John Lightfoot, the Westminster Assembly, and the *Horae Hebraicae et Talmudicae*.*

> "He [John Lightfoot] was of great use in this Assembly, in regard of his eminent skill in the Jewish and oriental learning. For these divines, in their inquiries into the primitive condition of the Christian church, and government thereof in the apostles' days, built much upon the scheme of the Jewish church; which, the first Christians being Jews, and bred up in that church, no question conformed themselves much to…"[1]

The Westminster Assembly (1643-52) remains a vital moment in English ecclesiastical history. The Assembly was, in the words of Chad Van Dixhoorn, "the last of the great post-Reformation synods", a council of the country's most prominent divines, convened and to a great extent controlled by the Long Parliament, tasked with entirely remodelling English church government and doctrine to bring it up to date with the best Reformed practice, whatever that might be.[2] The debates of the Assembly offer the historian an unrivalled opportunity to see theology in action, during an historical moment when theology was fundamental to England's present, past, and future.

The journal of John Lightfoot (1602-75), Hebraist and sometime Master of Catharine Hall, Cambridge, has in turn long been an irreplacable witnesses to the Assembly's discussions. Even since the publication of the Westminster Assembly minutes, no scholar can approach the Assembly without seeing it at least partly through Lightfoot's comments, which untangle and elucidate the cryptic jottings of its official notes.[3]

Yet, despite this, the depiction of Lightfoot in John Strype's words of 1700 – as someone intellectually at the heart of the Assembly's inquiries, due primarily to his

expertise in Hebrew - has somewhat receded from our modern-day impression of both Lightfoot and the Assembly. This recession has been accompanied by a relative silence from modern historians regarding the methodology, sources, and broader scholarly background lying behind the Assembly's debates. Scholars have of course for decades stressed the importance of "political Hebraism" to debates around church-state relations in the Assembly, especially excommunication, which relied on a reconstruction of the ancient Hebrew commonwealth as a model for Reformed early modernity.[4] With this political Hebraism came sources that might otherwise seem out of place in examinations of Christian polity, above all the Talmud and Moses Maimonides' *Mishneh Torah*. But it is also notable that the importance of Jewish learning has been limited to these questions around the Hebrew republic. Moreover, there remains a consensus, even among historians of scholarship, that the texts and methods relied upon by Hebraists like Lightfoot and John Selden were opposed by the Assembly's other members.[5]

Superficially the records support this observation, such as when the presbyterian Lazarus Seaman argued, *contra* Lightfoot's interpretation of Matthew 18:18, that it was dangerous to base scriptural exegesis on rabbinic sources.[6] Shortly thereafter Richard Vines made a similar protestation.[7] At an earlier stage Sir Benjamin Rudyard too had noted that it was "strange" and "a weake ground" to build Christian polity "upon the Jewish", a complaint repeated by the presbyterian George Gillespie.[8]

And yet there are reasons why we might think differently. Intellectual historians have long established that Jewish texts and traditions played a vital role in far more theological and religio-political issues than church-state relations.[9] Strype's own account of Lightfoot assumes that the other Assembly members agreed on the importance of Jewish learning to their mission: this was what made his specialism "of great use" to them. Even in the moments of apparent dissension just mentioned, a closer reading reveals a more nuanced picture. In response to Rudyard, Edmund Calamy defended the

importance of the Jewish church for Christian polity, cynically noting that Rudyard's real purpose was to hurry the assembly along.[10] The person who followed Calamy's *apologia* with evidence from the Sanhedrin and Jewish priesthood was Vines himself, who expressed doubts about arguments from ancient Judaism only when it suited him.[11] Similarly, when Seaman objected to Lightfoot's use of rabbinic sources, his complaint was ignored: instead, Gillespie offered a rebuttal of Lightfoot from the "Talmudicall writters" and the famous Hebraist Johannes Buxtorf I.[12] Like Vines, Gillespie was mercurial when it came to arguments from ancient Judaism.[13]

Given the purpose of this special issue to remap the intellectual traditions behind the long reformation, as well as recent calls for new visions of the Westminster Assembly, the first half of this article will argue that seemingly esoteric historical and philological questions about Second Temple Judaism permeated more of the Assembly's arguments than previously thought.[14] These questions arose from the Assembly members' differing visions of the ancient Jewish past, especially cultural and linguistic diversity in the first-century Middle East, and were crucial to issues beyond Erastianism and excommunication. In formulating their visions, the Assembly members were in dialogue with decades of European neo-Latin commentary that had dealt with the same problems, but which to date has mostly been the province of historians of scholarship. By recontextualising these debates, the first half of this article argues not just for a fresh image of the Westminster Assembly, but also for the urgency and vitality of what used to be called "Christian Hebraism" to the mainstream of Reformation and British history.[15]

The second half of this article examines the impact the Westminster Assembly had upon Lightfoot's more evidently critical-philological projects. While Lightfoot is famous among British historians for his role in the Assembly, among historians of scholarship he is best known for his *Horae Hebraicae et Talmudicae* (1658-78) an unprecedentedly thorough application of Hebrew scholarship to New Testament

exegesis.[16] These two facets of Lightfoot's legacy have remained separate, but this article brings them together by arguing that the *Horae Hebraicae* were scarred by Lightfoot's experience in the Assembly, even while moving beyond it. This argument has two important consequences. Firstly, it shows that the *Horae* were structured by theological conflicts in a way that has not yet been recognised. But secondly, and perhaps more importantly, it suggests that the Assembly itself may have played a hitherto underappreciated role as a stimulus for trailblazing seventeenth-century English biblical scholarship, inspiring Lightfoot to produce works such as the *Horae* that could act not only as a defence of the theological arguments he advanced in the Assembly, but also an affirmation of the methods he used to make them, aiming to put beyond doubt the power, validity, and value of studies of the ancient Jewish past to the Christian present.

The Westminster Assembly as Competing Visions of Second Temple Judaism.

In his 2021 monograph on John Selden, Jason Rosenblatt underlined the necessity of filling the lacunae of the Assembly minutes with the evidence provided by the "copious formal scholarship" produced by its members elsewhere.[17] Taking its cue from Rosenblatt, this section offers a new perspective on Assembly debates by contextualising them not only with the formal scholarship produced by its members, but also the wider pan-European traditions of scholarship with which they were engaging.

One important question about Second Temple Judaism that had plagued scholars for decades by the 1640s was its state: its internal coherence, linguistic diversity, degree of sectarianism, and diasporic reach. These issues arose directly from the New Testament, where references to the Sadducees and Pharisees inspired scholars to delve into the sects within first-century Judaism. And, in this case, such explorations were enlarged by the information in ancient historians like Josephus and Philo.[18] More

confusingly, and with less extra-biblical support, scholars wondered about the identity of the Hellenists (Ἑλληνῖσταί) in Acts (6:1; 9:29; 11:20), who existed in tension with another group known as the "Hebraists" or "Hebrews" (Ἑβραῖοί), but also seemed separate from the "Hellenes" (Ἕλληνες, e.g. Acts 14:1).

Early interpreters had treated this mysterious triad lightly: Erasmus classified the Hellenes as pagans, on the grounds (given without elaboration) that Jews of the time called all gentiles "Greeks", and identified the Hellenists as Jews born outside of Jewish lands, who spoke in vernaculars like Greek.[19] The Hebrews were thus Jews born in Jewish lands, who spoke Hebrew, and decried these foreign Jews as semi-pagan. Beza, writing in 1582, argued *pace* Erasmus that the Hellenists were circumcised proselytes to Judaism: these people were Jewish (a religion) but they were not Hebrew (a nation/people), and were distinct also from the "Hellenes", who were uncircumcised gentiles who nevertheless "knew God".[20] Such investigations remained perfunctory until, as Anthony Grafton has outlined, the great polymath Joseph Scaliger offered an interpretation of the Hellenists that sent shockwaves through New Testament scholarship. From the 1580s Scaliger advocated for a tripartite structure to first-century Judaism, which consisted of three communities with capitals at Jerusalem, Babylon, and Alexandria. The Jerusalem community was the centre: Jews here spoke Hebrew and Aramaic and produced the Targum Yerushalmi. The Babylonian community housed the Asian diaspora, whose members used the Targum Onkelos and had retained familiarity with their native language. Alexandria housed Jews of the European diaspora, who only spoke Greek, read the Greek Bible (the Septuagint) in their synagogues, had their own Temple, and boasted Philo as their most famous member. These Greek Jews, who had long forgotten Hebrew and Aramaic, were known as the "Hellenists" not just because they only spoke Greek, but also because they applied Greek philosophy and rhetoric to their scriptural exegesis.[21]

Scaliger's reimagining of Second Temple Judaism had polemical barbs: against Roman Catholics, he wished to discredit texts such as 2 Maccabees by making them the product of a relatively new diasporic community, who had absorbed too much from the pagan Greek culture around them.[22] Some (like Beza) disregarded Scaliger's theory, but among an influential circle of scholars in northern Europe it sparked an intense interest.[23] The grammarian Johannes Drusius expanded the notion of the Hellenists to include their use of an eponymous dialect, and Scaliger's precocious student Daniel Heinsius seized upon this to construct an intricate description of the "lingua Hellenistica" as a Hebraicising Greek.[24]

By the early 1640s, then, the investigation of first-century Judaism was a growth industry, and in the years directly before the Westminster Assembly, the existence of a "lingua Hellenistica" and the identity of Acts' Hellenists generated fierce debate. Heinsius had transformed his comments on the *lingua Hellenistica* into a mammoth commentary on the New Testament, which he argued was written in "Hellenistic".[25] But his bold claims had also attracted outrage from Scaliger's successor, the French classicist Claudius Salmasius. Salmasius was horrified at the counter-intuitive exegetical monsters Heinsius's New Testament analysis had birthed, and believed that Heinsius had simply fabricated a whole dialect from the Greek lexica in Conrad Kircher's concordance of the Septuagint.[26] From 1639-1643, Salmasius brutally attacked Heinsius's work, arguing that he had fundamentally misunderstood Scaliger (for whom the point of the Hellenists was that they *only* spoke Greek, not that they spoke a mixed Hebrew-Greek), but also that Scaliger himself was wrong.[27] Following Beza, Salmasius viewed the Hellenists as circumcised Greek proselytes to Judaism, who lived in Jerusalem but could not speak Hebrew and therefore were distinguished in Acts from those who were Jews by birth.[28] Salmasius also poured cold water over Scaliger's whole vision of first-century Judaism. It made no sense, he argued, that Jews resident in Alexandria would come all the way to Jerusalem, a

far-flung city, and convert *en masse* there so early in church history, before even the conversion of the first gentile, Cornelius, in Acts 10. It was more logical to assume that the earliest church was made up of local Jews, who were of two types: Hebraists, a.k.a. born Jews; and Hellenists, a.k.a. proselytes.[29] There were Jews in Alexandria, because all Eastern cities were cosmopolitan places, but these were not self-contained diasporic communities as Scaliger imagined: the only significant geographic division within first-century Judaism was that between Palestinian Jews, who had returned to Jerusalem after the Babylonian captivity, and Babylonian Jews, who had remained in Babylon, but nevertheless recognised Jerusalem as their religion's centre.[30] Salmasius's vision of first-century Judaism was thus of a community far more unified than Scaliger and Heinsius's dispersed, divided outline.

As this overview already hints, these disagreements had implications beyond the linguistic and philological. After all, the core of this debate concerned who constituted the first Christian church at Jerusalem and therefore how readily they could have been absorbed into one congregation, or whether they would have to have been split into several.

This was crucial for arguments over the existence of a presbytery in New Testament Jerusalem, which by definition required the existence of multiple congregations to be ruled over.[31] It was even more crucial for the congregationalists, as scripture seemed clear that from the earliest days the Apostles were recognised by all Jerusalem believers as a ruling authority: thus, if there were more than one congregation in Jerusalem, it would not take much to argue that this first Church had "a Presbyteriall government."[32] This is why when, on 22nd February 1644, the Assembly came to proving presbyterianism existed in the first Church, Thomas Temple (who supported presbyterianism but did not think it could be proved from New Testament Jerusalem) immediately queried whether there were multiple fixed congregations in Jerusalem, and

argued that there were not, on the grounds of their dwelling together and meeting together for sermons etc, just as a single congregation would.[33] There were several ways to combat Temple's position (e.g. by arguing that there were too many people for one congregation to be practical), but the most powerful argument, which Lightfoot brought up rapidly and which reportedly "pinched the independents", was that:[34]

> "There were divers languages [in Jerusalem] that understood not one another; ergo there could not but be divers Congregations."[35]

This was a trump card: people who could not understand each other could not live together, meet together, and eat together, let alone attend the same sermons, regardless of how many of them there were. And so, to "pinch" the independents, the Assembly marched into the same philological and linguistic thickets as Heinsius and Salmasius were fighting in on the continent. Selden led the charge, citing Drusius for evidence that the Hellenists were they who "in dispersion" used the Septuagint, of whom even the most learned member (Philo) "did not understand Hebrew", and who therefore lived "asunder & severally" from the Hebraists.[36] Selden drew evidence from the Talmud's statement that judges in the great Sanhedrin needed to know seventy languages to understand the cases brought by diasporic Jews: if there were a mono-cultural, mono-linguistic diaspora, why would this be necessary?[37] Lightfoot argued similarly, drawing on Scaliger's account to note that although the Asian diaspora knew Hebrew, this was because they lived so close to Jerusalem, being in Babylon: others (namely the Hellenists, or European diaspora) did not.[38] Gillespie referred the Assembly members to the continental debate, noting that the meaning of the term Hellenist was "controverted", but that *both* of the main scholarly interpretations supported multiple congregations. This was because, as Selden and Lightfoot outlined, "dispersed Jews" read "scriptures in Greeke", while

proselytes would at best acquire Hebrew late in life. It was ridiculous to think that everyone of either of these groups (such as "widdowes & servants" and "every poore widow") could read Hebrew.[39]

To avoid this logic, congregationalist William Bridge retreated into an older, Erasmian interpretation, arguing that Hellenists were just Jews "scattered" into Greek lands (i.e. not a culturally and linguistically distinct diaspora); that any proselytes must have learned Hebrew while converting in the Temple; and that since Jews in contemporary diasporas knew Hebrew, it would be strange if those in ancient diasporas did not.[40] But by this point, such arguments did not have the esteem or weight of evidence as the positions advanced by Gillespie, Selden, Lightfoot and others. In this case, finding themselves not even on the wrong side but entirely out-of-touch with a fast-moving continental debate on the constitution of first-century Judaism killed the congregationalists.

Even with the Westminster Assembly minutes and Lightfoot's journal it is difficult to reconstruct the arguments around this issue. We can gain more insight from a work Lightfoot published while in the Assembly: his 1645 commentary on Acts, which has its origins in the notes Lightfoot made at the end of one of his Assembly journals.[41] In this commentary Lightfoot unpacked in detail his position on the fractured state of Second Temple Judaism. It was not just that there were several diasporas, including the "westerne dispersion" (the Hellenists) and the Eastern dispersion at Babylon.[42] Even within diasporas there was enormous diversity: the Eastern diaspora, for instance, spoke languages from Mesopotamian to Persian to Syriac.[43] Hebrew was the most plausible common language, but that it was "utterly lost from [diasporic Jews] among common use" was clear from the production of multiple vernacular scriptural translations and paraphrases, from the Aramaic Targumim to the Greek Septuagint.[44] And then, in a turn

towards ecclesiology that could have been ripped from the Assembly itself, Lightfoot concluded that:

> "This then being past all deniall, that these Jewes of severall Nations, could neither understand one another in the tongue of the Countrey where they were borne, nor understand any one language as common to them all; it is past all deniall also, that when they were converted to Christianity, they were severed into diverse Congregations; for else it was impossible for them to joyne together in publike worship."[45]

This movement from scholarly to theological – which we see repeated across Lightfoot's *Acts* – could almost be taken as a model for what full speeches might have looked like in the Assembly itself.[46]

The Hellenists' identity was not only relevant to the number of congregations in the first church at Jerusalem. It was also relevant to the office of the deacon, given that it was because of the Hellenists' widows being overlooked in the daily ministration that seven men were selected to serve (διακονεῖν) the needs of the poor Hellenists (Acts 6:1-6). Vines's argument for the perpetuity of the office, for instance, derived from his vision of the Hellenists not as independent diasporic Jews, but vulnerable circumcised proselytes to Judaism, because while the creation of such proselytes was occasional, the need for someone to minister to the class they represented (the disadvantaged) was perpetual.[47] Lightfoot, contrariwise, used his interpretation of the Hellenists to argue for the temporal specificity and therefore optional status of the office of deacon. The Hellenists were Jews of "the westerne dispersion"; they complained and therefore had deacons "apoynted to them", but the other diasporas (such as the Eastern) were given none, implying that the office was intended for an historically contingent group with

contingent problems.[48] Vines countered Lightfoot by reasserting his own vision of the Hellenists. They might (as he had said earlier) have had "all the priviledges of the Jewes" due to their circumcision, but their status as proselytes meant that they were socially marginalised and susceptible to exclusion: being "not of the stocke of the Hebrewes & therfore they might come to be rejected."[49] Thus deacons were given to them not as a concession to one of several historically-particular communities, but as representing a class of people (the poor and needy) who would always require special attention in the church.

Lightfoot would, eventually, be outvoted on the question of the perpetuity of the deacon's office, but it is telling nevertheless that no one questioned the grounds on which he was arguing: where Salmasius and Heinsius's warring positions had been united to argue against congregationalism, they could easily be pitted against each other, as here, in debates over deacons.[50] But it was not only questions like the identity of the Hellenists that underwrote the Assembly's debates. Almost all the conditions and contexts of first-century Judaism had a confessional charge that could help or hinder one party or another: one might call it the common intellectual battleground of religious controversy in the period. To take another example, when dealing with their queries about whether the church at Jerusalem could have congregated in one place, the Assembly was compelled to cover such delicate areas as sectarianism in Second Temple Judaism, the extent to which the earliest Christians continued to practice some Jewish rituals, and whether (if so) they would have been permitted in the religious mainstream as if they were another idiosyncratic but fundamentally still-Jewish sect. Such topics were breached early in the discussion, after a chaotic day on 22nd February 1644 ended with the Assembly setting out a basic question: whether the large numbers of believers in Acts ordinarily met in one place together as a single congregation for acts of governance and worship, such as receiving the Lord's supper etc.[51]

On 23rd February Thomas Goodwin opened proceedings by answering in the affirmative that the church could easily have met in the Temple.[52] This laid the groundwork for congregationalism by identifying one place (the Temple) capacious enough for Jerusalem's nascent Christian community to meet as one body. Part of the subsequent debate required closely examining the terms that implied the church did indeed meet as one group (such as ὁμοθυμαδόν, Acts 5:12), but it also turned on a thornier issue. For no one (as Lightfoot acknowledged) denied that the "converted Christians" met in the Temple, but the question was whether they did so openly as Christians, "for ordinary place of divine worship" or as Jews, to "hear the Scriptures read" and perform other activities that were not uniquely Christian.[53]

This was a treacherous subject because it raised the question of the extent to which, at this early point, Christianity and Judaism were recognised as distinct religions. Gillespie and Vines, leading the presbyterian charge, argued that the boundaries were blurry enough that converted Christians could go to the Temple as Jews, for (in Gillespie's words) the "worship common" to both religions. However for worship peculiar to Christianity, especially taking the sacraments, they would split up into several houses, as indicated in Acts 2:46's mentioning of breaking bread from house to house.[54] Vines took a further step: since at this point in church history "the Jews Relig: still stood" it was permissible for the Apostles to preach and read scripture in the Temple, but to perform the sacraments would be an "affront" that would (as Gillespie later added) result in formal censure by the Jewish community.[55] Vines and Gillespie were supported in these arguments by Samuel Rutherford, Theodore Bathurst, and Seaman *inter alia*.[56]

It was in the afternoon session on the same day that those campaigning against a single *ecclesia congregativa* extracted this argument's full implications: that at this point, Christianity was viewed *both by Jews and Christians* as simply another Jewish sect and so

early Christians would have behaved accordingly. Selden led the case, drawing on contemporary scholarly interpretations of first-century Jewish sects.[57] The "present state of that time" was such that *only* Jews were admitted to the Christian church: because "as yet it was not condiscended to among the Jews that the Gentiles should come in," to become Christian one first had to convert to Judaism. Moreover, the "condition" of Judaism at that time was highly sectarian, with "divers sects" including the Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes: Christianity did not seem any different, and Selden here alluded to evidence in Josephus suggesting that "Essenes" might be another name for Christians. Furthermore, even those "that bec[a]me Xsians did beleeve that concern", i.e. viewed themselves as sectarian Jews, and so continued to "observe Moses laws and customs". Thus, it was no wonder that Acts referred to them as gathering in the Temple.[58]

This dismantled congregationalist arguments that relied on mentions of church-wide Temple-meetings in Acts, but Selden was willing to go even further. Since these early Christians saw themselves as sectarian Jews, they would have followed Jewish customs around when to cleave together and when to break into several congregations. Citing the Jerusalem Talmud and Maimonides, Selden established that in this period Jerusalem itself had 480 different synagogues (each catering to a different congregation), and that Jewish law required dwellings of ten households (i.e. containing ten adult men) to form their own synagogue/congregation if they did not belong to one.[59] Following these customs, the "Jewish Christians" of Jerusalem would have "cast themselves into severall Congregations" of at least ten men each, and would have seen no contradiction in practising their Judaism in the Temple with other Jews, while practising their Christianity in individual dwellings with small congregations composed of those who shared a language.[60]

This argument cut Goodwin's position at the root by stressing that early Christian converts could have started breaking into multiple congregations from

numbers as low as twenty and may even have felt a religious obligation to do so. More than this, however, Selden's speech here touched on a larger issue: that the nature of primitive Christianity as little more than a self-identified Jewish sect offered an incontrovertible argument for the importance of Jewish traditions to the reconstruction of the first Christian church and, therefore, to the best constitution of its early modern successor.

Although this section has focussed on ecclesiology, this is not to suggest that the rituals and practices of Second Temple Judaism had no wider relevance. In the next section we will see how another aspect of first-century Jewish religious life – the organisation of the synagogue's cycles of *parashiyot* (readings from the Pentateuch) – were crucial to debates over the ministerial reading of scripture in the Christian church. Even discussions of that "Ocean of many vast disputes", infant baptism, relied heavily on readings of postbiblical Jewish texts.[61] Infant baptism was a particularly charged issue in this respect because its most important Reformed proof was constructed from the analogy with circumcision.[62] This placed a lot of pressure on reconstructing first-century Jewish practices of infant circumcision as a model for infant baptism, as we can see in Lightfoot's attempt to argue for the permissibility of private baptism from Talmudic evidence for private circumcision.[63] Nor was it just issues of ancient history that underwrote larger debates. Longstanding philological problems of early modern scholarship, such as whether there existed an original Hebrew version of Matthew from which the Greek Gospel was translated, were woven into the Assembly debates, as we can see in Selden's marshalling the Hebrew Matthew as evidence in a multipronged argument against presbyterian views of excommunication.[64]

This should give a different vision of the functioning of the Westminster Assembly to the one that has prevailed until now: one in which questions around the nature of ancient Judaism generated by cutting-edge continental neo-Latin biblical

scholarship were unavoidable in debates over further Reformation in England. Indeed, we might even view the Westminster Assembly as an exercise of the "confessionalised erudition" which historians of scholarship have argued was at the core of early modern intellectual culture, in which even the slightest questions of history and philology were suffused with theological significance.[65]

At the same time, this is not to say that the Assembly was a satisfying experience for Lightfoot (or Selden), or that either of them felt personally central to the proceedings. Its mode of argumentation, so often historical and philological, should have allowed them to dominate, and did occasionally give them a real advantage beyond their numbers (as in the debate over excommunication). Yet they could just as often be ignored or, more maddeningly, see serious misreadings of the sources and histories in which they were expert triumph despite their objections. It may well have appeared to them as if texts like the Talmud and *Mishneh Torah* had simply been added to the key sources, alongside scripture and the church fathers, treated like a nose of wax by other Christian theologians. Historians have already pointed out how works like Selden's *De Synedriis* (1650-5) might have been scarred by his experiences in the Assembly.[66] The second half of this article will pursue this line of thinking further. If this section has aimed to show how a mass of scholarly labour lay just behind the Assembly debates, the next will turn this around to argue that these same debates and their frustrations underwrote much of Lightfoot's most famous work, the *Horae Hebraicae*.

The Westminster Assembly as the Genesis of the *Horae Hebraicae* (1658-78)

Lightfoot's *Horae Hebraicae* was one of the most important works of biblical scholarship produced in early modernity. Even within the century succeeding its publication its significance was recognised, with the German scholar Johann Christian Schöttgen

imitating Lightfoot's endeavour to the title, and adapting the much-adapted couplet to declare that "nisi Lightfootus lyrasset, multi non saltassent."[67] According to William Horbury, Lightfoot's *Horae* "remained the standard rabbinic commentary on the NT until Strack-Billerbeck began to appear in 1924", while others chart Lightfoot's influence into the 1970s.[68] And yet there is little research on the *Horae* themselves. While a proper account of their composition remains a desideratum, this section will focus on the relationship between Lightfoot's conclusions in the *Horae* and his arguments in the Assembly.

Although Lightfoot had been developing the expertise necessary to write the *Horae* since the 1620s, it could be argued that it was the Westminster Assembly that made him realise their urgency and importance. We can see this most obviously in the way in which Lightfoot repeatedly and with evident frustration used the *Horae* to try to prove the arguments he had made – but which were ignored – in the Assembly. For instance, discussing the meaning of the "binding and loosing" in Matthew 16:19 and 18:18 in the Assembly, Lightfoot insisted that the phrase originated from the common Talmudic expression *asar we-hittir* (in Aramaic *asar we-shera*) meaning to forbid or to permit, used to designate what was and what was not allowed within the law. By this reading, Matthew's expression was purely doctrinal, and did *not* refer to a disciplinary action like excommunication.[69] Lightfoot's journal records his disappointment at failing to convince the Assembly members of the significance of this derivation.[70] It is telling, then, that at the first opportunity in his *Horae* on Matthew, Lightfoot documented pages of Jewish sources attesting to the rabbinic meaning of *asar*, *hittir* and *shera*, all to establish the validity of the interpretation he had given in the Assembly.[71] Furthermore, we can hear his annoyance at this exhaustive evidence being ignored so many years earlier in his impatient concluding comment:

> "His addi posset, si esset opus, frequens dicam? an infinitus? usus Phrasium אסור ומותר quae centies millies occurrent…*Christum*, communi Phrasiologiâ utentem, communi & vulgari sensu ab auditoribus intellectum, ridiculum dicam? an amentiae esset? non opinari. "
>
> "To these examples could be added, if necessary, the frequent - should I say frequent? or perhaps endless? – use of the phrases "forbidden and permitted" which occur a hundred thousand times…To think that Christ, using the common phrase, was not understood in the common and vulgar sense by his listeners is, should I say, ridiculous? or perhaps insane?"[72]

Such words were surely written with his old Assembly divines in mind, who had dismissed these examples in the mid-1640s. But the *Horae* did not just give fresh air to old wounds. It also offered a substantially expanded scholarly ratification of the most controverted topics underwriting Assembly debates.

This is clear, for instance, in Lightfoot's comments about the Hellenists and Hebraists in his *Horae* on John. Lightfoot quickly cycled through the basics. The Hellenes were gentiles: here Lightfoot agreed with Erasmus that Jews referred to all pagans as "Greeks". On the question of the Hellenists, Lightfoot sided with Scaliger over Salmasius: the Hellenists were not proselytes but members of the Greek diaspora, they used Greek as their vernacular, and were contrasted to members of other diasporas who spoke tongues related to Hebrew.[73]

Lightfoot also started pushing beyond these basic statements into a more culturally-attuned analysis. Some hints of this are visible already in his *Horae* on John, where he noted in passing that these diasporas were not considered equal: using Rashi on BT Gittin 2a and the marriage restrictions in BT Kiddushin 69a, he established that the

Babylonian diaspora was viewed by the non-diasporic Jews (who lived in ancient Palestine) as nobler and more sacred than the Greek diaspora, which was considered unclean.[74] But it was in his posthumously published *Horae* on Acts that Lightfoot transformed these hints into an extensive disquisition into the nature and origins of the Jewish diaspora.

Here, Lightfoot turned his analysis of inequalities among diasporic Jews into a full-throttled argument against the Bezan-Salmasian interpretation of the Hellenists. The hatred against the Hellenists did not indicate they were gentiles or converts, but pointed towards longstanding prejudices against Greek within the Jewish community.[75] Lightfoot drew evidence for this from discussions in BT Bava Kamma and BT Sotah over the permissibility of learning Greek, which despite their confusions, Lightfoot believed demonstrated that a decree was issued in the Hasmonean dynasty against teaching Greek, which languished in subsequent decades, before being renewed during Titus's besiegement of Jerusalem.[76] This spoke generally to Jewish attitudes to the language, and was confirmed by stories in the same passages about how those who were exceptionally permitted to learn Greek were distinguished by their noble lineage, erudition, and political position.[77]

Moreover, Lightfoot found even in the Talmud itself evidence of the Hellenistic diaspora and the prejudices against them. JT Sotah provided particularly tantalising evidence, recounting a story of Rabbi Levi bar Hitah, who upon hearing Jews reciting the shema "אלוניסתין" (*elonistin*, in Greek*)* grew angry, only to be rebuked by Rabbi Jose, who said that those ignorant of Hebrew had no choice but to recite in their vernacular.[78] This seemed to attest not only to a Greek-speaking "Hellenistic" diaspora, but also to the biases of Hebrew-speaking diasporas against them.[79]

In short, Lightfoot argued that was a deep distrust of Greek among Hebrew-speaking Jews due to their long history of conflict with its native speakers: this in turn

underwrote a strong prejudice against those who spoke only Greek, who were considered the "lowest class" of Jews.[80] This explained not only the tensions between the groups in Acts, but also the Hellenists' poverty (and need for deacons). But Lightfoot did not limit his attention to the Hellenists: he also sketched what he could of the Hebraists, explaining how the term "Hebraeus" had undergone semantic shift between First and Second Temple Judaism. In the former period it designated the origin and language of a people, but by the latter it meant the *diaspora* and language of a people.[81] As evidence, Lightfoot pointed to the Septuagint translation of Genesis 14:13, which rendered עברי (Hebrew) with περατῆς (immigrant), as well as disputes in Bereshit Rabbah over whether עברי meant a race or transfluvial migration.[82] This pattern of semantic shift was accelerated after the Babylonian Captivity, when "pure" (biblical) Hebrew became known as Assyrian, and Syriac and Aramaic, the diasporic languages of migration, were called Hebrew instead.[83] Thus even within the "Hebrew"-speaking Jews there was linguistic variety, as well as bigotry. The Mesopotamian Jews were literally-speaking Hebrews, as they spoke Aramaic, but they were perceived as inferior by the Palestinian Jews, who had returned to their homeland after the Captivity, and so might be more properly be called the Hebrews. Paul's epistle to the Hebrews, for instance, was written to this latter group.[84]

None of this is to say that Lightfoot's analysis of the rabbinic attitude to Greek was right: indeed, as we will see later on, his position on the Hellenists and his desire to minimise any positive attitudes to Greek in the Talmud were driven by a particular set of highly confessionalised intra-Christian debates in the 1650s-1660s. Rather, it is to suggest that the disproportionate amount of space Lightfoot devoted in the *Horae* to the Hellenists was influenced at some level by the extensive role they played in the Assembly. Moreover, as before, the traces of tension peppering Lightfoot's otherwise sparse prose additionally lead us to suspect that the memory of his Assembly divines (who had after

all used the Bezan-Salmasian interpretation to knock down Lightfoot on issues such as the deacon's office) was not absent from his mind as he wrote:

> "at non video qua lege aut authoritate confundat Hellenistas & Proselytos & si fallantur qui Judaeos inter alias gentes dispersos putant Ελληνιστὰς dici, fateor me libenter errare cum ita falsis."[85]

> "I do not see by what law or authority he [Beza] conflates Hellenists and proselytes: and if they who think that Jews dispersed among other nations were called Hellenists stumble, then I confess that I willingly err with men deceived in this way."

Indeed, it is striking just how closely the issues to which Lightfoot devoted special attention in the *Horae* overlap with issues of special prominence in the Assembly.[86] This is especially true for an issue we have yet to address, but which occupied much of the Assembly's and Lightfoot's time: the reading of scripture in church. This seemingly uncontroversial topic intersected with a range of difficult questions: was the reading of scripture in church part of the pastor's office, the deacon's, or its own public office altogether? Was the reading of scriptures a distinct ordinance to preaching? Could reading be separated from interpretation at all? In the Assembly such questions arose in November 1643, when William Gouge set out the two parts of the debate: firstly, whether the reading of scripture was a public office in first-century Judaism, as suggested by verses like Neh. 9:2; and secondly, if so, whether Jesus himself had endorsed such a practice in places like Luke 4:16-17.[87]

Both of these questions raised complex historical problems. For a start, the Assembly wondered what Jesus was doing in Luke when he stood to read in the

synagogue. Men like Thomas Wilson argued that he was not *just* reading scripture, but reading to expound: this they used to prevent reading from being part of the pastor's office alone, rather than simply a starting-point for preaching.[88] The response of Lightfoot (who wished to preserve scripture-reading as a public office) illustrates the scholarship that lay behind such questions. Lightfoot spotted immediately that the scripture Jesus read in Luke 4 (Isaiah 61:1-2; 58:6) did not appear "in any Section in the Prophets read thorough the yeere", meaning that the "Lecture in law & prophets was finished, & our saviour chose this to preach upon" at will.[89] Lightfoot here was referring to the course of *parashiyot*, lectionary readings from the Pentateuch, and *haftarot*, Prophet readings, that took place every Sabbath in the synagogue. In fact, at the same time as this debate in the Assembly, Lightfoot was collating all the information he could find about how the Jewish ecclesiastical year was structured, including not just the cycles of *parashiyot*, *haftarot*, and festivals, but also the courses of *mishmarot*, the rota by which the 24 courses of priests served in the Temple. All this he mapped onto the Julian calendar and published a year later in 1644 in his gospel harmony: furthermore, according to this, Isaiah 61:1-2 and 58:6 were absent from the whole annual course of *haftarot*.[90] Thus, Jesus's actions in Luke could not reflect the synagogue's customary practice, and so his exposition on Isaiah could not be used to undermine the importance of public scripture-reading *sans* exegesis.

But Lightfoot was not happy to have Jesus breaking with the synagogue's norms either, developing a long disquisition to this topic in his *Horae* on Luke. Firstly, Lightfoot established that Jesus was in keeping with Jewish practice when he stood (Luke 4:16) to read from Isaiah, because it was customary to stand while reading the Law, and although the Prophets were inferior to the Law, they were nevertheless above the *Ketuvim* such as Esther, which (according to sources such as Mishnah Megillah 4:1) could be read while sitting.[91] Furthermore, Jesus was not barging disruptively into the synagogue: he

presented himself as the *maftir*, the person designated to read the prophets. This Lightfoot gleaned from BT Kiddushin 76b's mention of how, after a quarrel over who could serve publicly, Rav Bebai was granted care of the "matters concerning heaven" and Rashi's gloss that this included, *inter alia,* the duty of administering the reading the Prophets (ומפטירין) - although, in Jesus's case, Lightfoot conceded that Jesus was probably not appointed as *maftir* but rather approved of upon volunteering due to his miracles' fame.[92]

Here Lightfoot trod a delicate balance between contextualising Jesus's reading within normal Jewish practice, while also preserving some element of the exceptional. He had read some texts that suggested the *maftir* had to read at least 21 verses of the Prophets: Luke recorded that Jesus had read fewer, and yet this, Lightfoot insisted, could not be because he had ignored the synagogue's customs.[93] Instead, Lightfoot found in Masekhet Soferim that someone who interpreted scripture on the sabbath could read fewer verses: thus, to harmonise Jesus's actions with these norms, Lightfoot argued that Jesus was indeed here preaching on a sabbath.[94] Specifically, the sabbath on which Luke 4:16-17 took place fell at a time in the calendar when the *haftarah* was a section from Isaiah: after the *parashah* had been read, the minister of the synagogue passed Jesus the scroll for him to read as *maftir*.[95] Jesus, in the words of Luke, "ἀναπτύξας τὸ βιβλίον", which Lightfoot argued did not mean "opened the book" but rather unrolled the scroll.[96] Thus Jesus unrolled the scroll past the designated daily reading until he reached the place upon which he wanted to preach.[97] In this respect Jesus departed a little from the synagogue's customs, since he did not read the allotted portion of Isaiah, but only very little, since he knew such behaviour was permitted for the reading of the *haftarah* (but not the *parashah*), and that he had greater licence because he intended to expound the text on the Sabbath.[98]

This analysis of Jesus's behaviour in the *Horae* shows how far Lightfoot could take his arguments about Jesus's reading in the Assembly. Here, Jesus's actions respected the norms of the synagogue's public scripture reading, thus opening the door for the continuance of public scripture-reading in the Christian church, while also undermining any attempt to use Luke 4:16-17 as the institution of a new, different Christian custom. But if Jesus was simultaneously not contributing to the fixed component of the synagogue's reading schedule in Luke 4, and yet still approving this practice via his respect for it, the next question to ask was what this practice looked like.

Unsurprisingly, this was the other major question discussed in the Assembly: of concern here was *who* read the scripture in the synagogue (whether a public officer or any private individual) and how they read scripture (whether on its own or with an exposition). Scholars like William Gouge and Henry Wilkinson Snr argued that scripture-reading was part of the pastors' office using Nehemiah 8:7-8, where the Levites read aloud as assistants to Ezra; others (such as Edward Calamy) countered that these proofs argued only for "expounding joyned with reading", and that "reading without expounding is not the office of a pastor."[99] Others yet, such as Bathurst, advanced this latter argument by introducing another feature of ancient Jewish practice: that there was never any bare reading in the synagogue, because there was always an exposition from the original (forgotten) language of Hebrew into the vernacular language of "Chaldee".[100]

Bathurst here was alluding to the Targumim, Aramaic paraphrases of scripture, which Christian scholars had long understood to have arisen from the need for a vernacular version of the Hebrew Bible after Hebrew ceased to be a universally-understood language, and which occupied an ambiguous place between exposition and paraphrase. This was common knowledge by the mid-seventeenth century, having been available in Latin since the early sixteenth century.[101] In contrast, Lightfoot's arguments for a public office of bare scripture-reading rested on a far more multifaceted

reconstruction of reading and preaching in the ancient Jewish synagogue, a reconstruction which (once again) he laid out in his *Horae*.

Here, Lightfoot emphasised that every synagogue had to have a public minister, who spoke publicly, looked after the reading of the Law, and occasionally preached when no one else was available. From Nathan ben Yehiel's *Arukh* Lightfoot argued that this office was known by the term *hazzan* or *sh'liaḥ tzibbur* (which Lightfoot translated as "supervisor" and "angel/messenger of the church"[102] respectively), because he supervised the public reading of scripture by selecting the men who were to read each Sabbath and correcting them if they read poorly.[103] This office was separate from the *meturgeman* (interpreter), whose job was to translate the scripture into the vernacular, and whose existence Lightfoot inferred from the Mishnah, the *Mishneh Torah*, and Masekhet Soferim.[104] Thus the existence of a semi-expository translation after the reading could not be used to impinge upon the duty of scripture reading for its own sake. And, in a turn that could be taken from the Assembly itself, Lightfoot next offered a strongly-worded argument for why this set-up had to be considered when studying the modern Christian church:

> Leniori certè susurro determinatum esset, de significatione vocis *Episcopi*, atque *Angeli Ecclesiae*, si ad proprios fontes fuisset recursum, & non inaniter disputatum de significatione vocum, nescio unde desumpta. Abrogatâ Templi Liturgiâ & cultu, utpote ceremoniali, cultum atque publicam Dei adorationem in Synagogis, quae quidem moralis erat, Deus in Ecclesiam transplantavit Christianam, publicum scilicet ministerium, orationes publicas, lectionem verbi divini, ac praedicationem, &c.[105]

> Certainly the meaning of the words *Supervisor* and *Angel* [messenger] *of the Church* would have been determined with less fuss if there had been a return to the actual sources, and the meaning of the words (taken from who knows where) wouldn't have been pointlessly debated. Once the liturgy and worship of the Temple, insofar as it was ceremonial, had been abrogated, God transplanted the worship and public adoration of God (the moral part, that is) from the Synagogues into the Christian Church – that is to say the public ministry, public speeches, reading of scripture, and preaching etc.

This could have served as a direct response to queries in the Assembly by men like Carter over whether the synagogue's reading-practices should serve as a model for Christianity.[106] And, as in the examples above, Lightfoot was surely thinking of the Assembly arguments in his opening reference to pointless disputing over the meaning of terms like *sh'liaḥ tzibbur*. Indeed, we can even deduce the moment in the Assembly at which such disputes would have occurred, when William Rayner demanded proof that reading was the pastor's office and Lightfoot responded that "the epistles sent to the 7 churches are directed to the Angels to Publish them", i.e. alluded to John being told to write to the "angels" (ἄγγελοι) of the seven Asian churches in Revelation 1-3.[107] This response might seem obscure, but using Lightfoot's analysis in the *Horae* we can make sense of it. Evidently, Lightfoot took Revelation's use of the term "angel of the church" as evidence that early Christian churches had adopted the Jewish office of the *sh'liaḥ tzibbur* as a ministerial supervisor of public scripture-reading, which *ipso facto* proved an office of public scripture-reading.

Once again, Lightfoot's argumentation did not render him unusual in the Assembly. Temple made a strikingly similar argument for the continued value of the synagogue's scripture-reading as Lightfoot would more than a decade later.[108] Gillespie

gave the same account of the synagogue's reader and the interpreter as Lightfoot, taking them from the sixteenth-century Hebraist Hugh Broughton.[109] The difference between Lightfoot and these men was not in the value they placed on the "argument from the practice of the Jewes" but in the depth of Lightfoot's knowledge in this field.[110] This made Lightfoot extremely valuable when he agreed with the presbyterian majority, but it also made him extremely dangerous when he did not, as is nowhere clearer than in the disproportionate time he, Selden, and Thomas Coleman took up in the debate over church-state relations.

All this is not to say, of course, that no other factors influenced the *Horae*, which were printed during a very different, albeit equally turbulent period in European history. One important break from Scaliger's interpretation of the Hellenists, for instance, was occasioned by the intensive debate over what constituted the authoritative text of the Old Testament, which saw an unprecedentedly systematic attempt to undercut the authority of the Masoretic text of the Hebrew Bible and replace it with the Septuagint. This attack was most concerning for Reformed scholars, who from the 1620s had increasingly viewed the integrity and authority of the Hebrew Bible as bulwarks for Protestant scriptural doctrines.[111] Claims for the Septuagint's antiquity and independence had reached their peak by the early 1660s, and it was within this context that Lightfoot decided (contrary to his earlier opinions) that the Hellenists would have continued to read the Hebrew Bible in their synagogues, despite being ignorant of Hebrew.[112] This revision was intended to make a newly powerful case against the authority of the Septuagint, which Lightfoot outlined in his 1664 *Horae* on 1 Corinthians, highlighting beforehand to friends that he had some interesting things to say about this matter.[113]

This case Lightfoot based on Masekhet Soferim's description of how Ptolemy II Philadelphus had engaged not one but *two* groups of Jewish elders to help him understand Judaism and its laws.[114] Through a close reading of Soferim Lightfoot

adduced that the first group of five elders had translated Moses into Greek, while the second group of 72 had made a transcription of the Hebrew text to protect against fraud in the five elders' work.[115] Thus, the original Septuagint was just a copy of the law in Hebrew (albeit with some deliberate changes), while the Greek translation known as the "Septuagint" was the work of the five elders supplemented by translations of the Sanhedrin, who recognised that it was only a matter of time before their scriptures were fully translated by curious princes and rulers.[116] Translating their own scriptures first gave them the chance to reduce offence and avoid showing too many "mysteries".[117] This latter "Septuagint" was kept by Jews in their synagogues to show gentiles; malevolent rulers occasionally forced them to use it in worship; and when writing for a heathen audience Jews cited from it; but nevertheless within their own communities it was spurned, never even cited by the Talmud.[118] The Hellenists would thus not have read this version in their synagogues, but instead would have followed Talmudic injunctions about the Hebrew Bible's pre-eminence.[119] Equally, the Septuagint was thus in no sense a reliable or independent witness to the Old Testament.[120]

This was an eccentric account, as Lightfoot himself recognised, and a departure from his earlier belief that the Septuagint was read in the Hellenists' synagogues.[121] But it was not just this departure that would have surprised his contemporaries: many of Lightfoot's moves were debateable, not least his reliance on the Masekhet Soferim, a minor Talmudic tractate which had been printed with the Talmud since the Bomberg Talmud of 1520-23, but was later and non-canonical.[122] These strange qualities do, however, illustrate one way in which the *Horae* addressed concerns which were only just emerging in the 1640s, but urgent by the 1660s. Furthermore, it should give relief to the complex and in some ways jarring picture of the *Horae* painted by this article so far. On the one hand, the *Horae* were a belated and backwards-looking work, still frustratedly concerned with the Assembly debates several decades earlier; on the other hand, they

were also firmly situated in their time, responding to pressing contemporary issues in strange and unpredictable ways. And yet, despite both their belatedness and their idiosyncrasy, they nevertheless still managed to be future-facing and *avant-garde* in their ambition and scope, set to remain influential for centuries to come, earning Lightfoot a place in the annals of biblical criticism as the 'effective founder' of a new genre of New Testament commentary.[123]

Conclusion

At the beginning of this article, I alluded to the fact that scholars no longer use the term "Christian Hebraism". Some of the reasons for this have become obvious even throughout this article, such as its latent equation of "Jewish" with "Hebrew", when several of the most important Jewish sources for early modern scholarship were written in Greek, and some of the most exciting developments in the study of ancient Judaism were focussed on polyglot diasporas. Perhaps the most salutary reason, however, is not so much what the term excludes as what it implies: that there was a distinct, clearly-definable phenomenon we can label as "Christian Hebraism"; a canon of scholars we can assign to this label; and an accompanying anthology of great works which, due to their specialism, remained sequestered from mainstream theology. To some extent, this is not wrong: to become a Lightfoot or a Selden undeniably required expertise beyond the reach of most European Christians, and canon-formation began even in early modernity with the production of great scholars' *Table Talk* and *opera omnia*.

Yet such an approach is also limiting. By the late sixteenth century, there was a vast array of information available in Latin and English about seminal Jewish thinkers like Maimonides, Rashi, and Abraham ibn Ezra, as well as seminal Jewish texts like the Talmud, the Septuagint, and the Targumim. To access these sources did not require the

learning of Lightfoot, and even scholars who spurned them with accusations of Judaising in some contexts often drew on them in other contexts, when it was convenient. In short, one problem with the term "Christian Hebraism" is that it suggests a phenomenon too discrete and self-contained, when by the 1640s (and indeed much earlier) the type of knowledge captured by this label was widely disseminated throughout early modern intellectual culture. Moreover, this was not a trend limited to the godly end of the Protestant spectrum: as Polly Ha has shown in this special issue, avant-garde conformists felt as much pressure to make their arguments from Jewish practice, backed by great medieval rabbis like Maimonides or Abraham ibn Ezra.[124]

This is not to say that such knowledge resulted in better conditions for or relations with contemporary Jews: the opposite could just as easily be the case.[125] Rather, it is to say that the appropriation and assimilation of Jewish texts, sources, and authors into Christian scholarship and debate was a mainstream occurrence. In this respect, this article's vision of the Westminster Assembly as deeply concerned with the state of Second Temple Judaism should be unsurprising. Indeed, as suggested above, we may even say that the Westminster Assembly was an apotheosis of confessionalised erudition in early modern England, during which theological resonances that had previously remained under the surface of historical scholarship were pressed out in an unprecedently unambiguous fashion. The second reorientation of the Westminster Assembly suggested by this article is perhaps more surprising: that this intense exercise of unusually explicit, overtly confessionalised scholarship itself triggered the production of some of the most ambitious critical endeavours of the seventeenth century. Nevertheless, with these reorientations, the two visions of Lightfoot that have hitherto attracted quite separate historiographies – the Lightfoot of the Assembly, famous among historians of the long Reformation and the Lightfoot of the *Horae*, famous among historians of scholarship – finally come together as two sides of the same figure.

* I would like to thank Polly Ha and Anastasia Stylianou for inviting me to contribute to this special issue, and Jason Rosenblatt and Chad Van Dixhoorn for feedback on a first draft. I would like to offer special thanks to Chad Van Dixhoorn for sending me his draft edition of Lightfoot's journal, without which I could not have completed this article in time. Van Dixhoorn's edition is forthcoming with Oxford University Press.

[1] John Strype, "The Preface Relating to the Author", in *The Whole Works of the Rev. John Lightfoot, D.D.*, ed. John Rogers Pitman (London, 1825) 1:149.

[2] Chad Van Dixhoorn, "The Westminster Assembly and the Reformation of the 1640s," in *The Oxford History of Anglicanism*, vol. 1, *Reformation and Identity c.1520-1662*, ed. Anthony Milton (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), 430-42, and Anthony Milton*, England's Second Reformation: The Battle for the Church of England 1625–1662* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2021), 223-42, 251-60; Chad Van Dixhoorn, 'Westminster assembly (act. 1643–1652)', in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, accessed March 16, 2022, https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/92780.

[3] Chad Van Dixhoorn and David F. Wright, eds., *The Minutes and Papers of the Westminster Assembly,* 5 vols. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), henceforth *MPWA*, followed by volume number, session number, date, and page number.

[4] Weldon Crowley, "Erastianism in the Westminster Assembly," *Journal of Church and State* 15, no. 1 (1973): 49-69; Frank Manuel, "Christendom's Rediscovery of Judaism," *Bulletin of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences* 40, no. 7 (1987): 15-32; J. P. Somerville, "Hobbes, Selden, Erastianism, and the history of the Jews," in *Hobbes and History*, ed. G. A. John Rogers and Thomas Sorell (London: Routledge, 2000), 159-87; François Laplanche, "Christian Erudition in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries and the Hebrew State", *Hebraic Political Studies* 3, no. 1 (2008): 5–18; Eric Nelson, *The Hebrew Republic: Jewish Sources and the Transformation of European Political Thought* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2010), 112-28; Eric Nelson, "From Selden to Mendelssohn: Hebraism and Religious Freedom," in *Freedom and the Construction of Europe*, vol. 1, *Religious Freedom and Civil Liberty*, ed. Quentin Skinner and Martin van Gelderen (Cambridge:

Cambridge University Press, 2013), 94-114; Charles Prior, "Hebraism and the Problem of Church and State in England, 1642-1660," *The Seventeenth Century* 28, no. 1 (2013): 37-61.

[5] Anthony Grafton, "'Pandects of the Jews': A French, Swiss, and Italian Prelude to John Selden," in *Jewish Books and their Readers: Aspects of the Intellectual Life of Christians and Jews in Early Modern Europe*, ed. Scott Mandelbrote and Joanna Weinberg (Leiden: Brill, 2016), 169-90, at 171-2; Anthony Grafton, "Christianity's Jewish Origins Rediscovered: The Roles of Comparison in Early Modern Ecclesiastical Scholarship," *Erudition and the Republic of Letters* 1 (2016): 13-42, at 17-18.

[6] *MPWA*, vol. 4, session 614, April 3rd 1646, 46.

[7] *MPWA*, vol. 4, session 617, April 8th 1646, 51.

[8] *MPWA*, vol. 2, session 114, December 13th 1643, 449; see the same session in Lightfoot's journal, in Cambridge, Cambridge University Library (henceforth CUL), MS CUL Dd.xiv.21, fol. 61v; *MPWA*, vol. 3, session 303, October 14th 1644, 394.

[9] Theodor Dunkelgrün, "The Christian Study of Judaism in Early Modern Europe", in *The Cambridge History of Judaism*, vol. 7, *The Early Modern World*, *1500–1815*, ed. Jonathan Karp and Adam Sutcliffe (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018), 316-48.

[10] *MPWA*, vol. 2, session 114, December 13th 1643, 449.

[11] *MPWA*, vol. 2, session 114, December 13th 1643, 449.

[12] *MPWA*, vol. 4, session 614, April 3rd 1646, 47.

[13] As is perhaps clearest in his *Aarons rod blossoming, or, The divine ordinance of church-government vindicated* (London, 1646), in which chapter 1 argues that the Jewish "church" is irrelevant to the Christian, while the next eight chapters offer a detailed reconstruction of it to show that it nevertheless supports his position.

[14] Chad Van Dixhoorn, "New Taxonomies of the Westminster Assembly (1643-52): The Creedal Controversy as Case Study," *Reformation & Renaissance Review* 6, no. 1 (2004): 82-106; Chad Van Dixhoorn, "Politics and Religion in the Westminster Assembly and the 'Grand Debate'," in *Insular Christianity: Alternative Models of the Church in Britain and Ireland, c.15700-c.1700*, ed. Tadhg Ó hAnnracháin and Robert Armstrong (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2013), 129-45.

[15] For critiques of the term, see Anthony Grafton, "Christian Hebraism and the Rediscovery of Hellenistic Judaism," in *Jewish Culture in Early Modern Europe: Essays in Honor of David B. Ruderman*, ed. Richard I. Cohen, Natalie B. Dohrmann, Adam Shear, and Elchanan Reiner (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College, 2014), 169-80, at 169–70, 177; Scott Mandelbrote and Joanna Weinberg, introduction to Mandelbrote and Weinberg, *Jewish Books and their Readers*, 1–7; Dunkelgrün, "Christian Study of Judaism", 344–46.

[16] Grafton, 'Christianity's Jewish Origins," 16-17; William Horbury, "The New Testament and Rabbinic Study—An Historical Sketch," in *The New Testament and Rabbinic Literature*, ed. Reimund Bieringer, Florentino García Martínez, Didier Pollefeyt, and Peter Tomson (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 1-40, at 22-27.

[17] Jason Rosenblatt*, John Selden: Scholar, Statesman, Advocate for Milton's Muse* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2021), 227.

[18] On the most confusing sect, the Essenes, see Jan Machielsen, "What's in a Name? Essenes, *Therapeutae*, and Monks in the Christian Imagination, c.1500-1700," in *The Worlds of Knowledge and the Classical Tradition in the Early Modern Age: Comparative Approaches*, ed. Dmitri Levitin and Ian Maclean (Leiden: Brill, 2021), 277-335.

[19] Desiderius Erasmus, *In novvum testamentum annotationes* (Basel, 1527), 276.

[20] Theodore Beza, *Iesu Christi D.N. Novum Testamentum, sive novum foedus* (Geneva, 1582), 431.

[21] Anthony Grafton, "Joseph Scaliger et l'histoire du judaïsme hellénistique," in *La République des lettres et l'histoire du judaïsme antique: XVIe–XVIIIe siècles*, ed. Chantal Grell and François Laplanche (Paris: Presses de l'Université de Paris-Sorbonne, 1992), 51–63; Anthony Grafton, Joseph Scaliger: *A Study in the History of Classical Scholarship*, vol. 2, *Historical Chronology* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), 415-19; Grafton, "Christian Hebraism," 170-77.

[22] Nicholas Hardy, *Criticism and Confession: The Bible in the Seventeenth-Century Republic of Letters* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), 184-88.

[23] Theodore Beza, *Annotationes maiores in nouum Dn. Nostri Iesu Christi testamentum* (Geneva: 1594) 1:476-7.

[24] Johannes Drusius, *Annotationum in totum Iesu Christi testamentum, sive praeteritorum libri decem* (Franeker, 1612), 166-7, also 175, 177; Daniel Heinsius, *Aristarchus sacer, sive ad Nonni in Iohannem Metaphrasin exercitationes* (Leiden, 1627), sig. ***4v, ****7v-*******6r. On Heinsius, see Dirk van Miert, *The Emancipation of Biblical Philology in the Dutch Republic 1590-1670* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018), 104-32.

[25] Daniel Heinsius, *Exercitationes sacrae ad novvum testamentum* (Leiden, 1639); see Dirk van Miert, "The Janus Face of Scaliger's Philological Heritage: The Biblical Annotations of Heinsius and Grotius," in *Scriptural Authority and Biblical Criticism in the Dutch Golden Age*, ed. Dirk van Miert, Henk Nellen, Piet Steenbakkers, and Jetze Touber (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017) 91-108; Scott Mandelbrote, "Origen against Jerome in Early Modern Europe," in *Patristic Tradition and Intellectual Paradigms in the Seventeenth Century*, ed. S.-P. Bergjan and K. Pollman (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 105-35; Henk Jan de Jonge, 'The Study of the New Testament in the Dutch Universities, 1575-1700', in *History of the Universities*, vol 1, *Continuity and Change in Early Modern Universities* ed. C. Schmitt (Amersham: Avebury, 1981), 113-31.

[26] Claudius Salmasius, *De modo usurarum liber* (Leiden, 1639), sig. **7r-v. On Salmasius see John Considine, "Claudius Salmasius and the Deadness of Neo-Latin," in *Acta conventus neo-latini upsaliensis: proceedings of the fourteenth International Congress of Neo-Latin Studies* (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 296-302.

[27] Salmasius, *De modo usurarum liber*, sig. ***2v-3v. Heinsius believed the Hellenists knew Hebrew "less perfectly" than Greek, see anon [Heinsius], *Exercitatio prima de Hellenistis & lingua hellenistica* (Utrecht, 1641), 8.

[28] Claudius Salmasius, *De hellenistica commentarius* (Leiden, 1643), 21, 28.

[29] Salmasius, *De hellenistica commentarius*, 27, 175, 183-5, 233-9.

[30] Salmasius, *De hellenistica commentarius*, 189-90 210-18, 230.

[31] For earlier arguments over the nature of first-century Jerusalem and its significance for contemporary ecclesiology, see Polly Ha, *English Presbyterianism, 1590-1640* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2011), 59-96.

[32] Session 165, March 1st 1644 in MS CUL Dd.xiv.22, 202.

[33] Session 160, February 22nd 1644 in MS CUL Dd.xiv.22, 150-1.

[34] Session 164, February 29th 1644 in MS CUL Dd.xiv.22, 188.

[35] Session 160, February 22nd 1644 in MS CUL Dd.xiv.22, 152.

[36] Session 164, February 29th 1644 in MS CUL Dd.xiv.22, 191-2; *MPWA*, vol. 2, session 164, February 29th 1644, 562.

[37] From BT Sanhedrin 17b. *MPWA*, vol. 2, session 164, February 29th 1644, 562-3; see the same session in MS CUL Dd.xiv.22, 191-2.

[38] Session 164, February 29th 1644 in MS CUL Dd.xiv.22, 189-90.

[39] *MPWA*, vol. 2, session 164, February 29th 1644, 561; see the same session in MS CUL Dd.xiv.22, 190.

[40] *MPWA*, vol. 2, session 164, February 29th 1644, 561; see the same session in MS CUL Dd.xiv.22, 190-1.

[41] MS CUL Dd.xiv.23, 277.

[42] John Lightfoot, *A Commentary Upon the Acts of the Apostles* (London, 1645), 99, 172.

[43] Lightfoot, *Acts*, 44-5.

[44] Lightfoot, *Acts*, 45.

[45] Lightfoot, *Acts*, 46.

[46] E.g. Lightfoot, *Acts*, 25-8, 38-41, 44, 50-51,70-72, 101-2, 236-8.

[47] *MPWA*, vol. 2, session 116, December 15th 1643, 463.

[48] *MPWA*, vol. 2, session 116, December 15th 1643, 466; see also session 119, December 20th 1644, 486 and the same session in MS CUL Dd.xiv.21, fol. 67v.

[49] *MPWA*, vol. 2, session 116, December 15th 1643, 463, 467, and the same session in MS CUL Dd.xiv.21, fol. 63v.

[50] Session 120, December 21st 1643 in MS CUL Dd.xiv.21, fol. 69r.

[51] *MPWA*, vol. 2, session 160, February 22nd 1644, 539.

[52] Using Acts 5:11-14. *MPWA*, vol. 2, session 161, February 23rd 1644, 540, see the same session in MS CUL Dd.xiv.22, 161-2.

[53] *MPWA*, vol. 2, session 161, February 23rd 1644, 540-2; and the same session MS CUL Dd.xiv.22, 162-4.

[54] Session 161, February 23rd 1644 in MS CUL Dd.xiv.22, 167-8.

[55] *MPWA*, vol. 2, session 161, February 23rd 1644, 544-5, and the same session in MS CUL Dd.xiv.22, 167-8. Vines' comment drew on a common Christian interpretation of Daniel 9:24-27 that viewed Judaism as valid until the siege of Jerusalem/destruction of the Second Temple.

[56] *MPWA*, vol. 2, session 161, February 23rd 1644, 544-7.

[57] Grafton, 'Christianity's Jewish Origins," 13-42.

[58] *MPWA*, vol. 2, session 162, February 23rd 1644, 551, see the same session in MS CUL Dd.xiv.22, 175-6. See also Machielsen, "What's in a Name?".

[59] JT Megillah 3:1 73d; Maimonides, Mishneh Torah, Tefilah and Birkat Kohanim, 8:5, 11:1. *MPWA*, vol. 2, session 162, February 23rd 1644, 551-2, see the same session in MS CUL Dd.xiv.22, 176-7.

[60] Session 162, February 23rd 1644 in MS CUL Dd.xiv.22, 176. The Hellenists' identity also re-emerged in this debate, see session 161, February 23rd 1644 in MS CUL Dd.xiv.22, 167.

[61] Session 256, July 11th 1644 in MS CUL Dd.xiv.23, 108.

[62] Kirsten Macfarlane, "Why did Henry Dunster Reject Infant Baptism? Circumcision and the Covenant of Grace in the Seventeenth-Century Transatlantic Reformed Community," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 72, no. 2 (2021): 323-51.

[63] *MPWA*, vol. 3, session 256, July 11th 1644, 198-201, see the same in MS CUL Dd.xiv.23, 108-111. See likewise the arguments over dipping, *MPWA*, vol. 3, sessions 262-3, August 7th-8th 1644, 215-21 and the same in MS CUL Dd.xiv.23, 113-19.

[64] *MPWA*, vol. 2, session 158, February 20th 1644, 520-2; see the same in MS CUL Dd.xiv.22, 135-8. See William Horbury, "The Hebrew Matthew and Hebrew Study", in *Hebrew Study from Ezra to Ben-Yehuda*, ed. William Horbury (T&T Clark: Edinburgh, 1999), 122-34.

[65] Hardy, *Criticism and Confession,* 1-17; Jean-Louis Quantin, 'Reason and Reasonableness in French Ecclesiastical Scholarship', *Huntingdon Library Quarterly* 74 (2011): 401–36; Dmitri Levitin, 'John Spencer's De Legibus Hebraeorum (1683–85) and "Enlightened" Sacred History: A New

Interpretation', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 76 (2013): 49–92; see also the essays in Nicholas Hardy and Dmitri Levitin, eds., *Confessionalisation and Erudition in Early Modern Europe: An Episode in the History of the Humanities* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019).

[66] Rosenblatt, *John Selden*, 169-74; G. J. Toomer, *John Selden: A Life in Scholarship* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 1:260, 2:629. Haivry points out Selden held same outlook throughout his career, although suggests that the Assembly acted as a catalyst, Ofir Haivry, *John Selden and the Western Political Tradition* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017), 397-405.

[67] Christian Schoettgen, *Horae Hebraicae et Talmudicae in universum Novum Testamentum* (Dresden 1733), 1: sig. (a)3r.

[68] William Horbury, "Keeping up with Recent Studies: V. Rabbinics," *The Expository Times* 91 (1980): 233-40, at 240; Bruce Chilton, "Jesus Within Judaism," in *Judaism in Late Antiquity*, vol. 2, *Historical Syntheses*, ed. Jacob Neusner (Leiden: Brill, 1994), 262-84, at 262.

[69] *MPWA*, vol. 4, session 614, April 3rd 1646, 42-7.

[70] Session 85, October 31st 1643 in MS CUL Dd.xiv.21, fol. 19r-v. For the decision against Lightfoot, see *MPWA*, vol. 5, 167.

[71] John Lightfoot, *In evangelium sancti Matthaei horae Hebraicae et Talmudicae* (Cambridge, 1658), 198-203, 216-217.

[72] Lightfoot, *Horae Hebraicae* [*Matthew*], 201-2.

[73] John Lightfoot, *Horae Hebraicae et Talmudicae impensae in evangelium S. Johannis* (London, 1671), 121.

[74] Lightfoot, *Horae Hebraicae [John]*, 122.

[75] Lightfoot, *Horae Hebraicae et Talmudica impensae in Acta Apostolorum, et in partem aliquam epistolae S. Pauli ad Romanos* (Paris, 1679), 48-9. The date of first publication is disputed: there are attestations to a 1678 London edition, but I have not found a copy earlier than 1679.

[76] BT Bava Kamma 82b-83a; BT Sotah 49a. Lightfoot, *Horae Hebraicae [Acts]*, 49-50.

[77] Lightfoot, *Horae Hebraicae [Acts]*, 50.

[78] JT Sotah 29a. Lightfoot, *Horae Hebraicae [Acts]*, 51. Grotius alluded to this passage but did not explore its ramifications in Hugo Grotius, *Annotationum in novvum testamentum tomus secundus* (Paris, 1646), 27.

[79] Lightfoot, *Horae Hebraicae [Acts]*, 51.

[80] Lightfoot, *Horae Hebraicae [Acts]*, 50-1.

[81] Lightfoot, *Horae Hebraicae [Acts]*, 46.

[82] Bereshit Rabbah, *Lech Lecha*, par. 42.8, to Genesis 14:13, see H. Freedman and Maurice Simon, eds., *Midrash Rabbah* (London: Soncino Press 1939) 1:350.

[83] Lightfoot, *Horae Hebraicae [Acts]*, 46-8. Lightfoot's sources included Rashi on BT Megillah 8b, where he noted that Assyrian was the holy language, and Nathan ben Yehiel's dictionary of Talmudic words *Arukh*, which was available in multiple early modern editions and dispersed through works such as Elijah Levita's *Meturgeman* (Isny, 1541).

[84] Lightfoot, *Horae Hebraicae [Acts]*, 52.

[85] Lightfoot, *Horae Hebraicae [Acts]*, 48.

[86] E.g., just in the *Horae* on Matthew, Lightfoot devoted discursions to the existence of a Hebrew Matthew (Lightfoot, *Horae Hebraicae* [*Matthew*], 12-17); Jewish practices of baptism (40-51); Jewish sects (51-60); and the constitution of the synagogues (70-77).

[87] *MPWA*, vol. 2, session 87, November 2nd 1643, 265, see the same session in MS CUL Dd.xiv.21, fol. 21v. For an overview of the debate, see Chad Van Dixhoorn, *God's Ambassadors: The Westminster Assembly and the Reformation of the English Pulpit, 1643-1653* (Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage, 2017), chapter 5.

[88] *MPWA*, vol. 2, session 88, November 3rd 1643, 271-2, see the same session in MS CUL Dd.xiv.21, fol. 23v.

[89] *MPWA*, vol. 2, session 88, November 3rd 1643, 272, see the same session in MS CUL Dd.xiv.21, fol. 23v.

[90] John Lightfoot, *The Harmony of the Foure Evangelists…The First Part* (London, 1644), 21-31. Lightfoot could have found these courses in Maimonides, Mishneh Torah, Tefilah and Birkat Kohanim, 12:1-2. The *parashiyot* were printed in Hebrew Bibles including the Bomberg Rabbinic

Bibles, and a list of *parashiyot* and *haftarot* was given in full in an appendix to Plantin's 1566 reprinting of the Bomberg Bible.

[91] John Lightfoot, *Horae Hebraicae et Talmudicae, impensae in Evangelium S. Lucae* (London, 1674), 82, citing sources such as Rashi on BT Shabbat 115a to affirm the preference of the Law over the Prophets and the Prophets over the Ketuvim.

[92] Lightfoot, *Horae Hebraicae [Luke]*, 82; Rashi on BT Kiddushin 76b.

[93] Lightfoot, *Horae Hebraicae [Luke]*, 82, citing Piskei ha-Rosh on Megillah, although the material in BT Megillah 23a could have prompted the same thought.

[94] See Masekhet Soferim 12:7; Lightfoot, *Horae Hebraicae [Luke]*, 82-3.

[95] Lightfoot, *Horae Hebraicae [Luke]*, 84-5.

[96] On this see Theodor Dunkelgrün, "Tabernacles of Text: A Brief Visual History of the Hebrew Bible," in *Impagination – Layout and Materiality of Writing and Publication*, ed. Ku-ming (Kevin) Chang, Anthony Grafton and Glenn W. Most (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2021), 47-92, at 86.

[97] Lightfoot, *Horae Hebraicae [Luke]*, 85-6.

[98] Lightfoot, *Horae Hebraicae [Luke]*, 85-6. On skipping verses being permitted for the Prophets reading but not the Law, see Masekhet Soferim 11:2.

[99] *MPWA*, vol. 2, session 87, November 2nd 1643, 265-6, see the same session in MS CUL Dd.xiv.21, fol. 21v-22v.

[100] Session 88, November 3rd 1643 in MS CUL Dd.xiv.21, fol. 24r.

[101] See, for instance, the clear account in Elijah Levita, *Meturgeman: Lexicon Chaldaicum* (Isny, 1541), sig. A2r-5v, 1v-2v.

[102] Lightfoot translates *sh'liaḥ* with the Latin "angelus" and glosses it as "publicus minister". "Angelus" can mean "messenger" (a more literal translation of *sh'liaḥ*) or "angel", just like the word ἄγγελος in Revelation 1-3 discussed below.

[103] Lightfoot, *Horae Hebraicae* [*Matthew*], 70-1. Lightfoot is slightly off here, as strictly speaking the *sh'liaḥ tzibbur* is the cantor, or leader of prayers.

[104] Mishnah Megillah 4:4; Maimonides, Mishneh Torah, Tefilah and Birkat Kohanim, 12; Masekhet Soferim 11:1; Lightfoot, *Horae Hebraicae* [*Matthew*], 72-3, 75.

[105] Lightfoot, *Horae Hebraicae* [*Matthew*], 71.

[106] *MPWA*, vol. 2, session 90, November 7th 1643, 282.

[107] Session 88, November 3rd 1643 in MS CUL Dd.xiv.21, fol. 24v.

[108] *MPWA*, vol. 2, session 90, November 7th 1643, 282.

[109] *MPWA*, vol. 3, session 238, June 13th 1644, 140.

[110] *MPWA*, vol. 2, session 90, November 7th 1643, 282.

[111] Timothy Twining, "The Early Modern Debate over the Age of the Hebrew Vowel Points: Biblical Criticism and Hebrew Scholarship in the Confessional Republic of Letters", *Journal of the History of Ideas* 81 (2020): 337–58. See also Scott Mandelbrote, "The Old Testament and its Ancient Versions in Manuscript and Print in the West, from c. 1480 to c. 1780", in *The New Cambridge History of the Bible*, vol. 3, *From 1450 to 1750*, ed. Euan Cameron (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016), 82-109.

[112] Scott Mandelbrote, "Isaac Vossius and the Septuagint," in *Isaac Vossius (1618-1689) between Science and Scholarship*, ed. Eric Jorink and Dirk van Miert (Leiden: Brill 2012), 85-117. For an overview of early modern Septuagint scholarship see Scott Mandelbrote, "The History of Septuagint Studies: Early Modern Western Europe," in *The Oxford Handbook of the Septuagint*, ed. Alison Salvesen and Timothy Law (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2021), 33-51.

[113] See Lightfoot to Buxtorf II, February 1663/4, Basel, Universitätsbibliothek Basel GI 62, no. 11. Lightfoot, *Horae Hebraicae et Talmudicae impensae in epistolam primam S. Pauli ad Corinthios* (Cambridge, 1664), 123-51. Lightfoot made the same point in his *Horae Hebraicae [Acts]*, 105-6.

[114] See Masekhet Soferim 1:7-8 and parallel accounts in BT Megillah 9a-b.

[115] Lightfoot, *Horae Hebraicae [1 Corinthians]*, 139-41, 147, although Lightfoot thought both sets of elders did change the Hebrew, see 139, 148-9. For the legend of the Septuagint's creation, see Scott Mandelbrote, "The Letter of *Aristeas*: Three Phases in the Readership of a Jewish Text," in Mandelbrote and Weinberg, *Jewish Books and their Readers*, 15-44.

[116] Lightfoot, *Horae Hebraicae [1 Corinthians]*, 147-8, on the changes see 139-41.

[117] Lightfoot, *Horae Hebraicae [1 Corinthians]*, 148-9.

[118] Lightfoot, *Horae Hebraicae [1 Corinthians]*, 149-51, 141-5.

[119] Lightfoot, *Horae Hebraicae [1 Corinthians]*, 133-7; countering objections at 145-6.

[120] Lightfoot, *Horae Hebraicae [1 Corinthians]*, 149.

[121] Lightfoot, *Horae Hebraicae [1 Corinthians]*, 151. A study of the reception of Lightfoot's strange ideas about the Hellenists is another major desideratum: at least one reader, Humphrey Hody, took them seriously but was nevertheless unimpressed, calling them the result of a 'manifest error'. See Hody, *De Bibliorum textibus originalibus, versionibus graecis, & latina vulgata: libri IV* (Oxford, 1705), III.i:224.

[122] Marvin Heller, *Printing the Talmud* (Leiden: Brill, 2019), 302-3; Debra Reed Blank, "It's Time to Take Another Look at 'Our Little Sister' Soferim: A Bibliographic Essay," *Jewish Quarterly Review* 90, nos 1-2 (1999): 1-26.

[123] William Horbury, "The New Testament and Rabbinic Study: An Historical Sketch", in *The New Testament and Rabbinic Literature*, ed. Reimund Bieringer, F. García Martínez, D. Pollefeyt, and P. J. Tomson (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 22; Stephen Neill and N. T. Wright, *The interpretation of the New Testament, 1861-1986* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988), 312-5.

[124] **Cross reference.**

[125] E.g. see treatment of Jacob Barnet by Oxford scholars, Anthony Grafton and Joanna Weinberg, *"I have always loved the Holy Tongue": Isaac Casaubon, the Jews, and a Forgotten Chapter in Renaissance* Scholarship (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2011), 253-67.