

CHAPTER 2

Judaizing and Singularity

IN 1555, POPE PAUL IV issued a bull entitled *Cum nimis absurdum*. The Bull urged Christians to be more muscular in their condemnation of Judaism. It carried some legal injunctions. The Pope ordered that all Jews should be forced to wear a hat 'that they might be identified everywhere as Jews.'¹ Fifty years after this edict was issued, a text written by the Rabbinic scholar David HaLevi Segal made a similar point. He urged all Jews to wear the kippah in order that 'those who follow God might be distinguished from those who do not.' Segal saw the uncovering of the head in public as a contravention of *hukkot hagoyim*.²

In early modern England, the confluence of a broad range of cultural factors led to the representation of the Jew as paradigmatically 'other.' As Bauman demonstrates, this tendency to 'other' the Jew was not a novelty of this period. Nor, he writes, was this 'otherness' intrinsically pejorative. Both the philo-semitic elements (so prominent in David Katz's account of the period) and the anti-Judaic elements (prominent in James Shapiro's accounts) contributed to this process. The identification of 'the Jew' and of Judaism as the counterpoint of Christianity, of Englishness and of decency placed Judaism at the center of the consciousness of English men and women in the matter of their own and the collective, confessional identity. 'Royalists and republicans, high churchmen and radical sectarians, women and men, royalty, gentry and the middling sort,' Achsah Guibbory writes, 'looked to the Jews to define, confirm or legitimate their identity.'³ So, as William Prynne walked to Westminster on 6 December 1648, he encountered in a

1. Paul IV, 'Cum nimis absurdum,' 294.

2. Grossman, 'Kippah Comes to America,' 130.

3. Guibbory, *Christian Identity, Jews, and Israel*, 14.

short period of time several different kinds of people—soldiers, politicians and artisans—all defining themselves by alterity in relation to the Jews.⁴ But at the same time, a more positive sense of the irreducible otherness of the Jews arose from the pages of the Biblical accounts, read through the lens of a Puritan ethic of singularity.

A decade ago, Kevin Sharpe admonished historians of this period to ‘pay attention to the representations that contemporaries presented of (and to) themselves.’⁵ In no area is this more pressing than in the study of early-modern Judaizers. The picture of the Jew and of Judaism which sat in the consciousness of English men and women was extremely complex. In order to understand what was *meant* by Judaizing therefore, it is vital to understand what was *meant* by Judaism.

SINGULARITY AND THE LAW

When a seventeenth-century Godly professor turned to the first page of the first book of the Geneva Bible, he would have been greeted with a description of the patriarchal Jews:

this church dependeth not on the estimation and nobilitie of the world: and also by the fewnesse of them which have at all times worshipped him purely according to his word, that it standeth not in the multitude but in the poore and despised, in the small flocke and little number, that man in his wisdom might be confounded and the name of God evermore praised.⁶

This was the lens through which the Godly read the books of the Law in early modern England. Within the texts of Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus and Deuteronomy they found the story of a ‘smalle flocke,’ ‘little in number,’ seeking to affirm their righteousness in spite of their ‘fewnesse.’ This was not a perversion. Reading the Hebrew Bible through this lens allowed the Godly to perceive a literature of singularity and resistance that already existed in the texts themselves.⁷

4. Prynne, *Short Demurrer*, a3r.

5. Sharpe, *Remapping Early Modern England*, 3.

6. *Bible and the Holy Scripture*, a1r.

7. Grabbe, *Leviticus*, 49–60; Houston, *Purity and Monotheism*; Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*. For critical reflections on the holiness motif in the Priestly source—specifically Leviticus—see Haran, ‘Holiness Code,’ 9:318–21; Hurowitz, ‘P-Understanding the Priestly Source,’ 30–37; Milgrom, ‘Leviticus 17–22,’ ‘Priestly (“P”) Source,’ 454–61; Schwartz, ‘Leviticus,’ 203–80; Sun ‘Holiness Code,’ 254–57; Klavans, *Impurity and Sin in Ancient Judaism*, 17–25.

Two radicals are used to denote separation in the Hebrew Bible: **בדל** and **קדש**. Both of these words are used periodically throughout the books of the Law to identify the separation of the sacred from the common. They are particularly prevalent in those texts which emerged from the experience of exile. In various forms these words are also used to articulate the separation of Israel from the nations. The phrase ‘I am the Lord your God, who has separated (**הַבְדִּילְתִּי**) you from the peoples,’ recurs throughout the Levitical laws (Lev 20:24). It is also used to describe ethical action of individuals to maintain their own purity. Ezra describes the Passover, celebrated after the return from Babylon, ‘by every one who had joined them and separated (**הַבְדִּילְתִּי**) himself from the uncleanness of the peoples of the land.’ Nehemiah repeats this formulation to describe the people who renewed the covenant after the return from exile. Here, separation from the heathen is read as directly correlative to orthodoxy. Separation is also used to describe the status of the Levitical priesthood *within* the community of Israel. In Deuteronomy, it is recorded that ‘the Lord set apart (**הַבְדִּיל**) the tribe of Levi to carry the ark of the covenant of the Lord to stand before the Lord’ (Deut 10:8). Addressing the rebellious Levites, Moses asks ‘is it too small a thing for you that the God of Israel has separated you (**הַבְדִּיל-כִּי**) from the congregation of Israel, to bring you near to himself’ (Num 16:9). The Ark itself is kept behind a curtain and is therefore ‘separate’ (**וְהַבְדִּילָהּ**) from the people (Exod 26:33). In this mood, ‘separation’ from the majority is directly correlative to ‘closeness to God.’ The root **בדל** is not, however, only used positively in the Hebrew Bible. In Deuteronomy 29, the penalty for apostasy is described: ‘and the Lord will separate him (**וְהַבְדִּילֹוּ**) from all the tribes of Israel for calamity’ (Deut 29:21). In Ezra the word **הַנִּבְדָּל** is used to describe the honorable conduct of those exiles who had maintained Israel’s ethnic cohesion, but is later used to describe the penalty for not attending collective worship after the deliverance from Babylon. Anyone who failed to comply with the proclamation would be punished: ‘all his property should be forfeited, and he himself separated (**בָּדַל**) from the congregation of the exiles’ (Ezra 10:8). Isaiah ventriloquizes the foreigner who frets that he may be counted unworthy of election: ‘The Lord will surely separate (**יַבְדִּילֶנִּי**) me from his people’ (Isa 56:3).

The root **קדוש** is equally multi-valent. At Sinai, Moses is told to draw a boundary around the mountain to protect its sanctity (**‘אֶת-הָהָר, וְקִדְשְׁתֹּוּ**). In Genesis 2, God ordains the Sabbath as a day of rest and worship, separating it from the working week. The text reads ‘God blessed the seventh day and made it holy (**וַיְבָרֶךְ אֱלֹהִים אֶת-יוֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִי, וַיְקַדֵּשׁ אֹתוֹ**).’ In these settings, **קדש** denotes holy and precious to God. Elsewhere, however, the word is used with profoundly negative connotations. An edict from Deuteronomy

23 reads: ‘There shall be no *qedesha* (קִדְשָׁה) of the daughters of Israel’ (Isa 56:3). Another mention of the *qedesha* appears in Job 36 and is here associated with uncleanness and impurity. Hosea laments that ‘the men themselves go aside with prostitutes and sacrifice with the *qedeshot* (הַקִּדְשֹׁת)’ (Hos 4:14).

In her initial work on Leviticus, Mary Douglas emphasized the significance of ‘wholeness . . . unity, integrity, and perfection’ when describing ritual purity in the Biblical context.⁸ Elements which threatened the coherence of a category with mixture and miscegenation were eradicated. This concept was developed in Kristeva’s concept of abjection. Kristeva claims that the Biblical categories of ‘impurity’ emerged from a desire to eliminate and expel that which ‘undermines the clean and proper and makes it filthy.’⁹ Weiss, following Klawans, questions the notion that ritual impurity was valuational category. The ritual does not concern elimination of the ‘negative,’ but rather a fruitful act of separation.¹⁰ If this is the case, then ritual impurity is a necessary component of existence, a corollary of divinely mandated acts—most obviously reproduction. As such, that which is ritually impure must remain separate from that which is ritually pure. But nonetheless it must *exist*. Indeed, without that which is ritually impure, the category of ritual purity ceases to contain meaning. Klawans places the *imitatio dei* at the heart of the sacrificial Holiness Code. Participation in sacrificial worship required separation of the devotee from those aspects of human existence most alien to the Godhead: sex and death.¹¹ At other times—of course—the Israelites were enjoined to come into contact with sex and death. As such, the heart of ritual worship—and the principle responsibility of the priesthood—was not to eliminate that which was valuationally negative, but rather ‘the separation between the sacred and the profane.’ Within the category of the profane, are those entities which are themselves *tahor* or impure. These entities represent mixture, confusion or anomaly: ‘blurred frontiers.’¹² In performing these duties of separation, the ancient Israelites created, what Klawans calls, ‘a productive expression of religious ideals.’¹³

Those foods—most notably swine—which failed to conform clearly to carefully defined categories were removed from the diet. But the separation

8. Douglas, *Purity and Danger*, 54–55. Douglas moderated this position substantially in *Leviticus as Literature*.

9. Kristeva, *Powers of Horror*, 3.

10. Klawans, *Impurity and Sin*, 23–25; Weiss, ‘Impurity without Repression,’ 205–21.

11. Klawans, *Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple*, 49–74, esp. 58.

12. Schmidt, *How the Temple Thinks*, 90–95.

13. Klawans, *Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple*, 73.

of foods in Jewish life regularly functioned as a reflection of Israel itself, due to forces within and without of her control. In the Hellenistic period, pork became a 'uniquely abhorred substance'.¹⁴ Kraemer contends that this is due to the fact that, during this period, observant Jews would have had regular opportunities to watch non-Jewish neighbors consuming pork. As such, pork was 'viewed more and more as the food of the other'.¹⁵ Moreover, the *non*-consumption of pork became a stick with which the heathen beat the Jews. In the Roman context, the non-consumption of pork came to be a defining characteristic of Jewish otherness.¹⁶ The midrashic reading of Leviticus 18 included the claim that the non-consumption of pork was *specifically* a practice which the gentiles objected to. The same passage enjoined Jews not to 'do as they do in the land of Egypt' (Lev 18:3).

And the otherness of the Jew was just as entangled with the practice of abstaining from pork in the early-modern world. The financial successes of the Jews in medieval England was attributed by Fuller to their saving money by not buying pork.¹⁷ Meanwhile, those who looked for the conversion of the Jews recalled the strategy of Antiochus, who 'forced the *Jews* to eat Swines flesh, to forsake their Circumcision, and to adore his Gods'.¹⁸ The fact that 'in America they eat no swine's flesh' was evidence for Thomas Thorowgood that the 'people lost in the world' were to be found amongst the indigenous people of the new world.¹⁹

The practice of circumcision and its link with the covenant probably emerged during the period of the Babylonian captivity. Whilst circumcision had been a 'culturally expansive' practice in West Semitic cultures, it became associated primarily with Israel during the Second Temple period. As such, circumcision became the pre-eminent ethnic marker, 'a fruitful cut' by which the 'Jewish social body became differentiated from the body of other cultures'.²⁰ The distinctiveness of circumcision as an ethnic marker was particularly heightened during the reign of Hadrian when the practice was banned and stigmatized.²¹ So it would remain up to the early modern period. Intermittently, in the times and places when the sociological context for the initial requirement of circumcision was revived or recalled—that is

14. Kraemer, *Jewish Eating and Identity*, 30.

15. Kraemer, *Jewish Eating and Identity*, 33.

16. Rosenblum, *Food and Identity in Early Rabbinic Judaism*.

17. Fuller, *Church-History of Britain*, 13:85.

18. J. J., *Resurrection of Dead Bones*, 87.

19. Thorowgood, *Digitus Dei*, 7.

20. Hendel, *Remembering Abraham*, 21.

21. Cohen, *Beginnings of Jewishness*, 47.

in the condition of exile with the concomitant threat of miscegenation—the significance of circumcision was redoubled. Even Menasseh ben Israel was moved to refer to it as ‘the strange act.’²²

The observation of the Sabbath represented another ‘productive expression’ of the separation of the Israelites. In the condition of exile, the locus of ritual separation shifted from the Temple to the quotidian practices of daily life. Daniel Smith, Claus Westermann, Yaira Amit and John Van Seters have all argued that the significance of the Sabbath was augmented by the destruction of the Temple and the suspension of sacrificial worship.²³ Amit has claimed that the creation story of Genesis 1 emerged from a redaction of the Holiness School. Amit claims that the establishment of the Sabbath as described in this text was ‘an effective technique of separation.’ In the observation of the Sabbath, the Israelites were ‘cut off’ from the ‘rhythm of the environment’ and were ‘connected to a new understanding of . . . Divine time.’ For Amit, the establishment of these new ways of separating and ‘preserving Israelite society’ was necessitated by the absence of the Temple. The observation of the Sabbath provided a way to ‘establish a sanctified realm within an impure environment.’²⁴ As such, it functioned as a form of resistance, separating the devotee from ‘the world.’ To use the terminology we find in the letter of Aristeas, the law was a ‘wall.’²⁵ A similar understanding of ethics would emerge in the writings of seventeenth-century Judaizers. In other words, the presence of these practices in the devotional life of Judaizing Godly professors like Tillam, Totney and Traske represented something more profound than mimesis.

JUDAISM AND SINGULARITY IN THE BIBLICAL APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE

These concerns for passive separation by resistance—and in particular the association of Israel with ‘divine time’—also lie at the heart of early Jewish apocalyptic literature. The authors of Daniel and Enoch drew upon the exilic experiences of previous generations in order to make sense of their own experiences during the period of Seleucid domination. In the early 1990s, Rainer Albertz identified a connection between apocalyptic prophecy and resistance. By describing a ‘complex of eschatological ideas’ and envisioning

22. Israel, *Hope of Israel*, 71.

23. Smith, *Religion of the Landless*; VanSeters, *Law Book for the Diaspora*, 160–61; Westermann, *Isaiah 40–66*, 309–10.

24. Amit, *Hidden Polemics in the Biblical Narrative*, 239.

25. Aristeas, *Aristeas to Philocrates*, 156–57.

a 'total end of world history,' these authors 'preserved the religion of Israel from succumbing to Hellenistic pressure.'²⁶

The suggestion that apocalyptic thought and apocalyptic chronology served to shore up the boundaries between a Godly in-group and an ungodly outgroup has been revisited in recent years by Anatheia Portier-Young. In resisting the attempts by hegemonic forces to assimilate Jewish culture and religion, the authors of apocalyptic literature engaged in a cultural struggle, engaging with and disrupting the 'everyday metaphors of power.'²⁷ Portier-Young suggests that the apocalypses of Daniel and Enoch exemplify a number of strategies that served to undermine the authority of the secular rulers of the day—who sought to 'de-create' Jewish identity. Apocalyptic writers, she claims, established 'critical inversions,' reversing the conventional binaries of 'the hegemonic construction of reality' in order to 'create the possibility for resistance to hegemony . . . wherein categories are retained but the hierarchy of values or assignment of value is turned upside down.' They also 'turn to history to reveal the contingency of present reality.'²⁸

In the book of Daniel, the use of apocalyptic time served as a mode of resistance, rendering contingent the structures of earthly power. This tendency is both explicit and implicit in the text. In chapter 7, Daniel has a vision of the fourth Kingdom:

It will be different from all the other kingdoms and will devour the whole earth, trampling it down and crushing it. The ten horns are ten kings who will come from this kingdom. After them another king will arise, different from the earlier ones; he will subdue three kings. He will speak against the Most High and oppress his holy people and try to change the set times and the laws. The holy people will be delivered into his hands for a time, times and half a time.

For the authors of this text, the measuring of time, and the observation of 'God time,' provided the field of conflict between the Godly and 'the world.' This text informed a raft of millenarian theories in the early Stuart period.

For Portier-Young, the maintenance of clear, distinct boundaries between the sacred minority and the dominant, ungodly majority was both a political and a religious concern. The assertion of apocalyptic time at once demonstrated the temporal limits of earthly power, acting as a form of discursive resistance, and promised the fulfilment and the unveiling of a future condition in which the fortunes of the minority are reversed. In the latter

26. Albertz, *History of Israelite Religion*, 564.

27. Mitchell, 'Everyday Metaphors of Power,' 545–77.

28. Portier-Young, *Apocalypse Against Empire*, 202–17, 14, 13.

instance, the use of apocalyptic time located the author in an allegorical space, suspended between the future and the past and immune to the conditional, historical realities of the present. When Godly readers—and particularly those like Thomas Totney and Thomas Tillam who were engaged in a millenarian, political struggle—turned to these texts, they found within them profound resonances, shared convictions, shared concerns. Both the Godly, who believed themselves to be ‘elect,’ and the authors of Daniel, ‘depended upon signs which will be fulfilled at the end of time.’²⁹

ALLOSEMITISM AND THE EARLY CHURCH

The term ‘allosemitism’ was most clearly defined by Zygmunt Bauman in an essay written in 1998. The neologism itself was coined originally by Artur Sandauer. Bauman writes that philo-Semitic and anti-Semitic Christians, alike, share a common commitment to the ‘othering’ of ‘the Jew.’ Bauman cites the example of Friedrich Rühs who, observing the process of Jewish de-ghettoization in early nineteenth-century Germany, expressed relief that Jewish people would always be distinctive, inimitable and distinguishable. Rühs ‘could not bear the idea of the Jew melting inconspicuously into the crowd,’ Bauman writes: ‘Jews were different and their difference mattered.’³⁰ The origins of this tendency, to portray the Jew as irreducibly other, began in the earliest period of Christianity. During the period which followed the destruction of the Second Temple, radical reformulations of Judaism emerged from Christian, Jewish and Jewish Christian spheres. Each of these developments contributed to a physical and discursive separation of Judaism from Christianity.

The attitude of allosemitism is identifiable in the earliest Christian documents. The Johannine complaints concerning ‘the Jews’ and St. Paul’s discussion of carnal circumcision were read by early Christian apologues as expressions of supersessionism.³¹ Traditionally conceived, Paul’s epistle to the Romans represents a rejection of the binding nature of the ceremonial law and a derogation of the function of circumcision. Supersessionist tradition identifies these texts as proof of the abrogation of the old, carnal covenant, of the Law and of the chosenness of the Jews.

During the period in which the ‘whatness’ of Christianity was defined, a number of apologues contributed to the canon of, what has subsequently

29. Lewalski, *Protestant Poetics*, 126.

30. Bauman, ‘Allosemitism,’ 143–56.

31. Bieringer et al., ‘Wrestling with Johannine Anti-Judaism,’ 3–41.

become known as, *Adversus Iudaeos* literature.³² The claim that Judaism and Jews themselves were ‘carnal’ was articulated in Justin Martyr’s *Dialogue with Trypho*. The promise of salvation did not, Justin claimed, belong to the ‘carnal seed’ of Abraham, but rather to his ‘spiritual seed.’ Additional texts served to demonstrate that Israel’s covenant was not only *superseded* but that it was intrinsically *inferior* to the spiritual. Moreover, Israel herself was characterized as irredeemably carnal, a tendency which necessitated the carnality of the old covenant.³³ The story of the Golden Calf was used as evidence of this (Acts 7:37). Given that Jewish religion was intrinsically carnal, and given that God had abandoned His covenant with the Jewish people, Christian apologists were required to explain the continued existence of observant Jews in the early Christian era. The troubling perpetuation of Jewry was addressed by Augustine. The Jews, he contended, were the *scrinaria*, bearers of the truth to which they could not themselves attest.³⁴ They were ‘vessels of wrath’ of the kind mentioned by Paul in his letter to the Romans, walking testimonies to the wages of sin.³⁵ As such, the figure of the Jew was frozen in time, fossilized in the act of deicide. Jews existed as ‘biohermeneutic and biopolitical figures,’ walking reminders of divine vengefulness.³⁶ Denied coevalness, the Jews were located in an atemporal, allegorical space. For Bauman, this period marked the beginning of the association of Judaism and ambivalence. Anti-Judaism, for Bauman, was a form of proteaphobia, an anxiety elicited by the troublingly mixed nature of the Jew. The Jew was both blessed and cursed, empirical and symbolic. The protean nature of the Jew stood in counterpart to the pure, untarnished ideal of Christendom. Each of these claims centered on the otherness of the Jews, not only as different, as anterior but as *antithetical* to their Christian cousins. As Ruether, claims, the ‘negation of Judaism’ was a crucial stage in the development of the Christian identity in late antiquity. Judaism—and in particular the ‘carnal’ image of Judaism—was constructed as a productive antithesis to early Christianity. This process was replicated and mirrored in the proceeding centuries. Early modern scholars referred back to the texts of the *Adversus Iudaeos* canon in attempts to ‘other’ the Jews and Judaizers of their own period.³⁷

32. Ruether, *Faith and Fratricide*, 117–23.

33. Mach, ‘Justin Martyr’s *Dialogus cum Tryphone Iudaeo*,’ 27–85.

34. Cohen, *Living Letters of the Law*, 36; Augustine, ‘Reply to Faustus the Manichaeon,’ 128.

35. Fredriksen, *Augustine and the Jews*, 177–79.

36. Nirneberg, ‘Politics of Love and its Enemies,’ 508.

37. Warren, *Jews Sabbath Antiquated*, 220.

But the separation of Judaism during the period of late antiquity was not a one-way street. The 'maximalist' account of the emergence of rabbinic Judaism suggests that this phenomenon was catalysed by the interaction with anti-Jewish, Christian texts.³⁸ Knohl shows how, during the second Temple period, the Pharisees emerged as the successors of the Holiness School, promoting an ethos which broadened the concept of 'holiness' beyond the sacrificial cult. Holiness in this context does not necessarily imply 'moral,' but rather 'ritual' separation. Whilst the authors of the Priestly Torah maintained 'holiness' within the temple and the priesthood, the Holiness School 'burst the walls of the sanctuary.' It was this tradition that would form the cultural basis for the development of Pharisaism.³⁹ The Pharisees did not seek to supplant the priesthood, but rather to apply the holiness of the priesthood to the entire people of Israel. This project became even more urgent in the context of diaspora. As part of this process, rabbinic scholars engaged in a process of critical inversion. Drawing upon the negative appraisal of Judaism as described in the Hellenistic literature of the period, early rabbinic thinkers sought out and inhabited the pejorative space as an assertion of the distinctiveness and separateness of Israel from the heathen of the land. Rabbinic literature from the proto-Rabbinical period records an explosion of apparently 'carnal' beliefs and devotional practices. Rabbinic writers actively protested that the first man was embodied, in opposition to Hellenic contemporaries. Rabbinic scholars described the human person as an animated body. Rabbinic scholars avowed that the patriarchs observed Mosaic ritual laws.⁴⁰ The period during which Talmudic thought developed and during which the most 'carnal' aspects of Jewish divinity began to develop coincided with a sustained period of Jewish minority experience. During this time, as Boyarin notes, 'rabbinic Judaism was substantially differentiated in its representations of discourses of the body and sexuality from Greek speaking Jewish formations.'⁴¹ On this basis, Boyarin has contended that the earliest rabbinic traditions emerged from a desire to meet the anti-Judaic critiques of 'carnal Israel' with an inversion of this critique, an *embrace* of carnality. 'Proto-rabbinic Jews,' writes Boyarin, 'seem to have strongly resisted dualistic notions. . . . This resistance was at least in part owing to cultural politics.'⁴² Boyarin suggests that midrash represented an embrace of a carnal reading of the scriptures in the face of this very charge

38. Boyarin, *Dying for God*.

39. Knohl, *Divine Symphony*, 67; *Sanctuary of Silence*, 223–25.

40. Boyarin, *Carnal Israel*, 33.

41. Boyarin, *Carnal Israel*, 5.

42. Boyarin, *Carnal Israel*, 6.

from the Patristic authors. 'Midrash,' claims Boyarin 'refuses that dualism, eschewing the inner-outer, visible-invisible, body-soul dichotomies of allegorical reading.' Rabbinic scholars 'insisted on the essentiality of corporeality and sexuality' in the face of a prevailing ethos of self-abnegation in Pauline Christianity and Hellenic Judaism.⁴³ 'The division between Christianity and Judaism,' Peter Brown writes, 'was sharpest in this.'⁴⁴ Ruether, meanwhile, describes the Talmudic literature of this period as 'less of a direct argument with Christians than a defensive affirmation of Judaism.'⁴⁵ Rabbinic Judaism and early Christianity therefore, supervened upon one another.

On August 21, 1646, an advertisement appeared in a London newspaper. It read:

The Body of the Antient Lawes, both Civill and Ecclesiasticall of the Jews called Mischnaioth is printed and perfected this week at Amsterdam. A work much desired for its utility, never before published with the points.⁴⁶

The printing of rabbinic literature in early modern Europe—and the work of Hebraists like Jacob Buxtorf—brought about new and wider exposure of rabbinic thought to non-Jewish audiences.⁴⁷ The Talmud became emblematic of the distinctiveness of Jewishness from Christianity in the eyes of Christians as well as Jews. The 'sharp' distinction of carnality became heightened in the context of a Protestant culture that placed even more accent on the distinction between the carnal and the spiritual. The Talmud moved closer to the center of the devotional life of European Jewry. With the emergence of the practice of *pilpul*, the Talmud became even more internalized as a component of European Jewish identity.⁴⁸ Leon of Modena marvelled at the assiduousness of ordinary Jews in maintaining Talmudic observation.⁴⁹ The 'hypertrophic' significance of Talmud for European Jews drew the criticism of their Christian peers, and became a point of distinction for Christian apologetes between the polity of Israel and the 'pharasaical,' ceremonial religion of rabbinic Judaism. The Talmud became

43. Boyarin, *Carnal Israel*, 7, 35.

44. Brown, 'Person and Group,' 253–67.

45. Ruether, *Faith and Fratricide*, 169. It is worth noting that this process of auto-differentiation was not wholly immediately successful. This has been amply demonstrated in Fredriksen, *Jesus of Nazareth, King of the Jews*, 94–106.

46. *Perfect Occurrences of Both Houses of Parliament and Martiall Affairs*, no. 34.

47. Burnett, *From Christian Hebraism to Jewish Studies*; Heller, 'Earliest Printings of the Talmud,' 61–78.

48. Berkovitz, 'Rabbinic Culture,' 349–78.

49. Carlebach, 'Status of the Talmud,' 87–89.

a symbol of Jewish carnality. If the Gospel was 'light,' John Paget believed, then the Talmud was 'utter darkness.'⁵⁰ It was burnt in the streets.⁵¹ Talmud, a thousand years after its initial incarnation, once again became a fulcrum for sharp, discursive distinctions between Christians and Jews.

ALLOSEMITISM IN ENGLISH CULTURE

In 1583, Phillip Stubbes retold the story of the Jew of Tewkesbury:

So it chaunced that a certaine Iewe . . . by greate casualtie fell into a Privie upon one of their Sabbaoth daies, and the people endeououryng to helpe hym forthe, he forbad them to labor about hym upon the Sabbaoth daie, chosing to dye in that filthie stincking place, (as by morning he was dead) then to breake the Lordes Sabbaoth.⁵²

This myth was first recorded four-hundred years earlier but had remained canonical throughout the period of the expulsion.⁵³ It provides a crystallization of the central themes of anti-Judaic bias in medieval and early-modern England. The Jew, in his bondage to the carnal Law, is humiliated, destroyed and—most pertinently—rendered untouchable for his Christian peers. Carnality, legalism, humiliation and otherness are inextricably intertwined.

Before the expulsion, the English were more allosemitic than the people of any other country in Europe. Jews, during the medieval period, were monitored and excluded from participation in feudal life.⁵⁴ In graphic art, in literature and in every aspect of culture, Jews were portrayed as anterior, debased and deviant.⁵⁵ The figure of the male Jew was often located in a liminal space between genders, subject to lactation and to menstruation.⁵⁶ Demonstrations of Christian piety were often complemented by acts of anti-Judaic violence or slander. Anti-Judaic mythology often took the form of

50. Paget, *Arrow Against the Separation of the Brownistes*, 26, 287.

51. Burnett, 'Regulation of Hebrew Printing in Germany,' 348; Carlebach, 'Status of the Talmud,' 87–89.

52. Stubbes, *Anatomie of Abuses*, M8v.

53. Bale, *Jew in the Medieval Book*, 23–55; Bale, 'Framing Antisemitic Exempla,' 19–47.

54. Skinner, *Jews in Medieval Britain*, 2; Despres, 'Cultic Anti-Judaism and Chaucer's Littel Clergeon,' 413–27; Stacey, 'Anti-Semitism and the Medieval English State,' 166.

55. Lipton, *Images of Intolerance*, 25.

56. Katz, 'Shylock's Gender,' 44–48.

an inversion: Christian iconography or tradition was inverted, satirized or contorted into grotesque and scandalous forms. Blood libels, host-desecration libels, and other myths identified Jewish ritual as the shadow-form of Christian worship.⁵⁷

But even after the expulsion and into the early-modern period, the othering of the Jew retained a central role in English life. As James Shapiro has demonstrated, the anterior figure of the Jew remained a staple of Jacobean culture. Most famously in Marlowe's *The Jew of Malta*, but also in *The Tragical Raigne of Selimus*, *Jack Drum's Entertainment* and *The Travels of Three English Brothers*, the familiar tropes of Jewish villainy were rehearsed. Jews 'went about poisoning wells.'⁵⁸ The claim that Jews 'crucified children' remained feasible.⁵⁹ Jewish pleasure was correlative to Christian suffering: 'we smile when Christian's moan' says Marlowe's Barabbas.⁶⁰ Travel literature of this period perpetuated myths that presented Jews as alien, exotic and utterly other. Their worship was filled with roaring and chaos. Their skin was black and peculiar.⁶¹ Their nostrils flared.⁶² Even self-appointed ethnographers of European Jewry took as the basis for their descriptions of Jewish life the old, familiar, medieval slanders against Jewry, filling new skins with old, anti-Judaic wine.⁶³ Prynne's objections to readmission were based on the deeply entrenched impression that Jews were interlopers, 'murmuring, mutinous, rebellious, seditious against Governor, King and Priest.'⁶⁴

Various explanations could be offered for the prevalence of anti-Judaic sentiment in English culture. Some have argued that it represented an oedipal contest for the prize of elect nationhood, some that it represents the cultural valence of supersessionist theology.⁶⁵ In recent years Robert Stacey, Miri Rubin, Geraldine Heng and Anthony Bale have pointed to the identification of the Jew as antitype in the generation of English national identity in the medieval period.⁶⁶ The framing of Englishness as the antithesis of Juda-

57. Bale, *Jew in the Medieval Book*, 23–55; Rubin, *Gentile Tales*; Heng, 'Jews, Saracens, "Black Men," Tartars,' 249–55; Fesselstein, *Anti-Semitic Stereotypes*; Dundes, *Blood Libel Legend*.

58. Marlowe, *Jew of Malta* 2.3.179.

59. Marlowe, *Jew of Malta* 3.4.49–50.

60. Marlowe, *Jew of Malta* 2.3.170–73.

61. Munster, *Messias of the Christians and the Jewes*, 2.

62. Daborne, *Christian Turn'd Turk*, C4r.

63. Shapiro, *Shakespeare and the Jews*, 102.

64. Prynne, *Short Demurrer*, 79.

65. Loewenstein, *Christians and the Jews*; Ruether, *Faith and Fratricide*, 1–23.

66. Rubin, 'Identities' 408–12; Bale, *Jew in the Medieval Book*, 130–35; Rubin, *Gentile Tales*, 25–28; Heng, 'Jews, Saracens, "Black Men," Tartars,' 249–55.

ism recurred periodically throughout English history. In the period leading up to the expulsion of the Jews in 1290, anti-Judaic discourse and violence served in turn as cultural mechanisms, which incubated the nascent, national identity. The figure of the king, as the totemic figure of the nation, was often placed in contrast with images of Jews. The rood-screen at St. Peter and St. Paul in Eye, Suffolk bears the images of English kings (Henry VI and Edward the Confessor) along with the image of martyred William of Norwich tacitly positioning 'the Jews,' in the anterior. This polarity was dramatized in the events surrounding the coronation of Richard I. Notable Jews attending the coronation were set upon by an angry mob.⁶⁷ This event would linger in the consciousness of John Foxe and later of William Prynne. Especially at moments of heightened anxiety surrounding the stability and cohesion of the nation, myths which offered accounts of English, Christian victories over Judaism were mobilized in order to inculcate solidarity and unity. Ranulf Higden's *Polychronicon* book-ends an account of the Barons' War (which constituted an existential threat to the cohesion of a relatively young nation) with seemingly extraneous anti-Judaic anecdotes.⁶⁸ This rhetorical stratagem was intended as a warning of the perennial fragility of the Christian state.⁶⁹

In the early modern era, just as in the medieval era, the antitype of the Jew was mobilized in the task of crafting a national identity. An additional layer of Bauman's analysis of allosemitism posits that the topos of the Jew was identifiable—in Christian discourse—with 'radical ambivalence.' As such, anti-Judaic hatred is properly understood not as a form of heterophobia, but rather as a form of proteophobia; not as fear of 'the unfamiliar,' but rather the fear of 'something or someone that does not fit the structure of the orderly world, does not fall easily into established categories, emits contradictory signals and . . . blurs the borderlines.' Stigmatization of 'blurry' Jews, therefore, served in turn to sharpen the definition of the image of Englishness. In England, this tendency reasserted itself during sustained periods of uncertainty about national and ecclesiastical unity. Prynne rehearsed the stories of the threat of Jewish otherness that had been told generations earlier by Higden.⁷⁰ Samantha Zacher claims that the 'Jewish other,' formed the 'mythological ground' for the development of English national identity at the dawn of modernity.⁷¹ Rosenblatt links 'fear and loathing of Jews' in

67. Bale, *Jew in the Medieval Book*, 132, 26.

68. Higden, *Prolicionycion*.

69. Bale, 'Framing Antisemitic Exempla,' 19–47.

70. Prynne, *Short Demurrer*, 8.

71. Zacher, 'Judaism and National Identity,' 375.

the seventeenth century with 'the confused struggles among the English . . . to develop a religious and national identity.'⁷² The absence of 'real-life' Jews did little to undermine the success of this cultural strategy. 'England,' Shapiro writes 'was defined by its having purged itself of the Jews.' As such, 'English character was defined by its need to exclude Jewishness.'⁷³ By extension, renewed awareness of 'real-life Jews' brought with it renewed anxiety about 'cultural and personal miscegenation.'⁷⁴ The vicious response to the proposal of readmission from figures like William Prynne has been identified by Shapiro as a sign of the anxiety felt by Englishmen and women about the frailty of the nation in the aftermath of the English Revolution. This fear seeped into the cultural consciousness. Some feared that Judaism was infectious, a form of leprosy.⁷⁵ Ralph Josselin had nightmares that Thurloe himself would 'turn Jew.'⁷⁶ In other ways, the boundaries between Jewishness and Christianity were blurred, problematized and deliberated over. The question of whether Jews could easily be identified became fraught. James Howell reported that the Habasines were 'Christians from the girdle upwards, and Jews downward.'⁷⁷ The suggestion that Jewish immorality brought about somatic changes remained on the table, further demonstrating the anxiety that was abroad about the distinctiveness of the Jew from the Christian.⁷⁸

Most of all, commentators of this period feared the slippage that existed between Jewish and Christian ritual and devotional practice. This informed the perennial use of the charge of Judaizing as a rhetorical designation of doctrinal error and heterodoxy.⁷⁹ If Jews did not exist, it is tempting to claim, it would have been necessary for early-modern Englishmen and women to invent them. In a time of crisis of national identity—the period leading up to the Civil War—they did precisely that. It is to the charge of Judaizing that we turn next.

72. Rosenblatt, 'John Selden's *De Jure Naturalis*,' 103.

73. Shapiro, *Shakespeare and the Jews*, 7.

74. Shapiro, *Shakespeare and the Jews*, 8.

75. Collier, *Brief Answer to Some of the Objections*, 12.

76. Josselin, *Diary of Ralph Josselin*, 337.

77. Howell, *Instructions for Forreine Travel*, 154.

78. Daborn, *Christian Turned Turk*, c4r. For a broader discussion on early-modern conceptions of ethnicity in relation to morality and humor, see Wilson, 'English Mettle,' 133–34.

79. Glaser, *Judaism without Jews*, 54–63.

THE CHARGE OF JUDAIZING

Thomas Coryat was surprised, when he arrived in Venice, to find Jews who were ‘goodly and proper men.’ Living in a society within which the figure of the Jew had taken on mythic proportions, Coryat understood the word Jew to denote ‘a *weather beaten warp-faced* fellow, sometimes a phrenticke and lunaticke person, sometimes one discontented.’⁸⁰ ‘The Jew’ was an outsider: odd-looking, contrary and mad. In early-modern England, Glassman notes, ‘an entire people were made a derogatory term in the English language.’⁸¹ In this context, therefore, the topos of Judaism developed an additional association with sedition and deviance. In a variety of different settings, the singularity of ‘the Jew’ was co-opted as a pejorative term in order to marginalize a rival religious or political claim. Thomas Netter had accused the Lollards of being ‘Judaizers.’⁸² In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries this term was adopted by the antagonists of the Godly in their attempts to enforce conformity. They stigmatized the Godly, and thereby provided for them a sphere within which the Godly could exhibit their own, devotional, ‘singularity.’

In travel journals of this period, the Jew is portrayed as misguided but nonetheless assiduous in his commitment to the Law. The Law, as such, provided an obstacle to commerce, to progress and to reason. John Taylor expressed a grudging admiration for the misguided but, nonetheless, unimpeachably dedicated Jews:

When Christians dare Gods Sabbath to abuse,
They make themselves a scorne to Turkes and Iewes:
You stealing *Barabasses* beastly Race,
Rob God of glory, and your selues of Grace.
Thinke on the supream Iudge who all things tries,
When Iewes in Iudgement shall against you rise.
Their feigned trueth, with feruent Zeale they show.⁸³

Routinely, in this period, identification was drawn between the Jews—as extremists, zealous for the carnal law—and the Godly. At times, this identification was brazen. In Robert Davenport’s *A New Trick to Cheat the Devil*, Davenport describes a Puritan as:

80. Coryat, *Coryats Crudities*, 232.

81. Glassman, *Anti-Semitic Stereotypes without Jews*, 72.

82. Groeneveld, ‘Mourning, Heresy, and Ressurrection,’ 16.

83. Taylor, *Three Weekes*, b4r.

One that will eat no pork. Doth use to shut his shop on Saturdays, And open them on Sundays: A Jewish Christian and a Christian Jew.⁸⁴

At other times, the identification was more muted but nonetheless insidious. Godly conventicles were referred to as 'sinagogues'.⁸⁵ Godly professors were labelled as 'rabbis'.⁸⁶ Acts of 'divisive identification,' by which the Godly identified themselves as other, were met with the accusation of being 'Jewish.'

The portrayal of Puritanism, and in particular the Judaizing figure of 'Zeal-of-the-Land Busy,' in *Bartholomew Fair* has been examined by Jeanette Ferreira Ross, Eliane Glaser, Patrick Collinson and Nicholas McDowell.⁸⁷ Busy is portrayed as a zealot, an extremist, an enemy of fun, a killjoy. In his own words, he is:

One that rejoiceth in his affliction, and siteth here to prophes the destruction of fairs and Maygames, wakes and Whitsun-ales, and doth sigh and groan for the reformation of these abuses.⁸⁸

Busy makes regular reference to his sense of separateness and deviation from worldly society:

The lion may roar, but he cannot bite. I am glad to be thus separated from the heathen of the land and put apart in the stocks for the holy cause.⁸⁹

Like the woman who was arrested for hooting at the bishop of London in the late sixteenth century, and who, throughout her ordeal, 'prayed the Lorde for that He had made hir worthy to suffer persecution for ryght-wysnes,' Busy saw the humiliation of the stocks as a mark of 'separation' and thus a benediction.⁹⁰

Zeal-of-the-Land himself professes concern about the association of his own community with Judaism. In order to dispel the similarity, he attempts to negate the comparison by ostentatiously indulging in 'swine's flesh':

84. Davenport, *Pleasant and Witty Comedy*, f4v.

85. Sacristan, *Whetstone of Reproofe*, 431; Cleveland, *Revived Poems*, 71.

86. Heath, *Clarastella*, 8.

87. Ferreira-Ross, 'Religion and the Law,' 348–63; Collinson, 'Ben Johnson's *Bartholomew Fair*,' 157–69.

88. Jonson, *Bartholomew Fair* 4.6.87.

89. Jonson, *Bartholomew Fair* 4.6.83.

90. Stowe, 'Stowe's Memoranda,' 140.

Indeed, I will eat exceedingly, and prophesy; there may be good use made of it, too, now I think on't: by the publike eating of swine's flesh, to profess our hate and loathing of Judaisme, whereof the brethren stand taxed. I will therefore eat, yea, I will eat exceedingly.⁹¹

Jonson's audience would have recognized the tropological interaction between the extremism and carnality of the Jews and the extremism and carnality of the Godly. But it is also telling that 'Rabbi' Busy here explores the process of the development of his own pious practices *in light of* the way in which these practices will be apprehended by his peers. In this respect, the figure of Zeal-of-the-Land Busy reflects the problem of Puritan identity that Ferreira, Collinson and—latterly—Glaser have all debated. Zeal-of-the-Land is a stereotype. But as Ann Hughes has demonstrated, the distinction between the stereotype of the Puritan and the real thing was not a straightforward one. Stereotypes, as Hughes writes, 'interact in a complex way with stigmatized groups' self-images in processes of identity formation.'⁹² The question of whether Puritan-Judaizer 'the thing' or Puritan-Judaizer 'the name' came first is recognized as fraught by Jonson and, indeed, by Zeal-of-the-Land himself.⁹³ In the play, Zeal-of-the-Land's character is created by a series of interactions between the Godly and the ungodly. The same was true of the interaction between Jonson and his Godly peers.

CRANKISHNESS, SEPARATION, AND THE SABBATH

The centerpiece of Godly 'Judaizing' in the discourse of seventeenth-century England was sabbatarianism. Sabbatarianism offers perhaps the clearest picture of the distinctiveness of Puritan divinity, not only in relation to English Protestantism but also in relation to the other Reformed Protestant movements of continental Europe. Popkin called it 'a crankish kind of reform.' He meant that it appeared to have no point of correspondence with the ethos of the continental Reform project.⁹⁴ 'The English attitude,' Katz writes, 'was radically different from that which prevailed on the continent.'⁹⁵ Calvin ostentatiously played bowls on the Sabbath, while Luther famously declared

91. Jonson, *Bartholomew Fair* 1.6.95.

92. Hughes, *Gangraena*, 10–11.

93. Collinson, 'Theatre Constructs Puritanism,' 158; Ferreira-Ross, 'Religion and the Law,' 45–66; Glaser, *Judaism without Jews*, 33; Adkins, 'Genesis of Dramatic Satire,' 81–95.

94. Popkin, *Jewish Christians and Christian Jews*, 7.

95. Katz, 'Jewish Sabbath and Christian Sunday,' 119.

that 'if Sunday were anywhere made holy merely for the day's sake or its observance set on a Jewish foundation, then I order you to walk on it, to ride on it, to dance on it.'⁹⁶ Puritans, on the other hand, zealously exhibited their veneration of the Sabbath day.⁹⁷ Katz identifies this phenomenon as an offshoot of Puritan Biblicism. 'The explanation for English Sabbatarianism,' he writes 'must in the first instance be sought in light of the Puritan emphasis on a direct understanding of the word of God as it appears in the Bible.'⁹⁸

Certainly, however, Sabbatarianism was understood by the peers of the Godly as denoting something *apart* from Biblicist obedience. Sabbatarianism was rather understood as a designation of deviance and dissent. The flash-points of conflict between the Godly and their neighbors often centered on issues relating to Sabbath observation.⁹⁹ The most obvious of these related to the playing of Sports. The playing of Sports became a politicized issue in Jacobean England because Sabbatarianism was understood to be demonstrative of a refusal to conform to the traditional patterns of rural life. This in itself was understood as an act of non-conformity which threatened the cohesion of the Kingdom. Sabbath festivities were identified explicitly by the authorities as a means of generating social solidarity and cohesive social-identities. On November 5, 1633, Bishop Piers of Bath and Wells wrote to Archbishop Laud detailing the extent to which Feasts of Dedication were observed in his see. Piers reported that seventy-two of his ministers had defended the celebration of the feasts on the basis that they should be maintained:

For the civilizing of the people, for their lawful recreations, for composing differences by meeting of friends, for increase of love and amity as being feasts of charity.¹⁰⁰

In refusing to participate in them, therefore, the Godly were disruptive of this process.

That the Sabbath offers an intrinsic demarcation of holiness—of the devotee as well as the practice—was recognized by Bozeman who called it 'a showpiece of a repertoire of means for ethical amendment and self-control.'¹⁰¹ The English people recalled the role of the Jews themselves as interrupters, uneasy presences in economic and social life. The tenacity of myths like that

96. Katz, 'Jewish Sabbath and Christian Sunday,' 121.

97. Parker, *English Sabbath*, 139–61.

98. Katz, *God's Last Words*, 62.

99. Watt, *Cheap Print and Popular Piety*, 325.

100. Prynne, *Canterburies Doome*, 142.

101. Bozeman, *Precisianist Strain*, 113.

of the Jew of Tewkesbury, which itself located Sabbatarianism, deviance and extremism in juxtaposition with Judaism, attests to this. The Sabbath was one of an armoury of practices that firmly designated the Jews as 'other.' It was on this basis, not *just* on the basis of the similarity of the doctrinal claims of the Sabbatarians to Judaism, that they were designated Judaizers. 'Judaizing' represented a rupture in social life and it was described as such by the critics of Sabbatarianism. For Bishop Morton, Sabbatarianism was a sinister undermining of clerical and secular authority. He ordered that 'all such kinds of people as are said to encline to Judaisme' be 'observed.'¹⁰² William Cotton also assimilated Sabbatarianism with an overall spirit of anti-authoritarianism:

Every day complaints are made by ministers who are railed on and shrewdly beaten by lewd persons; in one place a minister was made to kiss the bare hinder parts of a man. Jewism also aboundeth, twenty factions in one city; many conventicles held in gardens and fields and sermons preached at midnight; few or none come to church, but they will follow rattle headed preachers from town to town.¹⁰³

Peter Heylyn saw the practice of Sabbatarianism as far more than simply a matter of doctrinal difference. He suggested that it was evidence of 'the declining period of the church.'¹⁰⁴ The Sabbath was disturbing, uncanny. In the words of Thomas Fuller, the Godly were 'conjuring up the ghosts of long dead Judaisme,' which were 'walking, frightening people with their terrible apparitions.'¹⁰⁵

But the association of Sabbatarianism with dissent and disruption was not a contingent association. The Sabbath, from its inception and in every instance of its observation *necessarily* represents an interruption of life, commerce, and normality. The Sabbath cut off its observer from 'natural time.'¹⁰⁶ The power of the Sabbath to subvert earthly authority was recognized by Romme and Depuis when they devised the Revolutionary Calendar. It was also recognized by James and Charles Stuart in their attempts to enforce conformity on the English Church. It was championed as a mark of resistance by Judas Maccabeus in the struggle against Seleucid domination. Daniel 7 visioned the changing of times and days as a struggle between

102. Tait, 'Declaration of Sports for Lancashire,' 561–68.

103. *Calendar of the Manuscript of the Marquis of Salisbury*, 10:450–51.

104. Heylyn, *History of the Sabbath*, 129.

105. Fuller, *Infants Advocate of Circumcision*, 81; Fuller, *Church-History of Britain*, 17:76.

106. Amit, *Hidden Polemics in the Biblical Narrative*, 239.

the saints and the beast. Whatever else, these acts functioned as a mark of resistance, of self-differentiation. By observing the Sabbath—and by refusing to observe saints' days—the Godly were not only exhibiting their own piety, they were putting their bodies upon the gears and the wheels of the communal life, creating an 'assault on the existing order.'¹⁰⁷

CONCLUSION

'All things are in pairs,' reads Ecclesiasticus, 'each the opposite of the other, but nothing the Lord made is incomplete. Everything completes the goodness of something' (Sir 42:24–25). The observation of the Sabbath is incomplete without the observation of days of labor. The recognition of the sacred is impossible without the recognition of the profane. The identification of early Christians was impossible without 'the Jews.' The identification of the Godly in early modern England was incomplete without the presence of the ungodly. Much ink has been spilt in recent decades over the responsibility of relying on pejorative terms in order to develop a clear picture of religious practices during the seventeenth century. Christopher Hill relied on figures like Thomas Edwards and Ephraim Pagett and their descriptions of the devotional practices of Godly professors. Colin Davis, on the other hand, lamented this practice and claimed that it was akin to 'relying on Horatio Bottomley or Joseph McCarthy for sound, objective depictions of the social realities of their day.'¹⁰⁸ Ann Hughes, however, has argued that representations should not be unravelled from reality. In order to understand phenomena like Puritanism, or antinomianism or Judaizing, it is important to 'take polemical classifications seriously.'¹⁰⁹ The distinction between the signified and the signifier, the stereotype and the stereotyped is often unclear. The attempt to differentiate between the point at which the labelling of the Godly as Judaizers was descriptive and the point at which it was pejorative is not straightforward. The Godly exhibited many of those characteristics that their counterparts regarded as Judaizing. The ungodly stigmatized those behaviors as Judaizing. But these factors *cannot* be isolated or described in isolation. The stigmatization of the Godly as Judaizing is an essential component of the story of the emergence of Judaizing itself. Judaizing stereotype and Judaizer represent the 'two sides of a stressful relationship.' The figures to whom we turn next—John Traske, Thomas Tillam, and Thomas Totney—occupied *and* shaped the space created by this relationship.

107. Moltmann, 'Liberation of the Future,' 8.

108. Davis, *Fear, Myth, and History*, 126.

109. Hughes, *Gangraena*, 11.