. He invited Puritan nonconformists to argue their case and encouraged religious unity and compromise.⁵ Not only that, James expanded the number of sermons to be given per week, and decided on the preachers who he wanted to deliver them.⁶ Whereas Elizabeth was a reluctant attendee, and frequently clashed with preachers who would not adhere

³ Arnold Hunt, "Preaching the Elizabethan Settlement," in *The Oxford Handbook of the Early Modern Sermon*, Ed. Peter McCullough et. al (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 369, 374, 377.

⁴ Mary Morrissey. *Politics and the Paul's Cross Sermon, 1558-1642* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 33.

⁵ W.B. Patterson. *James VI and I and the Reunion of Christendom* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 48.

⁶ Emma Rhatigan, "Preaching Venues: Architecture and Auditories," in *The Oxford Handbook of the Early Modern Sermon*, Ed. Peter McCullough et. al (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 106, 112.

to her settlement, James built much of the pageantry of his rule around the ceremony of attending sermons and hand-selecting the preachers who would perform from the most important pulpit in Britain.

A significant theme and topic that occurred frequently in sermons from so called “Old Testament prophets” refer to a people not present in England, but central to many of their texts. The Jewish people, exiled from England in 1290 and who gained no significant presence in England until resettlement discussions in the mid-seventeenth century, remained ubiquitous in the English conscious for their consistent presence in the Christian Bible and the Hebrew religious texts. Accused of killing Christ and rejecting the Christian faith, Jewish people are mentioned frequently in sermons as having been punished by God for their indiscretions and sentenced to a lifetime of wandering the diaspora. Their city and home, Jerusalem, had been destroyed for their lack of faith, which many preachers were quick to state had been foretold by Jesus before his death. Moreover, early modern English preachers also mention Jerusalem in a variety of contexts, from its destruction as a physical city to its ascension to heaven as the dwelling place of the heavenly Christ. However, the discussion of Jerusalem and the Jewish people in the early modern sermon has been understated in English historiography. The comparison of Englishmen to the Israelites in English history has been well studied, as historians such as Mary Morrissey have discussed how Jacobean sermons often involved prophecies of destruction for England that mirrored the destruction of the Israelite kingdoms and Jerusalem.⁷ Beatrice Groves invokes similar comparisons, discussing how prominent English reformers such as John Jewel compared the English experience to the Jewish one. Protestant England, like

⁷ Mary Morrissey, “Elect Nations 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 (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000), 43, 45.

Israel, was vulnerable to factional dispute and division that would lead to disaster.⁸ This project aims to respond and add to the corpus of work that discusses Jewish and Israelite connections in early modern Christian rhetoric and argument. It will do so by including English Catholic responses to the discussion as well as considering how sermons described Jewish people on biblical, historical and contemporaneous levels. Recent works, such as Peter Marshall's *Heretics and Believers*, refer to churches that were associated with Jewish purification rituals and consequently accused of popish behavior, yet this historiography does not often investigate the consequences of this comparison, nor the extent to which it was harmful to be compared to the Jews.⁹

This work will examine Jews and Jerusalem through the wide and diverse medium of sermons. The aim is to gain more insight into how early modern English preachers conceptualized and portrayed the Jewish people and their city. Jerusalem was both a physical city and reminder of the punishment against the Jews for their supposed transgressions, but also a heavenly place that England aspired to imitate. The Jewish people were a providential people for having written the "Old Testament," yet also a people with whom early modern English preachers had no direct contact. Nevertheless, Jewish texts and Jewish authorities such as Josephus (c. 37-100) or rabbinical authorities such as Maimonides (1135-1204) were referenced in early modern English sermons. In addition, some English preachers also referenced the Hebrew language, though not in as great a frequency as Jewish authority figures. Taking this into consideration, this work emphasizes the discussion of Jews in the early modern English sermon

⁸ Beatrice Groves, "The Siege of Jerusalem and Subversive Rhetoric in *King John*," in *Shakespeare and the Early Modern Religion*, Ed. David Loewenstein and Michael Witmore (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 102.

⁹ Peter Marshall, *Heretics and Believers: A History of the English Reformation* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2017), 480.

to reveal how an increasingly English Protestant state perceived of this alien people who remained so closely associated with Jesus Christ. Further, the extent to which these discussions of Jewish people were often negative or pejorative will be remarked upon, as these works often faulted the Jewish people for the alleged crimes of their ancestors and for continuing to reject the message of Christ. Moreover, the place of Jerusalem in relation to Jewish people as the physical reminder of their punishment reflects the division between the physical and heavenly Jerusalems in the Christian mind.

Following the precedent of the primitive Church, the separation between the heavenly and earthly Jerusalem was integral to the perception of devotion and memory in this new yet older form of Christianity. Catholicism and its rituals were ignored in favour of the Protestant inclination to relate its struggles and peoplehood to the time of Jesus and shortly after his death and supposed ascension. As such, this work aims to explore how a people who were not physically present in England could play such a prominent role in the growing anti-papal English state through their language, their sages and historians, and most importantly, their city.

The following chapter details the historiography of sermons and their importance and contribution toward English Reformation history. Next, Chapter Three details the separation of the heavenly and earthly Jerusalem. The dismissal of the importance of the earthly Jerusalem in favour of the heavenly has been an ongoing project since the early days of Christianity. The chapter will pay particular attention to how Jerusalem is gendered as female, as well as how often preachers invoked the image of a destroyed Jerusalem to warn their listeners and readers that England was in danger of the same fate if the people did not change their ways. Chapter Four investigates how sermons employed Jewish people as a resource or as a source of refutation. Often, when preachers referenced post-biblical Judaic texts, they did so in a

dismissive way to further delegitimize the Jewish faith after the forced diaspora. However, the frequent references to prominent Jewish Roman historian Josephus also exemplifies how certain Jewish people could be used favourably by English preachers, so long as their narratives contributed to a Protestant Christian message. This chapter will also detail the influence of Christian Hebraism in England and the continental European influences that encouraged the study of Hebrew in England. Returning to the source of God's word in its original language influenced certain preachers and their sermons. Chapter Five examines the adjectives and words used to describe Jewish people and sources. Most often associated with their alleged contribution to the death of Jesus, this chapter will examine the negative language used to describe Jewish people, and how that negative language contributed to anti-Judaic and antisemitic perceptions of the Jewish people as a separate people or a people who were prone to certain actions based on biblical tales. Above all, this chapter considers whether biblical perceptions of Jews encouraged contemporary antisemitic stereotyping of early modern Jews far-removed from the actions of their biblical predecessors. Finally, Chapter Six examines English Catholic responses to English Protestant rhetoric surrounding the Jews, and particularly to the suggestion that Catholic ceremonial practices were inherently "Judaizing." Printing mostly from France, they focused on the close physical associations that Catholics held with Jerusalem, their spiritual connection to the city, and how it was in fact Protestants who were attempting to "Judaize" Europe. By framing these topics within the tumultuous periods of the Elizabethan settlement and pre-Civil War millenarian fervor, this project intends to demonstrate the centrality of the Jewish people, the Hebrew language, Jewish sources, and their most holy city of Jerusalem as sources of tension within Christendom. These tensions were sources from which Christian denominations attempted

to connect with the primitive past of the Church that in their eyes more closely resembled that practice that they argued Jesus Christ intended for his worshipers.

Before progressing further, it is necessary to mention that the sermons that will be referenced come from a variety of preachers, each with his own relationship towards the Elizabethan settlement and Jacobean church. The conformist and nonconformist clergy were widely different; the conformist clergy adhered to the Elizabethan settlement while the nonconformist clergy desired more radical reform in the English church in order that it not resemble the Catholic church too inundated with ceremony and papal provisions. Further, the context within when each sermon was written also influenced its intended impact and connection to Jerusalem. For example, sermons written after the defeat of the Spanish Armada in 1588 were more likely to contain fierce anti-papal rhetoric than sermons written when James first ascended to the throne in 1603 and desired reconciliation with English Catholics. The location of the sermon is also of significance, as a sermon delivered at Paul's Cross and printed in London would have more impact and influence on a broader range of the English population than a sermon written, delivered and published in a specific parish. The preacher who delivered each sermon is of importance as well, thus a brief outline of his beliefs and interaction with the English state will be provided as contextual background. As such, there are a multitude of factors that ought to be considered when quoting from and discussing sermons performed during the reigns of Elizabeth and James. This was not a stable religious or political period in English history. There were divisions within the English church concerning how far reform should go, constant threats from Catholics within and outside the state, and political turmoil. All of these factors in England should be justly reflected in the sermons written by preachers who had a rapt audience listening, reading, and reflecting.

Considering the multiple historiographical settings for any English sermon, there is a lot of content to consider when applying sermons as a source. Further, how they discussed Jewish people for better or worse adds a further layer of inspection, as this project will consider how the sermons refer to Jews as a biblical people and as a diasporic people forced into exile for the killing of the Christian saviour. Even though Jewish people had not been visible or allowed on English soil for hundreds of years, they still held a place of prominence in the English consciousness, not only for their crimes against Christ, but their accused crimes against the English population as well. Blood libel accusations and cultural memories of alleged Jewish crimes surrounded the memory of English boy saints such as William of Norwich, while English drama with Jewish characters invoked the belief in a specific Jewish odour (*foetor Judaicus*). Though they rarely if ever met a Jewish person, English preachers had very strong opinions about Jewish people. They served as the original cautionary tale of what occurs when division and godlessness strike a nation. The Puritan and nonconformist preachers that will be discussed and referenced were enthusiastic in presenting the destruction of Jerusalem and the might of the Romans as the consequences for what happens when a people ignore the message of God and refuse to follow his precepts. As a country already divided by the reformations of Henry VIII (r. 1509-1547), Edward VII (r. 1547-1553) and Mary I (r. 1553-1558), Elizabeth and James had much work to do in order to unify their nation under one faith. While preachers were a significant part of unifying the nation, they could also prove dangerous if they challenged the settlement and English safety by invoking warnings of destruction akin to that of Jerusalem.

Other important factors to this argument relate to how early Church representations of Jerusalem continued to impact and inspire early modern perceptions and conceptions of Jerusalem as a heavenly city. Augustine of Hippo (354-450 AD) and his vision of Jerusalem laid

out in his work *De Civitate Dei* (On the City of God) were a strong source of inspiration for how early modern preachers presented and described Jerusalem. Further, more context will be provided concerning the Christian Hebraist movement in the sixteenth and seventeenth-centuries and express how England's association with Christian Hebraism and Hebrew instruction in universities was different than the mainland European experience. A large factor in England's relationship with Hebrew was due to the fact that no Jewish people who were fluent in Hebrew resided in England, placing English scholars at a disadvantage for learning the language or desiring to do so. However, the universities in Oxford and Cambridge both had positions for Hebrew scholars, and some of the preachers relevant to this undertaking knew Hebrew and chose to include Hebrew letters and words in their sermons.

Moreover, when preachers applied negative language to describe Jewish ceremony or practice, it was common to associate Jewish people with Turks who were considered a significant threat to Christian Europe in the sixteenth and seventeenth-centuries. While England's own relationship with the Ottoman Empire was complicated through trading and possible collaboration against the Holy Roman Empire, the Ottoman Turks were still the Muslim "other" and thus a threat to English Christianity. It is not a coincidence that Jews are often mentioned alongside Turks and Papists, as Turks were the external Muslim enemy, papists were the traitorous adherents to the anti-Christ, and Jews were the stubborn "other" who remained stuck practicing frivolous biblical ceremonies and awaiting the Messiah who had already come. Yet, Jews also played a different role for having both made biblical errors by contributing to Christ's death and continuing those errors into contemporary times. This argument will focus on the importance of the latter point while still recognizing that Jewish people were far from the only group designated as a threat and "other" in early modern sermons.

Finally, the ways in which early modern Catholic recusants in England as well as English Catholic exiles maintaining their community outside of England utilized Jerusalem and Israelite discourse would require its own separate project. This work cannot cover the entirety of English Catholic tracts and sermons, but rather will focus on how they could make their own negative comparisons between Jewish and Protestant practices as a response to what was being produced in England by the Protestant establishment. English Catholics experienced their own tumultuous relationship with England outside of religious texts, for English Catholics were implicated in assassination plots against both Elizabeth and James. Despite James's attempts to distinguish between loyal English Catholics and those who were complicit in the Gunpowder Plot or other Catholic attempts to depose the English monarch, anti-Catholic feelings in England were rampant.¹⁰ Thus, English Catholics were arguably more concerned with proving their ability to be loyal to both English monarch and pope than debating the merits of England or London as a heavenly Jerusalem. Nevertheless, English Catholics did in fact engage with Jews and Jerusalem, and this work will conclude with discussing and analyzing them.

This project utilizes sermons as the basis from which to discuss English appropriation of biblical prophets and narratives. Further, it explores the ways in which English preachers discuss Jewish people in both biblical and contemporaneous contexts and how those contexts apply toward how Jewish people were framed in Christian Europe. In the words of Matthew Dimmock, Jews were a "phantom of the Christian psyche."¹¹ As Protestantism was intent on connecting to the primitive Church, and the conception of Jerusalem was integral to early Church practice, that is where this discussion begins.

¹⁰ Patterson, *King James VI and I*, 78.

¹¹ Matthew Dimmock, "Shakespeare's non-Christian Religions," in *Shakespeare and Early Modern Religion*, Ed. David Loewenstein and Michael Witmore (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 282.

Chapter 2

Literature Review: A Brief Discussion on Sermons

The historiographical discussion surrounding sermons, including listening and reception, is also one that deserves more attention before progressing further. Andrew Cambers describes sermons as the interaction between the spoken, written and printed word.¹² As such, there are three active actions involved in the early modern English sermon, consisting of actively listening to a sermon being performed, the preacher transmitting his notes to a publishable sermon, and then the sermon being read by those who purchased it. Reading was only subsidiary to the sermon, as sermons were intended to be delivered orally to a wide audience.¹³ As Arnold Hunt argues in his study on the interaction between the acts of listening and hearing in sermons, preachers wanted their sermons to elicit a strong audience response.¹⁴ Elizabeth and James both recognized the importance of sermons in mobilizing and connecting with their subjects, though James embraced the practice far more than Elizabeth. Hunt also affirms that the Paul's Cross sermons assumed the form of Jeremiads, invoking close connections between Israel and England or Jerusalem and London in order to warn their audience of what would happen if they sinned.¹⁵ Further, the Paul's Cross sermons attracted a large and heterogeneous audience during the reigns of both Elizabeth and James.¹⁶ While Paul's Cross sermons will not be the only referenced

¹² Andrew Cambers. *Godly Reading: Print, Manuscript and Puritanism in England, 1580-1720* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 100.

¹³ Cambers, *Godly Reading*, 249-50.

¹⁴ Arnold Hunt. *The Art of Hearing: English Preachers and their Audiences, 1590-1640* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 11.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 325.

¹⁶ Morrissey, *Politics and the Paul's Cross Sermon*, 24.

sermons, particular work has been done on them by authors such as Mary Morrissey because of their centrality and importance in London and the presence of the monarch at some of the deliveries. A sermon performed in northern England is sure to have a less heterogeneous audience than one at Paul's Cross, yet a large majority of sermons were printed in London. As such, the act and distribution of printing these sermons is one that this work will consider as well.

A significant reason why delivering sermons was so important besides the religious purposes were that one need not be literate to attend a sermon and hear the word of God. Some early modern Englishmen went so far as to create a distinction between the "true ear" of worship as opposed to the "false eye."¹⁷ Puritan circles were specifically wary of the printed word, believing it undermined the spoken.¹⁸ Ian Green's *Print and Protestantism in Early Modern England* thoroughly examines the intersections between Protestantism and print. Green identifies three types of Protestantism in print; the first consisting of shared ideals of faith under a general Protestant umbrella, the second that print was favoured by an educated laity with a classical education, and the third that print was influenced by pre-Christian and medieval and supernatural perceptions of the world.¹⁹ Green also emphasizes the increased use and reference to Greek and Hebrew translations of the Bible that preachers used to remain closer to the source text.²⁰ The increased usage of Hebrew as the period of study progresses reflected a desire from Reformation preachers to play closer attention to Hebrew texts and translations and to move beyond Latin and Greek. However, one must also consider that an audience listening to a sermon may not have been interested in Greek and Hebrew. Indeed, there was a lay desire for more Latin to be used,

¹⁷ Hunt, *Art of Hearing*, 24.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 119.

¹⁹ Ian Green. *Print and Protestantism in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), xiii

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 165.

but not Greek or Hebrew.²¹ The preference for Latin is one that must be considered when reviewing why a preacher would use more Latin than Greek or Hebrew, not only because the access to Hebrew sources in England was not as accessible or desired amongst the educated laity either. Thus, the versions of the sermons that will be referenced would not necessarily match the versions that were performed to a broader populace. This populace may not have been as interested in hearing Hebrew words, but the published sermons were meant for a specific, literate, educated and likely multilingual audience.

Despite the differences in their attitudes towards sermons, both monarchs recognized their importance. As Elizabeth was compared to the biblical judge Deborah and James to the great king Solomon, each monarch recognized that the preachers who delivered sermons during their reigns were an extension of their power. For such reasons, both knew that the preachers they selected would have to be handsome.²² Since the monarch was also an extension of God (especially with no papal power to mediate that relationship), the words of the preachers were integral to portraying the power and image of the monarch. It was common to equate preachers with prophets, and preaching had to be an expression of God's will.²³ Further, the preachers connected themselves to prophets of the Jewish scriptures, known to Christians as the Old Testament. This connection often took the form of warning the people that if they did not stop in their evil ways, similar catastrophes that befell the Israelites in the Tanakh (the Jewish canonical religious texts) would happen to them as well.²⁴ Some early Elizabethan preachers, including the

²¹ Hunt, *Art of Hearing*, 287.

²² Kate Armstrong, "Sermons in Performance," in *The Oxford Handbook of the Early Modern Sermon*, Ed. Peter McCullough et. al (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 134.

²³ Eric Josef Carlson, "The Boring of the Ear: Shaping the Pastoral Vision of Preaching in England, 1540-1640," in *Preachers and People in the Reformations and Early Modern Period*, Ed. Larissa Taylor (Brill: Boston, 2003), 263, 279.

²⁴ G.J.R. Parry. *A Protestant Vision: William Harrison and the Reformation of Elizabethan England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 228.

infamous John Foxe, went so far as to compare Elizabeth to the first Christian emperor Constantine for failing to bring about a complete restoration to the true universal Church.²⁵ Clearly sermons were a complex and multi-faceted aspect of the English Reformation. Yet sermons also hold significant value when discussing religious views towards Jews and Jerusalem. These limitations and benefits will be considered within the following chapters.

²⁵ Ibid., 242.

Chapter 3

Jerusalem on Earth, Jerusalem in Heaven

For there will be nothing there which pertains to the terrestrial Jerusalem only, if whatever is there said and fulfilled of or concerning her signifies something which also refers by allegorical prefiguration to the celestial Jerusalem; but there will be only two kinds, one that pertains to the free Jerusalem, the other to both

– St. Augustine, *City of God Vol. II*, pg 346.

This chapter examines how early modern sermons portrayed the dual Jerusalems; the Jerusalem in heaven, and the Jerusalem on earth. Ultimately, the sermons reflect a continuity in how these two Jerusalems were portrayed by early and influential Church figures such as Augustine of Hippo. The difference is in how preachers in England and more specifically preachers in London used the same rhetoric used by prophets of the Jewish texts. They did so in order to warn the people of England that the Church had to be rebuilt to cast off the shroud of Catholic ritual practice and popish misconceptions. They aspired to build a godly London and England to reflect the heavenly Jerusalem and become the model Israelite people. In these representations of Jerusalem, English preachers used Jewish prophets for their words of warning to the Jewish people; where the Jewish people failed and lost their city to corruption, ruin, and destruction, preachers postulated that it was not too late for England to change its ways to achieve a status closer to heaven. In many ways this was similar to the Jeremiad model used by Puritans in the American colonies, which will be discussed later. As such, this chapter begins by discussing early Church representations of Jerusalem as a heavenly city rather than an earthly one, and then progresses to explore how English preachers used similar language as those early Church fathers to represent the heavenly Jerusalem within an English context. The preachers decentralized the importance of the physical city in order to focus on the importance of bringing

a heavenly city to London rather than return to the Jerusalem of ruin and sin. This chapter demonstrates the continuity with the early Church that English preachers maintained in their discussions of Jerusalem while still emphasizing the unique English commentary within each sermon.

Prophets as early as Ezekiel portrayed Jerusalem as a “cosmic mountain,” the place where heaven and earth met.²⁶ Early church figures built upon how Jerusalem was portrayed in Ezekiel. Influential figures such as Hilary of Poitiers, Augustine of Hippo, Origen, and Justin Martyr all discussed Jerusalem on a celestial level rather than an earthly one. Each figure also portrayed Jerusalem differently. What is important is that each figure created a distinct separation between the spiritual Jerusalem that belonged to a perfect people and was untouchable, in opposition to the earthly Jerusalem that was subject to earthly society and passions. While each figure differed in how they described the heavenly city and those within it, the same message remained that the heavenly Jerusalem was a more welcoming place than the earthly city of the Jews. Ellen Scully explains that for Hilary, Jerusalem is the city of Christ’s body, whereas for Augustine, Christ is present in Jerusalem.²⁷ Writing just before Augustine, Hilary of Poitiers (310-368), believed that humans were to dwell in the body of Christ which was the temple of the heavenly Jerusalem.²⁸ Thus, though Mt. Zion and Jerusalem were physical places, the sacrifice of Christ superseded the physicality of Zion and Jerusalem, transforming Christ’s body into the location of salvation for Christians. As Hilary stated, “This city [Jerusalem] is the house of the multitude of angels and of the first-fruits of the elect, and its

²⁶ Robert L. Wilken, *The Land Called Holy: Palestine in Christian History and Thought* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992), 11.

²⁷ Ellen Scully, “Jerusalem’s Lost Etymology: How Augustine Changed Latin Eschatology,” in *Vigiliae Christianae*, 70 (2016): 26.

²⁸ Ellen Scully, *Physicalist Soteriology in Hilary of Poitiers* (Leiden: Brill, 2015), 188.

foundations are living stones and precious gems, living, rising, and reigning in Christ, who is blessed forever.”²⁹ The foundational aspects of the city of Jerusalem were noted frequently by the prophets and were recycled by the early modern English preacher to discuss how the heavenly Jerusalem should be built up with heavenly stones. However, while Hilary focused on the place of Christ as the heavenly body, Augustine took a different approach while still responding to Hilary’s eschatological claims.

Augustine of Hippo’s perspective concerning the Jews, especially in how they related to Jerusalem, also reflected how later English preachers would reference Jews and their relation to the city. Augustine conceptualized the holy city of God as a place containing those who “live according to God” and await redemption.³⁰ He went on to divide the two cities between the earthly and heavenly by associating the earthly with the contempt of God, and the heavenly with love of God.³¹ While Augustine did not specifically mention Jewish people, the English Protestant sermons used similar language to describe Jewish reactions to Jesus. However, Augustine did describe the Jews in comparison with Cain, a comparison that will come up again in Chapter Five. Paula Fredriksen remarks upon a difference between Augustine’s portrayal of the Jews in his earlier work compared to in *The City of God*. In earlier interpretations, Augustine viewed Cain as a symbol for the Jews; Cain had established an earthly city when he murdered his brother, comparable to when the Jews murdered their brother Christ.³² Frederikson argues that Augustine abandoned this reading of Cain in the latter half of *The City of God* because he

²⁹ Ibid., 211. Translation provided by Scully, citing from ps. 118 Koph 12 (CCL 61A 185.22-186.28) ... *quae domus angelorum frequentiatum et electorum primitiuorum est, cuius fundamenta sunt uiui lapides preiosaeque gemmae in Christo uiuentes, resurgentes, regnantes, qui est benedictus in saecula saeculorum.*

³⁰ Augustine, *City of God*, Volume II, Trans. Marcus Dobs, 50.

³¹ Ibid., 125.

³² Paula Fredriksen, *Augustine and the Jews: A Christian Defense of Jews and Judaism* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010), 346.

had to portray Cain more as a “heavenly pilgrim” suffering an earthly exile.³³ Meanwhile, Augustine portrayed Jews as important for having been present to witness Christianity rather than challenge it; an important distinction that would inform later medieval and early modern Christian treatment towards Jews.³⁴ Indeed, Augustine argued that the visibility of Jewish ceremonial practice identified how they could service the Church; their exile and blindness were for a purpose and those who went against God by harming Jews should themselves be cursed.³⁵ Even while the majority of Europe did not heed that particular warning from Augustine, the early church figure’s practice of interpreting passages from Jewish prophets to foresee the coming of Christ and a heavenly city continued to influence Christian theologians. Three important prophets to Augustine were Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi. Augustine cited all three prophets, interpreting their prophecies to fit within his narrative of the coming of Christ and thus the ascension of a heavenly city. However, though he did not emphasize the physical land itself, he still treated actual earth from Palestine as holy for having had physical contact with Christ’s body.³⁶

There was no consensus within the early church or its theologians concerning the status of Jerusalem. Origen (185-254), writing earlier than both Augustine and Hilary, spoke only of a Jerusalem above, repudiating the idea that a holy land could exist on earth.³⁷ As such, there were no clear designations on whether the land of Jerusalem was significant or if that significance had diminished with Christ’s coming and sacrifice. However, Augustine’s popularity in the later sixteenth-century, and frequent references to him in sermons, exhibit the strength of his influence

³³ Ibid., 349.

³⁴ Ibid., 351-2.

³⁵ Ibid., 319.

³⁶ Wilken, *The Land Called Holy*, 125.

³⁷ Ibid., 71, 77.

more than any other early Christian theologian.³⁸ Despite Origen and Hilary emphasizing the spiritual aspects of Jerusalem, as well as English preachers focusing on the heavenly aspects over the earthly, English pilgrims continued to travel to Jerusalem throughout the Reformation. While these pilgrims are not the topic of this chapter, their existence is still remarkable in that while preachers were discussing the merits of the heavenly Jerusalem and building that heavenly Jerusalem within England, Englishmen were still traveling east to see the physical city under Ottoman occupation. Literature was even produced about pilgrims traveling to Jerusalem, such as Simon Patrick's *The Parable of the Pilgrim* in 1622.³⁹ The next section discusses how preachers examined Jerusalem in their sermons and the ways in which prophets were invoked to emphasize their closeness to the original Church and to attempt to bring Jerusalem to England.

John Stockwood was one of the earlier Elizabethan preachers whose surviving sermons discussed the destruction of Jerusalem. Though Stockwood died in 1610, he was more well known for his role in the Elizabethan period, for his "famous, uncompromising preaching."⁴⁰ He preached the *Fruitfull and necessary Sermon of the moste lamentable destruction of Jerusalem* in 1579, though it underwent multiple printings throughout the 1580s. The version cited in this chapter is from a 1584 printing by Thomas Dawson. Accordingly, Stockwood spoke out against "popish education" and wished for further reform in the Elizabethan church. His sermon describing the destruction of Jerusalem used the physicality of the destruction of the city to warn of the spiritual damage that England could incur without reform.⁴¹ Stockwood remarked upon the importance of Jerusalem as a physical space, noting that "we doe knowe that the churche was

³⁸ Green, *Print and Protestantism*, 258-60.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, 421.

⁴⁰ Lowe, Ben. "Stockwood, John (d. 1610), schoolmaster and writer," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. 5 Jan. 2018. <http://www.oxforddnb.com.proxy.queensu.ca/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-26548>.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*

firste gathered there, and afterwards from thence spread forth into other parts of the world, as the Actes of the Apostles doe at large declare.”⁴² Stockwood never outright dismissed the importance of Jerusalem as the founding city of Christianity, but in the pattern of early Church fathers like Origen and Hilary, he also moved beyond Jerusalem as the center and rather turned his attention toward the apostles who helped spread the spirit. The apostle Paul stated that it was his God-given duty to preach the gospel to the gentiles, which is why he went to communities in Arabia and Damascus and away from Jerusalem.⁴³ While the topic of Paul’s relationship with the Jerusalem Church is still heavily debated in theology and historiography, he did still maintain a connection with the Jerusalem Church, as he returned there between missionary trips.⁴⁴ Following a Pauline apostolic model, Stockwood recognized the importance of Jerusalem while still believing that he had a God-given role to preach the gospel and encourage a heavenly city outside of its borders.

Yet, in following the title of his sermon, Stockwood spent a considerable amount of his work discussing the physical destruction of Jerusalem, as forewarned by Jesus. Very early into his sermon, Stockwood referenced Jesus’s prophecy, stating that “when he [Jesus] was come neere, he beheld the citie, & wept on it. . . he is sory to see the miserable end, that was like shortly to ensue upon his nation, whose salvation he most earnestly desire.”⁴⁵ Stockwood opened his sermon with Christ’s words of warning and sorrow for what his people were about to undergo. While Christ’s words went unheeded and the city was destroyed, perhaps Stockwood believed his own warning would prove effective for the English people. This introduction set the

⁴² John Stockwood, *A Very Fruitfull and Necessary Sermon of the Moste lamentable Destruction of Jerusalem* (London: Thomas Dawson, 1584), 9.

⁴³ Eckhard J. Schnabel, *Paul the Missionary: Realities, Strategies, Methods* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2008), 60.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 53.

⁴⁵ Stockwood, *A Very Fruitfull Sermon*, 4.

tone for his sermon of a piece that was both descriptive and yet aware of the parallels that were to be drawn between England and Jerusalem. It is worth noting that when Stockwood first delivered this sermon, it was a mere two decades after the Elizabethan settlement had been put into effect in 1559, which scholars have described as a “half-reformed” approach to English religious practice.⁴⁶ Stockwood perceived London as a “contested space in which weak religious policy was producing civil disorder.”⁴⁷ Portraying the emperor Titus as “the minister of God his vengeance to be executed upon them,”⁴⁸ Stockwood aimed to warn England of the consequences of sin by using the earthly citizens of Jerusalem as the ultimate warning. Stockwood also portrayed the Jews in Jerusalem as “most abominable wicked creatures,”⁴⁹ emphasizing their crimes and deservedness of divine punishment. Chapter Five will go into more detail concerning such language. As part of the closing remarks in his sermon, Stockwood placed emphasis upon the fact that “Christes kingdome is spiritual, and not of this worlde.”⁵⁰ Despite the Jewish people and their city being destroyed, the words of Christ survived, as did his kingdom. In effect, Stockwood reminded his audience that while Jerusalem had already fallen, the faith had grown greater than any earthly city, and that any people may be subject to divine punishment if they were to ignore his message. Simon du Toit notes that despite preaching at Paul’s Cross, Stockwood faded into obscurity after his moment of fame preaching at the most powerful pulpit in England.⁵¹ Despite du Toit’s claim, Stockwood’s work did undergo multiple reprints throughout the 1580s, though the impact that his words had on the audience is unknown. The

⁴⁶ Louise Campbell, “A Diagnosis of Religious Moderation: Matthew Parker in the 1559 Settlement,” in *Moderate Voices in the European Reformation*, Ed. Luc Racaut & Alec Ryrie (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004), 34.

⁴⁷ Simon du Toit, “The Market for Argument: Preaching the Puritan Counterpublic at Paul’s Cross,” in *The Journal of Dramatic Theory and Literary Criticism* (Vol 26: No 2, Spring 2012), 77.

⁴⁸ Stockwood, *A Very Fruitfull Sermon*, 29.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 40.

⁵¹ Du Toit, “The Market for Argument,” 91.

1580s were still considered part of an earlier phase in England's transformation to a Protestant nation, and Stockwood used the history of the earthly Jerusalem to subtly criticize those who restricted Puritan reforms and thus allowed sin to continue unchecked.⁵² Stockwood's sermon is one of many of its kind; he was among the earlier recorded preachers in the Elizabethan period to preach such views from an influential pulpit with the permission of state power.

While there are many sermons that discuss Jerusalem, the city's feminine character, and the connection between Israel and England, Thomas Adams combined all of those topics in his sermon called *Englands Sicknes, comparatively conferred with Israels Divided into Two Sermons*, printed in London in 1615. Adams (1583-1652) held conformist views toward the English Church rather than being a nonconforming Calvinist. However, his hostility towards anything associated with Rome, the Jesuits or the Pope won him Calvinist approval. Indeed, he was a vocal opponent of associating England with Catholic crowns and spoke out against James I's attempt to wed his son Charles to the Spanish Catholic princess.⁵³ He began his sermon by quoting from Jeremiah, followed by a direct comparison between Israel and England: "*Israel & England, though they lie in a divers climat, may be said right Paralels; not so unfit in Cosmographicall as fit in Theologicall comparison. And saving Israels Apostacie, and punishment for it, wee neede not thinke it harsh to be sampled.*"⁵⁴ Adams thus commenced his sermon by remarking on differences in climate and geography and then dismissing those variances in favour of theological discussion. As seventeenth-century England had started to identify itself as a "second Israel" the use of the original Israel as form of comparison and

⁵² Ibid., 85.

⁵³ J. Sears McGee, "Adams, Thomas (1583-1652), church of England clergyman," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, <http://www.oxforddnb.com.proxy.queensu.ca/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-131>

⁵⁴ Thomas Adams, *Englands sicknes, comparatively conferred with Israels Divided into two sermons*, 1615, STC (2nd ed.) / 114, 1-2.

warning is unsurprising.⁵⁵ Even while Jerusalem was viewed as an idealized city for the English populace to strive toward becoming, preachers were constantly using the city as a warning as well for the dangers of rejecting Christ and committing egregious sins. Adams also discussed why Jerusalem was recognized as feminine, because “*Israel’s* offspring, must be a *Daughter*, that she may be married to the God of *Israels Sonne*. *Christ* is the *beloved*: the *Church* is his *Spouse*. *My beloved is mine, and I am his*.”⁵⁶ Here, Adams used the words from King Solomon’s Song of Songs concerning betrothal and marriage to describe Christ’s relationship with the Church, which must be feminine. In this way, Adams continued a precedent of presenting the relationship between God and England as one of marriage. Referencing Augustine directly, Adams then claimed that the union was in heaven, as heaven was Christ’s location.⁵⁷ Augustine and the scriptures remained the primary sources of his sermon; each reference was available on the margins for curious readers to search up for themselves if they were so inclined. Having spent the earlier part of his sermon declaring the relationship between God, Jesus and the feminine Israel, he established his connection to early church eschatology and its relationship with Jesus before connecting that to England.

Adams then separated the terrestrial Jerusalem from the heavenly one. He described that “The *Leaprosie* kept men but from the fading citie, terrestriall Ierusalem. This *Leaprosie* unpurged by repentance restraines men from that *Ierusalem* which *is above*; a *city built upon Iaspers and Saphyres and pretious stones*; flowing (in stead of *milke and hony*) with blisse and glorie.”⁵⁸ Here Adams emphasized the Christological nature of this heavenly Jerusalem. Rather

⁵⁵ Adam Sutcliffe, “The Philosemitic Moment? Judaism and Republicanism in Seventeenth-Century European Thought,” in *Philosemitism in History*, Edited by Jonathan Karp and Adam Sutcliffe (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 69.

⁵⁶ Adams, *Englands sicknes*, 3.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 4.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 94.

than it consist of the milk and honey that Jewish texts use to describe Israel and Jerusalem, Adams supplanted that image with a quote from the Book of Revelations concerning the precious stones, bliss, and glory that make up this new Jerusalem in heaven. While the Jerusalem on earth could be struck with disease and was susceptible to destruction, the heavenly Jerusalem was susceptible to a different and more dangerous type of sickness. With Christian acts of repentance, it could be saved, yet Adams warned that “spirituall sickness is more bitter than corporall.”⁵⁹ Thus he brought the conversation back to his warning for England, in that it would become spiritually sick if it continued to refuse to revise its ways.

In another sermon, *Heaven and Earth Reconcil[e]d*, given in 1612 and printed in 1613, Adams took on the role of the prophet Daniel, discussing the state of Jerusalem and his desire to have the city be rebuilt. In what appears to be a moment of vulnerability, Adams explained his eagerness to rebuild Jerusalem: “I confesse, it would be a ioyfull day to me, to see the breaches of Jerusalem made up again.”⁶⁰ Notably, the King James Bible version of Daniel 9:25 states that the “commandment to restore and build Jerusalem unto the Messiah the prince shall be seven weeks, and threescore and two weeks: the street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times.” Unlike Daniel, Adams took a less enthusiastic approach to the restoration of Jerusalem. He also did not appear to be calling for a crusade to Jerusalem, but rather for actions to be taken within England to go about rebuilding the structures of a heavenly Jerusalem. While Daniel also provides certain numerical expectations for when this will happen, Adams instead warned of the danger of the Church going to ruin. He appeared to be withholding from embracing an outlook as confident in its timeframe as Daniel’s, which may be attributed to the

⁵⁹ Ibid.

⁶⁰ Thomas Adams, *Heaven and Earth Reconcil’d* (London: W.W., 1613), 22.

fact that self-identified prophets were viewed with suspicion by the clergy.⁶¹ Rather, even while beginning his sermon with a small section of Daniel, and using similar language desiring a restoration of Jerusalem's fortifications, Adams did not go so far as to call himself another Daniel or to speak with the conviction of an important prophet. Instead, he broached the topic of this spiritual restoration near the end of his sermon and concluded with a lament of the work that still needed to be done to shine a light onto the world. At this point for Adams, a complete spiritual reconstruction of Jerusalem still appeared to be out of reach due to the limitations of his own audience and their convictions.

In another sermon, printed in 1619, Adams continued to emphasize the otherworldliness and ethereal nature of Jerusalem. He described the city as "mystical," and discussed possible origins behind the name.⁶² Adams included references from Hebrews, Galatians and Corinthians to emphasize that Jerusalem, even as an earthly city, was a "city of Peace" following with the statement that "Gods church is a Church of peace."⁶³ It is notable that the verse from Hebrews 7:2 that he cited which refers to Jerusalem as a city of peace is also about the biblical King Melchizedek: "Melchizedek was king of Salem, that is, King of Peace." The fact that this sermon was delivered within the first half-decade of James I's reign may reflect a relationship between the two kings. James aimed to gain a similar reputation as Melchizedek, who was represented favourably as the king of the city of peace, his name deriving from the Hebrew words for King (Melekh) and Righteous (Tzedek). While this was still early in his reign, Adams may have been gesturing towards what James could become rather than what he already was. Considering that

⁶¹ Alexandra Walsham, *Providence in Early Modern England*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 214.

⁶² Thomas Adams, *The happines of the church, or, A description of those spiritual prerogative where with Christ hath endowed her considered in some contemplations upon part of the 12 chapter of the Hebrewes*, (London: GP, 1619), 31.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, 32.

when this sermon was published, there were hopes amongst more radical clergy for further reform that James would introduce with his reign. The reverend Lancelot Andrewes (1555-1626), a Hebraist who grew up under the Elizabethan regime and preached throughout the Jacobean regime expressed similar sentiments. In a sermon preached in front of James himself, Andrewes said the following about a righteous king: “If he be a *righteous King*, as *Melchisedek, King of righteousness*: If he *sow the fruit of righteousness in peace . . . that is a peaceable King*, as *Salomon*: If he Rule *Per Me* (that is) *Per Sapientiam . . . Those are Per Me propitium*; Those are Kings *primae intentionis*, Kings of special favour.”⁶⁴ This work, published after the death of James on the order of his son Charles reflected the continued tradition from those such as Andrewes and Adams who advocated for a godly kingdom under a ruler reminiscent of those found within the Bible. Adams and Andrewes were among the many who hoped for England to be a holy nation with a righteous king leading it closer toward holier practices.

As with Stockwood, Adams also created a distinct divide between the heavenly and the earthly versions of Jerusalem: “This city is on earth, but not of earth.”⁶⁵ Similar to the Church fathers preceding him, Adams also engaged in the act of lessening the importance of the physical state of Jerusalem. Even the Roman occupation was not one of just physicality; Adams echoed Paul the apostle’s claims that it was allegorical as well. Adams then explained how Jerusalem’s heavenly character reflected the three main creeds of the church: “The word above indicates that she is *holy*; the word *mother* that she is knit in *communion*. The word *Of all* that she is *Catholicke*.”⁶⁶ The gendering of Jerusalem as female was thus important to Adams as well to

⁶⁴ Lancelot Andrewes, “A Sermon Preached before the King’s Maiestie, at White-Hall on the V of November. A.D. MDCXIII,” in *XCVI Sermons by the Right Honourable and Reverend Father in God, Lancelot Andrewes, late lord Bishop of Winchester. Published by his Majestie’s Special Command* (London: George Miller, 1629), 939.

⁶⁵ Adams, *Happiness of the Church*, 33.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*

indicate the emphasis on communion that all Christians shared. By gendering it as not only female, but as mother and provider, Adams demonstrated the centrality of the heavenly Jerusalem in his belief system. He placed this centrality in contrast with the unimportance of the physical city which could not provide for the people of the church and the people of England in the same capacity as the heavenly city. He warned that Jerusalem was able to be threatened on a spiritual and allegorical level as well, which made reform and unity as a united and holy English nation all the more important to ensure the wellbeing of Jerusalem and perpetuation of the true faith.

English preachers gendering Jerusalem as female continued a tradition that predated Catholicism and drew instead from Hebrew sources and prophets such as Isaiah. As Christl Maier has said, the female personification of a city is due to the comparative aspects that patriarchal society draws between the two: mainly that “cities, like women, can be desired, conquered, protected, and governed by men.”⁶⁷ Perhaps no other city on earth has been more desired than Jerusalem, and the preachers that deployed these feminine aspects adhered to those power structures that viewed Zion and Jerusalem as something to be owned and conquered by men and deity alike. Indeed, gendering Jerusalem as female provided the city its own relationship between the population and God as well.⁶⁸ Isaiah, a great inspiration to reformers from Luther to Calvin to English preachers, described Zion as “in labour, she gave birth to her children.”⁶⁹ While Maier’s argument goes on to describe the several feminine features attributed to Zion in Isaiah, the importance lies in the tradition that preachers such as Adams and others later on assigned towards the female body of Jerusalem. Inspired by Isaiah’s works and a church

⁶⁷ Christl Maier, “Zion’s Body As a Site of God’s Motherhood in Isaiah 66:7-14,” in *Daughter Zion: Her Portrait, Her Response*, Ed. Mark J. Boda et. al. (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2012), 228.

⁶⁸ Ibid.

⁶⁹ Ibid., 230. Maier cites from Isaiah 66:8.

tradition that continued to feminize Jerusalem and Zion, Jerusalem as female is an important aspect of continuity from the prophetic tradition that inspired many English preachers.

Toward the end of his sermon, Adams posed a question to his audience: “What cause have we to bless our GOD that hath brought us from Babylon to Ierusalem, out of darkness into his marvelous light, from the Romish synagogue to the General Assembly, and church of the first born which are written in heaven?”⁷⁰ Referring to the English Catholics who were still allowed to reside in Jacobean England, Adams questioned why God should be thanked for delivering England to the true church, from Babylon to Jerusalem, when Roman Catholic worship still existed in the country. Comparing the “Romish synagogue” to the sins of Babylon, Adams acknowledged that England was practicing the proper form of worship, yet still called for more action to be taken to ensure that all of England practiced the true and correct faith. The theme of exiting Babylon for Jerusalem was common throughout the sermons that have been referenced; the sermons presented a clear dichotomy between Babylon and Jerusalem to criticize the failures of Elizabethan and Jacobean religious policies. Paul Christianson identifies John Bale, an early reformer during Henry’s reign, as one of the first English reformers to introduce the concept that Protestantism (not English-specific) represented a New Jerusalem opposing the pope/antichrist representing the basely Babylon.⁷¹

For many reformers, this dichotomy proved useful to make England the New Jerusalem and to continue to criticize the Elizabethan settlement and Jacobean church for refusing to move far away enough from the temptations of Babylon; papal adherents were still known to live amongst them. Reformers drew from Lutheran and Calvinist traditions which vilified Rome

⁷⁰ Adams, *Happiness of the Church*, 71.

⁷¹ Paul Christianson, *Reformers and Babylon: English Apocalyptic Visions from the reformation to the eve of the civil war* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1978), 9, 15, 20.

within the context of discussing Jerusalem and Babylon. In Luther's 1520 letter, *The Babylonian Captivity of the Church*, he claimed that ". . . the papacy is the kingdom of Babylon."⁷² Later on Luther referenced both Isaiah and Amos to discuss the place of Jerusalem: "I would cry out with Isaiah: 'Ye scornful men, who rule over my people that is in Jerusalem' [Isa. 28:14]; and with Amos: 'Woe to you that are wealthy in Sion, and to you that have confidence in the mountain of Samaria: ye great men, heads of the people, that go in with state into the house of Israel.'⁷³ Aligning himself with two prophets, Luther's letter continued by aligning the papacy with the sins of Babylon. He then took the position of a prophet to speak of the evils that were set upon Jerusalem, but also the potential for greatness as well. Luther, a former Augustinian monk, would have been well-acquainted with Augustine's positions on the heavenly city and had incorporated those ideas into his own perspective. John Calvin's commentaries on Isaiah were especially influential to English reformers as well; he dedicated the 1551 edition of his commentaries to Edward VI, and the 1559 edition to Elizabeth.⁷⁴ Calvin compared the restoration of Israel to the ongoing Reformation in Europe,⁷⁵ and the influence of his commentaries on Isaiah reflected his impact on English preachers. English preachers continued to quote from Isaiah and adopted similar roles to both Luther and Calvin as Old Testament prophets providing guidance and wisdom from a position of authority and with the permission of God. For Adams, following in this tradition, the physicality of Jerusalem was no longer important, just as England's physicality transcended the importance of his message. Rather, if England were to be the spiritual successor to Jerusalem, Adams argued that it must challenge

⁷² Martin Luther, "The Babylonian Captivity of the Church (1520)," In *Works of Martin Luther, Vol. II* (Philadelphia, A.J. Holman, 1916), Retrieved from Gutenberg.org

⁷³ Ibid.,

⁷⁴ Raymond A. Blacketer, "Commentaries and Prefaces: The Old Testament Commentaries and Lectures," in *The Calvin Handbook*, Ed. Herman J. Selderhuis, Trans. Henry J. Baron et al. (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2009), 188.

⁷⁵ Ibid.

those of the “hidden [Roman] Church”⁷⁶ in order for England to become the spiritual center that it ought to be. The original Jerusalem fell because of a lack of belief in the true faith and a wary Adams warned his audience of England’s potential to fall under the same conditions of division and improper belief and practice.

While Adams spent a significant amount of time describing the differences in the spiritual and physical Jerusalem, he did not go into a great amount of detail pertaining to the actual destruction of Jerusalem. While Jerusalem had developed a Christian tradition after the destruction, put in place by the emperor Constantine’s mother Helena, Protestant Elizabethan and Jacobean preachers expressed little to no interest in the physical holy spaces in the city. However, other preachers during the reign of James did discuss the Jewish contribution to the destruction of Jerusalem and how that in turn led to the rise of the heavenly city. The preacher Walter Balcanquhall discussed the heavenly city constantly. Born in Edinburgh in 1586, he rose to prominence later in life under James’s son Charles; his sermons preached during James’s reign reflected on how the physical Jerusalem could be interpreted without the use of Jewish text, but rather based on Jewish actions (or lack thereof) instead. Significantly, this approach was best presented in his sermon preached at St. Mary’s Spittle in London in Easter of 1623. As Easter is a time of contemplation for the death and resurrection of Christ, Balcanquhall’s sermon considered Christ’s death within the greater context of Jerusalem’s destruction. He assigned the blame for the destruction to Jewish crimes and then detailed the differences between the Jewish Jerusalem in ruins and the Christian Jerusalem in heaven.

Rather than focus on the Jewish connection to Jerusalem, Balcanquhall referred to how the “distraction of heart hinders the building of Jerusalem.” He then urged his followers to “Bend

⁷⁶ Adams, *The happiness of the church*, 71.

all your forces against them [Atheists and Papists], that make breaches in the walles of Sion; and seeke, ensue, procure the Peace of Jerusalem, who is the only Daughter of her Mother, and Spouse of Her Saviour.”⁷⁷ Balcanquhall discussed Jerusalem in the spiritual context, blaming atheists and papists for its downfall. As Alexandra Walsham

notes, the term “atheism” was used to cover a large swath of abuses, and by discussing both atheists and papists, Balcanquhall left out no one who may have been accused of beliefs that threatened the English Protestant settlement.⁷⁸ He also referred to England’s own internal disputes with its Catholic citizens. For a spiritual Jerusalem to be built in England, the resistance from English Catholics loyal to the pope must be stopped according to Balcanquhall. He also utilized the same language as Stockwood and Adams, portraying Jerusalem as the female daughter of Israel and spouse of Christ. This feminization built upon the idea of domination over Jerusalem as a feminine city to be owned by a patriarchal God with a distinctly Christian character. The male preacher thus employed his voice to send a message to protect the feminine spiritual city against the attacks on its walls from those who threatened its existence. Notably, he did not refer to Jewish people directly in this section of the sermon. As England was free of practicing Jews at this point, the internal enemies consisting of Catholics and possible atheists were the most prominent threat, especially since Balcanquhall’s sermon was delivered in the years following the negotiations of James I to marry his son Charles to the Spanish Catholic princess. However, while Balcanquhall’s discussion did begin with reference to the spiritual

⁷⁷ Balcanquhall, Walter, *A Sermon Preached at St. Maries Spittle on Monday in Easter Week the Fourteenth Day of April 1623* (London: FK for John Budge, 1623), 8.

⁷⁸ Walsham, *Providence in Early Modern England*, 30.

Jerusalem, the physical still formed a place of importance within his sermon as a warning to his audience of the dangers of not listening to the word of God and not following the true church.

Balcanquhall referred to the “proud buildings, and stately Towers” of Jerusalem before stating how “Titus and Vespasian would not leave one stone of them above another.”⁷⁹ By associating the physical Jewish Jerusalem with pride and pomp, Balcanquhall used Jesus as the modest and simple contrast to the sinning city accentuating how destruction was foreseen by the figure who was killed within it. After the death of Jesus, he described the hearts of the Jews to be “untouched” and then referred to those in the “traitorous city” not weeping and mourning the death of Christ.⁸⁰ He conflated the Jewish people with their city as both being traitorous to Christ for contributing to or being the site of his death, and then heartless and traitorous for refusing to mourn afterwards. He immediately followed this critique of the Jewish people and Jerusalem by referencing how Jews did mourn for their city while in exile in Babylon.

While Balcanquhall is evidently quite critical of the Jewish choice to mourn a city rather than Jesus, he framed it in a way to diminish the importance of the physical space in favour of the heavenly. Whereas Jews in the bible mourned the loss of their city from Babylon, Balcanquhall explained that they should have instead been conceiving of the heavenly Jerusalem, which was only made accessible after the death and sacrifice of Christ. This argument functions on multiple levels, for while the physical aspects of Jerusalem from Christ’s lifetime were dilapidated, if not entirely destroyed, the Jerusalem that the Christians and Jewish people should be devoted toward was the heavenly one. This heavenly city was permanent and immune from earthly disasters and Roman imperial destruction. Bringing his message back to Augustinian

⁷⁹ Balcanquhall, *A Sermon Preached at St Marries Spittle*, 47.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, 60-1.

conceptions of Jerusalem, to Balcanquhall the celestial was free and full of abundant and permanent pleasures while the earthly was in bondage and had fallen to pagan Rome.

Balcanquhall reinforced this idea by associating the physical Jerusalem with the Jewish people. He described the Jewish city as “earthly, old, robbed, spoyled, burned, sacked Jerusalem,” while the Christian Jerusalem was “a Heavenly new one, into which no arrow can be shot, no noyse of the Drum heard, nor sound of the Trumpet, nor calling unto battell: who would not then weepe, to be absent from hence?”⁸¹ The metaphysical emphasis of this otherworldly Jerusalem was very important for this improved city because the Jews who rejected Christ were intentionally excluded. As England still felt threatened by Catholic nations despite James’s efforts to make peace, Balcanquhall encouraged his audience to think of the new Jerusalem as immune from battle. This point digressed from Adams’ note of the types of sickness that could befall a heavenly Jerusalem. Balcanquhall ignored any threats of spiritual sickness and instead noted that war could not occur, and the city could not be sacked like the Jewish Jerusalem. Indeed, he even discussed “rivers of pleasure, which are permanent in the heavenly Jerusalem.”⁸² It is important to note that Balcanquhall’s sermon audience would not have contained any Jews but was rather directed towards a Christian audience who may have required some motivation for continuing to stand against the strength of Roman Catholic Europe. If England was working toward becoming more like the heavenly Jerusalem rather than the Jewish Jerusalem that was exposed to plundering, war, and fear, then all of their deeds would be worth it to reach this heavenly pinnacle presented by Balcanquhall. As such, while Adams’ tone was one of warning to do better and protect the heavenly Jerusalem, Balcanquhall presented it more as a perfect place to aspire to go in the afterlife, as a reward for standing against papist Catholics and atheism.

⁸¹ Ibid., 66.

⁸² Ibid., 65.

While the sermons that have been mentioned thus far have not made a direct connection between England and Israel or London and Jerusalem, John Jones's sermon made such a link. In the appropriately named *Londons Looking Back to Jerusalem*, Jones directly associated London with Jerusalem. Significantly as well, while the sermon was performed originally in 1630, it underwent multiple printings later into the 1630s. It was printed in London by William Jones in 1633 and 1635. Julia Ipgrave notes that Jones' Puritanism in this sermon is an example of a jeremiad sermon,⁸³ which was a specific type of sermon influenced by the lamentations of the prophet Jeremiah. As the 1630s progressed, the jeremiad structure and Puritanical outlook gained more traction within England. Jones' sermon reflected the Puritan sentiment by encouraging higher levels of religious observance, and trying to make people better Protestants, which Arnold Hunt identifies as a main goal of Puritanism by 1600.⁸⁴ The other referenced sermons have also attempted to promote this main goal. In fact, upon discussing providence in early modern sermons, Alexandra Walsham remarks on the fact that Jones' language at the beginning of his sermon is remarkably similar to the language Adams used in his earlier sermon.⁸⁵ Thus, it is clear that these preachers were listening to or at least reading one another's sermons and drawing upon one another's style and scriptural influences. As Walsham states, these preachers had great interest in discussing Jerusalem and its downfall in order to warn England of its own sins.⁸⁶ Jones' sermon attempted to create better Protestants, utilizing the crimes of Jerusalem as a way to warn Londoners of the consequences of sinful actions.

⁸³ Julia Ipgrave, *Adam in Seventeenth Century Political Writing in England and New England* (New York: Routledge, 2017), 67.

⁸⁴ Hunt, *Art of Hearing*, 243.

⁸⁵ Walsham, *Providence in Early Modern England*, 281.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, 312.

Jones treated Jerusalem as a very physical city to look back upon at the beginning of his sermon. Adopting the jeremiad format, he began by quoting Jeremiah 7:12, “But go yee now unto my place which was in Shiloh, where I set my name at the first: and see what I did unto it for the wickedness of my people Israel.”⁸⁷ Substituting the biblical city Shiloh for London, Jones placed London within the biblical narrative while also focusing on the physicality and geography that the prophet Jeremiah would have experienced. In beginning his sermon this way, he established a clear position as a prophet ready to deliver some awe-inspiring and hopefully life-changing words to those experiencing the sermon through listening or reading. He warned his audience that the destruction of Shiloh could easily have befallen Jerusalem as well, for it “was as deeply guilty as ever Shiloh was.”⁸⁸ In the same way, he related this to London’s guilt, for if London was comparable to Jerusalem, then it was subject to the same punishment that Shiloh and then Jerusalem received. The English viewed themselves as a unique nation under a direct covenant with God, just as the Jews were, and as such, they were subject to the same risk of punishment for breaking that covenant.⁸⁹

Throughout his sermon, Jones also aimed to decenter the physicality of Jerusalem, especially while discussing the sins of Jerusalem and the people within it. Jones took the time to establish the fluidity of Jerusalem and holiness before warning his people that this very fluidity also placed their own holiness at risk:

In the New Test[ament], because the Gospell was to be published through the whole world, that distinction of places is taken away; the time is now come, when neither in the mountaine of Samaria, nor yet at Jerusalem, men shall worship God by any such tye. Now every place is so long (no longer) the Temple and habitation of God, as there shall be found in it truth faith and holynesse of life. But where these cease, where superstition and heresie doe corrupt

⁸⁷ John Jones, *Londons Looking Back to Jerusalem* (London: William Jones, 1633), 1.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, 2.

⁸⁹ Walsham, *Providence in Early Modern England*, 305.

faith, and wickednesse succeeds in the roome of holinesse, there the like judgement is to be feared which befell Shiloh, that God will remove his kingdome of grace from such a place or people, and give it to a Nation that will bring forth the fruites of it. Jerusalem might goe to Shiloh, and England may goe to Jerusalem, to learne this lesson, that holiness of a place cannot protect a people ...⁹⁰

The first part of the passage contained an early church argument concerning the New Testament replacing the Old, and thus a new holy nation of gentiles replacing the holy nation of the Jews. Jones did not mention the destruction or ruin of Jerusalem and the Temple in such a direct way. Rather, he warned of the attitudes that led to the destruction, and how just as the elect nature of the people of Shiloh and Jerusalem did not save them from ruin, so too were the people of the holy English nation at risk for ruin if wickedness and heresy continued to run abound. Only a little earlier, Jones spoke out that “We need not with that order of popish priests,”⁹¹ combining the threats of Catholic wickedness from within with the outwardly non-Puritanical English population that had not yet fully embraced the precepts of Calvinism.

The topic of Protestant faith in English historiography is one that has been extensively discussed. This emphasis on faith relates toward how Calvinist preachers would warn of the sins of Jerusalem, aware that they were preaching to an audience who may not necessarily have held the same beliefs that they did. Every Puritan wanted their town to be a ‘New Jerusalem,’⁹² be it London itself, or in the case of the Reverend Richard Greenham, his hometown of Dry Drayton.⁹³ Christopher Haigh’s infamous claim that the Reformation created a Protestant nation but not a nation of Protestants is supported by the ways in which godly preachers such as Jones

⁹⁰ Jones, *Londons Looking Back*, 28.

⁹¹ *Ibid.*, 19.

⁹² Peter Marshall, *Reformation England 1480-1642* (Arnold: London, 2003), 139.

⁹³ Kenneth L. Parker and Eric J. Carlson, *‘Practical Divinity’: The Works and Life of Revd Richard Greenham* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1998), 84.

and Adams attempted to preach in order to encourage a revision in behavior and a change in belief.⁹⁴ By elevating the English nation as godly, which had been a hallmark of English belief since the miraculous events that halted the Spanish armada in 1588, these preachers attempted to instill a sense of fear and belief in a nation that still held on to its medieval Catholic belief system. This old system was now viewed as a threat to the English settlement and soul. As Adams and Jones especially have demonstrated so far, the call to the people of England for further reform was still closely tied with Jerusalem.

While arguing for the spiritual state of Jerusalem, Jones reminded his audience about what happened to the first Jerusalem. He stated, “Heer’s a master peece of Gods justice for sinne: Jerusalem once so glorious is now become a heap of stones, that holy citie, yea, that whole country is now become a ploughed field, layd wast under the feete of pagans; and the place of divine Oratory become a den of Dragons.”⁹⁵ Jones emphasized the totality of the destruction of Jerusalem, as well as the instrument of that destruction: Roman pagans. Whereas the Romans who destroyed Jerusalem were no longer a threat, the Roman church and the pope at the head of it remained prominent dangers. It is worth noting that in living memory of the 1630s, in 1605, James’s approach to Roman Catholics changed after the attempt on his life during the Gunpowder Plot.⁹⁶ Meanwhile, the physical Jerusalem had been under the occupation of various Muslim powers for hundreds of years at this point as well. Thus, Jerusalem maintained dual function in both its physical and spiritual forms. The physical Jerusalem had been destroyed by Roman pagans and was continually occupied by different pagan, non-Christian powers.

⁹⁴ Christopher Haigh, *English Reformations: Religion, Politics & Society Under the Tudors* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), 280.

⁹⁵ Jones, *Londons Looking Back*, 29.

⁹⁶ W.B. Patterson, *King James VI and I and the Reunion of Christendom* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 76.

Meanwhile the spiritual location of Jerusalem, now in London, was under similar threats from Roman Catholic influence. Citing ancient Christian communities in Ephesus, Smyrna and Antioch giving their land to “Turkes and infidels”⁹⁷ Jones warned that similar pollution was right at England’s doorstep as well lest it change its ways and embrace its holiness.

Throughout this chapter, these English preachers have demonstrated continuity with early Church fathers. The emphasis on the celestial Jerusalem, Jerusalem feminized as both mother and daughter and wife, and removing the need for a physical Jerusalem are all themes that carry throughout the sermons. Preachers utilized these themes to position themselves closer to the early church and as enemies of the heretical Roman Catholic pope. Themes of pollution and warning echo from the pages of all of the men, as they took upon roles as English representatives of the prophet Jeremiah. Yet where Jeremiah’s words were intended for an Israelite people in Jerusalem, these prophets preached to a group of new Israelites who were the spiritual replacements of the flawed and misdirected Jews, and the inhabitants of a spiritual Jerusalem should they desire it. These preachers emphasized that further reform was necessary. Often preaching from the most important pulpit in the nation at Paul’s Cross, these preachers often had the monarch’s permission to go in front of a diverse London audience to tell them that they needed to implement further reforms. These types of reform often included revising behavior and practices deemed “popish” and which would incur divine wrath upon the entire nation if they continued.⁹⁸ Simon du Toit has also considered the performative aspect of preaching,⁹⁹ seen especially in the language that the preachers used. Warning their audiences of the potential wrath from God rather than unlimited pleasures of paradise produced a clear motivation for an

⁹⁷ Jones, *Londons Looking Back*, 29.

⁹⁸ Walsham, *Providence in Early Modern England*, 143.

⁹⁹ Du Toit, “The Market for Argument,” 92.

audience to revise its ways, though the effectiveness of these sermons is less certain. It appears that the language and message that these preachers communicated relating to the destruction and subsequent ascension of Jerusalem carried a degree of significance to members of the English population. The scriptures, the early church fathers, and early modern English Protestants calling for more reform all worked within a tradition of Jerusalem's holiness, or lack thereof. The holy city of the Jewish people lost its physicality in favour of a city that served as both a warning for its potential for ruin, but also its aspirations to be a city of paradise for those willing to leave behind the remnants of popish rituals and Roman Catholic beliefs.

Chapter 4

Jews as Source and Hebrew as a Resource: The Soldier and the Sage

For as to the seditions they [the Jews] have been in, and the famine they are under, and the siege they now endure, and the fall of their walls without our engines, what can they all be but demonstrations of God's anger against them, and of his assistance afforded us? . . . And indeed, how can it be esteemed otherwise than a base and unworthy thing, that while the Jews, who need not be much ashamed if they be deserted, because they have long learned to be slaves to others, do yet despise death, that they may be so no longer . . . – Flavius Josephus, *The Wars of the Jews*, Book VI, Chapter I.

The Bible contains detailed descriptions of Jerusalem and the events surrounding the life of Jesus, yet the scriptures were not the only place that preachers drew from to discuss Jerusalem or theological differences with the Jews. Indeed, a number of sermons and tracts produced in the Elizabethan and Jacobean periods referenced Jewish scholars and historians. The primary scholars and texts referenced were from Josephus, Maimonides, and the Talmud. Josephus (37-100) was a Jew who wrote under the auspices of the Roman empire after changing his allegiance to the emperor. The Talmud was an important Jewish rabbinical text outlining Jewish laws; the medieval Jewish sages as Maimonides (app. 1135-1204) famously discussed it in detail in his work the *Mishneh Torah*. This chapter examines how these authors were used in texts produced for an English audience, alongside other Jewish and Hebrew resources. These texts reflect how non-Christian sources could be used by English preachers to reinforce their own beliefs concerning Jerusalem, Jewish tradition, and Christian relevance to those concepts. The place of the Christian Hebraist movement and its transmission from Europe to England will be examined, as well as how the Hebrew language became more important for the narrative of connecting early modern preachers to the primitive church and Hebrew prophets such as Yeshayahu (Isaiah) and Yirmiyahu (Jeremiah). Ultimately, the preachers utilized the historians, rabbis, rabbinic texts, and the Hebrew language to demonstrate their own willingness to commit to an early

church narrative where Hebrew was still valued and treated as an important linguistic resource. Further, the preachers and theologians exhibited how certain Jewish writers and resources could prove useful so long as they strengthened a Protestant Christian message of salvation that they were trying to spread to the English population.

The Christian Hebraist movement arrived relatively late to England and was a product of a northern European humanist movement that encouraged more accurate translations of the Bible. This movement benefited from having Jewish (or formerly Jewish) scholars with an established knowledge in Hebrew to educate Christian scholars. Thus, England was at a disadvantage for having maintained its 1290 Jewish expulsion decree and remaining unwelcoming toward Jews. Even so, influence from Lutheran and Calvinist Hebraist movements were reflected in the texts of later English reformers. Notably, the practice of connecting the Old Testament with the New Testament by placing New Testament messages into the texts of Jewish prophets is a marked aspect of Lutheran scholarship that English preachers utilized as well, and not only with Old Testament texts.¹⁰⁰ Even so, Luther notoriously stated that he was not a Hebraist, but had expressed some regret at not having learned the language when he was younger.¹⁰¹ Jerome Friedman has remarked that Luther often had to turn toward more skilled Hebraists in Wittenberg such as Johannes Forster for clarification on Hebrew translations.¹⁰² Unlike Luther, Calvin had more knowledge in Hebrew,¹⁰³ and applied his Hebrew knowledge in tracts that responded to and targeted Jewish beliefs.¹⁰⁴ Moreover, he utilized Jewish beliefs and

¹⁰⁰ Jerome Friedman, "Luther, Forster, and the Curious Nature of Wurttemberg Hebraica," *Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance*, Vol 42, No. 3 (1980): 612.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*, 613-4.

¹⁰² *Ibid.*, 614.

¹⁰³ William J. Bouwsma, "Explaining John Calvin," *The Wilson Quarterly*, Vol. 13, No. 1 (New Year's 1989): 69.

¹⁰⁴ Stephen G. Burnett, "Calvin's Jewish Interlocutor: Christian Hebraism and Anti-Jewish Polemics During the Reformation," *Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance*, Vol. 55, No. 1 (1993): 114. Burnett focuses on Calvin's tractate, *Response to questions and objections of a Certain Jew (Ad quaestiones et obiecta Judaei cuiusdam responsio)*. Burnett affirms that Calvin utilized this tract to refute and clarify certain theological issues (115).

people to dehumanize Jews and to criticize Anabaptists and Catholics; English preachers employed similar strategies, as Chapter Five will demonstrate.¹⁰⁵ Early English reformers such as William Tyndale drew from both Hebrew and Lutheran inspiration. Tyndale utilized both Luther's German translation as well as some Hebrew sources for his edition of the English Bible in the 1530s.¹⁰⁶ Nevertheless, despite Hebrew type-face remaining unavailable to English printers until 1590, Hebrew books were imported along with bibles translated out of Hebrew by the Christian convert from Judaism, scholar Immanuel Tremellius.¹⁰⁷ Eric Nelson's influential monograph on Christian Hebraism in early modern England recognizes a few English scholars who embraced the Hebraist movement, including Henry Ainsworth, a prolific preacher, and John Selden, a historian and political theorist.¹⁰⁸ Selden especially relied on Josephus's descriptions of the Israelite political system as a source of comparison and inspiration for a political system that placed God as the ultimate sovereign and ruler.¹⁰⁹ While Selden's political analyses form a large portion of Nelson's work, in the present context Josephus will be used to examine his influence on English preachers who were inspired by the Jewish historian for more geographic reasons than Selden's politically focused work.

Josephus was a Jewish historian who wrote in the first century CE, and throughout the Reformation his work was made more accessible for Western European scholars and was valued for its first-hand accounts that described the Temple, the geography of Jerusalem, the political system of the Israelites, and the reasons for the downfall of Jerusalem. While his biases are clear

¹⁰⁵ Ibid., 120-1.

¹⁰⁶ Gerland Hammond, "William Tyndale's Pentateuch: Its Relation to Luther's German Bible and the Hebrew Original," *Renaissance Quarterly*, Vol. 33 No. 3 (1980): 355.

¹⁰⁷ Ian Green, *Print and Protestantism in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 110-111

¹⁰⁸ Eric Nelson, *The Hebrew Republic: Jewish Sources and the Transformation of European Political Thought* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2010), 16.

¹⁰⁹ Ibid., 90.

as with any author,¹¹⁰ he was a valuable resource, and one from whom preachers evidently found inspiration. Preachers often quoted Josephus' descriptions of Jerusalem between passages of scripture. Josephus considered himself to be a diaspora Jew, though he also viewed Jerusalem as an important city and never gave up his Jewish identity despite associating with Roman emperors.¹¹¹ From as early as the beginning of the sixteenth-century, Josephus's works were being translated out of Latin and French and into English, making them more accessible to an increasingly literate population. Peter Morwen published an edition in 1558, while Thomas Lodge's 1602 translation of Josephus was printed throughout the seventeenth-century; both versions were recommended to congregations.¹¹² Peter Auger surmises that based on the numerous plays that borrow from Josephus's narrative, that Josephus was on "the cusp of popular recognition in early modern England."¹¹³ This statement appears to be true from the perspective of preachers and church figures who often cited the Jewish historian. Auger concludes by stating that he does not believe an early modern English audience attending a play would have recognized the name of Josephus despite the respect given to the figure by playwrights in their plays.¹¹⁴ A similar pattern appears when Josephus is referenced by religious figures as well, who were respectful and reverential towards Josephus's authority without expecting their audience to have read *The Wars of the Jews* before attending a sermon.

¹¹⁰ A Hellenized Jew, Josephus sided with Rome during the Wars and thus escaped any punishment and expulsion.

¹¹¹ Tessa Rajak, *Josephus: The Historian and His Society*, 2nd Ed., (London: Duckworth, 2002), 11-12.

¹¹² Peter Auger, "Playing Josephus on the English Stage," in *International Journal of Classical Tradition*, Vol. 23, No 3 (2016): 326. Auger cites the following sources for this information: B. Groves, "'They repented at the preaching of Ionas: and beholde, a greater then Ionas is here': A Looking Glass for London and England, Hosea and the destruction of Jerusalem", in *Early Modern Drama and the Bible: Context and Readings, 1570-1625*, ed. A. Streete, Basingstoke, 2012, pp. 139-55 (146); R. Sowerby, 'Ancient History', in *The Oxford History of Literary Translation in English, II: 1550-1660*, ed. G. Braden, R. Cummings and S. Gillespie, Oxford, 2010, pp. 301-11 (302); P. Burke, 'A Survey of the Popularity of Ancient Historians, 1450-1700', *History and Theory*, 5, 1966, pp. 135-52 (152).

¹¹³ Auger, "Playing Josephus," 328.

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 332.

William Alley was a figure within the early Elizabethan regime who likely did not require an English translation of Josephus. Alley published a work that was meant to be read aloud to an English audience, though not in the form of a sermon. The early Elizabethan regime approved the publication of books such as Alley's that contained references to Josephus, the Talmud, and the Hebrew language. Printed by John Day, who also published John Foxe's *Acts and Monuments*, William Alley's *Ptochomuseion (The Poor Man's Library)* was read publicly at St. Paul's Cathedral in 1560 before making its way into print in 1565 and again in 1571. Alley, the bishop of Exeter until his death in 1570, advocated for conformity to the practices of whatever church an individual chose to attend. He had also attempted to publish a Hebrew grammar book which failed to make it to print.¹¹⁵ Alley was an early example of an English Hebraist who advocated for the study of Hebrew and remained loyal to the Elizabethan settlement. Unlike later figures to be discussed who were avowedly nonconformist and departed England for not becoming reformed enough, Alley worked within the early Elizabethan settlement in order to portray his knowledge of Hebrew and Jewish authors. His work functioned as a primer, or as he puts it, "Poor man's library" in a topic which an early modern English audience perhaps would not have held a wide amount of knowledge. Though his audience is not known, the publication title states that this work was "red publicuely" to an audience potentially learning for the first time about these Jewish topics, and from a Protestant perspective.

In his section on the Qur'an, or the "Alchoran," Alley compared the Qur'an to the Talmud. His description of the Talmud provided a general overview of the text:

[The Talmud is] a doctrine or discipline, conteyning all their [the Jews'] former commentaries, statutes, lawes, and histories, which were collected into one booke by Rabbi[s], written and made as

¹¹⁵ Nicholas Orme. "Alley, William (1510/11–1570), bishop of Exeter," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. 31 Jan. 2018. <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-397>.

some say the yeare after Christ .CCC. other say CL. Galatinus writeth .CCCC. xxxvi. yeares after the burnyng of the second Temple.¹¹⁶

Comparing the Talmud to the Qur'an allowed Alley to place a distinct separation between works produced before and after Christ. Alley's goodwill or positive descriptions of Jews and Muslims began and ended with his description of their holy books, though this initial description appeared to be neutral. Alley presented no indication that he had actually read the Talmud or the Qur'an, but his neutrality would have been beneficial and informative for an audience that may not have known which texts were holy to Jews or Muslims and how those texts fit within the timeline of the arrival of Christ.

Alley also exhibited his Hebrew knowledge in another section, where he described the parentage of the prophet Isaiah, who he called by his Greek name, Esay:

He was the sonne of one Amos, not Amos the prophet, for his name is written with *Ain*, being the first letter, and *Samech*, being the last letter of his name. But Amoz the Father of Esay, is written with *Aleph*, and the last letter is *Zade*. What maner of man this Amoz was, there is no certayne tradition.¹¹⁷

Here Alley demonstrated his knowledge of Hebrew, discussing the letters in their Anglicized forms. Evidently, either the type was not available to provide the Hebrew lettering, or Alley simply preferred to render the letters in a format that could be read by anyone in England even if they did not know Hebrew. Either way, Alley provided a philological explanation for why he believed in a certain parentage for the prophet. Alley's engagement in close readings and attention to detail was encouraged by the Christian Humanist movement, as he demonstrated

¹¹⁶ William Alley, *Ptochomuseion [sic]*. = *The poore mans librarie Rapsodiae G.A. Bishop of Exceter upon the first epistle of saint Peter, red publicely in the cathedrall church of saint Paule, within the citye of London. 1560. Here are adioyned at the end of euery special treatie, certaine fruitful annotacions which may properly be called miscellanea, bicause they do entreate of diuerse and sundry matters, marked with the nombre and figures of Augrime.* 2 (London: John Day, 1560), 30.

¹¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 71.

how his knowledge of the Hebrew language might be applicable for a mainstream Christian audience. His later reference to “Rabbi Kimhi” a medieval Jewish scholar who published Hebrew grammar workbooks reflected the importance of Kimhi throughout Christian Hebraist scholarship. Alley quoted Kimhi in Latin, which meant that he may have received a Latin version of Kimhi’s work. Alley displayed extreme comfort moving between Latin, Hebrew, English and even Greek as he provided a Greek version of a Jewish prophet’s name before analyzing the Hebrew letters and quoting the work of a medieval Jewish scholar. All of this for an audience that most likely had never heard Hebrew letters read out loud before, let alone seen them appear in print in Latin characters.

Josephus was also a prominent source of authority, especially to preachers who wrote and preached to London audiences. Evidence of Josephus’s impact to an English-literate audience comes from John Stockwood’s sermon on the destruction of Jerusalem. On Josephus’s monumental work, *The Wars of the Jews*, Stockwood stated the following:

. . . the book is in English. I would with every man to buie, that reading in him the most fearfull examples of God his wrath upon the people for their sinnes, they may for fear at least, of like punishments be moved to repentance, whereas with the Jewes these figures coulde do no good at all, but they remained still until their last destructions, most abominable wicked creatures.¹¹⁸

While Josephus was not by any means a sanctified figure in any Christian tradition,¹¹⁹ amidst Stockwood’s sermon warning of the dangers of destruction and lack of faith, he used a Jewish historian discussing his own history and people as his main source to relate the Jewish suffering during the destruction of Jerusalem. Moreover, he encouraged his audience at Paul’s Cross to

¹¹⁸ John Stockwood, *A Very Fruitfull and necessary sermon of the moste lamentable destruction of Jerusalem* (London: Thomas Dawson, 1584), 29.

¹¹⁹ Josephus never converted to Christianity. He was a Hellenized Jew, but never left the Jewish faith. However, the first statue of Josephus that was put up in Rome was erected by Christians, according to Rajak, *Josephus*, 229.

buy the work of Josephus, available in English thanks to Peter Morwen's 1558 edition. Rather than only use biblical sources, Stockwood utilized all available resources to describe the suffering of the "abominable wicked" Jews. Rather than dismiss a Jewish author or even a non-Christian piece of writing, Stockwood recognized the value in Josephus's narrative as it supported the absolute level of suffering that the Jews endured at the hands of the Romans. By assigning the Romans as the agents of God destroying the Jews for their lack of faith, Stockwood used this source to support his terrifying claims of the punishment that would await an English populace who refused to undergo further reforms. Stockwood described the future emperor Titus as "the minister of God his vengeance to be executed upon them."¹²⁰ Following and citing the narrative of a Romanized Josephus, Stockwood emphasized that it was pagan Rome working through God that destroyed the Jewish people and their city according to the prophecy of Christ.

So too, John Jones in *Londons Looking Back to Jerusalem* used Josephus as a geographical reference amidst quotes from Numbers, Ezekiel, and Psalms. However, Jones's reference to Josephus also included a sentence in Greek. While it is unclear whether or not Jones read a section of his sermon aloud in Greek or not, it is safe to assume that a large majority of his audience, if not all of them, would not have understood a word of Greek. However, because this was a printed sermon as well, Jones could have been providing his reader with a direct reference from Josephus, who did originally write all of his work in Greek. Josephus's original work was not written in Hebrew, which was not the common language of first century diaspora Jews; Josephus's primary language was Greek. He did write a first edition of *The Jewish War* in Aramaic, though a full version in Aramaic has not been found.¹²¹ Rather, English Protestants, especially within the Jacobean period, viewed Greek and Hebrew as a way to get closer to the

¹²⁰ Stockwood, *A Very Fruitfull and Necessary Sermon*, 29.

¹²¹ Rajak, *Josephus*, 12, 175.

original translation of the Bible or other sources.¹²² Jones used Josephus for geographical descriptions of Jerusalem as well as for information about the Jewish actions that were taken during the war:

Because of the beauty and glory of it, *Iosephus*, speaking of this matter, saith: they placed the sacred Tabernacle in the Citty of *Shiloh*, and sets downe this as the reason of ... Secondly, Because of the convenience of it for the whole people to meet there, being seituate [look up] about the midst of the land of promise, as I said not above sixe miles distant from *Ierusalem*, which was even in the midst, the navel of the land, as *Iosephus* terms it.¹²³

Here, Jones was quite comfortable quoting Josephus to describe the events in the city. Whereas the Bible and prophets could only be so helpful, he has quite clearly used a Greek version of Josephus to provide extra information regarding the destruction of Jerusalem. Indeed, he even used a term coined by Josephus calling Jerusalem the “navel of the land” which contributed to emphasizing the importance of the city for both geographical and spiritual reasons. Chapter Three has already discussed the spiritual importance of Jerusalem, but even here a term was taken from Josephus that was intended to focus on the physical centrality of Jerusalem but was still used by Protestant preachers. Josephus was not simply another source to be used by Jones; rather, he was integral to Jones’s argument and a valuable resource that Jones took advantage of multiple times to describe the city as it would have looked to Jesus, and the destruction it suffered after its residents rejected Christ. Biblical and historical accounts worked in harmony under Jones while Josephus’s Jewish past was never mentioned; preachers valued him due to his contributions originally written in Greek and proximity to Rome while neglecting his Jewishness.

¹²² W.B. Patterson, *King James VI and I and the Reunion of Christendom* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 46.

¹²³ John Jones, *Londons Looking Back to Jerusalem* (London: William Jones, 1633), 9.

Meanwhile, preachers from as early as the Elizabethan period also cited from religious Jewish texts that had been written after the fall of the Temple, and thus fell outside the range of appropriate books to be studied alongside the New Testament. The Talmud, also known as the Oral Torah was a hallmark of rabbinical Judaism and contained extra laws and post-exilic concerns that fell outside of the range of the Written Torah (*Tanakh*). The early sixteenth-century had established a precedent for using Jewish texts, primarily by the German humanist Johannes Reuchlin (1455-1522). Reuchlin wrote *The Art of Kabbalah* based off of his version of Jewish mysticism and often quoted from Talmudic sages and emphasized the importance of the Hebrew language.¹²⁴ Reuchlin also placed emphasis on the medieval Jewish Hebrew scholar Moses Kimhi, whose dictionary Reuchlin assigned to his own Hebrew students.¹²⁵ Reuchlin's approaches to Hebrew and Jewish sources were criticized heavily. One significant opponent of Reuchlin's was Johannes Pfefferkorn, a Jewish convert to Catholicism who accused Jews of holding ill-will towards Christians. Despite concerns from other Christians, multiple English preachers echoed Reuchlin's humanist approach to the Hebrew language, acknowledging the value of Hebrew sources. However, in his description of Reuchlin, David H. Price discusses the "Christian appropriation of Jewish learning"¹²⁶ which also must be applied to the discussion of English preachers as well. Whereas Reuchlin did have rabbis as instructors and interacted with German Jews, the lack of Jews for English preachers to consult within England did not make their actions any less appropriative of Jewish texts.

Most references concerning Jewish sages and the Talmud did not come from those who considered themselves to be part of the Church of England, but rather from those who rejected

¹²⁴ David H. Price, "Christian Humanism and the Representation of Judaism: Johannes Reuchlin and the Discovery of Hebrew," *Arthuriana* Vol. 19, No. 3. (Fall 2009): 87.

¹²⁵ *Ibid.*, 90.

¹²⁶ *Ibid.*, 84.

the church and left for Europe. Born in 1569, Henry Ainsworth departed from Cambridge without a degree to settle in Amsterdam after he had denounced the teachings of the Church of England as “false and anti-Christian.”¹²⁷ While his controversialist and separatist opinions imply that he would not have been welcomed at Paul’s Cross by Elizabeth or James, his opinions were still embraced by some in England. Published in Amsterdam, his writing made its way across the channel. In his exchanges with the Catholic John Ainsworth,¹²⁸ Henry discussed a variety of arguments concerning his own, purer faith, which happened to involve the discussion of Maimonides and the Talmud. Even while preachers such as Hugh Broughton, William Fulke and Lancelot Andrewes were Christian Hebraists who could function within the English church,¹²⁹ it is important to recognize that there were English Protestants such as Ainsworth who did not adhere to the Elizabethan settlement. Indeed, even while there is evidence that Hugh Broughton studied with Christian Hebraists and Jews within Europe, the same cannot be said for Ainsworth despite his living in the mixed city of Amsterdam. While Broughton’s work will be mentioned later, Ainsworth’s letters will be the first topic of discussion.

While Ainsworth’s beliefs would not have allowed him the opportunity to preach at the main pulpit in London, his words did still hold merit regarding nonconformist, controversialist perspectives that were present in England and the English Protestant diaspora. Moreover, it is significant how those perspectives referenced Maimonides. Born in Cordova in the twelfth-century, Maimonides spent most of his formative years in North Africa, wrote about rabbinical,

¹²⁷Michael E. Moody, "Ainsworth, Henry (1569–1622), separatist minister and religious controversialist," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. 24 Jan. 2018.
<http://www.oxforddnb.com.myaccess.library.utoronto.ca/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-240>.

¹²⁸ There is no relation between the two Ainsworths implied anywhere in the text.

¹²⁹ G. Lloyd Jones, *The Discovery of Hebrew in Tudor England: A third language* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1983), 147, 151, 164.

philosophical and health-based topics.¹³⁰ He was referenced by Protestants primarily for his *Mishneh Torah*, which was a monumental undertaking that combined the laws (halakha) within the Babylonian Talmud, Palestinian Talmud and other rabbinic writings in order to be a “full and sufficient complement of the Written Torah.”¹³¹ For a man who dealt only with Jewish law and Jewish topics, Maimonides came up quite frequently within nonconformist works. In one of his dialogues with the Catholic John Ainsworth, Henry quoted Maimonides as part of his rebuttal. He said the following:

This is your learned Linguists as *Arias Montanus* and others doo acknowledge, and so correct your translation. So the best of Iewish Rabbines, as Maimony, who sayth *Benjamin was written on the Iaseph* [Jasper]: And thus Paul of [The tribe of] Benjamin, hath colour to be the head of the church, as well as Peter.¹³²

The printer of the work, Giles Thorp, was based in Amsterdam and was known for managing the printing press of the separatists such as Ainsworth.¹³³ The cover title of the book mentions that this book was published “for the good of others,” implying that it was meant for an audience in England that Ainsworth wanted to appeal to with his nonconformist perspective. This passage was highly representative of the impact of the Christian Hebraist movement from a Protestant viewpoint. Here Ainsworth responded to a Catholic and corrected him by using the “best of the Jewish rabbines” as a source of refutation. As Chapter Five will demonstrate, it was very rare for Jewish figures to be spoken of with any sort of respect or favourable language, but the fact that

¹³⁰ Herbert A. Davidson, *Moses Maimonides: The Man and His Works* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 28, 75.

¹³¹ *Ibid.*, 197-8.

¹³² Ainsworth, John and Henry Ainsworth, *The trying out of the truth [electronic resource] : begunn and prosecuted in certayn letters and passages between Iohn Aynsworth and Henry Aynsworth; the one pleading for, the other against the present religion of the Church of Rome. The chief things to be handled, are. 1. Of Gods word and Scriptures, whither they be a sufficient rule of our faith. 2. Of the Scriptures expounded by the Church; and of unwritten traditions. 3. Of the Church of Rome, whither it be the true Catholike Church, and her sentence to be received, as the certayn truth* (Amsterdam: Giles Thorp, 1615), 167.

¹³³ Keith L. Sprunger, *Trumpets from the Tower: English Puritan Printing in the Netherlands, 1600-1640* (Leiden: Brill, 1994) 85.

Ainsworth appeared to have held respect toward Maimonides (called Maimony in the text), showed that Protestants were willing to use Jewish figures to refute Catholic viewpoints. Moreover, he utilized a Maimonidean perspective regarding the tribe of Benjamin and the stone Jasper to connect to Paul's legitimacy and place of importance within the church. Thus, even a medieval Jewish writer's works were not immune from Christian appropriation to fit a Christian worldly perspective, and most significantly to assist in refuting the grave errors made by the Catholic Church and its theology.

Ainsworth's citation of Maimonides came from the section of the eighth book of the *Mishneh Torah*, known as "The Book of Temple Service" (*Sefer Avodah*). According to Moshe Halbertal, this book "sets forth the laws related to the Temple and its fixed, public cult as well as the characteristics of the various sorts of sacrifices."¹³⁴ The *Mishneh Torah*, which was produced in Hebrew between 1170-1180 remained a monumental work across the Jewish world, and as aforementioned, was defended by earlier Christian humanists like Reuchlin, who were Catholic. However, Ainsworth's strategy entailed using a Hebrew work by a Jewish sage in order to refute and debate a Catholic to discuss a point on Paul. Indeed, Ainsworth appeared to have criticized his Catholic counterpart's simplistic readings of the scriptures and early Church figures like John of Chrysostom. Rather, Ainsworth, who had demonstrated a desire for a return to ancient practices, used a medieval Jewish figure to correct Catholic errors which he argued were still too far embedded within English religious practice, despite the Reformation.

In other works, Ainsworth also revealed his knowledge and skill in Hebrew that allowed him to read and appropriate works from Jewish writers such as Maimonides. Citing another post-biblical Jewish text, the Talmud (Oral Torah), Ainsworth's letter to another controversialist that

¹³⁴ Moshe Halbertal, *Maimonides: Life and Thought* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2013), 232.

was published by Thorp provided a plethora of references to Hebrew and Hebrew texts. In his letter to another exiled English separatist, Richard Clifton, Ainsworth began with a plea to his Christian readers to reject the popish rituals of the Catholic church, which he had criticized the English church for maintaining. First, citing Maimonides again, Ainsworth discussed the Jewish perspective in his work, making it very clear who he was referencing: “Hereunto we may add out of the Jewish records, how they hold that *Al have leave to circumcise ,yen [even] though it be an uncircumcised person, or a servant, or a woman, or a child, circumcising in the place where there is no man.*”¹³⁵ Ainsworth then immediately connected the idea of circumcision to baptism and baptism’s impact in staving off the effects of the antichrist (the pope). He used a Jewish medieval writer discussing the circumcision traditions within his own religion to connect to the dangers of entering a misleading covenant such as Catholicism. Ainsworth utilized a pattern of reading and taking from Maimonides’ monumental discussions concerning Jewish ritual and covenant and applying them to his own radical concerns. He did so to encourage Christians to refrain from turning to the pope and to instead consider his more radical form of Protestantism.

Ainsworth continued to demonstrate his comfort in both reading Hebrew and applying post-biblical Jewish texts to his own Christocentric frame of mind. Ainsworth also took a direct quote from the Talmud, translating the Hebrew to Latin characters:

And how the Iewes afterward also esteemed of their faith and godlynes, their rabbines testimonies in the Talmud showeth, where they say of the ten tribes, *Ein lahem cheleck leolam haba:* that is, *they have no part in the world to come,* in life eternal; and that *the Lord did put them upon from their land into this world, and will find them unto another land in the world to come.*¹³⁶

¹³⁵ Henry Ainsworth, *An animadversion to Mr Richard Clyftons advertisement [electronic resource] : Who under pretense of answering Chr. Lawnes book, hath published an other mans private letter, with Mr Francis Iohnsons answer therto. Which letter is here justified; the answer therto refuted: and the true causes of the lamentable breach that hath lately fallen out in the English exiled Church at Amsterdam, manifested, by Henry Ainsworth* (Amsterdam: Giles Thorp, 1613), 75.

¹³⁶ *Ibid.*, 95

The belief in “the world to come” (*leolam ha-ba*) is the Jewish concept of the afterlife. This Talmudic discussion is a postbiblical perspective of the loss of the ten tribes of Israel and their exclusion from any part of the afterlife. Simcha Paull Raphael acknowledges that rabbinic literature held multiple views towards the world to come, juxtaposing it against the current world (*olam ha-zeh*), and describing the multiple discussions that occurred over the nature of the world to come and whether it was a collective or individualistic experience.¹³⁷ While Ainsworth quoted rabbinic literature as a method of trying to disprove the faith of Judaism or using it for Christian reasons, he discussed Jewish conceptions of the afterlife which were quite different from Christian ideals concerning salvation, hell and damnation. Having no place in the “world to come” was different than being condemned to hell, but Ainsworth only implied that hell was the punishment for adherents to the antichrist rather than outright argue that in his letter. Indeed, he only seemed to have quoted the Talmud and provided an anglicized translation to once again display his knowledge of Hebrew. He also found a way to transplant Jewish concepts about Jewish tribes into a Christian framework concerning the antichrist and attempted to apply Christian eschatological concepts that simply did not translate well from a rabbinical Jewish source. Nevertheless, an English-speaking audience reading Ainsworth would no doubt have found his level of competency in Hebrew to be impressive, and perhaps even endearing, despite his diversion from the mainstream English church.

Although Ainsworth found it necessary to leave England to practice his form of Protestantism, there were other English-speaking Christian Hebraists who did not leave England right away and who also read and utilized Hebrew in their writings. One such man was Hugh Broughton, whose letters contained direct references to Hebrew. Notably as well, Broughton

¹³⁷ Simcha Paull Raphael, *Jewish Views of the Afterlife* (Northvale: Jason Aronson, 1994), 121, 124, 129.

learned Hebrew from a French Huguenot Hebraist, Anthony Chevallier, who held an appointment at Cambridge while Broughton attended.¹³⁸ Further, Broughton preached in England until a falling out with the Archbishop of Canterbury prompted him to depart from England to Western Europe. In Western Europe he found the opportunity to interact with a wider range of Christian Hebraists and rabbis.¹³⁹ Like Ainsworth, Broughton published from outside of England, though he served an English-speaking community in Middelburg, a town in the Netherlands. Yet, his letter was explicitly for his home community, called *An Epistle to the Learned Nobilitie of England*. In this 1597 letter, he encouraged the Elizabethan nobility to push for a more accurate translation of the bible, though the letter was filled with references to Hebrew, Jewish educators, recent rabbis, and the state of the Christian Hebraist movement in England. Broughton's preacher background shone through in the letter as he implored the nobility to use what he believed to be a more accurate version of the bible.

Near the beginning of his epistle, Broughton analyzed some Hebrew pieces of writing and the Rabbis who studied them:

Iewes would skoph [at] such Hebrew professors; that mark not how fables are made of purpose upon Moses phrasings: that children should better marke them. Thus a Rabbin is feined in the *Talmud* to reason before great *Alexander* against *Egyptians* complayning that Israel robbed them & requiring restitution. The Rabbin objecteth the text as an unskillful man would take it: the dwelling of the children of Israel in Egypt servants more than 430 years: and all their spoyles were little enough for the long service. This fable made for skil of phrase will make us simple, if we be indeed babes.¹⁴⁰

¹³⁸ G. Lloyd Jones. "Broughton, Hugh (1549–1612), divine and Hebraist," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. 27 Jan. 2018.

<http://www.oxforddnb.com.proxy.queensu.ca/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-3585>.

¹³⁹ Ibid.

¹⁴⁰ Hugh Broughton, *An epistle to the learned nobilitie of England. Touching translating the Bible from the original, with ancient warrant for euerie worde, vnto the full satisfaction of any that be of hart* (Middleburgh: Richard Schilders, 1597), 16.

Broughton created a distinction between Jews and the “Hebrew professors” (Rabbis) who were interpreting the Torah within the Talmud. Broughton presented the “fable” as a lesson to his noble audience, banishing rabbinic interpretations to the realm of myth rather than the reality of the Bible. There is an entire class of literature within the Talmud known as *aggadah* (pl. *aggadot*). *Aggadah* consist of a “broad range [of literature] from homilies to anecdotes to interpretations of biblical verses” which were not meant to be understood as Jewish law (*halakha*), but merely a way to learn more about the sages and leaders through stories not meant to be taken as complete truth.¹⁴¹ Thus, within these Jewish texts that Broughton and others referenced were tales that Maimonides and other scholars treated as partial truths, or merely legends which heightened the reputation those sages who wrote the *halakha* that Jews were expected to follow.¹⁴² Whether Broughton treated all of the Talmud as myth or only the same sections that Jewish scholars viewed as *aggadot* is unknown. He stressed the importance of reading the texts while also dismissing their content as something that the nobility should not believe. Though the events in Exodus of the Jews departing from Egypt belong in the realm of “truth” being part of what Broughton recognized as the “Old Testament,” he interpreted the Talmud, or at least significant parts of it, within the realm of myth created by Hebrew scholars who produced tales to apply them to the Bible. Thus, quite early on Broughton used his Hebrew background to exhibit his knowledge in Talmudic interpretations before dismissing them into the realm of mythical extensions of the events that occurred in Exodus.

Broughton used this interpretation on the same page of the printed letter to criticize Elizabeth’s government while also discussing the state of Hebrew scholarship within England. On topic of falsehoods and myth, he said:

¹⁴¹ Shulamis Frieman, *Who’s Who in the Talmud* (Northvale: Jason Aronson, 1995), xi.

¹⁴² *Ibid.*, xiii.

And furthermore, this one thing should be sufficient to urge amendment, that none of our nation read that, but we are deceived or grieved: and weakened in zeal to religion. Wherefore they must lay their hand upon their mouth, that say, The Queen will not have the translation bettered. Her majesties footmen know that shee sent an othergates worde to Sir *Francis Walshingham*, even to consider of furthering the matter: and Bishop *Elmer* [Aylmer], the best Ebreccian of all the Bishops, was very earnest with myselfe to take the matter in hande: and deserveth this mention of honouring Gods word. Now that the good, of Bibles . . . be not in any part hindered, which lightly are not faultie but where Papists erred before, I will rather touch observations which falsifie the text, and make men to holde it corrupt.¹⁴³

This passage covered a lot of subjects in relatively few words; censorship, the Hebraist movement in England, the validity of biblical translations and the crimes of papists are all topics of these few sentences. 1586 printing decrees had enforced conservative censorship laws upon England, limiting printing to London, Oxford and Cambridge, and restricting the number of printers, all under the authority of the Queen and her representatives.¹⁴⁴ Writing from the relative comfort of the Netherlands, and publishing an English-language letter from overseas allowed Broughton to take some liberties that may not have been available to those publishing within England proper. This is an important factor to consider, and something that Broughton realized as well. He could criticize the limitations that he saw Elizabeth as enforcing while avoiding having to handle censorship or publication limitations.

Broughton also recognized the English Hebraist movement that existed without him there, through the figure of Bishop John Aylmer. Aylmer had never attempted to be at the center of controversies or respond to any controversial works such as Edmund Campion's pro-Catholic

¹⁴³ Ibid.

¹⁴⁴ Cyndia Susan Clegg, *Press Censorship in Elizabethan England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 58.

tracts.¹⁴⁵ If not for Elizabeth taking the crown after Mary, it was likely that Aylmer would have assumed a Hebrew chair at a university in Saxony.¹⁴⁶ As such, it appears as though Aylmer was a very strong scholar in Hebrew, but chose to return to England and serve in Elizabeth's church. It is interesting that a talented Hebrew scholar such as Aylmer seemed to have refused to cause too much of a stir within the Elizabethan church while maintaining relationships with controversialists who refused to stay within a settlement that they did not view as reformed enough. However, by the time Broughton wrote the letter, Aylmer was dead and thus immune from any consequences of having been mentioned by his nonconformist friend.

Broughton also took the opportunity to criticize the crown for not having adopted a more accurate translation of the Bible. As part of a community of Christian Hebraists who valued translating the Bible from Hebrew rather than the error-riddled Greek and Latin versions, Broughton placed blame on where the "papists erred" and called for a better translation. Having just spent part of his letter analyzing Hebrew-language materials, Broughton emphasized his interest in having English people read religious texts that better represented the original intentions harkening back to the ancient church. However, in his position overseas, Broughton criticized the Elizabethan church for continuing to have a "papist" translation of the Bible that still contained errors. These errors again referred to the falsehoods that the pope and his followers were spreading as alleged followers of the anti-Christ. While Broughton recognized his own position of powerlessness on the continent, he targeted his letter to those who held a position of power within England to hope to encourage change. Lloyd Jones's *The Discovery of Hebrew in Tudor England* points to evidence that noblewomen learned Hebrew in the Tudor

¹⁴⁵ Brett Usher, "Aylmer, John (1520/21–1594), bishop of London," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. 29 Jan. 2018. <http://www.oxforddnb.com.proxy.queensu.ca/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-935>.

¹⁴⁶ Ibid.

period, and adds that an emphasis on the study of the language never really expanded beyond support from Hebraists and churchmen.¹⁴⁷ While exiles returned to the Elizabethan regime with education in Hebrew studies from Christian Hebraist and Jewish scholars, the Elizabethan settlement never seemed to have taken full advantage of this influx of Hebraic scholars. Those Hebrew scholars who were unhappy such as Ainsworth and Broughton simply left. Yet despite leaving England for the reasons they did, by continuing to publish in English and appealing to English audiences, both men exhibited a continued passion for reform in England. Ainsworth and Broughton also imbued their scholarship with Hebrew references and responses from post-biblical Jewish sources that could be used to appropriate Jewish scholarship for Christian readings or to dismiss Jewish interpretations as mythical and thus easily dismissible as Jewish superstition.

This chapter has traced the path that the Christian Hebraist movement took from England beginning with Elizabeth's reign. Though scholarship and scholars had been in the country beforehand, the influx of continental exiles who had studied under Jewish scholars returning to England enhanced the movement with a new passion for Hebrew. Scholars such as William Alley held public discussions in London concerning Jewish works such as the Talmud, scholars like Maimonides, and historians such as Josephus. Scholars engaged with the Hebrew language in front of a broad population of the English people and were thus able to introduce a language and analyses that would not have been as popular under Henry or Mary. Under preachers such as John Stockwood, the Jewish Roman historian Josephus was used beyond the stage and was quoted between passages of scripture. This interspersing of scripture and a Jewish historian explored this renewed use of a Jewish historian to examine concepts related to Jewish history,

¹⁴⁷ Lloyd Jones, *Discovery of Hebrew*, 240, 244.

Jerusalem, and the period immediately following the death of Christ. In the same vein as Stockwood, John Jones invoked Josephus in *Londons Looking Back to Jerusalem*, directly quoting what the historian had to say about the physical aspects of the land. Despite his religious background, Josephus was treated as a figure of authority regarding the physicality of Jerusalem, which he had seen firsthand. Whereas the scriptures served as a source of divine inspiration, the preachers use Josephus's grounded narrative to support the words of the prophets and as an alternative voice of authority within the sermons.

Josephus was relatively popular in comparison to texts such as the Talmud and Maimonides' *Mishneh Torah* which demanded a relatively high skill level in Hebrew, inspired primarily by the grammar books of medieval rabbi Moses Kimhi. Rather than reflect a disruption from the medieval period, the Christian Hebraist movement was influenced by medieval scholars who continued to impact how early modern humanists interpreted texts within a Protestant context. It is also significant that the scholars who engaged most critically with Hebrew rabbinic texts were ones who had left England for holding controversialist views that they decided were irreconcilable with the English faith. However, their tracts and letters printed in the Netherlands were intended for an English audience and often encouraged that audience to push for further reform within the Church. The threat of papists always loomed heavily in these texts, and Hebrew texts were used to respond to and delegitimize Catholic interpretations of scripture and theology. Thus, preachers and theologians viewed Jewish historians and scholars as quite useful for strengthening their own arguments and criticizing the errors of Catholicism. At the same time, most of these texts also included negative and unfavourable language to describe Jewish people, which will be the subject of the next chapter.

Chapter 5

Those Miserable, Devilish Hebrews: Descriptions of biblical and contemporaneous Jews

All which heavenly graces, albeit you miserable Hebrews will not acknowledge, and most disdainfully do blaspheme in your synagogues, the angel of the everlasting testament, having regard to the part of him only, wherein he seemeth weake according to the utter appearance and dispensation of the flesh by reason of his death and burial:”- John Foxe, A Sermon Preached at the Baptism of a Jew (pg 118)

The method of insulting Jews that preachers deployed in their sermons did not begin or end with the English Reformation. Rather, the negative portrayals of Jewish people were part of a long tradition within English history dating back to before Jews were expelled in 1290. Blood libel, the accusation made against Jews performing ritual murder on Christians as well as “wandering Jew” stereotypes originated in England.¹⁴⁸ Despite the Jewish expulsion, tales of Jews using Christian blood to bake their unleavened bread and capturing Christians for other nefarious rituals continued within England and has continued to influence contemporary antisemitism. Elizabethan and Jacobean preachers were more distinct since these preachers delivered their sermons within a period where the divide between Catholicism and Protestantism was made more prominent. The Protestant emphasis on the ancient church contributed to how preachers described and discussed Jewish people within a biblical and contemporaneous context. Although the majority of sermons discussed the biblical errors of the Jews, preachers also linked the degradation of biblical Jews with their contemporary early modern descendants who maintained what English preachers believed to be an erroneous rejection of Jesus Christ. The distinctions between biblical Hebrews and their European Jewish descendants were blurred and made less distinct. This chapter traces the use of adjectives that preachers used to describe Jews

¹⁴⁸ Bernard Glassman, *Anti-Semitic Stereotypes without Jews: Images of Jews in England, 1290-1700* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1975), 17.

for having rejected Christ. Additionally, an examination of the words used to describe Jews, Turks (who are utilized as a stand-in to represent the entire Muslim world), and “papists” reflects the relation and conflation amongst those groups rejected by the English Church. All three groups were perceived as threats to the English reformation and Christendom in varying ways. The intersections in how they were described is fundamental for understanding the place of Jews in the English sermon and what Reformation preachers chose to say about them from St. Paul’s Cross and other pulpits. This chapter begins by briefly tracing the origins of anti-Judaic sentiments in England before identifying examples within previously discussed sermons alongside others that contain vicious descriptions of the Jewish people in both a biblical and non-biblical context.

In his monograph, *Judaism and the Early Christian Mind*, Robert Wilken uses Cyril of Alexandria (378-444) to examine how the church father’s plethora of anti-Jewish polemic came about. Wilken discusses how factors such as the number of Jews that lived alongside Cyril in Alexandria informed his opinions and perspectives toward Jewish people.¹⁴⁹ Wilken begins his work asking similar questions to this chapter about Jews in the Christian mind. However, he works with a context that is much closer to the early church, more than one thousand years before preachers such as John Stockwood and John Foxe preached against Jews while using similar inflammatory language. As with Wilken’s work, this chapter’s primary preoccupation is with how Christians discussed Jews when Jews were unlikely to be present to defend themselves. As the previous chapters have argued, the English Reformation placed an emphasis on seizing back religious control from the Catholic church which, in the eyes of the English, had corrupted the practices touted by the ancient church and the early church fathers. Cyril’s language and faith

¹⁴⁹ Robert L. Wilken, *Judaism and the Early Christian Mind* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1971), 6-7.

appear to be part of the tradition that English preachers found inspiration in for not only religious purposes, but also in how to portray the errors of the Jewish people in the age of Christ that led to their downfall, diaspora, and supposed curse to wander the world without ever finding a home.

Much like the English preachers of the Reformation period, Cyril did not hold the same opinions towards all Jews. He called Josephus “a man famous and wise” and spoke favourably about the Maccabees.¹⁵⁰ Yet according to Wilken, Cyril would also call Jews “senseless,” “blind,” “uncomprehending,” and “demented.”¹⁵¹ As with the early church fathers such as Cyril, preachers found a way to speak favourably about Jews and Jewish people who they deemed to be useful, such as Josephus, while collectively blaming Jews for the death of Christ and associating Jewish people with a senselessness or lack of knowledge. Not all Jews could be painted with the same brush, but Jews such as Josephus were consistently referenced positively, reflecting how little has changed concerning the Jews who Christians approved of using in their own work. To Christians in both the early church and later, it was incomprehensible to understand why Jews rejected Christ in their right mind, so preachers and theologians placed derogatory and insulting labels upon the majority of them to try and make sense of the senseless.

However, the English preachers were not only inspired from figures such as Cyril. England had developed its own anti-Judaic culture throughout the Middle Ages that was related to the crimes against Christ but filtered through a lens that portrayed Jews as dangerous to contemporary Christians, not only Jesus. Bernard Glassman discusses how even after the 1290 expulsion of Jews from England, the sermons that were delivered afterward continued to preserve and popularize a “crude antisemitism” towards Jews.¹⁵² Glassman later argues that the

¹⁵⁰ Ibid., 58.

¹⁵¹ Ibid., 61. Wilken quotes Cyril’s work *In Lucam, Homily 101*.

¹⁵² Glassman, *Anti-Semitic Stereotypes*, 10.

only time that Puritans referred to Jews positively in sermons was in order to encourage their conversion.¹⁵³ However, the sermons that mentioned Jews come from a variety of Puritans and non-Puritans who functioned with some level of conformity under the English church and appeared to consistently refer to Jews negatively. There is no significant division between how conformist and nonconformist Protestants discussed Jews. The section of the sermon that this chapter begins with comes from the pen of John Foxe, who delivered a sermon at the conversion of a Jew. Foxe is famously known for his *Acts and Monuments* which provided a martyrology detailing the Christians who had lost their lives in God's name. An exile during the Marian regime, Foxe returned to the Elizabethan religious settlement with a desire to enact further reform than Elizabeth was willing to instate, but he remained an authoritative figure within the Church nonetheless. He wrote a number of sermons that diplomatically called for further reform without criticizing Elizabeth. In this sermon, he turned from reform to what was viewed as a great success within the Reformation. He had convinced a Jewish person to convert to Protestantism. Yet even while he spent a section of his sermon lauding the ability of the Jewish people to choose to convert to Christianity, he could not help but also refer to them as "miserable devilish Hebrews." Foxe was both a major church figure in the Elizabethan settlement and a martyrologist, and his historical knowledge of the Jewish presence in England was prominent throughout his work. While Foxe only really focused on Christian martyrs throughout history, his knowledge of English history with the assistance of chronicles would have included the persecutions and conversions that Jews in England suffered from prior to exile. Indeed, all of the sermons that follow must be understood within both the theological Christian and English historical context. The medieval English history of blood libel and the myth of the "wandering

¹⁵³ Ibid., 153.

Jew,”¹⁵⁴ must be considered alongside the biblical and early church narratives that deemed Jews dangerous, murderous and traitorous for reasons related to Jesus. The medieval narratives built upon and enhanced the early Christian narratives to turn Jews from a biblical people accused of murdering Christ to a real danger to contemporary Christian society, yearning for more Christian blood.

While many of the sermons and documents that have already been discussed contain statements and insulting descriptions towards Jews, there is only one sermon from the Elizabethan and Jacobean periods that was directed towards a Jewish audience. In *A Sermon Preached at the Christening of a Certain Jew*, originally written and preached in Latin under the title *De Oliva Evangelica*, John Foxe preached at the christening of the Jew Nathaniel. A sermon that presumably should have ostentatiously praised Jewish people in the hope of encouraging more to convert could not help but to continue to perpetuate negative stereotypes against the Jewish people. Foxe displayed no sign of halting the accusations that had been made against Jews since the death of Jesus. As Sharon Achinstein has said, Foxe’s descriptions of Jews were inconsistent and contradictory.¹⁵⁵ Foxe began by appearing to be welcoming to Jews, but as his sermon proceeded his perceptions coloured by centuries of blood libel became clearer. This pattern of oscillating between appealing to Jews and then speaking negatively about them was not uncommon among reformers; Luther’s Jewish-positive tract *That Jesus Christ was Born a Jew* gave way to the later *On the Jews and their Lies*. Thomas Kaufmann describes ‘Luther’s Jews’ as the “product of literary sources and inherited biblical traditions” as well as “reflections of a distrust shared by many contemporaries towards a ‘community’ on the fringes of society, to whom all kinds of bad things could be attributed and who aroused feelings of unease and

¹⁵⁴ Ibid., 17.

¹⁵⁵ Sharon Achinstein, “John Foxe and the Jews,” in *Renaissance Quarterly*, Vol. 54, No. 1 (Spring 2001): 92.

security.”¹⁵⁶ As with Luther, Foxe worked from literary sources and a biblical tradition that painted Jews as foreign ‘others’ and who could thus easily be blamed for a litany of unfortunate events. Yet as with Luther, Foxe could also show positivity toward Jews when he wanted to encourage their conversion to Christianity. Relatively early in his sermon, Foxe told his audience that there was no need to reject the Jewish nation:

In the meane space, touching that part that apperteineth to the casting away of the Jewish nation, as many things are conteyned therein worthy not to be negligently overpassed, so this one caution ought diligently to be marked: That no such thought enter into any of our minds, as though the Jewes are so altogether forsaken of god, and dispoyled of ghostly consolation, as that no sparkle of mercie is reserved in store for them to hope upon.¹⁵⁷

Foxe attempted to appeal to a Jewish audience, reminding them that they were not lost from the potential of finding the right path to salvation. In this section, Foxe was particularly informed by the writings of the Apostle Paul, who was often concerned with establishing the differences between Gentiles and Jews and emphasizing the opportunity of spiritual fulfillment for all peoples rather than just the Jews within their particular covenant. Foxe employed Paul’s words to work both ways; just as gentiles in Paul’s time could be received within God’s covenant, now too were Jews open to converting and entering the Christian covenant. Foxe appears to have tried to erase the English stereotypes that portrayed Jews as “forsaken” and without hope. Rather, if Foxe’s model Jew Nathaniel could see the error of his ways and convert to Christianity, then logically any Jew part of the Jewish nation had the potential to accept Foxe’s definition of God’s grace. On the path to encouraging more conversions, making Jews feel accepted would be a primary concern, despite the number of Jews who could even read English in this time period

¹⁵⁶ Thomas Kaufmann, *Luther’s Jews: A Journey into Anti-Semitism*, trans. Lesley Sharpe and Jeremy Oakes (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), 39.

¹⁵⁷ John Foxe, *A Sermon Preached at the christening of a certaine Jew, at London*, trans. James Bell (London: Christopher Barker, 1579), 30.

remaining negligible. More significantly, as the sermon went on Foxe was unable to maintain this façade of positivity towards Jews as his language quickly took on the similar stereotypical language that had been used to describe English Jews since the twelfth-century.

Foxe acknowledged his feelings towards Jewish practices (or at least his perceptions of them) by referring to Temple era rituals involving animal sacrifice. On the topic of Jewish custom of animal sacrifice, Foxe stated the following:

That they [Jews] might persevere still in sacrificing the blood of goates and lambes to the Lorde: And where should this be done: in one family only: But God is not delighted with such sacrifices, nor dwelleth he in the Temples made by men, but even in the very hearts of men: he taketh no pleasure in external pompe . . .¹⁵⁸

This practice of animal sacrifice was something that had not occurred since the destruction of the Second Temple, as Jews had stopped making animal sacrifices because there was no longer a temple in which to carry out the sacrifice. However, Foxe discussed sacrifices as if they were still undertaken regularly, despite him having no frame of reference beyond the Jewish religious texts. Unlike the figures referred to in Chapter Four, as with Luther Foxe did not appear to have shown a desire to learn Hebrew, nor did he take advantage of his time in Europe to study with a rabbi. Rather, his conceptions of Jewish practice appear to be mired in biblical conceptions that portrayed Jews as tribal practitioners of blood sacrifice rituals. If he had read rabbinic texts or taken the opportunity to study with a rabbi, he would have understood that it was no longer something that Jews practiced after the destruction of the Temple. Indeed, Foxe did not even take the opportunity to learn German or French despite living in German lands and had reportedly wanted his sermon translated into German for German Jews to be able to read it.¹⁵⁹ Foxe's

¹⁵⁸ Ibid., 37.

¹⁵⁹ J.F. Mozley, *John Foxe and His Book* (New York: Macmillan, 1940), 57, 95.

limited knowledge of contemporary Jewish practice increasingly gave way to discriminatory language used to portray Jewish life, Jewish practice and Jewish religiosity.

In one of the many moments in his sermon when he addressed a Jewish audience, despite the number of Jews in any audience for this sermon being non-existent, Foxe acknowledged traits that he deemed to be negative in Jews. Writing from the perspective of a Christian who only knew a Christian society, Foxe could not comprehend what could lead Jews to continue to disavow Christ and maintain their erroneous ways. He stated as much to any Jew who may have happened upon his sermon: “What answer doest thou make thou frowarde [sic] nation of the Jewes: what canst thou bring: what canst thou alledge, if not to defend yet to colour at the lesse thy obstinate stubbornness: Hast thou any Scriptures: No surely.”¹⁶⁰ Bernard Glassman recognizes that many preachers continued to call for the conversion of Jews, and that many stories continued to circulate in England after the 1290 expulsion concerning “stubborn” Jews who refused to convert.¹⁶¹ The theme of “stubborn” Jews appeared consistently in the sermons of this period, and was maintained throughout English sermons despite no Jews living in England. This obstinacy was not viewed positively amongst the preachers and echoed throughout other portrayals of Jewish people in English culture such as Shakespeare’s Shylock. Foxe was distinct in that a known (former) Jew was present at his sermon. However, whereas this Jew had already been convinced, other living Jews were still viewed as other and lesser for not having taken the same path as the newly Christian Nathaniel.

Indeed, once Foxe began to address Jews directly (though which Jews remains unclear), his accusations increased, and his claims descended further into classic libelous accusations that were indefensible by virtue of no Jew being present to debate the claims. On Jesus, Foxe asked

¹⁶⁰ Foxe, *A Sermon Preached at the Christening*, 57.

¹⁶¹ Glassman, *Anti-Semitic Stereotypes without Jews*, 29-30.

Jews about their alleged biblical crimes: “And being Jewes borne yourselves, why do you so vylanously persecute your natural kinseman, beyng likewise a Jew borne, and why have you slayne him so cruelly.”¹⁶² Echoing Martin Luther’s tract, *That Jesus Christ was Born a Jew*, Foxe took a similar approach in noting the similarities between Jewish people and the Christian saviour. Yet, he also placed a type of intergenerational blame on contemporary Jews for what their ancestors were accused of doing. Words such as “villainously” and “cruelly” punctuate the text, and the idea of murdering one’s kin involved lasting consequences. Just as Cain killed his kinsman Abel and was punished with the crime of wandering the world, Foxe implied that Jews carried out a biblical-level crime against one of their own. While the brothers are never referred to directly in this section, kin-killing was universally viewed as among the worst actions one could do. This argument also hearkens back to Augustine in Chapter Three, who used a similar comparison between the Jews and Cain for killing one’s kin and being cursed for it by God. Time is irrelevant, as Jews were held accountable for their crimes using incredibly strong language to lambast them for their limitations in character.

The negative language continued later on as the accusations of the attributes that Jews lacked increase in ferocity:

In the parte that treateth of sinnes, the obstinate and unvanquishable rebellion of the Jewes against God and his Lawes: In the second parte, where the wrath of God is spoken of, the Justice of God may be discerned, which will not suffer the wickednes of his people to escape long unpunished.¹⁶³

Here Foxe expanded upon the negative language, adding “obstinate” and “wicked” to describe the Jewish people. He also created a dichotomy between “loyalty” and “rebellion” to God. Using this language allowed Foxe to accept converts like Nathaniel who had realized the futility of

¹⁶² Ibid., 60.

¹⁶³ Ibid., 101.

their resistance and joined the “correct” side, as it were. Foxe also used the justice of God against a people whose scriptures were full of examples of God’s justice being carried out against those who rebelled against His laws. Foxe flipped the perspective to make Jews the subject of God’s wrath, as evidenced by their exile, diaspora and their continued persecution. By colouring their deeds in negative language, Foxe placed both biblical and contemporaneous Jews within the same context and thus subject to the same punishment of dispersion and punishment. Nathaniel was an anomaly for choosing to convert and yet Foxe utilized the opportunity to speak poorly of all Jews wherever they resided who continued to live, in Foxe’s words, as “obstinate.”

Throughout his sermon, Foxe always attempted to distinguish between good Jews like Nathaniel opposed to the ones who refuse to convert. He went so far as to say that many Jews believe in Christ: “There are very many Jewes (as I saide before) which do confesse and professe Christ (as is this one Jewe whome ye see here present at this time) so is the Lord mightie and of power to have compassion upon the remnant, and rayse them up, which are yet forsaken, and trodden under foote.”¹⁶⁴ Nathaniel quite literally became a prop for Foxe to gesture toward when necessary. The sermon was ostensibly preached in honour of his conversion, and rather than give the Jewish figure any sort of voice, he was merely there to give his public acceptance of the word of Christ before being shuttled off to the side. Such a direct reference remaining in the text is also significant because the sermon was initially printed in Latin and translated by another man. The sermon appears to have remained close, if not exactly the same as the version that was delivered with Nathaniel present. Indeed, Foxe’s acknowledgement of the newly converted Protestant is a reminder of the multiple audiences meant to consume the sermon. One was the actual English audience who had likely never met a Jewish person and required the reiteration

¹⁶⁴ Ibid., 202.

that Jewish people were real and open to conversion. The other was any Jewish person who, in Foxe's mind, would hopefully come to their senses and join the Protestant faith.

The idea of senses and feeling were a prominent aspect of Foxe's and other sermons from English preachers. Just a few paragraphs after he spoke of the potential for Jews to convert, Foxe decried those who had not yet converted for their lack of senses: ". . . because wee seeme to stand in better estimation than the Jewes: therefore he [God] would not have us ignorant of this great blindness of the Jewes, as the which neither happened to all the Nation in general, but in part, upon Israel. . . . Jews shall be restored againe, if I not be deceived."¹⁶⁵ Palle Olsen states that Foxe's perspective on salvation was aligned with many other contemporary theologians as well as medieval ones, believing in a "correspondence, between the histories of the people of the two testaments."¹⁶⁶ Olsen goes on to say that Foxe laid out those correspondences in very neat time frames, including the comparison that both Jews and Protestants apparently suffered for seventy years.¹⁶⁷ Along with those comparisons, Foxe viewed the conversion of the Jews as necessary for the end of days, maintaining the ideology of other theologians of his time as well as the medieval tradition and early church.¹⁶⁸ Thus, Foxe was torn between insulting the traits that he perceived that Jews held for not having accepted Christ yet while also believing that all of them converting would help bring about his eschatological end goal of the apocalypse. Foxe and his contemporaries were by no means breaking new ground with these kinds of thoughts and were in fact contributing to a time-honoured tradition of degrading Jews on one hand while extending a welcoming hand into the Church of Christ with the other. Yet the tensions within his

¹⁶⁵ Ibid., 202-3.

¹⁶⁶ Palle J. Olsen, "Was John Foxe a Millenarian?" in *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, Vol. 45, No. 4 (October 1994): 613.

¹⁶⁷ Ibid., 614.

¹⁶⁸ Ibid., 622.

sermon, as well as his self-congratulatory attitude for having already gotten one Jewish person to convert reflected the broader tone in other English sermons that used similar language as Foxe. The main difference to be shown is that these other preachers did not have a prop to gesture toward. Thus, how they constructed their Jewish insults came across quite differently, lacking the stick and carrot approach that Foxe attempted with Nathaniel in such close proximity.

John Stockwood preached his sermon on the destruction of Jerusalem only a few years after Foxe, and despite his sermon not having a Jewish audience, he still managed to fit in multiple references to Jews and their crimes and moral limitations that contributed to their city's downfall. The destruction of Jerusalem was linked in the Christian mind to the holiness of Christ, as Jesus foresaw the destruction of the city that was filled with sinning Jews. As such, Stockwood's sermon continued a lengthy tradition of linking the two events and continuing to portray the Jewish nation as a stubborn and morally corrupt group. On discussing the Roman invasion of Jerusalem, Stockwood stated the following: And thus were the wicked Jewes worthily bared [sic] with warre, that refused Jesus Christ, the God of peace, and chose rather to have Barabbas a cutthroat manqueller delivered to them."¹⁶⁹ The sentence construction placed the Jews as the wicked people who were the subject of a "worthy" war for having rejected Christ. This statement continued within an early church and medieval framework that perpetually positioned Jews as deserving of their punishment for their actions. It was a collective punishment that persisted through time, since Stockwood made no effort to distinguish between the Jews who allegedly refused Christ and the Jews who continued to do so by virtue of remaining Jewish. In fact, popular English culture often framed Jews as the violent people for rejecting Jewish conversion to Christianity; Christopher Marlowe's Jewish character Barabas murdered his

¹⁶⁹ John Stockwood, *A Very Fruitfull and Necessary Sermon of the Most Lamentable Destruction of Jerusalem* (London: Thomas Dawson, 1584), 25.

daughter Abigail for converting to Christianity in *The Jew of Malta*, which was written only a few years after this sermon.¹⁷⁰ These Christian perceptions of Jewish violence and actions were a deflection of the history of violence that had been a hallmark of the relationships between Jewish people and their Christian neighbours throughout medieval Europe and into the early modern age and beyond. However, if Jews were to be blamed for the death of Christ, then that one initial and greatest sin of all would reverberate through time and allowed preachers to make sense of negative characteristics attributed to Jews and why they were so consistently rejected from the Christian body of Europe.

Stockwood was aware of this power imbalance, referring to how well read he was in chronicles that discussed Jews: “Of great plagues and pestilence Chronicles do make plentiful mention . . . for commonly such diseases are either companions or waiting servants, upon warres and battailes . . . the Iewes were almost never free.”¹⁷¹ Here Stockwood conflated biblical and contemporary Jewish history. He referred back to chronicles he read which detailed the history of the Jews in England. Stockwood traced Jewish history from slavery under Egypt as described in the Torah, before skipping forward to the wars with the Romans and the exile to relate a history marred by unfortunate events. Plague, pestilence and death had followed the Jews since their expulsion by the Romans. Stockwood used his sermon on Jerusalem’s destruction to discuss how that string of events was part of a pattern of Jewish stubbornness and wickedness, including their complicity in the death of Christ, which led to a destroyed city and perpetual misery. While his sermon did not contain the same proselytizing zeal as Foxe’s, Stockwood was certainly not discounting the opportunity to welcome converts from Judaism to Christianity into

¹⁷⁰ Michelle Ephraim, *Reading the Jewish Woman on the English Stage* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008), 113.

¹⁷¹ Stockwood, *Lamentable Destruction of Jerusalem*, 25.

the fold. Even so he was also quite aware of the unlikelihood of a Jewish audience reading his sermon, let alone listening to it.

While thus far Jews have been associated with negative adjectives, “Jewishly” could often function as an adverb, and with the negative connotations that one would expect from a sermon written by an English Protestant in Elizabethan or Jacobean England. Jacobean conformist Thomas Adams, who discussed Jerusalem as outlined in Chapter Three, had quite a lot to say about Jewish people and their actions as well. In, *The Devils Banquet [Banquet]*, from 1614, Adams discussed the “selfe-blinding” Jews who again rejected the message of Christ.¹⁷² He later described the Jews as holding a “false opinion toward their *Messias*, whose temporall Monarchie they only gaped [sic] for.”¹⁷³ While these uses have been seen already throughout the period, Adams also used the phrase “Jewishly” to elicit associations with blood lust and violence: “With what face can thou expect an inheritance from Christ that detainest from Christ his inheritance here on earth? Let us not so Jewishly with the spoyles of Christ, purchase fields of blood.”¹⁷⁴ Adams advocated for better behavior through the lens of Christ’s inheritance and associated the opposite of that behavior with the word “Jewishly.” This format thus once again perpetuated the accusations of blood libel made against Jews. This quote also referenced the betrayal of Judas Iscariot, who was buried in the “Field of Blood” (so told by Mark and Matthew), that he purchased with the money he received for killing Christ.¹⁷⁵ The double meaning of “blood money” and “blood lust” associated with Jewish actions imported Judas’ actions onto the entire Jewish nation. The mention of Jewish guilt concerning the death of Christ

¹⁷² Thomas Adams, “The Sinners Passing-Bell. Or a Complaint from Heaven for Mans Sinnes. The Fifth Sermon,” in *The Devils Banquet Described in Four Sermons* (London: Thomas Snodham, 1614), 215.

¹⁷³ *Ibid.*, 228.

¹⁷⁴ Thomas Adams, *The Happines of the Church, or, A description of those spiritual prerogatives wherewith Christ hath Endowed Her*” (London: George Purslowe, 1619), 27.

¹⁷⁵ Kim Paffenroth, *Judas: Images of the Lost Disciple* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001), 11.

was a constant reminder for a Christian audience that their lord and saviour perished at the fault of Jews, and more particularly through Judas' corruption. All of these associations served to emphasize the goodness and purity within Jesus that was cut short due to bloodlust and corruption at Jewish hands.

Adams moved fluidly between references to the New Testament and the Torah. He utilized examples from the Hebrew Bible to emphasize Jewish guilt and place Jewish crimes within a context that could be transmitted to apply to the Jews who contributed to the death of Jesus. Cain and Abel, the original example of the crime and consequences of jealousy forms the basis of how Adams described the Jews:

There is great resemblance of Christ to *Abel*. *Abel* was slain by his brother, *Christ* by his brethren: the voice of the Jewes was *Crucifie* him. *Abel* was slaine because he sacrificed; *Christ* was slaine that he might be sacrificed. *Cain* envied *Abel* because he was accepted; the Jewes hated *Christ* because he was good. *Abel* might say to his brother; *For my sacrifice dost thou kill me? Christ did say to the Jewes; For which of my good workes doe you stone mee? Abel* was so slaine, that his blood was abundantly shed, and that in many places; for it is said *Vox sanguinum; the voice of blouds*. So *Christ's* blood was let out with thornes, scourges, nailes, speare.

As *Cain* sustained a threefold punishment; he was *cursed* in his soule, a vagabond on earth, unprosperous in his labours. So are the Jewes plagued; they have no place they can call their owne; when they have heaped up riches, some other takes them away; they cannot see their owne City but they must pay for it; they are cursed in their obstinate blindness: thus according to their owne request, the blood of *Christ* is upon them and upon their children.¹⁷⁶

Here is a prime example of how the intergenerational crimes were prominent in the minds of English preachers such as Adams who were working within that same Augustinian framework. Adams laboured through a rather extended comparison between Christ and Abel to come to the conclusion that just as Cain was forced to forever atone for his crime of murdering his blood

¹⁷⁶ Thomas Adams, *The Happines of the Church*, 158.

relation, so too did Jews have the same burden for killing one of their own. The punishment of expulsion from Jerusalem was not enough for Adams. Rather, for their “obstinate blindness” the crime of killing Christ remained a bloodstain on the hands of all Jews. While Adams was not clear whether or not the punishment for the crime continued to impact the Jews who converted to Christianity, the idea of a punishment extending into the soul did not bode well. Indeed, this comparison also allowed for preachers to make sense of the continuing persecution and diaspora of Jews who were unable to return to Jerusalem. Rather than assign any responsibility to the swaths of Christians who murdered or expelled Jews (or both), the onus of the blame remained on the Jews for their crime of killing their kinsman Christ out of jealousy, and bloodlust.

Adams continued using Jews as a consistent target of comparison with deeper threats to the English Church, referring to them as “serpents.” He began this section of the sermon with a quote from Matthew 10:16 “Be ye wise as serpents, and harmlesse as doves,” using Matthew to frame the potential dangers of those who desired the downfall of the English Church as insidious threats. He extended the threat to compare serpents to Jews, saying, “I may say of them [serpents], as it is sayd of the Jewes. *Hostes sunt in cordibus, suffragatores in codicibus*. They are our enemies in their hearts, our friends in their bookes. The malice of Serpents is mortall, their use shall be vitall. So it may, so it shall, if our sobrietie keepe the allowed compasse.”¹⁷⁷ While Adams did not mention papists directly, associating the pope as the anti-Christ with the serpent’s role in original sin would have been a powerful image to dissuade Protestants from listening to Catholic messages. Adams also portrayed a stark contrast between Jews being the eternal enemies of Christians and their texts that Christian theology still viewed as useful. Nevertheless, he presented the Latin quote as a common phrase among Christendom regarding

¹⁷⁷ Ibid., 158.

Jewish people. Here Adams drew from a cultural and theological memory of the Jewish people; their crimes against Jesus assuredly made them enemies of Christendom while the blood libel accusations in medieval England cemented their threat to the body of Christendom. To Adams, the Jews remained as both a threat in and of themselves and as a group to align with more prudent threats to the current English settlement and religious environment.

A prolific sermon writer and preacher, Adams's sermons were often peppered with casual references to practices associated with Jews that were the product of a few hundred years of English accusations of libel. In another sermon, *Mystical Bedlam or the World of Mad-Men*, Adams took a similar accusatory stance towards Jewish actions: "Then reject the *buyer*: set him no price of thy heart, for he will take it of any reckoning. He is near driven, that sells his heart. I have heard of a Jew that for security of his lent money have only assured to him a pound of Christian debtors living flesh: a strange forfeit, for default of paying a little money."¹⁷⁸ In a section of the sermon dealing with papal corruption, Adams referenced rumours he had heard concerning Jews. This sermon was also significantly a post-Shylock sermon, with the play having been first performed a decade earlier than the publication of the sermon. While the pound of flesh was by no means an invention of Shakespeare and a continued perpetuation of bias, the pound of flesh was still prominent in the English Christian mind. David Bevington goes so far as to describe Shakespeare's portrayal of Shylock as ethnic bias, along with associating Jews with cold-heartedness.¹⁷⁹ Adams almost appeared to be thinking out loud about the rumour of Jews expecting a pound of living flesh from their Christian debtors. This section was without religious bias; it was based solely on ethnic assumptions as well as the role that Jews were forced to play

¹⁷⁸ Thomas Adams, *Mystical Bedlam, or the World of Mad-Men* (London: George Purslowe, 1615), 14.

¹⁷⁹ David Bevington, "The Debate About Shakespeare and Religion," in *Shakespeare and the Early Modern Religion*, Ed. David Loewenstein and Michael Witmore (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 39.

in Christian Europe as money lenders and debtors. Although this was the only mention of Jews within this specific sermon it was significant for both its lack of religious accusations towards Jews and also its focus on the traditional Jewish role within Europe as moneylenders, which contributed to their expulsions from multiple countries including England. In another sermon, Adams made another aside concerning Jewish associations with money:

The great man, that thinkes he may securely be wicked, because he is honourably great; and dares affront the Pulpit, though the greatest Bishop in the land were preaching in it; cares not for *repentance*. The wealthy Gentleman . . . whiles Owles and Dawes parlour themselues in his countrey-manors: that (as it is storied of that Iew for the use of his money) takes his rent in bloud; the *heart-bloud* of his racked Tenants; cares not for *Repentance*.¹⁸⁰

Adams seized upon the association between Jews, money and bloodthirst, and compared that to the corruption within the upper-class. Jews were not the main focus of his attack, but simply a way to speak more about how corrupt the “wealthy Gentleman” was. Its significance to the passage itself was minor, as the comparison was used as an aside within brackets, but the perpetuation of harmful stereotyping continued despite the unlikelihood of Adams having ever met a Jew before. Adams’s musings were part of a tradition that had been continually presented on the English stage and contributed to an ethnic stereotyping of Jews as miserly lenders who were not only out for Christian flesh for Jewish rituals, but for monetary purposes as well.

Thomas Aylesbury performed his sermons slightly later than Adams, and the timing of his sermon made his choice to discuss Jews understandable. Performing the passion sermon at Paul’s Cross in 1626 is arguably one of the most important sermons in the Christian calendar. Aylesbury straddled three regimes, having been baptized in Elizabeth’s lifetime, receiving an education under James, and preaching throughout Charles’s reign. Indeed, Aylesbury was a high

¹⁸⁰ Thomas Adams, “The End of Thornes. The Fifth Sermon,” in *A Divine Herbal Together with a Forrest of thornes in Five Sermons* (London: George Purslowe), 148.

churchman, spending time criticizing both the Catholic and controversialist sides.¹⁸¹ In the lead-up to the Civil War, he had taken Arminian positions, which resulted in his family losing their wealth until the Restoration. His positionality as an entrenched Churchman who criticized both Catholics and Calvinists makes him an interesting figure to explore within the context of how he situated Jewish people within his sermons.¹⁸² His sermon, preached on the occasion of the Passion of Christ, was filled with a combination of religious reasons for the failure of Jews to accept Christ, their bloodlust in calling for the death of Christ, as well as their moral degradations for continuing to reject his message.

Early on in his sermon, Ailesbury established the moral degradation and layers of character flaws facing Jews that has been an ongoing theme throughout the sermons. Ailesbury lays out where he placed the blame for the death of Jesus as well as why the Jews were guilty:

I begin with the Iewes ignorance, and shall end with their malice to the Lorde of Glory. The Iewes proceeded against their Messias out of error. Ignorance was that cloud in which all the stormes that fell upon our saviours head were ingendred; so the due punishments which hung over their heads, and by the tradition of just revenge upon their children, to them were vailed; *Ierusalem si cognovisses & haec*, a Citie in this miserable, in that she did not understand her approaching misery.¹⁸³

The recurrent themes continued as Aylesbury established that the Jews were both ignorant and malicious and that these exactions as revenge contributed to the loss and misery of their holy city. To an extent, this passage reflects all of the messages that the earlier sermons have attempted to convey. Jews were ignorant at first for rejecting Christ, and then outright aggressive

¹⁸¹Colin Alsbury, "Aylesbury, Thomas (bap. 1597, d. 1660/61), Church of England clergyman and religious writer," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. 10 Feb. 2018.

<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-930>.

¹⁸² Ibid.

¹⁸³ Thomas Ailesbury, *The Passion Sermon at Pauls-Crosse Upon Good-Friday Last April 7, 1626* (London: G.M, 1626), 3.

according to the Christian tradition by contributing to his death. Further, as Chapter Three has noted, there was a connection between the Jewish crimes against Christ and the downfall of their city. The punishment that they received was comparable to what Cain received in the Torah. He established a sense of the “Old Testament” God lashing out at his people for their erroneous ways against their Messiah and paying the price of expulsion and continued misery. Aylesbury took a biblical tradition of Jews being blamed for killing Christ and assigned a generational guilt that made all Jews, past and present, complicit.

As aforementioned, Aylesbury was also an anti-Catholic preacher, and was representative of his Elizabethan and Jacobean background wherein he compared Jews to Catholics and spoke negatively of both groups:

The vulgar *Iew* conceived well, but not truly, of him; yet somewhat popish loath to leave the tradition of his fathers . . .
Their *Theory* was vertiginous, swom in the braine, there floating without anchor, and was of no credit with the will. They cavelled at his preaching, traduced his person, slandered his miracles, fathering them upon divels . . . Yet their ignorance was a sinne . . .
In the *Iewes* their knowledge shall accuse them not acquit them, they knew enough to condemne them, but not enough to save them.¹⁸⁴

English preachers were seemingly unable to discuss Jews without attaching some sort of negative modifier, and “vulgar” is a strong indication of where Aylesbury planned to take his thought. He also connected the Jewish stubbornness to maintain tradition with Catholic stubbornness. By aligning Catholics with the Jews, Aylesbury positioned the Catholic tradition as something that, like Judaism, was no longer relevant. He also insulted the learned men of the Jewish tradition, and thus criticized contemporary controversialists for reading and drawing from Jewish texts. In only a few sentences Aylesbury thus condemned the two extreme sides of the

¹⁸⁴ Ibid., 13.

spectrum. He dismissed “papists” for stubbornly clinging to traditions like Jews, and controversialists for even considering that they might find anything of value within postbiblical Jewish texts that continue to criticize Christ. Further, Aylesbury did not deny that the Jewish people held a reputation for being well learned; this was an idea that was upheld by medieval figures like Maimonides and Kimhi, but also relevant to prominent early modern rabbis across Germany, Italy and the Netherlands. However, any amount of knowledge could not erase that they rejected Christ, which added to the complicated image of the Jew that he was creating. The Jew was both vulgar and prolific, intelligent and yet ignorant. Aylesbury assigned any attribute that he wanted to the Jew, comfortable that the majority, if not all of his audience had never met one. He could use this spectral threat to the Christian church to bring down both controversialists and papists, who were more likely to have been in the audience, though presumably none too pleased to be associated with the killers of Christ. As Aylsebury put it, the Jews remained a mystery to him as well, for in “his [Christ’s] astonishing words and convincing workes, what mettall were the Jewes composed off, that these would not soften?”¹⁸⁵ The Jews existed out of his conception of peoplehood and nationhood, yet continued as a solid enough target for him to consistently criticize on the occasion of marking the death and resurrection of Christ.

Preachers such as Adams also brought in associations between Jews and Turks, demonstrating the othering and grouping of these non-Christian, non-Protestant groups. In a passage portraying the viciousness with which Jews treated Christ, Adams said that they “spoiled Christ of his Vestmentes, and then mocked him with basenesse . . . The *Turkes* lay it as an imputation on our Religion, that we spoyle our Gods: for shame, doe not the *Turkes* and

¹⁸⁵ Ibid., 9.

shall the Christians?"¹⁸⁶ Adams closely associated Jews and Turks by making Jews the mockers of Christ and Turks critical of the religion. He made associations between Jews and Catholics as well:

Shall the Papistes so outbid us, and in the view of their prodigality, laugh our miserableness to scorne? Shall they twit us, that our, *Our Father*, hath taken from the Church, what their *Pater-noster* bestowed one it? Shall they bid us, bate of our Fayth, and better our Charitie? Indeed, where heard you of a Papist, that cuttes short his Minister? Where see you a Protestant, that doth not? I speake not to commend the Religion of the Papist above the others, no more then Christ preferred the Religion of the *Samaritane*, to the Priestes and Levites, when he prayed his charitie; but to apply that to us, which Christ once to the Iewes, *Tyre and Sidon shall condemne you*: So the Papistes shall iudge us.¹⁸⁷

Here Adams presented a clear-cut comparison between Catholics and Jews. As with the Turks, this association was made in a format that made both groups foreign and outlined their similarities. Thus, papists and Jews were both presented as excessive in their ceremonies, while also overly critical of the “true believers” in Christ’s church. By quoting Christ’s warning words of condemnation toward the Jews, Adams took on the distinctly Protestant message that divided those who were true believers in the faith from those who worked against the word of Christ. Adams placed himself in Christ’s perspective of not being the overly judgmental one, but rather accused papists of being judgmental. The next chapter will investigate the Catholic response to such accusations but using the word “papists” betrayed Adams’ view that Roman Catholics were too overtly connected to the pope and their priests, much like the Jews were too connected to their priestly and Levitical classes. As with the Jews being condemned and punished, so too would the papists get their due, according to Adams.

¹⁸⁶ Thomas Adams, *The Gallants Burden. A Sermon Preached at Pauls Crosse, the twentie nine of March, being the fifth Sunday in Lent* (London: W. White, 1612), 14.

¹⁸⁷ Thomas Adams, *Heaven and Earth Reoncil’d* (London: W. White, 1613), 22-unknown.

Throughout the Elizabethan and Jacobean periods, there was a consistency in how preachers described and discussed Jews. John Foxe, a relic of the European experience of self-imposed exile, preached to both entice and insult Jews. Despite the sermon apparently being delivered with the intent of persuading Jews to convert to Protestantism, and in the presence of a recently converted Jew, a layer of derision and distinction remained that clarified that Foxe's position towards Jewish people. He still spoke of them negatively and thus believed that conversion was not always good enough to completely remove that generational guilt for the murder of Christ. Foxe had big plans for a sermon originally written and delivered in Latin that never seemed to materialize. It is unlikely that a sermon printed only in Latin and English ever had any meaningful impact on Jewish communities that did not speak, let alone read, either language. Even so, a lack of Jewish people to appeal to did not halt preachers from discussing them in detail. John Stockwood, in a sermon written and performed to relay the Jewish crimes and ignorance that contributed toward the downfall of Jerusalem, did not hold back in calling Jews "wicked" and assigned full and continuous generational blame towards Jews for having killed the Christian saviour. Thomas Adams took his rhetoric a step further, using "Jewishly" as an adverb to assign the entire nation a negative propensity toward violence and ignorance. Adams also utilized biblical analogy to understand Jewish punishment within a framework of the Hebrew Bible to understand the vengeful punishment that the Jews received was fully justified. He also connected Jews to both Turks and Catholics, conflating all three groups as a foreign "other" to be criticized and condemned. Finally, Aylesbury continued the tradition of those before him, consistently calling Jews "vulgar." Aylesbury also aroused comparisons between Jews and Catholics. Considering that a Catholic was much more likely to have heard or read this sermon than a Jewish person, the comparison could have had more dire consequences, by

associating Catholic tradition with Jewish tradition as outdated and without merit. Jews had been cut off from their city, as described in scripture, and continued to suffer for their wickedness. While converting Jews was still the goal for many reformers, especially in the earlier days of Puritan ideology in England that was defining itself against the Elizabethan settlement, Jews were the primary target for insults and accusations. They were not there to defend themselves, and even if they were, the threat of violence always loomed over Jews in Europe who would debate their theology with Christians. The comparisons made between Jews and Catholics were significant because Catholics employed the same strategy by comparing Jews to Protestants. The comparisons that Catholics made between Jews and Protestants along with their own relationship with Jerusalem will be the topic of the next and final chapter.

Chapter 6

“You and I, We are Not of One Religion”: Catholic Responses to English Protestantism through the Use of Jews and Jerusalem

Thus far, the only authors and audiences who have been discussed in much detail were Protestants. Among those discussed were passionate adherents to the English church, those who conformed to the settlement, or dissenting Protestants who rejected the limitations placed upon their faith. Chapter Five has explored the Jewish threat to a Christian church, but the more immediate threats to the English Protestant church were not Jews or Turks. Jews had been expelled already, and the Muslim Turks were more of a threat to Eastern Europe than to Britain. Rather, English Catholics had been a near-consistent thorn in the side of the English settlement. Both Elizabeth and James faced assassination plots against them by Catholic conspirators, and English preachers often reflected upon the threat of internal and external Catholicism to England's status as a Protestant country and a new Israel. Moreover, writing and publishing in English primarily out of France, English Catholic exiles and Jesuits continued to produce literature that appealed to English Catholics living quietly within England. Many of the themes that appeared in Protestant literature and sermons continued in Catholic writing, with mentions of Jerusalem and Jews. The marked similarities are significant, as are the differences that betray a Catholic interpretation of the themes of Jerusalem and Jews. These differences include framing Protestants as the ones practicing a religion closer to Judaism, as well as Jerusalem holding a continual place of importance as a physical space for Catholics. Jews and Jerusalem were a universally utilized theme within Christianity as part of a shared past and history for all of the denominations. As such, the ways in which Catholics used Jews and Jerusalem on both a historical and biblical level factor heavily into how they responded to Protestant messages and polemic.

It must be acknowledged that the medium of delivery was much more limited for Catholics. While Protestants could preach their words to a large audience, Catholics had to be much more covert, risking a death sentence for proselytizing Catholicism within England. Rather than preach to large crowds such as the ones at Paul's Cross that Protestant preachers had access to, Catholic writers instead had a very limited audience of literate English Catholics. Most Catholic apologies existed in print. Other options included reading the works out loud in private, which greatly limited the audience and influence. Indeed, though Protestantism and Catholicism both fall under the Christian umbrella, renowned English Jesuit Edmund Campion said to a Protestant that "You and I, we are not of one religion."¹⁸⁸ Despite this divide, Peter Marshall argues that day-to-day toleration of English Catholics did exist throughout the Tudor Reformations.¹⁸⁹ Nonetheless, English Catholics were not allowed to practice their religion in public, and many prominent English Catholics such as Edmund Campion met violent ends at the hands of the Elizabethan regime. The sermons produced by John Foxe were understandably less focused on an idealized Jewish audience and more so on targeting the open or covert Catholics who he knew existed within his audience; Foxe and other Paul's Cross preachers postulated that the Catholic Church was a false church and was aligned with Babylon and the anti-Christ.¹⁹⁰ Indeed, one of the few things English Protestants could agree on was their distrust towards Catholics, and it was something that James used to encourage greater unity within his church and across European churches.¹⁹¹ All of these factors must be considered as Catholic tracts and

¹⁸⁸ Peter Marshall, "Choosing Sides and Talking Religion in Shakespeare's England," in *Shakespeare and Early Modern Religion*, Ed. David Loewenstein and Michael Witmore (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 44.

¹⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, 47.

¹⁹⁰ Mary Morrissey, *Politics and the Paul's Cross Sermon, 1558-1642* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 175, 185.

¹⁹¹ W.B. Patterson, *King James VI and I and the Reunion of Christendom* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 122-3.

figures are discussed, as these Catholic works were functioning within a hostile English state that viewed Catholicism and papal allegiance as a threat to English unity and sovereignty, and thus among the greatest risks to the English people and their one true faith.

English Catholics had a continuous history with Jerusalem, arguably rooted in more physical acts of land acquisition, occupation and traveling than English Protestants, who had much less physically based material history related to Jerusalem. English Catholic rulers had a past history of participating in the Crusades. In June of 1191, King Richard I of England (1157-1199) joined the siege of Acre to take the city and spent a significant amount of time trying to take Jerusalem itself from Saladin.¹⁹² Less than a century later, Edward I (1239-1307) landed in Acre as well in May 1271, with the intention of winning the land back from the Baibars; his participation in crusading reportedly boosted his reputation as a leader when he returned to England.¹⁹³ Englishmen were among the Europeans described living in the twelfth-century Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem; one English monk reportedly even established a scriptorium at the Church of the Holy Sepulcher, and later became the Prior of the Church.¹⁹⁴ William Wey, a priest, traveled to the Holy Land in 1458 and 1462, producing a map and an itinerary in English relating his travels.¹⁹⁵ Secular Christians would make the journey as well. A well-known pilgrimage was undertaken by the infamous Margery Kempe, a Catholic woman from Norfolk

¹⁹² John Gillingham, "Richard I [called Richard Coeur de Lion, Richard the Lionheart] (1157–1199), king of England, duke of Normandy and of Aquitaine, and count of Anjou," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. 2 Apr. 2018. <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-23498>.

¹⁹³ Michael Prestwich, "Edward I (1239–1307), king of England and lord of Ireland, and duke of Aquitaine," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. 2 Apr. 2018. <http://www.oxforddnb.com.proxy.queensu.ca/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-8517>.

¹⁹⁴ Adrian J. Boas, *Jerusalem in the Time of the Crusades: Society, Landscape and Art in the Holy City under Frankish Rule* (London: Routledge, 2001), 34, 193.

¹⁹⁵ Nicole Chareyron, *Pilgrims to Jerusalem in the Middle Ages*, trans. W. Donald Wilson (New York: Columbia University Press, 2005), 229.

born in the fourteenth-century who had a priest write down her experiences in the form of an autobiography in the fifteenth-century.¹⁹⁶ All of these events and figures cemented a longstanding English presence in the Holy Land and Jerusalem either through conquest, living there, or simply traveling there as part of a religious order or for personal religious reasons. While English Protestants also traveled to Jerusalem and recorded details about their journeys there, they could not claim continuity with the land in the same way as their Catholic counterparts.

As will be shown, Catholics writing to an English audience took advantage of the rich history of their physical presence in Jerusalem, while also responding to Protestant claims that placed Catholics and Jews in close association for practicing useless rituals. Rather, the Catholics adhered to Tridentine reforms and Jesuit practice by doubling down on Catholic practices and explaining their legitimacy. At the same time, they associated Protestants with Judaizing laws and mindsets along with the devilish temptation to lead Christians away from the heavenly Jerusalem. The presence of Augustine loomed heavy in these texts, as his words concerning the heavenly Jerusalem continued to be used by both sides of the confessional boundary. Further, in reference to the early modern period, Abraham Melamed argues that Catholics and Protestants were ambivalent towards Jewish people, and portrayed conflicting representations of them, which often led to Jews being called stubborn for their refusal to convert.¹⁹⁷ Similar language that the Protestant sermons used to describe Jews continued to appear in Catholic texts. Yet

¹⁹⁶ Felicity Riddy, "Kempe [née Brunham], Margery (b. c. 1373, d. in or after 1438), visionary," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. 2 Apr. 2018.

<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-15337>.

¹⁹⁷ Abraham Melamed, "The Revival of Christian Hebraism in Early Modern Europe," in *Philosemitism in History*, Ed. Jonathan Karp and Adam Sutcliffe (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 64.

before Jews can be discussed, their highly prized city is what figured more prominently in the texts and will be what this chapter turns toward first.

Protestant texts and preachers have been discussed in this project preceding Catholics because the Catholic works must be understood as responses to Protestant English preachers and beliefs. Counter-reformation was in full effect by the mid-Elizabethan period into the Jacobean, as the Jesuits had been legitimized by papal decree to work at bringing Protestants back to the Catholic faith. The English Reformation's tumultuous relationships with popes had reached a turning point when Pope Paul III (from 1534-1549) excommunicated Henry. Under Elizabeth, sermons from newly returned exiles such as Richard Cox continued to discuss the evils of the popes and papal power.¹⁹⁸ In 1570, Pope Pius V (pope from 1566-1572) released his famous *Regnans in Excelsis* which excommunicated Elizabeth. Pius V's successor Pope Gregory XIII (pope from 1572-1585) claimed that English Catholics should not take up arms against Elizabeth, but if the opportunity presented itself that they should help in the rebellion against her.¹⁹⁹ Catholicism had undergone vast reform between the reigns of father and daughter. While the Tridentine reforms strengthened the beliefs that set Catholics apart from Protestant denominations, the Jesuits were tasked with the duty of instilling and encouraging these beliefs in populations that could be hostile toward what Protestants monarchs deemed to be Catholic insurgency. English Catholics were writing to a likely sympathetic audience, but that did not diminish the complicated political dynamics that they had to consider when writing. The works of Catholics that will be covered focus less on the legitimacy of Elizabeth or James and more on the figures who represented the Protestant movements, specifically John Calvin. By focusing on

¹⁹⁸ Peter E. McCullough, *Sermons at Court: Politics and Religion in Elizabethan and Jacobean Preaching* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 60.

¹⁹⁹ Peter Marshall, *Heretics and Believers: A History of the English Reformation* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2017), 529.

the fathers of the Reformation rather than Elizabeth or James who did have the loyalty of many of their Catholic subjects, Jesuits and English Catholics could avoid producing overtly treacherous or libelous literature, though they still faced accusations of both libel and treason.

A strategy that Catholics utilized to avoid alienating loyal subjects was to adopt a different stance on the heavenly Jerusalem than Protestant preachers. At the same time that John Stockwood was preaching from Paul's Cross about the destruction of the physical Jerusalem and the building of a heavenly Jerusalem through Protestant Christian faith, Catholics were producing widely divergent interpretations, though using the same Augustinian sources. William Allen was one of the most prominent Jesuits during the Elizabethan period, publishing his early work from Belgium. Allen (1532-1594) was a central figure within the Oxford counter-Reformation under Mary, and was aghast at the practice of his fellow Lancashire Catholics attending Elizabethan services.²⁰⁰ Allen also founded the Douai College in France in 1567, which became a primary center for the education and training of Catholics who wanted to win back England.²⁰¹ His 1565 treatise, *A Defense and Declaration of the Catholike Churchies Doctrine*, was published from Antwerp, indicating that he had probably just left England around that time and was thus aware of the content of sermons such as Stockwood's as well as the different kinds of claims that English Protestants were making about Catholics. In *A Defense and Declaration of the Catholike Churchies Doctrine*, Allen defended Catholic practices and reinforced Catholic doctrine while also maintaining an emphasis on Augustine's heavenly Jerusalem. On the topic of the holy Trinity and being a proper Christian, he stated the following:

Ther can nothing doubtlesse present it selfe before the seate of
Goddess glory, nor stand in his sight, that hath any blemishe of
sinne, any spotte of corruption, any remnant of infirmity . . .

²⁰⁰ Eamon Duffy, "Allen, William (1532–1594), cardinal," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. 4 Mar. 2018. <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-391>.

²⁰¹ Ibid.

Nothing can joyne with theyme in freedom of that heavenly city, in the joyfull estate of that triumphant comonwellthe, that is not purified to the poynt, and by the woorke of Goddes own hande fully fined and perfieted. This is the newe City of Hierusalem, whiche the holy Apostle sawe by vision . . . Nothing shall entre therin, that is defiled. It is the Churche with oute spotte and wrinkle, it is the temple of God, it is the seate of the lambe, and the land of the lyving.²⁰²

Allen succinctly laid out the beliefs that Catholics considered to be fundamental for “the newe city of Jerusalem.” Allen focused on the importance of removing sin to enter the city of God, in keeping with Augustinian conceptions of the city as a heavenly space and not an earthly one. He presented a Catholic emphasis on purification and acts rather than an English Protestant focus on faith alone. The heavenly Jerusalem could be manipulated by the different confessions to make it whatever they needed it to be to fit their religious context. While Protestant sermons such as Stockwood’s encouraged the creation of a heavenly Jerusalem free from sin on an earth that still required work, Allen referred to an immaculate church “without spot and wrinkle” in the land of the living. He produced the image of a sort of perfection that already existed which Protestants were only striving toward. Johannes van Oort outlines the divide between Catholic and Protestant interpretations of Augustine; Roman Catholics objected to a “two-fold concept” of the Church as both a ‘vulgar’ hierarchic institution and an “ethical-religious” one.²⁰³ Yet, Protestants did view the Church as something that existed on two levels rather than one, as has been demonstrated in the previous chapters. As such, these English reformers on both sides of the confessional divide played into their faith’s conceptions of Jerusalem in their

²⁰² William Allen, *A defense and declaration of the Catholike Churchies [sic] doctrine, touching purgatory, and prayers for the soules departed. by William Allen Master of Arte and student in divinitye*, (Antwerp: John Latus 1565), 57.

²⁰³ Johannes van Oort, *Jerusalem and Babylon: A Study into Augustine’s City of God and His Sources of Doctrine of the Two Cities* (Leiden: Brill 1991), 125.

own writings towards the English people. In doing so, writers such as Allen reinforced the universal Catholic interpretation of a heavenly Jerusalem but did so within an Augustinian context and within an established Catholic tradition.

A little later on, Allen continued to emphasize purity, which was not a word that appeared as often, if at all, in Protestant discussions of Jerusalem. On the celestial Jerusalem, Allen delivered a strong statement on its purity:

marvell not nowe to see the Prophet seeke not onely for the remission of his grevous sinnes, but to be better cleansed, to have theime wholly blotted owte, to be made as white as snowe: behoulding the purity that is requisite for a citizen of the coelestiall Hierusalem. And I note this the rather of the soule, bicause I see that the body allso, before it can shake of the stroke and plage of sinne, must be driven (by the common course) to doust and elementes, that being at the ende raised uppe ageine in the same substance, may yet wholly in condicion and quality be so straungely altered, that in honoure and immortality it may everlastingly joyne with the soule ageyne.²⁰⁴

Whereas Protestant preachers delivered sermons from a positionality of relative power within the English settlement, Catholic writers had to explain the importance of purity rituals that Protestants dismissed as unnecessary. Jerusalem again played a prominent role within Allen's discussion of purity, for according to him Christians must be pure within the soul and body to join the celestial Jerusalem. The intercession of priests for cleansing sins was not explicitly mentioned by Allen, and yet he also believed that these citizens required help to attain the level of purity that was necessary to gain entry to the celestial city. While sermons from Protestants that have been cited thus far contained a much more ominous warning for the state as a whole if it does not strive to become a heavenly Jerusalem, Allen focused more on the individual and the Catholic Church's role in the lives of individual Christians. This could be indicative of audience,

²⁰⁴ Allen, *A Defense and Declaration*, 59.

for while a Protestant was preaching and publishing for a wider body of English people to encourage a Protestant nation, Allen's words were meant for a much more limited audience. Rather than convert people as a group, his words were instead intended to resonate with singular individuals worried about their purity and entering the next phase of their existence in the celestial city in heaven. Even while evangelizing to mass Protestant audiences may not have been possible, the work could also have been utilized to target those Protestants who happened upon it and were concerned about their purity and entering heaven. Thus, while it appeared that the text was for a Catholic audience, it would have carried the same purpose in touting the benefits of holding Catholic beliefs over Protestant. The different preoccupations based on power dynamics as well as religious considerations influenced the ways in which different figures used Jerusalem. For Catholics as has been shown thus far, relating the destruction of the biblical physical city was less important than the celestial role that the city played in the lives of Christians. As will be discussed shortly, there was a physical emphasis placed on the city, but it was within a more recent timeframe and directly related to the actions and whereabouts of English kings and Catholic priests. Whereas for Protestants Jerusalem was a warning on the physical level within biblical history as well as a spiritual level of holiness to strive toward as a holy nation.

Catholics also did not omit discussing the physical nature of Jerusalem within their writings, and when they did so, it was often in reference to more recent events in history. Multiple Catholic writers did not reference Jerusalem within a context contemporary to Jesus, but rather as a place where Catholics traveled to, or at least as a possible destination. As Protestants did not have the same physical relationship with Jerusalem that Catholics were able to maintain through crusades and monasteries and landholdings, they focused more on bringing

Jerusalem to the people than going to Jerusalem themselves. Even though English Protestants did make pilgrimage trips to Jerusalem, they did not have the same historical crusading type relationship that Catholics did. Edmund Campion, also a Jesuit, was aware of this imbalance regarding Jerusalem. Campion (1540-1581) lived in Elizabethan England for the first decade of her reign before managing to escape to the English College that Allen had established in Douai. Along with other Jesuits, he focused on converting England back to Catholicism by returning to England, and for his efforts he was arrested, tortured and executed in 1581 and cemented his position as a Catholic martyr of the English Reformation.²⁰⁵ In a work published the year of his execution, Campion's words were printed and responded to by Meredith Hanmer, a member of the Church of England. While his perspective was published within a refutation written by a Protestant, his message still served as impactful to a Catholic audience. The work, known as *The Great bragge and challenge of M. Campion a Jesuit commonlye called Edmunde Campion*, contained Hanmer's responses, but also full versions of Campion's chapters, according to Gerard Kilroy.²⁰⁶ Whereas Hanmer may have viewed Campion's words as harmless, if the right audience found his work, Campion's message could provide further fuel for Catholic legitimization within England. Upon discussing the history of the Jesuits, Campion stated that the pope gave them permission in 1537 to visit Jerusalem and the holy places there, but that because of the Turks making the journey difficult, they decided to preach instead.²⁰⁷ While a Protestant audience may not have been so impressed with the papal legitimization, the concept of

²⁰⁵ Michael A. R Graves, "Campion, Edmund [St Edmund Campion] (1540–1581), Jesuit and martyr," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. 5 Mar. 2018.

<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-4539>.

²⁰⁶ Gerard Kilroy, *Edmund Campion: A Scholarly Life* (Farnham: Ashgate Publishing, 2015), 190.

²⁰⁷ Edmund Campion, *The Great bragge and challenge of M. Campion a Jesuit commonlye called Edmunde Campion, letelye arrived in Engladne, contayninge nyne articles here severallye laide downe, directed by him to the Lordes of the counsail, confuted & answered by Meredith Hanmer* (London: Thomas Marsh, 1581), Document Image 8. Retrieved from EEBO.

an authority figure calling for the Jesuits to visit universally revered religious sites in Jerusalem potentially spoke to the devotion with which some Christians viewed any visit to Jerusalem. Even if Jesuits were not of the same faith of all those reading the texts, Campion placed a level of importance on the idea of visiting the holy sites in Jerusalem as well as the external non-Christian forces keeping them out of the city. Indeed, Jerusalem's physicality was a consistent theme throughout Catholic work, as casual references to Catholics within the city emphasized their place within it and concerning it.

William Allen's tract concerning the succession to the crown of England (in anticipation of the death of Elizabeth) continued to influence how Catholics regarded themselves in relation to a city under Ottoman rule. In a section refuting the concept of direct succession, Allen cited multiple examples within Norman England wherein succession did not fall to the direct next of kin:

But this King William Rufus being slayne afterward by the error of a crosbow, in new forest, as is wel knowne, and this at such tyme as the foresaid duke Robert his elder brother (to whom the crowne by succession apparteyned) was absent in the war of the holy land, wher he was chosen king of Hierusalem, but refused it upon hope of the kingdom of Inghland. ²⁰⁸

Much later on in the work, Allen referred to Robert again, citing his lack of presence in England due to being "absent in the war of Hierusalem."²⁰⁹ Allen constructed his argument on both biblical and historical levels. The precedent of a commonwealth selecting a monarch rather than selection based solely on succession existed within the Bible, which

²⁰⁸ William Allen and Robert Parsons, *A conference about the next succession to the crowne of Inghland divided into two partes. Where-of the first conteyneth the discourse of a civill lawyer, how and in what manner propinquity of blood is to be preferred. And the second the speech of a temporall lawyer, about the particuler titles of all such as do or may pretende within Inghland or without, to the next succession. Where vnto is also added a new & perfect arbor or genealogie of the discents of all the kinges and princes of Inghland, from the conquest unto this day, whereby each mans pretence is made more plaine. Directed to the right honorable the earle of Essex of her Maiesties privy counsell, & of the noble order of the Garter* (Antwerp: R. Doleman, 1595), 15-16.

²⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, 191.

Protestants were known to emphasize as the sole source of authority. Allen used that biblical authority but enhanced it with his use of English Catholic history to demonstrate the idea of a commonwealth of people selecting a monarch rather than mere order of succession. He also emphasized that the reason that succession was not necessarily based only on birth because Robert (c.1051-c.1134), the eldest son of William the Conqueror never fulfilled his claim to the kingdom of England. While both his brothers became kings, Robert was off on the First Crusade, fighting as a Catholic to win back the holy city of Jerusalem. The biblical model of a commonwealth-style selection of monarch being enacted in Catholic England alongside the very physical nature of English monarchs having fought in Jerusalem with other Catholic powers under papal purview cemented the strong connection between English Catholicism, Jerusalem, and the Bible. This continuity that Allen established was a reminder of what religion England belonged to until very recently, and the potential to return to that if the commonwealth were to select the next ruler rather than the laws of succession. As such, Catholics writing to appeal to an English audience worked on both the biblical level that Protestants were prone to using, alongside a historical precedent within English history. Save for only three monarchs, England had consisted entirely of Catholics loyal to the pope and part of the fight to regain Jerusalem, and Catholics regularly remind their audience of this fact. This “Jewish commonwealth”²¹⁰ that was referenced from biblical texts provided inspiration for medieval English kings but could also be used to ensure a Catholic successor to Elizabeth if that was what the commonwealth desired. This continued emphasis on Jerusalem as a place that played a prominent role in England’s theological and political history was an

²¹⁰ Ibid., 148.

important facet of counter-Reformation efforts in England that Allen and other prominent English Catholics used. While the extent to which they influenced those who read their work is uncertain, any attempts to replace Elizabeth with a Catholic monarch clearly failed with the accession of the Protestant James.

Robert Parsons, another infamous English Jesuit at the time of Elizabeth and James utilized similar references to English Catholic history and Jerusalem. Born in 1546, it is believed that he was converted to Catholicism as a child and studied medicine in Padua before becoming ordained through the Jesuits in 1578 at the English College. Parsons also corresponded regularly with William Allen and was sent on a mission to England in the 1580s at around the same time as Edmund Campion, though without the same disastrous consequences. His fear of facing the same fate as Campion led to him leaving England and coordinating with Catholic powers to try and encourage a rebellion against Elizabeth. He was active in converting Englishmen who traveled to Catholic Spain and Italy and collaborated with Allen in the previously cited *Conference about the next succession*. He was a prominent figure into the Jacobean period as well, encouraging James and Cecil to enact conciliatory policies toward Catholics. He published a work very early into James's reign in which he defended Catholics in light of how they were viewed with extra suspicion in England after the Gunpowder Plot. A controversial figure amongst Catholics and Protestants alike, he inspired English exiles until his death in 1610.²¹¹ In a section on King Henry II, the fifth king after the Norman conquest, Parsons used this earlier Henry as an example of a foreign-born king leading England within the context of English politics and Jerusalem:

²¹¹ Victor Houlston, "Persons [Parsons], Robert (1546–1610), Jesuit," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. 6 Mar. 2018. <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-21474>.

Queene *Eleanor* lately divorced from K. Lewes the seventh of *France*, upon their falling out after the return from *Ierusalem*, which Queene was daughter and heir to the Duke of *Aquitaine*; so as all those States of *Gascoyne*, *Gwyane*, *Poytoun*, *Anjoy*, and *Normandy*, were united together in this *K. Henry*, and by him conjoined to England.²¹²

Parsons framed the example as both a representation of England doing well under foreign leadership, as well as the extent to which England ruled parts of the European continent earlier in its history. Parsons emphasized that under this Catholic Henry who was born abroad, England had much more territory and was a larger continental European power in comparison to England's landholdings under Henry VIII and his Protestant heirs. Listing all of the lands that England had lost over the past few hundred years was a reminder of where the Protestant Tudor line had led England, as well as the possibilities of what a Catholic match could mean to England territorially. All of this was interspersed with the casual reference to monarchs visiting Jerusalem as another small way to show the holiness imbibed within the English monarchy when it was Catholic, and the contrast to James and Elizabeth who had not and would not ever visit Jerusalem. While Parsons did not go so far as to demand another crusade, his reference to English territory implied that a non-English born Catholic ruler with a claim to the English throne would not necessarily be a bad thing for England.

Parsons continued by discussing Richard I, focusing on the warrior-king Catholic tradition within England. Delving into history again, he stated how "the Duke of *Austria* persidiously tooke and held him [Richard] prisoner in his returne from *Ierusalem*, and Henry the

²¹² Robert Parsons, *An answer to the fifth part of Reportes lately set forth by Syr Edvard Cooke Knight, the Kinges Attorney generall Concerning the ancient & moderne municipall lawes of England, which do apperteyne to spirituall power & iurisdiction. By occasion wherof, & of the principall question set downe in the sequent page, there is laid forth an evident, plaine, & perspicuous demonstration of the continuance of Catholicke religion in England, from our first Kings christened, unto these dayes. By a Catholicke deuyn*, (Unknown: Unknown, 1606), 197. Retrieved from EEBO. STC (2nd ed.) / 19352

Emperor laid him in fetters . . . until at length he was disasterously slain by a poisoned arrow, shot out of a Castle against him, as our histories doe testifie.”²¹³ The history and religion of English monarchs were inseparable, as Richard’s disastrous journey home from his attempt to retake the Holy Land resulted in political turmoil in England as well as an early death for a popular king. Richard was portrayed as a holy warrior King, having left his kingdom to retake the Holy Land for Christendom and encountering struggle and adversity for his efforts. Parsons was aware that Catholic history was irremovable from English history, punctuating the sentence with “our histories.” Whereas English Protestants focused on the physical destruction of the city, Catholics were able to build upon that destruction and subsequent conquests. They were able to utilize the more recent history of English rulers and their multiple interactions with Jerusalem after the destruction of the Second Temple to create a physical connection to the city that was unmatched by Protestants. Even though the mediums were different, as most of the Protestants who have been cited were preaching sermons, the Catholics that have been discussed were deeply religious figures writing with biblical, historical and theological considerations in mind. While the Protestants were more focused on biblical history and the writings that were produced around the time of Jesus, Catholics carried a much richer resource base through English chronicles produced largely in monasteries that detailed the good Christian acts of a kingdom of proudly Catholic monarchs.

Catholics also made use of Jewish sources in their works, particularly Josephus. While the history of Christian Hebraism originated from within a Catholic context, Catholic writers did not appear to have showed as much interest in referencing Jews or Hebrew in their work as their Protestant counterparts. Indeed, one of the only references to a Jewish convert to Christianity is

²¹³ Ibid., 209.

when William Allen referenced Antonius Margarita, “a Jew that forsook his profession, and became Christian, [who] witnesseth in a booke that he made of the faithe of the Iewes. Where he reportethe owte of theyre sacrifices, this prayer . . . but we muche neede not his report herein . . . to have bene used long before Iudas Machabeus his dayes.”²¹⁴ Born in Germany, Margarita accused Jews of praying both for Christians to be destroyed and for the Ottoman empire to succeed in conquering Europe.²¹⁵ While a Catholic such as Margarita would not have been viewed as a popular choice amongst Protestant preachers, even Allen seemed dismissive of the convert’s knowledge of Jewish prayer and ritual. Allen quoted a prayer written by Margarita in Latin, and Margarita was quickly moved aside for Allen to continue discussing his defense of the Catholic faith. Margarita did not carry the same impact such as John Foxe’s Nathaniel Menda. Perhaps this lack of focus was because Margarita was not converted by English Catholics; the goal of English Catholics was to reconvert England and there were very few Jews in England to target for conversion. Even so, Menda had no voice within Foxe’s work while Allen quoted Margarita directly, despite it being brief. The half-hearted use of both Jews suggests that each figure served as a device for either side to use to further bolster their own talking points. Menda was important to Foxe but was used only as a prop during his sermon. On the other hand, Margarita’s formerly Jewish life appeared unimportant within the greater context of Allen’s work which presented Margarita’s perspective as a former Jew as relatively inconsequential. This divide also reflected the concerns of Protestant preachers and controversialists within and outside of England appealing to a majority-Protestant population as opposed to Catholic attempts

²¹⁴ Allen, *A Defense and Declaration of the Catholic Church*, 148.

²¹⁵ Maria Diemling, “Anthonius Margaritha on the ‘Whole Jewish Faith:’ A Sixteenth-Century Convert from Judaism and His Depiction of the Jewish Religion,” in *Jews, Judaism, and the Reformation in Sixteenth-Century Germany*, Ed. Dean Phillip Bell and Stephen G. Burnett (Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2006), 324.

to reconvert a large majority of the population. Whereas Protestants had already become entrenched within the English church, with occasional Puritans calling for further reform and greater consideration towards Hebrew and even Greek sources, Catholics maintained counter-Reformation practices. These practices included continuing to uphold the importance of Latin in Mass and prayer as well as emphasizing the significance of maintaining Catholic tradition and not turning towards a wholehearted reading of Hebrew or even too many Jewish authors. Although Hebrew did play a role in the counter-Reformation and was used by a variety of Catholic Hebraists, within the English context it was not a concern to write or parse Hebrew but rather to remain steadfast in Latin and to maintain Catholic beliefs and works.

Josephus appeared to be the exception in referencing Jewish authors, as various Catholics referenced his name a few times throughout their works, and in much the same way as in Protestant sermons. Josephus thus seemed to belong to this same “collective” history within the century of the death of Jesus and was a source of authority for what Jerusalem was like following the death of Jesus. In his *Defense*, Allen cited Josephus while discussing the Sadducees, a Jewish sect contemporaneous to Jesus: “For in those dayes, the haeresie of the Saduces denying the resurrection and the lyefe to coom (as Iosephus writeth) began to take greate houlde amongst the Iews . . .”²¹⁶ Here, Allen used Josephus to support his telling of how the Sadducees had rejected the resurrection. The availability of Josephus served as a buttress to biblical and apostolic accounts, as the Sadducees were mentioned within the New Testament as well. As such, an expansion beyond the holy texts was something undertaken by both Catholics and Protestants so long as it was used to support what was also within the holy books.

²¹⁶ Allen, *A Defense of Declaration of the Catholic Church*, 139.

So too did Robert Parsons employ the use of Josephus alongside the apostles to increase the validity of his argument, and in much the same format as Allen as well. On discussing events that occurred during the apostle Paul's lifetime (c. 5-67), Parsons quoted from both Paul's Acts and Josephus in the same sentence in his *A Christian directorie guiding men to their salvation*:

So Felix the governor of Iurie [Jerusalem] when S. Paul began to talke of *justice, chastity, and gods judgementes* before hym; he was wonderfullie a feard, and said to Paul, *that he should depart for that tyme: and that he would call for hym againe afterward, when occasion should require*. But he never dyd, and what was the cause? For that (as Iosephus testifieth) he was a wicked man & Drusilla his fayre ladie that was with hym at S. Pauls speech, was not his true wife ...²¹⁷

Parsons wrote this work in response to the Anglican Edmund Bunny who had amended an earlier edition. Part of the beginning of the tract consisted of Parsons responding directly to Bunny's critiques and defending Catholicism. As such his work must be read within a framework of both a Catholic and Protestant audience being likely readers. As Parsons reminded his readers, "we are al members of one true Catholique and Apostolique Churche, albeit some of us be somewhat better members in that Church then others."²¹⁸ A significant of number of Protestant sermons responded to a need for further reform as well as to dissuade their audience from being persuaded by the guiles of figures like Parsons. Protestants responding to and publishing the works of the Jesuits gave English Catholics a larger audience to read about their shared beliefs and similarities rather than simply be accused of attempted regicide, rebellion and a desire to send England to hell. Not only did Allen and Parsons both utilize Josephus, he was cited in the same format. This type of reference reflected the format of delivery in which their writings reached their audiences. Whereas sermons were originally spoken, and may not contain a

²¹⁷ Robert Parsons, *A Christian directorie guiding men to their salvation* (Unknown: Unknown, 1585), 10.

²¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 19.

bracketed reference, English Catholics delivered their material through the written word only. The reference to Josephus discussing Felix added further detail concerning this encounter, enhancing the narrative. Indeed, Englishmen of both Catholic and Protestant beliefs were drawing from a time-honoured tradition within the Church dating back to early church figures such as Theophilus of Antioch (died c.183-5) who Heinz Schreckenberg and Kurt Schubert identify as the earliest Christian author who used Josephus for anti-pagan polemical purposes.²¹⁹ While Josephus was not the main source for these authors, the small but meaningful ways in which he was used reflect a continued acknowledgement from Christians that the Jewish historian carried a sense of authority during his lifetime and that his testimony could thus be useful.

Later on, in the same work, Parsons brought specific attention to Josephus' identity and how his Jewish identity reflected his position within both the time period and Christianity immediately following the death of Christ. However, while Josephus previously went unquestioned as a source of authority, here his identity as a non-Christian writing a non-holy book was something that Parsons focused on and critiqued in opposition to the scriptures:

This I am sure, that Josephus the Jew, who for glorie of his eloquence, and his image of mettal, erected by Titus the Emperor in the market place of Rome, wrote the same storie, which the scriptures containe . . . the scriptures are able to pearse the hart, and wring owt teares of the reader, whom Josephus will not greatlie move with his rhetorical narration, though otherwise verie learned and artificiallie penned.²²⁰

While Josephus could be used to buttress the scriptures, he could also be utilized in stark contrast to the holy texts. The Protestants who cited Josephus never seemed to compare Josephus and the

²¹⁹ Heinz Schreckenberg and Kurt Schubert, *Jewish Historiography and Iconography in Early and Medieval Christianity* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992), 53.

²²⁰ Parsons, *A Christian Directorie*, 78-9.

scriptures in this way, perhaps because Protestants were more open to the variety of languages in which scripture could be read or preached. Meanwhile, Parsons brought great attention to the fact that Josephus was both a Jew and a human, while scriptures were divinely inspired work. Parson compared events told in both scripture and Josephus and emphasized the emotional connections and feelings that the scriptures inspired which Josephus failed to do. This may have been done in part to support the translation made by Saint Jerome, whose translation was represented in the Catholic tradition as divinely inspired as opposed to the works of Josephus and other mere humans which were “artificial.” Even though Josephus was one of a few examples of the failures of human authors to write of divine events in the same compelling way as scripture, his identity as a Jew served as a reminder from Parsons that not only was the historian human, but also a Jew and thus someone open to more criticism for refusing to accept Christ.

Catholics discussed Jews and the Jewish faith in multiple forms which both complemented and diverged from Protestant discussions depending on the context. In one of his works, Parsons laboriously went through the differences between Judaism, paganism, and heresy before declaring that, “in regard to the greater multitude of Christian articles which pagans and Jews doe denie more them hereticks doe: yet in malice which maketh the principall point of sinne, and draweth on more grievous damnation, *heresie* is a greater infidelitie, then is, either *Paganisme*, or *Judaisme*, and consequently more damnable.”²²¹ Here Parsons wrote in response to James’s attorney general Edward Cooke, showing a deep engagement with Jacobean government and politics. Parsons did not refer to any Jew specifically, but rather the Jewish faith in general as antithetical to Christianity alongside paganism and heresy. Yet, as has often been noted, Judaism was one of the least threatening concerns within England and to English people

²²¹ Robert Parsons, *An answer to the fifth part of Reportes lately set forth by Syr Edward Cooke Knight*, 381.

in general as well. This was in opposition to Protestantism, considered as heresy to faithful Catholics, and as a much greater danger both to global Christianity and to the state of England itself. Further, in addressing an audience that was most likely both Protestant and Catholic, as he was responding to a Jacobean Protestant, Parsons made it clear that the heresy of Protestantism led one on a path to hell. Such a warning would resonate more with an audience that was in all likelihood neither Jewish nor pagan.

In a work produced earlier in the Elizabethan period, Parsons was adamant in a letter to a friend about not forcing Jews to convert, which contrasted sharply with a document such as Foxe's which sought out further Jewish conversions to bolster the Protestant faith. In a document written to defend the reasons why English Catholics refused to go to Protestant services, Parsons invoked the use of the Jews:

As to receave against their will, to sweare against their wil, & the like: Surely, as I am now minded I wold not for ten thowsand worldes, compell a Iewe, to sweare that their weare a blessed Trinity. For albeit the thing be never so trew, yet should he be damned sor swearinge against his conscience, and I, for compelling him to commit so heyneus and greevous a sinne.²²²

John Foxe published his sermon only a year before this document was produced. Even though Foxe did not compel his audience to go out and convert Jews by force, Parson's argument still appears to have been directed against figures like Foxe. Priorities were again the main factor here; Parsons focused on the positive elements of Catholicism that differed from Protestant Christianity such as not enforcing those to attend services of a different confession. Indeed, Parsons also seemed reflective upon a history of Catholics who had forced Jews to convert to Catholicism. Yet writing in a post-Tridentine counter-Reformation context, he used the Jews as a

²²² Robert Parsons, *A brief discours contayning certayne reasons why Catholiques refuse to goe to church. Written by a learned and vertuous man, to a friend of his in England. And dedicated by I.H. to the Queenes most excellent Maiestie* (Douai: John Lyon, 1580), 5.

tool to show the ways in which Catholics would defend a religious minority rather than the oppressive English state which forced English Catholics to attend Protestant services. While Parsons did not go so far as to compare Jews to Catholics directly, there was an implication in the ways in which he described a forced religious attendance that related to feeling like a persecuted minority. As Protestants were the ones with the power in England and English government, as a Catholic, Parsons and others could present themselves as repressed (which based on how they were mentioned in Protestants sermons was not entirely untrue) and thus able to connect to a group that had been continually oppressed throughout Europe by means of expulsion, forced conversion and the inability to practice their religion openly. Whereas Protestants connected to the biblical Jews while simultaneously portraying them as stubborn Christ-killers, not all Catholics took the same approach to the discussion of a Jewish person. While Catholics and Protestants fell under the Christian umbrella, Catholics such as Parsons sought to identify more with persecuted Jews than with being the dominant religion in a region as Catholicism had been until very recently.

It is also clear that Catholics viewed Jews and Judaism as something undesirable like Protestants did. The major point of interest is that both faiths responded to critiques of one another by invoking Jews; while Protestants associated Catholics with Jewishness, Catholics did the opposite and associated certain Protestant leaders with Jewishness. One who practiced this with particular pointedness is Laurence Anderton, a Jesuit who was active in the late Jacobean and early Carolingian periods. Anderton is of interest because he was active within England, specifically Lancashire, and was not forced into exile abroad; when he did go abroad it was to

conduct “Jesuit business.”²²³ Though his work was still published overseas in St Omer, France, his prominent presence in Lancashire would have been advantageous for disseminating his work. In one of his tracts, Anderton criticized Calvin, accusing the Protestant leader of “playing the Jew,” and using Jewish corruptions.²²⁴ Anderton’s tract, *One God, one faith*, maintained what other Catholic works had by attempting to appeal to a greater good and finding the common threads that joined the different Christian faiths together. Anderton was not paving new ground by speaking harshly of Calvin, yet his word choice to describe Calvin’s actions was significant. As Chapter Five discussed in detail, Jews were often brought up within a biblical context, but also in comparison with “papists” and “Turks.” Anderton flipped the script by taking a highly respected figure amongst Protestants, especially within the Puritan movement, and accusing him of Judaizing. Eliane Glaser’s monograph on philosemitism examines examples of philosemitism amongst Puritans. Glaser refers to Elizabeth’s Archbishop John Whitgift accusing Puritan theologian Thomas Cartwright of Judaizing tendencies for allegedly adopting Jewish ceremonial laws.²²⁵ This accusation was clearly one that had been dogging Puritans and Calvin, and was not limited to being used by Catholics, as Whitgift was an Elizabethan Church Protestant. Insults such as “playing the Jew” and accusations of Judaizing from Catholics in combination with Protestant sermons that deployed Jews as an easy group to insult portrayed a complex depiction of a people who were never available to represent themselves. Either Catholic or Protestant figures used Jews as an insult. Protestants focused on Jewish stubbornness, guilt for the death of

²²³ Michael Mullett, "Anderton [alias Scroop], Laurence (1575–1643), Jesuit," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. 13 Mar. 2018. <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-511>.

²²⁴ Laurence Anderton, *One God, one faith. Or a discourse aginst those lukewarm-Christians who extend salvation to all kinds of faith and religion; so, that the professors do believe in the Trinity, the Incarnation, the passion, howesover they differ in other inferior articles* (Saint-Omer: English College Press, 1625), 157.

²²⁵ Eliane Glaser, *Judaism without Jews: Philosemitism and Christian Polemic in Early Modern England* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), 41.

Jesus, error in beliefs, and excessive ceremonial practices, and Catholicism as an extension of those errors. Catholics responded in turn with accusations that Protestants (and more specifically Puritans) were encouraging Judaizing and following laws that they deemed to be unnecessary and too related to Jewish practice.

Catholics also utilized a similar style of insult that appeared in Protestant works. For instance, in a section on his defense for why Catholics did not want to attend Protestant services, Parsons mentioned that, “it appeareth by S. Paul, whoe circumcsised Timothye for satisfiynge the weake Jewes, and yet afterward he condemned in al men al circumcison.”²²⁶ This configuration maintained Protestant associations with Jews. Jews were associated with the negative “weakness” in opposition to Saint Paul and Timothy who were good Christians. Parsons referred to Catholicism as “the common receaved religion of universal Christendom.”²²⁷ He then described Catholics as “the first, the auncientest, the more [in] number, and the most beneficial to al the rest.”²²⁸ All of these points affirmed Catholicism as the most ancient and universal religion in Christendom. Jews had been weakened, and according to Parsons, Catholicism reigned supreme even after the newer religions of Protestantism and Puritanism were introduced. He placed the newness of Protestantism in contrast against the longevity of Catholicism and its continued prominence. Christianity had taken hold over Judaism because of the Jews who contributed to the death of Christ. The intergenerational punishment described in Protestant works was also prominent in Catholic works. William Allen discussed conceptions of punishment and the different groups that suffer while singling out the Jews as the most deserving and continually impacted:

²²⁶ Parsons, *Reasons why Catholiques refuse to go to Church*, 63.

²²⁷ *Ibid.*, Image 3.

²²⁸ *Ibid.*, Image 3-4.

Mightily hathe God executed this sentence of iudgement, upon al sortes of men that hath withstand the trueth. The Iewes feeling it till this day, the folowers of Mahomet, the Arians, and all other haeretikes that have forsaken the felowship of the faithfull, and haue left the fountaine of lyfe, could never be reduced to the truethe, coude neuer see theyre owne misery, bicause God hath giuen theime ouer for their withstanding. And let not the forsakers wonder that I shoulde compare their case to the misery of the Iewes, seeing S. Augustine confesseth, that all haeretikes be much more blinded then they, bicause the Prophets speake more plainely of the Churche, which properly all haeretikes doo impugne, then they doo of Christe him self, whome the proude Iewes doo contemne.²²⁹

The titles from both Allen and Parsons appealed to the priority of defending Catholic worship and the Catholic church in a country that had become quite hostile towards Catholics and their form of worship. When Allen discussed “truth” he spoke of his own truth as a professed Catholic, and brought in examples of Jews, Muslims (Mahometans) and heretics such as the Arians to support his point. He discussed those groups as people who God had forsaken, much in the same way that Protestant sermons compared the sins of the Jews to the crime of Cain. Allen also took care to emphasize the particular misery that Jews felt for having rejected Christ outright rather than heretics who rejected Church structures but not Christ. He associated Jews with misery for their punishment as well as their pride for condemning Christ and their ongoing miserable lives. Catholics continued to associate Jews with the crime of rejecting and contributing to the killing of Christ, which shaped how they were treated in Europe. While the English Catholics did not go into detail concerning how Jews were treated in England, nor into the lives of contemporary Jews either, the reasoning for that seems more linked to their desire to defend Catholicism against Protestantism rather than to attack a people who carried no influence in Elizabethan or Jacobean religious politics. Allen maintained his faith in God’s judgement

²²⁹ Allen, *A Defense and Declaration of the Catholique Churches*, 288.

against those who worked against Christianity and spent a particular amount of time singling out the Jews, who in the Christian mind had been subjected to the longest and most continual punishment for what they purportedly did to Jesus. While Protestants were interested in both biblical and contemporaneous Jews, Catholics appeared to be much more specific in discussing Jews in a Christological context and focusing their contemporary concerns on freeing English Catholics from an oppressive Protestant state while also encouraging further collaboration or even toleration. Even so, when contemporary Jews were brought up, they were mentioned as an example of a people allowed to live as a minority within a Christian majority. Amongst his examples of toleration in Europe, Allen hoped that England would allow for the same “peece of that libertie, which Catholiques enioy in *Germanie, Zuicherland*, or other places among Protestants; or half the freedom the *Hugonots* have in *Fraunce* . . . or but so much courtesie that Christians find among the verie *Turks*; or verie *Jews* among Christians.”²³⁰ There is some irony in associating the toleration of Protestants in England alongside the allowance of Jews amongst Christians when England was a nation that still banned the entry of Jews. Nevertheless, he maintained a continual association between Jews and other types of Christians as minority groups throughout Europe and even outside of Europe.

English Catholics were not writing from the same position of power as Protestants. Whereas Protestants of multiple identities were often writing or preaching toward a large audience, Catholics often had to take on a more conciliatory position, which has been demonstrated throughout this chapter. While there was definitely a dominant Protestant faith that led to antinomians or controversialists leaving for the European continent to continue to write how they wanted, Catholics were able to publish abroad in France and then feel welcomed back

²³⁰ Ibid., 211.

in England by the small groups of loyal Catholics. English Catholics often also had to balance papal egos while trying to prove their loyalty to the English crown amidst a half-dozen plots in which Catholics were implicated for trying to assassinate the monarch. Primarily drawing from three prominent Catholic Jesuits William Allen, Robert Parsons, and Edmund Campion amongst others, there is a recognizable pattern between how Catholics and Protestants discussed Jerusalem with some notable differences. In Catholic works, Jerusalem was not simply a biblical city that existed on a physical and spiritual level. Rather, there was a longer and unbroken history that existed between English Catholic monarchs in the middle ages, that Catholics frequently referenced and emphasized in their works. Unlike Protestants, the Catholics did not have to reconcile their religion with the religion of their ancestors. Rather, English Catholicism had been integral to English history and culture until very recently. Thus, Jesuits used this fact when writing to their loyal followers, as well as to those who had strayed, that one religion held more longevity and importance within English history due to the number of monarchs who had fought for Jerusalem or even lost their lives defending the city. Moreover, the use of Josephus served as a further source to bolster any biblical narratives from the After-Death period. Yet, Josephus's narrative and his perspectives were shown to have their limitations due to his identity as a Jew which could not compare to divine words and inspiration direct from God. This idea factored into how Jews were represented in Catholic works in general. While they were not mentioned frequently, as Jews had little to do with Catholics trying to win back Protestant England, they were used in much the same way as in Protestant sermons. That is, Jews were associated with weakness, stubbornness, and eternal punishment for their crimes. Their relationship to Jerusalem was that they once lived there, and for neglecting and killing Christ, were forced into a perpetual and miserable diaspora by a vengeful God. Conversion was not the main goal of Catholic works.

While the same could be said for Protestants as well excluding John Foxe, in the cited examples, Jews were less important in general to Catholics. When Jews were mentioned, it was to be associated with John Calvin and Calvinist practices that were deemed to be too closely associated with Jewish practices, just as Catholicism was accused of being too close to Jewish ceremonialism in Protestant works. Protestants in England, and even abroad held a higher degree of power over English audiences. Through the lens of Jerusalem, Jewish sources, and Jews themselves, this chapter has made clear that Catholics spent more of their time defending their own practices, aiming for a type of reconciliation and advocating for their own rituals rather than spend too much time discussing the apparent errors and misguided ways of the Jewish people.

Chapter 7

Conclusion

This work began by asking questions about the place of Jewish people and their holy city within the Elizabethan and Jacobean periods of the Reformation. England did not hold one monolithic belief, but rather was made up of multiple Christian identities, ranging from discrete Catholics to Anglican Protestants to conformists to dissidents. Religion was by no means static and examining Reformation beliefs through the lens of Jews and Jerusalem entertains different perspectives as well as further lines of inquiry. While Jews were not a prominent physical presence at any point in English Reformation history, their role as foil and villain for the Christian faith proved useful to both sides of the confessional divide. Their language was viewed within a humanist lens that prioritized the ancient Hebrew language over a bastardized Medieval Latin to make biblical translations to secular languages more accurate. Jewish historians and religious figures were continually utilized to augment Christian supersessionist and historical beliefs that consistently attempted to portray Judaism as a dead and outdated religion for a perpetually punished nation. The Jewish city of Jerusalem was destroyed by Jewish greed, malice and ignorance to be replaced by a Christian Latin Kingdom on earth. More importantly, the heavenly version of Jerusalem became an important beacon and reflection of salvation for early Christian thinkers such as Augustine, who later heavily influenced Christian interpretations of the city no matter the confession.

Chapter Three outlined the different ways in which preachers drew from biblical and early Church sources to form identities as modern-day prophets for their audiences. Augustinian influence played a prominent role in these sermons, as his double-Jerusalem theory with a Christian lens informed most of their work. Notably, Augustinian beliefs toward Jews did not

factor into their arguments; where Augustine viewed the Jews as witnesses to the destruction of the city and thus an important living reminder to keep around, Protestant preachers associated Jews with the sins and destructions of their city. Jews and Jerusalem had become the earthly and base Babylon, and it was the duty of the holy nation of Protestants to create a heavenly city wherever they were. In the case of preachers at Paul's Cross, this meant transforming England, and more specifically for some, London, into a holy city. All of these works had to be considered within the context of Reformation, monarchy and European politics. Whereas earlier Elizabethan preachers were still finding their footing in a recently reformed Church, Jacobean preachers functioned within a more established Church, though one that had more danger to fall due to a Catholic marriage or even serious Catholic assassination attempts. These sermons never ceased to remind their audiences that Jews were not the main threat to the creation of a heavenly Jerusalem. Rather, those who were Catholic or simply not reformed enough in their practice were the true dangers to the English monarchy, English sovereignty, and the English Protestant faith. Further, following in the tradition of Isaiah, portraying Jerusalem and Zion as feminine aroused the same patriarchal feelings of ownership and possession. While these sermons contained a distinctly Christocentric rendering of Jerusalem as the spouse of Christ, maintaining the tradition that went back to Isaiah cemented a sense of continuity in how the city was described, even if it carried a flair of supersessionist ideology.

Chapter Four continued to investigate how Jerusalem was used, but with a distinct focus on Jewish authors. Josephus was a prominent presence in early modern English work, as his personal experience with first-century Jerusalem added a distinctly non-Christian perspective to the holy city. Transmission and translation were explicitly large factors, as the Christian Hebraist movement started to look more carefully at Hebrew sources. Josephus's Greek-language works

were accessible on some level, but Hebrew was a language that was more difficult to learn in England. A majority of England's Christian Hebraist scholars were either educated in Europe by Jews or had learned from someone else who had been educated by a Jewish person. Anglican Protestants still did not view Hebrew as the most common or treasured of languages, but Hebrew characters and analyses of Hebrew works came up more often with controversialists. While there were attempts to introduce Hebrew to a wider swath of the English populations, most attempts at Hebrew seemed limited to the educated upper echelons of society. Further, Hebrew was often used to embarrass or diminish Catholic arguments or beliefs. Though little (if any) respect was given to Jewish people in a contemporary context, their sages and historians provided ample resources to further delegitimize the Catholic faith and encourage more reform within England. Josephus and Maimonides were often the only two Jewish figures who were treated with any kind of reverence within early modern English sermons and tracts at this time.

Chapter Five examined how many of those same Protestant preachers discussed Jews in general. The beginning of the chapter traced the continued use of medieval-era blood libel as well as accusations made against Jews for their purported crimes against Jesus. It then delved into the major difference of the era in that Protestant preachers discussed Jews, Catholics, and Turks alongside one another. This was a major difference for it aligned Catholics with two other dangers to Christian Europe; Jews from within the body of Christ, and Turks as a threat from the outside of the Christian body. While insulting and degrading Jews was part of the continuous Christian tradition, connecting them with "papists" added a new layer of interest. Catholics were not just nuisances; they represented a more imminent threat to the English Protestant nation than Jews did, and thus were featured heavily alongside descriptions of Jews. Josephus and Maimonides maintained their positions as "acceptable" Jews to cite from, while Jews in general

were trotted out as props or as foils to Christian holiness and faith in Christ. Roman Catholics were the true enemies of England, and while Jews were also a threat, they were external in comparison to the internal Catholic traitors within England.

Chapter Six introduced Catholic responses to these Protestant works. Following the works of prominent Jesuits, it traced the similarities, differences, and responses that Catholics placed in their own work. It was demonstrated that Catholics took advantage of the material history that Catholicism had with Jerusalem. Catholics referenced English crusading Kings who were Catholic and had fought for a Catholic Jerusalem alongside papal powers, all the while referencing the ways in which a Protestant successor to the throne could be removed with the help of a commonwealth-style selection. The Bible provided such precedents, as well as inspiration for these moments in medieval English history. English Catholics were able to latch on to those historical details to demonstrate the closer Catholic connections with Jerusalem. Of course, all of this functioned under the universal spiritual Church that Catholics promised was open to those who had assistance in reaching the proper level of spiritual purity to be able to enter. Meanwhile, Catholics utilized similar insults as Protestants to insult Protestants. They did this by focusing on the figure of John Calvin, associating his Puritanical Christianity with “Judaizing.” This format of insult used Jews in a slightly different way than Protestants, but with the same level of impact. Jews were the group who erroneously continued to practice their own religion despite the arrival of their Messiah. Catholics and Protestants were thus both able to mock contemporary Jews for continuing those outdated practices after so much time had passed, yet also to associate their enemies with those blind and foolish people.

This work has demonstrated that Jews and Jerusalem were inseparable, even within an English context that contained little to no actual Jews. Jerusalem had taken on a spiritual and

physical level of its own after the Jewish expulsion, but the Jewish people remained intimately connected with their city. Jewish people had maintained this connection despite Christian supersessionist thinking that believed Jews to be the means to an end in bringing about the end of days. Though Catholics and Protestants viewed themselves as very different faiths, they both functioned under the greater Christian umbrella that recognized the resurrection and heavenly ascension of Christ. Turks were different for not having ever lived or integrated in Europe to the same extent that Jews did. Jews, in the Augustinian perception, were witnesses of Christ, and a reminder of the errors of rejecting his sacrifice. Catholics and Protestants may have disagreed about a large majority of theology, but they did agree that Jews were erroneous in their beliefs, that Jews were to be converted if possible, and that Jews should be used as tools to encourage conversion. This project has been limited to discussing sermons and tracts from theologians, but further inquiries into the topic of the Jewish place in England could move beyond theology and into popular culture and political documents. English plays and sermons were not the only types of document that discussed Jews and Jerusalem, and more investigation concerning how Jews were discussed in political documents and personal correspondences could invite further conclusions into how Jews figured into the early modern world.

What this project has made clear is that continuity from early church traditions was an important facet of the Reformation in England. Despite the many different levels of devotion that one could hold toward Protestantism, Protestants believed in the same basic libelous and anti-Jewish beliefs that had plagued Jews since the medieval period. Moreover, the city of Jerusalem continued to be an important Christian beacon on both a spiritual and physical level, but more so regarding its spiritual status due to the physical occupation by Muslim powers. Catholics and Turkish Muslims were large concerns but portraying those concerns through the lens of Jewish

people and beliefs created a tripartite comparison even though Jews held much less power than the other two. Despite their small status in number and presence, Jews still factored heavily into the Protestant Christian mind. It is no coincidence that Martin Luther was originally very intent on winning Jewish converts over to his faith. Jewish scholars could be used, but only sparingly, and their Hebrew language was only useful for making translations of scripture more accurate. Catholics carried on much of the same traditions, though in doing so they tried to associate more with the marginalization that Jews had experienced in Europe; this marginalization was a new feeling for them and using Jews to understand that feeling of marginalization adds an interesting level of nuance to English Catholic Counter-Reformation works. Despite their minimal presence in England on a physical level, both Jerusalem and the Jewish people were prominent within the English mind and in English works, and thus should never be discounted when discussing early modern England's culture, religion, and belief-systems.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Adams, Thomas. *Englands Sicknes, comparatively conferred with Israels Divided into two sermons*. London, 1615. Early English Books Online.

Adams, Thomas. *Heaven and Earth Reconcil'd*. London: W.W., 1613. Early English Books Online.

Adams, Thomas. *Mystical Bedlam, or the World of Mad-Men*. London: George Purslowe, 1615. Early English Books Online Text Creation Partnership, University of Michigan.

Adams, Thomas. "The First Sermon." In *A Divine Herbal Together with a Forrest of thornes in Five Sermons*, 139-157. London: George Purslowe, 1616. Early English Books Online Text Creation Partnership, University of Michigan.

Adams, Thomas. *The Gallants Burden. A Sermon Preached at Pauls Crosse, the twentie nine of March, being the fifth Sunday in Lent*,(London: W. White, 1612. Early English Books Online.

Adams, Thomas. *The Happines of the Church, or, A description of those spiritual prerogative where with Christ hath endowed her considered in some contemplations upon part of the 12 chapter of the Hebrewes*, London: George Purslowe, 1619. Early English Books Online.

Adams, Thomas. "The Sinners Passing-Bell. Or a Complaint from Heaven for Mans Sinnes. The Fifth Sermon." In *The Devills Banket Described in Four Sermons*, 293-unknown. London: Thomas Snodham, 1614. Retrieved from Early English Books Online Text Creation Partnership, University of Michigan.

Ailesbury, Thomas. *The Passion Sermon at Pauls-Crosse Upon Good-Friday Last April 7, 1626*, London: G.M, 1626. Early English Books Online.

Ainsworth, Henry. *An animadversion to Mr Richard Clyftons advertisement [electronic resource] : Who under pretense of answering Chr. Lawnes book, hath published an other mans private letter, with Mr Francis Johnsons answer therto. Which letter is here justified; the answer therto refuted: and the true causes of the lamentable breach that hath lately fallen out in the English exiled Church at Amsterdam, manifested, by Henry Ainsworth*. Amsterdam: Giles Thorp, 1613. Early English Books Online Text Creation Partnership.

Ainsworth, John, and Henry Ainsworth. *The trying out of the truth [electronic resource] : begunn and prosequuted in certayn letters and passages between Iohn Aynsworth and Henry Aynsworth; the one pleading for, the other against the present religion of the Church of Rome. The chief things to be handled, are. 1. Of Gods word and Scriptures, whither they be a sufficient rule of our faith. 2. Of the Scriptures expounded by the Church; and of unwritten traditions. 3. Of the Church of Rome, whither it be the true Catholike Church, and her sentence to be received, as the certayn truth*. Amsterdam: Giles Thorp, 1615). Early English Books Online Text Creation Partnership.

Allen, William. *A defense and declaration of the Catholike Churchies [sic] doctrine, touching purgatory, and prayers for the soules departed. by William Allen Master of Arte and student in divinitye*, Antwerp: John Latius, 1565. Early English Books Online Text Creation Partnership.

Allen, William and Robert Parsons. *A conference about the next succession to the crowne of Ingland divided into two partes. Where-of the first conteyneth the discourse of a civill*

lawyer, how and in what manner propinquity of blood is to be preferred. And the second the speech of a temporall lawyer, about the particuler titles of all such as do or may pretende within Ingland or without, to the next succession. Where vnto is also added a new & perfect arbor or genealogie of the discents of all the kinges and princes of Ingland, from the conquest unto this day, whereby each mans pretence is made more plaine. Directed to the right honorable the earle of Essex of her Maiesties privy councill, & of the noble order of the Garter. Antwerp: R. Doleman, 1595. Retrieved from Early English Books Online Text Creation Partnership, University of Michigan.

Alley, William. *Ptochomuseion [sic]. = The poore mans librarie Rapsodiae G.A. Bishop of Exceter vpon the first epistle of saint Peter, red publicly in the cathedrall church of saint Paule, within the citye of London. 1560. Here are adioyned at the end of euery special treatie, certaine fruitful anotacions which may properly be called miscellanea, bicause they do entreate of diuerse and sundry matters, marked with the nombre and figures of Augrime. 2. London: John Day, 1560. Early English Books Online Text Creation Partnership.*

Anderton, Laurence. *One God, one faith. Or a discourse aginst those lukewarm-Christians who extend salvation to all kinds of faith and religion; so, that the professors do believe in the Trinity, the Incarnation, the passion, howesover they differ in other inferior articles. Saint-Omer: English College Press, 1625. Early English Books Online Text Creation Partnership.*

Andrewes, Lancelot. "A Sermon Preached before the King's Maiestie, at White-Hall on the V of November. A.D. MDCXIII." In *XCVI Sermons by the Right Honourable and Reverend Father in God, Lancelot Andrewes, late lord Bishop of Winchester. Published by his*

- Majestie's Special Command*, 889-900. London: George Miller, 1629. Early English Books Online Text Creation Partnership, University of Michigan.
- Aurelius Augustine. "The City of God Volume II." In *The Works of Aurelius Augustine, Bishop of Hippo*, edited by Rev. Marcus Dods. Edinburgh: Murray and Gibb, 1871. E-Book retrieved from Gutenberg.org.
- Campion, Edmund. *The Great bragge and challenge of M. Campion a Jesuit commonlye called Edmunde Campion, letelye arrived in Engladne, contayninge nyne articles here severallye laide downe, directed by him to the Lordes of the counsail, confuted & answered by Meredith Hanmer*. London: Thomas Marsh, 1581, Image 8. Early English Books Online Text Creation Partnership.
- Balcanquhall, Walter. *A Sermon Preached at St. Maries Spittle on Monday in Easter Week the Fourteenth Day of April 1623*. London: FK for John Budge, 1623. Early English Books Online.
- Broughton, Hugh. *An epistle to the learned nobilitie of England. Touching translating the Bible from the original, with ancient warrant for euerie worde, unto the full satisfaction of any that be of hart*. Middleburgh: Richard Schilders, 1597. Early English Books Online Text Creation Partnership.
- Foxe, John. *A Sermon Preached at the christening of a certaine Jew, at London*. Translated by James Bell. London: Christopher Barker, 1579. Early English Books Online.
- Jones, John. *Londons Looking Back to Jerusalem*. London: William Jones, 1633. Early English Books Online.

- Josephus, Flavius. "The Wars of the Jews." In *The Geunine Works of Flavius Josephus the Jewish Historian*, translated by William Whiston. London, 1737. Retrieved from <http://penelope.uchicago.edu/Josephus/index.html>
- Luther, Martin. "The Babylonian Captivity of the Church (1520)." In *Works of Martin Luther, Volume II*. Philadelphia: A.J. Holman, 1916. Gutenberg.org
- Parsons, Robert. *A brief discours contayning certayne reasons why Catholiques refuse to goe to church. Written by a learned and vertuous man, to a friend of his in England. And dedicated by I.H. to the Queenes most excellent Maiestie*. Douai: John Lyon, 1580. Early English Books Online Text Creation Partnership.
- Parsons, Robert. *A Christian directorie guiding men to their salvation*. Unknown: Unknown, 1585. Early English Books Online Text Creation Partnership.
- Parsons, Robert. *An answer to the fifth part of Reportes lately set forth by Syr Edvard Cooke Knight, the Kinges Attorney generall Concerning the ancient & moderne municipall lawes of England, vvhich do apperteyne to spirituall power & iurisdiction. By occasion wherof, & of the principall question set dovvne in the sequent page, there is laid forth an euident, plaine, & perspicuous demonstration of the continuance of Catholicke religion in England, from our first Kings christened, vnto these dayes. By a Catholicke deuyne*, (Unknown: Unknown, 1606), Early English Books Online, Text Creation Partnership.
- Stockwood, John. *A Very Fruitfull and Necessary Sermon of the Moste Lamentable Destruction of Jerusalem*. London: Thomas Dawson, 1584. Early English Books Online.

Secondary Sources

Achinstein, Sharon. "John Foxe and the Jews." *Renaissance Quarterly* 54, No. 1 (Spring 2001):

86-120. Doi: 10.2307/1262221

Alsbury, Colin. "Aylesbury, Thomas (bap. 1597, d. 1660/61), Church of England clergyman and religious writer." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. 10 Feb. 2018.

<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-930>.

Armstrong, Kate. "Sermons in Performance." In *The Oxford Handbook of the Early Modern Sermon*, edited by Peter E. McCullough, Hugh Adlington, and Emma Rhatigan, 120-136. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Auger, Peter. "Playing Josephus on the English Stage." *International Journal of Classical Tradition* 23, No. 3 (2016): 326-332. doi: 10.1007/s12138-016-04-6-6

Bevington, David. "The Debate About Shakespeare and Religion." In *Shakespeare and the Early Modern Religion*, edited by David Loewenstein and Michael Witmore, 23-39.

Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015.

Blacketer, Raymond A. "Commentaries and Prefaces: The Old Testament Commentaries and Lectures." In *The Calvin Handbook*, edited by Herman J. Selderhuis, translated by Henry J. Baron, Judith J. Guder, Randi H. Lundell, and Gerrit W. Sheeres, 181-192. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2009.

Boas, Adrian J. *Jerusalem in the Time of the Crusades: Society, Landscape and Art in the Holy City under Frankish Rule*. London: Routledge, 2001. Google Books.

Bouwsma, William J. "Explaining John Calvin." *The Wilson Quarterly* 13, No. 1 (New Year's 1989): 68-75. www.jstor.org/stable/40257444.

- Burnett, Stephen G. "Calvin's Jewish Interlocutor: Christian Hebraism and Anti-Jewish Polemics During the Reformation." *Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance* 55, No 1. (1993): 113-123. www.jstor.org/stable/20679398.
- Cambers, Andrew. *Godly Reading: Print, Manuscript and Puritanism in England, 1580-1720*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- Campbell, Louise. "A Diagnosis of Religious Moderation: Matthew Parker in the 1559 Settlement." In *Moderate Voices in the European Reformation*, edited by Luc Rucant and Alec Ryrie, 53-86. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005.
- Carlson, Eric Josef. "The Boring of the Ear: Shaping the Pastoral Vision of Preaching in England, 1540-1640." In *Preachers and People of the Reformations and Early Modern Period*, edited by Larissa Taylor, 249-296. Brill: Boston, 2003.
- Chareyron, Nicole. *Pilgrims to Jerusalem in the Middle Ages*. Translated by W. Donald Wilson. New York: Columbia University Press, 2005. Google Books.
- Christianson, Paul. *Reformers and Babylon: English Apocalyptic Visions from the reformation to the eve of the civil war*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1978.
- Clegg, Cyndia Susan. *Press Censorship in Elizabethan England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997. Mylibrary.com, Queen's University Database.
- Davidson, Hebert A. *Moses Maimonides: The Man and His Works*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005. Mylibrary.com, Queen's University Database.
- Diemling, Maria. "Anthonius Margaritha on the 'Whole Jewish Faith:' A Sixteenth-Century Convert from Judaism and His Depiction of the Jewish Religion. In *Jews, Judaism, and the Reformation in Sixteenth-Century Germany*, edited by Dean Philip Bell and Stephen G. Burnett, 303-333. Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2006.

Dimmock, Matthew. "Shakespeare's non-Christian Religions." In *Shakespeare and the Early Modern Religion*, edited by David Loewenstein and Michael Witmore, 280-299.

Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015.

Duffy, Eamon. "Allen, William (1532-1594), cardinal." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. 4 March 2018.

<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-391>.

Ephraim, Michelle. *Reading the Jewish Woman on the English Stage*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008.

Fredriksen, Paula. *Augustine and the Jews: A Christian Defense of Jews and Judaism*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010. Google Books.

Friedman, Jerome. "Luther, Forster, and the Curious Nature of Wurttemberg Hebraica."

Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance 42, No. 3 (1980): 611-619.

www.jstor.org/stable/20676202

Frieman, Shulamis. *Who's Who in the Talmud*. Northvale: Jason Aronson, 1995. Google Books.

Gillingham, John. "Richard I [called Richard Coeur de Lion, Richard the Lionheart] (1157-1199), king of England, duke of Normandy and of Aquitaine, and count of Anjou."

Oxford Dictionary of National Biography. 2 April 2018.

<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-23498>

Glaser, Eliane. *Judaism without Jews: Philosemitism and Christian Polemic in Early Modern England*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.

Glassman, Bernard. *Anti-Semitic Stereotypes without Jews: Images of Jews in England, 1290-1700*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1975.

- Graves, Michael A.R. "Campion, Edmund [St Edmund Campion] (1540-1581), Jesuit and martyr." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. 5 March 2018.
<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-4539>.
- Green, Ian. *Print and Protestantism in Early Modern England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Groves, Beatrice. "The Siege of Jerusalem and Subversive Rhetoric in *King John*." In *Shakespeare and the Early Modern Religion*, edited by David Loewenstein and Michael Witmore, 96-110. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015.
- Haigh, Christopher. *English Reformations: Religion, Politics & Society under the Tudors*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993.
- Halbertal, Moshe. *Maimonides: Life and Thought*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2015.
Google Books.
- Hammond, Gerland. "William Tyndale's Pentateuch: Its Relation to Luther's German Bible and the Hebrew Original." *Renaissance Quarterly* 33, No. 3 (1980): 351-385. doi: 10.2307/2860912.
- Houliston, Victor. "Persons [Parsons], Robert (1546-1610), Jesuit." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. 6 March 2018.
<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-21474>.
- Hunt, Arnold. *The Art of Hearing: English Preachers and their Audiences, 1590-1640*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

Hunt, Arnold. "Preaching the Elizabethan Settlement." In *The Oxford Handbook of the Early Modern Sermon*, edited by Peter E. McCullough, Hugh Adlington, and Emma Rhatigan, 366-386. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Ipgrave, Julia. *Adam in Seventeenth Century Political Writing in England and New England*. New York: Routledge, 2017. Google Books.

Jones, G. Lloyd. "Broughton, Hugh (1549-1612), divine and Hebraist." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. 27 Jan. 2018.
<http://www.oxforddnb.com.proxy.queensu.ca/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-3585>.

Jones, G. Lloyd. *The Discovery of Hebrew in Tudor England: A Third Language*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1983.

Kaufmann, Thomas. *Luther's Jews: A Journey into Anti-Semitism*. Translated by Lesley Sharpe and Jeremy Oakes. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017.

Kilroy, Gerard. *Edmund Campion: A Scholarly Life*. Farnham: Ashgate Publishing, 2015. Google Books.

Maier, Christl. "Zion's Body As a Site of God's Motherhood in Isaiah 66:7-14." In *Daughter Zion: Her Portrait, Her Response*, edited by Mark J. Boda, Carol J. Dempsey, and LeAnn Snow Flesher, 225-242. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2012. ACLS Humanities E-Book

Marshall, Peter. "Choosing Sides and Talking Religion in Shakespeare's England." In *Shakespeare and the Early Modern Religion*, edited by David Loewenstein and Michael Witmore, 40-56. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015.

- Marshall, Peter. *Heretics and Believers: A History of the English Reformation*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2017.
- Marshall, Peter. *Reformation England, 1480-1642*. Arnold: London, 2003.
- McCullough, Peter E. *Sermons at the Court: Politics and Religion in Elizabethan and Jacobean Preaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- McGee, J. Sears. "Adams, Thomas (1583-1622), church of England clergyman." In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*.
<http://www.oxforddnb.com.proxy.queensu.ca/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-131>
- Melamed, Abraham. "The Revival of Christian Hebraism in Early Modern Europe." In *Philosemitism in History*, edited by Jonathan Karp and Adam Sutcliffe, 49-66. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- Moody, Michael E. "Ainsworth, Henry (1569-1622), separatist minister and religious controversialist." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. 24 Jan. 2018.
<http://www.oxforddnb.com.myaccess.library.utoronto.ca/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-240>.
- Morrisey, Mary. "Elect Nations and Prophetic Preaching: *types and examples* in the Paul's Cross Jeremiad." In *The English Sermon Revised: Religion, Literature and history – 1600-1750*, edited by Lori Anne Ferrell and Peter McCullough, 43-58. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000.
- Morrisey, Mary. *Politics and the Paul's Cross Sermon, 1558-1642*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Mozley, J.F. *John Foxe and His Book*. New York: Macmillan, 1940.

- Mullett, Michael. "Anderton [alias Scroop], Laurence (1575-1643), Jesuit." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. 13 March 2018.
<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-511>.
- Nelson, Eric. *The Hebrew Republic: Jewish Sources and the Transformation of European Political Thought*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2010.
- Olsen, Palle J. "Was John Foxe a Millenarian?" *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 45, No. 4 (October 1994): 600-624. Doi: 10.1017/S00220246900010782.
- Oort, Johannes van. *Jerusalem and Babylon: A Study into Augustine's City of God and his Sources of Doctrine of the Two Cities*. Brill: Leiden, 1991. Google Books.
- Orne, Nicholas. "Alley, William (1510/11-1570), bishop of Exeter." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* 31 Jan. 2018.
<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-397>
- Paffenroth, Kim. *Judas: Images of the Lost Disciple*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001. Google Books.
- Parker, Kenneth L. and Eric J. Carlson. *'Practical Divinity': The Works and Life of Revd Richard Greenham*. Ashgate: Aldershot, 1998.
- Parry, G.J.R. *A Protestant Vision – William Harrison and the Reformation of Elizabethan England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- Patterson, W.B. *James VI and I and the Reunion of Christendom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

- Prestwich, Michael. "Edward I (1239-1307), king of England and lord of Ireland, and duke of Aquitaine." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. 2 April 2018.
<http://www.oxforddnb.com.proxy.queensu.ca/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-8517>.
- Price, David H. "Christian Humanism and the Representation of Judaism: Johannes Reuchlin and the Discovery of Hebrew." *Arthuriana* 19, No. 3 (Fall 2009): 80-96.
 Doi:10.1353/art.0.0063.
- Rajak, Tessa. *Josephus: The Historian and His Society, 2nd Edition*. London: Duckworth, 2002.
- Raphael, Simcha Paull. *Jewish Views of the Afterlife*. Northvale: Jason Aronson, 1994.
- Rhatigan, Emma. "Preaching Venues: Architecture and Auditories." In *The Oxford Handbook of the Early Modern Sermon*, edited by Peter E. McCullough, Hugh Adlington, and Emma Rhatigan, 87-119. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Riddy, Felicity. "Kempe [née Brunham] Margery (b. c.1373, d. in or after 1438), visionary." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. 2 April 2018.
<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-15337>.
- Schnabel, Eckhard J. *Paul the Missionary: Realities, Strategies, and Methods*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2008. Google Books.
- Schreckenberg, Heinz, and Kurt Schubert. *Jewish Historiography and Iconography in Early and Medieval Christianity*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992. Google Books.
- Scully, Ellen. "Jerusalem's Lost Etymology: How Augustine Changed Latin Eschatology." *Vigiliae Christianae* Volume 70, Issue 1 (2016): 1-30. <https://doi.org/10.1163/15700720-12301029>

- Scully, Ellen. *Physicalist Soteriology in Hilary of Poitiers*. Leiden: Brill, 2015. Google Books.
- Sprunger, Keith L. *Trumpets from the Tower: English Puritan Printing in the Netherlands, 1600-1640*. Leiden: Brill, 1994. Google Books.
- Sutcliffe, Adam. "The Philosemitic Moment? Judaism and Republicanism in Seventeenth-Century European Thought." In *Philosemitism in History*, edited by Jonathan Carpe and Adam Sutcliffe, 67-92. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- du Toit, Simon. "The Market for Argument: Preaching the Puritan Counterpublic at Paul's Cross." *Journal of Dramatic Theory and Literary Criticism* 26, no. 2 (2012): 75-96.
<https://doi.org/10.1353/dtc.2012.0021>
- Usher, Brett. "Aylmer John (1520/21-1594), bishop of London." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. 29. Jan. 2018.
<http://www.oxforddnb.com.proxy.queensu.ca/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-935>.
- Wabuda, Susan. *Preaching During the English Reformation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Walsham, Alexandra. *Providence in Early Modern England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Wilken, Robert L. *Judaism and the Early Christian Mind*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1971.
- Wilken, Robert L. *The Land Called Holy: Palestine in Christian History and Thought*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992.