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Abstract

Christian philosemitism promotes a positive view of Jewish people, in contrast to the substantially antisemitic approach of the church until the mid-seventeenth century. The source is during the Puritan era, strongly promoted by Evangelicals within the Protestant church. They taught about Jewish Restorationism and Millennialism, emphasising the Jewish nation, but not the Jews as individuals. Cromwell responded to the petition from Manasseh ben Israel, an influential Rabbi from Amsterdam requesting the Readmission of the Jews to England, by convening the Whitehall Conference in December 1655. The Conference ended in chaos, but it stated there was no legal objection to a Jewish return. Existing Conversos in London were allowed a synagogue in 1657 and a Jewish cemetery. Why did Cromwell support the Jews; was he philosemitic or did economic prosperity influence him?

At the Restoration of Charles II in 1660, he supported the Jews, legally accepting them in 1684. Mainly Sephardic merchants and traders became established in London. In 1688, William III brought his philosemitic attitudes from Holland, because some Jews there had financed his return. Jews actively supported George II during the Jacobite rebellion, winning the King’s favour. Samson Gideon (1699-1762) was a wealthy and influential Jewish international banker, demonstrating Jewish integration into English society. When the Jewish Naturalisation Bill (Jew Bill) was passed in 1753, the response shockingly resulted in riots and it was immediately repealed, against a background of national antisemitism.

The early eighteenth century witnessed a resurgence of Evangelicalism, with the Evangelical Awakening, connected with the Wesley brothers and George Whitefield. This revived an active philosemitic interest in the Jews, dormant between 1660 and 1730. The theme of Jewish and Christian identity will inform this study, focussing on the Jews as individual people, and take a biographical trajectory. Recently Jewish studies has embraced English social history and Jewish conversion. The underlying question is: how philosemitic were the English people between 1656 and 1753, and subsequently?
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Chapter 1

An Introduction to Christian Philosemitism

The development of Christian Philosemitism in England began to emerge from the time of the Puritans.¹ This study will examine the influence of Oliver Cromwell and the Evangelicals at the Whitehall Conference in December 1655, which debated the petition for the Readmission of the Jews;² it will then extend to the 1753 Jewish Naturalisation Bill (Jew Bill), throughout examining the Christian response. There was a major crisis during this period concerning identity for both Christians and Jews. In the chaos of the Civil War, and immediately afterwards, England sought again to discover whether it should be a Protestant or a Roman Catholic country. This had been largely settled in Tudor times, now the challenge was what kind of Protestantism should prevail. This time the Catholic influence was still a challenge, but essentially the varieties of Protestant views were debating if the nation wanted a monarchy. To compound this uncertainty, when Cromwell proposed the Readmission of the Jews, the challenge became how to incorporate an alien religion into Christian England. There was a genuine suspicion and fear about how these Jewish immigrants would assimilate.

Philosemitism is a term widely found within Jewish scholarship, but has only recently been used by Christian scholars. It demonstrates the positive actions and attitudes of Christians towards Jewish people over the centuries. Gertrude Himmelfarb, the American Jewish historian, examines this attitude in The People of the Book: Philosemitism in England from Cromwell to Churchill.³ During the Puritan era, the most commonly used term by Evangelical Christians would have been Restorationism or ‘the Restoration of the Jews’. Here the focus was on the Jewish nation as part of a future prophetic fulfilment, following a literalist interpretation of the Bible, and not on the Jews as people.⁴ Donald Lewis has picked up the historical theme of Christian philosemitism and the land of Israel,⁵ linking it to the Balfour Declaration of 1917.⁶ At that significant time, the Parliamentary support for a homeland for the Jewish people

² Menasseh ben Israel, Petition, The Humble Addresses (London: 1655). He had previously written to Cromwell, The Hope of Israel (originally in Latin as Spes Israelis 1650) and then after Whitehall, Vindiciae Judaeorum (London: 1656).
⁵ Professor of Church History at Regent College, Vancouver.
occurred when many in the British Cabinet were evangelical Christians. The nearest modern term for Restorationism is Christian Zionism, but this now carries very negative tropes; such as an association with the American right-wing militaristic support for Israel, which focuses mainly on the land and the modern State of Israel. This American movement has been closely linked with dispensationalism from the early nineteenth century, and the questionable interpretation of the place of the Jewish people in the end times, found in the notes to the Scofield Bible. Donald Lewis, a Canadian, argues for a more balanced view of Christian Zionism. In contrast, he wants to "present a thorough and detailed exploration of the roots of philosemitism and Restoration theology in Protestant thought, an area...scholars have largely ignored". This study of Christian philosemitism will stress the importance of the Jews as people, as those who are worthy of respect and honour. Philosemitism also reminds the Church of its Jewish roots, in contradistinction to the traditional Christian doctrine of replacement theology or supercessionism.

The intention of this study is to trace the development of a fundamental change in the attitude of the Evangelicals towards the Jews. This group emphasised the importance of the Bible, the Puritans began to demonstrate a respect for the Jews as 'the People of the Book', and promoted a new interest in Hebrew studies, Jewish culture and the Old Testament. This was in stark contrast to the previous Roman Catholic tradition that promoted negative images of the Jews as 'Christ-killers'; as those who were from the synagogue of Satan; as a race eternally condemned as outcasts and strangers; merely because they had rejected Jesus as their Messiah. At the start of the Protestant Reformation from 1517, this negative attitude was also exhibited by Martin Luther (1483-1546) himself, who later in life revealed a deep antisemitism. Luther, in his book The Jews and their Lies, (1543) promoted a shameful hatred towards the Jews, which some scholars argue was merely historically and culturally conditioned. Lewis asserts that a major, much more positive distinction is found within later

---

7 David W. Schmidt, Partners Together in this Great Enterprise (Jerusalem: Xulon Press, 2011). In his published PhD thesis from the Hebrew University, Jerusalem, he claims that seven of the ten Cabinet members were from the Evangelical tradition. p. 357.
9 Michael Williams, Origins and Development of Dispensationalism (Fearn, Scotland: Mentor, 2003).
12 This tradition considers that the covenant with the Jews has been replaced or appropriated by the Church, which is now the ‘New Israel’.
15 It took until 1965, for the Roman Catholics at Vatican II, to decree that “the Jews should not be spoken of as rejected or accursed”. Nostra Aetate, a document only two pages long.
16 Robert Kolb, ‘Luther’s Views of the Jews and the Turks’ in The Oxford Handbook of Martin Luther’s Theology, ed. by Robert Kolb and others (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), ch. 13.
17 Martin Luther, The Jews and their Lies (1543). Luther’s hatred for the Roman Catholic church was equally vehement. Brooks Schramm, Martin Luther, the Bible and the Jewish People (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2012).
Protestantism, when ‘philosemitism became an important marker of Evangelical identity...distinguishing Protestantism from the Roman Catholic shortcomings’.\textsuperscript{18}

Throughout the Puritan period, following the Reformation in England, there was a fundamental theological shift in the attitude towards the Jews. This led to the broad Puritan Jewish paradigm, which included: the restoration of the Jews to Palestine (Restorationism), the national conversion of the Jews to their Messiah in the Last Days (Conversionism) and the important involvement of the Jews in the Millennium and the Parousia (Millennialism).\textsuperscript{19} There were nuances to this approach within the Puritan tradition, as some groups were not so strongly millennialist. This narrative focused on future eschatological events, rather than on any current social contact with Jewish people, because they had been expelled from England in 1290.

**From Christian Hebraism to Philosemitism**

A tradition of Christian Hebraists had developed in Europe from around 1500, and this led to a ‘Christian Hebrew Reading Public’, which resulted, according to Burnett,\textsuperscript{20} in two thousand Christian Hebraist imprints between 1500 and 1600. This encouraged the study of the original Biblical languages, especially Hebrew. It developed much later in England from around 1540, though some Christian Hebraists from the Continent had earlier taught at English universities.\textsuperscript{21} A significant influence was Immanuel Tremellius (c.1510-1580), a converted Jew, who became the third Regius Professor of Hebrew at Cambridge between 1549 and 1553.\textsuperscript{22} At the heart of this movement was the Reformers’ concern for an accurate Hebrew translation, providing a deeper understanding of the Hebrew Bible, to reinforce their reformation slogan of ‘sola scriptura’.

David S. Katz prompted the writer to engage with this research over fifteen years ago. The discovery of his D.Phil. thesis in the Bodleian Library, and his subsequent book, *Philosemitism and the Readmission of the Jews 1603-1655* demonstrated how the foundational elements of Puritan theology introduced the concept of philosemitism into the Christian vocabulary. Most of the previous Christian research has been limited to millennialism, Restorationism, and more recently, Christian Zionism. None of these approaches offered an adequate explanation to understand the Jews as individuals, as those worthy of respect and honour by Christians, in this period between 1656 and 1753. This study offers new research that contributes towards filling in this gap in

\textsuperscript{18} Lewis, *Christian Zionism*, p. 102.


\textsuperscript{22} Kenneth Austin, *From Judaism to Calvinism. The Life and Writings of Immanuel Tremellius (c.1510-1580)* (London: Routledge, 2007).
Christian scholarship to date, drawing heavily on recent Jewish scholarship. This current close affinity between Jewish and Christian scholars demonstrates a new mutual respect, as well as a shared appreciation of philosemitism. Katz goes on to argue that philosemitism involves “an attitude which finds Jews and Jewish culture admirable, desirable or even in demand [to Christians].”23 In the same article, Katz accepts that a Christian “could be committed to Jewish mission and yet still be considered a Philosemite”.24 This contentious issue will be addressed in a later chapter.

Christian Philosemitism Examined

Philosemitism is a positive view (Gk. philo, love) for the Jews, which emphasises the Jews as people worthy of respect. Todd Endelman strongly challenges the theme of this study:

The term Christian Philosemitism is something of a misnomer. Christians, to whom historians apply the term philosemitic, love Jews not as Jews, but rather as peculiarly valuable converts to the Christian faith, whose fulfilment requires Jewish acknowledgement of Jesus as the Christ.25

This challenge will be refuted as the study develops. Donald Lewis describes the Evangelicals as those who promote “a teaching of esteem, instead of a teaching of contempt”, towards the Jews.26 William Rubinstein from the Jewish perspective, considers a wide range of Christian positive attitudes and actions, his definition is “admiration and support in the English-speaking world for the Jews”.27 In contrast, Yaacov Ariel from Tel Aviv states firmly that

Evangelical attitudes to the Jews cannot be defined as either philosemitic or antisemitic. Rather, their attitudes represent Evangelical theology, which is Biblical, messianic and evangelistic in nature.28

There is a wide variety of modern attitudes in current Jewish scholarship towards Christian philosemitism, from the benign and appreciative, to the strongly hostile. The Jewish scholars, Jonathan Karp and Adam Sutcliffe in their edited collection, Philosemitism and History question in their introduction, “is there such a thing a

24 Ibid., 328.
25 Endelman’s assertions are made in a review for the journal American Jewish History, 72 (1983), no. 3, 410-412. It can be suggested that this more negative comment is expressed to please the potential Jewish readers, who would not appreciate a more generous view of Christian Philosemitism. Of further interest is his review of Katz’s book about Philosemitism and the Readmission of the Jews to England 1603-1655.
26 Lewis, Christian Zionism, p. 12.
philosemitism”. They argue that Jews have been idealised in the Christian tradition as “God’s chosen people” and also for “such imputed virtues as their superior intelligence, economic acumen, ethnic loyalty, cultural cohesion or familial commitment”. They warn that the philosemitism of many Christians has been motivated by a conversionist desire, “ultimately to eradicate Jewish distinctiveness altogether”. This is a robust challenge for Christians to answer. However, they also recognise the “significance of non-Jewish impulses to befriend, defend, support or learn from the Jews”. In the recent Messianic Jewish movement, which originated about sixty years ago, these Jewish converts remain proud of their Jewish heritage, but acknowledge that Jesus is their Messiah, normally worshipping on a Saturday. This is in direct contrast to the previous generations of Hebrew Christians, mainly in the nineteenth century, who were culturally encouraged to reject their Jewish identity at conversion, to prove to their fellow Christians that they were ‘genuine’ converts.

In another recent book, An Acknowledged Harmony, Philosemitism and the Survival of European Jewry by Alan Edelstein, he shows the Christian influence on Jewish emancipation quoting Oliver Cromwell, “great is my sympathy with this poor people, whom God chose, and to whom He gave His Law”. Edelstein argues that from this tradition, originating in the Puritan period, it eventually led to Jewish emancipation, “particularly in England (1858) and France (1809) during the nineteenth century”. Cecil Roth, in his seminal, A History of the Jews in England gives several examples of Christian philosemitism. Gertrude Himmelfarb recognises that the history of philosemitism “may well start with England, which more than any other country, has produced over the past several centuries, a rich literature of philosemitism”. Her definition also recognises “the support of the Jews from Christians”. Professor David Feldman, acknowledges that “English Protestantism and the philosemitic strain within it have been widely thought of as an element which encouraged the Jews’ integration”.

The context of the discussion about philosemitism is in complete contrast to the teaching of Wilhelm Marr (1819-1904), who first used the word antisemitism in 1879, when he founded the ‘League of Antisemites’ and promoted Judenhass. The tragic

---

30 Ibid., p. 2.
31 Ibid., p. 3.
32 Ibid., p. 6.
35 Ibid., p. xi.
38 Ibid., p. 5.
39 The Director of the Pears Centre for the Study of Antisemitism at Birkbeck College, London.
history of Christian antisemitism does not need to be rehearsed in this study. There is now a clear recognition of the negative and destructive attitudes of Christian people and the active persecution of the Jews by the Church, over many centuries, both in the Roman Catholic and the Protestant traditions.

The Historical Development of this Study

Various themes will be examined as part of this study as well as philosemitism, including the developing concepts of religious toleration; the theological challenges to the Puritans of an inadequately reformed Anglican church; the divisions between the Presbyterians and the Independents during the Commonwealth, and the later challenge to all groups about how they should regard the Jews. This approach will follow a continuum that starts by respecting the Jews, because of their historical identity as Hebrew scholars, who could give a greater insight into the OT. The teachings of the 1560 Geneva Bible from Romans 9-11, especially in the footnotes, outlined a revised Christian attitude towards the Jewish nation. This provided a Calvinist interpretation from Theodore Beza (1519-1605) and his fellow continental Puritans, which influenced Puritan Jewish theology.42 This hermeneutic underpinned a focus on the Millennium in the 1630s and 1640s, as the nation confronted the Civil War.43 Early in the 1650s, the narrative changed to England, when several petitions were presented to readmit the Jews; arguing that they would be beneficial to England economically, and also bring a blessing to the nation. This study will show the wide divergence of Christian response; from the eager Evangelicals, to hostile opposition around 1655. Once the Jews were accepted and admitted from 1656, generally their presence was tolerated. Following the Restoration in 1660 and the Glorious Revolution in 1688/9, despite all the political upheaval, their community was strengthened. The continuum examined here extends to the 1753 Jew Bill, and in the conclusion, links are made to the 1917 Balfour Declaration, which could be deemed to be the pinnacle of English Christian philosemitism. The main emphasis of the study is on England, but extends to the close interaction between the Christians and Jews in Amsterdam, the Moravians from Halle, and the nascent settlement in Georgia, New England.

Jewish Readmission

The petition for the Readmission of the Jews to England in 1655 was a unique challenge to the English Christian perception of the Jews.44 Cromwell called the Whitehall Conference in December 1655, and this study will seek to examine how philosemitic it really was. The most common approach by Jewish scholars is to interpret this period as an early example of Christian conversionism, motivated by the

---

44 Menasseh ben Israel’s Petition to Cromwell. This petition followed on from a previous messianic document from him in 1650, The Hope of Israel (original in Holland 1650, English translation by Moses Wall 1652, reprinted by Oxford: Littman, 1987).
desire to bring Jewish people back into a Christian country. They further link these actions with Puritan millennialism, and challenge the prophetic view of Manasseh ben Israel (1604-1657), the Dutch Rabbi from Amsterdam, who believed that England would be the influential maritime power that would return the Jewish nation to Jerusalem and to Palestine. Early Christian Restorationists such as Thomas Brightman (1562-1607) and Joseph Mede (1586-1638) originated this teaching. Brightman’s book was published in 1615, Shall They Return to Jerusalem Again? affirming that “there is nothing more certain: the prophets do everywhere confirm it and beat upon it”. Andrew Crome and Philip Almond agree with the commonly held opinion that Brightman was the founder of English philosemitism. This study will also examine why this issue of readmission became so important to Cromwell. His motives were certainly conversionist, but they also included geopolitical influences. He understood the importance of the international Jewish merchant community, which incorporated their familial networks of worldwide trade, but especially their access to finance. Lucien Wolf argues that the Jews were also uniquely useful as an important part of the international espionage network, because they reported directly to Cromwell, via John Thurloe, mainly spying against Spain, and watching Charles II on the continent. The external pressure from Menasseh ben Israel was vital to promote the possible acceptance of the Jews, several of whom were already ‘secretly’ back in England, as Conversos. The Rabbi petitioned in his Humble Access in 1655 for freedom to allow foreign Jews to return, especially from the Low Countries.

Post Restoration and into the Early Eighteenth Century

The swift changes in English society following the collapse of Cromwell’s influence and the rejection of the Puritans, witnessed the Restoration of Charles II in 1660. The Jews had anticipated another expulsion like 1290, as revenge against Cromwell and the Puritans. They were surprised when they were generally well treated by Charles II; this royal protection helped Post Restoration Jewry to become an established reality. The Jewish issue soon cooled in England at the start of the eighteenth century, as the Church became more concerned with establishing its own identity. The Jacobite challenges and the short reign of James II, resulted in a constant religious and political tension between Protestants and Catholics, as well as the growth of a

47 Almond, Brightman, p. 4. See John Bale (1495-1563) and his study of the book of Revelation, The Image of Both Churches (London: 1547).
48 John Thurloe was Cromwell’s Secretary of State. The Thurloe State Papers (TSP) in 7 volumes. (Oxford: Bodleian Library).
51 Also known as Marranos, outwardly Roman Catholics, originally from Spain, following their expulsion in 1492 and from Portugal in 1497. They were known to meet in secret to continue their Jewish rituals.
more rationalistic philosophy in the church.\textsuperscript{53} This followed the loss of any further substantial Evangelical and Puritan influence.

Slowly, the social acceptance of the rich and influential Jews in the early eighteenth century, like Samson Gideon (1699-1762) encouraged a more tolerant Jew Bill in 1753, promoting their naturalisation.\textsuperscript{54} When passed by Parliament, it ignited a genuine religious and social shock at the intensity of the anger directed against the Jews. This reaction forced its immediate repeal, prompted by the Whig fear of defeat at the forthcoming election in 1754. This raised the fundamental question whether English Christians were still essentially antisemitic, like many of the other European nations at that time.

Early in the eighteenth century, from the start of the Evangelical Awakening in the 1730s, led by the Wesley brothers and George Whitefield, Evangelicals grew stronger in influence and the philosemitic interest in the Jews returned.\textsuperscript{55} In Germany, there had already been an outreach to the Jews, following the Pietist movement, encouraged by the Moravians in Halle, with their foundation of the Institutum Judaicum in 1728.\textsuperscript{56} This significant group distinctively influenced Wesley’s conversion on 24 May 1738 in London, and they subsequently prompted the birth of the missionary movements worldwide. In England, this started from 1792 with the foundation of the Baptist Missionary Society, where there was a renewed emphasis on worldwide mission; soon other Protestant missionary societies flourished. The growth of philosemitism continued, particularly towards the end of the eighteenth century, especially around the time of the French Revolution in 1789. During this internationally uncertain period, there was a revival of interest in the Biblical Parousia; many Evangelicals, as they approached the year 1800, exhibited a form of ‘Millennium fever’. They were confused by the actions of Napoleon, who promoted the Restoration of the Jews to the Holy Land, forming a Sanhedrin in Paris in 1807. This English national anxiety, and the fear of a French invasion, resulted in a strong resurgence of interest in Jewish Restorationism and the place of the Jewish people in God’s end time plans. The evangelicals were prompted by James Bicheno’s book, The Restoration of the Jews. He was an influential Baptist minister from Newbury in Berkshire, who wrote about political matters; he was accused by some opponents of supporting the French Revolution.

At the start of the nineteenth century, a more sophisticated form of Christian Philosemitism developed. This approach regarded the Jews as individuals, who as well as being respected and affirmed, should be given their emancipation. Building on the Puritan tradition, the Evangelicals emphasised again that Jesus the man, was a Jew. They argued that the Jews should be respected, because they provided the spiritual

\textsuperscript{53} Arianism, Deism and Socinianism.
\textsuperscript{54} The Jewish Naturalisation Bill 1753 was the legal title, but it was commonly called ‘the Jew Bill’, this will be the preferred term in this study.
roots of the Christian faith, and furthermore, should be recognised as the older family members in the Jewish-Christian heritage. This teaching was based on the motif of the ‘Olive Tree’ used by Paul in Romans.\(^5^7\) Previously, the Jews had been mainly regarded as a nation, and not as individuals; their function merely limited to their national place in the Parousia and during the Millennium. This later theological shift early in the nineteenth century was when William Wilberforce, Charles Simeon and the Evangelical Anglicans became involved with the London Jews Society (LJS), founded in 1809.\(^5^8\)

The Distinctive Approaches within this Study

This study of philosemitism will examine the Jews as people, which will incorporate social and cultural history from 1656 onwards, and then follow a biographical trajectory.\(^5^9\) Some Christian fringe groups were accused of being Judaisers and supporting Judaism *too much*, because they promoted the view that the Sabbath for Christians should be on a Saturday.\(^6^0\) The distinctive focus of this study will be on Jews as individual people, their identity and the Christian response, as part of contemporary English society between 1656 and 1753, and subsequent developments.

The theme of ‘identity’ will be used as a helpful method to understand Jewish people in this period, by investigating their challenges to Christian identity in England. This concept was prompted in 2010 by Achsah Guibbory in *Christian Identity.*\(^6^1\) The book gives a fresh approach that will contribute to this discussion about Christian philosemitism. The Jewish scholar, David B Ruderman has widened the theme of identity in his book, *Connecting the Covenants,* in which he demonstrates the closeness of the Jewish tradition to the roots of Christianity in eighteenth century England.\(^6^2\) A further contribution highlighting the importance of Christian identity is found in the new *Oxford History of Anglicanism* (2017), the subtitle is *Reformation and Identity c.1520-1662.* This book examines “the contested identity” within the Church of England and the complicated relationships with Dissent.\(^6^3\) The issue of Jewish conversion and mission will also be explored; this is a subject that Jewish historians did not want to consider until very recently. In 2015, Todd Endelman

---

\(^{5^7}\) Romans ch. 10, vv. 17-24.


provided a scholarly examination of this contentious issue in *Leaving the Jewish Fold*.\(^{64}\) He covers the period from the Medieval to ‘the Age of Enlightenment and Emancipation’, mainly in Europe, but also in England. His provocative approach has encouraged a renewed scholarly interest in this topic.

A strand missing in much of the current debate about the Jews is the place of Dissent in Jewish theology; especially the contribution of the Baptists and the Quakers. Around the time of Cromwell and the Readmission debate, Margaret Fell (1614-1702), the wife of George Fox, the founder of Quakerism, was actively engaged in promoting Jewish toleration by her writings in England and Holland. She was notable as a woman who had influence with Cromwell, Menasseh ben Israel\(^ {65}\) and Spinoza.\(^ {66}\) The contribution of the Dissenters as fellow outsiders, like the Jews, will be considered. In essence, whether the Jews were accepted within English society, and how they were regarded by the Christian community? The underlying question will be, how philosemitic were English Christians between 1656 and 1753?

---


\(^{65}\) Margaret Fell, *For Menasseh ben Israel. The Call of the Jewes out of Babylon* (Amsterdam: Giles Calvert, 1656).

Chapter 2

Cromwell, the Readmission of the Jews and the Whitehall Conference of 1655

There has been an ongoing controversy over the centuries regarding the contribution of Oliver Cromwell (1599-1658) to the history of Britain; in summary, was he a ‘Hero or a Villain’?¹ From the perspective of the Jewish community in England, he was a hero, who had influenced the readmission of the Jews in 1656. They still celebrate this anniversary annually, regarding him as a philosemitic, who championed their cause. For example, at the tercentenary in 1956, The Jewish Chronicle ² wrote of the importance to Anglo-Jewry of Cromwell’s actions

the historians have long pointed out the three main factors which conduced to the consolidation of the community: no legal bar to resettlement; a generally philosemitic climate; and no formal ‘statute of resettlement’ capable of repeal later.³

Fifty years earlier at the February 1906 anniversary, a banquet held by the Anglo-Jewish Historical Society in London, heard speeches “in praise of Oliver Cromwell, ‘the saviour of Anglo-Jewry’... and the great moral awakening following the Whitehall Conference”. Lucien Wolf spoke of “Cromwell the great-hearted Protector,⁴ and Menasseh ben Israel of Amsterdam, the devoted Jew”.⁵

The question to be considered here is why Cromwell supported the readmission of the Jews, and why he chose to call the Whitehall Conference in December 1655. This significant group formally debated whether the Jews should be allowed back into England, following their national expulsion in November 1290 by Edward I. The Puritans, as has been demonstrated earlier, welcomed the return of the Jews for Biblical, theological and millennial reasons. In the midst of all the battles and various parliamentary conflicts facing Cromwell, this chapter will examine why the Jews were such a priority for him. A group of evangelical Christians, mainly Independents and Dissenters, had seen the ‘born again’ Cromwell as sympathetic to their cause; as someone who would treat the Jews with respect and welcome them back into England. Cromwell had experienced a ‘conversion’ in the 1630s.⁶ His changed spiritual priorities influenced the kind of soldiers that he wanted as part of his New Model Army; “upright

¹ ‘A brave bad man’ was another view, promoted by the title of an exhibition at Cambridge University Library in October 1999 to celebrate the 400th anniversary of his birth. Thomas Carlyle’s book of his letters and speeches was one of the bestselling Victorian books.
² Jewish Chronicle (JC), Robert S. Paul, Oliver Cromwell and the Jews, p.5. Paul was the Director of the Ecumenical Institute of Geneva and author of The Lord Protector (1955).
³ JC, 27 January 1956, p. 3.
⁴ Here the normal political title for Cromwell is being applied as the Jewish Protector.
⁵ Barbara Coulton, Cromwell and the ‘Readmission’ of the Jews to England, 1656 (Private paper, Leicester University, n.d.), p. 1. A link is found on The Cromwell Society website.
and holy”. For the battlefield, Cromwell provided *The Souldier’s Pocket Bible*, compiled by Edmund Calamy in 1643, using texts from the Geneva Bible, containing the most (if not all) of those places contained in holy Scripture, which doth set the qualifications of his inner man, that is a fit Souldier to fight the Lords Battels, both before he fight, in the fight, and after the fight...And may bee also ufefull for any Christian to meditate upon, now in this miserable time of Warre.  

Cromwell’s vision and national passion was for ‘Godly men in a Godly nation’. In his thinking, by both welcoming and blessing the Jews, this would encourage God to bless him and England too.

The Puritan Context

The Puritan engagement with the Bible, especially the Hebrew Bible is highlighted by Cecil Roth, the leading Jewish historian,

the religious developments of the seventeenth century brought to its climax an unmistakable philosemitic tendency in certain English circles. Puritanism represented above all a return to the Bible, and this automatically fostered a more favourable frame of mind to the people of the OT.

The Puritans also believed that they were witnessing the fulfilment of the promised Biblical prophecies concerning the Jews, as they experienced the fast approaching millennial chaos in the midst of the Civil War. Dates had been set for the arrival of the Messiah by both Christians and Jews. The Christians believed between 1656-1666; the Jewish scholars of the Zohar expected him in 1648; and for the more orthodox and traditional Jews worldwide, it was to be 1666. Thus, the earthly and spiritual dimensions of this apocalyptic speculation coincided for both religions.

---

12 Mary Clary, *The Little Horn’s Doom and Downfall* (London, 1651) p. 164. Joseph Mede, the Cambridge scholar in *Clavis Apocalyptica* (1629) believed that he had demonstrated from Daniel and Revelation that the Millennium would begin 1260 years after the fall of the Roman Empire, c.1660.
14 They also believed that the Messiah would arrive 1260 years after the fall of the Roman Empire. Guillaume Postel had claimed that he had found this in Kabbalistic texts. He had influenced Isaac La Peyere, who published *Du Rappel des Juifs* in Paris in 1656; a close friend of Menasseh ben Israel. Popkin, *Jewish Christians*, p. 58.
1665/6, the Jews were to witness in Gaza, and in Turkey, a claim by Shabbatai Zevi (1626-1676) that he was the ‘Messiah’. It can be argued that Cromwell had an element of this Messianic calling in himself, which affected his own identity; his firm conviction was that he was called by God. This motivation underpinned his actions and his life, at the least, he clearly considered himself to be a Moses figure. In this heady mix, the Jews assumed a special significance for the Puritans.

**Menasseh ben Israel and Amsterdam**

The drama of the Readmission of the Jews to England focused on two key personalities – Oliver Cromwell and Menasseh ben Israel (1604-1657) from Amsterdam. His original contact with England was in 1650 by his book, *The Hope of Israel*, which had been carefully planned and co-ordinated with Christians in both Amsterdam and England. Popkin affirms that “Menasseh ben Israel was the point of contact for the Jewish and Christian worlds, especially in Holland and England”. The city of Amsterdam presented for England a model of toleration towards its Jewish community. Following the expulsion of the Sephardic Jews from Spain in 1492, and from Portugal in 1497, many wealthy Jewish merchants and international traders had eventually found a safe home in Holland. As the years progressed, their wealth and their ability to network and trade worldwide clearly benefitted the nation, especially in Amsterdam. This was to be the ‘Golden Age of Dutch culture and prosperity’. Cromwell was aware of their contribution to the economic well-being of that nation. In the Netherlands, the mixture of religious tolerance, originating from the Calvinistic authorities, as well as the financial success of the Jews, deeply influenced Cromwell’s thinking. Roth claims that “apart from this philosemitic tendency, there was an incipient movement in favour of religious toleration as such”. Many of the Puritans with whom Cromwell identified had been forced from England because of their Protestant beliefs and their experience in Holland in their daily relationships with the Jews was positive. The Cartwrights were an example of this group; Baptists, who had fled from persecution in England. Joanna

---

15 Nathan of Gaza, a follower, endorsed him.
21 Roth, *History*, p. 150.
Cartwright, a widow, and her son, Ebenezer sent a petition in 1649 to Lord Thomas Fairfax (1612-1671) from Amsterdam. This asked for freedom for the Jews “to trade and dwell in this land [England] as they do in the Netherlands”. They had strong support from the officers of New Model Army.

This movement towards the legal readmission of the Jews, initiated in 1649 by the Cartwrights, preceded Menasseh ben Israel’s proposal for readmission. His earliest formal link with England was on 10 October 1651, when the Council of State considered his letter, following his book *The Hope of Israel*, dedicated to Parliament. This book contained his messianic vision concerning the alleged discovery in 1641, of Jews in Ecuador among the South American Indians by Antonio de Montezinos, a Portuguese traveller, who claimed that he had discovered the ten lost tribes. Menasseh ben Israel immediately visited Peter Serrarius (1600-1669), the Protestant millennialist, who believed that the fulfilment of Biblical prophecy would soon be witnessed. He had studied with John Dury (1596-1680) in Leiden; Serrarius later became a Sabbatarian. This millennial news stoked an emotional response in England too. According to Glaser, the Anglo-Jewish historians argued that “this was the culmination of Protestant philosemitism, which had developed during the first half of the seventeenth century”. The Rabbi’s argument was that, as the Jews were clearly dispersed worldwide, but not in England, an open door must urgently be created for them. Many Evangelicals had taught that it was the duty of the English to allow the Jews to return, and even to transport them back in English ships to the Holy Land, in preparation for the Parousia. Thomas Brightman earlier believed that England was “an Elect Nation”, sovereignly chosen by God for this purpose. This millennial fever, expecting that the Millennium was imminent, was shared by Christians and Jews.

---

23 Larry J. Kreitzer, *William Kiffin and his World vol.5* (Centre for Baptist History and Heritage Studies, Regent’s Park College, Oxford, 2016).
24 *Jewish Monthly* i.12 (1948) 11-17. (Quoted from a reprint in San Francisco, 1941).
33 Kaplan and Popkin, *Menasseh ben Israel*, p. 35.
alike. Cromwell wrote in 1649, “the Lord is very near”. Later in 1653, Cromwell had opened Parliament by telling its members that “they were the Parliament of Saints who would usher in the Millennium”. This sentiment was confirmed in the papers of John Thurloe, Cromwell’s close advisor and Secretary of State.

A pass for the Rabbi to visit England was agreed by the Council of State on 22 November 1652. Because of the outbreak of the First Anglo-Dutch War between 1652-1654, he was prevented from travelling. Menasseh ben Israel finally arrived in London in September 1655, invited by the British government, according to Thurloe. The Rabbi lived in the fashionable Strand until September 1657, funded by Cromwell and his supporters, other sources show that he was not funded from Amsterdam. On 31 October 1655, he delivered his Humble Address in person, to the Council of State chamber. Following this, Cromwell brought the matter formally to their attention on 13 November 1655. The Council ordered that should they should draw up a list of suitable people by 15 November 1655, and then twenty-eight members were summoned. Three extra members were added on 11 December 1655 by Cromwell, because he wanted to increase his supporters, who would promote his view to allow the Readmission.

A previous attempt had been made to raise the issue of Jewish people returning to England. David Abravanel Dormido (d.1667), a relative of ben Israel originally from Brazil, along with Samuel, Menasseh’s son had already petitioned Cromwell on 3 November 1654, presenting their request to the Council. They were pleading for sympathy for the suffering of the Conversos; this group was variously described as secret Jews, Crypto-Jews or New Christians. They were suspected of using baptism and a false profession of conversion to join the Roman Catholic church, but still secretly continuing to worship as Jews. Writing from Amsterdam, the Rabbi explained in an open letter to the Jews of Europe,

I have been informed by letters, and faithful correspondents, that today this English nation is no longer our ancient enemy but has changed the Papistical religion and has become excellently affected to our nation, we as an oppressed people have good hope.

36 Popkin, Messiah, p. 168.
37 The Thurloe State Papers 1638-1660 (TSP in 7 vols), vol.5, p. 383. The edition consulted was from the Bodleian Library, part of the Trevor-Roper papers (London: Fletcher Giles, 1742).
38 Lucien Wolf, ‘Menasseh ben Israel’s Study in London’, JHSE vol. 3, (1896), 144.
39 Ibid., 147.
40 Menasseh ben Israel, The Humble Addresses of Menasseh ben Israel, a Divine, and a Doctor of Physick, on behalf of the Jewish Nation, 1655, Addressed to the Lord Protector, hence referred to as ‘Menasseh’s Petition’. [EEBO, British Library].
41 Also known as David Abarbanel, he was part of a rich and influential Jewish family.
43 Cecil Roth, contained in Anglo-Jewish Letters (republished in London, 1938), pp. 37,38. Roth notes the contrast between the continued persecution of the Jews in Spain and France, as well as the more Roman
John Dury and Samuel Hartlib (c.1600-1662), leading messianists from the 1640s, had previously visited and regularly corresponded with Menasseh ben Israel in Holland.\textsuperscript{44} The Rabbi was popular in Amsterdam and several other Christians had visited the Sephardi synagogue to hear him preach.\textsuperscript{45} “Menasseh ben Israel was incontrovertibly a forerunner in Jewish-Christian relations” according to Roth.\textsuperscript{46} Van Den Berg describes him as “the Father of Judeo-Christian friendship”.\textsuperscript{47} His esteem among the Gentiles was further demonstrated when Queen Henrietta Maria of England, the wife of Charles I, visited his synagogue in 1643, to meet with him and hear him preach.\textsuperscript{48} A Roman Catholic woman being welcomed into a Jewish Sephardic synagogue was a significant event. The Baptist minister, Henry Jessey (1603-1663), a leading member of the Whitehall Conference, had already been another correspondent with the Rabbi.\textsuperscript{49} Jessey could both write and speak Hebrew. In 1650, Sir Edward Spencer had formally replied to \textit{The Hope of Israel}, it is clear that this book was already on the agenda, and discussed within the political sphere in London. Samuel Herring had also pleaded “that the Jews might be admitted to trade as well as in Holland”. The Rabbi also met Arise Evans, a Royalist, who had written \textit{Light for the Jews} and was subsequently promoted and reinstated by Charles II at the Restoration.\textsuperscript{50}

Menasseh ben Israel was esteemed not only as a Rabbi, but also as an author and a printer, establishing the first Hebrew press in Amsterdam between 1627 and 1632 and was at the centre of influence there.\textsuperscript{51} Born in Lisbon, though some say Madeira, to parents whose ancestors had escaped the Spanish Inquisition, they had arrived in Amsterdam in 1610. In 1651, Oliver St John (c.1598-1673), the Chief Justice and acting as the British ambassador had visited the Rabbi in Amsterdam, when on an official state visit to negotiate closer trade links with the Dutch.\textsuperscript{52} The Rabbi had taught the philosopher, Baruch Spinoza (1632-1677)\textsuperscript{53} in the Sephardic synagogue, engaging in fervent discussions with him. Spinoza was later excommunicated from the Jewish community in Amsterdam in 1656. Interestingly in 1655, Spinoza was courting controversy at exactly the same time that his ex-Rabbi was travelling to London to meet Cromwell. Thus, the crucial period of the Readmission and the contacts with Cromwell were between 1649-1656.

\textsuperscript{44} Ernestine der Wall, \textit{Petrus Serrarius and Menasseh ben Israel: Christian Millenarianism and Jewish Messianism in Seventeenth-Century Amsterdam} (Leiden: Brill, 1989). Nathaniel Homes was another member of the group, p. 164.
\textsuperscript{45} Seating 2000 and it is still open to visitors today.
\textsuperscript{46} Introduction to the reprint of \textit{The Hope of Israel} (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987), p. 25.
\textsuperscript{48} \textit{Menasseh ben Israel and his World}, ed., Yosef, Kaplan, Henry Mechoulan and Richard H Popkin (Leiden: Brill, 1989). Her future son-in-law, who was to be William III attended too.
\textsuperscript{50} Arise Evans, \textit{A Light for the Jews or the Means to convert them, in answer to the Hope of Israel} (London: 1656). [EEBO, British Library].
\textsuperscript{51} The \textit{Hebrew Bible}, printed in 1639 by ben Israel for the Polish market (University of Leeds, Special Collections, Roth 104).
\textsuperscript{52} ODNB, Oliver St John. His wife was a cousin of Cromwell.
\textsuperscript{53} Popkin, \textit{Spinoza}, p. 66.
Cromwell initiated the Whitehall Conference to further his personal ambition to allow the Jews to return to England. He could not legally achieve this action on his own, so on 12 November 1655, he brought the petition to the Council of State, telling them firmly that he wanted a swift decision. The first question to consider was whether there was any legal impediment to Jewish Readmission. The lawyers seemed to answer that question easily, Lord Chief Justice Glynne and Steele, the Lord Chief Baron of the Exchequer, advised that “there is no law against the Jews coming”. They stated that the reversal of the Edict of Expulsion enacted by King Edward I in 1290 was possible, as it was no longer valid, and it had no current parliamentary authority. The lawyers attended all the sessions and Cromwell attended several too. The membership of the Conference of twenty-eight was by invitation only, the attendance was fluid. Three groups were included: the lawyers above, clergy and merchants.

Some of the key attendees were

Clergy – Dr Thomas Goodwin, Dr John Owen (no show?), Thomas Manton, Professor Ralph Cudworth, Thomas Bridge. Influential Baptists - William Kiffin, Henry Jessey and Daniel Dyke.

Merchants – Sir Christopher Pack (Lord Mayor of London), Sheriff Tompson, Alderman Andrew Riccard and Alderman Richard Tichbourne.

Cromwell later added some extra independents, attempting to boost his support – Hugh Peters, Peter Sterry and John Bulkeley.

Larry J. Krietzer from Regent’s Park College, Oxford has carefully assembled a summary schedule by dates, showing which members attended each sitting. His main research was about the Baptist minister, William Kiffen, who was “the wealthy merchant-pastor…one of the real representatives of commerce” at the Conference. He was not an extremist millennialist, as many of the earlier Baptists had been.

There was strong opposition from the merchants and the City traders, who claimed that it would “enrich foreigners, lower prices and impoverish the natives of our own land”. Some of the members of the Conference were keen to seek outside opinions. Opponents warned of the effects of the Readmission, initiating a plan for the rejection

---

54 13, 15 November, 4, 7, 12, 14 and 18 December 1655.
55 4, 7 December and the final chaotic one on 18 December 1655.
57 Kreitzer achieved this by combining the State Papers (TSP) 18/101 (15 November) and 25/76 (7, 12, 13 December), The Public Intelligencer newspaper (7, 12 and 13 December), Henry Jessey’s, A Narrative of the late Proceeds in Whitehall (London: 1656) [EEBO, Huntington Library 1656] and Nathaniel Crouch, Two Journeys to Jerusalem (London: 1695), pp. 192.
58 Kreitzer, Kiffen p.199. This was a challenging task, as he had to organise the varying and conflicting records found within the sources available.
of Cromwell’s proposal by circulating a variety of negative images of the Jews, claiming they were seeking to control England. False rumours were spread that the Jews had offered to buy St Paul’s Cathedral for £500,000, and Parliament would accept £800,000. Further destructive fables asserted that the Jews wanted to purchase a library for their Jewish books at Cambridge University. From some of the Jewish proponents for Readmission worldwide, there was even an idea that Cromwell could be their Messiah. Immediately, searches were made to see if he had any Jewish family link, consulting sources in both Huntingdon and Cambridge. When the unsurprising result was proved to be negative; they decided that a Gentile could not be their Messiah anyway.

The formal meetings were held in the Council Chamber in Whitehall and the first assembly was attended by Cromwell on 4 December 1655. He posed the question, whether the readmission of the Jews was lawful, and on what terms it would be appropriate. Cromwell tried to influence the outcome by adding some of his supporters, but on 18 December 1655, at the public meeting which he oversaw, the Conference was suspended to prevent a negative decision. Any formal decision was postponed until 1656, pending further guidance by Cromwell, but then early in 1656, plans to recommence the Conference were abandoned. Some reported a tense atmosphere in that final meeting, describing the anger of the public who attended as a ‘threatening mob’. Cromwell’s supporters were convinced that they had been sent by his opponents to disrupt the proceedings. The London merchants were accused of raising the crowds using rhetoric and via their pamphlet war. They wanted to provoke fear and prejudice towards the Jews as “the dangerous other”.60 The main published example of the very strong opposition to the Jewish readmission was by William Prynne in his Short Demurrer,61 who with Ross, invoked the infamous Blood Libel.62 Jewish scholars regularly condemn the English for this ongoing national antisemitism, protesting that Christians should repent for this scandal, which originated from Norwich in 1144, Bury St Edmunds in 1181, Bristol in 1183 and Lincoln in 1255.

Therefore, no legal judgement was forthcoming following the Whitehall Conference, so the Jews were not legally readmitted. Cromwell accepted this unsatisfactory conclusion, and instead he chose to take an alternative view, which Jewish scholars describe as, a don’t see, don’t tell attitude towards the Crypto-Jews, who had been revealed as living in London during the debates. John Evelyn (1620-1706) in his diary notes that “now were the Jews admitted on 14 December 1655”. Early in 1656, this informal acceptance was established with certain conditions. The committee of the Council of State outlined the terms; the Jews were considered, when they returned to be ‘on probation’. They would be accepted in England, but they must behave in an appropriate way. These terms included:

60 The portrayal of the Jews by Shakespeare as ‘the Other’. This argument is developed by James Shapiro in Shakespeare and the Jews (New York: Columbia University Press, 1996). Also see the 1992 Parkes lecture on this subject at the University of Southampton.
62 The Blood Libel is the accusation that young Christian children, especially boys, were killed and their blood used in the Jewish Passover rituals.
The Jews could not hold any judicial functions or any public office, they could not employ Christian servants. The Jews should do nothing to dishonour Christianity, they must respect Sunday as the Christian Sabbath. They were not allowed to distribute or to print any anti-Christian literature, though Hebrew books were allowed. They were further forbidden from seeking to convert Christians to Judaism, or in any way attempt to prevent Christians from evangelising them.63

Fierce Opposition

Cromwell had made the strategic decision on the last day of the Whitehall Conference to suspend it, amidst a carefully planned counter demonstration by his opponents. William Prynne (1600-1669) was the main influence, who by raising the fury of the mob with his religious and legal arguments, mixed with the fears of the merchants, sought to frustrate Cromwell’s plans for Readmission. These opponents regarded it as a means of preserving the Christian foundations and identity of the English nation. The wider religious context was the ongoing fear of Roman Catholicism continuing to undermine the unique Anglican Reformation, with the ongoing challenge of the Dissenters, especially the Presbyterians and Independents, as well as the Baptists and Quakers. It was a period of fighting to establish a new religious identity for England.64 This opposition movement demonstrated that the proposal to allow the Jews to return was clearly not supported by all, as the speed of the Readmission debate was proving to be too much of a cultural shift for some of these English. As early as 1653, James Howell, a Royalist spy had written to an Amsterdam friend, “touching Judaism, some corners of our city smell as rank of it as doth yours there”. Certainly, there were religious ‘zealots and enthusiasts’, as Prynne described them, influencing Cromwell, but there was also fierce anger from other Christians, who still despised the Jews. William Prynne had published his book, *Short Demurrer*65 within the period between the start and the end of the Conference, though in preparation much longer. In 360 pages, he produced a book of extreme hatred; repeating a variety of vile anti-Jewish claims such as the Blood Libel; quoting the negative tropes of the Jews poisoning wells; causing disease; belonging to the ‘synagogue of Satan’ and having a ‘foul odour’. Gretz described it as “a venomous work”.66 Prynne quoted with enthusiasm the raw hatred towards the Jews expressed within Luther’s book. He further doubted the genuineness of any Jewish conversion, despite never meeting a Jew in person. Consistent with his prejudiced views, he stated that there had only been about four reliable converts, one was Immanuel Tremellius.67

65 William Prynne, a bencher of Lincolnes Inne, the full title, *A short demurrer to the Jewes long discontinued remitter into England: Comprising, an exact chronological relation of their first admission into, their ill deportment, misdemeanors, condition, sufferings, oppressions, slaughters, plunders by popular insurrections, and regal exactions collected out of the best historians. The English laws, Scriptures, as seem strongly to plead and conclude against their readmission into England, especially at this season* (London: 1656).
A very unusual claim is made by modern Jewish historians that Prynne is ‘the Father of Anglo-Jewish Historiography’. He had written an early Jewish history, though negative, within the *Demurrer*. In his archival daily work, he accessed State papers and various histories. *Demurrer* was not reprinted after 1656; in that year Menasseh ben Israel wrote a rebuttal, *Vindiciae Judaica*. It was obvious that Christian philosemitism did not apply to Prynne and his followers, or even to a large group within England.

The Readmission of the Jews around 1656

The Jewish community in England had developed slowly and invisibly from about 1604 with the arrival of Dutch Sephardic merchants, wanting to continue trading with Portugal from England, because their own ships were banned in the Spanish war. The new community in London started from about 1630 with Antonio Fernades Carvajal (1590-1659), a successful trader from the Canary Islands and Portugal; it was soon noticed that he had failed to attend church. He is recognised as the founder of English Jewry and well respected by all, both Christians and Jews; this was demonstrated at his death, when the local church tolled its bell. The petition of Menasseh ben Israel had revealed these Conversos. In January 1656, the assets of Antonio Robles (d.1688), described as “a Portuguese of the Hebrew nation living in England” were seized. Previously, any admission that he was Jewish would not be used as defence in court. He offered multiple identities from being Portuguese to English, he was really Spanish, a status that would not help him in the midst of the Spanish war. He eventually admitted that he was a ‘secret Jew’, taking the risk that he would be expelled, but hoping that in Cromwell’s more philosemitic climate, this would be the safest nationality. His status as a Jew prevailed and was accepted by the court. So, instead of being regarded as a potential Spanish spy, ‘Robles the Jew’, won the right to retain his goods and to live safely in England. Simon de Caceres (d.1704) originally from Hamburg was an intelligencer or spy, undertaking spying expeditions to Chile and Jamaica.

The next chapter will examine this Converso community in more detail. An earlier Jew, who lived in England and was accepted for his usefulness, was Dr Roderigo Lopez (c.1517-1594). Lopez was employed as the physician to Queen Elizabeth, but convicted of high treason and executed in 1594. Cecil Roth studies this group in *A History of the Marranos*, they were all rich merchants, owning ships and trading worldwide, mainly with the East and the West Indies and the Levant. They had won contracts with Parliament for grain, gunpowder and munitions. This small Sephardic community from March 1656, was allowed to worship privately in a house in Creechurch Street, following the Dutch model. This building was soon converted into a private synagogue in 1657, remaining in use until 1701. Public synagogues were

---

68 Menasseh ben Israel, *Vindiciae Judaeorum: or, a letter in answer to certain questions propounded by a noble and learned gentleman, touching the reproaches cast on the nation of the Jews* [EEBO 1656]. (London: Bickerton, reprinted 1743).


only permitted following William III’s Toleration Act of 1689. This house was located next to the current Bevis Marks synagogue, built in 1699 by Joseph Avis, a Quaker. A Torah scroll was also sent from the Amsterdam synagogue, the spiritual home of Menasseh ben Israel, to authenticate their worship. In 1657, the Jews were also allowed their own cemetery in Mile End Road, East London.

Cromwell, the Puritan and the Economic Pragmatist

Oliver Cromwell was unsympathetic to the ‘mystical considerations’ of extremists, opposing the extreme millenarians and the literalists, as exhibited by the Fifth Monarchy men, who were on the verge of becoming Judaisers.\(^{71}\) Regarding his personal faith, “his Godliness was the true size of his greatness...he has been misrepresented. But he was also an example of how the Godly do err”.\(^{72}\) Yet he regarded the Jews as “those who deny the divinity of our saviour and have blasphemous opinions contrary to our religion”. Despite this, the Jewish trade was important for him, significantly influencing the prevailing English wars with Spain and the Netherlands. Cromwell was attracted to the commercial prosperity that the Jews had brought to Hamburg, Leghorn and Amsterdam.\(^{73}\) The ongoing debate has been about which factors had chiefly motivated him. Krietzer suggests that these “probably involved a combination of theological, religious, economic, political and social factors”\(^{74}\). Cromwell had sought divine help for the outcome of Whitehall by the declaration on 6 December 1655 of a Solemn Fast.\(^{75}\) He saw the positive treatment of the Jews as a public demonstration of the shared religious values of the Jews with Christians; belief in the same God; the Hebrew Bible, and the emphasis that Jesus was a Jew. But again, as Rubinstein further points out “in addition to the rise of Protestantism in England, the growth of capitalism and parliamentary democracy contributed towards a greater sympathy for the Jews”.\(^{76}\) According to Patinkin, “Cromwell certainly saw the benefits of capitalism within a well-ordered society”.\(^{77}\) Edgar Samuel perceptively comments that “all proposals to readmit the Jews are presented in tracts on religious, rather than economic topics”.\(^{78}\) Samuel asserts that a better explanation would be that

it was this mercantilist outlook, rather than the Millenarian theory of Henry Jessey or the Messianic optimism of Menasseh ben Israel, which led Cromwell to sanction the readmission of the Jews to England.\(^{79}\)

---

76 Rubinstein, *Philosemitism*, p. 41.
79 Ibid., p. 168.
Cromwell agreed with the sentiment of Hugh Peters (1598-1660), proposing that “strangers, even Jewes must be admitted to trade and to live with us”. Two leading Jewish historians differ about Cromwell’s true attitude towards the Jews. Katz narrowly argues that conversion was Cromwell’s main motive. Wolf in contrast, argues it was the economic issues and the usefulness of the Jewish merchants as spies, particularly against the Spanish. It appears that the economic argument finally won, even though the readmission debate was originally influenced by deep Puritan religious motives.

The Quakers and the Jews

In the wider context of the national debate about the Jews at Whitehall, this study has revealed the important contribution of the Quakers to philosemitism. Their positive view of the Jews is a strand that has been largely missing from the scholarly narrative. The Quakers were known as enthusiasts and independently minded people, following the ‘inner light’. This made them especially sympathetic towards the position of the Jews, who were very similar, as another excluded group. Margaret Fell (1614-1702) from 1669 was engaged in correspondence with the Dutch Jews and her book was translated into Hebrew by Baruch Spinoza (1632-1677) himself. In 1658, she wrote A Loving Salutation, a missionary tract in Low-Dutch, later printed in London in 1660, also circulated in Germany. This introduces a new and an interesting narrative to the common tropes about Christian philosemitism. It emphasises the strong link between the Quakers and Amsterdam, particularly with Spinoza and Menasseh ben Israel; but it also significantly involves a powerful woman, around the Readmission debates. Fox wrote from Utrecht on 17 April 1657:

Theare is a Jew at Amsterdam that by the Jews is Cast out (as he himself and others sayeth) because he oweth no other teacher but the light and he sent for me and I spoke to him...and soo the name of Christ it is like he doth owne.
Fell, Fox’s second wife, had come from a privileged family; in 1660 she wrote to King Charles II about the Quaker persecution. Baruch Spinoza has been regarded as a very important contributor to the religious and philosophical changes within Judaism and Christianity in Holland. Consequently, he also influenced the attitudes towards the Jews in England. There was a very close physical and spiritual link between London and Amsterdam, already demonstrated in this study. Fell is normally called ‘the mother of the Quakers’. Fell wrote in 1656, at the height of the readmission debate, *For Menasseh ben Israel*. William Ames (d.1662), a Quaker at the Amsterdam mission established in 1656, was seeking to convert the Jews, as well as other Christians, he personally encouraged Jewish emancipation. George Fox had a deep personal interest in Hebrew and had his own Hebrew Bible and wrote extensively about the conversion of the Jews. The Quaker cause was undermined in 1657 by James Naylor, an eccentric English Quaker, who claimed that he was Jesus, whilst riding into Bristol on a white horse. Some of the more extreme Quakers continued to encourage him, even regarding him an English Messiah, others in that group also supported Shabbatai Zevi, the false Jewish Messiah. The close links between the Jews and the Quakers will be examined further in the next chapter.

Conclusion

This chapter has shown the contrasting reactions within Christian England to the readmission of the Jews; from the enthusiastic support by Cromwell, to the fierce opposition from many other groups. It is understandable that the traditional Jewish narrative has been so appreciative about the events of 1656, and subsequently adopted a positive narrative. However, this narrow approach generally ignores the coordinated opposition that was carried on immediately after the Whitehall Conference, even up to the Jew Bill of 1753. The Jewish community has always been grateful for the pivotal, though ‘informal’ readmission, celebrating the date of 1656. However, the underlying antisemitism has not been adequately confronted by them in their desire to be accepted, fearing their portrayal as ungrateful English citizens. The enthusiasm for the readmission debates around 1656 soon evaporated. Menasseh ben Israel had returned home in 1657, a broken man and dying at Middelburg, en route

---


90 Fox’s own Hebrew Bible, which was Menasseh ben Israel’s edition printed in Amsterdam in 1635, was discovered by David S. Katz in 1986 at the Friend’s House Library, London in case 43. See ‘Quakers and Jews: A Hebrew Appeal from George Fox’ *Jewish-Christian Relations in the Seventeenth Century*, Dordrecht: Springer, (1998), 201-205. A copy is also available in the special Collections of the University of Leeds Library, (Roth 104). It was printed by Menasseh ben Israel in 1639, financed by a Christian publisher for the growing Polish market.

91 George Fox, *A Visitation to the Iewes* (London: 1656), *A Declaration to the Iewes for them to read over* (London: 1661), *A Demonstration to the Christians...how they Hinder the Conversion of the Jews* (London: 1679).


to Amsterdam. Steven Nadler comments in his new book, “His long campaign for the readmission of the Jews to England...had come to naught. He died probably thinking his life had been a failure”.94 But it had not, but obviously, it did not achieve all that he had petitioned for. In the same year as his death, he had already left his remarkable legacy behind in London. By 1657, there was a private synagogue at Creechurch Lane and a Jewish burial ground. Nadler asserts that “Menasheh ben Israel was, for much of the seventeenth century, the most famous Jew in the world”.95 The informal acceptance of the resident Conversos had opened a door to the slow readmission, so the Rabbi had not failed. Cromwell was soon distracted by many more pressing national problems, and he died in 1658. Then the climate quickly changed in 1660, heralding the Restoration of Charles II. Soon the earlier activities towards the Readmission of the Jews became insignificant. At this time, the Jews were in fear of a new expulsion by Charles II, which many expected. As it turned out, the Jews were both protected and accepted by him and he passed a legal measure in 1664 to support them.96 This was to be the formal approval of the Jewish presence in England, something that Cromwell had failed to achieve. The next chapter will consider how this new open door worked out in practice for the Post Restoration Jews, and it will also examine whether the philosemitic attitude of Cromwell and the Puritans was continued.

95 Ibid., p. 4.
96 Conventicle Act 1664 (Statutes of the Realm vol.5: 1628-1680), pp. 516-20. Designed to limit freedom of worship for Dissenters, the Jews were worried that they would be excluded too. Rabbi Joseph Sasportas met Charles II, who instructed the Privy Council to write formally to reassure them that the only requirement was for them to “demean themselves peaceably and quietly, with due obedience to His Majesty’s laws and without scandal to his government”. Paul Johnson, A History of the Jews (London: Phoenix, 2001), p. 278.
Chapter 3

Christian Relations with the Readmitted Jews between 1656 and the Glorious Revolution of 1688

The Whitehall Conference had apparently failed to achieve what Cromwell had wanted. The debate had revealed the Conversos, the ‘hidden’ Jews, then the challenge became how to deal with this resident community, certainly before allowing any more Jews to enter England. This chapter will examine the Jewish Readmission experience from 1656, which soon faced major changes following the deaths of Cromwell in 1658 and Menasseh ben Israel in 1657. This prompted Jewish fears for the security and social acceptance of the existing London Jews. A major social and theological turn was taking place in England during this period; the Puritan influence suddenly ceased and substantially lost its power; 1 to be replaced by a popular clamour for a fresh start in 1660, when Charles II was welcomed home as the King. 2 The legal status had been ‘adjusted’ to establish that Charles II had ruled from the death of his father in 1649. 3 There appeared to be a national desire that the period from the regicide of Charles I, up to the crowning of Charles II, should be deleted from history as a terrible mistake. Cromwell’s earlier vision of the Commonwealth was quickly dismissed. The small Jewish community was anxious about their new status, anticipating the uncertainties of the new reign of Charles II. 4 In fact, there followed a quiet period for the Jews, some antisemitic incidents occurred, but their numbers were gradually increased by immigration. 5 Charles II granted them a formal legal acceptance in 1664, 6 something that Cromwell had failed to achieve. From 1688 onwards, following the Glorious Revolution of William III and Mary II, their acceptance was more secure, because the tolerant attitudes that these new monarchs brought back with them, following their direct experience of the Jews in Holland, were much more sympathetic. The stark contrast and the real danger for the Jews had been during the reign of James II (1685-1688), which revealed a strong French, Roman Catholic influence, known to be much more antisemitic.

The continued toleration of this nascent Jewish community up to 1753, led to a parliamentary Act, the Jewish Naturalisation Bill, (Jew Bill), which sought to strengthen their security and status as members of English society. When the Bill was passed, it provoked an unexpected outburst against the Jews, mainly engineered within the House of Commons and by mob agitation, similar to the close of the Whitehall conference, forcing its immediate repeal. An election was due in the following year in 1754 and Walpole feared his defeat. The question to be examined now is whether, in this new environment, as residents in England, there was still any genuine Christian

3 Proclamation on 8 May 1660, House of Commons Journal (1802a), 16-18. EB15, p. 1012.
4 Tim Harris, Restoration: Charles II and his Kingdoms 1660-1685 (London: Allen Lane, 2005), p. 47.
6 The Conventicle Act in July 1664.
philosemitism shown towards the Jews? Post Whitehall, the English religious climate was also changing fundamentally, with less emphasis on the fulfilment of prophetic revelation and the certainty of the Bible. In contrast, it was moving towards the priority of reason and the philosophical influences of the Enlightenment. The dilemma for the Jews in England was what would happen to them, following the demise of Cromwell and the Puritans, in a society that had so convincingly rejected the religious and social values of 1649-1658? The history of early restoration Anglo-Jewry will be discussed here, to consider whether ‘the other’ within English society was actually still tolerated. It will also examine the Jewish experience within the context of all the other substantial social and religious changes challenging the Christian identity of the nation.

The London Jewish Community from the 1630s

The Jewish community had developed slowly and invisibly from about 1604 and by May 1656, Robles ‘the Jew’, had won the legal right to retain his ships and his goods, the Admiralty commissioners commented that “he [Robles] was either noe Jew or one that walks under loose principles, very different from others of that profession”.7 There was still a suspicion about the identity and the presence of the Jews, doubts about their true intentions, challenging their full acceptance within Christian England. Two notable successes had been achieved post Whitehall; firstly, a synagogue in 1657 and secondly, a Jewish burial ground. Menasseh ben Israel had earlier been rejected by most of the London Jewish community, who regarded him as too messianic and confrontational. Surprisingly, he related more closely to the Christian community in both London and Amsterdam. In 1656, these London Jews agreed to invite Rabbi Athais, a cousin of Carvajal, from Hamburg. The small Jewish community grew in London without any real resistance, despite the anti-Jewish efforts of Prynne at the end of the Whitehall Conference. The English from 1656, tolerated the resident Jews, they no longer had to remain hidden as Conversos. Samuel Pepys (1633-1703) visited the synagogue in Creechurch Lane on 14 October 1663, “I never…could have imagined there had been any religion in the whole world so absurdly performed as this”. But he approved and warmly responded “to their ‘Prayer for the King’, as part of the service”.8 John Greenhalgh had visited it earlier in 1662, observing that “they were happy and secure, noting three sets of locked doors to enter”.9

The report of the Whitehall Conference by Henry Jessey had established that “there is no Law that forbids the Jews to return in England”.10 Thus, the existing community was tolerated, and so, the door opened slowly and carefully to allow the entry of mainly Sephardic merchants and traders, particularly from Holland and Iberia. Now the debates about the Readmission and the presence of the Jews, evolved from just
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8 Pepys, The Diary in eleven volumes from 1660 to 1669.
10 Henry Jessey, A Narrative of the late proceeds at White-Hall concerning the Jews (Chapman, 1656), [EEBO, Huntington Library], p. 9.
religious factors, such as the messianism of the Puritans, and then developing towards more economic, political and social determinants. The challenge became, how should this alien people and these un-Christian Jews be treated, living in a Christian land. From 1656, the established but secret, London Jewish community had wanted to distance themselves from the extremists (both Christian and Jewish), and the millennialists like Menasseh ben Israel. They just longed to live in safety; to keep a low profile; to continue uninterrupted with their trade; and to be gradually accepted within English society. This was the identical motivation that was observed in Jewish behaviour from the middle of the nineteenth century in England, eventually culminating in the Jewish emancipation of 1858.  

The Changes around the Restoration of Charles II in 1660

Following Whitehall, the subsequent debates concerning the status of the Jews included James Harrington (1611-1677). In 1656, he proposed in his book Oceana, that the Jews should be settled in Ireland, to “plant it with Jews, allowing them their own Rites and Lawes”.  

Some other London merchants following Whitehall had continued to attack them from fear of business competition. In December 1659, Thomas Violet (1634-1662) described as “the arch Jew-baiter” and as a “restless meddling man” by Hyamson, wanted legal action to be taken against these Conversos. One of Violet's outrageous lies was that Carvajal had told him that foreign Jews had offered to advance Cromwell one million pounds, if he allowed 2000 Jewish merchants to live in England. In complete contrast, as a gesture of appreciation in October 1660, Charles II knighted Augustine Coronel-Chacon (d.1665) following his swift and convenient conversion. He was known as ‘the littell Jue’ at the Royal Exchange; he with George Monck (1608-1670) had negotiated the king’s marriage settlement with the infanta, Catherine of Braganza. As part of this financial settlement, the Portuguese Jews in Amsterdam had negotiated a huge dowry for Charles II.

By the end of 1661, most of the resident London Jews, who were foreigners or aliens, had been allowed their denizations, now they were regarded as nearly English. The influential Mendes and Da Costa families, both related to Coronel-Chacon, had escaped from Spain and Portugal to London. The Lord Mayor of London and the City merchants continued to warn about any increase in the numbers of the Jewish Community. Charles II was actually tolerant, because for him the Jews had already proved to be very useful, as some rich Jews had facilitated funds from the King of Portugal towards his efforts to reclaim the throne. The Petition for the Restoration of the King was submitted on 7 December 1659 to the Privy Council and then accepted by the Commons on 17 December. All this was happening just four years after Whitehall.
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15 Hessayon, Trappaner, p. 220.
16 ODNB, Monck by Ronald Hutton, 2008.
Legal protection for the Jews followed from 1663, when the Jews were allowed to trade with few restrictions. Further legal security was achieved in July 1664 by the Second Conventicle Act, when the King intervened to exempt them permanently from exclusion. Thus, the formal readmission of the Jews was eventually authorised by Charles II in 1664, and not in 1656, as Cromwell and ben Israel had hoped. As events turned out, there was no need for any formal Readmission legislation, as some Jews were already resident, and they were soon accepted by most English people.

In 1685, thirty-seven Jews were arrested just after James II took the throne, following a precedent during 1673 of growing threatening behaviour towards the Jews. James II replied, to the petitioners’ surprise, demonstrating his own tolerance:

    His Majesty’s intention is that they should not be troubled on this account, but quietly enjoy the free exercise of their religion, whilst they behave themselves dutifully and obediently to his Government.  

This was the last of any such major legal challenges. Their national loyalty was demonstrated by their Annual gift of silver to the Lord Mayor of London. Some Dutch Jews had followed William and Mary to England, and as more foreigners immigrated, the Lord Mayor continued to oppose, but in vain. Later Sir John Barnard (c.1685-1764), Tory MP for the City of London and the leader of the Commons, had personal issues with Samson Gideon, because Walpole had allowed him to own land. Barnard also complained that the Jews were exercising too much power and influence, even fearing that Christians would become Jews. This was to be a familiar trope in the later opposition to the 1753 Jew Bill.

Post Restoration Jewry

The status of the Jews in England was soon hidden under the seismic shifts occurring in the nation, following the rejection of the Puritans and the failure of Richard Cromwell to continue his father’s dream. The desire for a new king immediately led to revenge on those who had killed Charles II’s father. Katz shows evidence of the positive Anglo-Jewish identification with the Restoration, as well as earlier active Jewish support for Charles II in Amsterdam. In September 1656, while Charles II was in Bruges, General John Middleton negotiated for him with some Dutch Jews for funds and practical support to reclaim the throne. They later helped him with financial support and weapons, he promised that when he was restored, he would “publish how farr they have contributed towards our restoration”. This can explain his desire to protect and welcome the Jews, as gratitude for facilitating his return to England. The Jew, Mendes da Costa was popularly denounced in England for raising £4000 to finance the Royalist venture, though the Thurloe papers dismiss this claim. In December 1660,

19 Barnard was originally a Quaker, but later became an Anglican.
22 1656 BL Egerton 2542, f.240.
23 Birch, TSP, p. 572, 578.
Jewish merchants had petitioned Charles II seeking his protection. Hessayon affirms that “ultimately, the Jews’ fate rested with Charles II, and like Cromwell, he showed himself favourably disposed”. It is unlikely that the Jews would have imagined that both Cromwell and Charles II would be regarded as philosemitic towards them. During Charles II’s reign, forty-eight Sephardic Jews were endenizened, yet another proof of his tolerance and his appreciation of their loyalty.

The Growing Jewish Community

This section will provide a biographical perspective about some of the Jews who began to settle in England. Antonio Fernandez Carvajal (c.1590-1659) had arrived from Portugal and lived in Leadenhall Street from 1635. In 1649, he was awarded the army contract for corn and by 1653, he owned several ships trading with Brazil, the Levant and both the East and West Indies. He was noted for his silver trade; in recognition he and his sons were granted denizens in 1655. When another war broke out with Spain in 1656, Cromwell personally arranged to carry Carvajal’s goods to the Canaries in an English ship with Dutch colours. Carvajal was one of the three men who acquired the Sephardic Jewish burial ground. Around 1656, his value as a spy was appreciated, because he had provided information about the Royalist plans in Holland, through his servant Butler, via some of Carvajal’s relatives there. Cromwell had learned from him details of the various negotiations between Charles II and Spain. On 4 February 1657, Burton writes that Cromwell had told Carvajal that he intended to allow the Jews to safety return to England:

> the Jews, those able and general intelligencers, whose intercourse with the Continent Cromwell had before turned to profitable account, he now conciliated by a seasonable benefaction to their principal agent [Carvajal] resident in England.

Thus, the Post Restoration period enabled the Jews to continue to live without any serious challenge. The synagogue continued from 1657, an alien religion was tolerated, all this began to reverse the Christian antisemitism observed before then. There were no riots as the Jews began to establish themselves. Jewish worship had been allowed in England for the first time since 1290, and with their cemetery in Mile End, this publicly demonstrated that the Jews were back in England and were at home. David Katz gives a provocative assessment of this period in the last paragraph of his book:

> these English philosemites wanted Hebrew without tears, philosemitism without the Jews. This proved to be impossible, and once Cromwell and Charles II realised that the Jews as a nation could never be admitted through the front door, they were anxious to go around to the back themselves and let them in through the entrance reserved for tradesmen.

---
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The normal Jewish narrative about Charles II and his appreciation of the Jews has narrowly limited its focus to just the financial support provided for him from the Continent. This study has discovered that by examining the Jewish family networks, the essential foundation of Jewish identity, other close links to royalty are found, especially with Charles II and the Jews. A good example of this is Jacob da Costa, who arrived in England in 1655, at the same time as Menasseh ben Israel. Thurloe refers to his wife, Leonora Mendes, the daughter of the Marrano physician to King John IV of Portugal, who moved to London from Portugal in 1660. Jacob’s son, Moses (Anthony) da Costa (c.1668-1747) married his cousin, Catherine da Costa (1679-1756). Her father, Fernando Mendes (1647-1724) was physician to Charles II from 1669, but mainly to his wife, Catherine of Braganza. Catherine da Costa was christened Catherine, after Queen Catherine, who was her godmother in England at a private service at Somerset House. Fernando da Costa returned to Judaism later on in his life, he was buried in the Mile End Jewish cemetery, along with Carvajal. His son, Moses da Costa became a major shareholder in the Bank of England in 1694. These family networks show a combination of the readmitted Jews from 1655, who had close links to royalty in Portugal, as well as with Charles II; both in exile and at his Restoration.

The Christian Response following the Jewish Readmission

As the social acceptance of the Jews gradually improved from 1656, the complete opposite applied to the Puritans. When Charles II came to power, he had scores to settle with those who had killed his father; for him the Puritans and their religious tradition were clearly responsible. It was this group, with the encouragement of Cromwell, promoting the Jewish cause. The question immediately arose whether any other Christian group would continue their philosemitic attitudes. The Royalist supporters of the Charles II included Prynne and Ross, both loyal Anglicans, but vehement antisemites. The Declaration of Breda in April 1660 had promised greater religious toleration following the return of Charles II. His intention soon proved to be illusory, as legislation was quickly enacted to ban the Presbyterian and Independent influence, so closely identified with the Puritans. Charles II had accepted them for two years as he settled back into England, but he quickly reinstated the Bishops, and gradually those clergy who had previously lost their livings, some of whom had emigrated for their own safety. The new theological power of the Anglican church moved back towards the Laudian tradition, as Moorman observes:

29 Henry R. Lew, Smitten by Catherine (Self-published, 2017). A family history, she was the first noted Jewish artist, whose work has survived in England; a pupil of Bernard Lens.
the Laudian party had spent the last fifteen years preparing for this moment, and they were not in a mood for compromise. With Lord Clarendon, they intended to see the restoration of the Church of England...as the one and only legal and established Church in the Land.\(^{33}\)

This revived Anglican group won parliamentary approval in 1662 for the Act of Uniformity, forcing ‘unfeigned assent and consent’ to the revised Prayer Book, which contained non-Puritan rituals. Public oaths of loyalty from the clergy were required from 1662; any opponents became part of the Great Ejection of 1662, designed to remove and persecute the Puritan ministers.\(^{34}\) About 700 Puritan clergy were removed from their livings.\(^{35}\) “I hear most of the Presbyters took their leaves today, and the City is much dissatisfied with it”, wrote Pepys on 17 August 1662.\(^{36}\) This new religious atmosphere was Royalist, returning to the concept of the Divine Right of Kings.

With vigour, the Stuart monarch affirmed the status of the Anglican church and returned its theology to the Laudian experience. A series of Acts followed known as the ‘Clarendon Code’, beginning with the Corporation Act in 1661, which barred outsiders such as the Dissenters, Quakers and Deists from public office; these groups were treated far more harshly than the Jews. The Anglican control was strengthened in 1666 by the Five Mile Act and then the Conventicle Acts of 1664 and 1670. The social impact of the removal of the earlier Puritan high ethical values resulted in a new laxity in national moral standards, which followed the example of the licentious lifestyle of Charles II himself. The Cabal was established in 1673 at the time of the Test Act,\(^{37}\) forcing public office holders to receive Holy Communion in an Anglican church. In Parliament, the Whigs and the Dissenters opposed the Tories, closely linked to the Anglican church. These religious changes became well established by the time Charles II died in 1685.

An interest in Jewish issues was stirred by the arrival in 1674 of Templo, who toured England with his scale model of Solomon’s Temple.\(^{38}\) Exhibitions had already been held in Holland, mainly by the Christians, but it had also caught the attention of the Freemasons, as their rituals were connected with Solomon and the Temple builders. Christopher Wren, a leading Freemason, arranged for the display of the model in London for the Royal Society, the Archbishop of Canterbury, the court of Charles II and the general public. This exhibit prompted Isaac Newton to study further about Solomon’s Temple and to read Ezekiel. The model remained on show until 1680.\(^{39}\) The philosemitic element within freemasonry will be examined later.

---


\(^{36}\) Moorman, *History*, p. 252.

\(^{37}\) Cabal represents the initials of the men who signed the *Treaty of Dover* in 1682 for Charles II. Some other Jewish scholars suggest that it also has links to the Jewish mystical tradition of *Cabala*.


Theological Changes

A different theological atmosphere developed that embraced philosophical change, promoting the priority of reason. Leading proponents of this view, especially the Cambridge Platonists. As Marilyn Lewis explains, they regarded “Reason, the very voice of God” as their approach to truth and they exhibited strong ethical values and encouraged their followers to maintain personal lives that were pure and holy. Called Latitudinarians, they stoutly resisted enthusiasm and individualism in any form, actively distancing themselves from the Puritan overemphasis on enthusiasm and millennialism. The philosophical world was also changing, Moorman comments “Newton in physics and Locke in metaphysics had both shown the orderliness of nature and of God”. This new spirit of the age was represented by Locke’s three essentials – Reason, Simplicity and Morality. The religious turn moved from Puritan theology and practice, to a stronger Anglican church that forced a national allegiance to the Prayer Book, returning to ritual and giving more power to the clergy. A major consequence was to exclude Dissent in any form, especially the Baptists, Presbyterians and Quakers. The Jews were also excluded, but were not seen as the present enemy like the Dissenters, in many ways they were tolerated more than the Dissenters. This relative religious acceptance eventually led to the movement to promote the more positive 1753 Jew Bill.

As discussed earlier, during the reign of James II from 1685, who promoted a stronger Roman Catholic influence, it soon led to his downfall. The cry went out in 1688 to Holland for new Protestant monarchs, William, a Dutch Calvinist married to the English Queen Mary. Amidst all these changes within Christian society, the status of the Jews became even more influenced by social and economic factors, rather than by religious ones. The earlier millennialist attitude towards them had been firmly rejected as too Puritan. A theological shift was quickly made from the earlier evangelical, Bible based theology exhibited by the Dissenters and some Anglicans, to an approach which emphasised rationalism. For some it moved yet further, towards a more Deist and eventually Unitarian position.

Millennial Signs in London?

During 1665 in London, there was great social instability caused by the Great Plague; then in 1666, the Great Fire of London destroyed 50% of the City. The millennialists had predicted 1666 as an apocalyptic year; many had added 666, the key number in
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the Book of Revelation to 1000 years. But in the Jewish community there was also a parallel, vociferous claim that the Messiah had actually come in the person of Sabbatai Zevi (1626-1676). In 1665 and 1666, Nathan the prophet of Gaza had promoted Zevi as the Messiah and this group had given a fresh hope for the millennialists. The eventual shock that Zevi was merely a fraud and an illusion, was proved when he, under duress converted to Islam in September 1666. This false Messiah had even been called a Quaker Jew. Around him, another surge of millennial fever worldwide had surfaced, particularly in Amsterdam, where Zevi’s followers divided the Sephardic synagogue. In London, little interest was shown by the more stable and less religious, Jewish merchant community. In the midst of a greater rationalism, Jews did want the fanatics to draw attention to claims of a ‘false Messiah’, when they were seeking to model religious and social stability. The identity they sought was to be acceptable, reliable English citizens and not alien religious extremists. This would merely have given further ammunition to the antisemitic elements in England, who still didn’t trust the Jews.

Jewry following the Glorious Revolution of 1688

William of Orange returned on 5 November 1688, and like Charles II had the benefit of Jewish financial backers. Solomon Medina, a Dutch Jew paid off William’s debts to Churchill, the Duke of Marlborough. The Jewish banker, Francisco Lopes Suasso, lent him two million guilders, and when William III questioned what security was required, Suasso replied “if you are victorious, you will surely repay me; if not, the loss is mine”. A surprising offer of another loan came from a most unexpected Catholic source, from Pope Innocent XI himself, who fiercely despised Louis XIV of France. At sixteen, William had accompanied, Henrietta Maria, the mother of Mary his future wife, to the Amsterdam Sephardic synagogue to hear Menasseh ben Israel in May 1642. That she was a Roman Catholic in a city with Jews, whose forebears had been persecuted by the Inquisition in Spain and Portugal, was significant in itself. William was fully aware of the respect shown by the Christians to Jews in that city, and he consistently exhibited a philosemitic attitude. His parents and the local Christians were also dependent upon the Jews as the source of their personal jewellery and gems, obtained from the Far East and Brazil, which they lavishly displayed. Henrietta Maria was visiting the city with her son, to sell her jewels to raise funds to finance an army to support her husband, Charles I. Diego Duarte, the King’s jeweller, now became the agent to maximise the proceeds from the sale of the Crown jewels. As Jonathan Israel shows, William III was later noted for his tolerance and he had

brought this philosemitic attitude with him to London as the King, “he observed a working model of religious toleration in the Dutch Republic”. Israel goes further
possibly no other major statesman of early modern times came to be so closely associated with the cause of religious toleration in his own lifetime and made so considerable a contribution to the advancement of religious and intellectual freedom in the Western world as the Stadholder-King, William III...including the North American colonies.\textsuperscript{52}

By 1670, it was estimated that there were 2500 Sephardic and 1800 Ashkenazi Jews living in Holland.\textsuperscript{53} In England, new financial legislation led to the foundation of the Bank of England in 1694 and the establishment of the National Debt. The Jewish community in England were substantial investors in the Bank, because they believed that this action would further demonstrate that they were loyal and trustworthy members of British society. They followed the Jewish ethics of their Fathers, “pray for the welfare of the government, for without the fear of it, people will swallow one another alive”.\textsuperscript{54}

The English Toleration of the Jews

Rubinstein contends that “in addition to the rise of Protestantism in England, the growth of capitalism and parliamentary democracy contributed towards a greater sympathy for the Jews”.\textsuperscript{55} Cromwell had certainly seen the benefits of capitalism within a well-ordered society. The social approval of the London Jews was demonstrated on 23 June 1700, when Sir Solomon Medina (c.1650-1720) was knighted. The City of London had previously limited the freedom of the Jews to trade, but there was a small group who were accepted from 1657, when Solomon Dormido was admitted as a broker and the oath was changed for him and subsequent Jews; he was soon followed by Simon de Caceres. This group at the Royal Exchange was referred to as ‘those in Jewes Walk corner’. When the Exchange was reorganised in 1697, it restricted the membership to 100 and a maximum limit was established of 12 aliens\textsuperscript{56} and 12 Jews, for whom the Christian oath was modified. This demonstrated a priority for the Jews, who were just a tiny group. This prompted the foreign Protestant traders [aliens] especially the Huguenots, to protest the unfairness, but in vain.\textsuperscript{57} There were about 50,000 Huguenots in London at this time.\textsuperscript{58} Further City notables objected in 1720 and they tried to restrict the Jews from trading, but again this was


\textsuperscript{53} Schama, \textit{Belonging}, p. 253.

\textsuperscript{54} \textit{Mishnah, Pirkei Avot}, Rabbi Chania. ch. 3, 2. A fundamental Jewish teaching in the Siddurim, recited on the Shabbat.


\textsuperscript{57} James Shapiro, \textit{Ethnicity and Identity. How were the Jews regarded in 16th Century England?} British Library article (15 March 2016).

rejected. The place of the Jews in England was raised in Parliament in the reign of Queen Anne, when an Act was passed “to oblige Jews to maintain and provide for their Protestant children”. Jews could own land from 1722, the legal contract accepted with a Jewish oath. Again in 1732, further anti-Jewish libels were raised, which accused them of killing those who had married out of the Jewish faith.

Conclusion

The debate over the Readmission of the Jews was inconclusive, but it was legally established that there was no bar to their return. The Conversos, the hidden Jews, who were already in London as merchants, were forced to publicly acknowledge their Jewishness. The formal requests for a synagogue and the cemetery had revealed the leading Jews, such as Carvajal. The acceptance of the identity of Robles as ‘a Jew’ and establishing his legal rights to his ships and his goods, confirmed an acceptance of this nascent Jewish community. They no longer had to remain hidden. The synagogue records in London for this period show a rich Sephardic community, whose ancestors originated from Spain and Portugal. They had the ability to interact professionally with the upper classes in both English and European society, as they were doctors, bankers and merchants, like Mendes. This group later became substantial investors in the new Bank of England from 1694. There were also a few poor Ashkenazi Jews escaping persecution from Eastern Europe to England, but most came later. The original ‘Jewish Protector’, Oliver Cromwell had suddenly died, leaving the Jews at the mercy of the major social and religious shifts in society from 1660. The Jews who had financially supported Charles II, from the extended Jewish community on the Continent, were treated with gratitude; and so, when in England, he was predisposed to treat them well. The City merchants were angered by the King’s new ‘protection’ for the Jews, and frustrated even further that the legal system was protecting them. The outcome for the Jews with their new status, showed that they were accepted in England in a more positive manner than they could have anticipated. This chapter has also revealed the strong link between England and Holland, prompted by ben Israel and his influence on Cromwell. Holland, with the support of the Dutch Calvinists was a safe home for the Jews. Rembrandt painted a portrait of his close friend Menasseh ben Israel and also painting Jewish people and Jewish social scenes in Holland. The Jews and the Rabbis in Holland had been learning English in preparation for their readmission to England during the late seventeenth century. The Quakers were established in Amsterdam, and a group of fellow evangelical Protestants were resident there too. There was still a latent desire within that group for the Restoration of the Jews to Palestine. This attitude was also still present in England, though not expressed in the
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extreme form witnessed during the 1630-1660 period.\textsuperscript{65} The close link with the Dutch people was reinforced in 1688, when William and Mary returned to take the English throne.\textsuperscript{66} The Christian philosemitic tradition they had experienced in Amsterdam clearly influenced them.

Chapter 4

Jewish Assimilation during the Early Eighteenth Century. From Conversos to the 1753 Jew Bill.

The Jewish community had begun to establish itself into English society; initially prompted by Cromwell’s support and then reinforced by their positive acceptance by both Charles II and William III. This chapter will consider the characteristics of this English Jewish community; their social, economic and religious experience, examining the perception of Jewish identity and philosemitism in England. The early eighteenth century was a relatively peaceful period for the Jews and consequently, by the middle of the century, the perceived acceptance of this previously 'alien and foreign' community encouraged Parliamentary legislation in 1753. This was the first time that Parliament had considered the national status of the Jews alone, as a group worthy of attention and protection. All the previous legislation had been linked with other disparate groups like the Dissenters, as in 1664.

The initial Converso or Marrano community in London after 1656 was from a very limited social group. It comprised Sephardic immigrants, whose families had escaped from Spain and Portugal following the Catholic persecutions from 1492 onwards. Their forebears then settled in Holland, Brazil, North America and the Far East, soon establishing successful worldwide trading networks. Most of those readmitted had been Conversos (hidden Jews), outwardly appearing to be Roman Catholic, when resident in the Iberian Peninsula. The nucleus of the leaders of the London community up to 1656: Carvajal, Dormido and Robles had all arrived from Portugal. After readmission, new immigrants arrived very slowly, until it was realised abroad that Jews would be welcomed back into England. Then the message quickly passed within the family networks overseas, and sons were often sent to England to open new trading branches. However, these earliest returnees were still very similar to the 1656 community; Sephardic and wealthy. It was estimated that these Jews had brought £1.5 million worth of assets back with them into England, and soon contributed towards one-twelfth of the overseas trade. This was exactly the sort of Jewish people that Cromwell had wanted to attract, believing that they would benefit England economically. His aim had been to eventually make London a stronger trading and

67 Hebrew sepharad, Spain.
68 From Spain 1492 and Portugal 1497.
70 This was the argument presented by Menasseh ben Israel in his Petition.
banking centre, in preference to the current domination of Amsterdam and the Dutch.  

As the eighteenth century developed, it witnessed the arrival of Ashkenazi Jews in London from Germany, Central and Eastern Europe. These originated from a completely different sort of Jewish community. They were very poor, escaping from the persecutions of Christian Europe and they immediately became a drain on the financial charity of the wealthy, established Sephardic synagogue funds. The Ashkenazi had also become an embarrassment to these established Jewish City businessmen, who heard complaints from the indigenous Londoners about these Jewish paupers on their streets. Potentially, the Jewish community could have been seriously fractured. As social groups, they were polar opposites, as Jews they shared a religious and a racial heritage; yet their recent origins and lived experience were so diverse. Even their religious practice and liturgies were different; their worship, their dietary laws and their traditions about interacting with Gentiles also clashed. Most importantly the Ashkenazi spoke a different form of Hebrew, Yiddish. The Sephardic reaction was to move the Ashkenazi out of London to the provinces, to cities such as Bristol, Plymouth, Liverpool and Ipswich. Hence the later Jewish scholarly term, Port Jews. They were also settled inland in Birmingham and Canterbury. Their unwelcome presence in London further complicated the status of the established Conversos, who had adopted Christian traditions in order to be assimilated into English society. This chapter will adopt a biographical narrative to consider the behaviour of some of these key families, to examine how they interacted with the native English.

The Jewish Naturalisation Bill merely sought to give the immigrant, alien Jews, the benefit of British citizenship. The Bill would only apply to a very small rich group, the Sephardis, who could purchase this status. Jewish children born in England were already fully accepted as English by birth. In modern terms the question raised, is whether the new Jews were economic migrants or refugees? The clear distinction between the groups demonstrates that the Sephardi were economic migrants, and the Ashkenazi were refugees from continental persecution. The essential feature of any Jewish community was a local synagogue and their own cemetery; already established
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from 1656 in London. As the community grew, the Sephardic group built the impressive Bevis Marks synagogue in 1701, providing a strong visual statement that the Jews were now established. This was a public synagogue, in contrast to when they had initially worshipped, hidden in Carvajal’s house. The first Haham [Rabbi] was Jacob Sasportas (1610-1698), followed by David Nieto (1654-1728), who served from 1701 until his death. In 1690, the Ashkenazi built the Great Synagogue in Duke’s Place.

The Merchant Jewish Community

The Jews helped to increase the importance of the English trade networks from the start of the eighteenth century, eventually, Great Britain eclipsed the marine power and the mercantile skills of the Dutch. This was a crucial stage in England’s economic history. As well as the Jewish trading ability in goods, their banking skills and their facility to raise capital for investment was vital for the English economy. They imported jewels, coral and silver, providing consumer goods for the emerging middle classes, allowing them to display their growing wealth in a more prosperous London. Kagan and Morgan reveal the Atlantic spread of this trade in a series of essays, *Atlantic Diasporas* through the interwoven themes of markets, politics, religion, culture and identity; the essays demonstrate the world of Atlantic Jewry, most often typified by *Port Jews* involved in mercantile pursuits. Jonathan Israel in his essay in the book asserts the view that of the various trading diasporas that played a significant part in the commerce and maritime links of the Atlantic world during the early modern era, the Sephardic Jewish variant, together with the connected Crypto-Jewish element among the descendants of the forcibly baptised Jews of the Iberian Peninsula, surely was the widest-ranging in its operations and the longest-lasting in its general impact, on both culture and society and on the international trade system.

A new wealth of Jewish commercial talent was now being established in England and soon proved to be significant. Holly Snyder in her essay shows their importance for England in *English Markets*, she quotes that 90 Jews were endenizened in England.
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between 1655 and 1680. Consequently, between 1660 and 1680, the Christian objection towards the Jews moved from the religious to the economic. There was a fear of a dominance by these Jewish merchants, still regarded as aliens, despite their denizens.\textsuperscript{85}

\textit{Mercantile philosemitism} is a new concept introduced by Jonathan Karp, he defines it as

an appreciation of the Jews’ presumed commercial and financial capacities translated into practical programs and policies to ensure their settlement and at least toleration.\textsuperscript{86}

This term has not been encountered elsewhere in the sources used for this study, but it sums up very well the reality of the pragmatic approach of Cromwell, along with the positive economic effects of these Sephardic merchants. They were accepted by many for their usefulness. This mercantile motive again challenges the argument originally posited by Katz, who said that it was solely millennial philosemitism that was the main motivation for readmission.\textsuperscript{87} The economic evidence shows that his approach is a far too narrow interpretation.

\textbf{The Converso Identity}

The London Conversos were only a part of the worldwide Sephardic community following the expulsion in 1492, when this group had held important executive and administrative roles. There they had been at the forefront of international commerce based on the strength of Spanish marine power and through exploration.\textsuperscript{88} It is suggested that Christopher Columbus was a Converso, who was seeking a new, safe home for fellow Jews through his travels.\textsuperscript{89} Scholars have debated the numbers, many suggest that only 100,000 were expelled from Spain in 1492.\textsuperscript{90} From this total, a

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{86} Jonathan Karp, \textit{The Politics of Jewish Commerce. Economic Thought and Emancipation in Europe 1638-1848} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), pp. 91, 99. He is the joint editor of \textit{Philosemitism in History} with Adam Sutcliffe.
\item \textsuperscript{87} Katz, \textit{Philosemitism}. Christopher Hill is also influenced too much by a millennial explanation in \textit{Anti-Christ in Seventeenth-Century England} (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1971), p. 115.
\item \textsuperscript{88} Columbus begins his diary with ‘in the same month in which their Majesties [Ferdinand and Isabella] issued the edict that all Jews should be driven out of the kingdom and its territories, they gave me the order to undertake with sufficient men my expedition of discovery to the Indies’.
\item \textsuperscript{89} The contention that Columbus was a Converso was strongly argued from the nineteenth century onwards. More recently, Simon Weisenthal promotes this opinion in his book, \textit{Sails of Hope: The Secret Mission of Christopher Columbus} (London: Macmillan, 1973) and provocatively suggests that Columbus had a messianic motive reach Jerusalem and to rebuild a new Temple. This view is supported by Carol Delaney from Stanford University, who thinks that he wanted to find a safe home for the Spanish Jews after their persecution and slaughter from 1391 in Iberia. This is a contentious opinion. It is agreed that his trip was funded by two wealthy Conversos, and the famous Rabbi, Don Isaac Abrabanel.
\item \textsuperscript{90} This is a highly controversial number, estimated to be from 200,000 to an unlikely 800,000. Benzion Netanyahu, the father of the present Prime Minister of Israel, was a respected, but highly contentious
\end{itemize}
substantial number escaped to Portugal; where in 1497, they were forcibly baptised or tortured to ‘convert’ to Christianity. These disputed figures have been more recently examined in detail by Henry Kamen and Norman Roth. The Conversos had an identity problem forced on them, but many still retained a pride in their Jewish heritage, yet outwardly conforming as Roman Catholics. They were always considered to be second-class citizens, even if they had been baptised, yet still not trusted and regularly accused of maintaining another racial and cultural loyalty. Crude attitudes were endemic that the Jews had inferior or tainted ‘blood’, mining the horrors of the Blood Libel. These Conversos, even from the perspective of the more orthodox Ashkenazi Jewish community, especially from Eastern Europe, were regarded by them as ‘suspect’ Jews. Ashkenazis considered that their dress, customs, food traditions, language and integration, however tenuous, rendered them syncretistic and compromised.

The early London Jews brought this identity problem with them into England. The image of a duplicitous Jewish person was used by Shakespeare to invent Shylock. The memory of this suspicion about where exactly Jewish loyalty was rooted, still affected their eighteenth-century acceptance into English society. This ongoing suspicion had been a strong part of the opposition by Prynne and his followers around the time of Whitehall in 1655. The presence of these new immigrant Conversos, originally hidden from the 1640s, still raised questions about who really were these merchants, now allowed to trade in London? Could they be trusted, or were they really spies? Many had agreed with Cromwell that the Jews could bring profit to England, but questioned whether they would be an asset or a liability to the nation? As they were trading worldwide, whose national interests would they serve? These were significant questions that were constantly raised, expressing serious doubts about this now resident, Jewish Sephadic elite.

The Sephardic Families

The Jewish population grew from about 160 in 1657; to 750 in 1700; 6000 in the 1730s; 8000 in 1750, and up to 25,000 by 1800. This tiny group soon made a significant contribution to the commercial life of the rapidly developing marine trade of England, which eventually eclipsed the Dutch. As observed, the earliest group were
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92 Shapiro, *Shakespeare*. This prejudice was further reinforced by Marlowe’s play, *The Tragedy of the Rich Jew of Malta*.
Sephardic families, they now chose how they would be assimilated into English society. Some moved in elite circles, such as Fernando Mendes (1647-1724), the physician to Catherine of Aragon. Others like Pereira and Suasso, had close relationships with both Charles II and William III, providing funds and military supplies. The synagogue *imposta* (a religious tax paid to the synagogue as a percentage of income) gives an indication of the wealth of each individual member. This section will explore some of the biographical details of how these Conversos began to be accepted into English society. Essentially, they quickly adopted the mores and the ethical values of the rich; they soon wanted large houses and to move freely within the higher levels of London cultural life. A distinctive cultural contribution was made by a Converso woman, Catherine da Castro, who was well respected as a portrait painter. She was named after her godmother, Queen Catherine, when she lived with her father, Fernando Mendes in Somerset House in the Strand, a home of Charles II. The social influence of de Castro was enhanced by Queen Catherine, who supported her from her baptism onwards; outwardly da Castro was a fully converted Christian.

Appendix 3 shows a summary of the significant Jewish people in England, their origins and how long they lived here. The people most closely connected with the Readmission period in London, Carvajal and Robles were from Portugal, like Fernando Mendes. Alvaro da Fonseca (c.1657-1742) extended the reach of the diamond trade to England from as far as Madras in India. He left London for nineteen years to establish a Jewish community there, later expanding his business to pearls and precious goods for the growing luxury market in London. His trading network grew to Bengal, Burma and the Philippines, finally returning to London in 1700. According to Edgar Samuel, he eventually “diverted this profitable [diamond] trade from Lisbon to London”. Alphonso Rodrigues (d.1716), a sugar and diamond merchant, was from Lisbon, also Isaac Pereira (c.1658-1718), an important army contractor from the Netherlands, who moved with William III to London in 1688. Two more physicians came from Portugal; Samuel Ribeiro (c.1667-c.1741) and Isaac Samuda (1681-1729), both educated at the leading Iberian universities. This demonstrates the importance of their Portuguese roots, their high professional status, and the commercial experience of this established Sephardic community.

Duarte da Silva (1596-1677) was a sugar merchant from Lisbon, arriving in England with Queen Catherine in May 1662, responsible for the Portuguese payment of her dowry of £325,000. This was not paid due to changes in the leadership in Portugal, so he was imprisoned in the Tower of London until April 1663, when the debt was eventually paid. Afterwards he commenced a business trading in diamonds, and later in silver from Goa; he died in Antwerp. His son, Francisco was appointed the
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94 Hyamson, *Sephardim*. This book was written in 1951 to celebrate the 250th anniversary of the Bevis Marks synagogue. It is the most thorough use of the synagogue records to date.


96 ODNB Fonseca, entry by Herbert Samuel.

97 They had to convince the universities of their genuine Christian conversion for admission.

treasurer general of Queen Catherine, obviously reinstating the reputation of the family. In 1670, Sir Solomon de Medina moved to London from Amsterdam and by 1689 he was providing silks to Mary II. He lived in Pall Mall, near the court, and became the main English link to the influential Amsterdam financiers, who provided loans for the Dutch army. Medina was awarded grain contracts for Flanders, and in November 1699, William III dined at his house in Richmond. The King knighted him at Hampton Court in June 1700; he was the first professing Jew to be so honoured. Medina later moved back to Amsterdam, contracted to feed the troops of the first Duke of Marlborough, John Churchill, on his campaigns. Later a scandal erupted in both England and Holland, when it was revealed that Churchill had received bribes of £6000 a year from Medina, which had been demanded by Churchill to keep the contract. From this evidence, the Tories in England helped to ensure Marlborough’s downfall.

Jacob de Castro Sarmento (1691-1762) was significant, not only as a physician and a scientific writer, but because he remarried his wife in a Jewish ceremony at Bevis Marks synagogue in 1721, wanting to publicly affirm his restored Jewish faith. Several readmitted Jews remarried, once these Jewish religious traditions were re-established in London. Now they could regard themselves as fully Jews. In contrast, the religious and ethical values of the community were severely tested by Joseph Salvador (1716-1786) born in London. When he inherited his parents’ fortune, he extended his country estate in Tooting and owned a town house in Bishopsgate. By 1759, he became a fellow of the Royal Society, then in 1764, a fellow of the Society of Antiquities. He was elected the first secretary of the London Committee of Deputies of British Jews, founded in 1760, becoming the President in 1778. The scandal was that he spent a fortune on two successive ‘expensive mistresses’, eventually marrying one of them. He also fathered an illegitimate child with yet another woman. Sarmento then lost most of his fortune, and he was forced to escape to Charleston, Georgia. Some saw that his losses were the result of him lowering his Jewish ethical standards, and behaving too much like the worst of the English aristocracy, and so reaping the consequences.

The Ashkenazi Jews

The Ashkenazi Jews as they arrived from Europe, mainly from Germany and further East, were seen to be distinctively different from the Sephardi. They had always been uniquely Jewish, separated from Gentile society, either by choice or because they had been forced into ghettos or prescribed areas. Their dress and manners marked them out as distinctive, their language was normally Yiddish, with Hebrew reserved for
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sacred events and Torah study. This was in marked contrast to the original London Conversos, previously living in Christian lands in Iberia or in the Sephardic diaspora. As they were in daily contact with Gentiles, pretending to be Roman Catholic, they were familiar with Western values and culture. They had their own special language, Ladino, but they normally spoke the local language as well as the natives. Now in London, there was a different Jewish identity problem; the Ashkenazi had always been only Jews; in contrast, the Sephardim were seen as compromised Jews, behaving like Christians, but still secretly Jews. An added complication was that some Jews had genuinely converted to Christianity.

As the Ashkenazi arrived, they worshipped with the original Sephardic nucleus, but the tensions and the cultural differences led to the formation in 1690 of the Great Synagogue. Sadly, the records for the first fifty years of its existence were lost, as Freedman points out. 101 Benjamin Levy was the sole wealthy Ashkenazi merchant, he funded a separate Ashkenazi cemetery, also at Mile End. The scarcity of the contemporary records of this group, follows the normal historical tradition, that as they were poor, there were no records. Unlike the elites, there were no family archives, few letters or books, and most interaction was oral. 102 In this period from 1656-1753, little is known about the Ashkenazi. However, the communities were clearly separated from one another. The Jews were only a small immigrant group, but for most English people, all the Jews were the same, rich or poor. However, the locals soon noticed the poor Jews on the streets of East London, obviously so different from the wealthy merchants in the West End and the suburbs. Normal street life in the poorer areas of London forced the Ashkenazi to live in crowded conditions with nominally Christian Londoners. Both religious groups shared in this poverty and they were forced to interact with each other.

Jewish Assimilation in England

The social and cultural history of the Jews within English society is a comparatively new avenue of research by Jewish academics. Until recently, most Jewish history has been focused on their religious distinctives. This tradition has mainly looked at the Jews as a separate group, dealing with internal Jewish concerns; the activities of synagogues, rabbis, key personalities and disputes between the various parties. Todd Endelman has led this new wider sociological approach, based on social history paradigms since the 1980s, when he began to investigate Jewish people within the wider British and European context. His books, *The Jews of Georgian England* (1979) and *Radical Assimilation in England* (1990) 103 have contributed towards a fresh way

102 Ibid., p. 20.
of understanding the social acceptance, or otherwise, of this alien, yet present people group. His method follows a more anthropological, scholarly tradition. His most recent book, *Leaving the Fold* will be considered in the next chapter.\(^{104}\) David Ruderman has also extended this recent Early Modern Anglo-Jewish scholarship, he considers the parallels between Christians and Jews in *Connecting the Covenants*.\(^{105}\) He takes a more philosophical narrative, looking at the life of Moses Marcus, a Jewish convert to Christianity in England in 1723. Ruderman perceptively observed that “Christians preferred to engage with Jewish ideas and texts, *rather than with actual Jews themselves*”.\(^{106}\) This was certainly true for the early Christian Hebraists and the Puritans, because even though they respected the concept of Jewish people, they had very little personal contact with them until after 1656.

Endelman discusses integration and what it means, he questions how far Jews can move away from their tradition and still remain Jewish. He provocatively suggests that converted Jews, especially those born in England, become unreliable Christians too.\(^{107}\) He investigated the reality of ‘marrying out’, inter-marriage and the problems that this brought to both religious groups. He contrasts the contribution that these Jewish elites made to English society, compared with the German and the Continental Jews. He claims that in England no Jewish philosopher emerged of the status of Spinoza.

Samson Gideon (1699-1762)

Samson Gideon was the outstanding Jew in the early eighteenth century, who was accepted within English society. He had demonstrated to the English a positive view of the benefits that a rich Jewish person could contribute to the nation. When the stock market was in crisis during the 1745 Jacobite Rebellion, he was very useful, because he urgently raised loans for the nation of £1.7 million pounds.\(^{108}\) Within the wider Christian community, Gideon sponsored a subscription for a pension to help Captain Coram of the Foundling Hospital.\(^{109}\) Financially, he was prudent, choosing not to invest in the ‘South Sea Bubble’ of 1720. His notable public achievement around 1749 was to negotiate with the South Sea Company to reduce the government debt, when Henry Pelham was the Chancellor. Gideon demonstrated the link between the successful Sephardi merchants and bankers from the late seventeenth century to the
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mid eighteenth century. The Jews still had an uncertain status, but they were *financially useful*. The English, like Cromwell, generally liked to take the pragmatic, economically beneficial approach towards the Jews.

Samson Gideon had originated from the Abudientes family, Conversos from Lisbon. Later the family escaped and settled in Amsterdam, adopting the name Gideon when they moved to London. Gideon had married a Christian, Jane, and he brought up his children as Anglicans. He was a member of the Stock Exchange, a governor of the Bank of England, he made several loans to the government and he advised them on financial matters. Many considered him to be one of the most powerful men in the City. He became closely involved with both Pelham and Horace Walpole. Gideon tried to negotiate for a baronetcy to enhance his status, but as he was Jewish, it was refused. As an alternative response by the establishment, his son, Samson Junior was made Baron Eardley, aged 13, while still at Eton. This compromise was acceptable because his son was being brought up as a Christian. The idea of a Jewish merchant getting so close to the heart of English society was too much to bear. Samson senior was never baptised, and because he had 'married out', he was considered compromised within the Jewish community. Yet at his death, he requested, and was granted, burial *with his people* in the Jewish cemetery. Throughout his life he had secretly maintained his subscription the synagogue, using an alias. Many other people resented the power of this family.110

The Jewish Naturalisation Act of 1753

A more positive attempt was made in 1753 to treat the Jews as an accepted part of English society. The 'Jew Bill', as it was commonly known, initially seemed innocuous enough.111 The intention of the Bill was to encourage such benefactors as Gideon to settle in Britain. An important feature of this Bill was to recognise the problems that the Jews, *as well as* the Dissenters, had with their civil liberties.112 The Jews had demonstrated their allegiance to George II during the Jacobite Rebellion of 1745, and as a further expression of loyalty, several of the London Jews had helped to defend London from the Jacobites. In return, it is commonly asserted that Pelham introduced the bill in 1753 to allow

persons professing the Jewish religion, born outside of England [aliens] and resident for three years, to be naturalised by Parliament, without receiving the sacrament of the Lord's Supper.

This was seen as an extension of the Toleration Act of 1689 for the nearly 8,000 Jews in England at the time; but this 1753 Bill only applied to the wealthiest. The Jewish

Naturalisation Bill was passed on 16 April 1753 by the Lords as an expression of religious toleration, but on 22 May, the Whig motion was challenged by the Tories in the Commons, claiming that it was a betrayal of Christianity.\textsuperscript{113} The Whigs persisted until it received the Royal assent on 7 July 1753,\textsuperscript{114} but by then the public opposition was so great, and it continued aggressively. The Act was repealed in November 1753 at the next parliamentary sitting, as the administration was mindful of the approaching election in 1754.\textsuperscript{115} While some Christians still sought to evangelise them and welcomed the idea of new Jewish immigrants, many others took a very negative stance. The strength of the popular Christian public opinion against the Jews had now been revealed, previously it had been dormant.

The Bill had fundamentally challenged the status of both the Jewish and the English identities, revealing the antisemitic English culture of the period, and it “highlights contemporary concerns about the deep religious and political divisions”.\textsuperscript{116} There was a genuine shock at this torrent of abuse and antisemitism,\textsuperscript{117} directed towards English Jews generally, but especially against the wealthy Jewish merchants,\textsuperscript{118} whose status it was intended to regularise. This storm of protest and the emotional and religious propaganda that followed, led Horace Walpole to refer to the Jew Bill which superstitious bigots in the Commons repealed under the influence of a fanatical mob, thus demonstrating how much the age, enlightened as it is called, was still enslaved to the grossest and most vulgar prejudices.\textsuperscript{119}

**Destructive Jewish Satire**

Around this time, satire was emerging strongly, both visually in cartoons and in print, as a means of political comment, actively influencing public opinion. Slogans were chanted

No Jews! No wooden shoes! No long beards, nor whiskers! Christianity forever!\textsuperscript{120}

\begin{itemize}
  \item Ibid., Rabin, *Jew Bill*, p. 158.
  \item Albert M. Hyamson, ‘The Jew Bill of 1753’, *JHSE*, (April 1906), 156.
\end{itemize}
with ballads mocking the Jews heard on the streets. As most satire invoked derision and contempt, the exaggerations and distortions found a ready target when aimed at the Jews. Those who supported the 1753 Bill were portrayed receiving bags of gold from wealthy Jewish City traders. Sir William Calvert, MP for the City of London and a wealthy brewer, was portrayed holding a £100,000 bribe to vote for the Bill. In another cartoon, Henry Pelham (1695-1754), the First Lord of the Treasury, and his brother, the Duke of Newcastle (1693-1768), the leader of the Lords, were mockingly called the Two Brothers. They were shown with bags marked £500,000, in payment for their joint effort to force the Bill through parliament. Even at Pelham’s death in 1754, just after the repeal of the Bill, a cruel cartoon appeared with the caption, *His Arrival at his Country Retirement and Reception*, picturing him with demons in the next world. Bishops who had supported the Bill were denounced as anti-Christian, and derided as circumcised Gentiles - their bribe was pictured at only £1000.

Josiah Tucker (1712-1799), the Dean of Gloucester, who had written in support of the Bill, was burnt in effigy by a mob in Bristol, along with his pamphlets.

Further opposition stoked a fear that Judaism would be imposed on Christians; a vile cartoon showed Englishmen queueing outside St Paul’s Cathedral for circumcision by butchers.

John Percival (1711-1770), later the Earl of Egremont, led the Commons opposition to the Bill. Solomons comments, “it may be conjectured that Gideon undoubtedly exercised great influence with the Pelhams in promoting the Naturalisation Bill”. More recent Anglo-Jewish histories have wanted to minimise the fierce opposition, instead focusing on a more positive view of Jewish integration and assimilation. In contrast, many attitudes during this period were actually founded on antisemitic stereotypes, stories and rumour. However, this virulent antisemitism evaporated, just as soon as it had been so destructively expressed in 1753. In 1756, Richard Trevor, the Bishop of Durham, who had supported civil rights for the Jews and the Jew Bill, bought the Zurbaran paintings as a public demonstration of his philosemitic position. Sadly, the repeal in 1753, meant that Jewish emancipation was delayed for more than a century until 1858, when Baron Lionel de Rothschild was allowed to take his seat in Parliament as an MP.
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Conclusion

As this chapter has shown, following the Readmission of the Jews and then into the eighteenth century, the form of philosemitism changed. The millennial fever and the strong desire for the Restoration of the Jews to Israel, linked with a strong conversionist approach, died away. Instead, the Jews were tolerated and accepted as net contributors to the economic wealth of England. The Sephardic merchant skills were regarded as a prime contributor to the prosperity of their host country. Their networks of finance had clearly benefitted both Charles II and William III, both Kings had close links with the Jews of Amsterdam. They had experienced in Holland a model of social integration, recognising the contribution that the Jews had made to the established global trading networks. As the eighteenth century developed, greater religious toleration for the non-Anglicans, especially the Dissenters, helped the Jews to assimilate too. Until 1753 and the passage of the Jew Bill, the Jews had settled in quietly, without seeking to seduce Christians to become Jews, one of the fears of Prynne and the post-Whitehall mobs. This perceived acceptance had encouraged the Jew Bill, but the vicious antisemitism that resulted was not anticipated. The philosemitism of the ordinary English people was revealed at that time to be non-existent. The opponents adopted many of the destructive anti-Jewish tropes from the past, including the Blood Libels and the accusations of financial manipulation.

This chapter has reflected upon the impact of the Jewish people upon English society, mainly from the Jewish perspective. The next chapter will consider the varied Christian responses to the Jews, who were now established and interacting at all levels of English culture. The issue of Jewish conversion to Christianity will be examined. The shock in the middle of the century of this negative response by Christians around 1753 was a major setback for the assimilation and acceptance of the Jews in England, after ninety years of resettlement. A feature of the next chapter will be to look at the Christian attitude towards the Jews during the period that witnessed the resurgence of the Evangelicals; especially during the early years of the Evangelical Awakening under the Wesley brothers and Whitefield, both in England and in Georgia.
Chapter 5

Christian Identity and Jewish Conversion. The Evangelical Awakening and Mission between the 1730s and 1760s.

This chapter will examine the Jewish community in England and Georgia from the Christian perspective, and then consider Jewish mission, as prompted by the influence of the Moravians and the Evangelical Awakening. The 1730s witnessed the early period of the Evangelical Awakening in England,\(^\text{130}\) connected with the Wesley brothers and George Whitefield (1714-1770).\(^\text{131}\) All three were deeply affected by their residence in Savannah, Georgia from 1736, and the work of the Moravians in that colony. For each one, this was to be a formative experience, because they had close contact there with Jews, which influenced their attitude to Jewish people on their return to England. The chapter will further consider how the Jews were tolerated in England, their assimilation, and some accounts of Jewish converts to Christianity. The contentious issue of philosemitism and conversionism will be confronted, to deal with a common Jewish personal response that Christians cannot be truly philosemitic, as they only want to convert us.\(^\text{132}\) The Evangelical influence had waned after the Puritan period, leading to a more philosophical and rationalistic Christianity in England.\(^\text{133}\) The attitude towards the Jews had also changed, with little concern for conversion or millennialism. A worldwide missionary zeal was revived following the Evangelical Awakening,\(^\text{134}\) which encouraged the vision that for the first time Jews were considered worthy of the Gospel. The Moravians were the pioneers of Jewish mission at Halle in Germany from 1728. An earlier prototype mission had been established in Hamburg by Esdras Edzard (1629-1708) in 1667. The Wesleys and Whitefield learned about the significance of the Jews from the Moravians. Earlier the deep antisemitism in the church had regarded Jews as beyond the Gospel, in some way eternally cursed by


\(^{132}\) This has been a common reaction when I have discussed this topic in meetings with Jewish professors at Oxford, London and Southampton Universities.


God. This influenced the concept of the *Wandering Jew*, a race condemned to be homeless and excluded by Christian society.\(^{135}\)

The Evangelical Awakening, the Wesley Brothers and the Jews

The Evangelical Awakening witnessed a major theological turn in England from the 1730s.\(^{136}\) The Evangelicals had been very active during the time of the Puritans and Cromwell, but following that they had lost their influence. During this dormant period between 1660 and 1730, little interest was shown in Jewish conversion and eschatology. Instead the motivation for Jewish conversion came from the Jews themselves, who wanted to adopt Christianity to facilitate their acceptance into English society. The obvious example was Gideon Samson, who married a Christian wife, bringing up his children as Christians. The Wesley brothers and George Whitefield were the pioneers of this new evangelical revival.\(^{137}\) John Wesley (1703-1791) explained “that my heart was strangely warmed” on 24 May 1738,\(^{138}\) at a Moravian fellowship meeting in Aldersgate Street, London, while studying Luther’s preface to the book of Romans.\(^{139}\) This was the impetus for him to embrace his earlier family Puritan tradition.\(^{140}\) George Whitefield (1714-1770) had been born again in 1735 in Oxford.\(^{141}\)

The personal contact with Jewish people by the Wesleys’ originated in their early years in Savannah, Georgia from 1736.\(^{142}\) John had been sent there as a missionary for the SPCK.\(^{143}\) On his outward journey, in the middle of a fierce storm, John was impressed by a group of Moravians, who sang hymns and prayed, while he was terrified. He had

---

\(^{135}\) *Wandering Jew*. This essentially antisemitic legend from the thirteenth century is linked to the curse of Cain in Genesis and this encouraged the ongoing prejudice that the Jews should be rejected by Christians. The motif remained that Jewish people were cursed as a punishment for their rejection of their Messiah, Jesus.


\(^{139}\) Often called John Wesley’s ‘evangelical conversion’. He records “about nine my heart was strangely warmed. I felt I did trust in Christ, Christ alone for salvation”.

\(^{140}\) The Wesley maternal grandfather was Dr Samuel Annesley, a noted Puritan Dissenting preacher and evangelist. Philip Wingeier-Rayo, *A Wesleyan Theology of Missions* (paper delivered at the Oxford Institute for Methodist Studies, 8 August 2013), p. 2.


\(^{143}\) The Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge (SPCK) is an Anglican missionary society formed in 1698. It worked in Maryland, South Carolina from 1700, promoting evangelical philanthropy, particularly through the distribution of Christian books ‘to the colonies and on the plantations’. Samuel Wesley, John’s father, was active in the Society. Archives at Mundus, Cambridge University Library. SPG also claims Wesley as their missionary, formed in 1701 as the Society for the Propogation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts by Thomas Bray, the earlier founder of SPCK, they were linked missionary societies.
been challenged by the strength of their inner faith in Christ, as it contrasted with his own High Church tradition, suspicious of enthusiasm. Charles Wesley (1707-1788) was working at St Simons Island with Governor James Oglethorpe, Charles was his secretary in 1736. and Charles was respected for the Orphanage that he established in Savannah in 1740. The original Charter for the colony was granted to Oglethorpe in 1732. A group of Jews arrived by ship in July 1733, including the physician, Samuel Nunez. Wingeier-Rayο comments, "Wesley’s time in the New World was an encounter with Native Americans, Jews and African Americans”. The brothers encountered in Georgia a mixed group of Sephardic and Ashkenazi Jews from London. John Wesley had formed a theological impression of Jews only from Scripture, yet here in Georgia, he meets ‘real’ Jews. John records in his diary that he is beginning to learn Spanish to converse with “my Jewish parishioners” and taking lessons with a Portuguese Jewish physician, Samuel Nunez. Between June and August 1737, he records 34 visits to him. On 7 July, John repents of a dispute with Nunez about the Messiah, afraid that he had offended him. Nunez had been instrumental in ending an epidemic of yellow fever raging there. Nunez had lived in London from 1726, following his escape from Lisbon. Much earlier in Portugal, his Converso identity had been challenged, and he was imprisoned in 1703 by the Inquisition. When back in London, he had remarried his wife, following the Jewish rites at Bevis Marks, and was circumcised. Nunez later moved from Georgia to New York, becoming a leader in the synagogue. Fifty years later in 1787, John quoted his Jewish friend in a sermon ‘On Charity’, when he recalled the opinion of Nunez that “I wish every Jew were to carry it [I Corinthians 13] with him everywhere he went…this single chapter contains the whole of true religion”.

The local Jews were described as honest and law-abiding, who welcomed the immigrants with gifts of food and there they were treated as equals. They would sometimes attend church and join in Christian wedding celebrations. “These actions surprised Christians, who were conditioned to regard Jews with suspicion and distrust”. The local Moravian minister, Johann Boltzius had been educated at the University of Halle, where he experienced first-hand the Callenberg, Institutum

144 Religion in Georgia at georgiahistory.com. The website uses the 1743 source, the Earl of Egmont List of Early Settlers (MS 1395 on microfilm).
145 Wingeier-Rayο, Missions, p. 2.
147 Also known as Samuel Nunez Ribiero.
152 English, Wesley, p. 221.
Judaicum. Jewish tracts were requested from Callenberg for use in Savannah, but these bore no fruit. Later in 1748, John Wesley defended the rights of the Jews to benefit from the laws of England against a mob in Yorkshire. He further commends the friendly behaviour of the people of Liverpool in 1755 towards the Jews, who lived among them. On a Fast Day in London in 1756, he is impressed that:

   even the Jews observed this day with a peculiar solemnity. Their synagogue prayer began “Come and let us return unto the Lord...incline the heart of our Sovereign Lord King George, to use us kindly, and all our brethren, the Children of Israel; that in his days and in our days, we may see the restoration of Judah, and that Israel may dwell in safety, and the Redeemer may come to Zion”. Wesley comments – May it be your will! And we say, Amen.

Charles Wesley’s Jewish Hymn

Charles Wesley’s hymn, Calling the Hebrews Home or Almighty God of Love was written in Bristol in 1762.

   We know, it must be done, for God hath spoke the word,
   All Israel shall their Saviour own, to their first state restor’d:
   Re-built by His command, Jerusalem shall rise.

McGonigle hints in his article about this hymn, that differing attitudes can be seen between John and Charles, towards the Jews. Charles held a strongly philosemitic position as expressed in his hymn, ‘All Israel shall be saved at last’, John later wanted to change it. Charles shows genuine compassion towards the Jews, for example, following the Lisbon earthquake on 1 November 1755. He noted with anger that the residents had been planning on that day, “An Act of Faith to make a Bonfire of the poor Jews and Heretics”. In contrast, John can be harsh towards the Jews. On an early trip to Germany to meet the Moravians in September 1738, following his

157 JWJ, 25 August 1748.
158 JWJ, 15 April 1755.
159 JWJ, 6 February 1756.
160 Herbert McGonigle in his research for The Wesley Fellowship has confirmed that the hymn was not by John, as commonly asserted, but by Charles Wesley. The italics are original. He explains that it is based on Isaiah 66:19 and Romans 11:26 and refers to ‘the re-gathering of the Jews to Mount Zion and from there the Gospel will go out to all the world’.
161 See Appendix 4 for further details about the hymn.
162 Letter from Charles to his wife Sarah (Sally) Wesley, (Methodist Archives and Research Centre (MARC), DDCW 5/86, John Rylands Library, Manchester).
conversion, he visits a synagogue ‘en route’ in Rotterdam, writing “my spirit was
moved within me at that horrid, senseless pageantry, that mockery of God which they
called public worship”. However, John showed a more positive response on 23
February 1770, when he was invited to the Great Synagogue in London, where he was
very impressed with the singing.

I never before saw a Jewish congregation behave so decently. Indeed, the place itself
is so solemn that it might strike an awe upon those who have any thought of God.

New Missionary Movements

In contrast to the former millennial speculations, most Evangelicals soon took a more
philosemitic approach. They began to realise that the Jews, though not initially seen
to be the focus of this new missionary movement, should be. Jews had previously
been excluded by the teaching of the church over the centuries, tainting them as
‘Christ-killers’ and as those who were cursed as outsiders from the grace of God. The
first example of a new positive outreach to the Jews was found with the Moravians, with
the support of Count Zinzendorf. In 1728, Professor Johannes Callenberg (1694-1760)
formed the Institütum Judaicum at their missionary centre in Halle, printing tracts in Yiddish and Hebrew for Jewish evangelism, and providing housing
for new Jewish converts. Just before in 1727, the Moravians had experienced a
revival and commenced a ‘prayer watch’ for one hundred years. By 1791, they had
sent three hundred missionaries worldwide. They provided an example of the priority
of prayer for Jonathan Edwards (1703-1758), who wrote in 1746, An Humble Attempt
in America. Later in the century this book prompted the group, mainly Baptists, to
initiate the British Prayer Call in 1784. This initiative led to the formation in 1792 of
the first ‘modern’ missionary society, the Baptist Missionary Society. The influence of
the Moravians on the Wesley brothers is well known, but the Pietists began to influence

---

163 JWJ, 4 September 1738.
164 He went to hear the famous cantor, Myer Leoni, who was a popular opera soloist on several London stages.
165 JWJ, 23 February 1770.
166 A revival centre, closely associated with Count Zinzendorf from 1722, with a community in Herrnhut. This
had Lutheran and Pietist origins. Despite the negative attitudes of Luther towards the Jews, this Lutheran
group was the first to show genuine philosemitism. William Brown, History of the Society of the United
Brethren [Moravians], (London: Haddon, 1815), p. 5.
168 It was the first German Protestant mission to the Jews, which influenced the Wesleys and later provided a
169 Clark, Conversion, pp. 47-82.
170 Ward, Global, pp.126-128. A special feature of this revival was the conversion of children, who had then
exhibited a great maturity. Ward gives an example of Susanne Kuhnel, aged eleven.
171 Jonathan Edwards and George Whitefield were the leaders of the First Great Awakening in New England
from 1730.
172 The Baptists, Andrew Fuller, John Ryland Jnr. and John Sutcliff had just read the book An (sic) Humble
Attempt and they decided to respond to it. In 1792, they became the founders with William Carey of the
Baptist Missionary Society, the first of the worldwide surge in mission at the end of the eighteenth century.
many other English Evangelicals, Anglicans and Dissenters, particularly Baptists, with their vision for worldwide evangelism, which must include the Jews.

The Moravian Influence from Germany

The Moravians had a significant influence on John Wesley, both spiritually and by modelling an example of how to love the Jewish people. Zinzendorf had been brought up in a castle, by his grandmother and an aunt, they both read the Bible in the original Hebrew and Greek. At Hernhutt on 13 August 1727, a revival started which focused on prayer. The immediate result prompted them to teach “the simple truth that to be a Christian was to be involved in a mission to the whole world”.173 One of them, Leonard Dober, was sent as a missionary to the Jews of Amsterdam. Zinzendorf emphasised the teaching of Romans 1:18 “to the Jew first and then to the Gentile”. He thought that the church had ignored this command, actively rejecting the Jews as unworthy of the Gospel.174 By 1739, Moravian missionaries were sent to Dutch Surinam to witness to both Jews and slaves.175 When Zinzendorf sailed to the West Indies, he met a very poor, sick Jewish lady on the ship; his genuine compassion prompted him, so “he turned over his cabin to her, while he spent the rest of the voyage below decks in the ill-smelling [steerage] part of the ship”.176 This was the context of the true philosemitism that the Wesleys learned from their Moravian brothers.

English Philosemitism in Georgia

This section will link several related themes about attitudes towards the Jews in Georgia, many of whom had originally lived in England and whose journey was funded by the London Jews. It may appear to be a discursus, but it is not, as it links several key people already introduced in this chapter. The new colony of Georgia demonstrated a different English perception of the local Jews, recently arrived in Savannah in 1733, especially, Samuel Nunez,177 John Wesley’s close friend. The Governor Oglethorpe (1696-1785)178 warmed to his forced Jewish immigrants and this section will record his distinctive philosemitism. He was also a Freemason, who

174 Ibid., p. 88.
176 Lewis, Zinzendorf, p. 19.
177 Earl of Egremont’s List of Early Settlers of Georgia [1743] (MS 1395).
178 Oglethorpe was a graduate of Corpus Christi College, Oxford in 1714, he was respected and supported by the Duke of Marlborough.
founded the first lodge in Georgia.\textsuperscript{179} The religious revival in Europe had also provoked Roman Catholic persecution of the Protestants in Austria, especially around Salzburg. Following the Edict of Expulsion for the Salzburgers,\textsuperscript{180} their escape was financially supported by various Protestant groups throughout Europe, by the SPCK in England, but significantly, also by Jews from Hamburg.\textsuperscript{181} Jews had genuine sympathy for them as another persecuted group, who were sharing a similar experience of the regular expulsion and persecution experienced repeatedly by the Jews within Europe.\textsuperscript{182} A group of 200 Salzburgers were allowed by Charles II to find refuge in Georgia in 1734, settling in Ebenezer.\textsuperscript{183} Thomas Coram met them at Dover, a ceremony was arranged there for them to swear allegiance to King George II; thus they ‘became’ English. The Moravian ministers Johann Boltzius (1703-1765)\textsuperscript{184} and Israel Gronau were their pastors. The merging of these connected strands reveals a new insight into the English tolerance of the Jews in Georgia.

The Colony of Georgia was founded in 1732 by royal Charter. A group of English trustees were responsible under George II, to establish a new home for debtors and ‘the worthy poor’ from London. Thomas Coram, the benefactor of the Foundling Hospital, and the Fourth Earl of Shaftesbury were two notable trustees. The Colony was formed in February 1733 for residents of good spiritual standing and capable tradesmen, not just beggars and ‘malcontents’ from prisons in England. General James Oglethorpe was appointed as the Governor, and the Charter was established to give freedom of worship to all; apart from Roman Catholics and slaves. Cotton seeds were taken with them to establish the cotton industry and new plantations. Oglethorpe soon developed good relations with the Creek Indians,\textsuperscript{185} who feared a Spanish invasion and they appreciated the military protection. The status of the Jews was contested; some Trustees said that “they did not want to make a Jew’s colony of Georgia”.\textsuperscript{186} Oglethorpe had been presented with a practical dilemma on 11 July 1733, when the 42 Jews had arrived in a boat from England. His first reaction was to turn them away, as they were not officially approved by London, but the Governor had compassion on them. They were soon described by a local clergyman as “so honest and faithful that their like is hardly to be found”,\textsuperscript{187} they established themselves as successful planters,

\textsuperscript{179} Oglethorpe established Solomon’s Lodge (Masonic) on 21 February 1734.
\textsuperscript{180} Most went to Prussia, but some marched through Europe, both east and west. Francis Tannie Arnsdorff, \textit{Ebenezer and the Salzburgers’ Separatist Identity in Colonial Georgia} (Savannah: Armstrong University, 2013). Their link with Halle is found in Renate Wilson, ‘Halle and Ebenezer: Pietism, Agriculture and Commerce in Colonial Georgia’ (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, 1988).
\textsuperscript{182} George II was from Germany and he had Lutheran sympathies.
\textsuperscript{183} Boltzius founded the city of Ebenezer in 1736, on land allocated by Oglethorpe. In 1737 he was refused communion by John Wesley following a dispute over episcopacy. He formed strong relationships with the local Jews. Shane A. Runyon, \textit{Ebenezer} in \textit{New Georgia Encyclopaedia}.
\textsuperscript{184} Oglethorpe brought the Chief and some Creek Indians to England in June 1734 to meet King George II at Kensington Palace, as well as the Archbishop of Canterbury at Lambeth Palace.
\textsuperscript{186} Ibid., 9.
shop and tavern keepers, and shipping merchants. Nunez who was a specialist in infectious diseases, previously the physician to the King of Portugal, who immediately imposed health restrictions to protect the original inhabitants, as twelve had already died. No further deaths occurred, so this intervention endeared Nunez to Oglethorpe. Oglethorpe had ignored the prejudice of the Trustees, thus threatening his post; he then petitioned them to clarify that the Charter would include Jews.\textsuperscript{188} He further disobeyed orders by allowing fourteen Jews to have allocations of land,\textsuperscript{189} like the other settlers, something else that was strictly forbidden by London. The Jews were later allowed to buy land.

This was the community and the challenge that faced John and Charles Wesley in 1736, when Charles ministered at Frederica at St Simon’s Island.\textsuperscript{190} John later persuaded George Whitefield to join them a year later. This scenario merged the nascent Evangelical Awakening in England and Europe, the Pietist and Moravian influence, and for all of them, a close working relationship with the Jewish community. In London, the Jews were generally free to be socially undisturbed; here in Georgia, there was genuine interaction. This Georgian Jewish community was closely linked to the earlier narrative about the London Sephardic Jews eager to ‘move on’ poorer members out of London or abroad. The 42 arrivals included 34 Sephardis and 8 Ashkenazis, including Benjamin Sheftall, Abraham Minis and their families.\textsuperscript{191} This whole immigrant group was funded by the leaders of Bevis Marks.\textsuperscript{192} As they established themselves in Georgia, Abraham de Lyon was particularly admired because he introduced vineyards, so he was given extra land. He had owned vineyards in Portugal\textsuperscript{193} and he had obtained new vines from there; the whole community toasted his skills. A minyan\textsuperscript{194} was immediately established for worship, called \textit{Mickve Israel}, the Hope of Israel.\textsuperscript{195} The Saltzburgers arrived in March 1734, via Rotterdam and England\textsuperscript{196} and they were immediately welcomed by the Jews, Sheftall and his family provided breakfast for them. Boltzius records in his diary that

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{188} The Charter stated, ‘that there shall be a liberty of conscience in the worship of God’ for the residents and ‘they should not give offence or scandal to the government’. The Trustees wanted a Protestant colony and they interpreted the Charter as excluding Jews.
\item \textsuperscript{189} Oglethorpe said that this generosity was in direct appreciation of the positive intervention of Nunez and his action to save the colony from disease. Nunez, Sheftall and Minis were some of the beneficiaries in December 1733. Jones Jnr., \textit{Georgia}, p.8.
\item \textsuperscript{190} 3000 Spanish landed there to invade in 1742 and were repulsed. A group of Scots were also settled there and provided an infantry force.
\item \textsuperscript{191} Jones Jnr., \textit{The Settlement}, 5-12.
\item \textsuperscript{192} The funders were Francis Salvador, Alvaro Lopes Suasso and Antonio da Costa.
\item \textsuperscript{193} Between 1700 and 1735, 1500 fled from Portugal to England.
\item \textsuperscript{194} A minimum group of ten Jewish men had to be together to form a minyan [quorum] to allow formal worship.
\item \textsuperscript{195} Menasseh ben Israel’s book was called the same, \textit{The Hope of Israel} in 1648, thus further establishing their link with the London Readmitted Jews in 1656. Sourced from the Congregation of Mickve Israel, Savannah website, archives and museum. This became the third synagogue in America after New York (1654) and Newport, Rhode Island (1695). They brought with them a Torah [Safertoro] scroll, inscribed on deerskin, donated by a London merchant, this is still used today. See Helene Schwartz Kenvin, \textit{The Land of Liberty: A History of America’s Jews} (New Jersey: Behrman House, 1996).
\end{itemize}
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the oft-mentioned Jew [Sheftall] has shown so much love and rendered so many services to us and the Salzburgers that no one could ask more. And whenever he was offered money for his troubles, he refused to accept it. For this reason, the Salzburger men have decided to cultivate his fields and clear his trees.\textsuperscript{197}

They all soon established close relations, as they respected each other’s high moral standards.\textsuperscript{198} The only German speakers were Benjamin Sheftall and his wife, and they worked closely with the Saltzburgers to help them settle in. This was an encouraging example of both Protestant and Jewish refugees co-operating together.\textsuperscript{199} The Salzburgers established an orphanage in 1737,\textsuperscript{200} a few years before George Whitefield established his Bethesda Orphanage in Savannah in 1740.\textsuperscript{201}

### Jewish Conversion after the Readmission

In the early eighteenth century, the issue of Jewish conversion was revived, Jewish people had lived in England for a century, since the earliest ‘hidden Jews’ in the 1630s. There was a renewal of mission and evangelism in the 1730s within England for all people, and this raised the question about what kind of Jewish mission was appropriate, or whether it was relevant? The aggressive plan to readmit the Jews and then convert them promoted by the Puritans, had been left behind. In England, in contrast to the Iberian experience from 1492, the Jews did not encounter forced baptism or forced sermons, this country was more tolerant. Most cultural conversion was initiated by the Jewish residents, these converts were accepted, and fortunately, there was not the slur about Jewish ‘tainted blood’, experienced in Spain.\textsuperscript{202} Some Christian extremists still did not trust the Jews or their loyalty, the genuineness of the converts new faith was doubted, and their testimony was treated with scepticism. These views were still influenced by attitudes of racial inferiority and prejudice, believing that Jews could not really truly become Christians. For some critics, Jews could never become ‘true Englishmen’.\textsuperscript{203} The identity of these converts was

\begin{footnotes}
\item[200] One of the children from the orphanage, John Treutlen, became the first elected Governor of Georgia in 1777. The community at Ebenezer was 25 miles north of Savannah. George Fenwick Jones, \textit{The Salzburger Saga} (Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1984).
\item[201] This orphanage still exists.
\item[202] Jerome Friedman, ‘Jewish Conversion, the Spanish Pure Blood Laws and Reformation’, \textit{The Sixteenth Century Journal}, vol. 18(1), (Spring 1987), p. 26. The Spanish ‘Purity of Blood’ laws defined the Jews as a racial group, and at the extreme interpretation of this law, baptism and grace could not extend to the Jews. This negative stereotype could also be applied to all future generations too; consequently, from this perspective, they were always eternally cursed! This imported fear of the Conversos encouraged the distance that the English kept from ‘these alien and dangerous Jews’ living among them.
\end{footnotes}
conflicted, as they were stranded in a subtle ‘new ghetto’; both excluded from their Jewish community, yet not fully accepted by English Christians.

Jens Aklundh examines several conversion narratives and their recent significance. “The role of Jewish conversion in late sixteenth and seventeenth-century England has become one of the pillars of Anglo-Jewish historiography since the 1970s... [the period] from 1656 and developing notions of English identity”.204 This builds on the earlier work of James Shapiro, who studied individual Jewish converts and their testimony narratives. Shapiro considers these testimonies generally to be uninspiring and formulaic, “often appealing to the same scriptural proofs”.205

What kind of Philosemitism?

The common trope that modern Jewish sceptics express, is to argue that Christians can only have a very narrow and manipulative view of their love for Jewish people, which is really Conversionism. The purpose of this study is to widen the vision of such doubters, demonstrating that Christian philosemitism has a much broader perspective. Of course, for some Christians, who have an aggressive understanding of evangelism, Jews are a target, who they want to gently (or otherwise) force to accept that Jesus is their Jewish Messiah too.206 Endelman offers a narrow personal definition of philosemitism, seen from the defence of his own Jewish status and perspective.207 His recent work on Jewish Conversion, Leaving the Fold has softened his view.208 Another valid objection to Jewish evangelism is that, if all Jews were to recognise Jesus as their Messiah, it follows that this would eradicate Jewish identity, resulting in a subtle form of ‘religious ethnic cleansing’.209 The challenge is whether it is possible to widen philosemitism to include love and respect for Jewish people, whether they convert or not. In Georgia, the Jews and very evangelistic Moravian Christians lived together in religious toleration. The Wesleys, Whitefield and the Moravians were ‘aggressively’ seeking to convert other Christians as well, who for them were not proper Christians, because they were not ‘born again’. The Moravians and the Salzburgers had both experienced a revival in Germany and Austria, but they did not achieve any Georgian

205 Shapiro, Shakespeare, p. 155. This book examines how Jewish converts were influenced by the concept of Englishness. Also see Guibbory, Identity.
206 This is the valid objection about the modern group, Jews for Jesus. They are Messianic Jews, who are now convinced as Jews, that Jesus is their personal Messiah, so they ‘aggressively’ evangelise other Jews.
207 The book was published by the American Jewish Historical Society.
209 This was the logical view that was recently expressed by Professor Philip Alexander of Manchester University at a JHSE meeting in London in November 2017.
Jewish converts, yet they could all still coexist in a philosemitic atmosphere. In England, the prevailing tolerant approach to the Jews did not promote a strong conversionist agenda, because Jewish conversion was normally initiated by the Jews themselves, who wanted greater social and cultural acceptance by adopting Christianity.

Endelman looks back and considers that “the Jews’ position in England at the end of the seventeenth century was superior to that of Jews in other European states”. Looking forward into the eighteenth century, he provides a perspective of why some Jews converted, “in a Christian society it is easier to be a Christian than a Jew”. He observed that conversion offered better prospects for Ashkenazis, who “once baptised...faced little resistance to their social integration”. For the richer Sephardis, they were able to integrate with the gentry, which was generally an easier assimilation. They were soon accepted as Freemasons, reinforcing their social acceptance. However, always underlying this idealistic picture was still a vicious antisemitism, as revealed around the 1753 Jew Bill. Frank Felsenstein positively asserts that “English Jews enjoyed without interruption a civil and religious freedom that was almost unique”.

Moses Marcus – a ‘Converted Jew’

Moses Marcus (1701-?) was born in London and converted to Christianity around 1721, baptised on New Year’s Day 1723. He wrote a significant book justifying his decision, *The Principal Motives*. He belonged to a very wealthy family, his father,

---


211 This was a means to access the professions or the universities, like Oxford and Cambridge, who excluded both Jews and Dissenters.


213 Ibid., p. 32.

214 Ibid., p. 44.


216 His family name was Moses ben Mordechai Hamburger.

217 That day Moses was confronted in a local tavern and he was threatened by men sent by his father, who via them, offered him a large sum of money to return to the Jewish faith. He then turned to Christians to financially support him. Moses later legally petitioned his father for financial support using a 1702 Bill enacted by Queen Anne that required Jewish men to financially support their Protestant children. This was intended for illegitimate children by Jewish men with Christian women; but Marcus claimed that it applied to him too. The court required his father to pay him £60 per annum. Ruderman, *Covenants*, pp. 24, 26.

218 Marcus Moses, *The Principal Motives and Circumstances that induced Moses Marcus to leave the Jewish and Embrace the Christian Faith* (London: Humphreys 1724) at the age of 23. The book was dedicated to Archbishop William Wake. The edition consulted in the Bodleian library was signed by J. Sarum, the Bishop of Salisbury, who had commented, “Moses Marcus taught me Hebrew".
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Moses Marcus\textsuperscript{219} was a diamond merchant trading in India\textsuperscript{220} and his apostacy cost him his inheritance. David Ruderman highlights his self-identity, noting that he called himself a ‘ Converted Jew ’, which he regularly repeated in his writings, emphasising that he was stranded between two competing faith traditions. As we will see, he remained proud of his Jewish heritage, post-conversion he sought to make a new living ‘trading’ on his Hebrew skills and his knowledge of Judaism for a Christian audience. Ruderman is correct to focus on this term, ‘ Converted Jew ’ as it is at the heart of the conflicted identity of anybody who wanted to be both a Jew and a Christian. Many Messianic Jews today would deal with this identity problem by describing themselves as ‘completed Jews’;\textsuperscript{221} Marcus did not have a ready label to identify himself in his own period. At the beginning of the nineteenth century the term ‘ Hebrew Christian ’ was widely used and accepted within the Christian world. This changes the subtle emphasis onto the noun Christian, for a person who has Hebrew origins as the adjective; a reversal of emphasis. The simple challenge for Marcus was whether he had to reject his Jewish identity and his cultural roots to be accepted as a good Christian. Instead, he wanted to use the noun Jew, and imply the positive choice that he had made to convert. The example of the identity crisis of converts like Marcus was to be significant for the next two hundred years. Generally, converted Jews were not trusted by Christians, their motives were doubted and some still experienced the antisemitic trope that Jews were eternally cursed and would never be accepted within the church. During the early nineteenth century, when the London Jews Society was founded in 1809, their leaders were also suspicious of false converts.\textsuperscript{222} They had good reason to be careful as they were working with immigrant Jews, living in extreme poverty, wanting any charity that was available, even if it was from ‘the missionaries’ in the East End of London.

Marcus was unusual in the early eighteenth century, as he had made an intelligent and a considered choice. Most of the other Jews who chose conversion were merchants, with a social and an accultural motivation, intending to improve their personal identity and social acceptance in England. Many had not been very active or committed to their local synagogue before conversion. Marcus was born in London and then sent, between 1715 and 1718, to the yeshiva of Hamburg to study. There he met some ‘ German Protestant Divines ’,\textsuperscript{223} as he expressed it, and he began to

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{219} His father was in dispute with the chief rabbi Aaron Hart about a decision he had made concerning a divorce. Hart resented any criticism of his authority and excommunicated him from the synagogue; so, he moved to India leaving his son in London. Moses Marcus then founded a rival synagogue called the Hambro and funded a rival Jewish cemetery. Ruderman, Covenants, p. 22.
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{220} Moses Marcus had been in Paris in 1712 and was connected to the famous ‘ Pitt diamond ’. In 1715 he moved to Madras until 1721.
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{221} They consider that by embracing Jesus as their Messiah they have completed or fulfilled their calling as Jews. Confirming Paul’s mission ‘ to the Jew first ’, in the same way as the disciples, Paul and most of the early church were Jews, and there were converted Jews up to the fourth century.
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{222} London Jews Society (LJS).
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{223} Possibly a missionary group founded by Esdras Edzard (1629-1708) in Hamburg or a Pietist group, likely to be disciples of Jakob Boehme, or even resident Anglicans allowed to worship there from 1719, who were from the Merchant Adventures Company. The latter are the most likely as English was his native language. Esdras Edzard (1629-1708) was a converted Jew, who had studied in Basel with Johann Buxtorf the younger, he was
examine Christianity and to read the New Testament. He was impressed how the OT prophecies had been fulfilled in Jesus. His father had planned that his son should be a rabbi and scholar, because his mother was part of the famous Ashkenazi family of Gliki of Hameln (1646-1724), an outstanding female Yiddish diarist and businesswoman in Hamburg.

Marcus linked himself in London with David Wilkins (1685-1745), an Anglican, who was a chaplain to the Archbishop of Canterbury, William Wake. Marcus became a trophy convert, moving within the academic and the theological elites of his day. He was active in Oxford, Cambridge and engaged in the philosophical disputes surrounding Arianism, Deism and the reliability of the Hebrew scriptures. Earlier Christians Hebraists had embraced Kabbalah, challenging the canon of Scripture. He briefly stayed in Amsterdam between 1724-1725. The Protestant argument was that the overbearing authority of ‘the Rabbis’ and the power of the Roman Catholic church were identical, both oppressive and in error. The notable work of Marcus was the translation from Latin of the German biblical scholar Johann Carpzov. This book was his defence of the Hebrew Bible against Wotton in 1729. He also wrote about adult circumcision.

Yet Ruderman regards the intellectual ability of Marcus as limited, which may be unfair, but he was certainly heard and accepted at the highest levels. Christian identity was also at stake during this period. The doctrine of the Trinity was being challenged by the Arians and the Deists, and by the new scholarship that began to undermine the textual accuracy and reliability of the Bible. Cambridge especially had been influenced by Newton, from his approach a group developed there, who adopted a more sceptical, scientific approach to the Christian traditions. At the start of the eighteenth century Ruderman considers that Christian scholars were driven to study Judaism, especially rabbinic literature and culture, because their own identity as Christians urgently required it. Historical scholarship had denuded the positive markers of what Christianity had always meant; it had obscured the teachings of Jesus and the Apostles, had called into question the very authority of sacred

---

an expert on rabbinic Judaism. In Hamburg he taught Hebrew; one of his students was August Francke (1663-1727), the Moravian and professor of theology at the University of Halle, who was closely associated with the Institutum Judaicum at Halle. It was possible that Moses knew Buxtorf. Edzard claimed that between 1671-1708, 148 Jews had been baptised through his mission. This outreach was probably the first local mission to Jews; the work was later eclipsed by the more extensive centre that Callenberg established at Halle.

224 Ruderman, Covenants, p. 23.
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228 Moses Marcus, A Defence of the Hebrew Bible, in answer to the charge of corruption brought against it by Mr Whiston, confuted by Dr Carpzov (1679-1767) of Leipsick (Lintot: 1729). The Bodleian copy of this work is from the personal collection of Archbishop Wake.
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Scripture, and had eroded the very links from which the New Testament legitimised its teaching in relation to the Hebrew Bible. Marcus was involved in the prevailing debates over this current crisis of faith, which also challenged Jewish scholarship and tradition. He had engaged in controversy with David Nieto, the rabbi of Bevis Marks. Marcus was connected to William Whiston, then Anthony Collins (1676-1729); who in turn was linked to John Toland and John Locke. Further links were with William Wotton (1666-1727) and the Dutch scholar, William Surrenhusius, and notably the Archbishop, William Wake. Hence the title of Ruderman’s book, Connecting the Covenants, who used his research about Marcus as a practical example of someone who joined the Jewish and Christian worlds; as well as the broader, nascent shared scholarship, in both the Jewish and Christian traditions. Now that the Jews were established in England, a closer understanding and a genuine philosemitism was possible.

In essence at that time, to be a Christian involved rejecting a convert’s Jewish culture and faith tradition. This meant the Christians were encouraging the rejection of any fulfilment of the Old Testament, instead of validating the Jewish roots of the Christian faith. They were seen as polar opposites and not capable of integration. As Christian philosemitism developed, the fusion and mutual respect for the apparently disparate faiths began to merge more closely. There were still differences, but later a Jew did not have to reject his Jewish culture and attempt to behave like an ‘English gentleman’. Marcus often described himself as a “Gentleman and a Scholar”. As Ruderman expresses it

one might perhaps discern in such modest efforts of self-discovery a more tolerant, nuanced and appreciative attitude towards Judaism as a cultural factor, if not towards actual Jews themselves.

The social network was of Moses was extensive, he had asked Lord Hans Sloane (1660-1753) for a loan, and he also worked closely with Humphrey Prideaux (1604-1724), the Dean of Norwich, who had written The Old and New Testament Connected. Marcus was also linked to General Oglethorpe, through his fellow

---
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founder of Georgia, John Percival (1683-1748), the Earl of Egremont. Percival had bailed Marcus out of a debtor’s prison in 1736.

The lived experience of Marcus Moses helps to focus on the reception of Jews into the academic world in the eighteenth century. With similar echoes of the earlier Jewish interaction with Christian Hebraists, he was appreciated for his Hebrew skills and his direct experience of rabbinic Judaism, and accepted on equal terms. It was clear that his intellectual skills were not as sophisticated as the Christian scholars, especially those in Cambridge. Moses had tried to find a niche to provide himself with a new living and an income. By the end of his life, his original success as a ‘trophy convert’ was dispensed with, and he died in poverty. His almost unique, notable contribution was that he was an intelligent, academic convert, in contrast to most of the other converted Jews. They had converted only for social acculturation, or because they were in poverty seeking Christian charity or work. He did not despise his fellow Jews, as converts like Johannes Pfefferkorn (1469-1523) had done, instead he affirmed that “I retain and ever shall retain that regard for my Brethren, whom I have left for the sake of Christ”. Marcus provides a model for the complexities of the developing Jewish Christian relations both then and into the future.

Conclusion

The interaction of Jews and Christians was well established in England by the 1770s, one hundred and twenty years after their readmission, despite the stark antisemitic outburst around 1753 and then there followed a quiet period for Jewish assimilation. This generation was mainly born in England, though some immigration continued. The chapter has shown the various streams of shared experience; from the close contact in Georgia, to the Moravian influence upon the new missionary movement and the Wesleys. The treatment of Jewish people as ‘worthy’ of evangelism was a significant step, as they were to be considered to be equal, along with all the other people groups. The complexities of this Jewish conversion narrative clearly demonstrates the threat to retaining a Jewish identity, as well as the continued suspicion of Christians about false professions of conversion. The church still had a problem with converted Jews living as English Christians.
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Chapter 6


This study has examined the development of Christian philosemitism from 1656 to 1753 emphasising the importance of the evangelical influence. The Puritan millennialist approach, Restorationism, had originally limited its emphasis on the end times, with the return of the Jewish people to Palestine, following an evangelical theology that focused on the Jews at the Second Coming of Jesus to Jerusalem. Several Jewish scholars would prefer to use the term conversionism, because this Christian doctrine was linked with the prophetic prediction that the Jewish nation would convert and accept Jesus as their Messiah at that time. However, if the definition of philosemitism is widened from Restorationism, to include a love and respect for the Jews as individuals; then the earlier Christian Hebraists clearly respected the OT, Jewish history and culture. However, it is not obvious that they esteemed the Jews as people. Until 1656, Christians had been separated from real Jews since 1290. The long history of Christian antisemitism and the negative attitude towards Jewish people is now identified as ‘a theology of contempt’.

In England around 1656, the English religious identity was challenged by Cromwell’s initiative to readmit the Jews. Immediately, the social and racial identity of these Jewish people, potential immigrants within English society, had to be urgently confronted. It was only at this point that the term philosemitism could be applied to the attitudes towards Jewish people in England. Previously, there had been a ‘conceptual’ philosemitism, which respected the Jewish heritage and the Hebrew roots of the Christian faith. In the chaos of the Civil War, many Puritans embraced Restorationism and Jewish millennialism, this study has expanded that limited perspective by emphasising the social history of Jewish people. Following readmission, the Christian experience of the Jews as people was narrowly limited to this small, Jewish community in London. In the late seventeenth century, social contact was restricted to the wealthy Converso merchants, who directly traded and lived with them. The benefits of the economic influence of these Jewish merchants and financiers soon became apparent to the English, post Cromwell. Following the restoration of Charles II, he demonstrated an unanticipated philosemitism. Then the next major

historical shift, the Glorious Revolution of William and Mary from 1688, was funded mainly by continental Jews, particularly in Amsterdam.

Christian and Jewish Identity

In the short period between 1656 and 1688, a significant battle for both Christian and Jewish identity was taking place. For the English, the ongoing threat was the return to a Catholic monarchy that would destabilise the nation, possibly analogous to Cromwell’s Civil War. As this study has revealed, the Jews were a crucial part in helping to restore a functional monarchy to England by financially supporting both Charles II, and then the Protestant succession of William of Orange from Holland. Dutch Jewish financiers funded these armies and established a new constitutional stability in England. Following 1688, England witnessed the birth of a substantial economic, mercantile and naval resurgence. This was one of the major arguments presented by Menasseh ben Israel in his Petition, where he argued that the return of the Jews would benefit England commercially. Cromwell was proved to be right when he promoted the readmission of the Jews for economic purposes, and by the start of the eighteenth century, the positive evidence was available. His own Jewish philosemitism had moved from a millennialist, restorationist, abstract theological argument, to the added simple realisation that the Jews would boost English trade and improve the nation’s future financial stability and maritime influence.

Protestant identity was also being challenged during this period. A revived Anglican church emerged following ‘the Great Ejection’ of 1662, when most of the Puritans were excluded. The Clarendon code mounted a fierce attack on religious dissent. Amidst this battle for ‘spiritual England’, the nascent Jewish community in London was attempting to be accepted. Yet within their ranks, a tension soon emerged between the established rich Sephardic merchants and the poorer Ashkenazi immigrants. The richer Jews, who had settled here from Iberia and Holland, dissociated themselves from their German and Eastern European co-religionists. The poorer Jews were forced to leave London for the provinces, and as this study has revealed, some were even sent to Georgia. Members of the Bevis Marks synagogue were willing to pay to remove them from London to New England. The Ashkenazis split from the Bevis Marks synagogue in 1690, establishing their own place of worship and a cemetery. At the heart of this Jewish rift was the clash of different languages; Portuguese, Ladino and Yiddish, and distinctly separate forms of worship, traditions and lifestyle. In the Christian community, the resurgent Anglicans imposed their beliefs and their Prayer Book upon England, seeking to punish the Baptists, Dissenters and Quakers for not being religiously acceptable. Fractured relationships and contested identities were to be found in both the Christian and the Jewish camps. However, the success of the
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Jewish merchants and their positive contribution to the English economy was willingly accepted, but not always appreciated.  

Can Christians and Jews be Genuine Friends?

At the heart of this study is how the Jewish people were regarded by Christians in England. A distinction has already been made between ‘conceptual’ Jews, those who were regarded as members of a nation that would be significant at the Millennium; and ‘real’ Jews, who were only readmitted from 1656. Andrew Crome raises the important question, whether Christians and Jews can be genuine friends? He observes “how often [in the readmission debate] the Jews were portrayed as ‘friends’: either of God, or of the English nation as a whole...[however] it was formed without any reference to actual Jews”. Van der Wall clearly answers this, “it is a well-known fact that the famous Amsterdam Rabbi Menasseh ben Israel maintained various friendly relationships with non-Jewish contemporaries”. He cites John Dury, Henry Jessey and Nathaniel Homes as his English friends. The initiative for these relationships came from the Rabbi, who needed their personal support for his Petition. Menasseh ben Israel also had genuine friends when he stayed in London, such as Jessey and Henry More from Cambridge. Katz highlights Jessey, the millenarian and an associate of the Fifth Monarchy Men in Menasseh ben Israel’s Christian Connection: Henry Jessey and the Jews. It is clear that to be a millennialist did not exclude friendship with Jewish people, as evidenced by the gift from the Rabbi to Jessey of a personal copy of his Hope of Israel in Latin. As Katz reminds us, the Rabbi and his wife stayed in London for two years from September 1655, financed by his Christian friends. The Rabbi was even “once civilly entertained by Cromwell at his Table”. Oliver St John had earlier visited the Rabbi at his Sephardic synagogue in 1651, whilst he was on his diplomatic duties in Amsterdam. Ralph Cudworth, the Regius Professor of Hebrew at Cambridge also visited him, and ben Israel had close contact with John Dury and Samuel Hartlib. Crome comments, “English writers began...to suggest that any man claiming to be a friend of God also had to claim to be a friend of the Jews”.
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The Quakers always had a close affinity with the Jews; their weaker Trinitarian theology was not such a threat to Jewish dialogue. Margaret Fell notably had close Jewish friends in Amsterdam and a link there with Spinoza. A Quaker built the Bevis Marks synagogue in London. The friendship between John Wesley and Dr Nunez in Georgia was important, where a mutual respect was established. Furthermore, the interaction in that colony from 1733 of the Jews, the Christians, the Moravians and the Salzburgers marked a significant period in shared friendship and toleration. Other friendships can be explored around the time of the controversy over the Jew Bill, such as Richard Trevor, the Bishop of Durham. Samson Gideon had an English wife and his son was educated at Eton, a sign of the ultimate assimilation into elite society. The English networks of trading partners worldwide included Jews. From the middle of the eighteenth century the richer Jews were welcomed into the lodges of the Freemasons, an unusual evidence of acceptance and even friendship. At the poorer end of society, especially in the East End of London, Jewish and Christian families lived closely together. Christians helped their neighbours on the sabbath, carrying out the tasks that were forbidden as work, such as lighting fires. The quality and the characteristics of such Jewish and Christian friendships between 1656 and 1753 is worthy of further extensive study. A more detailed examination of individual friendships during this period would be informative; I am prompted to write a future journal article to extend the research into this topic.

The Rebirth of Mission

As the Evangelicals regained their strength from the 1730s and rediscovering the gospel priority for mission, prompted by the example of the Moravians at Halle; there was a renewed motivation to include the Jews in this fresh movement for worldwide evangelism. The wider Christian tradition had previously excluded the Jews from any previous missionary activity, considering them to be unworthy of the Gospel, because they had rejected their Messiah. In Georgia, there was an attempt by the Moravians to convert the local Jews, but this ended in failure. John Wesley was unhappy whilst in Georgia, but one personal solace was his close friendship with the Jewish doctor, Nunez. Wesley tried to debate with him and to convert him, but he also failed. The heart of the problem is whether Christians can be genuinely philosemitic, or if there is always a hidden motive for conversion; many Jews see this as conversionist philosemitism. They argue that to treat the Jews with greater kindness and dignity than was common at the time, is just a ruse to encourage them to voluntarily embrace the Christian religion. They correctly defend their Jewish identity, affirming that this kind of conversionist philosemitism would lead to the destruction of Judaism (though not the physical destruction of the Jews), if they all converted. Endelman asserts that “conversionist philosemitism (to give it its proper name) has the same object as many forms of antisemitism”.

257 They were called the Shabbos Goy in Yiddish, when non-Jews helped their neighbours.
Further Influences

Two important themes have undergirded this study and require further attention. The first is the development of religious toleration, which extended much wider than the evangelical influence. Religious tolerance was an important principle for the Puritans; however, many of the Presbyterians were not fully in agreement with this approach. But they were united in a demand for freedom of worship. When the Jews were readmitted, the challenge was how these people should be treated, and how toleration applied to them. John Toland (1670-1722) was certainly not an Evangelical, he was called a freethinker, pantheist or even a proto-unitarian, and he claimed that Spinoza followed his approach too. He was noted for his promotion of toleration, living in London most of his life, he interacted with the Jewish community. He demonstrated his philosemitism in 1714 in Reasons for Naturalizing the Jews, where he argued strongly for liberty, promoting Jewish rights and the full emancipation for the Jews. Toland was closely connected with James Harrington of Oceana fame, and with Spinoza on the continent. A wider example of his tolerance was his acceptance of the Huguenots, a significant immigrant Protestant community in London.

An unusual element revealed in this study is the ‘philosemitism within freemasonry’. This warrants a further journal article, as some details about Jewish freemasonry are available, but the philosemitic link between Christians and Jews in local lodges demands further study. An important aspect of Jewish assimilation is revealed when Jews were accepted as Freemasons; a select group, who closely guarded their membership and their secrets. There is evidence of Jewish Freemasons after 1717, when the Grand Lodge was formed, and later in the eighteenth century Jewish only lodges were formed. Elias Ashmole (1617-1692) was claimed as a mason in 1646. Rabbi Jacob Templo and his model, during the reign of Charles II, linked the masons of King Solomon’s Temple to these new masonic lodges, Templo was reputed to be a
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Freemason, along with many of the founders of the Royal Society. The salient point is that in these early days, for Jews to become members, they would have to be elected by two Gentiles, who would confirm their financial and social standing, thereby showing a philosemitic acceptance. Aubrey Newman identifies fifteen Jewish freemasons between 1723 and 1738 in the records of the Grand Lodge. He also identifies an Irish Jew, Laurence Dermott (1720-1791) in London in 1741, who was a supporter of the Sephardic hospital and later a Grand Secretary. "I have argued that the question of anti-Jewish feeling was minimal in England... in contrast to the Continent, especially Germany". He concludes, "freemasonry proved attractive to Jews at an early stage in their acculturation within the wider host community... there is certainly scope here for a great deal of research". Later on, the Duke of Sussex (1773-1843) was a Grand Master, and was noted as an active philosemite and Hebrew scholar.

Future Developments from 1753

By the end of the eighteenth century, a different form of philosemitism developed. The Jews began to be seen as part of the wider European society and their human rights were boosted following the French Revolution. Napoleon (1769-1821) supported their emancipation, forming the Grand Sanhedrin in Paris in 1806-7. Napoleon's Restorationism was similar to the Puritans, and even his philosemitism was revealed in 1799, when he supported the return of the Jews to the Holy Land, in the midst of his campaigns there. In England, early in the nineteenth century, concern for the antislavery movement encouraged England to show a moral leadership to the world. William Wilberforce, the leading opponent of slavery, an Evangelical Anglican and an MP, was a member of the Clapham Sect and also a Vice-President of the London Jews Society (LJS) from 1813. Here for the first time in England there was a Jewish mission, promoting a new respect for the Jews. Joseph Frey, a converted Jew, had trained at Halle in Germany and founded the LJS in East London in 1809. Subsequently, the Anglicans took control in 1815. The LJS still exists and was

---
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supported from 1813 by the Duke of Kent. Lord Shaftesbury was the President for fifty years and another leading LJS member, Professor Alexander McCaul became the Professor of Rabbinics at King’s College, London. The LJS established the first Bishopric in Jerusalem in 1842, the first Bishop was a converted Jew, Michael Solomon Alexander, previously Professor of Hebrew at King’s College, London. The wider emphasis on philosemitism, and not only on mission, expanded to embrace Jewish emancipation. Lewis Way, another Vice-President of the LJS, with the authority of Czar Alexander I, spoke to the crowned heads of Europe at the Aix-la-Chapelle conference in 1818, pleading for Jewish emancipation. Much closer relations between Jews and Christians were observed in 1840, when they organised a joint public protest, with Moses Montefiore, at the Mansion House in London refuting the Damascus Blood Libel. From England, the LJS established centres throughout Europe, in key cities such as Amsterdam, Prague, Tehran and Jerusalem by 1890.

The Puritan Restoration movement was eclipsed by the birth of the Zionist movement in 1896, founded by Theodore Herzl. A key partner was William Heschler, an LJS minister in Vienna; Herzl called him the ‘first Christian Zionist’. The Evangelical influence was at its zenith at the time of the Balfour declaration in 1917, with the British proposal for a Jewish homeland. On a broader Christian approach, not solely evangelical, James Parkes founded the Council for Christians and Jews in 1942, to combat antisemitism and to promote closer Jewish-Christian relations. This is still an active national organisation, supported by the Queen. The United Nations vote in 1947 allowed the Jewish people to return to Palestine in May 1948 and form the new State of Israel. There in 1948, the Puritan dream of those Christian Philosemites who had proposed Jewish Restorationism had been achieved.

---
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Appendix 1  
Timeline from 1640-1760

Royalty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Reign</th>
<th>Key Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charles II</td>
<td>1630-1685</td>
<td>(1660-1685) Scotland (1649-51) Catherine of Braganza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James II</td>
<td>1633-1701</td>
<td>(1685-1688) Anne (1), Mary (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William III</td>
<td>1650-1702</td>
<td>(1689-1702) Mary II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne</td>
<td>1665-1714</td>
<td>(1702-1707) Britain and Ireland, (1707-14) United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George I</td>
<td>1660-1727</td>
<td>(1714-1727) Sophia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George II</td>
<td>1683-1760</td>
<td>(1727-1760) Caroline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George III</td>
<td>1738-1820</td>
<td>(1760-1820) Charlotte</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant Dates

1642-1651 English Civil War
1643 Queen Henrietta Maria visits Menasseh ben Israel's (MBI) synagogue, Amsterdam
1654 First petition from Dormido and Samuel, Menasseh ben Israel's son
1648 Restoration of the Jews predicted in the Zohar
1649 Cartwright Petition
1650 Menasseh ben Israel (MBI) The Hope of Israel
1655 MBI petition to Cromwell. Whitehall Conference 4-12 December
1656 Re-admission of the Jews. Private synagogue allowed, Rabbi Moses Athias from Hamburg. Robles accepted as a Jew.
1657 Sephardic Mile End Cemetery
1658 Oliver Cromwell dies, Richard Cromwell resigns 1659
1659 MBI dies, buried at Amsterdam, his son Richard dies, buried at Middelburg.
1660 Restoration of Charles II. Jews to Dublin
1662 The Great Ejection of the Puritans
1663 Pepys visits the synagogue
1664 Conventicle Act, accepted by the Privy Council, special terms for Jews
1665 The Great Plague of London. Rabbi Athias died in it
1666 The Great Fire of London. Shabbatai Zevi. Jewish Messianic year (6000)
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1667 Jews allowed to swear on OT. 1671-1790 annual gift of silver to the Lord Mayor
Esdras Edzard, Jewish evangelist in Hamburg
1674 Illegal synagogue service reported, ignored. Rabbi Templo’s model of the Temple
1675 Templo’s temple model from Amsterdam. Queen Henrietta Maria, widow of Charles I
1685 37 Jews reported for not attending church
1688 Glorious Revolution, William III and Mary II from Amsterdam
1690 Battle of the Boyne, James II. The Great Synagogue (Ashkenazi) built
1695 Census records 853 Jews, separate Ashkenazi cemetery, East London.
1697 Royal Exchange, maximum of 12 Jewish stockbrokers out of the total of 100
1691 Whitehall Palace burnt down, Kensington Palace
1700 First Jewish knight, Solomon de Medina
1701 Act of Settlement, Protestant. Bevis Marks Sephardic synagogue built
1707 Act of Union of Great Britain, including Scotland
1715 Jacobite rising, James II
1719 Spanish invasion, Jacobites
1720 South Sea Bubble
1727 Moravian revival and 100-year prayer meeting begins
1728 Moravian mission at Halle, Germany, Institutum Judaica
1730s Evangelical Awakening. Wesleys and Whitefield
1733 42 Jews arrive in Savannah, Georgia
1736 John and Charles Wesley in Georgia
1745 Jacobites, Bonnie Prince Charlie invades Scotland, defeated at Battle of Prestonpans
1746 Prince William, Battle of Culloden, end of the Jacobite influence
1753 The Jewish Naturalisation Bill (Jew Bill), passed and immediately repealed
Appendix 2
English Philosemites, Restorationists and Millennialists 1550-1800

1550-1600

John Bale (1495-1563) (RCJ) Exiled in Holland, met Jews. Revelation, 1545. Influenced by Foxe’s Book of Martyrs, 1563

Johanna Cartwright/Cartenwright ? (Son, Ebenezer) Baptists from Amsterdam. Petition for the Readmission of the Jews, 1649

William Perkins (1558-1602) Beza advocate, Geneva Bible. Revelation 1-3, 1585

Francis Kett (c.1547-1589) (M) Millenarian, Heretic Heavenly Jerusalem, 1585.

Thomas Draxe (d.1618) (RJ) The General Calling of the Jews, Romans 11, 1608

Sir Henry Finch (c.1558-1625) (RJ) World’s Great Restauration [Jews], 1621


Thomas Brightman (1562-1607) (RJ) Father of Restorationism. Eschatology, future prophecy Shall they Return to Jerusalem Again? 1615

@William Gouge (1575-1653) Blackfriars. Printed Finch’s book (imprisoned)

@William Twisse (1578-1646) (M) Vicar, Berkshire. Premillennialist? Preface to Mede’s book

Joseph Mede (1586-1639) (M), Hebraist. Clavis Apocalyptica, 1627, expected a miraculous conversion of the Jews. Parousia 1654.

Johann Alsted (1588-1638) (M) German Calvinist. Encyclopaedia Biblica, 1610 Taught Comenius
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@John Dury  (1596-1680) (RCJ) Scottish, but influential in England. Based in Leiden.  
Networked with Hartlib, Comenius and Serrarius. Royal  
chaplain, Cromwell’s ambassador in Amsterdam. *Israel’s Call*,  
1645. Jewish Studies College?  
Hugh Peter  (1598-1660)  (RJ) Close to Cromwell. Pro Readmission of Jews, at WH  
Oliver St John  (c.1598-1673) Chief Judge, MP. Linked with Thurloe, Dutch mission  
Chancellor, Cambridge University. Wife, a cousin of Cromwell  
Praise-God Barebone  (1598-1679) (M) MP, Baptist, Fifth Monarchy man  
Oliver Cromwell  (1599-1658) (M) (CJ) Readmission of the Jews, 1656  
Nathaniel Holmes  (1599-1678) (M) Aldersgate, influenced by Brightman and Alsted.  
*Israel’s Call Approaching*, 1650. Links Jessey and MBI

1600-1700

@Thomas Goodwin  (1600-1680) (CJ in 1656). Pope defeated in 1666. Chaplain to Cromwell  
Dissenter  
Samuel Hartlib  (c.1600-1662) (M) Spy and scholar, networker, neighbour of Pepys. 1655  
Petrus Serrarius  (1600-1669) (M) London & Amsterdam, influenced Spinoza and MBI  
Close to Quakers in Amsterdam, Ames and Jessey. Pro Zevi  
@Herbert Palmer  (1601-1647) President of Queens, Cambridge  
@John Lightfoot  (1602-1675) Hebraist, ‘England’s Chief Rabbi’. *Horae Hebraicae*, 1658  
*Polyglot Bible*, 1657  
Henry Jessey  (1603-1663) (RCJ) Baptist at Whitehall Conference 1655. Jerusalem funds  
Hebraist. *Jewish Nation in Europe and Judea*, 1658.  
Moses Wall  (c.1606-c.1664) Translated MBI *Hope of Israel*, 1652  
Robert Maton  (1607-c.1653) (M) *A Treatise of the Fifth Monarchy*, 1655  
William Sherwin  (1607-1690) Dissenter, London
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John Tany (1608-1659)  (M) (RJ) Deluded prophet, disputed whether a Ranter or Quaker. *High Priest to the Ievves* 1652


William Ames (d.1662)  (CJ) Baptist minister in Somerset, then Quaker missionary to Jews in Amsterdam in 1657, *Mysteries of the Kingdom* 1663.


Thomas Tillam (d.1674)  (M) Seventh Day Baptist. *False Jew of Hexham*, 1653.

George Fox (1624-1691)  Founder of Quakerism. Hebrew Bible.

Samuel Petto (c.1624-1711)  (M) Dissenter, Suffolk. Links to Fifth Monarchists.


Pierre Jurieu (1637-1713)  (M) French, then Anglican, Hebrew professor. Apocalyptic writings, Pope to be overthrown in 1689. Fanatic?

Isaac Newton (1642-1726)  Natural scientist, MP. Interpretation of prophecy, follows Mede, biblical chronology. Royal Society.


Call of the Jews, 1650/1656, fall Rome 1666. Parousia 1700

William Lowth (1660-1732) (RJ) Oxford and Winchester. *Commentaries on the Prophets*
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John Gill (1697-1771) Baptist, Hebrew scholar, hyper Calvinist, pro Whitefield

Graham Killingworth (1698-1778) General Baptist Norwich, friend of Whiston

1700-1800

Philip Doddridge (1702-1751) Northampton Dissenter, Daventry Academy

Thomas Newton (1704-1782) Bishop of Bristol. *Dissertation on the Prophecies*, 1754

John Eyre (1711-1789) (RJ) *Restoration of the Jews*, 1771. Future prophecy

Joseph Priestley (1733-1804) (M) Scientist and Unitarian. Daventry Academy Religious toleration


Richard Brothers (1757-1824) (RJ) 1793 British Israel Movement, Ten Lost Tribes. Insane


Samuel Collet ? *Future Restoration of the Jews to their own Land*, 1747

Evangelical Awakening

John Wesley (1703-1791) Georgia Jews, friend of Dr Nunes

Charles Wesley (1707-1788) Restorationist hymn

George Whitefield (1714-1770) Worked with Jews in the New World
### Appendix 3  Significant English Jews  1550-1750

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># in ODNB</th>
<th>Profession</th>
<th>Place of birth [English residence]</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#Roderigo Lopes (c.1517-1594)</td>
<td>Physician and (M)</td>
<td>Portugal. [1559-1594] Elizabeth I’s doctor, treason 1586 (poisoning), executed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henrique Nunes</td>
<td>Physician and (M)</td>
<td>Portugal. [1546-1554] lived in Bristol, moved to Rouen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#Hector Nunes (1520-1591)</td>
<td>Physician</td>
<td>Portugal. [1549-1591?] (E 1579), Spanish Armada (S), outwardly Anglican, buried at St Dunstan, Stepney. Hidden Jew.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moses Israel Athias (d.1665)</td>
<td>Rabbi</td>
<td>Hamburg. [1656-1665] First London Rabbi in Creechurch Lane, cousin of Carvajal. Died in the Great Plague 1665</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Abrabanel Dormido (d.1667) (M)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Spain. [1654-1667] arrested in 1627 by Inquisition, 1640 Amsterdam. 1654 original petition to Cromwell. Cromwell claimed his lost Brazilian assets from King of Portugal. Community leader and buried at Mile End.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#Duarte da Silva (1596-1677) (M) sugar</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lisbon. (B) [1662-1668] Dowry, Queen Catherine of Braganza. d. Antwerp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua da Silva (d.1679)</td>
<td>Rabbi</td>
<td>Amsterdam. [1670-1679]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solomon Dormido (1622-1700) Broker</td>
<td></td>
<td>First Jew at Royal Exchange in 1657, modified oath 1668</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(B) baptised, (N) naturalised, (E) endenizened, (BJ) buried Jewish, (OJ) open Jew, (CJ) converted Jew, (S) spy, (M) merchant
Significant English Jews

Charles Marie de Veil  (c.1630-c.1690) Scholar and priest
Metz. [1672-1690] (CJ 1654), RC, to Calvinist, to Anglican, then Baptist

#Jacob Abendana  (c.1630-1685) London Rabbi (brother Isaac)
Spain. [1668-?] 1681 Haham Bevis Marks, Princess Anne visited at Passover 1681.

#Isaac Abendana  (d.1699) Hebraist, scholar (br. Jacob)
Spain. Translated Mishnah into Latin. Taught at Magdalen, Oxford 1662
and Cambridge 1663-67. 1660s established a Christian Hebrew network

Simon de Caceres  (d.1704)  (M)
Amsterdam. (S) Signed MBI petition. Requested cemetery 1657 (RQ1)
St Katherine Cree bells tolled at his funeral. Links with Queen Christina of Sweden

#Antonio Fernandez Carvajal (c.1599-1659) (M) bullion, army
Portugal. [1635-1659] (E 1655, first since 1290) (S) (RQ2). Convert to Judaism

#Antonio Rodrigues Robles (d.1688)  (M) wine
Portugal. [1648-1688] (E 1675) 1656 vessels seized, argued that 'he was a Jew'.
(RQ3)

Jacob ben Sasportas  (c.1610-1698) Rabbi
Anti-Zevi. 1693 Rabbi Amsterdam. Sons remained in London

Alvares Mendes da Costa (1646-1728)  (M) diamonds
CJ. (N 1668) owned land. Links with East India Company (EIC)
Dowry of Catherine of Braganza

#Fernando Moses Mendes (1647-1724) Physician
Portugal. [1669-1724] (E 1687) Charles II physician. 1721 portrait by d. Catherine

#Sir Solomon de Medina (c.1650-1720) (M) and financier

David Nieto  (1654-1728) Astronomer, mathematician and philosopher
Venice. [1701-1728] Padua University, medicine. 1701 Rabbi at opening of Bevis Marks. 1703 founded home for orphans. Debated Newtonian science
Significant English Jews

Joseph Cortissos (1656-1742) Army contractor
Antwerp. [1711-1742] Provisioned troops 1705, War of Spanish Succession

#Alvaro da Fonseca/Alvares (c.1657-1742) (M) diamonds
Lisbon. [1673-1742] (E 1675) India 1682-1700 Fort George, Madras
1714-1721 W. Indies. Pitt diamond

#Alphonso Rodrigues (d.1716) (M), sugar, textiles, diamonds
Lisbon. [1662-XX] Major diamond importer, links with East India Company

Marcus Moses (c.1660-1735) (M) Gems

#Isaac Pereira (c.1658-1718) Army contractor
The Hague. [1688-?] Funded William III and returned with him
Funded Boyne campaigns. d. Netherlands

#Samuel Nunes Ribeiro (c.1667-1741) Physician
Portugal. [1726-1733] (OJ) 42 Jews to Georgia in 1733, a friend of John Wesley, in Savannah (1733-1740). 1740 to New York, where he died

#Catherine da Costa (1679-1756) Female Painter
London. [1679-1756] (B) Godmother was Queen Catherine.
She painted her father's portrait, hangs in Bevis Marks

Abraham Reb Aberle (d.1745) (M) Gems
Parnass (warden) Ashkenazi synagogue. Accused Nieto of heresy, combative.
Sir Herbert Samuel (1870-1963) a descendent, the first Jew in cabinet. Zionist.

#Isaac Samuda (1681-1729) Physician, poet
Lisbon. (B) [1709-?] 1723 First Jewish Fellow of the Royal Society (FRS)

#Meyer Schomberg (A) (1690-1761) Physician (father twins)
Germany. [1721-1761] FRS. Physician to Great Synagogue. FRS. 1730 Freemason
1746 rejected Judaism, became Deist

#Jacob de Castro Sarmento (c.1692-1762) Physician
Portugal. [1721-1762] Rejected Judaism and Christianity, but buried in a church
Significant English Jews  4


Moses Marcus (1701-?) (CJ 1723) 1724 wrote a book to explain his conversion


#Isaac Schomberg (A) (1714-1780) Physician (twin Ralph) Germany. [1721-1780] (B 1747), (N 1750), Anglican for career advancement. 1747 graduate Trinity, Cambridge, 1771 fellow

#Ralph Schomberg (A) (1714-1792) Physician (twin Isaac) Germany. [1721-1792] (B) Anglican. m. Elizabeth (Christian) 1774 MD from Aberdeen University


Emmanuel Moses Mendes (1717-1791) Naturalist, mineralogist Freemason. FRS librarian, but stole subscriptions, imprisoned

Anthony Moses da Costa (c.1669-1747) (M) corals, diamonds Director of the Bank of England. Action against the Russia Company as they would not admit him as a Jew. Son of Jacob da Costa, the spy (S) in the Thurloe papers. Married Catherine da Costa, artist

All Sephardi, except for (A) Ashkenazi. Key 1656 Readmission trio, requested a synagogue and a cemetery - Carvajal, Dormido and Robles (RQ)

Appendix 4  
Charles Wesley’s Restorationist Hymn

Almighty God of Love, 1762

Set up the attracting sign and summon whom Thou dost approve
For messengers divine. From Abraham’s favour’d seed
Thy new apostles chuse, in isles and continents to spread
The dead reviving news.

Them snatched out of the flame, through every nation send
The true Messiah to proclaim the Universal Friend.
That all the God unknown may learn of Jews to adore
And see Thy glory in Thy Son till time shall be no more.

O that the chosen band might now their brethren bring
And gathered out of every land, present to Zion’s King!
Of all the ancient race, not one be left behind
But each impelled by secret grace, his way to Canaan find!

We know, it must be done, for God has spoke the word,
All Israel shall their Saviour own, to their first state restored:
Rebuilt by His command, Jerusalem shall rise,
Her Temple on Moriah stand again and touch the skies.

Send then Thy servants forth, to call the Hebrews home
From West and East, and south, and north, let all the wanders come.
Where’er in lands unknown Thy fugitives remain,
Bid every creature help them on, Thy holy mount to gain

An offering to their God, there let them all be seen
Sprinkled with water and with blood, in souls and body clean.
With Israel’s myriads sealed, let all the nations meet
And show Thy mystery fulfilled, Thy family complete.

[Italics in the original]

Originally in the 1780 hymnbook, A Collection of Hymns for the use of the People called Methodists and included in subsequent editions until 1933. A fuller commentary is found on the Wesley Fellowship website.

Based on Romans 11:26, ‘and so all Israel shall be saved’ and Isaiah 66:19,20.