

Church History: Studies in Christianity and Culture

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CHH>

Additional services for ***Church History: Studies in Christianity and Culture***:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)



The Fall of the Ottoman Empire and the Restoration of Israel in the “Judeo-centric” Strand of Puritan Millenarianism

Richard W. Cogley

Church History: Studies in Christianity and Culture / Volume 72 / Issue 02 / June 2003, pp 304 - 332

DOI: 10.1017/S0009640700099868, Published online: 28 July 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009640700099868

How to cite this article:

Richard W. Cogley (2003). The Fall of the Ottoman Empire and the Restoration of Israel in the “Judeo-centric” Strand of Puritan Millenarianism. *Church History: Studies in Christianity and Culture*, 72, pp 304-332 doi:10.1017/S0009640700099868

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

The Fall of the Ottoman Empire and the Restoration of Israel in the “Judeo-centric” Strand of Puritan Millenarianism¹

RICHARD W. COGLEY

For the American Puritan minister Increase Mather, the battle of Armageddon would be “the most terrible day of battel that ever was.” “Asia is like to be in a flame of war between Israelites and Turks,” he wrote in *The Mystery of Israel’s Salvation*, “[and] Europe between the followers of the Lamb and the followers of the beast.” In the Asian and European spheres of action, or so Mather anticipated, God’s Israelite and Protestant armies would “overthrow great Kingdoms, and make Nations desolate, and bring defenced Cities into ruinous heaps.” The inevitable victory would reshape the course of history, for the destruction of Roman Catholic and Ottoman power would be accompanied by the conversion of the Jews and the lost tribes of Israel to Christianity and by their restoration to their ancestral homeland in Palestine. Then would come the birth of the millennium in Jerusalem and the subsequent spread of the kingdom of Jesus Christ throughout Europe, the Middle East, and the rest of the world.²

This sequence or pattern of apocalyptic events—the Protestant destruction of Catholicism and the Israelite overthrow of the Ottoman Empire, the Christianization and repatriation of Jacob’s descendants, and the establishment of the millennium in the city of David followed by the universal dispersal of the millennial order—may be termed “Judeo-centric” because it located the start of the millennium in Jerusalem and because it assigned the role of inaugurating the kingdom to the converted posterity of Jacob. Endorsements of Judeo-centrism appeared in the writings of other early modern English and American Puritans besides Increase Mather. The list of subscribers included the English clergymen Thomas Brightman, Thomas

1. The author wishes to thank Susannah Heschel and John C. Lamoreaux for their assistance in writing this essay.
2. Increase Mather, *The Mystery of Israel’s Salvation* (London: John Allen, 1669), 36–37.

Richard W. Cogley is an associate professor of religious studies at Southern Methodist University.

Goodwin, and John Archer; the American divines John Cotton, Thomas Shepard, Ephraim Huit, and Nicholas Noyes; four persons who lived in New England before returning permanently to England, the layman William Aspinwall and the ministers William Hooke, Hanserd Knollys, and Samuel Lee; two other lay Puritans, the English lawyer Sir Henry Finch and the Massachusetts Bay magistrate Samuel Hutchinson; and the Scottish-born champion of Protestant ecumenism, John Dury, who spent large portions of his peripatetic career in England.

Although it appealed to various individuals on both sides of the Atlantic, Judeo-centrism should not be regarded as the normative form of Puritan eschatology, which is to say, as the normative interpretation of the "last things" disclosed in the Books of Daniel and Revelation and in other scriptural texts. In early modern Puritan sources, there was simply too much variation of opinion about the nature and the arrangement of these "last things" to identify an orthodox perspective. Two recent surveys of the subject, one on English Puritan eschatology from the mid sixteenth century until the late seventeenth century and the other on its American counterpart into the eighteenth century, forcefully make this point.³ Yet at the same time, the range of interpretive opinion within Puritan eschatology was not so diversified that no strands or schools of thought emerge. None of these strands achieved sufficient dominance as to constitute the mainstream; rather, each represented an outlook that Puritans of various stripes shared and that endured over time. To borrow the language of one scholar attuned to the different eschatological perspectives within Puritanism, there was no orthodoxy about the matter, only "orthodoxies."⁴ English and American Puritanism was probably not unique in this respect, for Reformed Protestant eschatology as a whole seems to be divided into schools of thought, none of them orthodox when the entire early modern period is taken into account.⁵

3. Crawford Gribben, *The Puritan Millennium: Literature & Theology, 1550–1682* (Portland, Ore.: Four Courts, 2000), 11–25; and Reiner Smolinski, "Apocalypticism in Colonial North America," in Bernard McGinn, John J. Collins, and Stephen J. Stein, eds., *The Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism* (New York: Continuum, 1998) 3:36–71.
4. Janice Knight, *Orthodoxies in Massachusetts: Rereading American Puritanism* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1994), especially 131–33, 166–67, 178–84.
5. This supposition is based on the following studies of Reformed eschatology outside England and America: Irena Backus, *Reformation Readings of the Apocalypse: Geneva, Zurich, and Wittenberg* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000); Howard Hotson, *Paradise Postponed: Johann Heinrich Alsted and the Birth of Calvinist Millenarianism* (Boston: Kluwer Academic, 2000); Arthur H. Williamson, *Scottish National Consciousness in the Age of James VI: The Apocalypse, the Union and the Shaping of Scotland's Public Culture*

A brief examination of disparate Puritan views about each link in the Judeo-centric chain of events reveals the diversity of eschatological opinion. Edward Holyoke, a magistrate in Massachusetts Bay, held that Armageddon was not "a great Battell which hath never as yet come to pass" but rather an expression for any past, present, or future military conflict between the righteous and their enemies; and Roger Williams, the founder of Rhode Island, thought that Armageddon was a future international battle, but one to be waged with words and not with weapons.⁶ Puritans also construed the other apocalyptic events in different ways. Like John Calvin before them, some Puritans rejected the notions of both a future conversion and a future repatriation of Israel. The layman William Pynchon, who lived in Massachusetts Bay before repatriating in 1652, stated that people who "look for a glorious Church of converted Jews, and for their restauration to the Land of Canaan," could "look their eyes out before they shall see it." The Reverend Richard Baxter reached the same conclusion in the late seventeenth century, as did Cotton Mather in the 1720s. Others, such as the English divine William Perkins and the New England minister Thomas Parker, resembled Theodore Beza more than they did John Calvin. These individuals accepted the idea of a future conversion but rejected the belief in a future restoration to Palestine.⁷

Similarly, there were different understandings of the millennium. Some early modern Puritans were unsympathetic to millenarianism, a term defined herein as a belief in the future establishment on earth of a millennial kingdom of long duration, though not necessarily one of a literal thousand years in length.⁸ In the sixteenth century, the

(Edinburgh: John Donald, 1979); J. van den Berg, "Eschatological Expectations Concerning the Conversion of the Jews in the Netherlands during the Seventeenth Century," in Peter Toon, ed., *Puritans, the Millennium, and the Future of Israel: Puritan Eschatology, 1600–1660* (Cambridge: James Clarke, 1970), 137–53; and Ernestine G. E. van der Wall, "Petrus Serrarius and Menasseh ben Israel: Christian Millenarianism and Jewish Messianism in Seventeenth-Century Amsterdam," in Yosef Kaplan, Henry Méchoulan, and Richard H. Popkin, eds., *Menasseh ben Israel and His World* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1989), 164–90.

6. Edward Holyoke, *The Doctrine of Life* (London: Nath. Ekins, 1658), 290 (mispaginated 298); and Williams, *The Complete Writings of Roger Williams* (New York: Russell and Russell, 1963), 2:269, 3:262, 4:354.
7. William Pynchon, *The Covenant of Nature made with Adam Described* (London: for the author, 1662), 417, 423; and Thomas Parker, *The Visions and Prophecies of Daniel Expounded* (London: Edmund Paxton, 1646), 149, 155. For Calvin, Beza, and Perkins, see Gribben, *The Puritan Millennium*, 38–40, 69; and for Baxter and Cotton Mather, see Smolinski, "Israel Redivivus: The Eschatological Limits of Puritan Typology in New England," *The New England Quarterly* 63 (1990): 366, 385–88.
8. This definition of millenarianism is adapted from Hotson, *Paradise Postponed*, 18; Gribben, *The Puritan Millennium*, 31; and Theodore Dwight Bozeman, *To Live Ancient Lives: The Primitivist Dimension in Puritanism* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1988), 198–99.

rejection of the doctrine of a future terrestrial millennium was so common in Puritanism, and in Protestantism more generally, that it represented a mainstream position at the time. Luther and Melancthon, Zwingli and Bullinger, and Calvin and Beza repudiated the millenarian doctrine, as did the Elizabethan Anglicans John Bale and John Foxe and their Puritan contemporaries Thomas Cartwright and William Perkins. These and other “amillennialists,” as they are often called, either assigned the millennium to a past historical epoch that antedated the supposed corruption of the apostolic church by Roman Catholicism, or saw the millennium as the whole period of the Christian dispensation between the incarnation and the second coming, or regarded the millennium as a purely spiritual condition existing only in heaven or perhaps in the souls of living believers.⁹ But in the early to mid seventeenth century, this amillennialist consensus unravelled as the idea of a future millennium on earth gained popularity, particularly in Reformed circles. On the Continent, the key figures in the transition to millenarianism were two German Reformed theologians, Johann Piscator and Johann Heinrich Alsted; and in England, they were Thomas Brightman and Joseph Mede, an Anglican whose influence on the emergence of Puritan millenarianism was profound.¹⁰ By the mid seventeenth century, millenarianism was well established among Puritans on both sides of the Atlantic, although amillennialism continued to find an audience.¹¹ Among those Puritans who accepted the doctrine of a coming earthly millennium, however, Judeo-centrism was not the only option. Some of the faithful located the

9. For sixteenth-century Protestant amillennialism in England and elsewhere in Europe, see Bozeman, *To Live Ancient Lives*, 199, 202–5, 211–12; Hotson, *Paradise Postponed*, 3; Gribben, *The Puritan Millennium*, 26–40; and Backus, *Reformation Readings*, 6–11, 25–36, 71–75, 108–12. Amillennialism was also the point of view of Augustine and Aquinas.
10. For Piscator and Alsted, see Hotson, *Paradise Postponed*, especially 121–53; and for Mede, see Katharine R. Firth, *The Apocalyptic Tradition in Reformation Britain, 1530–1645* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979), 213–38, and Paul K. Christianson, *Reformers and Babylon: English Apocalyptic Visions from the Reformation to the Eve of the Civil War* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1978), 124–29. John Napier, a late-sixteenth-century Scottish Presbyterian, taught a future terrestrial millennium in his *A Plaine Discovery of the whole Revelation of Saint John* (Edinburgh: R. Waldegrave, 1593). Because he antedated Piscator, Alsted, Brightman, and Mede, Napier might seem to be more deserving of the credit for starting the shift to millenarianism. Napier, however, was not a millenarian in the sense the term is used in this essay; his future millennium was of short duration, approximately fifty years in length. For more on Napier’s distance from millenarianism proper, see Bozeman, *To Live Ancient Lives*, 205.
11. For the growth of millenarianism in seventeenth-century Puritanism, see R. G. Clouse, “The Rebirth of Millenarianism,” in Toon, ed., *Puritans, the Millennium, and the Future of Israel*, 42–65; Bozeman, *To Live Ancient Lives*, 216–17, 235–36; and Gribben, *The Puritan Millennium*, 42–56. For the continuation of amillennialism in Puritan circles, see Bryan W. Ball, *A Great Expectation: Eschatological Thought in English Protestantism to 1660* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1975), 160–64.

future starting place of the millennium outside Palestine, in England for John Milton, in both Old and New England for the Indian missionary John Eliot, and in Mexico for the American Puritan diarist and magistrate Samuel Sewall.¹²

Brightman occupies the pride of place in the rise of Puritan millenarianism in general, and in the formulation of the Judeo-centric version of it in particular. He was, in the words of Theodore Dwight Bozeman, "probably the first Englishman otherwise in the mainstream of Reformed thought" to endorse the millenarian doctrine. Since he envisioned this coming earthly millennium in Judeo-centric fashion, Brightman doubtless qualifies as the first Puritan Judeo-centrist as well as the first Puritan millenarian. His works on biblical prophecy were published abroad in Latin and English editions within a decade of his death in 1607. Because they were harshly critical of the established Anglican Church, Brightman's books were not licensed for publication in England until the Puritans ended Anglican control over the domestic press in 1641. Summaries of his works were printed in London later that year; complete editions appeared in 1644. Therefore, his commentaries had been read in England only through foreign editions smuggled into the country or possibly through manuscript copies. Brightman's role in the emergence of Puritan Judeo-centrism, however, is sometimes difficult to track. Later Judeo-centrists did not always acknowledge his influence even when they borrowed heavily from his writings, and once the Judeo-centric perspective became more pervasive, advocates of it were not always cognizant of his seminal influence. Moreover, Judeo-centrists were disinclined to accept certain of his central views, such as his doctrine of two separate millennial eras, the first of which ended around 1300. But notwithstanding these difficulties, Brightman's place in the story of Puritan Judeo-centrism is undeniable.¹³

12. For Milton, see Firth, *The Apocalyptic Tradition*, 232–37, and Gribben, *The Puritan Millennium*, 130–31; for Eliot, see Richard W. Cogley, *John Eliot's Mission to the Indians before King Philip's War* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1999), 76–103; and for Sewall, see Smolinski, "Israel Redivivus," 378–80.

13. Brightman's major works were full commentaries on the Books of Revelation and Canticles, a partial commentary on the Book of Daniel, and a treatise on the figure of the Antichrist written against the Jesuit controversialist Robert Bellarmine. These four were published as *The Workes of That Famous, Reverend, and Learned Divine Mr. Tho. Brightman* (London: John Field, 1644). For the millennium that ended around 1300, see *ibid.*, 813, 816; and for scholarly treatments of Brightman, see Bozeman, *To Live Ancient Lives*, 198–214 (quotation on 206), and Firth, *The Apocalyptic Tradition*, 164–79.

I. THE JUDEO-CENTRISTS

This essay uses the writings of Brightman and the other aforementioned Judeo-centrists to delineate a shared eschatological point of view. These individuals were surely not the only Puritan Judeo-centrists, for further research into a broader range of sources, particularly ones emanating from England rather than from New England, will uncover the names of others. But even so, the figures in question constitute a large enough sample of opinion to establish the durability and the appeal of Judeo-centrism once Brightman had originated the perspective at the turn of the seventeenth century. Henry Finch stands at one end of the chronological spectrum; he was an early-seventeenth-century figure who had clearly read Brightman even though he did not cite him, or any other interpreter of biblical prophecy for that matter, in *The Worlds Great Restauration or the Calling of the Jews*.¹⁴ Increase Mather and Nicholas Noyes are at the opposite end; they remained active into the eighteenth century. The other individuals flourished at various intermediate points in time. Judeo-centrism had this staying power, in ways explained more fully later in the essay, because it could accommodate the course of historical events regardless of where an individual stood in time. In the first half of the seventeenth century, Judeo-centrists saw the Thirty Years War (1618–48) and the English Civil Wars (1642–48) as signs that Armageddon was beginning; and in the second half of the century, they viewed the plan to readmit Jews into England in the mid 1650s, the Sabbatian movement of the mid 1660s, and the decline of Turkish power in the 1680s and 1690s as foreshadowings of Jewish conversion and Ottoman defeat. Increase Mather, who wrote *A Dissertation Concerning the Future Conversion Of The Jewish Nation* in the mid 1690s, or about thirty years after he completed *The Mystery of Israel's Salvation*, provides a good illustration of the versatility of Judeo-centrism as a form of historiography. Both works are endorsements of Judeo-centrism: Mather, in fact, acknowledged that the “substance” of his argument in *A Dissertation* was the same as in *The Mystery*. The difference between the two works was not at the level of content but in the historical circumstances that led to their composition. Sabbatianism inspired *The Mystery* and the waning of Ottoman power, a *Dissertation*.¹⁵

14. For Finch's debt to Brightman, see Wilfrid R. Prest, “The Art of Law and the Law of God: Sir Henry Finch (1558–1625),” in Donald Pennington and Keith Thomas, eds., *Puritans and Revolutionaries: Essays in Seventeenth-Century History presented to Christopher Hill* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978), 108, 112–13.

15. Increase Mather, *A Dissertation Concerning the Future Conversion Of The Jewish Nation* (London: Nath. Hillier, 1709), 11. For time of authorship for the two works, see Michael

The Judeo-centric perspective, moreover, appealed to Puritans of different party affiliations. The New Englanders (Increase Mather, John Cotton, Thomas Shepard, Ephraim Huit, Samuel Hutchinson, and Nicholas Noyes) were Congregationalists, in keeping with the dominant church order in the region. The British figures and the repatriated colonists are harder to classify because party lines were not always clear in England, particularly in the early Stuart period, when even the meaning of the word "Puritanism" is difficult to specify.¹⁶ Scholars often identify Brightman as an advocate of Presbyterianism, but as Peter Lake has pointed out, he can also be considered a supporter of Congregationalism. Finch apparently favored Presbyterianism. Thomas Goodwin, John Archer, and William Hooke can be confidently placed in the Congregationalist fold. Samuel Lee occupied a Congregationalist pulpit during his residence in New England from 1686–1691; his orientation during his long English pastorate, which began around 1650, is less certain. Hanserd Knollys, after a brief career in New England, returned to England in 1641 and began a Baptist ministry that lasted until his death in 1691. William Aspinwall joined the Fifth Monarchists, a radical sect of the English Interregnum (1649–1660), after his repatriation in 1652. John Dury, in order to pursue his goal of Protestant union, deliberately avoided affiliation with either Congregationalism or Presbyterianism during his time in England.¹⁷ The fact that most of these individuals were Congregationalists (or, in the cases of Knollys and Aspinwall, had once been Congregationalists) is, at the very least, a reflection of the

G. Hall, *The Last American Puritan: The Life of Increase Mather* (Middletown, Conn.: Wesleyan University Press, 1988), 77, 273, 279, 325.

16. Students of English Puritanism are more concerned with the problem of defining "Puritanism" than their Americanist counterparts, who do not face the formidable challenge of trying to isolate a partisan minority within an established Anglican Church. For a discussion of the problems of definition, see Charles L. Cohen, "Puritanism," in Jacob Ernest Cooke and others, eds., *Encyclopedia of the North American Colonies* (New York: Charles Scribners' Sons, 1993), 3:577–79. A related issue is whether or not a person had to be of English nationality in order to qualify as a Puritan. David George Mullan has recently shown how definitions of Puritanism fit Scottish Presbyterianism equally well. *Scottish Puritanism, 1590–1638* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000).
17. Peter Lake, *Moderate Puritans and the Elizabethan Church* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1982), 252–56; Prest, "The Art of Law and the Law of God," 103, 112; Bernard S. Capp, *The Fifth Monarchy Men: A Study in Seventeenth-Century English Millenarianism* (Totowa, N.J.: Rowman and Littlefield, 1972), 240–241; and J. Minton Batten, *John Dury: Advocate of Christian Reunion* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1944), especially 100–112. For Goodwin, Archer, Hooke, Lee, and Knollys, see *The Dictionary of National Biography on CD-ROM* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995).

New England bias of the sources read for this essay.¹⁸ But at the same time, further research into English Puritan sources may reveal that Congregationalists were more inclined towards Judeo-centrism than Presbyterians, the other main party within English Puritanism. Scholars have suggested the greater affinity of English Congregationalists for millenarian eschatologies, but the point remains to be demonstrated.¹⁹

As indicated at greater length in the concluding portions of this essay, Judeo-centrism appealed to Puritans because it was deeply rooted in what Bozeman terms “the primitivist dimension in Puritanism.” The essay argues that the selection of Jerusalem as the inaugural location for the millennium and that the choice of repatriated Jews and Israelites as the inaugurating people were expressions of this primitivism. For Brightman and the millenarians under consideration here, the birth of the millennium would not only restore the original (or primitive) form of the apostolic church, a point that Bozeman explains at length, but also restore this church in its original home and among descendants of its original constituents. Bozeman recognizes that some Puritan millenarians thought that the millennium would begin in a Jewish-Christian Jerusalem; however, he does not incorporate repatriation and a Jerusalem-centered millennium into his interpretation of the meaning of primitivist restoration.²⁰

Judeo-centrists, of course, were not in complete agreement about the interpretation of each component in the sequence of events from Armageddon through the birth and expansion of the millennium. For instance, Knollys construed the millennial church order in accordance with his convictions about the necessity of believer’s baptism; and Aspinwall, reflecting his participation in the Fifth Monarchy movement, devoted more attention to the political and legal organization of the millennium than did any of the other Judeo-centrists under

18. I have read most of the printed sources written by New England Puritans, or by future or former New England Puritans, through about 1680. The eschatological views of many of these figures do not surface in their sources, or else do not surface to the extent needed to determine if the authors were Judeo-centrists, millenarians of a different sort, or amillennialists. Based on my research, I am prepared to say that for persons whose eschatologies can be confidently classified, millenarians outnumbered amillennialists in New England during this period, and Judeo-centrism was the dominant form of millenarianism. My research into the voluminous sources written by English Puritans is presently superficial, and I am reluctant to make any claims about the prevalence of any given form of eschatology there.

19. For example, John F. Wilson, *Pulpit in Parliament: Puritanism during the English Civil Wars, 1640–1648* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1969), 223–30; and Tai Liu, *Discord in Zion: The Puritan Divines and the Puritan Revolution, 1640–1660* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1973), 29–56, especially 38–39.

20. Bozeman, *To Live Ancient Lives*, especially 193–226.

discussion here. Both men, furthermore, belonged to groups for which the remaining individuals had little sympathy if not outright contempt. Judeo-centrists also differed about whether or not the Christian witnesses would be bodily resurrected at the start of the millennium, and about whether or not Jesus would make a brief literal appearance on earth at the start of the millennium before returning to heaven until the last judgment.

These and other differences are noted in the pages that follow. But as this essay hopes to show, there was sufficient agreement among Judeo-centrists about the interpretation of the sequence of apocalyptic events, and about the underlying primitivist assumptions, to speak of them as one.²¹ In discussing a perspective shared by individuals of different parties and of different periods, the essay adopts an approach to Puritan eschatology that differs from the ones used in most existing studies, which focus on the thought of a particular individual or sectarian group,²² or provide serial discussions of the views of individuals,²³ or concentrate on a short period of time.²⁴ There are clear advantages to these approaches, which enable scholars to immerse themselves in the range of exegetical details. Even within a particular strand of eschatological thought, there were probably no two Puritans whose readings of biblical prophecy were identical. This point becomes particularly conspicuous in studies that extend to Puritan interpretations of the seven trumpets, the seven seals, and the

21. Several citations are normally furnished to document a given point. Many of the references come from Brightman, Cotton, Goodwin, and Increase Mather, who were the most expansive of the figures incorporated into this essay. Citations are occasionally taken from persons outside my roster of Judeo-centric millenarians, either to document something more generally true of Puritanism or else to illustrate a point about Judeo-centrism. In these last instances, the author's extant discussions of eschatology are not extensive enough to establish that he was clearly a Judeo-centrist; however, they are sufficiently intriguing to suggest that he was one. Examples of these probable Judeo-centrists include Edward Taylor, Peter Bulkeley, John Fiske, and Edward Johnson.
22. Leslie P. Fairfield, *John Bale: Mythmaker of the English Reformation* (West Lafayette, Ind.: Purdue University Press, 1976); William M. Lamont, *Richard Baxter and the Millennium* (Totowa, N.J.: Rowman and Littlefield, 1979); W. Clark Gilpin, *The Millenarian Piety of Roger Williams* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979); and Capp, *The Fifth Monarchy Men*.
23. Firth, *The Apocalyptic Tradition*; Christianson, *Reformers and Babylon*; Gribben, *The Puritan Millennium*; Smolinski, "Apocalypticism in Colonial North America"; and Richard Bauckham, *Tudor Apocalypse: Sixteenth-Century Apocalypticism, Millenarianism, and the English Reformation: From John Bale and John Foxe to Thomas Brightman* (Oxford: Sutton Courtenay, 1978).
24. Wilson, *Pulpit in Parliament*; Liu, *Discord in Zion*; and Christopher Hill, *The World Turned Upside Down: Radical Ideas during the English Revolution* (New York: Viking, 1972).

seven vials, about which opinion was extraordinarily variegated.²⁵ The problem with these approaches, however, is that they can obscure broader patterns of interpretation. A thematic or topical approach is better suited for achieving this objective.²⁶

As a study in Judeo-centrism, the point of focus falls naturally on the Middle East, where the Jews and the lost tribes were to defeat the Ottomans and establish the millennium in Jerusalem.²⁷ In order to set a context for the discussion, a survey of general attitudes about Islam and Judaism is necessary.

II. MUSLIMS, JEWS, AND ISRAELITES IN PURITAN THOUGHT

Prejudice and ignorance shaped seventeenth-century Puritan attitudes toward Islam. In this respect, Puritans were scarcely different from most other early modern English men and women, with the exception of those who had lived or traveled in the Muslim world and become familiar with the faith.²⁸ The religion of Islam was commonly regarded as an "imposture" or invention by Muhammad.²⁹ As if to emphasize the supposed imposture, early modern English sources often termed Islam "Mahometanism" and Muslims "Mahometans."³⁰ Sometimes they referred to Muslims through national or regional designations, such as "Saracens" (Arab Muslims), "Moors," and

25. By the same token, there was probably no school of thought that did not hold some points in common with other schools. The destruction of Antichrist, for example, was anticipated by virtually all Puritans, as Christopher Hill shows in *Antichrist in Seventeenth-Century England* (London: Oxford University Press, 1971; revised edition New York: Verso, 1990); and the notion of a future Jewish conversion was not limited to Judeo-centrists, but was espoused by many amillennialists, as the cases of William Perkins and others indicate. Bozeman, *To Live Ancient Lives*, 202.
26. Notable examples of thematic studies are Ball's *A Great Expectation*, Hill's *Antichrist*, and James West Davidson's *The Logic of Millennial Thought: Eighteenth-Century New England* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1977).
27. Much of the terrain covered in this essay has been surveyed by Nabil Matar in two books and in two articles: *Islam in Britain, 1558–1685* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998); *Turks, Moors, and Englishmen in the Age of Discovery* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999); "The Idea of the Restoration of the Jews in English Protestant Thought: From the Reformation until 1660," *Durham University Journal* 78 (1985): 23–36; and "The Idea of the Restoration of the Jews in English Protestant Thought, 1661–1701," *Harvard Theological Review* 78 (1985): 115–48. Although I have benefited greatly from Matar's able and provocative work, I disagree with several of his main points, particularly his explanation for why Puritan millenarians of the Judeo-centric type advocated the repatriation of Judah and Israel.
28. Matar, *Islam in Britain*, 21–49.
29. William Hubbard, *The Benefit Of A Well-Ordered Conversation* (Boston: Samuel Green, 1684), 55; and Nicholas Noyes, *New-Englands Duty and Interest* (Boston: John Allen, 1698), 32.
30. According to the *Oxford English Dictionary*, the Arabic terms "Islam" and "Muslim" were not generally used in the English-speaking world until the nineteenth century, although the French loan word "Mussulman" was in circulation well before that time.

"Turks," and sometimes they called all Muslims "Turks." As Nabil Matar explains, English authors tended to move directly from the time of Muhammad to the time of the Ottomans as though nothing had happened in the interim. The uninformed claim of John Napier, a late-sixteenth-century Scottish Presbyterian, that the first Muslim empire was the Ottoman, illustrates Matar's judgment.³¹ When English Christians distinguished the Turks from other Muslim groups, it was usually to draw an invidious comparison of some kind. Ottoman culture was "brutish," "barbarian," and "tyrannical" in contrast to Arab and Persian culture, for which the English had a measure of respect.³² But whatever their cultural achievements, all Muslims shared the same eternal fate. The Reverend John Wilson spoke for many, whether Judeo-centrists or not, when he wrote around 1630 that "Wee cannot conceive [Muslims] better than a company of damnable creatures, . . . worship[ing] they know not what, millions of men going down to hell in death, because not receiving Christ the onely Saviour, the Salvation of God."³³

For Judeo-centric millenarians, Islam played an integral role in the divine plan for history. They thought that God used the Muslims in the same manner that he had used the ancient Assyrians, as instruments of his wrath. Specifically, God had permitted the Muslims to conquer Christian land and to inflict heavy losses on the crusaders, in order to punish Christendom for having defiled the apostolic church with theological, devotional, liturgical, and ecclesiological innovations.³⁴ Judeo-centrists blamed both Roman Catholicism and Eastern Orthodoxy for desecrating apostolic Christianity; however, they considered the Catholics more culpable because they placed graven images in houses of worship and because they believed in transubstantiation and purgatory, two doctrines that the Eastern Orthodox rejected.³⁵ The need for the continued existence of the Muslim scourge diminished in the sixteenth century, when the Protestant Reformation

31. Matar, *Islam in Britain*, 57–158; and Napier, *A Plaine Discovery*, 131.

32. For the Ottomans, see Brightman, *The Workes*, 922–24; John Cotton, *The Bloody Tenent Washed and Made White in the Bloud of the Lambe* (London: Hannah Allen, 1647), 13; Thomas Hooker, *The Stay of the Faithfull* (London: M. Flesher, 1638), 33; William Hooke, *A Discourse Concerning The Witnesses* (London: Thomas Cockeril, 1681), 16–17; and Ephraim Huit, *The whole Prophecie of Daniel Explained* (London: H. Overton, 1643), 211, 325. For the Arabs and Persians, see Matar, *Islam in Britain*, 155; and J. Marshall and Glyndwr Williams, *The Great Map of Mankind: British Perceptions of New Worlds in the Age of Enlightenment* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1982), 17–18.

33. John Wilson, *Zacheus Converted* (London: Fulke Clifton, 1631), 546–47.

34. Cotton, *The Bloody Tenent Washed*, 12–13; and Mather, *A Dissertation*, 12–13.

35. Noyes, *New-Englands Duty*, 33; and Thomas Goodwin, *An Exposition upon the Book of the Revelation*, in John C. Miller, ed., *The Works of Thomas Goodwin, D.D.* (Edinburgh: James Nichol, 1861), 3:61–62.

began to recover the apostolic church order and to wrest territories away from the Roman Catholics. By weakening Roman Catholicism and thereby reducing the need for an Islamic rod of divine wrath, the Reformation set the stage for Armageddon and for the Christianization of God's ancient people.³⁶

Judeo-centrists assumed that both branches of the children of Israel would fight the Ottomans, embrace Christianity, return to the land of Canaan, and inaugurate the millennium in Jerusalem. One branch consisted of the Jews, the descendants of the inhabitants of the southern kingdom of Judah (Judea), which came into existence as an independent entity following the division of the biblical monarchy in the tenth century B.C.E. The other was comprised of the ten lost tribes of Israel who disappeared from the biblical narrative after the Assyrian conquest of the northern kingdom of Israel in the eighth century B.C.E. There were important differences between these two peoples.³⁷ The Jews were concentrated in Europe, North Africa, and the Middle East, and they were religiously observant. They had not only a direct knowledge of Catholicism and Islam, but also a religious aversion to image worship, forcible Christianization, and Ottoman occupation of Palestine. The battle of Armageddon would remove what were considered the two major obstacles to the conversion of Judah: Roman Catholicism, whose worship of images and inquisitorial persecutions had supposedly alienated the Jews from the Christian religion, and Ottoman control over Palestine, which frustrated their presumed messianic Zionism.³⁸

The lost tribes, for their part, had moved outside the greater Mediterranean world centuries before the time of Jesus and had subsequently lapsed so deeply into paganism that they lost conscious memory of their religious heritage.³⁹ Most of the Judeo-centrists discussed in this essay did not speculate about the current whereabouts

36. John Cotton, *The Pouring Out of the Seven Vials* (London: Ralph Smith, 1645), 90–102; and Goodwin, *An Exposition*, 81–82, 130–31, 140–41.

37. Puritan usage of the words "Jew" and "Israelite" was rarely precise. Usually, the context of a given passage provides clues as to whether an author was talking about the descendants of the House of Judah, about the lost tribes of Israel, or about both branches of the posterity of Jacob.

38. Hooke, preface to Mather, *The Mystery*, f. [b5v]; Samuel Lee, *Israel Redux: Or the Restoration of Israel* (London: John Hancock, 1677), 114; and Edward Taylor to Samuel Sewall, September 29, 1696, in Mukhtar Ali Isani, "The Pouring of the Sixth Vial: A Letter in a Taylor-Sewall Debate," in Massachusetts Historical Society, *Proceedings* 83 (1971): 128.

39. John Archer, *The Personall Reigne of Christ Upon Earth* (London: Benjamen Allen, 1642), 9; and Dury in Edward Winslow, ed., *The Glorious Progress of the Gospel amongst the Indians in New England* (London: Hannah Allen, 1649), in Massachusetts Historical Society, *Collections*, 3rd series, vol. 4 (1834): 93–95.

of the lost tribes. Exceptions were John Cotton, Samuel Lee, and Increase Mather, who surmised that the Israelites were scattered throughout central and east Asia, and John Dury, who went one step further by suggesting that some of the lost tribes were living in the New World, having migrated from Asia through the Bering Straits.⁴⁰ But wherever their current locations, the ten lost tribes of Israel would be recalled to Palestine in time to participate in Armageddon and the ensuing events.⁴¹

Judeo-centrists viewed both Islam and Roman Catholicism as human inventions that were doomed to eradication. They supposed that Islam had been fabricated by Muhammad, and Catholicism by popes, scholastic theologians, canon lawyers, and Holy Roman emperors, who had corrupted apostolic Christianity with beliefs and practices of their own devising.⁴² The purpose of Armageddon was to purge Europe and the Middle East of these contrived religions in order to set the stage for the millennial restoration of the apostolic church in Jerusalem.

III. ARMAGEDDON AND ITS OUTCOMES

In the New Testament, Armageddon is mentioned explicitly only in Revelation 16:16; however, Judeo-centrists assumed that the battle was the primary subject of the section running from 16:12 to 20:3.⁴³ In this extended passage, to streamline the details, the forces of evil—the “whore” of the “great city” of Babylon, the “beast,” “the false prophet,” the “kings of the earth,” and the “dragon”—engage in battle with the “kings of the east” before whom the Euphrates is “dried up,” and with “the ten kings” who come to “hate the whore.” After the victory of the righteous, the whore is made “desolate and

40. Cotton, *The Powring Out*, 93; Lee, *Israel Redux*, 115; Mather, *The Mystery*, 31, 56; and Dury in Winslow, ed., *The Glorious Progress*, 93–95, and in Thomas Thorowgood, *Iewes in America, Or Probabilities That the Americans are of that Race* (London: Thomas Slater, 1650), ff. d2–e2.

41. Brightman, *The Workes*, 542–44, 861, 930; Mather, *The Mystery*, 5, 15–17, 46, 54; John Cotton, *A Brief Exposition with Practical Observations upon the Whole Book of Canticles Never Before Printed* (London: Ralph Smith, 1655), 185, 224; [Henry Finch], *The Worlds Great Restauration or the Calling of the Jews* (London: Edward Griffin, 1621), 20, 50, 97; Thomas Shepard, *The Sincere Convert, Discovering The Paucity of True Believers* (London: Humphrey Blunden, 1641), 82–83; Hanserd Knollys, *The World that Now is; And The World that is to Come* (London: T. Snowden, 1681), 2:20–22; and Archer, *The Personall Reigne*, 25–26. The seventeenth-century Puritan perhaps most associated with the lost tribes theory, Thomas Thorowgood, was not a Judeo-centrist. See Richard W. Cogley, “The Ancestry of the American Indians: Thomas Thorowgood’s *Iewes in America* (1650) and *Jews in America* (1660),” forthcoming, *English Literary Renaissance*.

42. Bozeman, *To Live Ancient Lives*, 51–80, 238–42.

43. Cotton, *The Powring Out*, 97, 107–8, 130; and Goodwin, *An Exposition*, 21–22, 28–29.

naked" and "burn[ed] . . . with fire," the beast and the false prophet are permanently cast into the "lake of fire burning with brimstone," the kings of the earth are "slain with the sword," and the dragon is imprisoned for a "thousand years."

Aside from the figure of the dragon, which Revelation 20:2 equates with Satan, the identities of the participants in Armageddon are not specified in the text. The beast, the false prophet, and the whore were often seen as referring to the papal Antichrist and to his political, ecclesiastical, and doctrinal pretensions.⁴⁴ The ten kings who hate the whore were the heads of ten European countries that had already moved into the Protestant camp, or were expected to do so by the time Armageddon began. Lists of the ten kings often varied from individual to individual, but always included England and France, and usually Sweden and portions of the Holy Roman Empire.⁴⁵ The kings of the east were the Jews and the lost tribes.⁴⁶ The drying up of the Euphrates was interpreted as the destruction of the Ottoman Empire in preparation for the repatriation of the descendants of Jacob.⁴⁷ Some Judeo-centrists also identified the Turk (or more particularly, the Ottoman sultan) as a co-Antichrist along with the Pope, thereby breaking with the assumption that the Antichrist could only be a Christian. Those who did not see the Ottomans as Antichristian, however, found other images that could be linked with the sultan, such as the "little horn" (Daniel 7:7–8, 20–21) and the "king of locusts" (Revelation 9:3–11).⁴⁸ As Henry Finch observed, "under other names this very tyrant is particularly described."⁴⁹ Perhaps the most common alternative to viewing the Turk as Antichrist was to associate the Ottomans, or Muslims in general, with the figures of Gog and Magog in Ezekiel 38 and 39.⁵⁰ Some commentators, like Increase

44. John Cotton, *An Exposition upon the Thirteenth Chapter of the Revelation* (London: Livewell Chapman, 1655), 7, 225, and *The Pwring Out*, 103, 108; and Hooke, *A Discourse*, 5.

45. Brightman, *The Workes*, 394–95; Cotton, *An Exposition*, 81; William Aspinwall, *An Explication and Application of the Seventh Chapter of Daniel* (London: Livewell Chapman, 1654), 39; Huit, *The whole Prophecie*, 184; and Hanserd Knollys, *Mystical Babylon Unveiled* (London: n.p., 1679), 30.

46. Brightman, *The Workes*, 543–44; Cotton, *The Pwring Out*, 93; Samuel Hutchinson, *A Declaration of a Future Glorious Estate of a Church to be here upon Earth* (London: for the author, 1667), 27; and Mather, *The Mystery*, 31, 46.

47. Brightman, *The Workes*, 548–49; Cotton, *The Pwring Out*, 90–102; Isani, "The Pouring of the Sixth Vial," 127; and Hutchinson, *A Declaration*, 27.

48. Matar, *Islam in Britain*, 158–59.

49. [Finch], *The Worlds Great Restauration*, 51.

50. *Ibid.*, 50; Lee, *Israel Redux*, 70; and Thomas Weld, *A Further Discovery of that Generation of men called Quakers* (London: S. B., 1654), 12.

Mather, were prepared to say that the Turk was both the eastern Antichrist as well as Ezekiel's Gog and Magog.⁵¹

The battle of Armageddon is more accurately phrased the "war of Armageddon" because it would consist of many battles over a period of time, generally assumed to be forty-five years. This figure came from subtracting the "1290 days" from the "1335 days" in Daniel 12:11–12, after assuming that a day in prophecy was a year in history (see Ezekiel 4:6).⁵² The fighting would be confined to the limits of the ancient Roman Empire, an expanse of territory that included the main Ottoman dominions.⁵³ In the western phase of Armageddon, the ten Protestant kings would engage the Catholic forces in battle. Judeo-centric millenarians saw no reason for these two western rivals to transport their armies to Palestine, the location for Armageddon implied in Revelation 16:16. "I know not why . . . the Christian Kings should goe to Jerusalem to fight this battel," John Cotton wrote, "their businesse will lie neerer home."⁵⁴

The Jews and the lost tribes would war with the Ottomans in Palestine as well as elsewhere in the eastern Mediterranean.⁵⁵ John Dury and Increase Mather suggested that the Karaites, Jewish sectarians who rejected the authority of the Talmud, would participate in the battle as well.⁵⁶ Some individuals also proposed that Eastern Orthodox and Protestant Christians would send soldiers to aid the reunited twelve tribes.⁵⁷ But even if they found themselves without allies in the war against the Ottomans, the children of Israel would be able to handle the grim work themselves, for they would have the divine support, not to mention the sheer numbers, needed to vanquish their redoubtable foe. "If all the Israelites which be in the world were together," Increase Mather wrote, "they would make the

51. Mather, *A Dissertation*, 30, and *A Mystery*, 25, 46.

52. Brightman, *The Workes*, 954, 967, 1065; [Finch], *The Worlds Great Restauration*, 56, 99; Goodwin, *An Exposition*, 198, 202; and Huit, *The whole Prophecie*, 366 (mispaginated 356).

53. *Ibid.*, 206, 334; and Goodwin, *An Exposition*, 23.

54. Cotton, *The Pouring Out*, 130. See also Noyes, *New-Englands Duty*, 68; John Norton, *A Discussion of that Great Point in Divinity, The Sufferings of Christ* (London: G. Calvert, 1653), f. A3; and Knollys, *Mystical Babylon Unvaild*, 30–31.

55. Hanserd Knollys, *An Exposition Of the whole Book of the Revelation* (London: for the author, 1689), 198–99; [Finch], *The Worlds Great Restauration*, 57, 71; and Peter Bulkeley, *The Gospel-Covenant* (London: Benjamin Allen, 1646), 8.

56. Dury in Thorowgood, *lewes in America*, ff. e3^v–[e4]; and Mather, *The Mystery*, 16–17.

57. Goodwin, *An Exposition*, 62–63; and Hooke, preface to Mather, *The Mystery*, ff. [b7–b7v]. Matar notes that some English millenarians also hoped that the Safavid Persians, enemies of the Ottomans, would fight on the Lord's side as unwitting allies of the forces of good. *Islam in Britain*, 175–76. None of the millenarians under discussion here advanced this idea.

greatest Nation upon the whole earth."⁵⁸ Finally, many Judeo-centrists expected that territories from outside the Roman Empire would send troops to fight on the Catholic or Ottoman side. These would be the forces of the "kings of the earth" (Revelation 16:14, 19:19).⁵⁹ Cotton proposed that Catholicized American Indians would be among their number, and he and others included the "Tartars," at the time an imprecise term that could refer to any or all of the inhabitants of the vast region stretching from the north and east banks of the Black Sea to the Bering Straits.⁶⁰ But for the most part, the millenarians discussed in this essay did not identify the "kings of the earth," probably because most seventeenth-century English authors knew little about central and east Asia and about the New World.⁶¹

There was general agreement that the battle of Armageddon would begin in the west, when the ten kings invaded the city of Rome.⁶² The start of the campaign against their Catholic oppressors would lead the Jews to conclude that the advent of the messiah was nigh. They would then assemble outside Palestine and march on Jerusalem "with great expectation," Samuel Lee wrote, "of a temporal glory under the messiah."⁶³ Reports of the commotion around Palestine would reach the lost tribes and revive dormant memories about their ancestral homeland; the Israelites would then return from their far-flung locations and join up with the Jews.⁶⁴ The invasions of Rome and Jerusalem would drive the Pope and the Turk into a desperate alliance against their common enemies.⁶⁵ The fighting would continue in both locations until its divinely ordained conclusion, the destruction of Catholicism and Islam (but not, as we shall see, the extermination of all Catholics and Muslims). The war in the west would end before the

58. Mather, *The Mystery*, 56–57.

59. Cotton, *The Powring Out*, 107; William Hooke, *New-Englands Sence, of Old-England and Irelands Sorrowes* (London: John Rothwell, 1645), in Samuel Emery, *The Ministry of Taunton* (Boston: J. P. Jewett, 1853), 125; and Goodwin, *An Exposition*, 28.

60. Brightman, *The Workes*, 830; Cotton, *A Brief Exposition*, 181, and *The Powring Out*, 112; Archer, *The Personall Reigne*, 52; and Hutchinson, *A Declaration*, 24. For Tartary, which early modern Europeans often called "Scythia" or "Cathay," see Lee Eldrige Huddleston, *Origins of the American Indians: European Concepts, 1492–1729* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1967), 121.

61. For the limited English knowledge of Asia and America, see Marshall and Williams, *The Great Map of Mankind*.

62. Brightman, *The Workes*, 802–4; Archer, *The Personall Reigne*, 49; Cotton, *A Brief Exposition*, 180–81; and Lee, *Israel Redux*, 120–22.

63. *Ibid.*, 118–19.

64. Dury in Thorowgood, *Iewes in America*, ff. [d4]–e, e3–[e4^v]; Mather, *The Mystery*, 46; and Huit, *The whole Prophecie*, 340–41.

65. Hutchinson, *A Declaration*, 27; Cotton, *A Brief Exposition*, 180–81; and Goodwin, *An Exposition*, 28.

war in the east.⁶⁶ After the eastern campaign was over, the Jews and the Israelites would be in possession of the area from the Nile to the Euphrates. This expanse of territory had been promised to the descendants of Jacob in Genesis 15:18; moreover, it would be needed to accommodate their considerable numbers.⁶⁷

The Christianization of Judah and Israel was to commence when the Jews assembled outside Palestine, at a time when they had no idea that they were about to perform a Christian objective rather than a Jewish one.⁶⁸ The process of conversion would continue until the final victory over the Ottomans.⁶⁹ Nevertheless, the mere removal of the two impediments to Jewish conversion—Ottoman occupation of Palestine and Catholic idolatry and persecution—would not suffice to bring about the expected spectacle of mass redemption. A divine sign, similar to the one Paul received on the road to Damascus, would be given to some of the Jews in order to convince them fully about Jesus. Then, accompanied by a massive outpouring of divine grace, these Jews would begin to evangelize the lost tribes as well as the remaining Jews.⁷⁰ By the time the process had concluded, most but not all Jews and Israelites would be Christians. In Increase Mather's phrasing, there would be "a National, and not a Universal Conversion" that embraced "not only a majority, but a very full and large generality" of the posterity of Jacob.⁷¹

IV. THE BIRTH AND EXPANSION OF THE MILLENNIUM

With Catholicism and Islam destroyed, the Jews and Israelites converted, and Palestine and its environs liberated, the time for the millennium had come.⁷² The millennial order, as Judeo-centrists envisioned it, was to be more than a simple improvement of present reality but less than a full return to prelapsarian perfection. In Dwight Bozeman's phrasing, the coming kingdom "would not abrogate the

66. *Ibid.*, 120, 198; and Cotton, *The Pouring Out*, 96.

67. [Finch], *The Worlds Great Restauration*, 147; Mather, *The Mystery*, 56–57; and Lee, *Israel Redux*, 76.

68. *Ibid.*, 119; and Huit, *The whole Prophecie*, 340.

69. Mather, *The Mystery*, 18, 46; [Finch], *The Worlds Great Restauration*, 3–4; Archer, *The Personall Reigne*, 47; and Goodwin, *An Exposition*, 201–2. Gribben observes that while most Puritan millenarians "thought that the conversion of the Jews would happen before the millennium," there were some who "argued that the great conversion would happen after the fall of Babylon and the beginning of the thousand years." *The Puritan Millennium*, 179. None of our millenarians held to this point of view.

70. Mather, *A Dissertation*, 12, and *The Mystery*, 90; and Cotton, *The Pouring Out*, 134, and *A Brief Exposition*, 188–89.

71. Mather, *The Mystery*, 9, and *A Dissertation*, 9.

72. Goodwin, *An Exposition*, 62, 199; Mather, *The Mystery*, 18; Lee, *Israel Redux*, 130; and Knollys, *An Exposition*, 198–99, and *The World that Now is*, 2:20–22, 43–44.

historical estate, but strain it to the limits of possibility.⁷³ The godly would remain mortal and continue to live under the power of sin; however, they would be free from the possibilities of religious persecution and of violent or painful death, be better able to withstand the vitiating effects of Adam's fall, and be in harmony with one another and with the natural world.⁷⁴ Furthermore, during the millennial era there would be proper civil and ecclesiastical institutions. Most Judeo-centrists focused their attention on the church order of the millennium and said little about its civil organization beyond indicating that political officials would uphold the true church and administer laws consonant with biblical precepts and with principles of equity.⁷⁵ An exception was William Aspinwall, who shared the Fifth Monarchist movement's characteristic fascination with the civil and legal forms of the coming kingdom.⁷⁶ But for Aspinwall, no less than for other Judeo-centric millenarians, the millennial church would be the restoration of the doctrine, polity, liturgy, discipline, ministry, and piety of apostolic Christianity. The millennial ecclesiastical order was neither an inferior reproduction of the apostolic church nor an enhanced version of it, but "the very same Church . . . which was in the time of the Apostles."⁷⁷ This yearning for the reestablishment of the apostolic church was an illustration of the "primitivist dimension in Puritanism." As Bozeman carefully explains in *To Live Ancient Lives*, Puritan primitivists believed that the apostolic church had been corrupted by Roman Catholicism and, to a lesser extent, by Eastern Orthodoxy, and that the Lollards and other late medieval groups had begun a process of recovery that was then deepened and sustained by the continental and English reformers, and that continued into the present day. Nevertheless, the restoration of the apostolic church in all its pristine

73. Bozeman, *To Live Ancient Lives*, 209.

74. John Cotton, *The Churches Resurrection* (London: Henry Overton, 1642), 5–6, 13, *An Exposition*, 164 (mispaginated 156), and *The Powing Out*, 152; Brightman, *The Workes*, 813–14; [Finch], *The Worlds Great Restauration*, 233; Mather, *A Dissertation*, 33; and Archer, *The Personall Reigne*, 28–30.

75. Cotton, *The Powing Out*, 45, 49, and *A Brief Exposition*, 202–7, 219, 222–23; [Finch], *The Worlds Great Restauration*, 80; [Goodwin], *A Glimpse of Sions Glory* (London: William Larnar, 1641), 25–26; and [Dury], *Considerations Tending To the Happy Accomplishment of Englands Reformation in Church and State* [London: Samuel Hartlib, 1647], 17–18.

76. Aspinwall's major discussions of the political and legal institutions of the millennium were *The Legislative Power Is Christs Peculiar Prerogative* (London: Livewell Chapman, 1656) and *A Brief Description of the Fifth Monarchy, or Kingdome That shortly is to come into the World* (London: M. Simmons, 1653).

77. [Finch], *The Worlds Great Restauration*, 34. For similar statements, see Aspinwall, *A Premonition of Sundry Sad Calamities Yet to Come* (London: Livewell Chapman, 1654), 24 (mispaginated 30); Archer, *The Personall Reigne*, 10; Knollys, *An Exposition*, 150; Cotton, *The Churches Resurrection*, 8–10; and Mather, *The Mystery*, f. [cv].

splendor had to await the millennium, when "the limits upon recovery were to be lifted, . . . [and] the cycle of return to origins could achieve closure and finality."⁷⁸

The apostolic church would be reinstated first in Jerusalem, among the Christianized Jews and Israelites. This millennial church would then become a Protestant pilgrimage site, as delegates from European and American congregations went to the city of David in order to behold the marvel. "Many godly Christians shall resort far and neer to Hierusalem," John Cotton explained, "and take hold of the fellowship of that Church."⁷⁹ By providing an absolute standard of faith and practice, the restored church would end the divisions that had plagued Protestantism since the Reformation. God's "ancient people . . . will learn us much that we have not learned," Cotton stated in anticipation of the time when these internecine quarrels would come to an end. Others shared these sentiments. John Fiske, a Massachusetts minister whose isolated comments about eschatology suggest that he was a Judeo-centrist, wrote that "in the recalling of the Jews . . . there will be a more clear and full understanding of the whole scriptures in the things appertaining to the kingdom of Christ than ever yet hitherto"; Thomas Goodwin expected that after the restoration of the apostolic church in Jerusalem, an "Abundance of hidden Mysteries of Godliness will be cleered . . . that are now exceeding darke"; and Increase Mather said that "Gentile Churches shall be enlightened, and therefore enlivened from Jewish Churches. Then shall many dark and difficult questions be resolved."⁸⁰

Judeo-centrists did not confine the kingdom to Jewish-Christian Palestine and to the existing limits of Protestantism. In time, missionaries akin to the apostles of old would carry the millennial church order throughout the world.⁸¹ This expansion of Christianity would

78. Bozeman, *To Live Ancient Lives*, 238–62 (quotation on 261).

79. Cotton, *A Brief Exposition*, 212. See also Lee, *Israel Redux*, 70; Thomas Shepard, *The Parable Of The Ten Virgins Opened & Applied* (London: John Rothwell, 1660), 2:56–57; and Bulkeley, *The Gospel-Covenant*, 6, 16;

80. Cotton, "Sermon upon A Day of Publique thanksgiving" (1651), in Francis J. Bremer, "In Defense of Regicide: John Cotton on the Execution of Charles I," *The William and Mary Quarterly*, third series 37 (1980): 114; Robert G. Pope, ed., *The Notebook of the Reverend John Fiske, 1644–1675*, Colonial Society of Massachusetts, *Publications* 47 (1974): 97; [Goodwin], *A Glimpse*, 23; and Mather, *The Mystery*, 64.

81. Cotton, *The Poring Out*, 151, 154; Archer, *The Personall Reigne*, 5; Aspinwall, *The Legislative Power*, 4–5; Knollys, *An Exposition*, 153, 199; and J. Franklin Jameson, ed., *Johnson's Wonder-Working Providence, 1628–1651* (1910: reprint. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1967), 138. In contrast to other Judeo-centrists, who anticipated that the millennial kingdom would eventually span the globe, Samuel Lee was open to the possibility that the kingdom would be limited to the bounds of the Roman Empire. *Israel Redux*, 89–90.

reach Catholics and Muslims who survived Armageddon. As Cotton put the point, God "will send forth such bright and cleare knowledge of his Christ . . . as to dispell all the fogs and mists of darknesse, not alone in the Antichristian [Roman Catholic] State, but in all the world: so that all Nations shall be brightened with the knowledge of God. All Asia shall see the vanity of Mahometry, and all the Pagan Nations, the fondnesse and blindness of their Superstitions."⁸² The millennium would also reach the Native Americans. "If Mr. Brightmans interpretation of Daniels prophecie be true . . .," Thomas Shepard wrote in 1647, in a discussion of John Eliot's nascent missionary work in New England, "the Easterne Jews shall trouble the Turkish tyrant and shake his Pillars when they are comming to repossesse their own land . . .; I shall hope then that these Westernne Indians will soon come in, and that these beginnings are but preparatives for a brighter day than we yet see among them, wherein East & West shall sing the song of the Lambe."⁸³

After the millennial order had reached universal proportions, Satan would be released from his long confinement and join with Gog and Magog (Revelation 20:8–9) for a climactic battle with the forces of good. In this case, Judeo-centrists did not restrict Gog and Magog to Ottoman or Muslim figures, as they often did in their interpretations of Ezekiel 38 and 39, but saw Gog and Magog as an assortment of enemies, including some Christians freshly seduced by Satan.⁸⁴ After the Lord's armies had achieved their foreordained victory, Satan would be thrown into a lake of fire and brimstone for eternity, and the final coming of Jesus, the universal resurrection of the dead, and the last judgment would occur.⁸⁵

While concurring about these points, Judeo-centrists were divided about four related ones. Two of these disagreements, the ones over the polity and the baptismal practice of the apostolic church, have already been noted. Thirdly, some Judeo-centrists anticipated that the Christian witnesses (variously defined, but always including the martyrs of

82. Cotton, *The Pouring Out*, 145.

83. Thomas Shepard, *The Clear Sun-shine of the Gospel Breaking Forth upon the Indians in New-England* (London: J. Bellamy, 1648), in Massachusetts Historical Society, *Collections*, 3rd series, vol. 4 (1834): 60. The many statements made by Judeo-centric millenarians about the expansion of the millennium to the Catholic, Muslim, and pagan worlds provide an ample basis for rejecting Matar's suggestions that "no Muslim . . . would survive" Armageddon and that "Protestant Britons (and converted Jews) alone would live to celebrate" the millennium. *Islam in Britain*, 183.

84. Aspinwall, *A Brief Description*, 4–5; Archer, *The Personall Reigne*, 21, 32; Mather, *The Mystery*, 80; and Hooke, *A Discourse*, 29.

85. Brightman, *The Workes*, 801 (mispaginated 701); Lee, *Israel Redux*, 88; Cotton, *The Pouring Out*, 115; and Shepard, *The Parable*, 1:9–10.

the early church) would be resurrected in body at the start of the millennium (see Revelation 20:4), and then walk the earth as sinless immortals or else go directly to heaven.⁸⁶ Others, such as Brightman and Cotton, insisted that Revelation 20:4 should be interpreted figuratively and not literally.⁸⁷ The fourth debated point was whether Jesus would make a brief physical appearance on earth at the start of the millennium before returning to heaven until the time of his climactic bodily descent on judgment day,⁸⁸ or whether he would begin the millennium through a special but noncorporeal manifestation of supernatural power called the “middle” or “bright” advent (see 2 Thessalonians 2:8).⁸⁹ Opinion about the latter two matters was sufficiently divided that some individuals could not make up their minds about them: Aspinwall interpreted the resurrection of the witnesses figuratively in one source and literally in another, and Goodwin embraced a middle advent on one occasion and a corporeal appearance on another.⁹⁰ These internal disagreements, however, remained within the framework of a larger consensus. The restoration of the apostolic church would reveal whether the true polity was presbyterian or congregationalist, and whether or not infants were to be baptized; ordinary humans were to remain mortal during the millennium, no matter if the witnesses were resurrected or not; and a special influx of divine power was needed to reinstitute the apostolic church, regardless of whether it came in the form of a brief physical appearance or a middle advent.

V. THE IMMINENCE OF THE APOCALYPTIC EVENTS

The destruction of Catholicism and Islam, the conversion and repatriation of Judah and Israel, the birth and spread of the millennial order—that these events would occur was “past all peradventure” for

86. Archer, *The Personall Reigne*, 16, 19; Thomas Goodwin, *A Sermon of the Fifth Monarchy* (London: Livewell Chapman, 1654), 27–30, and *An Exposition*, 180–93; and Mather, *A Dissertation*, 18, 27.
87. Brightman, *The Workes*, 359–77, 816–22, 837; and Cotton, *The Churches Resurrection*, 6, 18.
88. Hutchinson, *A Declaration*, 6, 15; Mather, *A Dissertation*, 17, 34; Archer, *The Personall Reigne*, 15–16, 21–22; and Aspinwall, *The Legislative Power*, 34.
89. Brightman, *The Workes*, 808; Cotton, *The Churches Resurrection*, 4, *A Brief Exposition*, 219, and *The Bloudy Tenent Washed*, 51; Shepard, *The Parable*, 1:9–10; and [Finch], *The Worlds Great Restauration*, 48, 75. For the middle advent, see Bozeman, *To Live Ancient Lives*, 207–9.
90. Aspinwall, *An Explication*, 41–43, and *The Legislative Power*, 35; and Thomas Goodwin, *Zerubbabels Encouragement To Finish the Temple* (London: R. Dawlman, 1642), 13, 48, and *A Glimpse*, 13–14.

the Judeo-centrists under discussion here.⁹¹ The uncertainty was about the time when they started to transpire. Throughout the first half of the seventeenth century, Puritan millenarians of various stripes anticipated that the destruction of Antichrist and the conversion of the posterity of Jacob were to begin in the early to mid 1650s.⁹² Many contemporary Judeo-centrists shared this supposition, and since they also assumed that forty-five years of fighting were required for the final destruction of papal and Ottoman power, they surmised that the millennium would begin around 1700.⁹³

Given their expectation that Armageddon would commence when the ten kings marched into the city of Rome, Judeo-centrists eagerly watched for signs that this invasion was in the offing. Such signs were not difficult to find in the early to mid seventeenth century. The Thirty Years War (1618–48) against the Holy Roman Empire was the prelude to Armageddon, or so Thomas Goodwin and Thomas Shepard concluded while the conflict was in progress.⁹⁴ Moreover, on various occasions between the late 1630s and his death in 1652, John Cotton drew the same conclusion from the battles in the British Isles against what he considered the quasi-Catholic regime of Charles I and Archbishop William Laud. Edward Johnson, a Massachusetts layman and probable Judeo-centrist, shared Cotton's views and wrote around 1650 that "if any shall say, they will not believe the day is come till they see . . . [the] battell with Antichrist; Verily, if the Lord be pleased to open your eyes, you may see the beginning of the fight, and what success the Armies of our Lord Christ have hitherto had: the Forlorne hopes of Antichrists Army, were the proud Prelates of England."⁹⁵ But as it turned out, Judeo-centrists were mistaken in both cases, for neither the Thirty Years War nor the English Civil Wars escalated to the level of Armageddon.

91. Noyes, *New-Englands Duty*, 68. For a similar expression of certitude, see Brightman, *The Workes*, 544.

92. See Hill, "Till the conversion of the Jews," in *The Collected Essays of Christopher Hill* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1986), 2:269–300, especially 270–76.

93. Brightman, *The Workes*, 954, 967; Archer, *The Personall Reigne*, 49; [Finch], *The Great Restauration*, 56, 60; Huit, *The whole Prophecie*, 366 (mispaginated 356); Shepard, *The Clear Sun-shine*, 60; and [Goodwin], *A Glimpse*, 32, and *An Exposition*, 198.

94. Goodwin, *An Exposition*, 104–5; and Thomas Shepard, *The Sound Beleever; or, A Treatise of Evangelicall Conversion* (London: R. Dawlman, 1645) 149, 250–51. Although first published in 1683, Goodwin's *An Exposition* was written in or around 1639.

95. Cotton, *An Exposition*, 96, 259, *The Pouring Out*, 77–78, 83, 95, *The Churches Resurrection*, 15, "Sermon upon A Day," 117–20, and Cotton to Oliver Cromwell, July 28, 1651, in Sargent Bush, Jr., ed., *The Correspondence of John Cotton* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press), 461; and Jameson, ed., *Johnson's Wonder-Working Providence*, 270–71.

Judeo-centric millenarians also looked for evidence that the Jews and the Israelites were preparing to return to Palestine. In the early to mid 1650s, the Amsterdam rabbi Menasseh ben Israel, with the support of John Dury, tried to convince Oliver Cromwell to permit the Jews to return to England, from which they had been banished in 1290 by order of Edward I. Menasseh, who believed that some of the lost tribes were living in the New World, argued that the dispersal of Jacob's descendants from "one end of the earth to the other" (Deuteronomy 28:64) was the precondition to their return to Palestine under the messiah. The readmission of Jews to England, in conjunction with the American diaspora of the lost tribes, would achieve the universal dimensions of the passage in Deuteronomy and thus set the stage for restitution in Canaan. But negotiations with Cromwell's government unraveled in late 1655, and Menasseh died less than two years later.⁹⁶ Another moment pregnant with possibility came in the mid 1660s, when reports reached Old and New England about the activities of Sabbatai Zvi, the Jewish messianic pretender rumored to be gathering the Jews and the lost tribes together in order to drive the Ottomans out of Palestine and reestablish a national state. These reports inspired Increase Mather's *The Mystery of Israel's Salvation*, which included supporting statements by William Hooke and others, as well as a flurry of millenarian excitement in England and in Calvinist areas on the Continent.⁹⁷ Moreover, the timing of Sabbatianism suited Puritan purposes no less well than the nature of it did. Ever since the early seventeenth century, an alternative way of calculating the prophetic calendar had determined that 1666 might be the year when the wonders began.⁹⁸ Yet once again, the saints were frustrated by the course of events—Sabbatai Zvi apostasized to Islam in late 1666.

The Ottoman Empire, in fact, showed few signs of weakening during much of the seventeenth century. Although ultimately unable to break the power of the Austrian Hapsburgs in central Europe, the Russians in the Ukraine, and the Safavids in Persia, the empire proved remarkably durable and even expanded territorially in the third quarter

96. For Menasseh and Dury, see David S. Katz, *Philo-Semitism and the Readmission of Jews to England, 1603–1655* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1982), 158–244; and Benjamin Braude, "Les contes persans de Menasseh Ben Israël: Polémique, apologétique et dissimulation à Amsterdam au xvii^e siècle," *Annales, Histoire, Sciences Sociales* 49 (1994): 1107–38.

97. Matar, *Islam in Britain*, 177–81; Gershom Scholem, *Sabbatai Sevi: The Mystical Messiah, 1626–1676*, trans. R. J. Zwi Werblowsky (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1973), 333–40, 348–54, 543–49; and van der Wall, "Petrus Serrarius," 185–89.

98. See David Brady, "1666: The Year of the Beast," in *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library* 61 (1978–1979): 314–36.

of the century. Only later, after the defeat in the second siege of Vienna in 1683 and the Treaty of Karlowitz in 1699, did the Ottoman Empire undeniably decline. But by this time, Matar argues, the idea of a Jewish state in Palestine threatened (if only temporarily) British commercial and diplomatic interests. As a result, he claims, increasing numbers of late-seventeenth-century Puritan theologians in England rejected the doctrine of the restoration of Judah and Israel.⁹⁹ While it may be true for English Puritans, Matar's argument does not apply to their American contemporaries. In his *Dissertation Concerning the Future Conversion of The Jewish Nation*, written in the mid 1690s long after Sabbatianism had been discredited in Puritan eyes, Increase Mather concluded that the time for Jewish and Israelite repatriation was imminent because "the Turkish Empire is near some fatal Catastrophe"; and several years later, Nicholas Noyes stated that "it is probable, Delay will not be much longer. The Great Turk, the Oppressor of the Jews & Eastern Christians, seemeth to be at his last prayers; and they likelier to reconcile him to Hell, than to heaven."¹⁰⁰ Thus, if only in somewhat diminished proportions, the hope for the restoration of Israel endured throughout the seventeenth century, having survived the false promises of the Thirty Years War, the English Civil Wars, Menasseh ben Israel's plan for readmission, and Sabbatianism.

VI. THE PRIVILEGES OF ISRAEL

This essay has focused on the attitudes of a like-minded group of seventeenth-century Puritan millenarians toward four religious traditions. One of them, Protestantism, was to be perfected with the establishment of the millennium in Jerusalem, when the restoration of the apostolic church revealed the true form of primitive Christianity, theretofore only approximated in Protestant history. The other three, Judaism, Catholicism, and Islam, were to be extinguished because they were vehicles of damnation. As John Wilson wrote in the same passage where he cast unrepentant Muslims into the flaming pit, "Iewes . . . dye in their sinnes, Iohn 8, without pittie and mercy," and "papisme . . . leades to perdition."¹⁰¹ But while they assigned the same eventual fate to the three religions, Judeo-centrists distinguished Judaism from Catholicism and Islam in other respects. The Jews, along with the lost tribes, would be on the winning side in the battle of Armageddon. They would be the destroyers, not the destroyed.

99. Matar, "The Idea of the Restoration of the Jews in English Protestant Thought, 1661-1701," 145-46.

100. Mather, *A Dissertation*, 12; and Noyes, *New-Englands Duty*, 68.

101. Wilson, *Zacheus Converted*, 546, 548.

Moreover, the descendants of Jacob were to be properly Christianized in advance of the millennium, in contrast to Catholic and Muslim survivors of Armageddon, whose sentences of damnation would not be lifted until later in time, when missionaries carried the millennial order to them. Finally, the Jews and the Israelites were to be restored to the Promised Land, where they would witness the millennial church before other peoples, including Puritans. Why Judeo-centrists bestowed these putative honors on the children of Israel is a problem that needs to be explained, as Nabil Matar has observed in *Islam in Britain* (1998) and in other writings.

As we saw in the essay's opening section, the future conversion and the future repatriation of Israel and Judah were debated propositions in early modern Puritanism. The central biblical text for a future conversion was Paul's discussion in Romans 9–11 of Israel's place in the divine plan for salvation, and the main passages for a future repatriation were Jeremiah 23:1–8 and Ezekiel 37:11–28, which spoke of the reunion of Judah and Israel under the messiah. Some Puritans, such as William Pynchon, Richard Baxter, and Cotton Mather, rejected both doctrines. These men argued that Romans 9–11 either referred to the conversion of the godly of all nations and times, or else to the spread of Christianity among Jews in the early church, and that the passages in Jeremiah and Ezekiel had been fulfilled in the sixth century B.C.E., when the Jewish exiles returned to Judah, where they were supposedly joined by some lost Israelites who had managed to find their way back to their ancestral homeland.¹⁰²

Of these two propositions, the one about a future conversion was less controversial in Puritan circles. Advocates of the conversionist doctrine argued that an insufficient number of Jews had become Christian during the early church period to constitute the fulfillment of Romans 9–11, and that early Christian missionaries had not carried the Gospel to the lost tribes, who were presumably included in Paul's statement that "all Israel shall be saved" (Romans 11:26). Moreover, the marginal glosses to Romans 9–11 in the Geneva Bible, as well as the support given to the idea by Theodore Beza, William Perkins, and others, also legitimated the notion of a coming conversion. By the early to mid seventeenth century, a belief in the future redemption of Israel and Judah had become "a staple component of . . . puritan eschatology," whether millenarian or not.¹⁰³ As Increase Mather observed at century's end, "That they shall return to their own Land

102. The citations for these points are given in note 7 above.

103. Gribben, *The Puritan Millennium*, 39–40.

again, and rebuild Jerusalem . . . is a thing doubted by many who are clear for their Conversion."¹⁰⁴

Although Mather lamented the existence of Puritan opposition to repatriation, he and other Judeo-centrists were comforted by their supposition that Jewish opinion was on their side. They assumed that contemporary rabbis read Jeremiah 23:1–8 and Ezekiel 37:11–28 in the same way that they themselves did, and accordingly, that the Jews were eager to overthrow the Ottomans and return to the Promised Land.¹⁰⁵ This was in itself a questionable assumption. To begin with, Judeo-centrists did not take into account the fact that Jewish interpretations of Jeremiah 23 and Ezekiel 37 were rarely taken directly from the biblical texts, but were shaped by rabbinic readings of the Talmud and often by Kabbalistic traditions as well. Early modern Jewish messianism was redemptionist but not necessarily restorationist, stressing the pursuit of mystical or spiritual goals, the achievement of which did not require repatriation. Even Sabbatianism was oriented toward the attainment of these goals, with the added proviso that they could be most fully realized in Palestine.¹⁰⁶ Moreover, Judeo-centrists wrongly attributed to the Jews an antipathy for the Ottomans. Gershom Scholem has written that while "the Jewish masses living under Muslim rule certainly did not harbor excessively warm pro-Turkish sentiments, . . . the 'utter ruin and extirpation' of the Turks . . . was a Christian chiliast rather than a Jewish ideal."¹⁰⁷ Along the same lines, Matar has pointed out that seventeenth-century Jews were not armed and that they had more cause to dislike Christians than they did Muslims. "It did not matter to Englishmen," he explains, "that there were no militarized Jews in the whole of Christendom, let alone Jews with the preparedness or the willingness to fight the Muslim enemies of their Christian enemies."¹⁰⁸ Matar's point even applies to Sabbatai Zvi, who did not plan on securing the Promised Land by force. Although Mather and others assumed that he was mobilizing the children for a war against the Ottomans, Sabbatai actually hoped to talk the sultan into voluntarily relinquishing control of Palestine.¹⁰⁹

For Matar, the doctrine of a restoration to Palestine was a symptom of anti-Muslim prejudice and an early expression of modern British

104. Mather, *A Dissertation*, 11.

105. Mather, *The Mystery*, 56–57, 79–83; Dury in Thorowgood, *Jewes in America*, ff. [d4v–e4]; and Goodwin, *A Sermon*, 24–25.

106. For discussions of early modern Jewish messianism, see Scholem, *The Messianic Idea in Judaism and Other Essays on Jewish Spirituality* (New York: Schocken, 1971), 1–48, and *Sabbatai Sevi*, 8–102.

107. *Ibid.*, 349.

108. Matar, *Islam in Britain*, 171.

109. Scholem, *Sabbatai Sevi*, 287, 449.

imperialist Zionism. He argues that with the rise of Ottoman power in the early modern period, Puritan millenarians saw the need for a new crusade against the Muslims. Remembering that "English soldiers had failed to 'take possession' of the Holy Land and destroy the Saracens in the Middle Ages," and hoping to prevail in the east "without the loss of a single Christian life," the faithful assigned the task of overcoming the Ottomans to the descendants of Jacob, whose desire to liberate Palestine would give them the fighting will needed for victory. Matar further claims that after their conversion and repatriation, "the Jews . . . would declare in Palestine the Protestant English kingdom of Christ" and give the country "to its owners: the Protestants of Britain."¹¹⁰ Thus, seventeenth-century Judeo-centric millenarianism provided a kind of mandate for the twentieth-century British mandate over Palestine.

It is certainly true that Judeo-centrists disliked Islam and longed for the day when the religion of the prophet ceased to exist and that they assumed that the Jews and Israelites would fight resolutely to win control of their ancient homeland. Nevertheless, Matar's explanation for the popularity of the notion of a future repatriation is unconvincing. No Judeo-centric millenarian known to me ever regretted the failure of the Crusades, given that a permanent victory in them would have extended Catholic power to the eastern Mediterranean, or anticipated that the war in the west against Roman Catholicism would be won "without the loss of a single Christian life." Moreover, Matar's discussion of the rightful ownership of Palestine seems to presuppose the validity of the popular academic thesis that Puritans regarded England as God's elect nation or as his new Israel. In light of the numerous challenges made to this thesis, scholars can no longer assume that Puritans characteristically thought that England (or for that matter, New England) was uniquely privileged in the end-times.¹¹¹ Finally, and most importantly for our purposes, Matar does not take Puritan primitivism into account in his analysis.

VII. CONCLUSION: PRIMITIVISM AND THE REPATRIATION OF ISRAEL

The idea of a restoration to Palestine is better understood as part of the larger "primitivist dimension in Puritanism." Judeo-centrists understood the millennium as the re-creation of the apostolic church in

110. Matar, *Islam in Britain*, 168–83 (quotations on 168, 169, 175, 181), and *Turks, Moors, and Englishmen*, 106–7.

111. Bozeman, *To Live Ancient Lives*, 217–36; Smolinski, "Israel Redivivus," 361–66, 388–90; Knight, *Orthodoxies in Massachusetts*, 159–61, 275; V.N. Olsen, *John Foxe and the Elizabethan Church* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973), 36–47; and Bauckham, *Tudor Apocalypse*, 70–88.

all its original grandeur. This restoration was to occur in Jerusalem, the city where the apostolic church first existed, and it was to take place among the first Christians, Jewish converts to the religion of Jesus. After its reestablishment in Jerusalem, the apostolic or millennial church would spread among the Gentiles. But on this occasion, in contrast to what supposedly happened in the Middle Ages, it would be preserved intact and never be contaminated by the inventions of men. For Judeo-centric millenarians, the Jews had to reoccupy Palestine so that Christian history could start anew. The lost tribes of Israel were also to repatriate even though they had not been part of the apostolic church. Judeo-centrists assumed that God would right the wayward course of ancient Israelite history by restoring the union of Judah and Israel that had existed during the time of Saul, David, and Solomon. Thus, the millennium involved the restoration of an institution (the apostolic church), a place (Jerusalem), and a people (the Jews and the lost tribes).

While it was a logical inference from the assumption that the apostolic church would be reestablished in the millennium, the belief that the reunited posterity of Jacob would inaugurate the kingdom in Jerusalem was not an inevitable deduction from that assumption. There were seventeenth-century millenarians who anticipated the millennial restoration of the apostolic ecclesiastical order, but who located the starting place of the restoration in England or elsewhere. But for those millenarians who made the inference and adopted the perspective under discussion here, the Jewish Christian church in Jerusalem would be the wonder of the world. England would be an outpost of Palestine and not, as Matar suggests, the other way around. John Cotton declared that the restored church in Jerusalem will "exceed . . . all earthly comparisons, to which the Reformed Churches were resembled," and the New England minister and probable Judeo-centrist Peter Bulkeley stated that the "light of the Gentile Churches, which is as the Sunne, shall both be dim in comparison of the light that shall be in that Church, when the glory of the Lord is risen upon . . . the Jewish Church after their calling."¹¹² Palestine did not belong to the English but to the children of Israel, and Palestine would reclaim its place as God's elect nation. "The most glorious manifestation of Christs Kingly power both in Church and State," William Aspinwall wrote, "will be reserved for his ancient people the Jews, when they are called home again." "The Israelites shall have the greatest glory," John Archer said, and "the Cities of the [Twelve]

112. Cotton, *A Brief Exposition*, 180; and Bulkeley, *The Gospel-Covenant*, 21.

Tribes shall be built againe, and inhabited by naturall Israelites, especially Ierusalem, which shall bee the most eminent city then in the world." Jewish-Christian Palestine, Increase Mather believed, "shall be acknowledged and respected in the world above any other Nation or people."¹¹³ The Ottoman Empire was indeed an obstacle to be removed, but one that stood in the way of Jewish and Israelite, not English or American, national destiny.

113. Aspinwall, *A Premonition*, 25 (mispaginated 33); Archer, *The Personall Reigne*, 26; and Mather, *The Mystery*, 58.