

JOHN LIGHTFOOT AND HIS RELATION
TO RABBINIC LORE.

A Thesis

Presented to the Faculty of the
Hebrew Union College

By

Myron M. Meyerovitz.

Cincinnati, Ohio

February 1921.



II

DEDICATED
IN LOVE
TO
DELLA FINKELSTEIN

mic. 5/79

III

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Bibliography	<u>IV.</u>
List Of Abbreviations	<u>VI</u>
Preface	<u>IX</u>
Chapter I	
England at the time of John Lightfoot. The Puritans and the Jews.	1.
Chapter II	
Christian Scholars and the Study of Hebrew.	70.
Chapter III	
John Lightfoot: His Life And Works.	23.
Chapter IV	
John Lightfoot: His Horae Hebraicae. 2. Was Lightfoot Anti-Talmud?	35.
Chapter V	
Lightfoot's Influence: Did his work influence others? 2. Did he materially aid the study of Hebrew among Christians?	52.

IV
BIBLIOGRAPHY

- 1 Cambridge History of English Literature, The, Cambridge, 1911.
- 2 Carpzov, Horae Hebraicae et Talmudicae, Lipsiae, 1675
- 3 Cyclopedia of Biblical, Theological and Ecclesiastical Literature,
New York, 1873.
- 4 Dictionary of National Biography, Vols. VI, XXIII, MacMillan, 1893.
- 5 Encyclopedia Britannica, Vols. XIII, XVI, XXIII, Cambridge, 1911.
- 6 Gandell, Horae Hebraicae et Talmudicae, 4 vols. Oxford, 1859.
- 7 Graetz, History of the Jews, Vols. IV, V, Philadelphia, 1891.
- 8 Hamburger, Real Encyclopädie des Judenthum, Liepzig, 1896.
- 9 Hastings, Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, Vol. X, Scribners, 1918
- 10 Hauck - Real-Encyclopädie, Vol. XIV, Liepzig, 1902
- 11 Jewish Encyclopedia, Vols. III, IV, X, V, VI, VIII, Funk & Wagnalls, 1904
- 12 Jewish Quarterly Review, Vol. XII, London, 1900.
- 13 Johnson's Universal Encyclopedia, Vols. III and V, New York, 1898
- 14 Karpels, Gustav, Jewish Literature and other Essays, Philadelphia, 1895.
- 15 Kitto - Biblical Cyclopedia, Vol. II, Philadelphia, 1866.
- 16 Lazare, Bernard, Antisemitism, New York, 1903
- 17 Leusden, Works of John Lightfoot, Vol. II, Franeker, 1699.
- 18 Margoliouth, Moses, The History of the Jews in Great Britain, 3 Vols.,
London, 1851.
- 19 Monroe, Paul, Cyclopedia of Education, Vol. IV. New York, 1913.
- 20 Nork, F. Rabbinische Quellen und Parallelen zu neutestamentlichen
Schriftstellen mit Benutzung der Schriften von Lightfoot, Wetstein,
Meuschen, Schottgen, Danz, Liepzig, 1839.
- 21 Pick, B., The Talmud - What it is and what it knows about Jesus and his
followers, New York, 1892.
- 22 Schaff - Herzog, Encyclopedia of Religions knowledge, the new, Vol. VI,
Funk & Wagnalls, 1910.
- 23 Schächter, Solomon, Studies in Judaism, Second Series, Philadelphia, 1908

V
BIBLIOGRAPHY (CONCLUDED)

- 24 Schürer, The Jewish People in the time of Jesus Christ, 5 Vols.
Giessen, 1885.
- 25 Sokolow, Nahum, History of Zionism, Vol. I, London, 1919.
- 26 Steinschneider, Jewish Literature, London, 1857.
- 27 Welton, D. M., John Lightfoot, the English Hebraist, Liepzig, 1878.
- 28 Wünsche, Aug., Neue Beiträge zur Erläuterung der Evangelien aus Tal-
mud und Midrash, Goettingen, 1878.

ABBREVIATIONS

- 1 Britannica -- Encyclopedia Britannica
- 2 D N B -- Dictionary of National Biography
- 3 G -- Graetz - History of the Jews
- 4 H H C -- Horae Hebraicae, edition Carpzov
- 5 H H G -- " " " Gandell
- 6 H H L -- " " " Leusden
- 7 J E -- Jewish Encyclopedia
- 8 J Q R -- Jewish Quarterly Review
- 9 Kitto -- Kitto Biblical Cyclopedia
- 10 Lazare -- Lazare, Bernard - Anti-semitism
- 11 Morley -- Morley, John - Oliver Cromwell
- 12 N S -- Sokolow, N. - History of Zionism
- 13 Welton -- Welton, D.M. - John Lightfoot, the English Hebraist

AN HISTORICAL PRESENTATION

OF

A GREAT HISTORICAL PERSONAGE

PREFACE

IX

The difficulty of handling an historical subject. Material on John Lightfoot meagre. Only one essay, to the writer's knowledge, has been written on the subject. Gandell's edition in English used for purpose of convenience.

The method of approach in an historical subject is two-fold: viz., (1) getting facts, and (2) interpreting these facts in the light of the Philosophy of History.¹ The main problem which confronts the writer of an historical theme is to get at the sources. Once he has made himself sure of the authenticity and reliability of his facts, he has a clear road ahead of him. Very often, however, the sources are written in a language foreign to the research worker, and as a result he must rely upon translations. Herein lies another difficulty. Unfortunately, some of our most famous historical works have been translated by mediocre scholars, who have either misquoted the facts, or have been so deficient in language as to be unable to express clearly the meaning of the author's words. A typical well known case is that of the translation into English of Heinrich Graetz's, *Geschichte der Juden*.² (While I have carefully weighed the facts in this thesis, I have been compelled at times to use second hand sources. These I have indicated in the foot-notes.)

1 By the Philosophy of History we mean the psychological tendencies of historical events of Dr. Deutsch, *Philosophy of History*, Pages 1 - 7.

2 These mistakes have been noted by Dr. Gotthard Deutsch in an article in the *Hebrew College Monthly* of February 1918, called "My Graetz". (Vol. IV, No. 5 Pages 135 - 144)

The method of interpreting facts depends on our viewpoint, whether we look upon the events or movements as isolated facts, or whether we interpret them as showing the tendencies of the particular period in which they took place. For instance, the Mortara case of 1858¹ may be merely an isolated fact in Jewish History showing the restrictions and inequalities of the Jews, or may show the method that Pope Pius IX used in order to bring about the realization of a "Catholized" world, or likewise the incident may evidence that the reaction to the affair, which led to the formation of the Alliance Isrealite Universelle, aroused protest on the part of the world and resulted in awakening feelings of sympathy and consideration for the Jew, as witness the election of Lionel Rothschild to a seat in the House of Commons of England.²

Then again we are apt to rationalize too much in interpreting our facts, which is often very hazardous. "A little bit of knowledge is a dangerous thing", runs the common proverb. Unless we are fully grounded on the facts, we dare not rationalize for this leads us to wild conjecture and strange hypotheses.

In handling the subject of "John Lightfoot and his relation to Rabbinic Lore", I have been greatly handicapped by the dearth of first hand material. There is sufficient biographic material, but as far as I know, only one essay has been written on the appreciation of the

¹ A case of forcible abduction in which a child named Edgar Mortara was violently removed from the custody of his parents by papal guards in Bologna on June 23, 1858, of JE Vol. VIII.

² The struggle of the Jews for civic recognition in England culminated in 1858 when Rothschild gained a seat in the House of Commons by accepting the "Chiltern Hundred" and omitting the oath "On the faith of a Christian".

man and his work.¹

In order therefore, to be able to interpret the work and influence of this great divine, I have made myself acquainted with conditions of his time: namely, the historical movements and tendencies of the seventeenth century.

I did not deem it necessary to read the entire works of Lightfoot, since I have limited myself to his relation to the Talmud and other Rabbinical Literature. Nor do I think it necessary to read the *Horae Hebraicae* in the original Latin only.² For the sake of convenience and expediency, I have used in my study of the subject, the best available translation of the *Horae*, that of the Reverend Robert Gandell,³ now and then making comparisons with Carpzov and Leusden editions.⁴ Gandell was very careful in his translation, for he made use of the Leusden and English folio editions in his work. All reference in the *Horae Hebraicae*, unless otherwise specified, will be made according to Gandell's edition.

Being an historical presentation of the subject, I have not laid any particular stress upon the exegetical, theological phase of Lightfoot's work. These will be mentioned indirectly and in their proper place

1 D. M. Welton wrote his essay on John Lightfoot, the English Hebraist, to obtain the doctorate of Philosophy at the University of Leipzig in 1878. The work shows only a fair knowledge of the subject, but evidences a warm appreciation for the noted English Hebraist.

2 One of the best Latin editions is Leusden's edition. Leusden was an eminent Oriental and classical scholar, born at Utrecht April 26, 1624; was made Professor of Hebrew in Utrecht University; edited many learned works, and died September 30th, 1669. cf Chap. IV Page 35 this thesis.

3 Rev. Robert Gandell, M.A., was assistant tutor of Magdalene Hall and Late Michel Fellow of Queens College, Oxford. He published *Franda* of the *Horae Hebraicae* in four volumes at the University Press in 1859. cf. pages

4. Vide Chap. IV pages 35, 41, etc.

XII

order. My main interest is to show the reader in what wise this Christian Hebraist made use of his profound and astounding knowledge of the Talmud and other Rabbinic literature.

I am greatly indebted to my teacher and advisor, Doctor Gotthard Deutsch, who suggested this thesis, and through whose advice and counsel the presentation of the subject was made possible. I am also indebted to Doctor Louis Grossmann for his copy of Welton's pamphlet, which has been a great help to me.

I have made an honest and modest attempt on this thesis. It will call forth criticism. I expect it, for I can not say:

גבול לא רבא אמר כפיתא, לא תוכיחו עלי' ז'

CHAPTER I

ENGLAND AT THE TIME
OF
JOHN LIGHTFOOT

The struggle of the Jews for readmission. Cromwell gives informal permission to the Jews to reside and trade in England with certain restrictions. Attitude of Charles II. In general did leniency toward the Jew encourage the study of Hebrew by Christian Scholars? The Puritans were friendly to the Jews. Was this amicability selfish and utilitarian? The Reformation and Lightfoot. Were ~~there~~ motives behind his study of this language?

The age in which John Lightfoot lived was important for the Jews of England, for during this period attempts were made for the resettlement of the Jews. Expelled in 1290 by Edward I, we find little, or no trace of them until the seventeenth century.¹ In 1542 we learn that many were arrested on suspicion of being Jews, and throughout the sixteenth century we find people by the name of Lopez finding refuge in England. Among them was Rodrigo Lopez, physician to Queen Elizabeth. Toward the middle of the seventeenth century a considerable number of Marano merchants settled in London and formed there a secret congregation, at the head of which was Antonio Fernandez Carajel. They carried on considerable trade with the Levant, the Indies and Brazil, as well as with the Netherlands, Spain and Portugal.² Their importance and position enabled them to give Cromwell information as to the plans of

¹ It is said Jews were connected with the *Doymus Conservorum*, a house in London founded by order of Henry III in the year 1232 to provide a home and free maintenance for Jews converted to Christianity. (See JE Vol. IV) An attempt to revoke the edict of expulsion was fruitlessly made in 1310. In 1376 we hear of a complaint made to the King that those trading as Lombards were Jews. (cf "Rot.Parl." II 332a).

² cf JE Vol. V page 168 and Art. "Commerce" in JE Vol. IV.

Charles Stewart in Holland and of the Spaniards in the New World.

An impetus to the readmission of the Jews in England was given by the Puritan movement. Petitions favoring the settlement of the Jews in England were presented to the army in 1649 by two Baptists of Amsterdam, Johanna Cartwright and her son, Ebenezer, and suggestions to this effect were made by men like Roger Williams and Hugh Peters. Some were moved in the same direction by messianic reasons. Their views attracted the enthusiasm of Manasseh ben Israel,¹ who in 1650 published his "Hope of Israel" in which he advocated the return as a preliminary to the appearance of the Messiah.²

The commercial policy which led to the Navigation Act of October 1651 made Cromwell desirous of attracting the rich Jews of Amsterdam to London, so that they might transfer their important trade interests with the Spanish main from Holland.

At the close of the war between England and Holland (1652-1654), Manasseh sent his brother-in-law, David Abravenel Dormido³ to London to present to the council a petition for the readmission of the Jews. The council refused to act. Cromwell induced Manasseh to go himself, and at the end of September 1655 he printed his address to Cromwell, the result being a National Conference held at Whitehall in December of that same year, including some of the most prominent lawyers, preachers and

1 Manasseh was born in La Rochelle in 1604, not as Welton says, in Spain or Portugal. He became 2nd or 3rd Rabbi at Amsterdam in 1622. As Graetz has it, he was the "Riesser" of the 17th century (see Vol. V. Chap. II) He died at Middleburg, Netherlands, Nov. 26, 1657.

2 Manasseh believed that the Messiah could not appear until Jews existed in all lands of the earth. In 1644 he came into contact with Antonio de Montesino, who claimed that the ten tribes had been discovered in the North American Indians and England was the only country from which Jews were excluded. If England admitted them the Messianic Age might be expected.

3 Warden of the Jewish Communities at Amsterdam and London in the 17th

and merchants of England. The lawyers declared that there was nothing against the Jews residing in England, but both the preachers and merchants were opposed to resettlement and Cromwell stopped the discussion in order to prevent adverse decision.

Early in the year 1656 the question came to a practical issue. Due to the declaration of war against Spain, resulting in the arrest of Antonio Rodriques Robles, the Maranas of England were forced to avow their Judaism as a means of avoiding arrest as Spaniards, and the confiscation of their goods. As a final result Cromwell appears to have given informal permission to the Jews to reside and trade in England on condition that they did not obtrude their worship on public notice, and that they refrained from making proselytes.

This permission, I would not say, meant much for it did not represent in the first place, equality for the Jew, and secondly it did not reflect the feelings of the people. The entire matter was too concealed, it was not an open thing. As Joseph Jacobs says, it was a "somewhat surreptitious method of solving the Jewish question".¹ We can not say that this apparent leniency toward the Jew was a boon for the study of Jewish literature by Christians. In general, I do not think that the study of Jewish literature depends upon the condition of the Jew, nor the attitude of the world to the Jew. Cromwell was by no means a patron of Jewish literature and culture.² He was selfish. He felt that the real-

century: born in one of the principal cities of Andalusia (Spain)
cf JE IV P. 641.

¹ cf JE Vol. V. p.168-9.

² Even if Cromwell were a patron of Jewish literature, he could not in any way have influenced Lightfoot. Placing Cromwell's dealings with Jews at about 1660, this would only make fifteen years before the great English Hebraist's death. But Lightfoot's study and knowledge of Rabbinics were made and acquired long before this, in fact, at a time when the feeling toward the Jews - if there were any Jews there then - was not any

mission of the Jews into England would aid his commercial enterprises. So likewise Charles II upon his return avoided taking any action on the petition of the merchants of London asking him to revoke Cromwell's concession, because he had been assisted by several Jews of royalist sympathies, as Mendes da Costa and Augustive Coronel - Chacon, during his exile. Even the Puritans were friendly to the Jews, because they saw through them a realization of some of their hopes and dreams. So granted that the Puritans did have sympathy for the Jews, and that some of them studied Jewish literature, we can not say that a man like Lightfoot was induced to study the Talmud and other Rabbinic literature by virtue of the fact that he breathed Puritan air.

That the Puritans were friendly to the Jews is evident. Why, remains to be seen, or answered. Graetz¹, in speaking of the Puritans, says: "Like the Maccabees of old, the Puritans fought sword in hand, and praise of God in their mouth". But not out of the New Testament could the Roundheads² derive inspiration and warlike courage. The Christian Bible, with its monkish figures, its exorcists, its praying brethren and pietistic saints, supplied no models for warriors contending with a faithless king, a fake aristocracy and unholy priests. In other words, only the heroes of the Old Testament, the Jew's Book, could serve as models and prototypes for the Puritans. Cromwell himself, compared himself to Gideon and Judas Maccabeus.

too good. cf Chapter III, pages 26-27

¹ vide Vol. V. p. 26.

² In the reign of Charles I, and later, a Puritan, or member of the Parliamentary party, who wore his hair cut short, so called in derision by the Cavaliers, who usually wore ringlets.

Among the Puritans, therefore, were many admirers of the Jews.

The existence of a people in spite of persecution was a marvel to them. They wanted to see Jews in England. Cromwell is said to have said: "Great is my sympathy with this poor people, whom God chose, and to whom He gave His law; it rejects Jesus, because it does not recognize him as the Messiah."¹ Cromwell dreamed of a reconciliation between the Old and New Testaments, of intimate connection between the Jewish people of God and English Puritan theocracy. To some Puritans the New Testament was of little, or no importance.² Holmes, the great Puritan preacher, it is told us, wanted to become the servant of Israel and serve him with bended knee. One author proposed the seventh day (Shabos) as the official day of rest.³ Some wished the Torah to be declared by the English Government as the code of England.

Hebrew became a favorite study with Puritan ministers, who dwelt much upon the Messianic hopes and promises of the Scriptures and Rabbinic works. "Puritans and Sectarians began to take the greatest interest in Jewish Messianic affairs just before King Charles I (1600-1649) was executed, for most of them were looking forward to some new reformed Commonwealth, some new communion of saints, some republic, some peaceful Kingdom of Truth and Justice, and they connected the restoration of Israel scripturally with its advent."⁴

¹ of G V, 26-28

² So absorbed were they in the Old Testament, that to them the teachings of the New Testament were of no consequence.

³ This occurred in 1619 and was condemned by Parliament.

⁴ NS Vol. I p. 40.

It seems at the very outset that Puritan sympathy for the Jews was selfish. It would also seem that their friendliness for the hitherto despised and persecuted race in England was due to the fact that their beliefs, especially their Messianic ideas, told them that they could better hope for their consum^mation by enlisting the services and support of the Jews. Let us look to the facts!

Sadler (1615-1674) Town Clerk of London and friend of Cromwell, was favorable to the Jews because the idea prevailed that the Jews had first to be dispersed throughout the world before the Lord would return to set up his Millennial Kingdom.¹

Isaace de La Peyrere (1594-1676) of Bordeaux in his book "Du Rappel des Loix" demands the restoration of Isreal to the Holy Land in an unconverted state, in the belief that the restoration will lead to the final triumph of Christianity.¹

Thomas Fuller (1608-1661), Prebendary of Salisbury, delivered sermons in which he argued that the Jewish nation was fulfilling an important office in the world and was an instrument of good.²

Whoever reads the Puritan literature of that epoch will note that the view was held by many that the Israelitish race would eventually be brought back to its own land. But to this was added the belief that Jews would return in a converted, i.e. Christian state.² This perhaps accounts for Puritan sympathy and friendliness. They thought that Jews would make splendid material - good, Puritan Christians. Hence it is not strange that a man like Thomas Draxe (-1618), a great theologian, in his book,

¹ NS. Vol. I p.40.

² NS Vol. I chap. VIII. p. 54.

"The Worlde's Resurrection" (London 1608), should demonstrate that "all the practical promises, such as the land of Canaan, a certain form of government were proper to the Jews and that we (Christians) must therefore acknowledge ourselves debtors unto the Jews, and deeply engaged unto them. We must be so far off from rendering or return evil for good."¹ Nor is it unusual that at the meeting of the Committee for the Propagation of the Gospel,² which met in 1644, to consider certain proposals of some twenty leading divines, included the question of the rights of Jews, and also, a comment signed R.W. read: "I humbly conceive it to be the duty of the civil magistrate to break down that superstitious wall of separation between us Gentiles and the Jews, and freely make way for their free and peaceable habitation amongst us."¹ The good will of the Puritans none can doubt, yet their motives were actuated by selfish desires to see the consummation of their ideas and hopes.

It is indeed very hard to believe that the attitude of the Puritans induced John Lightfoot to study Hebrew. In the first place, no mention of Lightfoot and his relation to the Puritans, is made, either by his own biographers or in his own works.³ I am sure that had he been influenced by the Puritans he would have mentioned something in his dedications in the Hora².³ Besides, Lightfoot was a Presbyterian. It is unwise for us to branch off into a discussion of the differences between Puritans and Presbyterians. Suffice it to say that they were not the same thing.⁴ The Puritans as a body may have been tolerant, and yet in its split-up

¹ Cited in NS

² Oliver Cromwell was himself a member of this Committee.

³ vide chapter III - page 23 and chap. IV.

⁴ vide Morley P 129, etc.

into bodies, some remaining with the established church, others splitting up into two bodies, the Presbyterians and Brownists, we can not in general say that all Puritans were tolerant. Morley speaks of the intolerance of the Presbyterians.¹

What part the Reformation played in Lightfoot's study of Hebrew is open to doubt and discussion. In the Cambridge History of English Literature we find that "Latin, Greek and Hebrew had been the aim of Protestant workers in education, not only for providing antagonists capable of meeting Catholic opponents in disputation - orally and in books, but also, for coming 'nearer' to the primitive times of the Christian Era".² So for the Authorized Version of the Old Testament (With the Apocrypha) thirty-two Hebrew scholars were chosen, (including Bishop Lancelot Andrewes, Adrian Saravia, Lively, for thirty years regius professor of Hebrew at Cambridge). The avidity with which scholars, as a result of the Reformation, studied Hebrew will be shown in the next chapter. It can be clearly seen that Protestantism - with its insistence on the Bible only - gave the great impetus to the study of Hebrew and other Oriental tongues, although this great movement was in a way anticipated by the rationalism of the Renaissance,³ and as Morley puts it:⁴ "It was from the rising spirit of rationalism, and neither from the liberal Anglicans like Taylor, nor from liberal Puritans like Cromwell and Milton that the central stream of toleration flowed with strength enough in time to mitigate law and pervade the national mind".

¹ Vide page 247-8, etc.

² Vide, Vol. VII Page 317 sq.

³ Cyclopedia of Education Vol. 4 page 563

⁴ Vide page 414

Cromwell's quasi-lenience came too late in Lightfoot's life to influence him. Puritan thought could not have induced him to study the wonderful literature of a despised people. Then we must look to the Reformation as responsible indirectly for Lightfoot's desire to know the ancient language.¹

Whether Lightfoot had ulterior motives in the study of Rabbinic Lore remains to be shown. I do not like to anticipate, since it is my aim to take up this matter in a later chapter. Undoubtedly to my mind, the rising tide of Humanism - which encouraged the study of the sources of Latin, Greek and Hebrew, swept Lightfoot along, and he was therefore encouraged to study Hebrew. What the results of his studies were, whether his knowledge of Hebrew was merely used to aid his study of the New Testament, or whether he studied Rabbinic Literature so as to be in a position to better attack the rabbis, or Judaism in general, will be the problem we must solve in this thesis.

From the contents of this chapter we have learned that Hebrew was studied by Christian Scholars. In the following chapter we shall try to briefly sketch the history and development of that study.

¹ To Sir Rowland Cotton's influence we must place the direct cause of Lightfoot's study of the subject. vide chap. III pages 24-25.

BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR THIS CHAPTER

- Jewish Encyclopedia vol. V. p. 168-169
- Graetz, History of the Jews, Vol. V.
- Sokolow, History of Zionism
- Morley, Oliver Cromwell
- Monroe, Cyclopedia of Education.

CHAPTER II

CHRISTIAN SCHOLARS AND THE

STUDY OF HEBREW

The Study of Hebrew encouraged by the early Fathers of Christian Church. Knowledge of Hebrew suffered decline as the separation between church and synagogue widened. Scholastics and translation of Jewish Literature. The Reformation brought a revival of the Study of Hebrew. Reuchlin, advocate of the Study of Hebrew. Christian Scholars sit at feet of Jewish teachers. The seventeenth century sees the apogee of the Study of Hebrew. Buxtorf, the Father of Rabbinic Study by Christians. England, and the Christian Hebraists. Study of Hebrew after the seventeenth century.

The study of Hebrew by Christian Scholars forms an interesting chapter in the intellectual history of the World. What the motives behind this study are, depend, in the main, upon the development, growth and vice versa, the alleviation and lessening of hatred and persecution of the Jew. Bernard Lazare in his book on Anti Semetism¹ would make it appear that the study of Hebrew by Christians is a certain form of Anti-Semetism. While it must be admitted that in certain cases Hebrew was studied for purpose of disputation and apologetics, Lazare's sweeping statement cannot be applied to Lightfoot until we get the facts. Let us then approach our subject unbiasedly and with a view of getting the facts, so that we may venture an interpretation.

Of the study of Hebrew during the days of the early Church Fathers we know very little. Undoubtedly they saw the need of understanding the idea of the Mother synagogue and got the knowledge of Hebrew traditions from their Jewish teachers.² A comparative study of the

¹ vide Chap. IV pages 45-46.

² The teacher of Jerome, for instance was Bar Hanina.

exegesis of Justin Martyr, Ephraem Syrus and Origen would reveal both an appreciation of and an acquaintance with Jewish tradition.¹

The interest in Jewish Literature grew less and less as the separation between Church and Synagog grew wider. The reason for this, to me, does not seem obvious. Of course, the natural thing to imagine is that, as long as the chasm between church and synagog were bridged - artificially or otherwise, there would be constant intercourse between spiritual leaders of both. But on the other hand, is it not just as easy to imagine that when the gap widened, open antagonism would ensue and that the study of Hebrew for polemical and antagonistic purposes would continue? But history is silent in this regard.

There was some activity along the line of Hebraics in England at this time, but we shall speak of this later in the present chapter.

During the period of Scholasticism the knowledge of Jewish Literature came to the Scholastics through the medium of translations only. The works of Albertus Magnus² evidence this fact. The "Magister Andreas, Nacione Anglus" mentioned by Roger Bacon and identified by S.R. Hirsch³ with an Augustinian monk who lived about 1150, must have been able to read the Bible in the original Hebrew. Bacon knew Hebrew tolerably.⁴

At the end of the fifteenth century, the Renaissance and Reformation brought about a return to the original text of the Bible and an attempt was also made to understand the later literature of the Jews. Heronymus Buclidius, a friend of Erasmus, gave over 20,000 francs to estab-

¹ vide JE Vo. VI p.300

² Albertus Magnus (1200-1280*) a medieval philosopher and theologian; founder of Scholasticism.

³ cf. J Q R XII Page 44.

⁴ vide chap. II Pages 17-18

lish a Hebrew chair at Louvain.¹ Francis called the chair of Hebrew at the University of Paris, Elijah Levita.² Cardinal Grimaldi and others studied Hebrew and Cabala with Hebrew teachers. Even the warrior, Guido Rangoni attempted the Hebrew language with the aid of Jacob Mantino. (1526)

It is interesting to note that Christian Scholars at this time were not ashamed to sit at the feet of Jewish teachers. There does not seem to be that independence of Jewish teachers that, perhaps, was the case with Lightfoot.³ The scholars needed Jewish guides. Elijah Levita had Cardinal Egidio de Viterbo and George de Selve, Bishop of Lavour, as disciples,⁴ and many other cases can be cited.

The interest in the study of Hebrew by Christian was profitable for printers and book sellers, for the need of books as text books and for reading purposes, naturally led to more printing and selling.

Pico de la Mirandola (- - 1494) was the first to collect Hebrew manuscripts and Reuchlin (1455-1522) was the first to write a modern grammar.

Reuchlin was an advocate of the study of Hebrew. It was through his efforts that the study of that language made such progress. Says

1 cf JE VI P. 300

2 Elijah Levita: Grammarian, Masorite and poet; born at Neustadt, near Nuremberg, in 1468; died at Venice Dec. 1549; wrote "Sefer ha Bahin" Rome 1518, a grammatical treatise; "Massoret ha Massoret" Venice 1538, a masoretic work; "Sefer Tub Ta'am" Venice 1538, a treatise on the laws of accents, etc. It is interesting to note that Levita maintained that the vowel signs were of late origin.

3 vide Chap. III Page 26-27

4 cf G. V pages 471-474.

Hirsch:¹ "It was not before the end of the fifteenth century that the self denial and dogged perseverance of Johann Reuchlin secured a firm footing for the study of Hebrew in Christian Europe ----." Born at Pforzheim in the Black Forest, he studied Latin, entered Freiburg University in 1470 and took his Masters degree at Basel in 1477. While employed on an embassy to the Emperor Frederick at Lentz, he began to read Hebrew with the Emperor's physician, Jacob ben Jehiel Loans. For many years Reuchlin became increasingly absorbed in Hebrew studies, which had for him more than a mere philological interest. As a scholar he was eager that the Bible should be better known and he did not want to tie himself to the authority of the Vulgate.²

Unfortunately, many of Reuchlin's contemporaries thought that the first step to the conversion of the Jews was to take their books from them.² The chief advocate of this view was Johann Pfefferkorn (1469-1521)³.

Pfefferkorn was backed by the Dominicans of Cologne and so, in 1509, he was able to secure from the emperor the authority to confiscate all Jewish books directed against the Christian faith. Pfefferkorn tried to enlist Reuchlin's support, but the latter evaded him. Finally Emperor Maximilian summoned Reuchlin in 1510 to give his opinion on the suppression of Hebrew books. Reuchlin showed that those books openly insulting Christianity were few, and even despised by the Jews themselves. He proposed that the emperor should decree that for ten years there be two Hebrew chairs at every German University, for which the Jews should furnish books.⁴

¹ J Q R XII p.35

² vide Britannica XXIII P. 205

³ It is strange that this bigot was himself a baptized Jew.

For further activity of Reuchlin cf Britannica XXIII page 205-6

During the fifteenth century, we find that all interest in Hebrew studies centered around the Bible. In the following century it was Hebrew grammar and Jewish Exegesis. Reuchlin's work was kept up by Sebastian Münster (- 1552), also a Hebrew grammarian. Pellicanus (- 1556) was a lexicographer. Bomberg (- 1549) became known as a printer of Hebrew books. Justinian¹ had Kimchi's¹ grammar printed in 1520. Arius Montanus (- 1598) edited the Masorah and Benjamin of Tudela's Travels.²

In my humble opinion, the seventeenth century marks the apogee of Hebrew learning by Christian scholars, because it was during this time that the study of rabbinics developed. The elder Buxtorf of Basle marks the turning point in the study of Jewish literature by Christians.³

Johannes Buxtorf, the principal founder of rabbinic study among Christian scholars, was born December 25, 1564 at Kamen, Westphalia, and died September 13, 1629 at Basel. He studied at Marburg and Herborn, where Johann Piscator persuaded him to study Hebrew. He continued his studies at Basel in 1584. In August 1590 he was graduated as doctor of philosophy and in 1591 was appointed professor of Hebrew at the University of Basel, which position he held until the time of his death. Buxtorf, in order to obtain a thorough knowledge of the Bible studied the Masorah, the Talmud and Targum. He was undoubtedly influenced by the philological impetus in Holland, which led to the study of Latin, Greek and Hebrew and their literatures.⁴ Hebrew, the language of religion, enjoyed a special preference and whoever understood it, as well as the other two

¹ David Kimchi (דוד קימחי): French grammarian, born Narbonne 1160, died there 1235. His most important work is his Miklol, a comprehensive exposition of Hebrew grammar.

² cf JE VI p 300 sq.

³ cf JE VI p 351

⁴ vide G V pages 18 - 50

tongues, was sure of distinction. Thus we hear of Joseph Scalinger, the Oracle of Dutch and Protestant theology, who gave to Rabbinical literature a place in the republic of letters beside the Hebrew language, and even treated the Talmud with a certain amount of respect. His Dutch, French and English disciples followed his example. Above him towers Buxtorf.

The first of Buxtorf's most noteworthy works was his great Rabbinical Bible, containing the Hebrew text, the Masorah and various commentaries, published in two folio volumes (Basel, 1618-19),¹ together with a supplement entitled "Tiberias, Commentaries Masorethicus" (1620). As a Lexicographer, his "Lexicon Hebraicum et Chaldaicum" published in various editions at Basel (1615-1735) Amsterdam (1645), etc. is noteworthy. Buxtorf's polemical zeal against Judaism, the ultimate goal of which was the conversion of the Jews, is seen in his "Synagoga Judaica", which was condemned by his contemporaries for its malicious character and numerous intentional distortions of facts.

Through Buxtorf's influence serious attempts were made to understand post-biblical literature, and many of the most important works were translated into Latin.

In this connection may be mentioned the names of Coccejus (- 1667); L Empereur (- 1648), and Leusden (- 1699).² Surenhius (1698) made a complete translation of the Mishnah. Jewish theology was

¹ Welton on page 1 gives incorrect date.

² vide preface page IX

studied by Carpzov (-1699) ¹ It was at this time that Christian theologians studied Hebrew and rabbinics before taking up their specific theological studies. Hackspar (-1659) wrote upon the value to the theologian of studying the works of the rabbis. John Lightfoot, the English Hebraist, a product of this period, showed the necessity of knowing Rabbinic Lore in order to correctly interpret and understand the New Testament.

So it was England that produced this great and distinguished Hebraist. One might say that Lightfoot studied Hebrew because the study of that language was encouraged particularly in England. Let us then briefly trace the history of Hebraic learning by English Christians. According to Hirsch, ² "It was long after the knowledge of that language. (Hebrew) and its literature, together with the study of the other Semetic languages which followed in its train - had made considerable headway on the continent, that this branch of learning was taken in hand in England". In other words, Lightfoot did not study Hebrew because of English tradition. Hebrew in the early days was taught in a haphazard way. ³ We may safely say that before the time of Bacon in the 13th century, there was little Hebrew taught or studied in England. Welton ⁴ would

¹ The Carpzov family had two great Hebrew Scholars, John ~~and~~ Benedict, who translated some rabbinical works and John Gottlob (- 1761) Superintendent at Lubeck, the celebrated author of the "Introduction" and of the "Critica Sacra".

² J Q R XII p.35. Hirsch's article on the "Early English Hebraists" is worthy of serious study.

³ Hirsch speaks of a certain popular novel, "Charles O'Mally" by Charles Lever, which shows this. The following is an excerpt of the book:
 "Belson ventured upon some strange excursions into the Hebrew verb - the Professor himself never having transgressed beyond the declensions - and the consequence is he is a disgrace among the seniors."

⁴ Welton page 2.

have it that during the space of five hundred years (before Bacon), Hebrew study received some attention in the island. He thinks that by the aid of Jewish teachers who came from the East into England during the Saxon period, certain scholars became acquainted with Hebrew. That the venerable Bede (673 - 735) was well skilled therein, is open to doubt, despite Welton's statement and that of Hody in his *De Bibliorum Textibus* (1705)¹. Steinschneider² justly says that the *Expositio Nominum*, found among Bede's works, proves as little as any other dictionary of names, a direct knowledge of Hebrew.

Alcuin, who was born in 735, must have known some Hebrew, although his works show little trace of it.³ The disturbed state of England during the incursions of the Danes and the banishment of the Jews by Canute, proved disastrous to the study of Hebrew by Christians for many years. During the reign of William I, the study revived with the re-introduction of the Jews into England. During the reign of William II Jews were permitted to open a school at Oxford, which was attended by many Christians.⁴

It was Roger Bacon in the twelfth century who did much to revive and encourage the study of Hebrew in England. Born about the year 1210, he first devoted himself at Oxford to the study of grammar and logic. His interest in philology led him to the study of languages. Foremost in his mind were two groups of languages, Latin and Hebrew. It is natural that he turned to Latin first. How he turned to Hebrew is complex in nature.

1 of J Q R XII p.37.

2 quoted ~~in~~ *ibid.*

3 His remark on Genesis XXV:8 that the word "deficiens" was not in the Hebrew text, but was added by the seventy interpreters, does not prove any direct knowledge of Hebrew. cf JQR XII page 40

4 cf Welton page 3

Like Renschlin, Hebrew to Bacon was the language of revelation. To him, also, the origin of all wisdom and knowledge must be sought in the Hebrew writings. He distrusted translations like Jerome and Renschlin. Both Renschlin and Bacon believed in a spiritual and occult meaning of every word, of every letter, of the Hebrew Bible,¹ and this acted on both as a stimulus to explore the unknown regions of Hebrew lore, and to establish the original divinely inspired text of the Bible.

What the extent of Bacon's Hebrew knowledge was, is very hard to tell. Hirsch says,² "But the little we do possess bears ample testimony that Bacon had sufficient knowledge of Hebrew to satisfy his own demands of a third rate, or even a second rate, Hebrew scholar. He clearly understands what he is about when explaining derivations of words from the Hebrew, or exposing blunders made by other scholars, and he speaks with undoubted authority and knowledge of the subject."

The expulsion of the Jews in 1290 meant the sale of Hebrew manuscripts. Many of these fell into the hands of Gregory Huntington, who became well acquainted through them with rabbinic literature. The monks, Robert Dodford and Lawrence Holbeck, followed in his train. The advances which were made in the study of Hebrew met with great opposition at the hands of such men as Cheke³, and Erasmus⁴, who is quoted as having said "I fear that the study of Hebrew will promote Judaism."⁵

¹ Lightfoot, himself, believed with them in the divine inspiration of Scriptures. vide chap. IV pages 44-45

² ibid page 76

³ Sir John Cheke (1514-1557) was born of good family at Cambridge and was educated at St. John's College. His learning gained him the position of King's scholar and in 1540 he was chosen to fill the chair of Greek then instituted by Henry VIII. of Britannica V 457.

⁴ Desiderius Erasmus (1462-1536); scholar and philosopher; 1511 "Encomium Moriae". Established reputation as most eminent scholar and wittiest writer of his time; 1524. His "Colloquia" Pre-eminent as a restorer of classical learning. cf Johnson's Cyclopaedia Vol. III page 184.

⁵ Quoted by Welton page 4.

Henry VIII issued an order which led to the establishment in 1530 of a Hebrew Professorship in Oxford - the first in England. Robert Wakefield, former professor of Hebrew at the University of Cambridge, was called to fill that position.

The Reformation left its good effects upon England also, and the result was that Hebrew studies broadened in scope. It is interesting to note that even ladies were beginning to study the Hebrew language. The youngest daughter of Sir Anthony Cook was distinguished for her Hebrew scholarship. Lady Jane Grey is said to have known Hebrew.¹ Graetz² speaks of a certain Anna Maria Schurman of Utrecht, who corresponded in Hebrew with Scholars, and also with an English lady, Dorothea Moore.

We find an impetus to Hebrew learning in England given by Queen Elizabeth, who in general was a patroness of learning. Welton tells us³ that "besides the instruction given by the regius professor of Hebrew, the Provost of King's College ordered a Hebrew lecture to be read in the chapel of the college and in his own private home." Quite an interesting fact for a "Jew-less" (?) England. This merely goes to show what influence the Renaissance and Reformation had upon learning and scholarship.

During the reign of James I, the study of the ancient Holy Tongue continued. James in making his Authorized Version of the Bible was fortunate in being able to secure the services of good Hebraists. Among his twenty-five translators, six were professors, or former professors at Oxford or Cambridge.

As was the case with Continental Europe, the seventeenth century in England was the time of the acme of Hebrew learning. Whether caused by the Puritan movement, which to my mind was a great factor in stimulating Hebrew Learning, or whether it was merely a continuation of

¹ of Welton page 6

² vide Vol. V chap. II

³ vide page 7

the spirit of the Reformation matters little. The seventeenth century in England saw the work of men like Pococke¹, Selden, Usher, Castell, Walton, and towering above them all - John Lightfoot, peer of English Hebraists.

Hebrew Learning by Christian Scholars did not cease with Lightfoot and the seventeenth century. The eighteenth saw the work of Basnage² (- 1725), who, although he knew no Hebrew, nevertheless in his "L'Histoire, de la Religion des Juifs", a first attempt at a complete presentation of this subject is made. It likewise witnessed the well known "Entdecktes Judenthum" of Eisenmenger (1654-1704), which although anti-Jewish, nevertheless exhibits a mass of Hebrew learning.³ And last, but not least, it produced Johann Christian Wolf, (- 1739) who with the help of the Oppenheimer Library wrote his well known Bibliotheca Hebraea, which laid the foundation for all later works in Hebrew Bibliography.

The state of Hebrew scholarship in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries is of a complex nature. It may be characterized in general, as the study of other Semitic languages and of Biblical criticism. There seemed to be a downward trend in the first half of the nineteenth century, as Jewish Literature became less and less a subject of investiga-

1 Pococke (1604-1691) was lecturer of Arabic in Oxford University in 1636. His knowledge of languages was extensive. In 1649 he published his specimen Historical Arabum; in 1655 his Porta Misis. As Chaplain of the English merchants in Aleppo, he was able to study Hebrew and Arabic from learned Jews and Arabians.

2 Jacques Basnage (1653-1723) was a French Protestant divine, well known as a good preacher and a prolific writer. His "L'Histoire de la Religion des Juifs" (Rotterdam, 1706, Eng. translation, 1708) is noted for its great scientific value. cf. Britannica III page 484.

3 Eisenmenger studied rabbinical literature for nineteen years, assisted by Jews, first in Heidelberg and Frankfort on the Main. cf. art. by Deutsch in JE Vol. page 80.

tion by Christians, and it seems only to have been studied for purposes of "forging weapons against the people whose literature it was."¹ This can be seen in the works of Hartmann,² Hitzig and Ewald.

Yet we can not overlook the work of men like Gesenius (1786-1842)³, of Abbe' ~~Porter~~ Perrean, who wrote many articles on the literature of the Jews in the middle ages; of August Wünc^she, who enlarged the work begun by Lightfoot;⁴ Gustav Dalman whose philological works on Talmudic grammar show a sound knowledge of rabbinic writings, and countless other Christian scholars who have done creditable work in the line of Hebrew scholarship.

But we have digressed beyond John Lightfoot and we must return to the seventeenth century that we may spend the rest of our time in studying the life and work of this great English scholar. Whether Lightfoot was a student of rabbinic lore much because he loved to study the literature of the ancient people of the book, or because he felt that he could better understand his own people's literature and religion through the study of the literature of the rabbis like Bacon and Renschlin, or because he felt, like Buxtorf and Eisenmenger, that he could better attack the teachings of Judaism by knowing the Talmud, or because the spirit of the Reformation, the spirit of inquiry - which was the indirect cause of his first study of the subject, persuaded and encouraged him to continue his studies, to ascertain that shall be the problem we must solve in the development of this thesis.

1 cf JE VI p. 301

2 ibid cf "Thesaurus Linguae Hebr. e Mischna Augendi" (1875-)

3 Wrote his famous "Hand Wörter buch" in two volumes 1810-12, and other lexicographical and grammatical works. cf JE V p. 643

4 cf his "Erläuterung der Evangelien aus Midrasch und Talmud".

BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR THIS CHAPTER.

Jewish Encyclopedia vols. V, Vi.

Graetz, History of the Jews vol. V.

Jewish Quarterly Review vol. XII

Encyclopedia Britannica vols. III, XXIII

Welton, John Lightfoot, The English Hebraist.

Johnson's Cyclopedia vol. III.

CHAPTER III

John Lightfoot: His Life And Works

The early life of John Lightfoot. His parents. His education.

Encouraged to study Hebrew by Sir Rowland Cotton. Where did Cotton learn

Hebrew? Lightfoot's perseverance and diligence in the study of Hebrew.

His later activities. His death. Lightfoot's disposition and physical ap-

pearance. His family. His works: (1) Those which he wrote himself. (2)

Those in which he was co-author. The various editions and collections of

his works. Were his books read?

As I stated in the preface of this thesis, I found plenty of Bio-graphic material on Lightfoot. Pitman, in the first volume of the collect-ed works of John Lightfoot,¹ and Strype in his memorials, have furnished plenty of biographic material from which many have drawn information. So, in this respect, there is of facts no dearth.

We have thus far in this thesis acquainted ourselves with the historic setting of the time of John Lightfoot. We have learned that Pur-itan influence led to the study of Hebrew, for selfish reasons, of course; we have seen that the quasi-lenience of Oliver Cromwell toward the Jew, as well as that of most Puritans, was likewise self-centered. We have noted that these Pro-Jewish outbursts did not represent the feelings of all of England. We have further seen that John Lightfoot, Christian divine and Hebraist, was not induced to study Hebrew through the influence of the Puritan movement; that he rather breathed the spirit of humanism, the spir-it of inquiry, which prompted and aroused by his patron, Sir Rowland Cotton, induced him to delve into the mysterious and strange labyrinths of Rab-binic Lore. For what purposes he continued and widened the scope of his Rabbinic studies, and in what ways he made use of his Talmudic learning,

¹ John Rogers Pitman in 1823 edited Lightfoot's complete works in thirteen volumes.

we shall endeavor to ascertain in the course of our research. Let us now turn to the life and works of the man.

John Lightfoot, second son of Thomas Lightfoot and Elizabeth Bagnall, was born at the rectory house of Stoke-upon-Trent, in Staffordshire, on March 29th, 1602. His father at the time was curate of Stoke, and in the year 1662 became rector of Uttoxeter, which ^{position} he held until his death on July 21, 1658. His mother came from a well known family which resided at New Castle-under-Lynne, and lived to the age of seventy-one, (Jan'y 24, 1636-7)¹ His first schooling was received at the school of a certain Mr. Whitehead, which was situated at Morton Green, near Congleton, Cheshire. In 1617, at the age of fifteen, he entered Christ's College, Cambridge, where he became the disciple of Doctor William Chappel.² At Christ's College, Lightfoot distinguished himself in the classical school, especially in Latin and Greek.³ He was also considered the "best orator" among the undergraduates.⁴

After receiving his Bachelor's degree, he spent the next two years as assistant Master at a school in Repton, Derbyshire, conducted by his former teacher, Mr. Whitehead. He then took orders and was appointed curate at Norton-under-Hales, Shropshire. It was here, as Montague Hawtrey says⁵ "that he ~~began~~ that acquaintance with Hebrew which ripened into the most familiar and consummate knowledge of the whole range of Biblical and Rabbinical literature." Here he met Sir Rowland Cotton of Bellaport, who became so fond of Lightfoot, that he appointed him his domestic chaplain. But more important, Sir Rowland induced the

¹ cf D H B Page 229

² Dr. Chappel later became Master of Trinity College, Dublin, and still later became bishop of Cork. cf. Welton page 12.

³ He does not seem to have studied any Hebrew here.

⁴ cf Brittanica XVI page 626

⁵ cf Kitto Vol. II page 833

young curate to study Hebrew. Cotton, as Welton notes, "was a perfect master of the Hebrew language,"¹ and through him, the spirit of the Reformation, the spirit of Inquiry, aroused Lightfoot to a realization of the fact that, without a knowledge of the original, Holy Scriptures is a puzzle.

The question now arises: where did Sir Rowland learn Hebrew? Welton gives us some evidence.² Speaking of his patron, Lightfoot is said to have said: "With much care, tenderness and condescension, did he guide and lead on my studies, in the same way that he had himself been trained by that choice and incomparable oracle of learning, Mr. Hugh Broughton." So, Sir Rowland was a disciple of Broughton, one of England's most famous Christian Hebraists.³ To what extent Cotton knew Hebrew is indeed questionable; at any rate he had a good Hebrew teacher in Broughton, and through Sir Rowland Cotton, "Broughton" was given to Lightfoot. As Welton says: "In a word, Sir Rowland Cotton was the medium through which Broughton's prodigious knowledge of Biblical and Talmudic Hebrew was communicated to Lightfoot."⁴

¹ cf Welton page 12.

² ibid page 18.

³ Hugh Broughton (1549-1612) was a noted divine and rabbinical scholar, born at Owlburg and educated by Bernard Gilpin, who sent him to Cambridge in 1659. His foundation in Hebrew was laid by his attendance on the lectures of the French Scholar, Antoine Rodolphe Chevallier. In London he became noted as a preacher and student. He made many friends, including the family of the Cottons. In 1588 appeared his "A Concoct of Scripture", in which he - like his pupil, Lightfoot, maintained the absolute incorruptness of the text of both testaments, including the Hebrew points. In a later work he maintained that in regard to the אֵל וְיְהוָה and יְהוָה וְיְהוָה that "both of them are of God, and of equal authority." He had many disputes with rabbis on points of theology. His works were collected by Lightfoot in 1662 under the strange title: "The Works of the Great Abi-onean Divine, renowned in many Nations for Rare Skill in Salems and Athens Tongues, and Familiar Acquaintance with all Rabbinical Learning, Mr. Hugh Broughton".
cf D N B VI 459-462

⁴ of Welton page 20

Lightfoot's diligence and perseverance enabled him to master Hebrew. I doubt whether Cotton taught him so very much. We hear little of Cotton. He is eclipsed in every way by his illustrious teacher, Broughton, and by his brilliant disciple, Lightfoot. When Cotton removed to London, Lightfoot followed him. He could not leave the living incarnation of Broughton; he was too interested in the study of Hebrew and Rabbinical lore. For the next couple of years Lightfoot was rector of Stone, Staffordshire. In 1628 he removed to Hornsey, Middlesex, because there he could have easy access to the rabbinical library of Sion College. In 1629 appeared the first fruits of his Hebraic studies, entitled "Erubhim, or Miscellanies, Christian and Judaical, penned for recreation at vacant hours". He dedicated the work to his patron and teacher, Sir Rowland. In September, 1630, Lightfoot was presented by Cotton to the rectory of Ashley, Staffordshire.¹ Here, as Hawtrey says, "that he might devote himself more uninterruptedly to his learned labours, he bought a piece of ground not far from his parsonage, and built upon it a small house with a study below, and a sleeping room above, where he spent most of his time, visiting his family once a day for a single meal to which he restricted himself. Enough evidence of his diligence and perseverance, is it not?

A "Miltha agav Orcha" (מילתא אגב אורחא) is to inquire as to how Lightfoot acquired his profound knowledge of the Talmud. In our study of Christian Hebraists² we learned that the scholars obtained their Hebrew knowledge very often from Jewish teachers. It would be reasonable to suppose that John Lightfoot was no different than most of his Hebraic studying confreres. Yet from an "argumentum e silentio",

¹ of Kitto II page 833

² vide chapter II page 12.

We might deduce the opposite. Lightfoot does not mention aught of Jewish teachers, and I feel sure that if he did have Jewish Pedagogues he would have let his readers know that fact. Yet assuming the possibility of his having had instruction from Jews, do the facts in English Jewish history warrant such an assertion? The major part of Lightfoot's life was spent at a time when there were few Jews in England. Cromwell's informal permission to the Jews came about fifteen years before the death of Lightfoot - too late to allow Jewish teaching to aid Lightfoot, seeing that his years of study and writing had then reached consummation.¹

As Welton notes,² Lightfoot did not leave England to study, so that unlike many other Christian Hebraists, he did not come into contact with the great Jewish scholars of Continental Europe.

Lightfoot then owed much to Whitehead and Cotton, who gave him his foundation, who encouraged him and urged him to study, but more credit goes to himself for his diligence and perseverance. It is hardly credulous to think that a Christian could study the Talmud, Israel's most difficult literature, without the aid of Jewish teachers. Study with Jewish teachers was the rule; Lightfoot's case was the exception thereof.

It is interesting to note, perhaps, that the student Lightfoot was concerned with his country's political condition, for we are told that during the Civil War which raged in England, he took the parliamentary side.³

¹ We place the return (?) of the Jews to England at about 1660; fifteen years before Lightfoot's death in 1675.

² of Welton. page 21

³ of D H B XXXIII. page 229.

In June 1642, Lightfoot resigned his rectory at Ashley to his younger brother, Joshid, and removed to London. What his motives were in going to London is hard to tell. Welton¹ would have it that he went there in order to "superintend the publication of his works, which could not safely be committed to the care of persons less scholarly than himself." Perhaps, he felt that his purposes were realized. He had, probably left the big city because he wanted quiet for study and contemplation. So, after he thought that he had sufficiently prepared himself, he could return to the big city once more. But all this is a matter of conjecture. In 1643 he took charge of St. Bartholomew's, near the Exchange London, residing in Moore Lane. He was also a member of the Westminster Assembly, an assembly of divines for the purpose of settling a new form of ecclesiastical polity² and he took a prominent part in the debates, deciding with the Erastian³ sections on questions of Church Government. As a Presbyterian⁴ he boldly denounced what he called "the vehemence, heat and tugs of the independents."

Frequently, he was invited to preach before the House of Commons. In 1643, for instance, he was appointed to preach the sermon on the occasion of the public fast of March 29th. It was published under the title of "Elias Redivivas", the text being from Luke : 17. In this sermon he drew a parallel between the Baptist's ministry and the work of reformation which in the preacher's judgment was incumbent on the parliament of his

¹ vide page 13.

² For further information cf Morley Pages 144-151 cf likewise Lightfoot's Journal of the Proceedings, the Assembly of Divines from Jan. 1, 1643 to Dec. 31, 1644. in Vol. 13 in the 8vo edition of his works.

³ The doctrine of Erastus, the Swiss physician and divine. Heidelberg 1583 of. Morley pages 153 - 4.

⁴ vide Chap. I Page 7.

own day. On August 26, 1845, on the day of their monthly fast, he preached again before the members of the House of Commons. His text was taken from Revelations XX: 1,2. "After controverting the doctrine of the Millenaries¹, he urged various practical suggestions for the repression with a strong hand of current blasphemies, for a thorough revision of the authorized version of the Scriptures, for the encouragement of a learned ministry, and for a speedy settlement of the church."²

In 1644 he accepted the rectory of the Great Munden, Hertfordshire, which he held until his death. In November 1650 he was appointed Master of St. Catherine Hall by the parliamentary visitors of Cambridge. In 1652, he was given his Doctor of Divinity degree by Cambridge for his thesis, "Post Canonem Scripturae Consignatum, non sunt revelationes expectandae."³ In 1654 Lightfoot was made vice-chancellor of Cambridge, and at the Commencement of 1655 he pronounced "a panegyric on Cromwell for the encouragement given by him to complete the Polyglot Bible." He also, called attention to the pitiable plight of the clergy of the Church of England.

At the Restoration, he offered to resign his mastership to Spurstow, its former holder, but the offer was declined and Sheldon, then archbishop of Canterbury, in recognition of Lightfoot's prodigious knowledge, confirmed him in both his mastership and his living.

In 1661, Lightfoot took part in the Savoy Conference, at which he was one of the assistants in the conference upon the liturgy, and here he again sided with the Presbyterians. In 1662 the Act of Uniformi-

¹ At the time of Augustine, Millenarianism became a heresy and soon disappeared. It was revived in the Middle Ages by mystical sect and after the Reformation by Anabaptists. cf article "Eschatology" in Hastings Vol. V. page 381 sq

² cf. Britannica XVI page 626.

³ In this thesis, he maintained that after the closing of the canon of Scripture, there was neither prophecy, miracles, nor extraordinary gifts in the church.

ty¹ was passed, and although he openly complied with it, he was not very scrupulous in fulfilling its provisions.²

On Jan'y 22, 1667-8, he was appointed to the Prebend at Ely, where he was collated by Sir Orlando Bridgeman. It is said that while travelling from Cambridge to Ely, he caught a severe cold, and died at Ely on December 6, 1675.³ Thus the eventful and useful career of the great English Hebraist came to an end.

Of Lightfoot's perseverance and diligence, the facts in his biography testify. A portrait of him which hangs in the hall of St. Catherine Hall, Cambridge, shows him to be a man, "comely in his person, of full proportion, and of a rudy complexion." He wears a skull cap and bands. Welton⁴ describes him as follows: "He possessed a grateful heart, and never forgot a kindness received. His vast learning ever shone through the air of a great and unaffected modesty." So comely in outward appearance, his inner grace and charm, his modesty, his grateful spirit radiated splendour and exercised pronounced influence upon many. Yet, as we shall see, he was intolerant, bigoted and narrow.

He married twice, first in 1628, Joyce, daughter of William Compton of Stone Park, and widow of George Copwood, who died in 1656, and secondly, Anne, widow of Austin Brograve, who died in 1666. He had issues from his first wife only, four sons and two daughters. His son John, was chaplain to Bryan Walton, bishop of Chester; Anast^{as}ius Cottonus Jacksonus, named after his patron, Sir Rowland, and his friend, Sir John Jackson, became Vicar of Thundridge, Hertfordshire, on June 25, 1661; Anastius became

¹ For further information on this subject, consult Britannica Vol. Xiv, page 380.

² cf D H B XXXIII page 230.

³ cf Britannica XVI page 626

⁴ cf page 14

a London tradesman, and Thomas Lightfoot died young. His daughter, Joyce, married John Duckfield, rector of Aspeden, on Jan. 8, 1635, and his other daughter, Sarah, married a Mr. Colclough of Staffordshire.

His Oriental books were bequeathed to Harvard College, but unfortunately these were burned in the fire of 1769. Many of his papers passed to his son-in-law, John Duckfield, who in turn gave them to John Strype,¹ one of Lightfoot's biographers.

In enumerating the works of Lightfoot, I have divided those which he himself wrote, and those to which he contributed.² Shall merely characterize the books briefly, depending in the main, on Welton's description as found in his pamphlet on Lightfoot.³

Lightfoot wrote the following:

(1) "Erubhim; or miscellanies, Christian and Judaical and others; penned for recreation at vacant hours." London, 1629. Dedicated to Sir Rowland Cotton, in which he expresses his indebtedness to him.

(2) "A Few and New Observations Upon The Book of Genesis; the Most of them uncertain; the rest probable; all harmless, strange and rarely heard before". London, 1642. Discusses the various facts which constitute the subject matter of the book of Genesis.⁴

(3) "Elias Redivivus", a sermon,⁵ March 29, 1643.

(4) "A Handful of Gleanings out of the book of Exodus", London, 1643. Similar in nature to that on the book of Genesis.

¹ of Strype's Memorials, Vol. I, Oxford, 1812.

² It is interesting to note that publishers would not undertake to publish his works. Lightfoot printed his books, or most of them, at his own expense.

³ cf. pages 24 - 36

⁴ Lightfoot/^{this}wrote while busying himself on one of his greatest works, "The Harmony".

⁵ cf page 28 of this chapter.

(5) The Harmony of the Four Evangelists, among themselves and with the Old Testament; with an explanation of the chiefest difficulties both in language and in sense, Pt. I, London, 1644; Pt. II, London, 1647, Part III, London, 1650. He arranged the texts chronologically, giving reasons for doing so, and explained the language difficulties by comparison with the Septuagint and other versions.

(6) Sermon on Rev. XX: 1,2.¹

(7) A Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles, Chapters I, XII, London, 1645. Critical examination of text.

(8) Sermon on Psalm IV, 4, preached before the House of Commons, February 24, 1647.

(9) A Chronicle of the Times, and the Order of the Texts of the Old Testament, London, 1647.

(10) The Temple Service as it stood in the Days of our Savior, London, 1649.

(11) The Temple, especially as it stood in the days of our Savior, London, 1650.

(12) The Harmony, Chronicle and Order of the New Testament, London 1655, inscribed to Oliver Cromwell.

(13) "Concerning the Anathema Maranthe", London, 1652.

(14) On the Canon of Scripture, 1652.

(15) The Horae Hebraicae et Talmudicae - his greatest and best known work - in four parts.²

Lightfoot contributed to the following:

¹ cf. page 28 of this chapter.

² cf chapter IV of this ^{thesis} chapter.

(1) Walton's ¹ Polyglot Bible, 1657. Lightfoot aided Walton in revising the Samaritan text of the Pentateuch, in drawing up a general sketch on the geography of the Holy Land, and correcting the Hebrew text and procuring subscriptions.²

(2) Poole's Synopsis Criticorum³ 1669.

(3) Castell's ⁴ Heptaglot Lexicon.

(4) Contributed a Memoir of his friend, Hugh Broughton, to the edition of Broughton's works (1662).

(5) Samuel Clarke⁵ submitted to Lightfoot's judgment his translation of the Targum on Chronicles.

Lightfoot's works underwent various editions and collections. The first collection of his works - all translated into English - was published in 1684 in two folio volumes, revised and collected by George Bright, rector of Loughborough, dedicated to Mary, princess of Orange, and prefaced by a memoir of Lightfoot by John Strype, with an account

1 Brian Walton (1600-1661) was graduated from Cambridge in 1623; got his Doctorate in 1639; published his well known Polyglot Bible in 1657. He was consecrated to the See of Chester, but died soon after.

2 of D N B XXIII, page 231.

3 Matthew Poole was born at York in 1624 and received his education at Cambridge. In 1662 he was ejected from his living of Michaelle - Querne for nonconformity and then undertook his great work, the "Synopsis Criticorum", which was published in 1669 in five large volumes in folio. He died in Amsterdam in 1679.

4 Edmund Castell (1606-1685) educated at Emanuel College and St. John's College. 1666 Chaplain to King and Arabic professor at Cambridge.

5 Samuel Clarke (1632-1669) educated at Merton College. In 1650 he kept a school at Islington, where he assisted in Walton's Polyglot.

of Lightfoot's papers. The second volume contains the "Horae", dedicated to Henry Compton, bishop of London. In 1686, a Latin edition was edited by Johannes Texelius at Rotterdam, (2 vol. fol.); another in Latin in three volumes by Johannes Leusden at Utrecht. In 1823, John Rogers Pitman issued a complete edition of Lightfoot's works in English (13 volumes).

The "Horae" likewise went through several editions. Carpzov edited them at Leipzig in Latin (1675 and 1684). Schoettgen¹ reprinted the greater part of Lightfoot's "Horae" in his own "Horae Hebraicae et Talmudicae on Universam Novum Testamentum", 1733, 4ts. The most reliable English edition of the "Horae" is the one by Gandell in 1859 in four volumes.

Lightfoot's works were read and made use of by many Biblical Scholars and exegetes, especially Wü^Snche and Siegfried. But this shall be discussed in the last chapter.²

1 vide chap. V page 56

2 vide chap. V

BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR THIS CHAPTER

- (1) Dictionary of National Biography, vols. XXIII, VI.
- (2) Encyclopedia Britannica, Vols. XVI.
- (3) Hauck, Real Encyclopedia Vol. XIV.
- (4) Jewish Encyclopedia Vol. VIII.
- (5) Kitto, Biblical Encyclopedia, Vol. II.
- (6) McClintock and Strong Cyclopedia of Biblical, Theological and Ecclesiastical Literature.
- (7) Morley, John, Oliver Cromwell.
- (8) Schaff-Herzog, Encyclopedia of Religious knowledge, Vol. II.
- (9) Welton, John Lightfoot, the English Hebraist.

CHAPTER IV

JOHN LIGHTFOOT: HIS HORAE

HEBRAICAE ET TALMUDICAE. WAS HE

ANTI - TALMUD?

Brief Summary of the contents of the *Horae Hebraicae et Talmudicae*. Lightfoot as Exegete. Evidence of his exegetical superiority in the *Horae*. Lightfoot as Rabbinic Scholar. Was Lightfoot antagonistic to Rabbinic Literature. Bernard Lazare's view explained. Evidence in the *Horae* which shows that Lightfoot studied Talmud for polemical purposes. His narrowness and bigotry. Ways in which Lightfoot may be compared to Reuchlin and Bacon. Lightfoot, Buxtorf and Eisenmenger. Credit due Lightfoot for opening new avenue of research.

The Gandell edition of Lightfoot's *Horae Hebraicae* has been used in the present chapter because of convenience, and also because of its scientific accuracy. Here and there, comparisons have been made with the Carpzov and Leusden editions in the Latin. These comparisons have been made merely to satisfy my curiosity, not because I doubted the scientific accuracy of Gandell's works. Gandell's preface in Vol. I of his edition gives us some valuable information. The *Horae*, as we have learned,¹ was originally written in Latin and the several portions thereof were published at intervals between 1658 and 1674. With the exception of Acts and Romans,² these portions appeared during Lightfoot's life time.³ The *Horae* were printed in Latin by Carpzov in 1675, and are found likewise in the collected Latin editions of Texelius (1686) and Leusden (1699). They are included in the English edition by Bright and Strype, and lastly in the 13 volume edition of Pitman.

The Gandell edition is printed from Pitman's, but wherever a passage seemed obscure, both the folio and original Latin editions were consulted. Much attention was paid to the accuracy of the Hebrew

¹ vide chap. III page 34 of this thesis.

² These were printed after Lightfoot's death by Richard Kidder, later bishop of Bath and Wells.

³ vide Pitman vol. I and chap. III page 34 of this thesis.

quotations.¹

Vol. I is entitled "A Chorographical Century Searching out, Chiefly by the Light of the Talmud, some more memorable places of the Land of Israel". This volume concentrates and combines all the geographical matter which Lightfoot prefixed to each of the Gospels.²

Lightfoot in the preface of his first section of the Horae³ states that in the study of the geography of Palestine, the Talmud should be consulted because the doctors of the Misnah and the Gemarists knew the land better than any one else, seeing that they were "Oculato testes", "eye witnesses". He further urges men to study in the following striking manner: "Et si fide eos dignos non reputaveris, quia sunt Judaea, at certe examine digni sunt, et venia fandi, quatenus sunt chorographi". "And though you esteem them not worthy of credit, because they are Jews, yet certainly they are worthy of examination, and may have leave to relate, as they are chorographers". As if to say, let not your prejudice against the Jew, interfere with your thirst for knowledge.⁴ Or, take the following as evidence: "Certainly, it is unjust, out of prejudice (Iniquum certe est, si ea vel ex praejudicii, etc.) to reject, or out of ignorance not to entertain, those things, which either might yield as the profit of the chorography of that land ----- etc."

So Lightfoot uses his astounding knowledge of Talmudic sources to enable him to gain a better understanding of the places mentioned in the Gospels. His own experience in reading Rabbinical literature revealed the fact to him that many corrections in the existing maps of the Holy Land had to be made. For instance, he speaks of the Sea of Sodon,

¹ of Preface Vol. I page IV.

² of Leusden Vol. II p 169, 397 etc. Carpzov pages 6, 517, etc.

³ of HHG Vol. I p. 3, and Leusden Vol. II p. 168

⁴ HHG Preface pages 3 and 4. It would seem that Lightfoot is badly misled and pro-Talmud from these statements, yet to our astonishment, further study of the Horae reveals the contrary.

as the Eastern Boundary of Judea. (Judea for instance is mentioned in Matthew, chap. 2: 1, 22, or chap. 3: 1, in connection with Bethlehem, the birthplace of Jesus, and Lightfoot gathers Talmudic data to bound Judea. He first divides the land into *חוצה לצרף*, and *שרץ*, and in accordance with Talmudic sources, giving as parallel Matt. II: 20, "the Land of Israel", and I Cor. V: 13, "Those that are without", (*לֹא-בְּתוֹךְ*). He then branches off into different points - a Talmudic habit.² After much discussion, in which he displays a wide, extensive acquaintance with Talmudic and other rabbinic literature, even quoting Maimonides *חוצה* chap. 10, (cf H H G p. 7, note H), he comes to the bounds of Judea. He ventures an interpretation - a wild one, in which he says that *חוצה* does not mean salt, but rather "bituminous". He refers the reader to *סודות* mentioned by Maimonides, (*כל' סודות, פרק א'*), which deals with the making of *סודות* incense. Quoting Josephus (Antiq. Lit. XV: 9), Pliny (Nat. Hist. Lit. I chap. 16) and Solinus (Polyhist. chap. 38), he says: "It doth not please me that Sodom, in the maps, is placed in the northern bounds of the Asphaltites; when it seems rather to be placed in the southern extremity of it". And he tries to prove his point by quoting Genesis X: 19, and Josephus. This is the method Lightfoot pursues in pointing out the mistakes of contemporaneous chorographers, showing that an extensive study of rabbinic sources would bring enlightenment and aid in the establishment of the truth.

[One would imagine that Lightfoot in his chorographical works breathes a pro-Talmud spirit. It seems evident from the most of Vol. I in the Gandell that he is so, namely that he urges the study of rabbinic

¹ cf H H G chap. V, page 15, or H H L, Vol. II, chap. V. p. 173.

² Simon (quoted in J E VIII, page 84) accused him of being "quelquefois trop rabbinique", "sometimes too rabbinic".

lore for the purpose of ascertaining the truth of the New Testament Scriptures, as an aid to the understanding thereof. Yet, interspersed here and there are passages which evidence anti-Talmud feelings, prejudice and narrow-mindedness.¹

Lightfoot is hard to understand. At times he urges the study of the Talmud and Rabbinic lore most strongly, stating that his own personal experience revealed the need of knowing the Talmud in order to understand the Scripture. His remarks in the preface of St. Matthew are not the only evidence of this. He knew the Talmud well, as he did Midrashic Literature, Maimonides, Ibn Ezra, and other post-Talmudic writings, and the world must give him credit for this. Yet it is surprising that certain statements, anti-Talmudic in spirit, should have come from his pen.]

So, in his chorographical works, Lightfoot points out the mistakes of contemporary chorographers and coeval chor^{ogr}aphies.² He says; "I very much wonder, that the authors of the maps have held Lod and Lydda for two towns; Lod not far from Jordan and Jericho; Lydda not far from the Mediterranean sea".³ And he then proceeds to say that the Talmudist would never have made such mistakes. "A Jew, or one versed in Jewish affairs, will laugh at these things; when Lod and Lydda have no difference at all between them -- unless that that is Hebrew, - this, Greek."⁴

Lightfoot has no patience with the tourist's guides, who, depending on oracles, point out places to travelers, historically inaccurate.

¹ These are discussed and quoted on pages 49-50 of this chapter.

² H H G Vol. I chap. XI page 27.

³ ibid page 38

⁴ ibidem

Speaking of Zion, whether it was in Judah or Benjamin, Lightfoot says: "It is objected that at this day a hill and ruins are shown to travelers under the name of Sion, and the tower of David on the South part of the City. I answer, But let us have leave not to esteem all things for oracles, which they say, who now show these places; since it is plain enough that they mistake in many other things: and let it be without all controversy, that they study, not so much truth in that affair, as their own gain. I wish less credit had been given to them, and much search had been made out of Scripture, and other writers concerning the situation of the places".¹

In his chorographical works, Lightfoot's exegetical ability is shown in many places. This will be taken up later on in this chapter.

Volume II in the Gandell edition treats of St. Matthew. The Horae are preceded by a short preface and by a dedication to the students of Catherine Hall². In both Lightfoot points out the utility of studying rabbinic lore in order to know the geography, customs and phraseology of the New Testament. In his dedication, he states the reasons which moved him to study the Talmud.³ His first reason is the one quoted by many later scholars.⁴ "For, first, when all books of the New Testament were written by Jews, and among Jews, and unto them; and when all the discourses made there, were made in like manner by Jews, and to Jews and among them; I was always fully persuaded, as a thing past all doubting, that that Testament could not but everywhere taste of and retain the Jew's style, idiom, form, and rule of speaking".⁵ A cogent reason for studying

¹ ibid p. 54

² Lightfoot, we remember, was Master of Catherine Hall, Cambridge.

³ cf H H G Vol. II page 3

⁴ vide Chap. V page 55sq.

⁵ H H G Vol. II page 3

the Talmud. His second reason is that in the obscure places of the New Testament, the best method of interpretation of the text was to understand both the vulgar and the common dialect and opinion of that nation, the Jews, and this could be done but by consulting the Talmudic authors, "who both speak in the vulgar dialect of the Jews and also handle and reveal all Jewish matters." ¹

He then gives the method by which he made use of rabbinic lore: viz.,

I He resolved to observe those things which seemed to yield some light to the Holy Scriptures, especially either to the phrases, or sentences, or history of the New Testament.

II He set down in his note book those passages which made mention of certain places in Israel and which afforded some light unto the chorography.

III He noted those things which referred to the history of the Jews, whether ecclesiastical, or scholastic, or civil; or which referred to the Christian history, or the history of the rest of the world. ²

In the Horae to St. Matthew, Lightfoot shows the Talmudic parallels to the text of the Gospel. For instance, in Matthew, chap. XII, verse 32, we find the expression 'Εἰς τὸ αἰὼν τὸ μέλλοντες "In the world to come", Lightfoot gives a Talmudic presentation of the subject of Olam Hazeḥ (עוֹלָם הַזֶּה) and Olam Habai^a (עוֹלָם הַבָּיָה) in which he displays a thorough knowledge of Talmudic and other rabbinic lore. Quoting Berachoth 54: 1, Targum to Ruth II:15, Rambam, etc. And so I might multiply example after example.

¹ ibidem page 4

² ibidem page 5

He uses Talmudic sources for other reasons, also. He showed how necessary it was to know rabbinic literature to understand the phraseology and chorography of the New Testament. Now he points out the necessity of studying the rabbis to understand the meaning of customs, etc., mentioned in the New Testament. So he comments upon the phrase: 'Ektivdgate Tōv Kor-
 uoptōv τῶν-πῶδων. "Shake off the dust of your feet" in Mat-
 thew X:II, and shows that in Talmudic interpretation, shaking off the dust of your feet means contempt for the heathen, as was the custom. "Whereso-
 ever a City of Israel shall not receive you, when ye depart, shew, by shak-
 ing off the dust from your feet, that ye esteem that city, however a city of Israel, for a heathen, profane, impure city, and as such, abhor it."¹
 It would be unnecessary to quote more examples, for the student who is in-
 terested in that matter can do better by consulting the Gandell edition. In
 volume II he likewise shows parallels in St. Mark; in volume III he does
 likewise for St. John, St. Luke, and in volume IV he shows the likenesses
 between Acts, Romans, the first Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians, and
 Talmudic Literature.

In all the Horae, Lightfoot plays the part of a Christian well. He still holds the biased view against the Pharisees² and Israel's selec-
 tion by God as his chosen people.³

Welton says⁴ that Lightfoot shows that the doctrine of a Messiah was fully acknowledged and fondly cherished by the Jewish nation; that the coming of the Messiah is fixed by them to the very time when Jesus of Nazareth did appear and approve himself to be the Christ; that the revelation

¹ H H G Vol. II page 186.

² It would be indiscreet to quote passages from the Horae to show this. cf HHG vol. II, page 67 - 77, which contains "some few remarks concerning the Pharisees and Sadducees" and other places in the Horae.

³ cf H H G II page 180, etc.

⁴ Pages 31

of Christ is designated by the synagogal phrases, "Kingdom of God", etc; that the names applied to Christ in the New Testament, as "the son of David," are found in Jewish writings as designations of the future Messiah; that among the offices they assign to the Messiah they recognize the "resurrection of the dead", and even ascribe to him a state of humility and suffering; that Christ condescended to borrow the sacraments from the rites of his countrymen, and that even the Lord's Prayer is derived from expressions that had long been familiar in the schools and synagogues of Judea".

These facts which Welton gives, are true on face value, but let us look into the matter a little more fully. Lightfoot, commenting upon Matthew I: 2, says that the Jews conceived of a Messiah, the Son of David, but invented another name, "Messiah ben Joseph", to comply with their giddiness and loss of judgment in their opinion of the Messiah. For since they despised the true Messiah, who came in the time fore-allotted by the prophets, and crucified; they still expect, I know not what, chimerical one, concerning whom they have no certain opinion: whether he shall be one, or two; whether he shall arise from among the living, or from the dead; whether he shall come in the clouds of heaven, or sitting upon an ass; they expect a Son of David; but they know not whom, they know not when".¹ Evidently Welton was not very exact for by this passage Lightfoot states that the Jews are not sure about the exact time of the Messiah's coming. Lightfoot is seen by this, and other passages, to hold a narrow view about Judaism and the Jews. He is bigoted and narrow minded. He does not tolerate the views of others; he elevates Christianity above the other religions. Thus he says, in commenting upon John I,² Ἰσραηλὶτὴς ὁ ἀληθινός "An Israelite indeed," "Our Savior, therefore calls him an 'Israelite indeed, in whom there was no guile', because he sought out that retirement to pray,

¹ HHG II page 10

² cf HHG II page 14

so different from the usual craft and hypocrisy of that nation, that were wont to pray publicly, and in the streets, that they might be seen of men" -- Not very complimentary to the Jews, is it? The invectives he hurls against the Talmud and Talmudists are even more vehement, but let us be patient for the present.

As an exegete, Lightfoot is of the Rashi type. Like the great exegete of Troyes, Lightfoot is interested in grammatical and syntactical points. Thus, for instance, in commenting upon Matthew I: 12, "Jechonias begat Salathiel" and in the course of the discussion of that verse he used the verse from I Chron. III: 17, וְכִנְיָהּ וְשָׁלְתִּיאל בָּנָיו which he translates, "Now the sons of Jechonias bound (or imprisoned) were Shealtiel, his son" and he argues thusly: "which version both the accent and the order of the words confirm; for Zakeph hung over וְשָׁלְתִּיאל, to which Munach beneath וְכִנְיָהּ serves, persuades that it is a conjunct construction; to wit, that וְכִנְיָהּ Jechoniah, and וְשָׁלְתִּיאל bound should be joined together, that is, a substantive and an adjective. And the word בָּנָיו his son, placed after וְשָׁלְתִּיאל Shealtiel not after וְכִנְיָהּ bound fixeth the genealogy in Shealtiel not in וְכִנְיָהּ Jechoniah at all.

Lightfoot is likewise interested in giving meanings of words. So, as I explained in another place of this thesis, he interprets the words ים דהמלח to mean bituminous sea, instead of the usual "salt sea". In explaining the origin of the word סִבּוֹן סִבּוֹן he links the word with burning, saying that the name of the lake is derived from its nature, which is fiery and bituminous - likewise a wild conjecture.

Lightfoot is also guilty of rationalizing. For instance, in trying to explain the origin of dens and caves in Palestine, he says that they are not the working of nature, but quoting Josephus (Antiq. XII:5) he claims that they were cut out of the mountains and rocks for the uses of war, that

they might serve for refuge and strength.¹

Lightfoot deserves a place as exegete and Biblical critic. Yet, as Chambers says, "he was not free from the unscientific crotches of the period". He believed for example in the inspiration of the vowel-points.² In this regard he takes an opportunity to criticize severely the Rabbis of the Talmud.³ And in many regards he is not scientific. He does not ^{possess} express the exegetical acumen of modern Biblical critics, and he makes many wild conjectures and interpretations, yet taken all in all, he was keen and possessed good judgment. Above all he was an excellent Hebraist, and as such showed to the scholarly world the value of knowing the rabbinic lore in understanding the New Testament.

Now we come to the main point of our Thesis. After a careful study of John Lightfoot's *Horae Hebraicae et Talmudicae*, I have come to the conclusion that he was anti-Talmud. In making this statement, which is the writer's original contribution to the subject, I am backed by much evidence gleaned from reading the *Horae*. It is true, very true, that Lightfoot urges the study of the Talmudic ^{Literature} in order to understand the phraseology, chorography and customs of the New Testament Scriptures. It is true, likewise, that Lightfoot himself studied rabbinic lore because he thought it would materially aid him in understanding his religion's Scriptures. Yet, why is it that so many anti-Talmudic statements are found throughout the *Horae*? We can not clinch the matter by saying that he is inconsistent, for if so, we would merely find one or two instances of his inconsistency. But the rule determines the exception, not the exception the rule - in Light-

1 cf HHG I p. 190 where he says furthermore that the Canaanites were a war-like nation and dug many of these caves before the Israelites came, quoting John 10:16; Judges 6:2 etc. as evidence.

2 See HHG I p. 160 or Leusden II 229. He also takes issue with Ebn Ezra's view that the whole Pentateuch was not written by Moses. cf HHG III p. 225.

3 vide page 45 sq. of this chapter.

foot's case, at least.

Lightfoot was a great Rabbinic scholar. His vast knowledge of rabbinic^S would be a credit to a Jewish scholar, and with Gibbons, we must say that "by constant reading of the rabbis, he became almost a rabbi himself." He felt with Schechter that "a thorough study of this literature might with due discretion help, to a better understanding of the writings attributed to Jesus and his disciples."

But, why so many anti-Talmudic tirades? The statements which show this are so many that I must choose them at random. Here is a typical one:

"There are some who believe the holy Bible was pointed by the wise men of Tiberias. I do not wonder at the impudence of the Jews, who invented the story, but I wonder at the credulity of Christians who applauded it. Recollect, I beseech you, the names of the Rabbins of Tiberias, from the first situations of the university there, to the time that it expired, and what at length do you find, but a kind of men made with Pharisaism, bewitching with traditions, and bewitched, blind, guileful, dotting; they must pardon me, if I say magical and monstrous? Men, how unfit, how unable, how foolish, for the undertaking, so divine a work. Read over the Jerusalem Talmud and see there how R. Judah, R. Chaninah, R. Judan, R. Hoshiaia, R. Chaya Rubha, etc. - and the rest of the grand doctors among the Rabbins of Tiberias, behave themselves. How earnestly they do nothing. How childishly they handle serious matters. How much of sophistry, froth, poison, smoke, nothing at all, there is in their disputes. And if you can believe the Bible was pointed in such a school, believe also, all that the Talmudists write. The pointing of the Bible savours of the work of the Holy Spirit, not the work of lost, blinded, besotted men."

I wonder if some still think that Lightfoot merely contradicts himself here. Does not this show a positive attitude. I am surprised that Lightfoot recommends the study of Talmud to his pupils, seeing that the writers thereof are "lost, blinded and besotted men", and moreover, that there is naught but "froth" and "poison" in their disputes.

At this point, let me set forth Bernard Lazare's view. In his book on Anti-semitism¹ he says, "In the seventeenth century, anti-Judaism took

¹ vide page 175 sq. of Lazare

on another form. The theologians were succeeded by erudites, scholars, exegetes. Anti-Judaism became milder and more scientific; it was represented by Hebraizers, often of great attainments -----." And he then gives several cases of men who studied Jewish literature and defended certain things in Judaism and literature, as for instance, Wagenseil, who denied ritual murder, and Buxtorf who declared that it (the Talmud) contained things of value for the historian and philosopher. Yet these two men were anti-Jewish and anti-Talmud, for the former declared that the Talmud contained "blasphemies, impostures and absurdities", and, as it is well known, the latter used his knowledge of Hebrew for polemical purposes. (He thinks, that John Lightfoot would fit in very nicely with these two. But let us wait).

Lazare continues,¹ "Yet the same ideas persisted which had inspired the authors of the preceding centuries. The object was always to prove the truth of the Christian faith and dogmas on the basis of the Old Testament ----- the apostles invoked the Zohar and Mishna in favor of Jesus and the polemic literature was still in bloom under Eisenmenger, whose 'Judaism Unveiled' has inspired many contemporary anti-Semites".

Lazare speaks as if he had read Lightfoot's *Horae Hebraicae et Talmudicae*. Lightfoot was of the seventeenth century, he was an "erudite, scholar and exegete", he was a Hebraizer of great - nay, unusual attainment. He studied Jewish literature zealously and industriously, and even defended certain things in Judaism. So, in urging the study of the Talmud he says: "And though you esteem them not worthy of credit, because they are Jews, etc." In other words, like Buxtorf, he says that the Talmud contains things of

¹ ibid And so, throughout the *Horae*, we find passages which show a readiness on the part of Lightfoot to give credit to the Jew - sometimes a mere condescension. For instance, in HHG Vol. I, p. 82, he says, "We may believe the Jews, asserting it (*אם נא*) to be within the walls of Jerusalem, since they illustrate the thing with so many examples; nor is there any reason why they should either feign or dissemble anything in this matter". These

value, and he thus defends the study of the Talmud¹. Unlike Pfefferkorn in this respect, yet, like that bigot, and like Wagenseil, Lightfoot, too, claimed that the Talmud contains "blasphemies, impostures and absurdities." I quoted one passage which shows Lightfoot's belief that the doctors of the Mishnah and Gemarists teach nothing but "froth, destruction and poison". We shall quote other anti-Talmudic passages later.

Lazare also tells us that the object of these Christian Hebraizers was to prove the truth of the Christian faith and dogmas on the basis of the Old Testament, and that furthermore, they "invoked the Zohar and the Mishnah in favor of Jesus". First of all Lightfoot takes every opportunity to cast slurs at the Jews. It is strange that he likes to use the words "feign" or "dissemble" ("fingant" or "colorent") in connection with the Jews, that they feign this or that.¹ He even calls Judaism a polluted religion². He calls the Jews "hypocrites" because "much provision is made concerning reciting the phylacteries and the prayers added, hence, those vainglorious hypocrites, etc., and because they addicted themselves to ejaculations, prayers and blessings, upon the sight of almost anything meeting them, either in the streets or in the way."³

And so by underestimating the value of the Jew and his Judaism, he tries to over-estimate the truth of the Christian faith. Judaism, to Lightfoot, had to give way to Christianity. He takes Old Testament passages and

pro-Jewish, or rather non-anti-Jewish statements are rare in the Horae. About the only thing of Judaism which Lightfoot seems to defend, is the study of the Talmud for the understanding of the phraseology, chorography and customs of the New Testament.

¹ cf HHG I Page 82; 144.

² cf HHG I P. 64

³ ibid page 144

⁴ cf also HHG II page 211 and 212 he says, "Therefore, our Savior seems allude to the casting out of devils by exorcisms; which art, as the Jews were well instructed in, etc." -----.

and interprets them Christologically. Thus~~h~~ for instance, he says "that the old Sabbath was not instituted till after the giving the promise of Christ, Gen. III: 15, and the rest of God on that seventh day was chiefly in having perfected the new creation in Christ."¹ Lightfoot says² that "the Jews themselves confess that the Kingdom of the Messiah was to begin with the resurrection of the dead, and the renewing of the world. Therefore it was very proper that that day from which Christ's Kingdom took its beginning should pass into the Sabbath, rather than the old Sabbath, the memorial of creation." Consequently the Jew's Sabbath had to give way to the Christian Sabbath.

Accordingly, Lightfoot says "For, first, the Jews had now lost their privilege, nor were they hence-forward to be called a peculiar people; nay, they were now become 'Lo - ammi'. They had exceeded the heathens in sinning, they had slighted, trampled upon, and crucified the Creator himself, appearing visibly before their eyes in human flesh; while the heathen had only conceived amiss of the creator, whom they neither had seen, nor could see, and thereby fallen to worship the creature". But he continues thusly: "Christ had now by his blood paid a price for the heathens also. He had overcome Satan, who held them captive. He had taken away the wall of partition."³ He had exhibited an infinite righteousness".

I believe that I have quoted sufficiently from the Horae to show Lightfoot's "anti-Semitic" attitude, his desire to underestimate the Jews and their religion and to exalt the Christian faith at the expense of the Old Testament and the "Rabbins!" Our next interest will be to quote passages from the Horae, which in addition to those already cited, show Light-

1 HHG II page 377

2 ibid

3 This refers to the "enclosure" by which the apostles were prevented from

foot's anti-Talmud and anti-Talmudists attitude. He attributes vain-glory, conceit and self praise to the Talmudists. For instance, he says ¹ "If, therefore, by cutting short the clause, (quoting teachings in the names of themselves or teachers, e.g. R.N. in the name of R.N. saith) they would be appropriating to themselves the blessings of the people ----- they do indeed like themselves, cunningly lying at catch and hunting after fame and vain-glory". Or, take the following: "Nor is it seldom that we meet with some of the Talmudists make their own perfection the subject of their boast -----etc." ²

Here is an excellent passage which reflects Lightfoot's attitude: ³

"I have been at some question with myself, whether I would insert in this place the blasphemous things which the Talmudic authors belch out (evomant) against the holy Jesus, in allusion (shall I say?) or derision of this word Amen, to which name he entitled himself, and by which asseveration he confirmed his doctrines. But, that thou mightest, reader, both know, and with equal indignation abhor, the snarlings (latratus) and virulency of these men, take it in their own words, although I can not without infinite reluctance allege what they with all audaciousness have uttered." Not very pro-Talmudic, I think.

Quoting from Bava Bathra

Moses and his law are truth". Lightfoot comments: ⁴ "It is indeed a great truth, what is uttered in this most false and ridiculous legend that "the

preaching the gospel to all gentiles. cf. Matt:X:15.

¹ HHG p. 149

² ibidem p/ 156

³ " p. 246

⁴ " p. 399

law of Moses is truth." But the Jews might (if they would) attain to a much more sound way of judging concerning the truth of it, and consider that the law is not the sum and ultimate of all truth, but that Christ is the very truth of the truth of Moses: John 1:17." The law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ."

I shall quote just one more passage in this connection: "When the Jewish maskers seriously prescribed many ridiculous things of this matter; sometimes defining the appointed times of _ _ _ _ _ Modesty forbids to relate their trifles: I had rather the reader should go to them himself, than defile our paper with them."

The evidence has been sifted and the verdict remains unaltered; John Lightfoot, although he encourages the study of the Talmud and rabbinic lore, in general, although he insists that a knowledge of rabinnic literature is advantageous, nay essential for a complete understanding of the phraseology, customs and chorography of the New Testament, is anti-Talmud. He tries to show the superiority of the teachings of Jesus over Judaism, and takes every opportunity to attack the Jew and his religion.

Lightfoot was like Reuchlin and Bacon, in that he advocates the study of Hebrew. Like them, Lightfoot believed that Hebrew was the language of revelation, and with them he shared the belief that every word and every letter of the Hebrew Bible had a spiritual and occult meaning. In other words, all three of these men explored the regions of Hebrew lore to establish the original divinely inspired text of the Bible.¹

Yet, like Wagensail, Eisenmenger and Buxtorf, Lightfoot, bigotly and lightheadedly was anti-Talmudic, claimed that the Talmud contained blasphemies, absurdities, "froth" and "poison" and he tries to over estimate

his religion at the expense of Judaism, the very knowledge of which he learned from his study of rabbinic lore.

To Light^{foot} however, goes the credit of opening a new avenue of research. Scholarship owes much to this noted Hebraist, for he encouraged the study of the Talmud for the purpose of knowing the parallels between that great literature and the New Testament.

BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR THIS CHAPTER

Horae Hebraicae et Talmudicae ed. Gandel 14 Vols.

" " " " " Carpzov 1 "

Works of John Lightfoot ed. Leusden Vol. II.

Welton, John Lightfoot, the English Hebraist.

CHAPTER V

JOHN LIGHTFOOT : HIS INFLUENCE.

Did Lightfoot have any pupils? Did he, at all, influence the study of Hebrew by Christian Scholars? Did his work create enthusiasm? Lightfoot's influence evidenced by the way in which his research was used. He stimulated the study of the relation between the New Testament and rabbinic lore. What others have said about Lightfoot. A personal reaction to the study of John Lightfoot, English Hebraist.

As a rule, Hebrew scholars, both Jewish and Christians, are surrounded during their lives by a coterie of pupils, who after their death carry on their learning and ideas.

John Lightfoot was quite different in this respect, for neither in his writings, nor by his biographers, are we told of any of his pupils. Yet, Lightfoot exerted as much, if not more, influence upon succeeding generations as did many teachers. As Welton says, "At the same time, by every work which he put before the world he made himself the teacher of hundreds; while learned men in and out of England were continually visiting him, not merely to make his acquaintance, but to get his opinion on some of the more obtruse points of rabbinic learning."

True, Lightfoot was Master of Catherine Hall, Cambridge, and in this position, by his personality, he was able to reach many. In the public light also, as preacher and upholder of certain ideals and principles, he influenced many. But as to the specific branch of learning in which he was interested, he had to rely upon the influence his writings would make upon the world.

The question now arises: Did Lightfoot stimulate the study of Hebrew by Christian scholars? The answer to this query is a negative one. After Lightfoot's death, England witnessed a decline in the study of Hebrew as well as in all other Oriental studies, and this decline continued until

the middle of the nineteenth century.¹ We can not say, however, that Lightfoot's exhortation to study the Talmudic and other rabbinic literature fell upon deaf ears, for his work did create enthusiasm. Lightfoot's influence can be measured by the manner in which the work was received and made use of. Specifically, Lightfoot opened a new avenue of research, for by his writing he showed succeeding generations the necessity of knowing the Talmudic sources for a thorough understanding of the style, phraseology and meaning of the New Testament Scriptures.

His influence can be best proved by what others have said about him, and also by quoting some scholarly works which have used Lightfoot as an authority. Most of these references have been obtained by my own research, but where I have secured the information through second hand sources, I have noted this fact in the footnotes.

From Welton,² we learn that during his life John Lightfoot corresponded with various scholars and he quotes several extracts from their letters. So, the younger Buxtorf,³ in a letter to Castell speaks of Lightfoot thusly: "Ex horis ejus talmudicas incepti illius doctrinam et diligentiam valde amare Illae salivam mihi moverant, ut propediem ab ipso somnia videre desiderem et gustare Precor ipsi omnia laeta ac mentis ejus digna." And Castell says in a letter to Lightfoot: "Renowned Sir, I made bold to beautify and embellish this worthless, contemned work I am upon, with the oriental lustre of your eminent and deservedly most famigerous name."²

¹ vide chap. II page

² See page 6

³ Johannes Buxtorf (1599-1664) was a son of Johannes Buxtorf, the elder. Succeeded his father as professor of Hebrew at Basel. He maintained relations with several learned Jews with whom he corresponded. Wrote "De Linguae Hebraicae Origine et Antiquitate", Basel, 1644. Translated Maimonides More Nebuchim at Basel in 1629 under the title "Doctor Perplexorum and Hakvi's Cosari", Liber Cosri (Basel, 1660)

Dr Adame Clark said "Dr. Lightfoot was a profound scholar, a sound divine and a pious man. His historical, chronological and topographical remarks on the Old Testament, and his Talmudical Exercitations on the New, are invaluable¹". Clarke spoke of Lightfoot's exeg^etical ability in the highest terms: he said, In Biblical criticism I consider Lightfoot the first of all English writers; and in this I include his learning, his judgment and his usefulness."

Carpzov² in his introduction to his edition of the *Horae Hebraicae* says, "Lightfootus, recondita ^{eruditionis} ~~emendationis~~, et exquisiti non minus ingenu, quam infinitae in Talmudicis Rabbinicisque lectionis var."

Kidder,³ in ^{vol. IV of} the preface of Gandell's edition of Lightfoot's *Horae* says: "Inter alios autem viros praestantissimos, populares nostros, qui insignem in veteribus sacrae Scripturae ritibus explicandis operam navant, merito primum locum occupat (ut ego arbitor) Johannes Lightfoot, S.T. D. Anlaeque - - non ita pridem praefectus".

Chambers⁴ says of him, "He has done good service to theology by pointing out and insisting upon the close connection between the Talmud and Midrashic writings and the New Testament, which to a certain extent, is only to be understood by illustrations from the anterior and contemporaneous religious literatures."

Welton, to whom I am greatly indebted for material which I was unable to secure, says "In rabbinical learning he was excelled by none, and had few, if any equals."⁵

1 See page 6 of Welton

2 vide Chap II page 16

3 " " IV " 25 note 2

4 " MacIntosh and Strong II, 426.

5 cf page 15

There are some who criticized Lightfoot, also. Simon¹ speaks of his method in the Horae as "quelquefois trop rabbinique" and Pick² ✓ says of him: "The Talmud has been used in the illustration of the New Testament by Lightfoot, etc. But in this department, also, its utility has been overestimated, and by none more than Lightfoot himself, who says in the dedication prefixed to his Talmudical exercitations, etc."

Pick mentions likewise, Isaac Vossius, who said Lightfoot would have sinned less by illustrating the Evangelists from the Koran than these "nebulae rabbinicae".

His opinions were attacked by Rhenford in his *De decem otiosis synagoga, Franequemaë*, 1686 and by Vitringa in his *De decem viris otiosis, Franequerae*, 1687." A short statement of the whole controversy will be found in Carpzov's *Apparatus historico*, *Crit.* pages 310-312.

On the whole, however, Lightfoot's works found favor and were widely used.

In addition to these statements, we find many scientific works which quote Lightfoot as an authority. Thus Schürer in his "The Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ", quotes Lightfoot frequently.³ He agrees with him as a rule, but very often points out his mistakes. Thus he says in speaking of the Essenes: "its ~~irrelevance~~ ^{irrelevance} is well pointed out by Lightfoot, who conjectures that the Lampsitae are merely an offshoot of the Essenes."⁴ On the other hand he says,⁵ in speaking of the

1 of JE VIII page 84

2 vide his "The Talmud - What it is and what it knows about Jesus and his followers. pages 123 - 4.

3 of Vol. I pages 10, 39, 135, 136, 144 II 67, etc.etc.

4 of Vol. II Div. II page 214

5 of Vol. II Div. II p. 67

ג'אבטא זאגט "as it is in none of these passages exactly stated what was the case with these men, Lightfoot was able to set up the mistaken hypothesis (in his Horae to Matthew IV:23) that the decemviri were officials of the synagogue, thus making the whole number of the synagogue officials to consist of these ten men. This mistake called forth a learned controversy in which Rheuford unsparingly, and Vitringa more gently, attacked Lightfoot's opinion."

August Wundt¹, who more than anyone else, carried on the work of John Lightfoot, quotes him in his "Neue Beiträge: (There are some who have used Lightfoot, but fail to mention him by name." So, Schottgen in the preface of his Horae (page 1) says "Nisi Lightfootus lyrasset, multi non saltassent".

Werk in his "Rabbinische Quellen und Parallelen zu neutestamentlichen Schriftstellen, mit Benutzung der Schriften von Lightfoot, Wetstein, Meuschen, Schottgen, Danz, quotes the noted English Hebraist a number of times.²

Dr. J. Hamburger in his Real-Encyclopadie des Judenthum, (Leipzig, 1896), quotes Lightfoot on page 1 of the Supplement of the work, and especially on pages 49 and 787 of Supplement II, Lightfoot's works are mentioned as authoritative books to show the parallels between the New Testament and the Talmud.

John Gerhard^a Meuschen in the Praefatio of his "Novum Testamentum ex Talmudi et Antiquitatibus Hebraeorum Illustratum" (Lipseae, 1836) says: "Vix autem speilegium hoc ad manus incluct^{te} Johanus Lightfoote par-

1 Vide especially pages VI, 16 and 542.

2 For instance on page IV he quotes the famous introductory paragraph of Lightfoot's Horae Vol. III.

venerat, cum ille hoc, tamquam acutissimo stimulo, incitatus"
and quotes him on pages 380, 401, 407, 409 and 410.

Henrich Laible in his "Jesus Christus ^{im} ~~un~~-Talmud" (G. Dalman, Berlin, 1891) mentions Lightfoot on pages 18 and 50.

I believe that I have pretty well exhausted the list of books which quote John Lightfoot as authority. These quotations are but witnesses to the real work of the man.

Personally, I think that I have greatly benefited from the study of John Lightfoot and his relation to Rabbinic lore. I was greatly impressed, in reading the *Horae Hebraicae et Talmudicae*, by the mass of rabbinic learning which he exhibits therein, by the maze of quotations from the Talmud, Maimonides, Ibn Ezra and others. I was greatly struck by his exegetical acumen, which is evidenced by his interpretations and commentaries. He makes many mistakes, wild and sad blunders, but so do others, Jews, who by nature should have a better "sprachgefühl" for our rabbinical lore.

But, alas, I was sadly disappointed to find that John Lightfoot was anti-Talmud, that he seemed to play the part of an ingrate; that he slandered the very men who gave him inspiration and enlightenment.

Yet, I could not lose my respect for the man and his knowledge and his work - I was only disappointed. The world owes much to Lightfoot. He opened a new avenue of research, for as one of his biographers said, "To him is ascribed the credit of opening to the modern world the fountains of Talmudic learning."

My one hope is that others may be induced to study the development of Hebrew learning among Christians. The work is difficult, for it demands original research, yet the reward thereof is great, for it will enlighten the world and enrich its culture and learning.