Anthropophagy in Three Keys: New World Cannibalism, the Blood Libel, and Corpse Medicine in the British Atlantic World, 1640-1660

Hannah Sparwasser Soroka

A Thesis in
The Department of
History

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Master of Arts (History) at
Concordia University
Montreal, Quebec, Canada

August, 2021

CONCORDIA UNIVERSITY

School of Graduate Studies

This is to certify that the thesis prepared

By: Hannah Sparwasser Soroka

Entitled: Anthropophagy in Three Keys: New World Cannibalism, the Blood Libel, and Corpse Medicine in the British Atlantic World, 1640-1660

And submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts (History)

complies with the regulations of the University and meets the accepted standards with respect to originality and quality.

Signed by the final examining committee:

_____ Chair
Dr. Peter Gossage

_____ Examiner
Dr. Anya Zilberstein

_____ Examiner
Dr. Shannon McSheffrey

_____ Thesis Supervisor
Dr. Ted McCormick

Approved by _____
Dr. Matthew Penney, Chair of Department

August 20, 2021 _____
Dr. Pascale Sicotte, Dean, Faculty of Arts and Science

Abstract

Anthropophagy in Three Keys: New World Cannibalism, the Blood Libel, and Corpse Medicine in the British Atlantic World, 1640-1660

Hannah Sparwasser Soroka

"Anthropophagy in Three Keys: New World Cannibalism, the Blood Libel, and Corpse Medicine in the British Atlantic World, 1640-1660" investigates the English responses to alleged Jewish and Indigenous anthropophagy in the mid-seventeenth century and contrasts them with the practice of medicinal cannibalism, which became widespread in Interregnum England. This thesis argues that cannibalism was used to distinguish in-group from out-group as anxieties around the literal and metaphorical consumption of human bodies resonated in both English metropole and New English colony. These anxieties were made manifest in concerns about territorial expansion, eschatology, and scientific and medical practice; they culminated in persistent, self-aware hypocrisy by English corpse medicine practitioners who were also deeply involved in colonizing efforts and the debate surrounding the possible readmission of Jews to England. Furthermore, "Anthropophagy in Three Keys" reveals the utility of cannibalism as an analytic tool for seventeenth-century Atlantic World history.

Acknowledgements

In one of the first and strangest documents I encountered in graduate school, the seventeenth-century inventor Cressy Dymock writes to his contact, the intelligencer Samuel Hartlib, to ask for money. This money, Dymock assures Hartlib, will be put towards the creation of a perpetual motion machine which he has designed. Through his kind donation, Hartlib will become the wet-nurse for the nascent machine. While Dymock's plan for perpetual motion would go down a phantom pregnancy, I have been reflecting on his letter as I write my own acknowledgements to this thesis. His particular choice of metaphor is rather unappealing to me, however I know that there are many people without whom my thesis would not have been possible at all, never mind a piece of scholarship that I find myself proud of.

I owe a tremendous debt of gratitude to Professor Ted McCormick who supervised my thesis. His insight, sharp eye for detail, and encouragement to always push towards more nuance and specificity have had a profound impact on how I understand my work and how I do it. I am appreciative also for the thoughtful engagement of my committee members, Professor Shannon McSheffrey and Professor Anya Zilberstein. I would like to thank Donna Whittaker for her tireless advocacy and support of the History Department graduate student body, which earns her the admiration and loyalty of all its members. Additionally, my gratitude goes to the community of friends, contacts, and colleagues within the academy who have, over the last two years, invited me into scholarly community and gave me confidence in my own research. I am especially grateful to Sólveig Hanson who has been as steadfast and excellent a friend and colleague as anyone could hope to have.

During the course of my time at Concordia University I have worked and studied in Tiohtià:ke, the lands and waters of which are under the custodianship of the Kanien'kehá:ka Nation, one of the six nations of the Haudenosaunee. This thesis touches on the way English colonizers characterized the Kanien'kehá:ka, as well as colonial treatment of the Massachusetts, Narragansetts, Nipmuc, Wampanoag, Pequots, and Mohegans in what is now called New England. I am thankful that these nations choose to make their histories, traditions, and stories available as resources and I know that I have benefited greatly from their generosity, both as a researcher and as a settler on these lands. As I remain in Tiohtià:ke to continue my studies, I recommit myself to the work towards a right relationship between Indigenous peoples and settlers that takes into account the land, waters, flora, and fauna all around us.

Finally, I want to thank my family: my parents, Gary and Sabine, and my brother, Toby, whose eternal enthusiasm, love, and belief in me motivates all that I do; also my partner Sam who has weathered all storms from family illness to international pandemic by my side with great-souled compassion and patience. I love you all so much.

Contents

Introduction

From the highest-possible vantage point, this thesis is about the English conception and assimilation of outsider groups within the contest of expanding colonial power in the 1650s. At a more granular level, it encompasses a dizzying array of topics including the allegation of Indigenous anthropophagy in the Americas, the lost tribes theory, blood libel, the debate around Jewish readmission to England, and cannibal remedies in European medicine. This thesis aims to show how all of these divergent threads weave together to form the warp and weft of a larger tapestry that depicts the rise in eschatological expectations, the development of Protestant intellectual networks, and English colonial aspirations in the Americas and the Middle East. It presents three case studies to that end: two spurious allegations of cannibalism and one real. These case studies reveal what cannibalism meant and continues to mean, both metaphorically and literally, and demonstrate the complex entanglements of eschatology, philosemitism, race-making, and geopolitics in the mid-seventeenth century Atlantic World.

Much has been made of the twin shocks of the Columbian 'discovery' of the Americas and the Protestant Reformation.[1] While Lee Palmer Wandel has described the enormous fissures they left on the physical and mental European landscape, she has simultaneously emphasized the new opportunities these events opened up for scientific discovery and religious contemplation as well as territorial expansion and financial exploitation.[2] By the mid-seventeenth-century, England was heavily implicated in all of these pursuits—as much under Oliver Cromwell's protectorate as it had been under the pre-Civil War monarchy.[3] Plantations in Virginia and Massachusetts Bay as well as nascent colonial projects in the West Indies gave the English metropole access to commodities as well as a foothold in the Americas as Spanish power in the region was weakening and other European nations such as France and the Netherlands sought to gain land in their own right. Simultaneously, Protestant movements such as Puritanism embraced new approaches to the Bible. Specifically, the Protestant doctrine of *sola scriptura* refocused

---

[1] See, e.g. Andrew Crome (ed.), *Prophecy and Eschatology in the Transatlantic World, 1550-1800* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016). Andrew Grafton, *New Worlds, Ancient Texts* (Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1995).

[2] Lee Palmer Wandel, *The Reformation: Towards a New History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011): 171.

[3] Carla Gardina Pestana, *The English Atlantic in an Age of Revolution, 1640-1661* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2004): 157.

attention on the text of the Christian Bible, including the so-called Old Testament.[4] Additionally, the availability of vernacular Bibles, growing literacy rates, and the notion that each Christian should have an individual relationship with the word of God meant that Biblical interpretations proliferated, especially of eschatological prophecies that were typically de-emphasized by the Catholic Church.[5] A trend emerged in which Protestant attentions turned towards Jews both for their knowledge of the Hebrew Bible and its commentaries, and as harbingers of the end times in accordance with Paul's prediction that Jews would come to accept Christ as the Messiah before the Second Coming.[6]

The renewed eschatological and Biblical focus by Protestants also influenced increased proselytism, especially in the American colonies. Unlike Catholic nations like France and Spain with their high centralized programmes of missionary activity, English attempts to convert Indigenous peoples in the American north-east, particularly the Algonquian-speaking nations dwelling within what became the Massachusetts Bay Colony, were significantly more decentralized and, therefore, more sporadic in nature.[7] As a result, the Anglo-American mission was, on the whole less 'successful' despite the proliferation of a mission literature describing contacts with Indigenous converts, both prospective and actual, and appealing to the metropolitan reader for additional funding. As Laura K. Stevens puts it, "these writings are the primary accomplishment of British mission in the American colonies."[8] Nonetheless, proselytism continued. Perhaps the most successful missionary was John Eliot, known sometimes as 'the Apostle to the Indians,' whose activities in New England resulted in an Algonquian translation of the Bible and several 'Praying Towns' in which new Indigenous converts would be encouraged to abandon their traditional ways of life in favour of English-style dress, housing, and agricultural practice.[9] This process of supplanting Indigenous lifestyles and foodways was self-

---

[4] Andrew Crome, *Christian Zionism and English National Identity, 1600-1850* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018): 63. This thesis uses the term 'Christian Bible' to refer to the Christian text comprising both the Old and New Testaments. As the term 'Old Testament' is anachronistic from a Jewish perspective, this thesis uses 'Hebrew Bible' or 'Tanakh' to describe the Jewish text. Additionally, 'Torah' refers to the first five books of the Hebrew Bible.
[5] Wandel, *The Reformation*, 63-71.
[6] Crome, *Christian Zionism*, 63-65.
[7] Laura K. Stevens, *The Poor Indians: British Missionaries, Native Americans, and Colonial Sensibilities* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006): 3.
[8] Stevens, *The Poor Indians*, 3.
[9] Kathryn N. Gray, "'How may wee come to serve God?': Spaces of Religious Utterance in John Eliot's *Indian Tracts*," *The Seventeenth Century*, 24, no. 1 (2013): 75. Richard Cogley, *John Eliot's Mission to the Indians Before King Philip's War* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999).

consciously erasive as can be seen in Eliot's writings, which demonstrate the paternalistic pity he felt for what he called the "poor Indians."[10] Conversion narratives that arose from Eliot's work also show the ways in which Indigenous tradition was framed as superstitious, undisciplined, and not fully human or civilized.[11]

This patronizing and inaccurate framing carried over in the works of writers in England who followed the progress of the Massachusetts Bay Colony with interest. One such author was Thomas Thorowgood. Thorowgood, a great admirer and eventual correspondent of Eliot, is best-known for his 1650 book *Iewes in America* and its 1660 confusingly-titled sequel *Jews in America*, the former of which marks the first English-language book-length engagement with the lost tribes theory of American population.[12] This theory posited that the Indigenous peoples in the Americas were in fact descendants of the ancient lost tribes of Israel that had been deported by the Neo-Assyrian empire in the eighth century B. C. E. Thorowgood's work on this theory is remarkable for its synthesis and presentation of Biblical, Classical, and even Spanish sources for an English audience.[13] Chapter One of this thesis is devoted primarily to the resurgence of the lost tribes theory in the English context and Thorowgood's to-my-knowledge unique argument that Indigenous cannibalism is evidence for the theory, due to a number of Biblical prophecies—most prominently Ezekiel 5:9-10—that predict that the children of Israel will resort to eating one another in periods of great misfortune. It is important here to note that Thorowgood spent his whole life in England, never traveled to America, and likely met neither a Jew nor an Indigenous person. His argument is characterized by sweeping generalizations that collapse the vastness of American geography and the diversity of Indigenous nations in America into a single, undifferentiated "Indian" people. These people, of course, in Thorowgood's unexamined assumption, are ripe for conversion to Christian religion and Protestant work-ethic with all the trappings in terms of lifestyle, agriculture, and property ownership that it entailed.[14]

---

[10] John Eliot, *The Glorious progress of the Gospel amongst the Indians in New England* (London: Printed by Hannah Allen, 1649): 118.
[11] John Eliot, *Tears of Repentance, or A further Narrative of the Progress of the Gospel amongs the Indians In New-England* (London: Printed by Peter Cole, 1653): E, recto.
[12] Richard Cogley, "The Ancestry of American Indians: Thomas Thorowgood's "Iewes in America" (1650) and "Jews in America" (1660)," *English Literary Renaissance*, 35, no. 2 (2005): 304-306.
[13] Zvi Ben-Dor Benite, *The Ten Lost Tribes: A World History* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009): 174. Lee Eldridge Huddlestone,
[14] Kristina Bross and Hilary E. Wyss, *Early Native Literacies in New England: A Documentary and Critical Anthology* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2008): 6-7.

It is useful here to reflect on Margo Hendricks' opening lecture to the 2019 "Race and Periodization" symposium at the Folger Library, entitled "Coloring the Past, Rewriting Our Future: RaceB4Race." Hendricks lays out two approaches to race in premodernity. The first, which she calls Premodern Race Studies, or PRS—pronounced 'priss'—understands racism primarily, if not exclusively, as anti-Blackness. In this approach, both the subject of PRS analysis and the analysis itself are ultimately superficial.[15] Hendricks proposes a second approach to premodern race which she terms Premodern Critical Race Studies, or PCRS. PCRS understands race not as ideological anti-Blackness, but rather as a technology of anti-Indigeneity.[16] Hendricks argues, "when we make anti-Blackness the pivotal narrative, we elide the anti-Indigenous strategies woven into white supremacy's insistence on anti-Blackness."[17] This shift towards recognizing anti-Indigeneity as the core of racism enables more complex analysis of race as a technology employed in the interest of capital, colonialism, and whiteness. For instance, Hendricks' suggests, a PCRS scholar would recognize the Atlantic trade of enslaved Africans as the anti-Indigenous dislocation of Africans from their lands rather than the exploitation of Black people by white people due to anti-Blackness.[18]

Hendricks' definition of racism and race-making processes as anti-Indigenous applies neatly to the seventeenth-century English incursion into North America. In the post-Columbian moment, the European imagination re-forged race once again and honed it over the century before English colonists began to expand into what is now New England.[19] Armed and bolstered with accounts by Spanish colonizers in South America, English colonists could define the Indigenous peoples they encountered in New England—primarily the Narragansetts, Wampanoags, Massachusetts, Pequots, and Mohegans—according to the information they received prior to their arrival, which defined Indigenous peoples as indolent, savage, and

---

[15] Margo Henricks, "'Coloring the Past, Rewriting Our Future: RaceB4Race,' opening lecture, RaceB4Race Symposium," September, 2019, The Folger Shakespeare Library, Washington D. C., 23:31, https://www.folger.edu/institute/scholarly-programs/race-periodization/margo-hendricks.
[16] Hendricks, "'Coloring the Past.'"
[17] Ibid.
[18] Ibid.
[19] I use the geographic boundaries of New England outlined in Kristina Bross and Hilary E. Wyss, *Early Native Literacies in New England,* 2, which reads, "*New England* in the colonial period referred to the four colonies (Massachusetts, Plymouth, Connecticut, and New Haven) brought together in a loose coalition by the Articles of Confederation in 1643."

childlike in their naivete.[20] It did not matter that the English could, for instance, observe as Narragansetts practiced conservation of beavers, cultivated tidal flats and wild-growing plants, had more sophisticated crop planting techniques than the English, and divided up fields for the use of individual families.[21] Moreover, as John Donoghue has noted, the fact that Indigenous agricultural surplus had saved settlers in Virginia and Plymouth from starvation was "a not obscure piece of intelligence in the early modern Atlantic."[22] English colonists simply refused to recognize methods of "improving the land" that did not involve enclosure, stone fences, European-style animal and crop husbandry, and permanent ownership of land.[23]

This erasure of Indigenous land use was deliberate. Roger Williams, Puritan minister and founder of the Providence Plantation, wrote a tract that challenged English assumptions around land management and called into question the Christianizing mission authorized by King Charles I's 1629 charter for the Massachusetts Bay Colony.[24] He had spent time with the Narragansetts in order to learn their language and, in *The Bloudy Tenent of Persecution for Cause of Conscience* (1644) describes:

> It cannot by their owne *Grant* be denied, but that the *wildest Indians* in *America* ought (and in their kind and severall degrees doe) to agree upon some *formes* of *Government*, some more *cavil*, compact in Townes, &c. some lesse. As also that their *civilly* and *earthly Governments* be as lawfull and true as any *Governments* in the *World*.[25]

Both Moynihan and Donoghue extrapolate that his earlier tract also questioned whether the English crown could truly assert jurisdiction over the Massachusetts Bay Colony without first negotiating a purchase from the Indigenous inhabitants.[26] We unfortunately cannot be certain about the actual contents of Williams' tract because it was lost—Moynihan asserts that he was forced to burn it by John Winthrop, governor of the colony.[27]

---

[20] For a more complete account of the Indigenous nations in the region, see Bross and Wyss, 2. Kelly L. Watson, *Insatiable Appetites: Imperial Encounters with Cannibals in the North Atlantic World* (New York: New York University Press, 2015): 152-157.
[21] Ruth Barnes Moynihan, "The Patent and the Indians: The Problem of Jurisdiction in Seventeenth-Century New England," *American Indian Culture and Research Journal,* 2, no. 1 (1977): 13-14.
[22] Donoghue, *Fire Under the Ashes*, 62.
[23] Moynihan, "The Patent and the Indians," 13.
[24] Ibid., 8. Donoghue, 60. Massachusetts Bay Colony, 1629, *The Charter of the Massachusetts Bay Colony*, accessed via EBSCOhost.
[25] Roger Williams, *The Bloudy Tenent of Persecution for Cause of Conscience* (London: 1644): 137.
[26] Moynihan, 12. Donoghue, 60.
[27] Moynihan, 12.

This kind of erasure is exactly what Hendricks means when she discusses "capitalism's capacious erasure of the sovereignty of Indigenous peoples."[28] English colonizers did not just misunderstand Indigenous sovereignty; John Winthrop, according at least to Moynihan, ensured that the Massachusetts Bay Colony's jurisdictional illegitimacy would not come to light. Winthrop's suppression of Williams' tract secured not only English jurisdiction, but the profitable enterprises and Christianizing efforts protected by that jurisdiction. Thus the interests of capital and colonial expansion fueled the racialization of Indigenous peoples as savage, incapable of the basic functions of civilization, and unworthy of sovereignty.[29] In this way, Hendricks' conceptualization of PCRS is highly applicable to this thesis and is a major influence on my approach.

Hendricks' approach seems, at first glance, to have a harder time explaining the racialization of diaspora peoples, such as Jews. The nature of diaspora, of being away from one's homeland, seems directly opposed to Indigeneity. Hendricks' focus on anti-Indigeneity as the crux of race-making seems to preclude early modern racialization of Jews because Jews had been in exile from their ancient, distantly-ancestral homeland since the second century C. E. This is especially the case for early modern Sephardic Jews, the Jewish ethnic group with which this thesis most concerns itself, who found themselves in double diaspora following their expulsions from Spain and Portugal.[30] These Jews not only carried the cultural memory of the expulsion from the Holy Land but also formed a uniquely Sephardic diaspora-within-a-diaspora as they were dispersed from the Iberian peninsula into North Africa, the Ottoman Empire, and Central Europe where they most notably settled in the nascent Dutch Republic.[31]

If it appears that Hendricks has overlooked early modern Jews in her conception of PCRS, that is partially due to the ways in which early modern Jewry often seems to evade classification along traditional racial lines. In recent years we have seen both Geraldine Heng and S. J. Pearce wrestle with the ways Jews were racialized and racialized others. Heng points to

---

[28] Hendricks, "'Coloring the Past.'"
[29] Hendricks uses sovereignty in the sense of a relationship between people and land, and a social order that arises from that relationship. In this, she follows Patrick Wolfe. For more on this, please see Patrick Wolfe, "Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native," *Journal of Genocide Research*, 8:4 (2006). Sovereignty as Hendricks conceives it does not apply neatly to early seventeenth-century England; rather, it corresponds to the Indigenous ways of life disrupted by English colonisation.
[30] For more on the Sephardic double diaspora, please see David A. Wacks, *Double Diaspora in Sephardic Literature: Jewish Cultural Production Before and After 1492* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2015).
[31] Wacks, *Double Diaspora*.

physiological forms of racialization, the *foetor judaicus*, the belief that Jews had a special stench, and the myth of Jewish male menstruation, as well as externally-imposed signifiers such as Jew badges to conclude that these "are constitutive acts in the consolidation of a community of Christian English—otherwise internally fragmented and ranged along numerous divides—against a minority population *that has, on these historical occasions and through these institutions and practices, entered into race*."[32] Pearce's critiques of Heng—that she relies too much on Christian sources, that she presents the archival silence of English Jews as though it can be extrapolated to the rest of Europe without investigating the rich material left behind by Jewish communities outside of England—demonstrate how almost any account of Jewish racialization winds up incomplete.[33] Pearce's own engagement focuses entirely on the experiences of Iberian and North African Jews such that, where she critiques Heng for universalizing the particularity of a Jewish community that left little archival material behind, her counterargument occasionally seems to advocate privileging those whose primary source material is relatively well-preserved over less historiographically fortunate groups rather than finding novel solutions to archival lacunae.[34] Due to the broad geographic dispersion of Jews throughout the world, there are such a wide variety of Gentile responses and racializing approaches to take into account that universal categorization becomes improbably difficult for overarching theories like Hendricks' and case studies like Heng's and Pearce's alike.

Nonetheless, I suggest that there are benefits if Hendricks' understanding of racism is applied to premodern Jews. The very fact of a diaspora population implies that its members belong somewhere else. Heng, whom Hendricks cites with approval, writes that "the threat signaled by Jewish difference, unlike Islamic difference, is the threat of the *intimate alien*, active and embedded in multiple communities and countries in the heartlands of the Christian *domus*."[35] The racialization of Jews, then, was a process of marking out people who were not immediately and visibly different from their neighbours, who spoke the shared vernacular, who participated in business exchanges and social relationships with Christian. It was a process of making people who were present all throughout Christendom, and, in many cases, had been dwelling and

---

[32] Geraldine Heng, *The Invention of Race in the European Middle Ages* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018): 15, 31.
[33] S. J. Pearce, "The Inquisitor and the Moseret: *The Invention of Race in the European Middle Ages* and the New English Colonialism in Jewish Historiography," *Medieval Encounters*, 26 (2020): 177.
[34] Pearce, "The Inquisitor and the Moseret," 177.
[35] Heng, *The Invention of Race*, 56.

flourishing in their countries of residence for centuries into outsiders, aliens, and strangers in both custom and origin. R. Po-chia Hsia and Miri Rubin both depict the suddenness and cruelty with which Christians turned on their Jewish neighbours when allegations of blood libel or host desecration arose.[36] Rubin in particular describes the way, following the eradication of a Jewish community, Christian perpetrators deliberately erased traces of Jewish life by, for instance, building chapels on former synagogue sites.[37] This fits in with Hendricks' conceptualization of racism as erasure.[38] Hendricks notes, "PCRS resists the study of race as a single, somatic event (skin color, in most cases) and insists that race be seen in terms of a socioeconomic process (colonialism)."[39] The re-definition of neighbours as strangers and the appropriation of Jewish possessions and spaces as a way of enriching Christians and denying Jewish history in Christendom seems to fit into this understanding.

Hendricks's conception is also valuable because it is germane to the seventeenth-century Protestant understanding of Jews. To a millenarian Protestant, Jews were a people Indigenous to the Holy Land, forced into diaspora by the conquering (and possibly colonizing) might of Rome.[40] Their promised homeland had been taken from them and was still occupied by invaders. It is no coincidence that the two great enemies of Protestantism—Islam and Roman Catholicism—were implicated in the Jews' continued absence from their homeland.[41] N. I. Matar has compellingly argued that, in fact, Protestant anxieties about expanding Muslim power and the continued strength of the Catholic Church directly led to Scottish and English Protestants' fixation on Jewish Restoration and eschatology.[42] For these millenarian Protestants, Jews were useful as future soldiers against the forces of the Antichrist; therefore, eschatology presented a solution to Protestant anxieties about territory and the place of other religious groups. As Andrew Crome has demonstrated, newly-invigorated Christian Zionism could easily be grafted

---

[36] R. Po-chia Hsia, *The Myth of Ritual Murder: Jews and Magic in Reformation Germany* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1988). Miri Rubin, *Gentile Tales: The Narrative Assault on Late Medieval Jews* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004).
[37] Rubin, *Gentile Tales*, 90.
[38] Hendricks, "'Coloring the Past.'"
[39] *Ibid.*
[40] Lindsay Powell, *The Bar Kokhba War AD 132-136: the last Jewish revolt against Imperial Rome* (Oxford: Osprey Publishing, 2017): 81.
[41] Richard Cogley, "The Fall of the Ottoman Empire and the Restoration of Israel in the 'Judeo-Centric' Strand of Puritan Millenarianism," *Church History*, 72, no. 2 (2003): 304.
[42] N. I. Matar, *Islam in Britain, 1558-1685* (Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press, 1998): 153.

onto existing ideas about the England's special status in the unfolding divine plan.[43] This again underscores the idea of Jews as outsiders, albeit in this case ones who needed to be returned to their proper place.

Additionally, there is a metaphorical level on which Christians were encroaching onto Jewish territory in the early modern period, especially post-Reformation as Jewish Biblical wisdom was sought-out by Protestant intellectuals. As the Old Testament became ever more important to Protestant prophetic interpretation, the text itself became increasingly dislocated from Jewish practice and understanding. In this way, for instance, the prophecy at Ezekiel 37:12-14 that the "dry bones" of the people of Israel will be clothed in flesh once more and returned to their "own land" was read in light of Paul's promise that "all Israel will be saved" (Romans 11:25-36) before the Second Coming and construed as a prediction that the lost tribes would be revealed and converted to Christianity along with all other Jews before Christ's arrival. This interpretation grafted the Christian expectation of spontaneous Jewish conversion onto the much older belief that the lost tribes would be redeemed, which was mainstream in seventeenth-century Jewish circles. In this way, Jewish interpretations of the Hebrew Bible were appropriated to the ends of a Christian supersessionist theology. The Protestant philosemitic tradition instrumentalized Jews as necessary players in an eschatological scheme that they themselves did not accept. The fact that these Christian and Jewish expectations shared a common belief that Jews would be returned to the Holy Land did very little to mitigate the paternalism manifest in the Protestant appropriation of Jewish knowledge. While, as we shall see in Chapter 2, Jewish intellectuals were able to leverage the commonalities in Jewish and Christian eschatology to argue for more tolerant treatment and even tried to advocate for ecumenical exchange, these attempts were largely rebuffed by their Protestant interlocutors who were far more keen to glean what they could from Jewish theology than they were interested in the welfare of actual Jews.

For mid-seventeenth-century Jews, the original calamity that had left them without a homeland was centuries in the past—although its memory had been continually refreshed over subsequent expulsions and persecutions. For Indigenous peoples in New England, the process of dispossession and expulsion by a colonizing force was still just beginning to reveal itself for what it was. Hendricks's definition of racism can be applied to the Christian appropriation of both Biblical knowledge from Jews and territory from Indigenous peoples in the Americas. This

[43] Crome, *Christian Zionism*, 24-25.

dual application is useful because this thesis explores the similar ways in which English intellectuals (and Europeans more broadly) conceived of both Indigenous peoples and Jews. The English fixation on Jews, as on Indigenous peoples in New England, was targeted towards their erasure as a distinct people and assimilation into English-led, Protestant Christendom.

Cannibalism is a useful tool for this exploration. Concerns about cannibals have been a part of the European cultural imagination for an almost immeasurable length of time. A short 1866 paper by Richard Stephen Charnock, given at a meeting of the Anthropological Society of London, traces the European pre-occupation with cannibalism all the way back to the text of the Odyssey in which the titular hero encounters man-eating monsters on his voyage.[44] Charnock also reflects on non-literary instances of cannibalism that took place in Europe's distant past, with particular attention to allegations that the inhabitants of Ireland consumed human flesh including, possibly, the flesh of early missionaries.[45] Throughout Charnock's survey, a clear theme emerges in which the cannibals, although they fascinate Charnock with gruesome prurience, are not able to access or understand civilization without the application of outside helpers and cleansing violence. To Charnock, instances of cannibalism merit the destruction not only of the cannibal but also of their entire culture and way of life. These threads are picked up by Hsia, Rubin, and Magda Teter, among others, who examine the development of blood libel narratives. Throughout the medieval and early modern periods, blood libel was a way of entrenching Jewish difference in the Christian imagination and firmly imposing a distinction between two communities that often lived closely together and shared not only many of the same quotidian experiences but also common Biblical touchpoints. This differentiation carried with it permission for Christians to enact brutality against Jews as they allegedly continuously violated the safety of the community and the sanctity of its traditions.[46]

Concerns around cultural difference, openness to Christianity, and the permissibility of corrective violence also spread widely on both sides of the Atlantic as first Spain and then other nations sought to carve out their own piece of the so-called New World. In the colonizing process, the cannibal loomed large; Wandel describes that, "cannibalism was among the first attributes offered as evidence for the essential difference of the peoples of the western

---

[44] Richard Stephen Charnock, "Cannibalism in Europe," *Journal of the Anthropological Society of London*, 4 (1866): xxiii.
[45] Charnock, "Cannibalism in Europe," xxv.
[46] Heng, 28-29.

hemisphere… figuring in arguments for enslavement and against gentle conversion."[47] These discussions denied dignity and agency to their subjects; even the staunchest advocates of so-called "gentle conversion" did not consider that perhaps missionary activity should not be undertaken in the first place. Carla Cevasco demonstrates that this dehumanization continued well into the seventeenth century:

> The English called all their enemies cannibals, and their accounts of cannibalism among both French and Indians shared provocative similarities. First, as in other English or French accounts of Indian cannibalism, eating people took its place in a liturgy of violence: torture, kill, consume. Second, cannibalism seemed almost addictive or contagious, as cannibals tried to convert others to a taste for human flesh.[48]

The same is true of the blood libel. While accusations were fairly rare by the seventeenth century, William Prynne's 1656 attempt to revive the blood libel to destroy the possibility of Jewish readmission attests to its extant power as an antisemitic prejudice.[49] The accusation of people eating draws lines between community and intruder, between neighbour and menace, between Christian and barbarian. It deploys loaded concepts such as "civilization" and "savagery" to the benefit of the accuser and the violent demise of the accused.

One key exception to this pattern—a case where there was no allegation, no accuser, and no suspect—is medicinal cannibalism. In this thesis, the term 'medicinal cannibalism' refers to medicines and remedies made, in part or entirely, out of human body parts. For my purposes, medicinal cannibalism does not only include cases of corpse medicine, where human remains were transformed into curative substances, but also remedies—such as those made from hair, nails, urine, and menstrual blood—where the source of the medicine lived on past their "donation." The practice was widespread in mid-seventeenth century England, with the publication of numerous medicinal texts, often written in English rather than Latin, recommending its benefits to physicians and making its supposed virtues accessible to curious patients.[50] Many of Interregnum England's best-remembered figures, such as Robert Boyle and Nicholas Culpeper, were not only advocates of the practice but consumed remedies made from

---

[47] Wandel, 59.
[48] Carla Cevasco, "This is My Body: Communion and Cannibalism in Colonial New England and New France," *The New England Quarterly*, 89, no. 4 (2016): 571-572.
[49] Magda Teter, *Blood Libel: On the Trail of an Antisemitic Myth* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2020): 279.
[50] Richard Sugg, *Mummies, Cannibals, and Vampires: The History of Corpse Medicine from the Renaissance to the Victorians*, second edition (London: Routledge, 2016): 60.

human bodies themselves.[51] Yet medicinal cannibalism has received only glancing attention from historians of early modern science. Andrew Wear's comprehensive *Knowledge and Practice in English Medicine, 1550-1680* does not mention it among the many remedies and medicinal approaches he described.[52] Joyce E. Chaplin's *Subject Matter: Technology, The Body, and Science on the Anglo-American Frontier, 1500-1676* likewise has nothing to say on the topic of medicinal cannibalism, despite the fact that Karen Gordon-Grube demonstrated in 1993 that medicinal cannibalism was practiced by Puritan settlers in the mid-seventeenth-century.[53] This thesis addresses the absence of scholarly engagement with medicinal cannibalism and provides additional insight into how it was understood and justified by its practitioners in light of their much more negative attitudes towards alleged cannibalism in the Americas and among Jews.

The anthropologist Peggy Reeves Sanday discusses the practice and meaning of ritualized forms of cannibalism in her book *Divine Hunger*. Her thesis is that "cannibalism is never just about eating but is primarily a medium for nongustatory messages—messages having to do with the maintenance, regeneration, and, in some cases, the foundation of the cultural order."[54] To demonstrate this, she embarks on numerous case studies which examine how cannibalism is constructed semiotically and how it appears in myth.[55] Sanday takes a fairly expansive view of ritual cannibalism, including effectively all forms of the practice outside of starvation cannibalism. Remarkably, she includes torture and dismemberment as it was allegedly practiced by the Haudenosaunee in the seventeenth century on the logic that it was often accompanied by the consumption of the victim's remains.[56] Published in 1986, just seven years after William Arens's *The Man-Eating Myth: Anthropology and Anthropophagy*, Sanday's in-depth analysis of ritual cannibalism appears to be a rebuke of Arens's assertion that all ethnographic evidence of cannibalism has been fabricated by bad actors steeped in western

---

[51] Sugg, *Mummies, Cannibals, and Vampires*, 89. Nicholas Culpeper, *A Physical Directory, or a Translation of the London Directory* (London: Printed for Peter Cole, 1649). Nicholas Culpeper, *Culpeper's Directory for Midwives: or, A guide for women* (London: 1651).
[52] Andrew Wear, *Knowledge and Practice in English Medicine, 1550-1680* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2000).
[53] Joyce E. Chaplin, *Subject Matter: Technology, the Body, and Science on the Anglo-American Frontier, 1500-1676* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001). Karen Gordon-Grube, "Evidence of Medicinal Cannibalism in Puritan New England: 'Mummy' and Related Remedies in Edward Taylor's 'Dispensatory,'" *Early American Literature* 28, no. 3 (1993): 185-221.
[54] Peggy Reeves Sanday, *Divine Hunger* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986): 3.
[55] Sanday, *Divine Hunger*, vii.
[56] *Ibid.*, 127.

imperialism and white supremacy. However Sanday softens her critique of Arens, writing only that, "although he is correct in asserting that the attribution is sometimes a projection of moral superiority… [he] overstates his case."[57] Sanday acknowledges that the sources on which she bases her book may be flawed, nonetheless she takes the position that it is impossible for all of these reports to be fabricated out of whole cloth.[58] If inconsistencies exist, there is still a germ of truth to these ethnographies which is worth exploring.[59] Sanday mitigates the possible problems in her source by taking a non-judgemental approach to cannibalism. While she demonstrates a keen awareness of how most individuals in contemporary western cultures are socialized to feel disgust and dread about cannibalism, her own work in this book betrays neither repulsion nor prurience.[60] Instead, Sanday extends empathy to her subjects whose cultural practices are so often misinterpreted, whether deliberately or inadvertently, and whose ways of life have been, in many cases, eradicated by colonial violence. So, for instance, she reads Jesuit records of Haudenosaunee ritual torture and cannibalism and concludes that:

> seventeenth-century [Haudenosaunee] torture was both part of the need to socialize and regulate violence and an acting out of the dissymmetries of power among Europeans and the various Indian nations of this part of colonial North America… Torture and cannibalism were the means by which a nation facing bondage sought to dominate.[61]

Sanday reads many of her sources against the grain to find evidence of strong internal cultural logic and even universalizable concepts, such as desperation over the loss of sovereignty, where the original authors planted only disgust. Simultaneously, Sanday avoids characterizing cultures with strong anti-cannibalism taboos as close-minded or unenlightened. Her discussion of the strong Algonquian prohibition against cannibalism demonstrates the diversity of cultural attitudes within north-eastern North America. By linking the Algonquian fear of cannibalism to conditions of famine, disease, and "social breakdown" brought on by European incursions into their territory, Sanday also underscores the disaster and disruption of colonialism.[62] Sanday's

---

[57] *Ibid.*, 9-10. William Arens, *The Man-Eating Myth: Anthropology and Anthropophagy* (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1979).
[58] Sanday, 10.
[59] *Ibid.*
[60] *Ibid.*, 34-35.
[61] *Ibid.*, 149.
[62] *Ibid.*, 104-122.

overall approach, with its diversity of thematic touchpoints and non-judgemental attitude, is a major influence on this thesis.

The notion of cannibalism as a limit often gets pressed into the platitude that, in a world that has cast off so many old taboos—against queerness, women in leadership roles, interracial relationships, and so on—eating people remains one of the last few real violations of the social order, along with perhaps incest. I dislike this flattened understanding of cannibalism as an extreme case as it is an oversimplification of what constitutes a taboo and why certain activities and identities pass from the forbidden to the acceptable. Instead, I prefer the historicized formulation brought up by the Romanian philosopher Cătălin Avramescu. Avramescu describes how the figure of the cannibal became a test for early modern moral thinkers:

> beyond the boundaries of the premodern city extends an inverted worlds, the opposite of civilization, peopled by grotesque figures, inverted images of civic man. The boundary of the republic is the symbolic limit whence begins another world, announced by such constructions as the *Rabenstein* (Ravens' Rock): the scaffold on which the ritual execution of capital punishment took place in German cities, the place where those who broke the laws of man and of nature were killed and their remains were left impaled on pitchforks. This was the limit beyond which evil nature became visible, whence it came and whither it was summoned to return.[63]

While Avramescu claims his work is "is in no way a history of cannibalistic practices," he is nonetheless interested in how the intellectualization of cannibalism both developed and was developed by alleged historical instances.[64] Avramescu's approach has him seek out places where the cannibal either literally or metaphorically enters society and social theorizing. He considers executioners and surgeons as possible cannibal-analogues and takes up theological and state responses to the practice.[65] In this way, he demonstrates how thought directly undergirds identity and action: the butchering executioner becomes cannibalistic in his disregard for the integrity of the human body while his employer's philosophical advisers, theorizing that cannibalism violates natural law, arrive at the conclusion that people accused of cannibalism must be put to death for their transgressions.[66]

---

[63] Cătălin Avramescu, *An Intellectual History of Cannibalism*, trans. Alistair Ian Blyth (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009): 8-9.
[64] Avramescu, *An Intellectual History of Cannibalism*, 3.
[65] Ibid., 49, 130-133.
[66] Ibid., 49, 115.

Maggie Kilgour takes an even much more metaphorical approach to cannibalism. In her book *From Communion to Cannibalism*, evaluating allegations of cannibalism for their factual content remains entirely peripheral. Kilgour is interested above all in exploring the metaphorical resonances of cannibalism as a "bodily experience" of consumption.[67] To this end, she investigates literary, folkloric, and theological examples where cannibalism is either explicitly present or implicitly invoked. Where Avramescu saw cannibalism as a limit between the in-group and the out-group, Kilgour sees it as a way of collapsing the distinction between inside and outside.[68] In this way, cannibalism becomes a "transcendent" way of incorporating whatever is foreign.[69] Cannibalism makes an unknowable external entity, another human being, knowable through the opening, dismantling, and consumption of their body.[70] Cannibals literally see parts of us that we ourselves can never see. For Kilgour, this is analogous to the pursuit of knowledge, or pleasure, or love wherein, according to her, the goal is to assimilate something external, whether that be information, or food, or the object of one's affection.[71] Avramescu finds cannibals hidden within the person of the executioner, the physician, the State; Kilgour sees them reflected in a scholar's reading glasses, the curve of a gourmand's spoon, a lover's locket.[72] According to Kilgour, cannibalism sets up a distinction between inside and outside, civilization and savagery, Gentile and Jew, subject and object and *at the same time* provides the means of overcoming it. The external, unknowable object threatens the unity and integrity of the internal, familiar subject; thus the subject must cannibalize the object, lest it be eaten instead.[73] This "eat or be eaten" mentality, Kilgour writes, underlies two allegations of cannibalism discussed in this thesis: Jews and Indigenous peoples were suspected of cannibalism and yet it was their Christian accusers who enacted violence against them.[74] Kilgour also provides compelling metaphorical grounding for the rise of medicinal cannibalism in seventeenth-century England. Following a civil war "that tears apart the body politic so that its organic Unity can never be remembered and… Revolutions in science, economy, and religion that are all in some way divisive," it stands to reason that some of these scientific practices also entail literal, rather than merely

---

[67] Maggie Kilgour, *From Communion to Cannibalism* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990): 4.
[68] Avramescu, 8-9. Kilgour, *From Communion to Cannibalism*, 11.
[69] Kilgour, 11.
[70] Ibid., 227.
[71] Ibid., 8-9.
[72] Avramescu, 49. Kilgour, 8-9.
[73] Kilgour, 17.
[74] Ibid., 16-17.

metaphorical, division of the unified body.[75] All together, Kilgour's work on cannibalism and metaphor creates an entry for this thesis to explore not only specific allegations of cannibalism, but also their resonances and ironies for both accuser and accused.

This thesis examines mid-seventeenth century English responses to allegations of cannibalism against Jews and Indigenous peoples in the Americas. It argues that English Protestant intellectuals employed cannibalism as a limit that distinguished civilized in-group from barbaric out-group and that this constituted a race-making process. Throughout, English anxieties about literal and metaphorical cannibalism resonate in the interconnected topics of eschatology, colonial expansion, and medical and scientific practice, all of which which attracted increased attention in the mid-seventeenth century. The thesis also compares English fears about anthropophagy on the part of other cultures to the practice of medicinal cannibalism, which became increasingly common during the Interregnum. Many of the most prominent practitioners of medicinal cannibalism also materially supported colonial expansion and became participants in the debate surrounding the readmission of Jews to England. This thesis reveals that they were aware of their own hypocrisy and explores the ways in which it was brought to bear upon Indigenous peoples in the Americas and Jews. Specifically, allegations of cannibalism against Jews and Indigenous peoples were treated differently despite the popular lost tribes theory, which proposed that these groups shared ancient Judaic ancestry. In fact, the mid-seventeenth century attempt to revive the antisemitic blood libel largely failed whereas accounts of cannibalism circulated through American missionary literature and were used to encourage sympathetic feelings and financial donations from the metropole to the colony.

As has already been stated, this thesis examines three cases of cannibalism: two of them spurious, one verifiable. Chapter 1 examines Thomas Thorowgood's assertion that alleged Indigenous cannibalism proves that Indigenous peoples in America were descendants of the lost tribes of Israel. Thorowgood's assertion that Indigenous peoples, specifically the Kanien'kehá꞉ka, consumed the bodies of others with relish rests on the observations of other colonizers, most notably William Wood. The question of whether anthropophagy occurred in north-eastern America and, if it did, what its nature was is still a live topic in anthropology and historiography. This chapter takes into account anthropologist Peggy Sanday Reeves' discussion of Northeastern American cannibalism, but leaves open the possibility that new findings may

[75] Ibid., 145.

cast doubt on Reeves' conclusions. Additionally, Chapter 1 explores the powerful metaphorical resonances of cannibalism in the colonial sphere, through the lens of Maggie Kilgour's work on the symbolic meaning of cannibalism as a form of consumption. In Chapter 2, this thesis turns to Menasseh ben Israel's reaction to the revitalization of the lost tribes theory, his rise to prominence and participation in the 1655 Whitehall conference on Jewish readmission, and his response to William Prynne's invocation of the blood libel. Here, the focus is on the tenuous position European Jews held in contacts with Protestant intellectuals and the way Prynne's ultimately unsuccessful attempt to revive blood libel in England called upon a long history of antisemitic violence to undermine Jewish readmission. Chapter 2 calls upon Geraldine Heng's research on the racialization of Jews and combines it with the work of R. Po-chia Hsia, which describes blood libel as an ethnographic project directed at making Jews not only different but dangerous to Christians. Chapter 3, unlike the previous chapters, takes up a true case of cannibalism: medicinal cannibalism, which was practiced widely in Europe and reached its heights in mid-seventeenth-century England. In this chapter, I rely on primary source materials including pharmacological recipes and the writings of Robert Boyle who was an avid practitioner of these kinds of remedies. Boyle is a particularly useful case study because he acknowledges the hypocrisy of consuming medicines made from human bodies while condemning cannibalism in the Americas. In this way, my thesis reveals how different attitudes towards cannibalism and its alleged perpetrators played out within English colonial expansion in the mid-seventeenth century and the eschatological commitments that both fed into and fed off it.

Chapter 1: New Englanders and Ancient Israelites

Antonio de Montezinos

In 1644, in the middle of Elul, the twelfth and final month of Hebrew calendar, a traveler from Spanish South America arrived in Amsterdam.[1] History remembers him by his Spanish name, Antonio de Montezinos, but he identified himself by his Hebrew name, Aharon Levi, when he testified before the Amsterdam *ma'amad*. His story was amazing, bordering on unbelievable. Montezinos claimed that high in the mountains of the Andes he had found Jews.[2] These Jews, he maintained, were the remnants of the tribe of Reuben and had given him a message of hope for the European Jewish diaspora: the time would soon be at hand where the lost tribes would reveal themselves and help their disheartened brethren "subdue the whole world to them, as it was subject to them formerly… because that they said, the Prophecies were fulfilled."[3]

This was an astonishing story. The tribe of Reuben was one of the ten tribes of Israel that had been deported by the Assyrians during the eighth century B. C. E. and were thought lost, died out or assimilated or dispersed.[4] But hope persisted that the lost tribes would one day return to usher in the Messianic age. Chapter 37 of the Biblical Book of Ezekiel describes God clothing the "dry bones" of the people of Israel in new flesh and returning the Chosen People to the land that was their heritage. Most overtly, Ezekiel 37: 21 reads, in part: "I will take the Israelites out of the nations where they have gone. I will gather them from all around and bring them back into their own land." This was widely understood in Jewish circles to prophesy the reunion of the tribes of Israel, the renewal of Biblical kingship, and the coming of the Messiah.[5] Montezinos's story was not only a remarkable tale of adventurous exploits in the so-called 'New World'; it was a beacon of hope that the long exile of the Jews and the myriad persecutions they had endured would soon be at an end.

---

[1] Menasseh Ben Israel, *The Hope of Israel*, trans. Moses Wall (London: 1650): 4. Accessed via EEBO. Thomas Thorowgood, *Iewes in America* (London: 1650): 129. Accessed via EEBO. Montezinos' testimony was published several times, most notably in Menasseh ben Israel's *The Hope of Israel* (1650) and Thomas Thorowgood's *Iewes in America* (1650). There are negligible differences between the two translations. In this thesis, I will use the translation that appeared in *The Hope of Israel* and also note the relevant page references in *Iewes in America*.
[2] Menasseh, 12. Thorowgood, 136.
[3] Menasseh, 13-14. Thorowgood, 136-138.
[4] Zvi Ben-Dor Benite, *The Ten Lost Tribes: A World History* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009): 31-32.
[5] Benite, *The Ten Lost Tribes*, 15.

Montezinos told his story as a Jew for other Jews. The use of his Hebrew name alone speaks volumes, as does the transcription's use of Hebrew dates in the record. Montezinos had been living as a Catholic in Spanish-held America, where the revelation of his Jewishness would have lead to persecution, likely torture, and possibly death at the hands of the Inquisition. The narrative he told the Amsterdam *ma'amad* contains the harrowing incident of his incarceration in Cartagena on the accusation of Judaizing.[6] Eventually, he was released—Ronnie Perelis has demonstrated that Montezinos was freed because there was not sufficient evidence that he was the suspect whom the Inquisition sought.[7] The Inquisition at Cartagena was unable to prove that Montezinos was the particular Jew they were looking for; in fact, from Montezinos's narrative and Perelis's corroboration, it seems that Montezinos's captors could not prove that he was a Jew in the first place.[8] In other words, Montezinos was able to live, in relative comfort, notwithstanding the burden of secrecy, among the oppressors of his people. And yet, following his startling discovery, he chose to reveal not his Jewish heritage but his Hebrew name. Certainly, Montezinos would have understood that such remarkable testimony would circulate beyond the Amsterdam *ma'amad*, although Ran Segev identifies it as a story, first and foremost, for Amsterdam's Sephardic Jewish community. He argues that Montezinos couched his experiences in ways that would have resonated with the former *conversos* in his audience.[9] The idea that the lost tribes were but one nation among many in America and that they sought reunion with their brethren abroad reflected the experiences of the Amsterdam Jewish community, called the *naçao*, or nation, in Portuguese, as a people who had needed re-introduction into their own religion and culture following a period of separation and lived as a tolerated minority community among strangers.[10] Montezinos invoked his own religious homecoming to create a parallel between himself and his audience as well as between European Sephardi Jews and the lost tribes in America.

Following his stay in Amsterdam, Antonio de Montezinos returned to the so-called 'New World' where he was once again forced to submerge his Jewish identity, albeit this time with

---

[6] Menasseh, 5-6. Thorowgood, 130-131.
[7] Ronnie Perelis, *Narratives from the Sephardic Atlantic* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2017): 101.
[8] Perelis, 101.
[9] Ran Segev, "Sephardic *Conquistadores* in the New World: Menashe ben Israel on the "Rediscovery" of the Lost Tribes," *Journal for Early Modern Cultural Studies*, 18, no. 4 (2018): 126-127.
[10] Segev, 126-127

more tangible proof of it available should he fall prey to the Inquisition again.[11] Why would Montezinos put himself in harm's way by associating his names, both Gentile and Hebrew, with his story? Perelis provides one reason. He understands Montezinos's entire narrative as an attempt at "Jewish self-fashioning."[12] For Perelis, Montezinos does not only attest to the external, physical discovery of the Reubenites, but also an internal, spiritual discovery of his own Jewishness. Montezinos begins his story in the guise of a *conquistador*, participating in a mule train through the mountains.[13] When a massive storm blows through, destroying not only the wares but also several pack animals, he reprimands the Indigenous porters for bemoaning their misfortune and claiming that "the notorious cruelty used by the Spaniards towards them, was sent of God, because they had so ill treated his holy people."[14] Apparently oblivious to this clear reference to Jews, Montezinos castigates the team leader, Francisco, for "[speaking] disgracefully of the Spaniards."[15] Only later, in his prison cell, is Montezinos struck by the urge to recite the Jewish dawn prayer, which thanks God for not having created the worshipper as a Gentile or enslaved person. Montezinos renders the prayer "Blessed is the name of the Lord, that hath not made me an Idolator, a Barbarian, a Black-a-Moor, or an Indian" and is immediately overcome with the question "can the Hebrews be Indians?"[16] Perelis notes that, in this moment, Montezinos has constructed a "racial hierarchy" wherein Jews, despite their general downtroddenness and Montezinos's specific incarceration, are still elevated above Gentiles of all races and Black and Indigenous people specifically.[17] Ran Segev echoes Perelis, noting that Montezinos's system here borrows heavily from the Spanish notion of *limpieza de sangre*, or blood purity.[18] Montezinos, at this moment, sets Jews apart from all other peoples in racial terms and, in acknowledging his own Jewishness by reciting the dawn prayer, ascends to the top of the hierarchy with them.

---

[11] Perelis, 101.
[12] Ibid., 103.
[13] Segev, 135.
[14] Menasseh, 5. Thorowgood, 130.
[15] Menasseh, 5. Thorowgood, 130.
[16] Menasseh, 5-6. Thorowgood, 130. In the *Iewes in America* translation, Montezinos's thought that the Indigenous peoples he encountered might be Jews is presented as an emphatic statement of realization, rather than a hypothesis.
[17] Perelis, 107. It is worth noting that, at this point in the Montezinos narrative, no distinction has been made between American Israelites and the Indigenous peoples with whom they have allied. Therefore, it can be argued that, in this phase, Montezinos is willing to accept Indigenous-cum-Judaic peoples into the highest sphere of the racial hierarchy. As he later learns that not all Indigenous peoples in America are lost tribespeople, this argument becomes moot in a matter of pages.
[18] Segev, 135.

The next crucial moment of Jewish self-fashioning comes when Montezinos reunites with Francisco, whom he understands as someone who knows about the American Hebrews. In an apparently public setting at the Port of Honda, he announces himself as a son of "Abraham, Isaac and Jacob."[19] Francisco, recognizing Montezinos as a Jew, agrees to take him on a journey to meet the Israelites.[20] Before they can set out, however, Francisco forces Montezinos to change his leather boots for linen shoes, to throw away the contents of his pack, and to abandon his cloak and sword.[21] Thus, Francisco strips Montezinos of the external signs of his *conquistador* identity, leaving him vulnerable without his disguise to conceal his true identity and without his sword to defend himself. Only when he has given up his Spanish *converso* performance is Montezinos prepared to be among his own people.

Crucially, even after all these preparations, Montezinos does not enter into the territory of the Reubenites; instead, they come to him in boats across a great river. According to his hosts, he is still not ready to be among them although they instruct him to return with twelve learned Jewish men who will record the Reubenites' knowledge.[22] In a moment of entitlement and frustration, Montezinos attempts to stow away on one of the Reubenite boats and is unceremoniously pitched overboard, nearly drowning in the deep water. After this transgression, the Reubenites do not return.[23] Montezinos turns to Francisco to learn that "thy brethren are the Sons of Israel," that they are served and protected by the Indigenous peoples who inhabited the Americas before the Israelites arrived, and that "after we have finished a businesse which we have with the wicked Spaniards, we will bring you out of bondage, by God's help."[24] Here, Francisco validates Montezinos's racial hierarchy by explaining that the Indigenous peoples in the Americas are indeed subservient to the Israelites and that, as soon as they repelled the Spanish from their own lands, both the lost tribes and their Indigenous servants would reveal themselves and liberate the Jewish diaspora.

The Lost Tribes Theory

---

[19] Menasseh, 6. Thorowgood, 131.
[20] Menasseh, 7. Thorowgood, 132.
[21] Menasseh, 7. Thorowgood, 132. Perelis, 112.
[22] Menasseh, 10.
[23] Ibid., 11.
[24] Ibid., 12, 15. Notably, Montezinos does not offer an alternative explanation of the origins of the non-Israelite peoples of America. While discourse around the ancestry of the Indians was active and included both pre-Adamite and strictly Biblical theories, Montezinos does not engage with any of them. This may be because, within the Spanish context, the discussion had receded as a topic of interest by 1650. For more on this, please see Lee Huddlestone, *Origins of the American Indians* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1967).

Montezinos had not been the first person to suggest that the Indigenous peoples in the Americas were the lost tribes of Israel. Spanish Catholic sources dating back to the early sixteenth century had made similar suppositions but discussion of the theory "stagnated" in the Spanish context; according to Lee Huddlestone, this was largely due to methodological and evidentiary inflexibility.[25] Unlike prior Christian lost tribes theorists, Montezinos does not take the entire Indigenous population of the Americas as descendants of the Israelites. While he did see the presence of the lost tribes in the Americas as a validation of sacred history, he understood that history differently, compared with Christian adherents of the theory; we have already seen that Montezinos claimed the Reubenites were one nation among many, as was typical of Jewish eschatology. For Christians, the existence of peoples who had gone unknown and unrecorded by Christendom prior to the arrival of Americas "seemed to challenge accepted theories of humanity's geographical origins, presenting the spectre of a people whose origins appeared to undermine scriptural history."[26] The idea that these people could be traced back to Biblical ancestors rescued sacred history for Christianity. Under this theory, it seemed as though the lost tribes had been brought to this place and hidden away according to the divine plan.

The theory that Indigenous peoples were actually the lost tribes of Israel, expelled by Assyrian conquerors and arrived in the Americas possibly by way of Asia, not only validated the accuracy of Biblical history but also opened up possibilities for eschatological interpretations.[27] To say that various Protestant factions understood the timeline and nature of the apocalypse differently is more than understatement. In fact, there were so many different eschatologies swirling through even like-minded communities in seventeenth-century Europe that Crawford Gribben suggests it is almost impossible to satisfactorily define terms like "millenarian" and "puritan," although the attempt and the continued preservation of the terminology are both useful.[28] Nonetheless, there are certain loose groupings that can be delineated, with the caveat that none of these are monolithic or even necessarily unified on any particular point of commonality. The first and most obvious distinction to be drawn is between millenarians, who

---

[25] Huddlestone, 77-79. Andrew Crome, "The Restoration of the Jews in Transatlantic Context, 1600–1680," in *Prophecy and Eschatology in the Transatlantic World, 1550−1800*, ed. Andrew Crome (London: Palgrave MacMillan, 2016): 131.
[26] Andrew Crome, "Politics and Eschatology: Reassessing the Appeal of the 'Jewish Indian' Theory in England and New England in the 1650s," *Journal of Religious History*, 40 (2016): 326.
[27] Crome, "Politics and Eschatology," 327.
[28] Crawford Gribben, *The Puritan Millennium: Literature and Theology 1550-1682* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2000): 16.

expected some kind of thousand-year reign prior to the Day of Judgement, and amillennialists, who did not. The broad category of millenarian belief can then be broken down into a startling diversity of interpretations regarding the literal or figurative nature of the millennium, the timing of the Second Coming either before or after the thousand-year reign, whether the relevant prophecies had or had not yet been fulfilled, and so much more.[29] Happily, Richard Cogley has identified the most common form of seventeenth-century millenarianism and described some of its common expectations: "the Protestant destruction of Catholicism and the Israelite overthrow of the Ottoman Empire, the Christianization and repatriation of Jacob's descendants, and the establishment of the millennium in the city of David followed by the universal dispersal of the millennial order."[30] Notably, this summary of millenarianism has little to say about the place of Indigenous peoples in the divine scheme. The lost tribes theory provided a straightforward and apparently-parsimonious solution for Christians whose keen anticipation of the Second Coming demanded that all the peoples of the earth be accounted for.

Montezinos, by contrast, was not interested in the return of Christ or the governance of the world. As a Jew, he did not believe in a Messiah who would reign over all the world but a righteous ruler in the style of the Israelite kings, who would bring together the diaspora and lead them into the promised land where they would enjoy eternal prosperity and Biblical law. Where Christianity implicated every person in the fulfillment of history, Jewish messianic expectation focused on one nation among many. Since Montezinos's message was *for* a Jewish audience, *by* a Jewish person (albeit one whose identity was still emerging), about the fulfillment of a specifically Jewish eschatology, it was not necessary to account for the descent of all the peoples in the Americas. Montezinos's story was about the discovery of his people and the recognition that he belonged among them. Hence, Jewish signifiers like his Hebrew name and the Jewish calendar date can be understood as the final phase in the transformation of Montezinos and the American continent: what was once hidden has now been revealed.

Protestant Readings of Montezinos

The self-conscious Jewishness of Montezinos's testimony also demonstrates that this story was intended for the closed circle of European Jewry. However, word got out. Protestant

[29] Andrew Crome, "Introduction," in *Prophecy and Eschatology in the Transatlantic World, 1550-1800*, ed. Andrew Crome (London: Palgrave Macmillan): 5.
[30] Richard Cogley, "The Fall of the Ottoman Empire and the Restoration of Israel in the "Judeo-Centric" Strand of Puritan Millenarianism," *Church History* 72, no.2 (2003): 305.

philosemites quickly learned of Montezinos' story—it is not clear how the message was transmitted but, very soon, Christian eschatological attention turned towards Amsterdam. Older texts that had advocated for the lost tribes theory were still in circulation and Montezinos's story cast new light upon their assertions.[31] For Christian philosemites, the possible discovery of the lost tribes was not merely a curiosity; seventeenth-century Protestants, much like Jews, interpreted Ezekiel 37 to predict the return of all of Israel, including the lost tribes, to the Holy Land. Eschatologically-minded Christians also trusted in New Testament prophecy that the Jews would convert to Christianity after their redemption. For instance, in Romans 11:25-32, Paul writes that God will show mercy to the chosen people and bring them into Christ before the endtimes. Protestant philosemites read Romans and Ezekiel together to arrive at the conclusion that the lost tribes would necessarily reveal themselves as part of the providential plan for the unfolding of history.[32]

Most consequentially, Montezinos's story reached John Dury, the itinerant Irenicist preacher of Scottish birth who wandered Western and Central Europe building an extensive network of like-minded religious thinkers in an attempt to unite the Protestant churches. It is likely that he first heard of this story while he was serving as chaplain to Princess Mary of Orange in Amsterdam and the Hague in 1644, the same year as Montezinos's testimony.[33] He maintained epistolary contact with Menasseh ben Israel, the Amsterdam rabbi, writer, and printer, and it may well have been Menasseh who passed along word of Montezinos's account.[34] Through Dury and other well-connected Protestant intellectuals, news of Montezinos's adventure spread even further and Menasseh found himself inundated with letters requesting copies of the account, additional information, and the rabbi's personal interpretation of these highly auspicious-seeming events.[35]

---

[31] Richard Cogley, "'Some Other Kind of Being and Condition': The Controversy in Mid-Seventeenth-Century England over the Peopling of Ancient America," *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 68, no. 1 (2007): 43.
[32] Andrew Crome, *Christian Zionism and English National Identity, 1600-1850* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018): 24-25.
[33] Richard Cogley, "The Ancestry of American Indians: Thomas Thorowgood's "Iewes in America" (1650) and "Jews in America" (1660)," *English Literary Renaissance* 35, no. 2 (2005): 309.
[34] It is not clear how Menasseh went about sharing news of Montezinos's discovery. Richard Cogley seems to suggest it was transmitted verbally during a visit to Amsterdam. Other sources indicate that he likely learned of it in the Hague, leaving open the possibility of a letter.
[35] This audience was made up primarily of philosemitic Protestants who participated in the Republic of Letters. Its most prominent members, as we shall see in Chapter 2, included Samuel Hartlib, John Dury, Adam Boreel, Henry Jessey, John Comenius, and Petrus Serrarius among others. Steven Nadler characterizes Menasseh's Christian readership as "an international lobby of religiously like-minded individuals" who expected the imminent conversion

Several years later, in London, the Norfolk minister Thomas Thorowgood was preparing for the print and publication of his book *Iewes in America*, which was to become one of the very first English-language book-length discussions of the theory. After years of delay due to the instability of the English Civil War and the need to rewrite the book's dedication following King Charles I's decapitation, he was finally at the threshold of sharing with the reading public his contention that the Indigenous peoples of America were, in fact, the lost tribes of Israel.[36] An introduction to John Dury would postpone publication of *Iewes in America* one final time as Dury, recalling Montezinos's story, wrote to Menasseh for a transcript in September 1649.[37] Menasseh's response, including a French-language version of the requested document and a letter vouching for its authenticity, arrived two months later.[38] By this point, Thorowgood had already quit London to return to Norfolk, weary and homesick after so much waiting.[39] He left it to Dury to append Montezinos's story, Menasseh's letter, and see the book through publication, which occurred in April of 1650.[40]

In a July 12, 1649 letter, Dury informs Benjamin Worsley of his intent to reach out to Menasseh "concerning the Iew's which are said to bee in America" and assures him that news of this endeavour is sure to please the intelligencer Samuel Hartlib.[41] This letter is one of the few references to Thorowgood's forthcoming book available in both the Hartlib Papers and Early Modern Letters Online; Thorowgood himself is not even mentioned by name. Nevertheless, this letter gives us evidence that news of the lost tribes was anticipated with excitement and that *Iewes in America* would have found keen readership within the Protestant intellectual networks of Europe. Worsley, a physician and experiment scientist who would go on to become Surveyor-General of Ireland, demonstrated an interest in both the expansionist and eschatological ramifications of Montezinos's discovery.[42] In Worsley's response, dated July 27, 1649, he illustrates the potential of English settlement in Virginia, writing that "many a good minister may there find a call, & be plentifully mainteyned…Trading very much advanced, & bettered./ And

---

of the Jews and the apocalypse that would follow upon its heels. Steven Nadler, *Menasseh ben Israel: Rabbi of Amsterdam* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2018): 135.

[36] Cogley, "Ancestry," 309.

[37] Ibid., 308.

[38] Ibid., 309.

[39] Ibid., 308-309.

[40] Richard Cogley asserts that it was John Dury who translated the document sent by Menasseh. See Cogley, "Ancestry," 309.

[41] HP 26/33/4A-5B.

[42] Ibid.

the knowledge of God among the Indians as well…there as in new England promoted."[43] Worsley explicitly linked colonial profit and divine providence in his letter to Dury, anticipating the themes of Thorowgood's forthcoming book.[44] While Thorowgood himself did not subscribe to the millenarian eschatology current among many members of the Protestant epistolary sphere—Cogley identifies him as an amillennialist who anticipated an abrupt apocalypse at the time of the Second Coming—many of his readers both in England and America certainly did. Especially in New England, *Iewes in America* was taken up with great interest by, among others, the Plymouth colonist Edward Winslow, the dissident preacher Roger Williams, and the missionary John Eliot.[45]

Thorowgood and Eliot

Eliot, in particular, found himself compelled by Thorowgood's reasoning. He had previously been an adherent of John Cotton's "Jews-then-Gentiles" theory regarding the series of conversions that would precede the final confrontation between Christ and Antichrist: Cotton asserted that the spontaneous conversion of the Jews would necessarily come before any mass acceptance of Christianity by Indigenous peoples and other unchristianized populations.[46] As a result, concerted missionary efforts, such as Eliot's, were at best a way of warming Indigenous people up to the idea of Christianity and converting isolated individuals so they would later serve as exemplars to the rest as they navigated their communities' new post-apocalyptic Christian lives.[47] In the 1630s and 40s, however, Eliot became more curious about the possibility that the communities to whom he was proselytizing played a bigger role in the fulfillment of history than previously anticipated by the Massachusetts Bay Colonists.

Eliot was not alone in this. In 1634, William Wood had published *New Englands Prospect* which claims that the Indigenous Algonquian-speaking peoples "might be of the dispersed *Iewes,* because some of their words be neare unto the *Hebrew*."[48] Wood, unlike later more enthusiastic proponents of the lost tribes theory, couches his account in ambivalence. Immediately after suggesting that Indigenous peoples might descend from ancient Israelites, he

---

[43] HP 33/2/18A-19B.
[44] Ibid.
[45] Thorowgood, "Ancestry," 307, 309, 329.
[46] Richard Cogley, *John Eliot's Mission to the Indians before King' Philip's War* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999): 15-16.
[47] Cogley, *John Eliot's Mission*, 15-16.
[48] William Wood, *New Englands Prospect* (London: 1634): 91, N2 recto. Accessed via EEBO.

admits a counterargument: "by the same rule they may conclude them to be some of the gleanings of all Nations, because they have words which sound after the *Greeke, Latine, French,* and other tongues."[49] These brief sentences on language are the only mention of a putative connection between ancient Israel and New England in Wood's work. Apparently unwilling to fully commit to the lost tribes theory, Wood never actually argues for it, however, he does not rule it out. It remains merely an interesting possibility, a theory worth mentioning but not worth investigating fully. This reflects Eliot's own stance on the lost tribes theory at this point.[50]

By 1649, it appears, Eliot was much more willing to tacitly endorse the lost tribes theory. Three letters by Eliot appeared in Edward Winslow's *The Glorious Progress of the Gospel Amongst the Indians of New England* (1649). Though the letters themselves made no reference to the lost tribes, they follow Winslow's dedicatory letter in which he demonstrates his own adherence to the Jewish Indian theory.[51] Winslow had clearly heard of Menasseh's contact with Montezinos.[52] Winslow not only points to Montezinos's testimony, but also provides his own evidence for the lost tribes theory. Unlike Wood, Winslow describes instances where Indigenous practice appears to align with Mosaic Law including customs around menstrual impurity, the belief in the immortality of the soul, and a story about "one man only that ever saw God" which Winslow takes as a reference to Moses.[53] This argument also has eschatological ramifications: "considering the juncture of time wherein God hath opened their hearts to entertain the Gospel," it seems likely that the Indigenous peoples are part of the Jewish diaspora which is prophesied to convert before the Second Coming.[54] Moreover, according to Winslow, "it is not lesse probable that these Indians should come from the Stock of Abraham, then any other Nation this day known in the world."[55] Where Wood equivocates on whether Algonquian languages are more like Hebrew or more like Greek, Winslow forges ahead and argues that the lost tribes theory is at

---

[49] Wood, 91.
[50] Cogley, *John Eliot's Mission*, 75.
[51] Eliot's letters are primarily concerned with his efforts to convert Indigenous peoples to Christianity. They include several "success stories," lists of questions about Christianity from Indigenous people, and an account of what progress has been made in pushing English-style enclosure-based land use onto Indigenous people.
[52] Edward Winslow, *The Glorious Progress of the Gospel Amongst the Indians of New England* (London, 1649): A5, verso. Winslow likely heard about Montezinos's testimony from John Dury; he makes reference to Dury's request for the transcript, albeit without naming him.
[53] Winslow, A5, verso-recto.
[54] Ibid., A5, recto.
[55] Ibid.

least as likely as any other. Winslow takes Wood's prevarication and turns it upon its head. However at the end of the dedicatory letter, Winslow protects himself and, more importantly, his fund-raising mission from lost tribe skeptics by stating that it does not ultimately matter whether the Algonquian-speaking peoples of New England are lost tribes or not because ongoing Christian missionary efforts stand to benefit Jews and Gentiles alike.[56]

The lost tribes theory does not come up again in *The Glorious Progress of the Gospel* until John Dury's appendix, where he writes that

> *the Iewes of the Netherlands* (being intreated thereunto) *informe that after much inquiry they found some of the ten Tribes to be in America…* Its the expectation of some of the wisest Jewes now living, that about the year 1650. *Either we Christians shall be Mosaick, or else that themselves Iewes shall be Christians.* The serious consideration of the preceding Letters, induceth me to think, that there way be at least a remnant of the *Generation of Iacob* in *America.*[57]

Thus Eliot—along with Thomas Mayhew Jr., who also contributed a letter to the book—finds his reports on the mission to the Algonquian-speaking peoples of New England sandwiched between texts that explicitly affirm the lost tribes theory. In a letter to Winslow, Eliot expresses his fascination with Dury's interpretation of the lost tribes theory, which "identified the Indian's as Ezekiel's 'dry bones.'"[58]

At the time he wrote the appendix, Dury was already engaged in helping Thomas Thorowgood prepare his manuscript for publication. He would have already known *Iewes in America* to be quite a different book from *New England's Prospect* and *The Glorious Progress of the Gospel*. Absent are the references to alternative population theories—it becomes clear very quickly that Thorowgood is not interested in hedging his bets. In fact, he only raises doubt as a way of segueing into his reasons for believing in the lost tribes theory.[59] Additionally, while Thorowgood is happy to accept the observations made Wood and Winslow, his evidence stretches beyond English sources and even eyewitness accounts. In his preface, he cites José de Acosta's story of Indigenous people in Mexico hunting a whale:

---

[56] Ibid., A.
[57] Ibid., 23.
[58] Cogley, *John Eliot's Mission*, 86.
[59] Thorowgood, "The Epistle Dedicatory."

> *Their ingenuity, cunning and courage is marvelously manifest in their leading a Whale as big as a mountaine, with a cord, and vanquishing him in this manner; by the helpe of their Canoes or little Boats*.[60]

In his account of this event, Acosta refers to Psalm 103:26 of the Vulgate Bible, which reads, "there the ships sail about; there is that Leviathan which You have made to play there" and Psalm 74:14, which reads, "You broke the heads of Leviathan in pieces, and gave him as food to the people inhabiting the wilderness."[61] Thorowgood repeats Acosta's story and includes the Biblical citations, on the basis of which he exhorts the reader to "*helpe to cover their naked bodies, and cloath their more naked soules with the Gospel, who, and who alone have so litterally fulfilled that Scripture of our God?*"[62] In Thorowgood, Acosta's connection between whale hunting and the Biblical Leviathan proves that Indigenous peoples in the Americas were the "[Israelite] people inhabiting the wilderness" and becomes evidence of the need for English Protestants to rally to the cause of showing these people their place in the divine plan.[63]

Thorowgood's ends appear to be overtly apocalyptic. Although, as Cogley has identified and I have already discussed, Thomas Thorowgood was an amillennialist, he still anticipated that Judgement Day was fast approaching. In his dedicatory letter, he cites Hebrews 10:37, which reads, "in just a little while, he who is coming will come and will not delay," to support his assertion that:

> these are *the last times… The ungodly shall not stand in the judgement,* for all faces shall then be unmasked, and every vizard shall be plucked off, *The Lord will then bring to light the hidden things of darknesse, and will make manifest the counsels of the heart, and then every one* that hath done well, *shall have praise of God.*[64]

Likely due to the suddenness of the apocalypse he expected, he seemed to feel that the soul-winning mission in New England was increasingly urgent. Throughout *Iewes in America*, he urges the reader to support the New England Company's efforts to establish missions to the Algonquian-speaking peoples. In doing so, he makes one of his only concessions to the possibility that the Indigenous peoples in the Americas might not be Israelites, arguing that, even

---

[60] Thorowgood, C2, recto. José de Acosta, *Natural and Moral History of the Indies*, trans. Jane E. Mangan (Duke University Press, 2002): 133-135.
[61] Acosta, 133-135. Psalm 103 in the Vulgate corresponds to Psalm 104 in the Septuagint and most English translations.
[62] Thorowgood, C3, verso.
[63] Psalm 74:14.
[64] Thorowgood, "The Epistle Dedicatory."

if "the lost Tribes are not to be found in *America,* of whatsoever descent and origination the poore Natives be, if they finde the Lord Christ… great cause shall wee have to lift up the high praises of our God in spirituall exultation."[65]

This description of Indigenous peoples as "poor" is repeated throughout the book and is of a piece with the attitudes of Winslow, Eliot, and the other settlers in the Massachusetts Bay Colony. As Laura M. Stevens describes, this rhetoric of pity was crucial to the fundraising efforts of the New England Company.[66] Stevens draws a cogent distinction between the pity for Indians and the sympathy for settlers "missionary writings" hoped to engender.[67] Pity for Indians came from a position of superiority, wherein English Protestants could be moved to extend Christian generosity to benighted peoples. The sympathetic, on the other hand, was grounded in admiration for the Christianizing project, including all its land-use implications, and the recognition that settlers and missionaries had willingly taken on a life of much more hardship than their brethren at home in the metropole.[68] Stevens specifically identifies Thorowgood as a writer who promoted a "triangulated" financial and redemptive relationship between metropole, colony, and Indigenous population. She writes, "Thomas Thorowgood… described two triangles of affection: the first between the English, their counterparts in America, and the Indians, and the second between the English, the Indians, and God."[69]According to Stevens, Thorowgood's invocation of the "poore Native" promises that the mission project will benefit contributors not only spiritually, but financially: "advocacy for Indians will enhance England's own case for salvation, just as underwriting the mission will increase trade."[70] John Eliot argues along similar lines when, in his contribution to Winslow's *Glorious Progress*, he requests money to purchase new hand-farming tools as the colonists have had a difficult time teaching Indigenous people how to properly use them.[71] A financial contribution to the missionary project would enable more conversions, both of people and land, to a Protestant English way of living and fulfill the colonial charter's exhortation to create a fruitful plantation and to bring Christianity to New England.

---

[65] Ibid.
[66] Laura M. Stevens, *The Poor Indians* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004): 4.
[67] Stevens, 13-14.
[68] Ibid.
[69] Ibid., 14.
[70] Ibid.
[71] Winslow, 13.

The "poore Native" described by Thorowgood was child-like, instinctual, and incapable by nature of the kind of productive land use Godly leadership that stood as the ideal of settler masculinity.[72] The deliberate erasure of Indigenous competence and accomplishment, which has already been discussed in the Introduction of this thesis, invented a pretext on which English settlers could claim that they were not brutal conquerors, as their enemies, the Spanish, had been, but gentle helpers, prepared to guide their ignorant neighbours and teach them the ways not only of Christ but also of fenced properties, of resource extraction, and of capital. It is not for nothing that the seal of the colony had, as its central motif, an Indigenous man, naked but for a strategically-placed bush, clutching bow and arrow, begging the English to "come over and help us." This condescending attitude typifies the "logic of elimination" by which colonization both demands and generates the destruction of Indigenous ways of life and the apologetics of that system.[73]

It is from this background that Thorowgood makes an argument that is, to my knowledge, unique among lost tribes theorists. He argues that the Indigenous peoples in the Americas must be Judaic because they are cannibals. Thorowgood acknowledges the bizarre nature of his conjecture, writing, "This which followeth next, at first sight, will appeare a Paradox rather than a Probability… for what an inference may this seem to bee; there bee Carybes, Caniballs, and Man-eaters among them, therefore they be Jewish."[74] As in his dedicatory epistle, he uses doubt as an rhetorical strategy. Acknowledging the unlikely nature of his claim allows him to invite the reader to hear him out. Thorowgood substantiates his supposition by pointing out that anthropophagy occurs in the Bible, an unimpeachable source. He cites several verses, beginning with Leviticus 26:29 and Deuteronomy 28:53, in which the Israelites are condemned to one day devour their own children.[75] These particular verses, however, Thorowgood argues, have already found fulfillment in 2 Kings 6:28 and Lamentations 4:10, respectively. The former verse, 2 Kings 6:28, describes a woman approaching the king of Israel during the famine in Samaria and

---

[72] Ruth Barnes Moynihan, "The Patent and the Indians: The Problem of Jurisdiction in Seventeenth-Century New England," in *American Indian Culture and Research Journal*, 2, no. 1 (1977): 9.
[73] For more on "the logic of elimination," please see Patrick Wolfe, "Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native," *Journal of Genocide Research*, 8:4 (2006): 388.
[74] Thorowgood, 17.
[75] Leviticus 26:29 reads, "you will eat the flesh of your sons and the flesh of your daughters." Deuteronomy 28:53 reads, "because of the suffering your enemy will inflict on you during the siege, you will eat the fruit of the womb, the flesh of the sons and daughters the Lord your God has given you."

offering a trade in which they ate his son that day and hers the next.[76] The latter verse, Lamentations 4:10, also details women eating children, this time during the Babylonian destruction of Jerusalem.[77]

Having provided Biblical grounding for the idea that anthropophagy was not alien to Jews, Thorowgood makes his claim that these practices are not merely historical. The final prophecy introduced by Thorowgood at this juncture is Ezekiel 5:9-10, which reads:

> Because of all your detestable idols, I will do to you what I have never done before and will never do again. Therefore in your midst parents will eat their children, and children will eat their parents. I will inflict punishment on you and will scatter all your survivors to the winds.[78]

This prophecy, Thorowgood writes, has never come into fulfillment. He finds several criteria that substantiate this claim. According to Thorowgood, in order for Ezekiel 5:9-10 to come true, not only must parents eat their children, but the devouring must be reciprocal. Moreover, this cannibalistic event must be such as has never been seen before: "it should be a publick and notorious calamity."[79] In other words, the cannibalism predicted by Ezekiel cannot borne out of profound desperation. Instead, people will eat each other because they enjoy the taste of human flesh.

According to Thorowgood, the anthropophagy found in the Americas meets all the criteria to fulfill Ezekiel. Certainly, he writes, the "anthropophagia Americanorum" qualifies as a previously unseen calamity because human flesh was not just eaten for sustenance, but enjoyed and deliberately sought out by its consumers.[80] Here Thorowgood turns away from the image of the "poore Native" and presents Indigenous people not as hapless naïfs, but as dangerous people, consumed by willful vice to the point of literal bloodthirstiness. He writes, luridly, "there be Caniballs and Man-eaters in great multitudes… hungring and hunting after Mans flesh, and devouring it, whose greedy bellies have buried Millions of them."[81] Thorowgood, once again

---

[76] 2 Kings 6:28 reads, "then he [the king of Israel] asked her, 'What's the matter?' She answered, "This woman said to me, 'Give up your son so we may eat him today, and tomorrow we'll eat my son.'" The fact that the woman later reneges on her end of the bargain is not mentioned by Thorowgood.

[77] Lamentations 4:10 reads, "with their own hands compassionate women/have cooked their own children,/who became their food/when my people were destroyed." The fact that these women go through with the plan to eat their children also does not seem valuable to Thorowgood. Moreover, he does not remark on the fact that both famines were caused by sieges.

[78] Thorowgood's version of this verse specifies fathers and sons rather than parents and children.

[79] Thorowgood, 18.

[80] Ibid.

[81] Ibid.

slipping into the register of "missionary writing," also describes the danger these cannibals pose to settlers:

> the Mauhacks [Kanien'kehá꞉ka] are such, and so neare they are, or were to some of our Planters, that finding an Englishman, they eate one part of him after another, before his face, while he was yet alive.[82]

This is one of the few moments in *Iewes in America* where Thorowgood mentions a specific nation in the Americas. Much of the time he follows Peter Martyr's assertion that all Indigenous peoples are in fact one people, owing to his observations of the common use of canoes and the common consumption of crops such as maize across the continent.[83] And yet, here, he singles out a particular nation for its apparent bloodlust and the threat it poses to settlers. Thorowgood gets his story about the Kanien'kehá꞉ka from William Woods's *New England Prospect* and repeats the detail about eating people alive almost verbatim.[84] The only change Thorowgood makes is that, in his version, the victim of the cannibals is an Englishman, whereas in Wood it is an "Abergenian" who is eaten alive.[85] Wood also includes a note, that Thorowgood omits, which explains that, "the very name of a *Mowhack* would strike the heart of a poore *Abergenian* dead, were here not hopes at hand of releefe from *English* to succour them."[86] In Wood, the Englishman appears as the poor Abergenian's rescuer, deserving the reader's admiration. In Thorowgood, the plight of the Englishman urges the reader to contribute to the colonial project so that settlers might have some defense against the depraved appetites of the Indigenous peoples.

Peggy Reeves Sanday further illuminates this incident through her anthropological study of cannibalism, *Divine Hunger*. Her research reveals that the Kanien'kehá꞉ka and other members of the Haudenosaunee certainly engaged in brutal torture and dismemberment of prisoners of war; Sanday deems it highly likely that this also entailed at least partial consumption of the bodies in some cases.[87] Significantly, Sanday locates these incidents within the context of European colonization. She writes, "torture and cannibalism were the means by which a nation facing bondage sought to dominate" the encroaching and asymmetrically powerful European

---

[82] Ibid.
[83] Ibid., 19.
[84] Wood, 57. It is not clear which specific nation the term "Abergenian" refers to, but it was a term for some of the Algonquian-speaking peoples in the northern part of the Massachusetts Bay Colony.
[85] Ibid.
[86] Ibid.
[87] Peggy Reeves Sanday, *Divine Hunger* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986): 148.

presence.[88] The Algonquian-speaking peoples in eastern North America, by contrast, developed strong anti-cannibalism attitudes as a result of the instability and disruption Europeans inflicted to their traditional ways of life.[89] Sanday draws connections between rising individualism as a response to disaster, breakdowns in social cohesion, and the fear of cannibalism: in famines and other crises, it was possible that friends, neighbours, and even relatives could turn to eating human flesh as a way of preserving their own lives at the expense of their communities.[90] It is important to note that, in the context of New England, Algonquian-speaking nations and the Kanien'kehá꞉ka were frequently at odds. As Neal Salisbury describes, all of these nations were part of the trading network that had existed in eastern North America for centuries and came to include English and French settlers alongside Indigenous nations.[91] Historical conflicts occasionally came to a head, especially in military conflicts with Europeans; according to Salisbury, it was the Kanien'kehá꞉ka who ultimately "sealed the fate of the Pequots" by assassinating their leader, who had turned to them as non-belligerents for aid during the 1636-1638 Pequot War.[92] Additionally, competition for favourable trading relationships led to tensions between the Kanien'kehá꞉ka and Algonquian-speaking nations. Carla Cevasco writes that Algonquians in New England told colonists that the Kanien'kehá꞉ka were cannibals, likely in an attempt to discourage contact and maintain some exclusivity over English trade goods.[93] The lurid tale told by Woods and Thorowgood actually contains great complexity and nuance beyond what either author cared to examine. It speaks of changing relationships between nations, different approaches to European incursions, and the meaning of cannibalism among colonized peoples in eastern North America. To Woods and Thorowgood, however, the story contained only one simple message: that Indigenous peoples in America were uncivilized, cannibalistic threats to other Indigenous people or European colonizers, depending on the version of the narrative.

---

[88] Sanday, *Divine Hunger*, 148.
[89] Ibid., 104.
[90] Ibid., 105-110.
[91] Neal Salisbury, "Indians and Colonists in Southern New England after the Pequot War: An Uneasy Balance," in *The Pequots in Southern New England: The Rise and Fall of an American Indian Nation* (Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1993): 86.
[92] Salisbury, "Indians and Colonists in Southern New England," 86.
[93] Carla Cevasco, "This is My Body: Communion and Cannibalism in Colonial New England and New France," *The New England Quarterly*, 89, no. 4 (2016): 571.

Thorowgood also finds evidence in America for Ezekiel's prophecy that "*the Fathers shall eat their Sons, and the Sons their Fathers*."[94] He cites Peter Martyr's account that "if they want the flesh of Foes and Forraigners, they eate then one another, even their owne kinred & allies."[95] Here, Thorowgood reveals a new facet of the "poore Native": the willfully murderous man-eater. This serves several purposes. First and most obviously, it makes the behaviour Thorowgood's sources claim to have observed fit into the prophetic criteria he establishes. Second, it also helps Thorowgood make his case for the importance of the New England mission. By this point in *Iewes in America*, Thorowgood has already deployed the trope of the "poore Native" who needs help to achieve full humanity. The contrasting, violent figure introduced in this chapter presents a second side of the coin: the dangerous potential of non-intervention and, worse perhaps, colonization without sustained support from the metropole. The "poore Native" is childlike and naïf, but also instinctual and primal; this is a formless state, ripe with the possibility of, on the one hand, glorious salvation and, on the other, subhuman bloodlust. Thorowgood's dual representation of Indigenous people makes the case that they need not only instruction in the ways of Christianity and prosperity, but also protection from their own basest instincts and those of their neighbours. This is an unwinnable dichotomy from an Indigenous perspective: either categorization justifies colonization.

Iewes and Jews

It seems perhaps surprising that Thorowgood, in an argument that cannibalism proves Judaic heritage, does not invoke the blood libel. The blood libel had been—and, frankly, continues to be—the dominant way of implicating Jews in anthropophagy. It is likely that Thorowgood never met a single Jewish person, nonetheless, he had firm ideas about what it meant to be Jewish, both to individual Jews and in the vast divine plan.[96] While Jews had been expelled from England since 1290, and only very few dared live in secrecy in large centers like London, the idea that Jews posed a threat to Christians never stopped circulating throughout England.[97] Simultaneously, as Richard Cogley notes, English Protestants, including Thorowgood, keenly anticipated that the spontaneous conversion of the Jews would prefigure the

---

[94] Thorowgood, 18.
[95] Ibid., 19.
[96] Cogley, "Ancestry," 306.
[97] Jens Åklundh, "Voices of Jewish Converts to Christianity in late Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century England," *The Seventeenth Century,* 29, no. 1 (2014): 56.

endtimes.[98] Thus, much like the "poore Natives," Jewish people were understood as both crucial actors in the divine plan and dangerous malefactors whose depraved appetites endangered Christians. Jews were keepers of the knowledge of the ancient Hebrews, whose status as God's chosen people meant they held a special place in Biblical history and the things to come. At the same time, Christians believed that Jews had rejected the good news of the gospel, were complicit in the death of Christ, and now engaged in such depravities as the abduction and murder of Christian children and the consumption of their blood in retaliation for their fall out of God's favour.[99] Yet Thorowgood seems to have no interest in relitigating these claims.

In fact, Thorowgood suggests that the revulsion at Jews is actually counterproductive: "when will Christians in earnest endeavour their conversion, if the name of *Jevv* must be odious everlastingly."[100] He argues that, if Christians truly do want to usher in the apocalypse, they require the conversion of the Jews; Jews are unlikely to convert if Christians continue to openly revile them. However, he also participates in the antisemitic trope that Jews are responsible for the death of Christ and that this is the reason for their subsequent misfortunes and peregrinations, writing, "they crucified their Saviour, and made him their enemy and avenger."[101] Thorowgood's concern here is not for Jewish well-being, but for the Christian narrative of salvation and for the coherence of his particular argument. He needs to demonstrate the unprecedented brutality of cannibalism in the Americas. Thus, he highlights it as a practice in which people are allegedly eaten alive, forced to look on during their own devouring. This parallels elements, common within the blood libel, in which the blood of a Christian child was collected and consumed before the victim was murdered.[102] Thomas Thorowgood does not specifically refute the blood libel, but he omits it when it could serve as additional proof for his claims. It appears that Thorowgood needs Jews to be innocent of the blood libel in order to succeed in his contention that cannibalism, as it is practiced in the Americas, has never been seen before in the scope of history.

---

[98] Cogley, "Ancestry," 321.
[99] Åklundh, "Voices of Jewish Converts," 56. R. Po-chia Hsia, *The Myth of Ritual Murder: Jews and Magic in Reformation Germany* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990): 127.
[100] Thorowgood, "The Epistle Dedicatory."
[101] Ibid., 53.
[102] Magda Teter, *Blood Libel: On the Trail of an Antisemitic Myth* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2020): 32. R. Po-chia Hsia, *Trent 1475* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992): 89.

Insofar as Thorowgood has any actual affinity for Jewish people, it is born out of shared animosity towards Spain. From and English Protestant perspective, Spain's historic persecution of Jews, which occurred as part of the *reconquista* that shaped Spain into a unified Catholic kingdom, further proves that the Catholic Church is the Antichrist.[103] Spain had rejected God's chosen people by expelling them or forcing them into Papist worship of objects and effigies, i.e. idolatry.[104] While England had also ejected its Jewish population, this had happened during the days before the true religion had been established there.[105] English Protestants had come to believe in the importance of Jews to the divine unfolding of history and understood that England, too, had been chosen by God, albeit as a "secondary nation to Israel," and endowed with the mission of restoring the Jews to the Holy Land.[106] Thus, English Protestants reframed the concept of chosen nations in such a way that the expulsion of Jews from Spain was an affront not only to Jews but also to their divinely-ordained protectors in England.

The lost tribes theory expands the footprint of that affront beyond just the Iberian peninsula to the Americas. If Indigenous peoples in the Americas are the lost tribes of Israel, the brutality of Spanish colonialism constitutes another assault on God's chosen people and another mandate for England to intervene. Thorowgood activated the Black Legend, the narrative that Spanish colonial abuses were so severe that English settlers had to colonize parts of the Americas to oppose Spain and protect Indigenous peoples from falling under its power.[107] The Black Legend combined the eschatological interpretation of Catholicism in general and Spain in particular as anti-Christian with the clear financial benefits of establishing overseas colonies to create a clear justification for English colonial expansion.[108] It created a win-win scenario where English settlers and their metropolitan backers could rest assured that any newfound colonial wealth came with the spiritual rectitude of confronting evil and the moral assurance that they were certainly more humane colonizers than their Spanish rivals.[109]

---

[103] Andrew Crome, *Christian Zionism and English National Identity*. (London: Palgrave MacMillan): 94.
[104] Crome, "The Restoration of the Jews," 132. Crome, *Christian Zionism*, 94.
[105] Cogley, *John Eliot's Mission*, 80.
[106] Crome, *Christian Zionism*, 24.
[107] Ralph Bauer, *The Alchemy of Conquest: Science, Religion, and the Secrets of the New World* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2019): 392.
[108] Carla Gardina Pestana, "Cruelty and Religious Justifications for Conquest in the Mid-Seventeenth-Century English Atlantic," in *Empires of God: Religious Encounters in the Early Modern Atlantic*, ed. Linda Gregerson and Susan Juster (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2011): 37.
[109] Pestana, 37. Crome, "Introduction," 10.

One of the most common ways English Protestants deployed the Black Legend was to turn Spanish accounts of colonial abuses against Spain. In particular, English Protestants relied on Bartolomé de las Casas's criticism of Spanish colonizing methods for proof that the Black Legend was true.[110] Thorowgood redeploys an account by de las Casas's as evidence not only of Spanish depravity but also of the lost tribes theory. He recalls the prophecy in Ezekiel, writing:

> And if the Americans bee Jewish, the Spaniards have yet in another sense fulfilled that Prediction of *Ezekiel,* for their owne Bishop *Bartholomeus de las Casas* writes, how they tooke Indians 10000, sometimes 20000 abroad with them in their Forragings, and gave them no manner of food to sustaine them, but the Flesh of other Indians taken in Warre, and so Christian-Spaniards set up a shambles of mans flesh in their Army; children were slaine and roasted, men were killed for their hands and feet sakes, for those they esteemed the onely delicate parts: this was most hideous and most barbarous inhumanity, the Tidings whereof was soone carryed through the Land, and overwhelmed the Inhabitants with Horror and Astonishment.[111]

Here is another reason why Thorowgood omits the blood libel from his discussion of Judaic cannibalism: Thorowgood relocates guilt for bloodthirsty atrocities, both current and historical, from Jews to Spain. He positions Jews, including alleged American Jews, as victims of the Antichrist by emphasizing Spain's cruel treatment of Judaic peoples by making it part of Ezekiel's prophecy. Bartolomé de las Casas's account reveals that the forced cannibalism perpetuated by Spanish colonizers produced such never-before-seen terror in the Indigenous peoples subjected to it—a population that, according to Thorowgood, already engaged in unheard-of cannibalistic depravity—that it is impossible to argue against the fulfillment of Ezekiel 5:9-10.

The Black Legend, as it is deployed by Thorowgood, is of a piece with his characterization of the "poore Natives." He reduces Indigenous peoples to pitiable victims of Spanish abuse, who need the intervention of a properly Christian country to both free them from the yoke of the Antichrist and the yoke of their own ignorance. Where the Spanish, "greedy for gold… [had] destroyed a fortune in agricultural revenues and a rich harvest in souls," the English were gentle missionaries who came bearing the tools, both physical and spiritual, for Indigenous people to establish prosperous Christian communities.[112] The Spanish tore apart the landscape

---

[110] Bauer, 392.
[111] Thorowgood, 19.
[112] Stevens, 47.

for precious metals whereas the English improved it with orchards and domesticated farm animals. Linda Gregerson describes the perspective of English colonizers: "the English faithful construed their mission as a merciful corrective to the murderous depredations they associated with the Spanish conquest—and thus with Roman Catholicism."[113] Thus we see a clear dichotomy between the Black Legend of Spanish colonization and what Ralph Bauer terms the White Legend of English expansion into a "virginal" America.[114] The White Legend narrative is based on a notional trade, where Europeans provide Indigenous peoples with spiritual salvation in exchange for the land and its bounty.[115] Laura Stevens relates this to the parable of the pearl of great price from the gospel of Matthew in which a wealthy merchant sells all his wares to afford a single precious pearl just as a Christian should give up all they have to gain the Kingdom of God, which is "costly and more valuable than all earthly treasure."[116] Of course, as Stevens notes, the Christian missionaries to the Americas often became wealthy themselves by convincing the subjects of their proselytism to give up their own assets as part of the Christianization process.[117]

Profit, Eschatology, and Metaphor

Profit and eschatology are closely related throughout all of the Puritan English incursion into New England. Linda Gregerson writes that, "the logic of eschatology was also entwined in New England with the fiduciary logic of mercantilism and plantation."[118] We see this in Thomas Thorowgood's assertion that:

> if wee meane the Indians shall be Gospellized, they must first be civilized… they must bee weaned from idlenesse, and hunting, and nakednesse, they must be perswaded to labour, planting, learning, arts, and manufacture, that they may get cloathing, they must be taught to build for their owne habitations, for meeting houses or Churches on the Lords dayes, Schooles must be erected for instruction of their youth at other times, books of all kinds, tooles and instruments of all sorts must be provided, many and necessary materialls towards this structure may be easily mentioned, but are not so easily purchased.[119]

---

[113] Linda Gregerson, "The Commonwealth of the Word: New England, Old England, and the Praying Indians," in *Empires of God: Religious Encounters in the Early Modern Atlantic*, eds. Linda Gregerson and Susan Juster (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2011): 79-80.
[114] Bauer, 7.
[115] Stevens, 37.
[116] Ibid., 51.
[117] Ibid.
[118] Gregerson, 78.
[119] Thorowgood, 94-95.

Thorowgood echoes other English Puritans' belief that Indigenous people would become more receptive to Christianity as they grew more accustomed to English-style enclosure and toil—both in the fields and on building infrastructure. Stevens points out that many English mission tracts depended on agricultural metaphors, demonstrating the close link between spiritual profit and material profit.[120] She describes how this metaphor was expanded in the missionary literature, writing, "churches become orchards and factories, while mission becomes inseparable from commerce. The figure of the heathen, the Christian, Indian—cultivated, transported, and consumed—stands for the settlement and trade already undertaken by England."[121] This not only underscores the intertwined nature of profit, expansion, and eschatology, it also introduces a new cannibal into the Americas: the consuming colonial presence.

Maggie Kilgour, in her book *From Communion to Cannibalism*, understands cannibalism as a metaphor of incorporation. Thinking along both psychoanalytical and Hegelian lines, Kilgour sees cannibalism as part of a range of acts that we perform to assimilate whatever is different or foreign to us.[122] Reading, for instance, is recognizable another kind of devouring where new knowledge is incorporated into what is already known.[123] We need only recall Francis Bacon's memorable assertion that "some *Books* are to be tasted, others to be swallowed, and some few to be chewed and digested" to understand Kilgour's parallel.[124] Ralph Bauer chooses a different metaphor for the sublimation of difference: he understands colonial expansion and the attendant efforts at proselytizing as akin to alchemical changes of state, both in terms of the scientific history of discovery and how missionaries approached conversion theoretically.[125] Bauer's hypothesis has a great deal of explanatory power when it comes to both the lost tribes theory and the intellectual community through which is circulated. His use of alchemy as a metaphor for colonialism has its roots in reality: it bears remembering that the letter

---

[120] Stevens, 36.
[121] Ibid., 37.
[122] Maggie Kilgour, *From Communion to Cannibalism* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990): 17.
[123] Kilgour, 9.
[124] Francis Bacon, *The Essays, or Councils, Civil and Moral, of Sir Francis Bacon*, third edition (London, 1696): 135.
[125] Bauer, 11. Bauer's discussion of cannibalism also relies heavily on alchemy. Here, he foregrounds Paracelsus whose use of mummified human remains in medicine drew together cutting-edge alchemical thought with occult spirituality.[125] He seems less interested in the accusation of cannibalism against Indigenous peoples, treating it as a kind of limit case, "the discursive space for marking social boundaries and cultural identities."[125] In this he follows the philosopher Cătălin Avramescu, who describes cannibalism as a way of clarifying the parameters of human behaviour and probing the margins of natural law. For more on the philosophical dimension of cannibalism, please see

exchange in which John Dury told Benjamin Worsley of his attempts to verify Montezinos's testimony primarily concerned Worsley's ongoing experiments in distillation and the applications of that technology to the plantation in Virginia.

Kilgour also brings up alchemy in her book. She refers to Peggy Reeves Sanday's comparison of alchemy and cannibalism.[126] Peggy Reeves Sanday writes,:

> The division of the victim [in a cannibalistic rite] is similar to a process known in alchemy as the *divisio*, *separatio*, and *solutio*… Through their experiments the alchemists believed that he spirit could be redeemed from matter… The union was represented as a mystical marriage—*coniunctio*—taking place within the alchemical vessel. Occasionally the union was conceived as a devouring of one element by the other in the alchemical vessel.[127]

Maggie Kilgour's account of cannibalism as a metaphorical and literal process of consumption is expansive enough to contain Bauer's focused use of alchemy to explain the logic of colonial expansion. For Kilgour, any kind of internalization, assimilation, or incorporation is related to eating and digestion.

New England settlers digested the Indigenous peoples they encountered by filtering these unknown peoples through the prejudices and stereotypes they had gathered prior to setting sail. The fact that, as in Thomas Thorowgood's *Iewes In America*, these prejudices were based on collapsing the vastness of American geography and the diversity of cultures that lived across it is yet more evidence of this assimilating, cannibalizing impulse. Where differences between such geographically disparate groups as the Tupí and the Wampanoag and even close neighbours like the Narragansetts and the Massachusetts could have plainly been observed, English settlers and their metropolitan backers saw mainly one undifferentiated population of Indians, all equally foreign and in need of digestion. The image of Indigenous peoples as cannibals can also be understood as one of the many preconceptions European settler carried with them. Yet the idea that the Algonquian-speaking peoples were cannibals seems at odds with Ralph Bauer's account of the White Legend of "virginal," naïve America and the fact of Algonquian anti-cannibalism taboos, as described by Sanday.[128] Kilgour provides an explanation of this through her analysis that cannibalism can be conceived as more "primal" and less inhibited than European mores.[129] This is plain in Thomas Thorowgood's appeal to an ancient Biblical past and a subsequent

---

[126] Kilgour, 17.
[127] Sanday, 97.
[128] Bauer, 7. Sanday, 105.
[129] Kilgour, 11.

descent into barbarism. There is no bashfulness or shame in the cannibalism Thorowgood describes because the people perpetuating it do not realize the depravity of their actions. In Thorowgood's alteration of William Wood's account of cannibalism against the Abergenians, we suspect that a story about a terrified Indigenous victim would puncture Thorowgood's narrative of unknowing atrocities committed by uncivilized people. Puritan settlers digested not only the ways Indigenous people allegedly lived, but also what these supposed lifestyles meant, in order to maintain internal coherence.

According to Kilgour, the settlers who landed on Algonquian territory were no strangers to metaphorical cannibalism themselves. In the decade before John Eliot began establishing the first prayer village at Natick, England butchered its body politic through the English Civil War, which Kilgour, borrowing from John Milton, describes as "intestinal."[130] Moreover, the English process of enclosure, begun long before the Civil War, had the effect of "dismember[ing] the land, which had been previously imagined as a communal body of property," to make it commodifiable, possessable, digestible.[131] The process of enclosing and selling parcels of land can also be understood as a push factor that led English Puritans to trade the crowded old England for the commodifiable possibilities of the new.[132] Once arrived they repeated the enclosure process, again parceling out land that had once been held in common. Settlers in New England also, per the gospel of Matthew, "hunger[ed] and thirst[ed] for righteousness."[133] This translated into a mission that pressured Algonquian-speaking Indigenous peoples to adopt Christian religion and English patterns of land-use. This whole project was in service of Christian eschatology; the endtimes were eagerly anticipated in the early 1650s and lost tribes theorists, in particular, believed that converting the Israelites in America would be crucial to their arrival. The lost tribes theory itself is a cannibalizing process which devours foreign cultures and digests them through a Biblical tract.

Devouring also a constitutive process: by internalizing whatever is "outside," the individual defines and reinforces their identity.[134] New England missionaries reinforced their Englishness, their Puritanness, their presumed moral rectitude through the encounter with

---

[130] Ibid., 145. John Milton, *Paradise Lost* (London, 1667): VI.259.
[131] Kilgour, 145.
[132] Ibid.
[133] Matthew 5:6.
[134] Kilgour, 6-7.

Indigenous peoples by converting them to that way of life. Thus, Narragansett harvesting and cultivation practices, construed as idleness, affirmed the industriousness of the settlers. Converting Indigenous peoples to Puritan religion and English land-use further strengthened the New England settler identity and affirmed the providential nature of their prosperity. Puritan settlers in New England along with their fellow travelers in Europe constructed a mutually reinforcing narrative. Lost tribes, Indigenous nations, land, profit, and even the figure of the cannibal could all be incorporated into the eschatological scheme in such a way that English Puritans always found the justifications they sought for their geographic expansion, missionary activity, and ceaseless hunger.

Chapter 2: Raising Stakes in the Promised Land

The Hope of Israel

The same year that Thomas Thorowgood printed *Iewes In America*, the Amsterdam rabbi Menasseh ben Israel published his own statement on the possible discovery of the lost tribes of Israel in the Americas. His book appeared in Spanish and Latin simultaneously under the titles *Esperança de Israel* and *Spes Israelis*, respectively.[1] Moses Wall's English translation of *Spes Israelis*, entitled *The Hope of Israel*, was published the same year.[2] By the time Moses Wall finished *The Hope of Israel*, *Spes Israelis* was already circulating through European intellectual circles. However, the production of an English translation allowed Menasseh to tailor his message to the audience befitting his latest endeavour; he chose to rededicate both *Spes Israelis* and *The Hope of Israel* to the English parliament, in the hopes that this would further his project of Jewish readmission to England.[3] The publication of *The Hope of Israel* was followed by an invitation to petition Oliver Cromwell directly in London. Menasseh's arrival in London and participation in the 1654 Whitehall Conference on Jewish readmission garnered significant attention from both philosemites and antisemites. William Prynne's 1656 pamphlet opposing readmission, titled *A short demurrer to the Jewes long discontinued remitter into England*, is of particular note due to its attempt to revive the blood libel, the accusation that Jews ritually consume the blood of Christians, especially children. Menasseh, who had previously tried to dismiss the blood libel as a sheer fabrication, felt forced to respond to Prynne in what would become his final publication, 1656's *Vindiciae Judaeorum*. This chapter traces Menasseh ben Israel's engagement with the Protestant Republic of Letters, as it culminated in his advocacy for Jewish readmission to England. It pays particular attention to the dichotomy between antisemitism and philosemitism, William Prynne's blood libelous pamphlet, and Menasseh's response to its accusations. Ultimately, it reveals the limitations of Jewish self-advocacy, the power of antisemitic accusations of cannibalism, and the persistence of Jewish racialization.

In recreating Menasseh's winding path from underpaid third rabbi of the Amsterdam congregation to Oliver Cromwell's 1654 Whitehall Conference, the theme of Jewish positioning emerges.[4] At every turn, Menasseh sought ways to enter into discussion with non-Jews at the

---

[1] Sina Rauschenbach, *Judentum für Christen* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2012): 184.
[2] Rauschenbach, *Judentum für Christen*, 209.
[3] Ibid.
[4] Steven Nadler, *Menasseh ben Israel* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2018): 38.

highest levels of intellectual discourse in Europe. Sina Rauschenbach has identified that all of Menasseh's ventures, ranging from book collecting to writing to Jewish readmission, were ultimately in service of his overarching aim towards an Abrahamitic theology in which Jews and Christians could freely exchange knowledge without subordinating one tradition to the other.[5] Menasseh's choice to rededicate *The Hope of Israel* is of a piece with his decisions to orient his works towards specific audiences. From the earliest Latin translation of his *Conciliador* 1630s, Menasseh published subtly different versions of his books depending on the language and intended audience.[6] When he wrote in Spanish, his work was oriented towards his own community of Sephardic Jews, including many former *conversos* and crypto-Jews who had limited proficiency in the Hebrew language and traditional Jewish rites.[7] Latin versions of his book were written for Christian philosemites and Hebraists who wanted insight into Jewish life and philosophy.[8]

Menasseh approached these audiences differently. According to Rauschenbach, he addressed his Latin readers with more distance than his Jewish readers, to whom he wrote from a position of trust and familiarity.[9] This is understandable, given not only the broader readership for Jewish-authored books in Latin but also the hostility that such works and their writers faced. Menasseh's own early translator and close collaborator Dionysius Vossius frequently justified his collegial relationship with the rabbi by explaining that he was only translating these works to provide Christian apologetics with arguments against Jews.[10] In the case of *Esperança de Israel*/*Spes Israelis*, Menasseh also adapted the content of the book to a Christian audience. He omitted references to Jewish martyrs who had been murdered by Christians, adapted comments about Jewish communities in China, and included the titles of saints.[11] The central argument, however, remained the same: the lost tribes of Israel had persisted following their deportation by the Assyrians and now inhabited all four corners of the earth, in fulfillment of Isaiah 11:11-12.

It is not clear whether Menasseh began writing his own treatise on the lost tribes before he heard of Thorowgood's project. However, we have evidence that *Spes Israelis* was underway by

---

[5] Rauschenbach, *Judentum für Christen*, 113.
[6] Ibid., 60-74.
[7] Nadler, 62.
[8] Ibid., 66.
[9] Rauschenbach, *Judentum für Christen*, 191.
[10] Sina Rauschenbach, "Mediating Jewish Knowledge: Menasseh Ben Israel and the Christian Respublica Litteraria," *The Jewish Quarterly Review* 102, no. 4 (2012): 569.
[11] Rauschenbach, *Judentum für Christen*, 191-192.

the time *Iewes in America* was published. During the summer months of 1649, Samuel Hartlib records that Henry Jessey had, "received a large letter from Menasseh Ben Israel conc*erning* the 10. Tribes."[12] In a December 1649 letter to Dury forwarding Montezinos's account, Menasseh also describes how his press burns to print the pages of *Spes Israelis* and reveals the contours of his argument.[13] This letter also demonstrates that Menasseh had already written to Dury about the project by that time, although I have not been able to find previous exchanges between them.[14] Menasseh's letter demonstrates that, as he brought Thomas Thorowgood's book to press, John Dury already knew a contribution from Menasseh was under way. Dury also likely would have realized that Menasseh's argument would differ significantly from Thorowgood's.

The largest point of argumentative difference is that, contrary to Thorowgood, Menasseh did not believe that all the people in the New World were members of the lost tribes. Instead, he followed Montezinos's assertion that only some of the people in the Americas were descended from ancient Israelites; the rest, he argued, were Gentiles, likely Tartars, who preceded the Israelites in that territory and persecuted them once they arrived, likely via the Strait of Anian.[15] Furthermore, Menasseh argued not all of the lost tribes had settled in the Americas. Here he relies on Montezinos's account that the tribe of Joseph "dwells in the midst of the sea," that is, on an island.[16] However, Menasseh also finds his own arguments for the widespread dispersion of the Jews. He retells the story of Matteo Ricci's encounter with Jews in China who were ignorant of Christianity and retained some Hebrew as well as other accounts of Jews in Tartary, Persia, Ethiopia, Syria, and India.[17]

Through all of these accounts of international Jewish diaspora, Menasseh enables himself to trace a path from the ancient kingdom of Israel through the near east, into east Asia, and, eventually, across to the Americas. At every point in this voyage across continents, he describes, some portion of the Israelites settled and began their own communities where they continued to observe Jewish law.[18] This all brings into fulfillment Isaiah 11:11, which Wall translates as, "It shall come to pass in that day, that the Lord shall set his hand the second time to recover the

---

[12] HP 28/1/26B-38B.
[13] HP 44/5/1A-2B.
[14] Ibid.
[15] Menasseh ben Israel, *The Hope of Israel*, trans. Moses Wall, ed. Henry Méchoulan and Gérard Nahon (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987): 161.
[16] Menasseh, *The Hope of Israel*, 108.
[17] Ibid., 127-141.
[18] Ibid.

remnant of his people which shall be left from Assyria, from Egypt, from Pathros, from Ethiopia [Cush], from Shinar, from Hamath, and from the islands of the sea."[19] Menasseh interprets this verse to apply perfectly to the list of places where he has found evidence of Jewish life:

> *Pathros* is not Pelusim, nor Petra, but Parthia, near to the Caspian Sea, where I think, with many others the Sabbatical river is… *Cush*, according to common opinion, is Ethiopia… *Elam* is a province in Persia… where are desert places in which perhaps a remnant of the Ten Tribes is. *Shinar* is a province about Babylon… *Hamath*: there are many Hamaths mentioned in Scripture… but I think that that is meant, which is placed in Scythia. The Septuagint by Hamath understands the sun… and they translate it 'from the rising of the sun'; and I think it no ill translation, for hereby all the Israelites who are in Greater Asia, India and China maybe understood. *The islands of the Sea*: so almost all translate it; but I think it is to rendered the islands of the West… and upon this account those Israelites are implied, who are westward form the Holy Land, among whom the Americans are.[20]

Thus all the lost Israelites are accounted for by Menasseh. He then turns his attention to Isaiah 11:12 which prophesies the return of God's chosen people to the Promised Land. Menasseh's geographic report, while extremely thorough and apparently in accordance with Isaiah, does not actually demonstrate that *all four quarters* of the earth are populated in part by the lost tribes, as the prophecy of Isaiah stipulates. Menasseh resolves this by explaining that Isaiah 11:12 likely refers to both Jews and Israelites who will be recalled and reunited in the Promised Land.[21]

This diverges tremendously from Thomas Thorowgood's position that all the Indigenous peoples in the Americas were lost Israelites. One reason for this is that *Iewes in America* and *The Hope of Israel* are different kinds of book. In *Iewes in America*, Thorowgood wants to convince the reader of the truth of the lost tribes theory; Menasseh, instead, uses contemporary interest in the theory to draw readers into the broader historical and eschatological engagement within *The Hope of Israel*. In other words, *Iewes in America* is argumentative where *The Hope of Israel* is discursive. Where Thorowgood divides his book into chapters, each providing another pillar of support to his assertions, Menasseh gives his position in a long numbered list in which he frequently repeats himself, pursues tangents of Biblical exegesis or minor points of Jewish history, and writes in a circuitous, meandering register. In one sense, Menasseh inverts

---

[19] Ibid., 140-141.
[20] Ibid., 141. Méchoulan and Nahon believe the comment about American synagogues refers to Sephardic Jewish settlers in Dutch Brazil and Dutch Guiana, rather than to the lost tribes.
[21] Ibid., 142.

Thorowgood's logic. Thorowgood uses Christian eschatology to prove the lost tribes theory, while Menasseh uses the lost tribes to explicate Jewish eschatology.[22]

Menasseh relied on many of the same sources as Thorowgood. Obviously, the Hebrew Bible was a pillar of the Amsterdam rabbi's argument. Unlike Thorowgood, he was able to avail himself of the vast tradition of Biblical exegesis that existed in Judaism and used it to cast further light on Biblical promises. For example, *The Hope of Israel* calls upon Rabbi Yohanan and Rabbi Jonathan ben Uziel's commentaries, which both suggest that the lost tribes were transported beyond the Sabbatical River.[23] Menasseh also participates in the Jewish exegetical tradition by giving himself the latitude to disagree with prior commentators and inserting his own interpretation. For instance, Menasseh weighs several possible meanings of the islands mentioned in Isaiah 11:11:

> *The islands of the Sea*: so almost all translate it; but I think it is to be rendered the islands of the West, for *Yam* in holy scripture signifies the west, as in Genesis 28;14 and in many other places; and upon this account those Israelites are implied, who are westward from the Holy Land, among whom the Americans are.[24]

Menasseh also demonstrates familiarity with secular lines of argument used by Thorowgood, especially the Black Legend of Spanish abuse. Rather than focusing on colonial abuses, however, Menasseh turns his attention to the Spanish mistreatment of Jews in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth century.[25] This, he suggests, amounted to a rejection of God's chosen people.[26] According to Menasseh, God has punished the persecutors of the Jews: "Have not the monarchies of great princes been destroyed? Consider with me the miserable ends of Antiochus, of Pompey, of Sisebut, of Philip the king of France, of Alfonso the son of João II."[27] The Spanish monarchy has also not been spared God's wrath. Menasseh recalls the untimely deaths of Isabella and Ferdinand and the misfortunes that plagued their family and, by extension, Spain:

> As for [Ferdinand's] son-in-law, his own subjects did persecute him; and his only son died (leaving no issue) on his wedding day, being seventeen years old. His

---

[22] Crucially, Thorowgood's project predated Montezinos's testimony in Amsterdam. Thus, he had to generate interest in the theory to begin with as well as evidence for it by mining Hebrew Bible prophecies. Menasseh already knew that an audience existed for his book's subject matter—he had been overwhelmed by their letters.
[23] Ibid., 134.
[24] Ibid., 141. Genesis 28:14 reads, "Your descendants will be like the dust of the earth, and you will spread out to the west and to the east, to the north and to the south. All peoples on earth will be blessed through you and your offspring."
[25] Menasseh, *The Hope of Israel*, 148.
[26] Ibid., 156.
[27] Ibid.

> daughter, being heir of the kingdom, and of her father's hatred, would not marry Manuel, king of Portugal, unless he would compell us to be banished… but she died in childbirth of her son… and also her son, before he was a year and a half old; and the succession was devolved upon the kingdom of Spain... and their kingdom declined.[28]

In this way Menasseh uses Jewish history to engage his Protestant readers by appealing to anti-Catholic and anti-Spanish sentiments. Simultaneously, he sets forth a case for Protestant Christians to be tolerant of Jews, lest they also come to ruin at the will of God.

The significant eschatological differences between Menasseh and Thorowgood are often chalked up to the distinctions between Christian and Jewish approaches to the end of history and the coming of the Messianic age. Protestant eschatology anticipates the conversion of the Jews and a pitched battle between the forces of Christianity and the Antichrist before the second coming of Jesus Christ.[29] It feels obvious, even redundant, to point out that, for Jews, there can be no conversion to Christianity, no anti-Christ, and certainly no second coming. While Jewish and Christian eschatologies share some source texts, mainly the Hebrew Bible Books of Isaiah, Ezekiel, Jeremiah, and Daniel, the gulf between Christianity and Judaism was vast, particularly in the context of early modernity. These debates were not purely academic in nature.

Menasseh was certainly aware of the long, painful history of Christian antisemitism, including the virulent hatred of Jews espoused by Martin Luther.[30] He does not bring up Protestant antisemitism in *The Hope of Israel*, choosing instead to focus on the abuses of the Spanish Inquisition. Activating the spectre of Catholic Spain, a likely candidate for the role of the anti-Christ, drew Protestants closer to Jews.[31] As we have already seen, Menasseh avoided mention of Jewish victims of antisemitism as "martyrs" in the versions of his book that were disseminated among Christian readers. Menasseh consistently tailored his message to avoid offending his Christian interlocutors by either connecting their particular form of Christianity to antisemitism or by elevating Jewish victims to the holy status of martyrs, which might inflame supersessionist passions. He does this as well with eschatology. Menasseh's initial approach to eschatology is somewhat self-deprecating. He describes the long wait Jews have had to endure,

---

[28] Ibid., 156-158.
[29] Richard Cogley, "The Fall of the Ottoman Empire and the Restoration of Israel in the "Judeo-Centric" Strand of Puritan Millenarianism," *Church History* 72, no. 2 (2003): 304.
[30] R. Po-chia Hsia, *The Myth of Ritual Murder: Jews and Magic in Reformation Germany* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990): 131.
[31] Cogley, "The Fall of the Ottoman Empire," 304.

repeating what he claims is a common phrase among Jews, "it is said that although he Messiah were lame, he might have come by this time."[32] Acknowledging the lateness of the timeline may be an attempt to neutralize some of the eschatological tensions between Christians and Jews. Still, Menasseh asserts, "though we cannot exactly show the time of our redemption, yet we judge it to be near."[33] This is a milder form of the Messianic fervour Menasseh nursed throughout his life.[34] Menasseh's muted discussion of eschatology avoided alienating his Christian readers. At the same time, Menasseh's expectation of the imminent Messianic age would have been shared by the Protestant millenarians of his correspondence. Thus Menasseh balanced a partial endorsement of millennial anticipation with discretion around specific Jewish beliefs.

Menasseh's Intellectual Circle

Certainly Menasseh had been an in-demand rabbi before Antonio de Montezinos arrived in Amsterdam. Throughout the 1630s and 1640s he worked to develop cordial relationships with Protestant intellectuals such as John Comenius, Petrus Serrarius, and John Dury in the Netherlands and became a frequent contributor of Jewish positions and Jewish wisdom on issues that concerned his interlocutors around Europe. For instance, Menasseh corresponded frequently with Dury and Serrarius on the topic of Hebrew-language pedagogy as part of their project of educational reform.[35] Crawford Gribben also describes Menasseh's 1655 exchanges with James Ussher, who wrote to the rabbi to ask his opinions on the Book of Elijah.[36] Steven Nadler writes:

> Menasseh had no problem with serving as the Jewish contact for the Christian Millenarian camp. As a teacher and a promoter of interfaith understanding, he was more than happy to engage with these messianic Protestants and find points of agreement.[37]

Menasseh's contacts with the Christian world also related to his own belief in and desire to promote his Abrahamitic theology. While there is plenty of evidence that Menasseh enjoyed

---

[32] Menasseh, *Hope of Israel*, 147.
[33] Ibid., 148.
[34] Nadler, 36, 123. Gemeente Amsterdam Stadsarchief, DTB 669, 189-190. Gemeente Amsterdam Stadsarchief. DTB 678, p.166. Both Menasseh and his sister married siblings of the Abarbanel family, which was supposed to descend from King David, and he married his daughter Graçia to her double-cousin Samuel in order to ensure that the Messiah would emerge from his line as well. Please note that Nadler uses Gracia's Hebrew name, which was Hannah, throughout his book.
[35] Nadler, 135-137.
[36] Crawford Gribben, *The Puritan Millennium: Literature & Theology 1550-1682* (Portland, OR: Four Courts Press, 2000): 83.
[37] Nadler, 137.

these relationships on their own terms as friendships, he also always sought ways of improving his particular station or that of his community. As a junior rabbi and school teacher within the congregation, his wages were paltry; he augmented them by operating a printing press—Amsterdam's first Jewish-owned one—that could produce books in Spanish, Portuguese, Latin, French, and Hebrew.[38] Thus he attempted to parlay his expertise as a rabbi and connoisseur of Jewish books into all manner of ventures, most of which failed. His 1633 Latin-language dedication of the *Conciliator* was rejected by the Magistrates of Holland and West Frisia to whom it had been penned.[39] His attempt to leverage his acquaintance with Isaac Vossius, brother of Dionysius, into a position as Queen Christina of Sweden's Hebrew-language librarian likewise fell apart, putting him under considerable financial strain after purchasing a number of books as proof of his competence.[40]

Yet Menasseh's fame continued to grow. In the second part of his *Conciliador*, he boasted of having received and responded to letters from over 150 Gentile European intellectuals.[41] The secondary literature of Menasseh's life and career often characterizes him as a tenacious and ambitious figure who consciously sought out and inserted himself into the intellectual networks of his time.[42] Nadler asserts that Menasseh's prolific letter exchanges with Protestant intellectuals impressed even well-placed Christian participants in the Republic of Letters.[43] His renown grew to the point where his name was appended to the 1646 edition of Adam Boreel's Latin-language translation of the *Mishnah*, even though he was not particularly involved in the project as a translator but rather as the printer, in order to "make it currant amongst the Iewes."[44] Boreel and his associates understood that the Latin *Mishnah* would not be received well among the Jewish community if it was known to be a Christian undertaking. They judged that Menasseh's reputation was both known and respected enough among Jews and Christians that, by advertising his involvement, the text could succeed among the full range of

---

[38] Ibid., 39-53.
[39] Rauschenbach, "Mediating Jewish Knowledge," 570. Aaron L. Katchen, "Menasseh ben Israel the Apologist and the Christian Study of Maimonides' *Mishneh Torah*," in *Jewish Thought in the Seventeenth Century*, ed. Isadore Twersky and Bernard Septimus (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1987): 210.
[40] Nadler, 150-157.
[41] Menasseh ben Israel, *Segunda Parte Del Conciliador* (Amsterdam: Nicolaus de Ravesteyn, 5041 (1642)): Unpaginated final page of "Menasseh ben Israel Al Lector."
[42] Nadler, 134-138. Katchen
[43] Nadler, 85.
[44] HP 3/3/32A-33B. HP 3/3/34A-34B.

intended readership.[45] Menasseh's furious output of letters and Jewish theological texts garnered not only admiration, but also sharp disapproval from Christian and Jewish readers alike.

Sina Rauschenbach describes the failure of Menasseh's more explicit attempts to advocate for an Abrahamitic theology during the 1630s.[46] The Magistrates of Holland and West Frisia's rejection of his Latin *Conciliador* stung deeply, as did reader responses that asserted the rabbi had crossed a line with his new book.[47] But Menasseh was not to be deterred and, in 1636, he published his treatise on the soul and the possibility of resurrection. As a consequence of his Abrahamitic theology, Menasseh wrote that Jews and Gentiles alike would be resurrected after death.[48] This assertion flew in the face of Jewish and Christian tradition alike and infuriated some of his staunch Protestant readers. Menasseh swiftly found himself accused of judaizing and trying to undermine the Reformed church, which were serious charges and could have resulted in repression and even expulsion for the Amsterdam Jewish community. [49]

For their part, Menasseh's community understood the risks he was taking and worried that the rabbi's books of scriptural commentary and Jewish apologia would enrage the Amsterdam *burghemeesters*—who had ruled that Jewish life in Amsterdam would be tolerated on the condition that Jews not criticize Christianity—and bring suffering upon the *naçao*.[50] Furthermore, Menasseh's frequent exchanges with Christians seemed to violate the Talmudic prohibition against teaching Torah to a Gentile.[51] Sina Rauschenbach also describes that some Amsterdam Jews suspected that Menasseh was beginning to distance himself from Judaism and would eventually convert to Christianity.[52] This further strained Menasseh's finances as the Jewish community began to avoid commerce with him.[53]

Taken together, the criticism he received from both his own *naçao* and the Gentile nations prompted a reconsideration of his methods in attracting Christian attention. Rauschenbach describes that, "during the late 1630s and the 1640s, Menasseh adopted a more passive stance, refraining from addressing the Christian world and waiting rather for Christian

---

[45] Katchen, 210.
[46] Rauschenbach, *Judentum für Christen*, 125.
[47] Nadler, 76.
[48] Ibid., 78.
[49] Ibid., 74-75, 80-81.
[50] Ibid., 17. Rauschenbach, *Judentum für Christen*, 248-249.
[51] Talmud Sanhedrin, 59a.
[52] Rauschenbach, *Judentum für Christen*, 248.
[53] Ibid.

scholars to consult him about theological problems *they* were worried about."[54] This had a two-fold effect. First, Menasseh's more reserved posture forced Christians interested in a Jewish perspective to reach out to him rather than waiting for his stance to come out in one of his books. This contributed to Menasseh's position as the preeminent source on Jewish theology and practice of his time. However the second outcome of Menasseh's newfound reticence was less positive: Menasseh's position of waiting for Christian intellectuals to write to him meant that he was forced to respond to their questions according to their framing rather than on terms more germane to Jewish tradition and Menasseh's Abrahamitic theology. Menasseh never abandoned his plan of Abrahamitic exchange—in fact, Rauschenbach identifies this project as the through line of his career; he just had to find more subtle ways to make the case for Christian-Jewish relationships of equality.[55]

These are patterns which can be observed throughout Menasseh's work. Sina Rauschenbach has traced the subtle differences between his Spanish and Latin texts, concluding that Menasseh not only approached his Latin audiences with more distance and less trust, he did so out of an awareness that "Jewish knowledge was expected to merge into Christian theology. As soon as it was presented as supplementary information with its own inherent value, it was rejected."[56] The careful positioning Menasseh undertook with *The Hope of Israel* is particularly significant in light of the broader project that work is situated within. *The Hope of Israel* was the first venture in what the early twentieth century historian Lucien Wolf calls "Menasseh ben Israel's Mission to Oliver Cromwell," Menasseh's attempt to gain official permission for Jewish readmission to England.[57]

The Humble Addresses

The body of *The Hope of Israel* does not overtly argue for Jewish readmission to England. However, its dedication to "the Parliament, the Supreme Court of England, and to the Right Honourable the Council of State" asks for "your favour and good will to our nation."[58] Menasseh alludes the execution of Charles I as the primary excuse for his dedication:

> And truly it is from hence, that of late you have done so great things valiantly, and by an unusual attempt, and things much to be observed among the nation. The

[54] Rauschenbach, "Mediating Jewish Knowledge," 575.
[55] Ibid.
[56] Ibid., 574.
[57] Lucien Wolf, *Menasseh ben Israel's Mission to Oliver Cromwell* (London: Macmillan and Co., 1901).
[58] Menasseh, *The Hope of Israel*, 99.

> whole world stands amazed at these things, and the eyes of all are turned upon you, that they may see whither all these things do tend, which the great Governor of all things seems to bring upon the world by so great changes, so famously remarkable, of so many Nations; and so all those things, which God is pleased to have foretold by the Prophets, do and shall obtain their accomplishment.[59]

In this way, Menasseh connects the outcome of the English Civil War to the broader eschatological scheme, which, he writes, must come to fulfillment with "Israel at last being brought back to his own place."[60] Thus, in the dedicatory preface to *The Hope of Israel*, Menasseh began to build his case that, eschatologically, the fate of the Jews was intimately bound up with that of England.

This reflected a position that was also current among English-speaking Protestants at this time. Andrew Crome describes that the prevailing belief in the sixteenth century was that Jews had lost their chosen status by rejecting Christ and that England had become the new Israel. This attitude gradually shifted and, by the seventeenth century, a new understanding of England's status in the eschatological scheme emerged: "God had chosen England, but only as a secondary nation to Israel… The nation [England] had a mission towards Israel and faced punishment if it failed to fulfil it."[61] Especially after the English Civil War, when new opportunities for discourse on rabbinical Judaism became possible, English Protestant intellectuals turned their attention to the Jews.[62] Many English millenarians, such as Henry Jessey, took this to mean that God had chosen England to lead Jews back into the Promised Land.[63]

Some millenarians, such as Johanna Cartwright and her son Ebenezer, believed that, in order to return Jews to the Holy Land, they first needed to return to England. In their 1649 petition *The Petition of the Jewes*, the mother-son millenarian duo write that:

> by discourse with them, and serious perusall of the Prophets, both they and we find, that the time of hercall draweth nigh; whereby they together with us, shall come to know the Emanuell, the Lord of life, light, and glory; even as we are now known of him, And that this Nation of ENGLAND, with the Inhabitants of the Nether-lands, shall be the first and readiest to transport IZRAELLS Sons &

---

[59] Ibid., 100.
[60] Ibid.
[61] Andrew Crome, *Christian Zionism and English National Identity, 1600-1850* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018): 24.
[62] Rauschenbach, *Judentum für Christen*, 211.
[63] Nadler, 169.

> Daughters in their Ships to the Land promised to their fore-Fathers, ABRAHAM, ISAAC, and JACOB, for an everlasting Inheritance.[64]

Their petition was received by the Parliamentary Council of War, a mere month before the execution of King Charles I.[65] While the Cartwright petition did not result in any immediate attention to Jewish readmission, the English Civil War, along with the collapse of Parliamentary censorship, opened new opportunities to engage with eschatology and directly discuss the place of Jews within that scheme.[66] The Cartwright petition fits into that context as an early example of advocacy in favour of Jewish readmission. Robert O. Smith even characterizes the Cartwright petition as the first work of Christian Zionism due to the fact that it describes the conversion of the Jews in concrete terms and connects that prophesied event to the geographic location of Palestine.[67] The Cartwrights also clearly focused on the Judeo-centric model of eschatology described by Richard Cogley.[68] Johanna and Ebenezer Cartwright occasionally write as though the conversion of the Jews is already in process, rather than something that will come about in due course, describing the Jewish devotion to "both their and our Lord God of salvation (Christ Jesus)."[69]

The month after the Cartwright petition gained acceptance by the Council of War, another, similar pamphlet appeared. This one, *An Apology for the honourable nation of the Jewes, And all the Sons of Israel*, ostensibly authored by Edward Nicholas, makes the case as the that Jews should be permitted to live in England, albeit with several important departures from the Cartwright petition. Nicholas does not suggest that England has some special position regarding the restoration of the Jews, but instead argues that English blood libel and the resulting 1290 expulsion incited God's wrath and that England must readmit Jews to make restitution for this grave sin.[70] He describes the Jews as an honourable and noble nation who have been scattered throughout the world and must suffer the violence and suspicion of those in whose

---

[64] Johanna Cartenwright and Ebenezer Cartwright, *The Petition of the Jewes* (London: Printed for George Roberts, 1649): 2.
[65] Robert O. Smith, *More Desired than Our Owne Salvation: The Roots of Christian Zionism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013): 97.
[66] Smith, *More Desired than Our Owne Salvation*, 98-100.
[67] Ibid.
[68] Cartenwright and Cartwright, *The Petition of the Jewes*, 2. Cogley, "The Fall of the Ottoman Empire," 304.
[69] Cartenwright and Cartwright, 3.
[70] Edward Nicholas, *An Apology for the honourable nation of the Jewes, And all the Sons of Israel* (London: Printed for John Field, 1649): 5.

nations they dwell.[71] Nicholas, unlike others including even Menasseh, does not suggest that the Jews' diasporic condition came as a result of God's wrath, but rather that "what God in his secret will and judgement intended in the scattering of the Jews, I presume not to understand or to guess at."[72] Moreover, Nicholas asserts that Jews cannot be held collectively responsible for the death of Christ—a historic antisemitic trope. Instead, only Jewish leadership at the time of Christ's death was at fault.[73] This counter-argument is one of the few times throughout the text where Nicholas brings up Christ. Unlike the Cartwrights he has no interest in Jewish conversion; his focus is on the sin of blood libel and Jewish expulsion and the benefits that would come to England if Jews were permitted to live there once again.[74] Nicholas also draws on Jewish history, describing that, "in *Spain* there were 120000 Jews cast out and banisht, in the year 1493."[75] This gives him the opportunity to engage in anti-Catholic rhetoric, where he invokes the image of the duplicitous, untrustworthy Jewish operator and twists it to apply instead to Catholic clergy:

> The Papists are especially offended with them, because the Jews so much abhor the Imagery and Idolatrous Worship of theirs, for touch that, and touch the corner stone of their Politique foundation: The Jesuits do nestle into all Kingdoms and States of Christendom, and have an influence on their Counsels, as also of Universities, Armies, great Cities and Corporations, wherein they imploy the choycest wits they have, who undertake any kinde of professions, the better to cloak their designs.[76]

Nicholas also invokes the iconoclasm of the Reformed Church and draws a connection between that and the Jewish prohibition on idol worship. This establishes an affinity between Protestants and Jews, against the Catholic Church. All of this pro-Jewish, rather than merely philosemitic, content has called into question Edward Nicholas's motives for scholars of this episode, given that the author was almost certainly pseudonymous. However, Nicholas dismissed the idea that he was being bribed by Jews for his contribution "what I have now written, was not upon any mans motion of the Jews Nation, but a thing that I have long and deeply revolved within my heart."[77] Despite the pamphleteer's protests, some scholars, such as Cecil Roth, entertain the

---

[71] Nicholas, *Apology*,
[72] Ibid., 6.
[73] Ibid.
[74] Ibid.
[75] Ibid., 11.
[76] Ibid., 13.
[77] Ibid., 15.

notion that the true author of the pamphlet may have been Jewish.[78] Roth even suggests that Menasseh "might almost" have been the author, citing the way Nicholas's eschatological comments reflect Menasseh's approach.[79]

Menasseh took up the eschatological necessity of Jewish readmission six years after Nicholas, in his petition to Oliver Cromwell, entitled *Humble Addresses to the Lord Protector* (1655). Menasseh actually cites Nicholas's pamphlet as an example of a Gentile author who understands the importance of Jewish readmission.[80] The *Humble Addresses* treats the eschatological outcome of readmission as only one of several supposed benefits to England. Eschatology is relatively de-emphasized compared to the other possible benefits, yet Menasseh nonetheless makes a significant claim regarding the role Jewish readmission will play in the Jewish return to the Holy Land. He builds on his discussion of the Jewish diaspora in *The Hope of Israel*:

> before all be fulfilled, the People of God must be first dispersed into all places & Countreys of the World. Now we know, how our Nation at the present is spread all about, and hath its seat and dwelling in the most flourishing parts of all the Kingdomes, and Countreys of the Worlds, as well in *America,* as in the other three parts thereof; except onely in this considerable and mighty Island. And therefore this remains onely in my judgement, before the *MESSIA* come and restore our Nation, that first we must have our seat here likewise.[81]

According to Menasseh, Jews are now scattered through every part of the world—including the Americas, per both the lost tribes theory and the establishment of Sephardic synagogues in Suriname and Dutch Brazil—except England. Thus, in order to fulfill Isaiah 11:11-12, Jews must be readmitted to England. Menasseh never explicitly mentions Isaiah in his *Humble Addresses*; nevertheless, its influence is palpable throughout the petition as Menasseh obliquely gestures towards prophetic assurances that Jews must be in a condition of total diaspora before the return to the Promised Land can begin. Here Menasseh plays on English Protestant fervour for the restoration of the Jews: "the opinion of many Christians and mine doe concurre herein, that we both believe that the restoring time of our Nation into their Native Countrey, is very near at

---

[78] Cecil Roth, *A Life of Menasseh Ben Israel: Rabbi, Printer, and Diplomat* (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1945): 197.
[79] Roth, *A Life of Menasseh Ben Israel*, 197.
[80] Menasseh ben Israel, *To His Highnesse the Lord Protector of the Common-wealth of England, Scotland, and Ireland. The humble addresses of Menasseh Ben Israel* (London: 1655): 26.
[81] Menasseh, *Humble Addresses*, unpaginated page within "A Declaration to the Common-Wealth of England."

hand."[82] Menasseh, ever cognizant of his audience, did not draw attention to the ways Jewish and Christian eschatology diverged, but rather emphasized the common expectation between Jewish and Christian millenarians. In this way, Menasseh engaged in what Ismar Schorsch terms "Realpolitik" by playing off Christian expectations for the Second Coming in the hopes of benefitting Jews.[83]

Ismar Schorsch suggests that Menasseh ben Israel's approach to readmission was also born of pragmatism. Schorsch rejects attempts to connect *The Hope of Israel* with the *Humble Addresses* on the grounds that *The Hope of Israel* does not make explicit mention of England as the only place where Jews do not yet dwell.[84] It would appear the dedications of the Latin and English editions of *The Hope of Israel* to the English parliament contradict Schorsch, although he argues that this reflects Menasseh's eschatological engagement with Puritan intellectuals rather than any nascent attempt to seek Jewish readmission.[85] Whether or not readmission already preoccupied Menasseh at the time he wrote *The Hope of Israel*, it is clear that England, the country where so many of his philosemitic interlocutors lived and where he had once been in contention for a university post, was very much on his mind.[86]

The opportunity to petition Cromwell came about in 1651, when Menasseh was invited by his Christian contacts in London, among them Hartlib and Jessey, to come to London and make the case for Jewish readmission. His voyage was delayed due to the First Anglo-Dutch War (1652-1654) and his own period of ill health. He sent his son, Samuel, in 1654, to prepare for his arrival. In 1655, he finally was able to make the journey from Amsterdam just in time to celebrate Rosh Hashanah with London's small crypto-Jewish community.[87] Menasseh was put up in comfortable accommodations on the Strand—Nadler asserts that it is unlikely that Menasseh would have been able to afford this prestigious address and suggests that Oliver Cromwell likely covered these costs.[88] To Nadler, this indicates that Cromwell took a favourable view of Jewish readmission.[89] At a minimum, he was keen enough on the debate to not only

---

[82] Ibid.
[83] Ismar Schorsch, "From Messianism to Realpolitik: Menasseh ben Israel and the Readmission of the Jews to England," *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research*, 45 (1978): 196-199.
[84] Schorsch, "From Messianism to Realpolitik," 190.
[85] Ibid.
[86] For more on the proposed Hebrew college, please see Nadler, 136.
[87] Nadler, 195.
[88] Kathy Lavezzo, *The Accommodated Jew: English Antisemitism from Bede to Milton* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2016): 222. Nadler, 195.
[89] Nadler, 195.

provide Menasseh with a guarantee of safe travel, but also, according to Nadler, housing during the duration of his stay.[90]

The *Humble Addresses* is not an overtly eschatological text, aside from Menasseh's early explanation of the necessity of readmission in order for the Jews to be truly scattered throughout all the world.[91] In fact, Menasseh echoes Nicholas primarily by reinforcing the grave injustice of the 1290 expulsion of the Jews and the dire consequences continued cruelty could have for England, citing God's promise to Abraham in Genesis 12:37:

> For none hath ever afflicted them, who hath not been by some ominous *Exit,* most heavily punished of God Almighty… And on the contrary, none ever was a Benefactor to that people, & cherished them in their Countries, who thereupon hath not presently begun very much to flourish. In so much that the Oracle to *Abraham (I will blesse them that blesse thee, and curse them that curse thee)* seemeth yet daily to have its accomplishment."[92]

Alongside this, Menasseh makes reference to the execution of Charles I, describing that "it is a thing most certain, that the great God of *Israel,* Creator of Heaven and Earth, doth give & take away Dominions and Empires, according to his own pleasure; exalting some, & overthrowing others."[93] In these lines, he seems to be reminding Cromwell that divine providence could ruin him as easily as it has raised him up. Taken together, the dedication makes a somewhat ominous case that denying Jews a home in England might bring the wrath of God down on Oliver Cromwell, just as it had on King Charles I.

Whatever Cromwell's stake in Jewish readmission, Nadler makes it clear that he was not particularly sympathetic to eschatological arguments due to his "lack of interest in Messianic speculation."[94] The eschatological project was, according to Menasseh, only one of four motivations that spurred him to petition Oliver Cromwell for Jewish readmission.[95] In fact, Menasseh devotes the bulk of the petition to explaining his two primary arguments for Jewish readmission, neither of which has any relation to eschatology, in sections entitled "How

---

[90] Ibid., 196.
[91] Menasseh, *Humble Addresses*, unpaginated page within "A Declaration to the Common-Wealth of England."
[92] Menasseh, Humble Addresses, unpaginated page within "To his Highnesse the Lord Protector of the Common-Wealth of England, Scotland, and Ireland."
[93] Ibid.
[94] Nadler, 196.
[95] Ibid., unpaginated page within "A Declaration to the Common-Wealth of England."

Profitable the Nation of the Iewes Are" and "How Faithfull the Nation of the Iewes Are," respectively.[96]

In the first section of the pamphlet, Menasseh lays out an economic argument for accepting Jews back into England. Jews, he argues, are particularly gifted at trade because of their diasporic status; God "having banished them from their own Countrey, yet not from his Protection, hee hath given them, as it were, a naturall instinct" to support not only themselves but also benefit the countries in which they dwell.[97] Menasseh recalls the way Sephardic Jews contributed to the economic strength of the Netherlands, Italy, and all other places they fled to from Iberia.[98] Moreover, the fact that Jews do not have a home country is a further boon to whatever country gives them a home. Menasseh describes that one of the problems with international traders is that "having gotten richesse where they are in a forain land; are commonly taken in a desire to returne to their natif soil, and there peaceably to enjoy their estate."[99] Jewish traders, on the other hand, do not have a home country to which to carry their wealth and therefore remain and benefit local communities through their wealth.[100] Menasseh's case here seems to contradict the eschatological expectation set out earlier in the *Humble Addresses* that, once Jews were able to live in England, they would promptly be returned to the Holy Land. This can be explained by Cromwell's disinclination towards eschatology and Menasseh's desire to appeal to readers who were skeptical about the advent of the millennium.

Menasseh's second section focuses on the loyalty and nobility of Jews. Menasseh begins by describing the way Jewish congregations always pray for "the safety of all Kings, Princes and Common-wealths, under whose jurisdiction they live, of what profession-soever."[101] In his petition, he also presents Jews as relatively passive subjects, far more interested in maintaining a peaceful and unthreatened lifestyle than intervening in matters of the state. This also corresponds pretty closely to the way the Jewish community of Amsterdam interacted with local authorities and managed intra-community concerns: to ensure that internal conflicts would be dealt with

---

[96] Ibid., 1, 11.
[97] Ibid., 1.
[98] Ibid., 2-4.
[99] Ibid., 4.
[100] Ibid.
[101] Ibid., 13. Nadler, 109. This seems to comport with the actual treatment Jews extended to Christian nobility. For example, in 1642, Menasseh hosted Queen Henrietta Maria, the wife of King Charles I of England, at his synagogue. His address of welcome was "warm and congratulatory… generous in its praise for the Dutch Republic, the province of Holland, and especially Amsterdam." Although England officially excluded Jews from its territory at this time, Menasseh filled his speech with flattery, comparing the royal family and their Dutch counterparts to Biblical heroes.

before they drew the attention of the local *burghemeesters*, the Amsterdam congregation set up a united "board of governors" known as the *deputados*.[102] Overall, Menasseh's account of how peaceable the Jewish community was aligns with his prior experiences in Amsterdam.

The second section of the *Humble Addresses* also takes a more defensive tone. Where the first section made a case that the Jewish talent for trade would bring prosperity to England, Menasseh here turns to the "calumniators that [endeavour] to make the Nation infamous."[103] Specifically, he addresses the charges that Jews engage in usury, consume the blood of Christian children as part of the Passover celebrations, and try to convert Christians to Judaism.[104] Menasseh's discussion of usury describes it as an Ashkenazi, rather than Sephardic, activity:

> As for *usury,* such dealing is not the essentiall property of the Iewes, for though in Germany there be some indeed that practise usury; yet the most part of them that live in Turky, Italy, Holland and Hamburg, being come out of Spaigne, they hold it infamous to use it.[105]

Menasseh's admission that some Jews engage in usury reveals how he prioritized his own Sephardic community over other Jews, despite the international sweep of much of his polemic. This is in line with existing tensions in the Amsterdam community, where the Ashkenazim had arrived in the city after the Sephardim settled there. The Sephardic community were merchants and businesspeople, seeing no contradiction between practicing their newly-rediscovered Jewish religion and international success in their various enterprises. The Ashkenazi community, on the other hand, came as beggars, having fled pogroms and instability following the Thirty Years' War.[106] Mocked and stereotyped by the Sephardic community for their unfashionable dress and sallow skin tone, the Ashkenazim were nonetheless dependent in large part on the charitable organizations set up by the Sephardim.[107] The Ashkenazim meanwhile prided themselves on their deep knowledge of Torah and their unwillingness to give up Judaism compared to the Sephardic *conversos*.[108] This led to conflicts between the spiritually rich, but materially poor Ashkenazim and the wealthier Sephardim who were still in the process of re-establishing their Judaism.

---

[102] Nadler, 54.
[103] Menasseh, *Humble Addresses*, 22.
[104] Ibid.
[105] Ibid.
[106] Nadler, 19.
[107] Lipika Pelham, *Jerusalem on the Amstel: The Quest for Zion in the Dutch Republic* (London: Hurst and Company, 2019): 108-109.
[108] Nadler, 19.

Menasseh's refutation of the blood libel is brief. He demonstrates that Jewish dietary law forbids any consumption of blood, writing, "even that blood which is found in an Egg is forbidden them, how much more mans blood."[109] Menasseh also appeals to the Christian experience of persecution under the Roman Empire to establish how "the very same ancient scandall that was cast of old upon the innocent Christians, is now laid upon the Iewes."[110] This application of Christian history not only attempts to develop Christian empathy for Jews based on universally-understood history, but also represents an effort by Menasseh to forge a Christian-Jewish relationship predicated on equality. The appeal to Jewish dietary law reflects a common Sephardic approach to defeating the blood libel; where Ashkenazim, who had been more directly affected by blood libel and ensuing violence, focused on the suffering of Jews to make an argument for the inhumanity of the charge, Sephardim instead tried to demonstrate that blood libel was an impossible accusation in and of itself.[111] The brevity of his discussion likely reflects the speed with which he wanted to dispense with blood libelous arguments. Menasseh's goal here is to totally dismiss the allegation that Jews consume Christian blood.

Finally, Menasseh turns to the accusation that Jews proselytize to Christians. He takes up the claim that, prior to their expulsion from Spain, Sephardic Jews paid prominent courtiers of Isabella and Ferdinand to convert to Judaism, only to quickly dismiss it as a Spanish fabrication.[112] He acknowledges that conversion to Judaism is possible, although cites the example of Ruth and Naomi to show that it is discouraged and made as arduous as possible for the putative convert.[113] However, Menasseh concedes that "it may happen, that some of the Sect of the Papists, of a better minde, embrace the Iewish Religion."[114] Menasseh likely intended this little dig at Catholicism to endear him to the anti-Catholic receivers of his petition. It sets up a hierarchy wherein Catholicism is subordinated to both Protestantism and Judaism, implying a shared Jewish-Protestant natural inclination against "the Sect of the Papists."[115] This underscores Menasseh's claims about the advantages of Jewish readmission: not only would permitting Jews

---

[109] Menasseh, *Humble Addresses*, 24.
[110] Ibid.
[111] Magda Teter, *Blood Libel: On the Trail of an Antisemitic Myth* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2020): 210.
[112] Menasseh, *Humble Addresses*, 25.
[113] Ibid.
[114] Ibid.
[115] Ibid.

to return economically benefit England, but it would also supply Cromwell with a loyal natural ally against Spain and, more eschatologically, Catholicism.

The Whitehall Conference

By the time the Whitehall Conference first met in early December 1655, the debate around Jewish readmission had already been circulating through English intellectual circles for some time. In a letter dated 29 April, 1654, John Dury wrote to Samuel Hartlib, informing him that, "Menasseh ben Israel was with me & intends to come ouer to sollicit a freedome for his nation to liue in England" and recommending that he pass the news to others.[116] In other words, it was widely known that Menasseh's presence in London meant that he would be arguing for readmission and many of his interlocutors, meeting with him in person for the first time, were initially highly supportive of his efforts.[117] Unfortunately, that support and enthusiasm was quick to dissipate when confronted with the real possibility of Jews actually and openly living in England.

Still, Menasseh may have gone into the Whitehall Conference filled with confidence that his interlocutors, some of whom were actually at the conference table, and the Lord Protector himself favoured readmission and would see it through. In particular, Menasseh seems to have put his faith in John Dury and Henry Jessey. Dury was once again abroad during the Whitehall Conference, traveling through the Low Countries and Palatinate, but Jessey, whose rabid philosemitism earned him the nickname "Jessey the Jew," was present.[118] According to David S. Katz, it was Jessey who effectively "stage-managed Menasseh ben Israel's English production and publicized it once it was underway."[119] Henry Jessey had been a particularly staunch supporter of Jewish readmission throughout the post-Civil War period; a Saturday-Sabbatarian, Jessey was a keen student of Hebrew and had been in regular, cordial contact with Menasseh

---

[116] HP 4/3/2A-2B.

[117] Yosef Kaplan, "Jews and Judaism in the Hartlib Circle," *Studia Rosenthaliana* 38/39 (2005): 190. Kaplan actually asserts that many of the most famous members of the Protestant intellectual scene in England, such as Samuel Hartlib, had never met any Jewish people before Menasseh's arrival. For a fuller account of whom Menasseh met with while in London, see David S. Katz, "Menasseh ben Israel's Christian Connection: Henry Jessey and the Jews," in *Menasseh ben Israel and his* World, eds. Yosef Kaplan, Henry Méchoulan, and Richard H. Popkin (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1989): 117-118.

[118] Nadler, 179. Claire Jowitt, "'Inward' and 'Outward' Jews: Margaret Fell, Circumcision and Women's Preaching," in *Philosemitism, Antisemitism and 'the Jews*,*'* eds. Tony Kushner and Nadia Valman (London: Routledge, 2004): 160.

[119] Katz, "Henry Jessey and the Jews," 119.

from 1649 onwards.[120] Moreover, Jessey was convinced that, by extending kindnesses such as charitable collections and readmission, he could convince Jews to convert to Christianity.[121] In other words, his advocacy for readmission stemmed from both his sympathetic attitude towards Jews and his own eschatological interpretation.

Aside from his close association with Menasseh, Jessey also enters into the historiography of this period through his *Narrative of the Late Proceeds at White-Hall concerning the Jews* (1656), which is one of the "major contemporary sources regarding the Whitehall Conference."[122] Jessey's account is notably sympathetic to Jewish readmission. For instance, his description of the breakdown in opinion highlights Oliver Cromwell's support for the proposal while downplaying the numerous councilmembers who opposed it:

> The [Lord] Protector shewed a favourable inclination towards our harbouring the afflicted Jews, (professing he had no engagements out upon scripture grounds) in several Speeches that he made. So did some of his Councel, though some inclined not to their coming hither.[123]

Jessey continually stressed support of the motion and underemphasized dissent. This approach continues with his discussion of the individual arguments in favour and against the proposal. In sections echoing Menasseh's *Humble Addresses*, Jessey points to the historical injustices inflicted on Jews by Catholic monarchs, including Spanish and English kings, and notes that "it's feared, it may offend the Lord, if we yeeld not to the Jews this courtesie which they desire."[124] Compared with the terrifying possibility of divine punishment, the arguments against admitting Jews are somewhat diminished in Jessey's *Narrative*. It appears, based on his account, that proponents of readmission were easily able to dispatch their opponent's arguments. For instance, Jessey recounts that, "some… feared greatly, it would prove the subversion of many here… because so many here are soon carried aside to new Opinions."[125] Immediately, he dismisses this concern by, first, describing the reply that people "are not like to be taken with the Jewish Religion, that deny Christ, and deny the Gospel; and have nothing in their solemn Worship that is so taking, but rather much that is very ridiculous," and also by relating the proposed

---

[120] Ibid., 119-121.
[121] Ibid., 119.
[122] Ibid., 126.
[123] Henry Jessey, *Narrative of the Late Proceeds at White-Hall concerning the Jews* (London: Printed for L. Chapman at the Crown in Popeshead-Alley, 1656): 9.
[124] Jessey, *Narrative*, 3-4.
[125] Ibid., 8.

compromise that, "if afterwards there be inconvenience, there may be proceeds against them, and no just cause of exceptions."[126] In Jessey's *Narrative*, it surprises to the reader to find that the conference ended without a clear decision because it seemed that the arguments in favour of readmission were prevailing and that most attendees supported it.

This tactic is explained by the *Narrative*'s purpose, which was to serve as a publicly-accessible record of the Conference and, above all, to dispel inaccurate rumours around the debate because "many good people in divers parts of this Nation, who have often prayed heartily for the Jews Conversion… are very desirous to know the Truth of things in those Proceeds, and what is the issue of those Debates."[127] It stands to reason, then, that Jessey, who remained a proponent of readmission, wanted to present the arguments in favour of the proposal in the best possible light so as to sway public opinion towards permitting Jews to return to England. As it stood in December 1655, no clear resolution had been reached and the question of readmission hung in limbo as did Menasseh's fortunes in England. Menasseh, Jessey concludes somewhat anticlimactically in the final section of the *Narrative*, "*stil remains* in London, *desiring a favourable Answer to his* Proposals."[128]

Steven Nadler and Cecil Roth both describe the absence of a clear outcome at the Whitehall Conference as personally devastating to Menasseh.[129] This disappointment was likely deepened by the way some of his close contacts appeared to withdraw their previous support of full Jewish liberty upon readmission. John Dury, in particular, partially reversed his earlier position in a letter to Samuel Hartlib, which was published as *A Case of Conscience, whether it be lawful to admit Jews to a Christian Common-Wealth* in 1656. In this letter, Dury argues that, while there are no lawful grounds on which to prevent Jews from living in Christian countries, "to advance the glorie of God by their admission… they must be restrained from some things; and may be fairly induced to som other things."[130] These restrictions include a ban on Jews blaspheming Christ, prohibitions on judaizing, and compulsory participation in "conferences" in which Jews and Christians each provide "the grounds" for their disparate beliefs while avoiding

---

[126] Ibid.
[127] Ibid., unnumbered page from "To the Reader."
[128] Ibid., 10.
[129] Roth, *A Life of Menasseh ben Israel*, 250. Nadler, 213.
[130] John Dury, *A Case of Conscience, whether it be lawful to admit Jews to a Christian common-wealth* (London: Printed for Richard Wodenothe, 1656): 5.

"all contradictory disputes."[131] In other words, Dury proposed only admitting Jews to Christian countries on the condition that they be subjected to proselytism and forced disputations. Additionally, Dury admiringly describes places in which Jews are subject to punitive fees and tariffs if they wish to remain there.[132] Dury finishes his letter by writing, in the postscript:

> *Menasseh Ben Israels* Demands are great, and the use which they make of great Priviledges, is not much to their commendation here, and elswhere. They have wayes beyond all other men, to undermine a State, and to insinuate into those that are in Offices, and prejudicate the Trade of others: and therefore if they be not wisely restrained they will in short time be oppressive… Time must ripen these Designes, and the Prudencic may lead them on.[133]

This was a disaster for Menasseh's proposal, which requested the freedom to practice Judaism openly in England, the dispensation to build a synagogue and cemetery, and the right for Jewish merchants to engage in trade. By describing these demands as over-reaching and possibly nefarious as well as by associating this conjecture with Menasseh specifically, Dury struck at the heart of Menasseh's undertaking. His apparently unprecedented attack on Menasseh himself—a man with whom Dury had previously been in close communication and whom he had recommended to his contacts—seems like a very sudden reversal of a previously encouraging and sympathetic position regarding Jews.[134] Even Henry Jessey seemed to balk at the prospect of Jews living freely among Gentile English people. His *Narrative* portrays the "*Medium*" position of a conditional readmission as the most reasonable way to see through some kind of Jewish presence in England. He, like Dury, also seems partial to the idea of punitive tariffs and taxes on Jews and strong prohibitions on blasphemy, Jewish proselytism, and "all unrighteousness, etc."[135] These reversals revealed the limitations of philosemitism: Jessey and Dury's enthusiasm for Judaism and Jewish wisdom did not translate into tolerance towards actual Jews. In fact, for philosemites, Jews were a means to an end. Both Dury and Jessey had been interested in Jewish readmission to England only within the context of an eschatological scheme that would see them converted to Christianity. Hence, Dury in particular advocated for mandatory evangelization sessions as a condition of readmission. The sudden anti-Jewish sentiment expressed by some of

---

[131] Dury, *A Case of Conscience*, 5.
[132] Ibid., 1.
[133] Ibid., 9.
[134] Jens Åklundh, "Voices of Jewish Converts to Christianity in late Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century England," *The Seventeenth Century,* 29, no. 1 (2014): 54.
[135] Jessey, 5.

Menasseh's closest correspondents was calamitous not only to the immediate project or readmission but also Menasseh's broader, life-long project of an Abrahamitic theology.

William Prynne's Short Demurrer

The disaster of the Whitehall Conference was compounded by William Prynne's response to it. Prynne, a polemical writer and lawyer, attempted to resuscitate the blood libel in , *A short demurrer to the Jewes long discontinued remitter into England*.[136] Prynne's pamphlet appeared in 1656 in the direct aftermath of the inconclusive conference. To hear Prynne tell it, he came into knowledge of the Whitehall Conference by accident, learning of it when he encountered some of his contacts who had been invited to participate.[137] These men seemed to Prynne not disinclined to the idea of readmission and behaved as though readmission was all but assured.[138] Thus, he explains, he was inspired to write his book:

> for the *general information, satisfaction of others, and honour of my blessed Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ the righteous, whom the Jews with malicious hearts, and wicked hands crucified* in person heretofore, and their posterity by their *blasphemies, despiteful actions* against Christ, his Kingdom, Offices, Gospel *crucifie afresh*.[139]

Prynne reacted with horror at the prospect of imminent Jewish migration to England, though the coming changes he foresees fall far beyond the contents of Menasseh's proposal. Specifically, Prynne relates that, very soon, all generals of the military would be forced to take an oath to protect Jews at all costs; that Jews would build "Synagogues of Satan" in England and its colonial holdings, where they would also be free to operate as merchants; and that they would import Mosaic law and resolve internal disputes according to its precepts.[140] In short, Prynne feared and predicted that Jews would shortly enjoy the same privileges and conditions as Gentile English people, if not better ones.

It is in this light that Prynne reintroduces the blood libel to England. For early modern Jews, the spectre of the blood libel hung over many of their dealings with Christians. We have

---

[136] Teter, *Blood Libel*, 4. In Magda Teter's comprehensive account history of the persistent antisemitic myth, the case of William of Norwich seems to be the earliest instance of blood libel. It is worth noting that the first medieval case of blood libel occurred in England, a country that, in 1290, expelled its Jewish population on blood libelous accusations and saw a small resurgence in the claim that Jews consume Christian blood during the readmission debates.

[137] William Prynne, *A short demurrer to the Jewes long discontinued remitter into England* (London: Printed for Edward Thomas dwelling in Green-Arbor, 1656): unnumbered page from "To the Christian Reader."

[138] Prynne, *A short demurrer*, unnumbered page from "To the Christian Reader."

[139] Ibid.

[140] Ibid.

already seen Menasseh's attempt to dispense with the blood libel by citing the Jewish prohibition on consuming any blood and by relating antisemitic oppression to the Roman persecution of the early church.[141] While Menasseh could anticipate the charge and try to defeat it in his *Humble Addresses*, Prynne clearly still believed Jews to vulnerable to it. Prynne brings up the blood libel in his pamphlet by reciting historical records of the charge in England and the many punishments that had been visited upon Jews in its aftermath, culminating in their expulsion.[142] Prynne spares no lurid detail in his descriptions. In his account of the alleged murder of Little Hugh of Lincoln, which is notable as the first case in England resulting in the execution of Jews, he dwells on scenes of torture and mutilation:

> He is whipped even unto bloud and lividnesse, crowned with thorns, wearied with spittings and shriekings: and moreover he is pricked by them all with ponyards, made to drink gall, derided with reproaches and blasphemies, and frequently called by them with grinding teeth, *Jesus the false Prophet.* And after they had derided him in divers manners, they crucified him, and peirced him with a spear to the heart. And when the child had given up the ghost, they took down his body from the crosse, and took the bowels out of his corps, for what end is unknown, but it was said it was to exercise Magical arts.[143]

This particular accusation is typical of what Prynne has to offer in his *Short demurrer*. In his formulation of the blood libel, he touches on many of its hallmarks. The alleged re-enactment of the crucifixion and the construction of the entire bloody affair as a deliberate act of ritualized anti-Christianity were two of the crucial themes holding together the long history of the blood libel.[144] The alleged victimization of a young boy recalls the Christ-child who was persecuted, first on the command of King Herod and, later, allegedly at the hands of his own people the Jews. It also facilitates circumcision of the foreskin which, while absent from Prynne's version of the Hugh of Lincoln story, is common to many blood libels.[145] Prynne actually mentions circumcision in some of his other blood label cases; for instance, in 1240, the Jews of Gloucester allegedly circumcised a small boy and were preparing to crucify him when his father came to his rescue.[146] Magda Teter describes how the logic of blood libel leads ever back to the inciting trauma of Christianity: the crucifixion of Christ. Hsia relates the blood libel to the idea that Jews

---

[141] Menasseh, *Humble Addresses*, 24.
[142] Prynne, 6-8.
[143] Ibid., 26. Teter, 27. Geraldine Heng, *The Invention of Race in the European Middle Ages* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2018): 28-29.
[144] Lavezzo, 216.
[145] R. Po-chia Hsia, *Trent 1475* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992): 59.
[146] Prynne, 15-16.

were directly responsible for the crucifixion and, thus, had excluded themselves from salvation not only by rejecting Christ but by effecting his execution on the cross.[147]

The blood libel not only had clear political and pragmatic dimensions—preventing Jewish settlement, creating a pretext on which to seize Jewish money and goods, and so forth—but also clear religious ones. Caroline Walker Bynum writes that, "the way in which anti-Jewish host-desecration libels were constructed suggests that the point of the stories was not merely hatred of Jews and greed for Jewish property, which any sort of libel could have unleashed."[148] Instead, the alleged Jewish need for Christian blood speaks to a Christian need for ongoing persecutions and what Bynum terms "blood miracles" to sustain and renew faith.[149] The blood libel also reflects Christian concerns about Jewish magic as well as anxieties about lay Catholic blood magic, according to R. Po-chia Hsia.[150] Hsia analyses the underlying themes that allowed the blood libel to be so closely tied to magic, concluding that "in Judaic, Christian, and Germanic folklore immense power was ascribed to blood, especially human blood… Blood was more than the substance of life; it became the symbol of the living spirit."[151] We see this reflected in Prynne's account of the Hugh of Lincoln case, where he makes a connection between the alleged murder and some kind of ritual magic.[152] It is worth noting that the analyses of blood libel here all pertain to the medieval period and mostly discuss events on the continent, rather than in England. In fact, Hsia cites the "broad Christian consensus" of the pre-Reformation world as integral to the ritual murder discourse.[153] That consensus was long gone by the time Prynne wrote and published his *Short demurrer*. Nonetheless, these older, medieval blood libels found renewed expression in Prynne's polemic. Despite the geographic and temporal distance and Prynne's own anti-Catholicism, he clearly prioritized damage to the readmission effort over his ideological differences with the historic blood libellers he cited.

To Geraldine Heng, the historic cases Prynne refers to are "constitutive acts in the consolidation of a community of Christian English… against a minority population *that has, on*

---

[147] Hsia, *The Myth of Ritual Murder*, 127.
[148] Caroline Walker Bynum, *Wonderful Blood: Theology and Practice in Late Medieval Northern Germany and Beyond* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007): 81.
[149] Bynum, *Wonderful Blood*, 81.
[150] Hsia, *The Myth of Ritual Murder*, 6-9.
[151] Ibid., 8-9.
[152] Prynne, 26.
[153] Hsia, *The Myth of Ritual Murder*, 126.

these historical occasions and through these institutions and practices, entered into race."[154] The blood libel transformed Jews from neighbours and associates into treacherous menaces whose insatiable lust for Christian blood could only be stemmed by curative violence. This danger was considered inherent to Jews so that, no matter how cordial or advantageous relationships with Jews had been previously, Christians could always be prepared to turn in and turn on their neighbours. Heng specifies that "the threat signaled by Jewish difference… is the threat of the *intimate alien*, active and embedded in multiple communities and countries in the heartlands of the Christian *domus*."[155] It is this intimacy that Prynne hopes to avoid. Prynne's twisted logic in his *Short demurrer* is that previous history of Jews dwelling among the English population resulted in such a threat that it was necessary to not only repeatedly subject them to murder and theft but also to expel them from the country. Hsia thinks of the process of racializing Jews through the blood libel as an ethnographic project.[156] He describes how medieval ritual murder trials established the antisemitic tropes that came to define Jewish stereotypes as they have persisted to this day: under torture, Jews confessed that they had killed Christian children and consumed their blood as part of Jewish ritual, that "the very essence of Jewish rites… demanded the sacrifice of Christian boys."[157] These coerced admissions of Jewish guilt addressed not only the "'present' and the 'history' of Jewish crimes."[158] By tying the murder of Christian children to Jewish religious practice, ritual murder trials set Jews apart as inherently dangerous to Christian communities. Miri Rubin evocatively describes the ways in which Christians turned on their Jewish neighbours in alleged cases of ritual murder or host desecration.[159] According to Rubin, this was a process that began with an accusation and almost-invariably resulted, first, in the destruction of a Jewish community and, later on, in Christian remembrance of the alleged murder often in the form of local cults, commemorative chapels, and antisemitic pageants.[160] Prynne's pamphlet called upon the bloody history of Jewish persecution in England and the established ethnography of racialized Jewish violence in an attempt to forestall the possibility that Jews might, once again, become neighbours to Christians.

---

[154] Heng, 28-29.
[155] Heng, 56.
[156] Hsia, *Trent 1475*, 89.
[157] Ibid., 94.
[158] Ibid.
[159] Miri Rubin, *Gentile Tales: The Narrative Assault on Late Medieval Jews* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004): 104.
[160] Rubin, *Gentile Tales*, 111-112.

Above all, Prynne's account reads of bitterness. At the beginning of his pamphlet, he describes how he came to be in the area surrounding Whitehall in order to commemorate his imprisonment in 1648 during the event known as Pride's Purge.[161] Evidently unimpressed by the absence of proper commemoration on this "*Day of solemn Fasting & Humiliation*," Prynne seems to have been particularly injured by Whitehall Conference attendees' apparent disregard for his experience and the day of remembrance.[162] Kathy Lavezzo also understands Prynne as resentful, writing:

> Prynne's repeated imprisonment and torturous punishments suggest how the religious and political tensions at play in the seventeenth century… rendered certain Christians no less alien or demonized than certain Jews.[163]

The "torturous punishments" Lavezzo mentions refer not only to Pride's Purge, in which Prynne and other Members of Parliament deemed antagonistic towards the New Model Army were prevented from entering the House of Commons and imprisoned in a public house known as Hell.[164] Fourteen years prior to that incident, in 1634, Prynne had part of his ears amputated for allegedly attacking King Charles I and Queen Henrietta in his *Histriomatrix*.[165] Additionally, in 1637, Prynne had been convicted of seditious libel and branded on both cheeks in punishment.[166] Throughout his life, Prynne's stridency and unwillingness to temper his opinions even in his own interest would cost him dearly time and again. Given his own harsh treatment at the hands of his government (in various incarnations), Prynne was unwilling to permit Jews to enjoy liberties he felt he had been denied.

Prynne's pamphlet landed with somewhat of a thud. By the seventeenth century, ritual murder accusations were in decline. As Hsia foreshadowed, the "broad consensus in Christian society" that undergirded the blood libel had been shattered by the Reformation and subsequent wars of religion.[167] Maggie Kilgour also notes a transition: "during the Middle Ages the Jews were accused of cannibalism, after the Reformation the Catholics were" due to their belief in transubstantiation.[168] This gradual change was obviously not as simple or monolithic as Kilgour

---

[161] Prynne, unnumbered page from "To the Christian Reader."
[162] Ibid.
[163] Lavezzo, 232.
[164] Ethyn Williams Kirby, *William Prynne: A Study in Puritanism* (New York: Russell and Russell, 1931): 97-98.
[165] Kirby, *William Prynne,* 31. HP 68/10/1A-10B.
[166] Kirby, 44-45.
[167] Hsia, *The Myth of Ritual Murder*, 126.
[168] Maggie Kilgour, *From Cannibalism to Communion* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990): 5.

depicts it but it marks a general trend in which Protestants began to reject ritual murder accusations against Jews while embracing the idea that Catholics may be the eschatological Antichrist due, in part, to their apparent practice of cannibalizing God.[169] R. Po-chia Hsia gives a more precise account of how the rise of Protestantism undermined blood libel:

> the belief in the power of blood, so crucial to ritual murder and Host desecration discourses, was undermined by the theological revolution of the Reformation… the psychological and intellectual foundations of ritual murder discourse also began to disintegrate among the clerical and magisterial elites, although the *popular* discourse on ritual murder was to persist well into the Enlightenment.[170]

In particular, the doctrine of *sola scriptura* made the Hebrew Bible crucial to Protestant theology and is closely related to the rise in Hebraism and philosemitic eschatology.[171] By the seventeenth century, it was mainstream for Protestants to see the Catholic Church, rather than Jews, as their anti-Christian enemy.[172] The renewed Christian appropriation of the Hebrew Bible as the so-called Old Testament was instructive, specifically for English revolutionaries who began to think of it as a model for law and social organization.[173] Theoretically, the turn towards the Hebrew language and the Old Testament may also have created opportunities for Jews and Christians to have more open discussion on religious topics. For instance, Hsia describes the post-Reformation Catholic anxiety that Protestant iconoclastic fervour was a product of judaizing.[174] However, as we have already seen, these exchanges were made profoundly unequal by the power differential between Christian and Jewish intellectuals and by Christians' ability to circumscribe debate according to their own priorities and comfort level.

Menasseh's Response: *Vindiciae Judaeorum*

Menasseh laid out his rejoinder to Prynne's *Short demurrer* in a 1656 pamphlet entitled *Vindiciae Judaeorum*. As Nadler describes it, *Vindiciae Judaeorum* refuted "century of anti-Jewish prejudice and calumny."[175] In it, Menasseh addressed several antisemitic myths including the allegation that Jews engaged in usury, coin-clipping, blasphemy, and judaizing.[176] In some

---

[169] Lee Palmer Wandel, *The Reformation: Towards A New History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011): 138-139. Hsia, *The Myth of Ritual Murder*, 131.
[170] Hsia, *The Myth of Ritual Murder*, 136.
[171] Crome, *Christian Zionism*, 63.
[172] Achsah Guibbory, *Christian Identity, Jews, and Israel in 17th-Century England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010): 22-24.
[173] Guibbory, *Christian Identity, Jews, and Israel*, 178-179.
[174] Hsia, *The Myth of Ritual Murder*, 131.
[175] Nadler, 206.
[176] Menasseh ben Israel, *Vindiciae Judaeorum* (Printed by R. D., 1656): C4 recto, E, recto-E2, verso.

ways, *Vindiciae Judaeorum* represents a turning point in Menasseh's career. By 1656, it had become clear that Cromwell would not be making a determination on whether Jews could return to England.[177] This was not an absolute loss, as it amounted to a tacit approval that crypto-Jews currently dwelling in London could continue in their practice.[178] However, for Menasseh, this was a dismal turn of events. His community in Amsterdam had put its hopes in him to open up England for Jewish life and, after two years abroad and many more preparing the way, it seemed his efforts had come to naught.[179] Menasseh was also suffering once again from a bout of ill health and, may have felt that he had little left to lose. Perhaps more pressingly, there was a small community of Sephardic crypto-Jews already in London and, although they externally appeared to be Catholic, their Jewish identity was known by many of their Protestant neighbours.[180] Prynne's attempt to breathe new life into the ritual murder accusation directly threatened their safety as well as Menasseh's as long as he remained in England. Hence, Menasseh felt obligated to respond in defense of himself and his people.

The first and most significant part of *Vindiciae Judaeorum*, however, concerns blood libel. Here, Menasseh expands his refutation of the ritual murder accusation beyond the brief segment he devoted to the topic in his *Humble Addresses.* While he brings up the Biblical prohibition on consuming blood and several commandments against killing another human, as he had in the *Humble Addresses*, his primary objective seems to be highlighting the absurdity and cruelty of the blood libel, rather than finding reasons it is an invalid accusation. He openly laments the fact that Jews are subjected to such cruel and false allegations, writing:

> I cannot but weep bitterly, and with much anguish of soul lament that strange and horrid accusation of some Christians against the dispersed, and afflicted *Iewes* that dwell among them, when they say (what I tremble to write) that the *Iewes* are wont to celebrate the feast of unleavened bread, fermenting it with the bloud of some Christians, whom they have for this purpose killed: when the calumniators themselves have most barbarously and cruelly butchered some of them.[181]

Menasseh also accuses Christian antisemites of outright fabricating their allegations of ritual murder by placing dead children—either ones incidentally dead or murdered for this purpose—

---

[177] Nadler, 201.
[178] Rauschenbach, *Judentum für Christen*,
[179] Nadler, 213.
[180] Nadler, 195. Lavezzo, 219-221.
[181] Menasseh*, Vindiciae Judaeorum*, A3, verso.

into the "houses or yards" of Jews.[182] Then, "with unbridled rage and tumult, they accuse the innocent *Iews,* as the committers of this most execrable fact… that they might thereby take advantage to exercise their cruelty upon them."[183] Menasseh shows his readers that, although Jews are accused of murdering Christians, the actual aggressors are invariably Christians. The brutality celebrated by Prynne in his account of executions and expulsions is revealed as an injustice perpetrated on innocent Jews by their bloodthirsty neighbours. This exposes the reality of the ritual murder accusation as a pretext for Christians to visit violence upon Jews. Menasseh also explicitly addressed Prynne's pamphlet, writing that the calumny that Jews clip coins to devalue them "drew its originall mainly from the suspicion and hatred the Christians bare against the *Iewes,* as appeares in the story, as it is set forth by Mr. *Prynne, In his second part of a Short Demurrer to the Iewes*."[184] It is due to direct engagements like this that *Vindiciae Judaeorum* is typically considered the work by Menasseh most openly critical of Christians and their unfounded prejudices and stereotypes of Jews.

Magda Teter's *Blood Libel* identifies a particularly clever and daring strategy employed by Menasseh in this pamphlet. She describes how Menasseh appropriates the language of anti-Jewish polemic only to turn it around on Christian accusers.[185] For instance, Menasseh takes up Prynne's version of the 1250 ritual murder accusation in which a boy allegedly was circumcised, given a Jewish name, and due to be crucified before his father arrived just in time to save him.[186] Menasseh reads this not as a kidnapping but as the story of a boy who undertook a conversion to Judaism and was duly and lovingly embraced by his new religious community until his father removed him from their midst.[187] He dispenses entirely with the idea that a crucifixion was under way, deeming it impossible that Jews would circumcise and child and give a Jewish name, thereby making him one of them, only to attempt to murder him in defiance of God's commandments and their own self-interest.[188] This entire case is, at best, a terrible and consequential misunderstanding and, at worst, a cruel smear on Jewish communal life. Having presented one case in which Jews appear to have been exonerated, Menasseh lists numerous

---

[182] Ibid. Teter, 218.
[183] Menasseh, *Vindiciae Judaeorum*, A3, verso.
[184] Ibid., 36.
[185] Teter, 219.
[186] Menasseh, *Vindiciae Judaeorum*, B, verso-recto. Prynne, 15-16.
[187] Menasseh, *Vindiciae Judaeorum*, B, verso-recto.
[188] Ibid.

others.[189] He notes that the evidence of Jewish innocence often is not uncovered until after Jews are threatened, tortured, and executed by their Christian accusers.[190]

The sharpest of Menasseh's criticism, however, is reserved for the Spanish crown and Catholic Church. Teter describes, "as if to fortify his polemic with an anti- Catholic tone, Menasseh recounted several recent cases of accusations against Jews, all from Catholic domains… and almost all involving torture."[191] The mention of torture here is significant as English Protestants largely rejected torture as an effective method of obtaining information.[192] Instead, torture was associated with the Black Legend of Spanish imperial violence and Catholic oppression.[193] Menasseh cannily plays into that, pointing out that many of Prynne's examples occurred under Catholic jurisdictions and suggesting that the entire ritual murder fabrication might be a product of Catholic malice and superstition. This emphasis provides Menasseh's Protestant readers with more grounding on which to dismiss Prynne's pamphlet. Menasseh writes:

> Surely this… looks more like a piece of the reall scene of the Popish *Spaniards* piety, who first baptiz'd the poor *Indians,* and afterwards out of cruel pity to their souls, inhumanely butchered them; then of strict-law-observing *Iewes,* who dare not make a sport of one of the seales of their covenant.[194]

By bringing up Indigenous peoples in the Americas, it seems that Menasseh's career in England has come around in a full circle. He makes no mention here of the alleged Judaic heritage of these "poor *Indians*;" nonetheless, he seems to be relating the Jewish and Indigenous experiences of oppression under Spain by activating the Black Legend. Readers familiar with his prior publications may have been reminded that Spain's treatment of Indigenous peoples was also ultimately anti-Jewish persecution according to lost tribes theorists. Readers unfamiliar with this additional context would nonetheless be encouraged to apply the revulsion they felt towards Spanish colonial violence to Jewish victims of the blood libel. It is also notable that Menasseh here engages in the infantilizing, patronizing language of the "poor Indian" that was discussed at greater length in Chapter 1. While it is certainly the case that Menasseh's attitude towards Indigenous peoples was no more enlightened or humanizing than that of his Christians

---

[189] Ibid., B2, recto-B3, recto.
[190] Ibid., B2, recto.
[191] Teter, 220.
[192] Ibid., 222, 232.
[193] Ibid.
[194] Menasseh, *Vindiciae Judaeorum*, B, verso-recto.

interlocutors, it nevertheless seems an odd choice in a paragraph comparing Indigenous peoples to Jews. In fact, Menasseh often uses language in *Vindiciae Judaeorum* and his other publications that evokes the pathetic and helpless aspect of diasporic living. Early in *Vindiciae Judaeorum* describes Jews as "dispersed, and afflicted," and this is the impression that remains throughout the pamphlet: in Menasseh's writing, Jews are absolutely vulnerable and susceptible to all manner of exploitations, indignities, and calumnies.[195] Menasseh suggests they are like the "poor Indians" who must suffer whatever Catholic cruelties befall them as they have neither the cunning nor the malice to properly avenge themselves. This contributes to Menasseh's overall argument that Jews are peaceable, passive neighbours and subjects who submit to and pray for whatever jurisdiction they live under, regardless of how they are treated.[196]According to Menasseh, the Sephardic Jewish community for which he advocated made not merely agreeable subjects but also profitable ones. He includes in *Vindiciae Judaeorum* a restatement of his argument for why Jews should be re-admitted to England, this time focusing on its economic benefits.[197] Sephardic Jews, he explains, will offer knowledge of all the other places they have lived and traded and "bring in new merchandises" which will make England wealthy and give it an advantage in the ongoing international competition for land, resources, and commodities.[198]

Menasseh ends *Vindiciae Judaeorum* by retelling the story of his arrival and sojourn in England. In this final section of the essay, he writes of his English contacts, "I alwayes found by them, a great probability of obtaining what I now request… our entrance into this Island… for seven yeares on this behalf, I have endeavoured… without any intervall."[199] I read some bitterness in these lines, where Menasseh reflects on seven years' labour towards a goal he was led to believe was easily in reach, only to find it ever elusive. Menasseh's long stay in England seemed, by 1656, ever less likely to reach its stated aim; his friend John Sadler later wrote to Richard Cromwell that the rabbi had remained in England too long in the hopes of not returning home empty-handed.[200] Despite his evident weariness, Menasseh inserts prayers honouring Oliver Cromwell and his entire country, writing:

---

[195] Ibid., A3, verso.
[196] Ibid., C4, recto.
[197] Ibid., E2, recto.
[198] Ibid.
[199] Ibid., 37.
[200] State Papers Vol. CC 8, John Sadler to Richard Cromwell, 4 January 1658-9.

> And to the highly honoured nation of *England,* I make my most humble request, that they would read over my arguments impartially, without prejudice, and devoid of all passion, effectually recommending me to their grace and favour.[201]

Finally, Menasseh concludes *Vindiciae Judaeorum* by stating, once again, his hope for imminent redemption for his people and a time when all could enjoy "the goodnesse of the Lord."[202] That hope, as his prior writing demonstrated, hinged, in part, on English people permitting Jews to live openly among them.

While it appears that Menasseh was able to convince Cromwell to agree to a synagogue and cemetery for the Sephardic community already in London, no further strides in Jewish readmission were made during the Interregnum.[203] Menasseh, for his part, would not live to see better days for Jews in England. After the publication of *Vindiciae Judaeorum*, his personal fortunes began to fail in earnest. Although he had been assured financial support of £200, Menasseh's long sojourn in England saw him accumulate debts that he could not discharge on his own and the promised money never arrived.[204] John Sadler, in the letter to Richard Cromwell mentioned earlier, brought up Menasseh's time in England as part of an argument that he should finally receive the money.[205] In 1657, his son Samuel died after an illness, leaving the father alone in London and stricken.[206] The death of his son finally forced Menasseh to abandon his dream of Jewish-readmission to England. He departed the city in 1657—Steven Nadler suggests the month of October—ostensibly to bury Samuel's body in Amsterdam's Jewish cemetery and to then return to his wife, daughter, rabbinical duties, and printing press.[207] On November 20, 1657, he died in Middleburg and it was his body, not Samuel's, that was returned to Amsterdam later that year.[208] His wife and some remaining admirers continued to petition the English government for Menasseh's pension, but nothing was ever proffered.

Although Menasseh approached his Christian interlocutors with enthusiasm, his contact with them was always couched in the desire to not offend; he was well aware of his tenuous position as a Jew in these circles. His position as "a rabbi who sought new ways for Christians

---

[201] Menasseh, *Vindiciae Judaeorum*, 39.
[202] Ibid.
[203] Nadler, 212.
[204] Ibid.
[205] State Papers Vol. CC 8, John Sadler to Richard Cromwell, 4 January 1658-9.
[206] Nadler, 212.
[207] Ibid., 215.
[208] Ibid., 216.

and Jews to live together while simultaneously holding to traditional Jewish values" exposed him to accusations of judaizing.[209] By the time of his so-called English Mission, he had begun to temper these impulses to better appeal to his Christian readership. Despite his admiring tone and pre-emptive defenses against antisemitic calumnies, he was nonetheless forced to answer to allegations that Jews consume Christian blood, destabilize governments, and engage in unfair business practices, including by some of his closest contacts. Menasseh's experiences during his so-called "English Mission" reveal the power of Jewish racialization. Even as belief in the blood libel was waning in England, William Prynne's ultimately unsuccessful attempt to revive the blood libel posed a genuine threat to Menasseh and the Sephardic community in London. Prynne used his reminder that an alleged case of ritual murder had caused the initial 1290 expulsion of Jews from England to try and inculcate fear of Jews as an "*intimate alien*" in a population that had largely not had any contact with them.[210] On the other side of the debate Edward Nicholas described the ritual murder accusation and the 1290 expulsion as sins committed by England against God's chosen people, the atonement for which required Jewish readmission to England. Menasseh did not follow Nicholas's sharp condemnation of historic English antisemitism, likely because he feared offending Christian readers, although he cited it with approval. Instead, Menasseh availed himself of variety of argumentative and rhetorical techniques to reframe the blood libel as a Catholic invention, invoking the Black Legend and the history of Jewish persecution by the Inquisition. In this manner, Menasseh tried to forge connections between Jews and Protestants along anti-Spanish and anti-Catholic lines that could also be applied to his projects of Jewish readmission to England and the broader pursuit of an Abrahamitic theology.

[209] Rauschenbach, *Judentum für Christen*, 289.
[210] Heng, 56.

Chapter 3: Hungry, Hungry Hypocrites

Medicinal Cannibalism in Theory

At the same time as English pamphleteers, clerics, and intellectuals were accusing Indigenous people and Jews of devouring human flesh, the practice of medicinal cannibalism was widespread in Europe. This practice, which is typically defined as the consumption of human bodies or their products for medicinal benefit, was tremendously popular in seventeenth century England. This popularity arose as a result of the rejection of Galenic medicine in favour of Paracelsian theories, as well as a shift in hegemonic medical attitudes towards the practice which can, in turn, be traced back to the ascendancy of Protestantism, particularly Puritanism, in England. The acceptance of medicinal cannibalism was by no means limited to England. Many of the practice's earliest adherents practiced medicine in Germany, Switzerland, and the Netherlands; by the mid-seventeenth century, the practice spread to the Americas, particularly New England which, as we have seen in Chapter 1, was a region in which alleged Indigenous cannibals were depicted as a constant threat to colonizers. This chapter traces the origins of medicinal cannibalism, its rise to prominence among English physicians, and its arrival in the Americas. This chapter investigates the hypocrisy inherent to the use of medicinal cannibalism by English people as they employed accusations of cannibalism to against others. Finally, it reveals that English practitioners of corpse medicine not only understood themselves as cannibals but were also aware of their hypocrisy, especially with regard to their treatment of Indigenous peoples in the Americas.

Medicinal cannibalism is typically discussed as an emergence of the Paracelsian theory of medicine. However, in more marginal forms, the practice appears to be much older than that. Richard Sugg vividly describes the Roman belief that the blood of fallen gladiators would cure epilepsy.[1] Medical ethicists Ferdinand Peter Moog and Axel Karenberg actually consider epileptic Romans' consumption of slain gladiators' blood to be the earliest instance in which blood was presumed to have special curative properties, although they also point to evidence that Etruscans particularly valued the blood and liver in animal sacrifices and ritual combat.[2] In the Middle Ages as well, blood was understood to have healing powers both by ordinary people and physicians. R. Po-chia Hsia discusses the persistent European belief in blood magic in *The Myth*

[1] Richard Sugg, *Mummies, Cannibals and Vampires* (London: Routledge, 2011): 15-16.
[2] Ferdinand Peter Moog and Axel Karenberg, "Between Horror and Hope: Gladiator's Blood as a Cure for Epileptics in Ancient Medicine," *Journal of the History of the Neurosciences*, 12, no. 2 (2003): 138, 141.

of Ritual Murder and describes medieval lay people stealing communion wine and wafers for use in charms and remedies.[3] Sugg, on the other hand, focuses more on the medicinal practices of physicians and apothecaries; according to him, preparations derived from blood were associated with elemental properties such as air, water, and the elusive quintessence.[4] In this way, blood remedies and other cannibalistic cures, such as oils derived from human bones, could be grafted onto existing humoral medical theories.[5]

The dominant humoral approach to medicine during the European Middle Ages and Renaissance was Galenism. Derived from the writing of the second century C. E. Greek physician and philosopher Galen, the theory held that everything was made up by the four elements—earth, air, water, and fire—which, in turn, were composed of "the union of matter and the four qualities of hot, cold, dry, and moist."[6] When matter was ingested by humans and animals, it was converted into one of the four humours: blood, bile, black bile, and phlegm.[7] Under the Galenic framework, all diseases can be attributed to an imbalance of humour, either due to the consumption of particular foods or an existing problem in the body.[8] Galenic therapies are often stereotyped as heavily reliant on blood-letting and similar invasive, gory procedures. While blood-letting and some forms of medicinal cannibalism were part of the range of Galenic treatments, dietetic remedies such as changes to food or oral administration of drugs predominated.[9] Regardless of the specific treatment, Galenic therapies operated on the principle of counteraction and supplementation to overcome the imbalances present in the body. For instance, a disease that left a patient cold and moist required a hot, dry cure.[10]

Galenism initially came to be in the Roman Empire and, after the empire's disintegration, was preserved primarily in its eastern parts. Eventually, Galen's theories became accepted by Muslim and Jewish philosophers in North Africa and the Mediterranean due to the close compatibility

---

[3] R. Po-chia Hsia, *The Myth of Ritual Murder: Jews and Magic in Reformation Germany* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990): 10, 145.
[4] Sugg, *Mummies, Cannibals and Vampires*, 17-19.
[5] Ibid.
[6] Owsei Temkin, *Galenism: Rise and Decline of a Medical Philosophy* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1973): 17.
[7] Temkin, *Galenism*, 17.
[8] Ibid., 18.
[9] Ibid.
[10] Ibid., 112-113. Galen approached this in a highly mathematical manner: Owsei Temkin describes Galen's tests for medicines specifying how many units of dryness, heat, and so forth a particular remedy possessed. In general, Galen recommended simples, medicines with only one component, but his later adopters compounded ingredients to produce more complex and potent preparations.

between his philosophy and Aristotle.[11] The affinity between Galen and Aristotle was also a selling point for Western Christian physicians who came into closer contact with both philosophers initially due to their inclusion in Latin compilations.[12] Galen's respect for Christians, despite his own paganism, likely increased his appeal for Christian readers, just as Jews and Muslims had approved of his "pious sentiments" towards the creator of all life.[13]

By the Renaissance, Galenic theory was overwhelmingly dominant in European medical practice.[14] The vast majority of young physicians learned almost exclusively from Galen during their training, which built on the years of Aristotelian education they had already received by that point.[15] Medical students not only read Galen's works in Latin but also observed the veracity of his precepts at dissection demonstrations in their lecture halls, where surgeons' cutting would be underscored by the physician delivering sections from his writing out loud.[16] It was out of these circumstances that Philippus Theophrastus Bombastus von Hohenheim (c. 1493 - 1541), known primarily as Paracelsus, would come to challenge and partially overturn Galenic medicine. Paracelsus' approach to medicine in many ways paralleled Galen. Both men understood medicine and philosophy as profoundly linked; both have been described as "physician-philosophers."[17] Paracelsus echoed Galen in his emphasis on experience as the key to accurate diagnosis and treatment and in his condemnation of physicians who pursue their line of work towards financial ends rather than out of a genuine desire to heal the sick.[18] Additionally, both Paracelsus and Galen represented breaks in the tradition and the emergence of a new approach to medicine.[19] Yet, to Paracelsus, Galen ranked high among the many outmoded theorists he wished to consign to irrelevance. To him, Galen and his body of work became representative of the theory-heavy but practice-poor kind of medical education he deplored as well as the arrogance of its professors.[20] Instead, Paracelsus advocated a kind of experience in which it was essential to

---

[11] Ibid., 71. Aristotle and Galen both write that all things are composed of the elements and share other similarities in their accounts of nature and physic.
[12] Ibid., 95-98.
[13] Ibid., 56.
[14] Ibid., 125.
[15] Ibid., 117-118.
[16] Ibid., 116.
[17] Andrew Weeks, *Paracelsus: Speculative Theory and the Crisis of the Early Reformation*, SUNY Series in Western Esoteric Traditions (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1997): 14.
[18] Temkin, 130.
[19] Ibid., 132.
[20] Ibid., 128. Weeks, *Paracelsus*, 51.

learn not only what kinds of symptoms a body could produce but to appropriate the body's knowledge of how those symptoms arose.[21] If Paracelsus was unclear about how to obtain this knowledge, as Temkin describes, he was extremely clear on what would not suffice: the condescending approach with which most of his contemporaries applied theory to their suffering patients.[22] For Paracelsus, who was an ardent, if not always orthodox Christian, a doctor had a God-given duty to care for patients.[23]

Paracelsus's theory of medicine was much more spiritual and allegorical than Galen's humoral approach. He described a "parable" of microcosm and macrocosm in which the higher, celestial realms and the lower, terrestrial world could effect each other through affective actions and practices.[24] His theory divided the world into three realms—the terrestrial, celestial, and supra-celestial—and proposed to cure diseases by attracting higher curative spirits down to the celestial realm by having the patient wear talismans or ingest particular substances.[25] Where Galenic physicians believed that matter itself was curative, for Paracelsians, matter could only benefit the patient through its ability to attract spirits.[26] In particular, Paracelsus favoured compound remedies which made significant use of chemical processes, especially ones involving metals.[27] He also coined the idea of *mumia*, or mummy as a kind of vibrant, living spirit within all of nature that could be activated for curative purposes.[28] This represents one of the entry points of that word into medical vocabulary; later in this chapter, we shall revisit both Paracelsus's *mumia* and another meaning of the word, both of which combine and find their way into medicinal cannibalism.

Another crucial facet of Paracelsus's remedies was his inversion of Galen's concept of curative opposites. Where, for Galenic physicians, hot, dry diseases demanded cold, moist cures, Paracelsians dispensed with the humoral theory altogether and instead adopted an attitude that

---

[21] Temkin, 135. Weeks, 54.
[22] Temkin, 130.
[23] Ibid., 132.
[24] Ibid.
[25] Karen Gordon-Grube, "Evidence of Medicinal Cannibalism in Puritan New England: "Mummy" and Related Remedies in Edward Taylor's "Dispensatory"," *Early American Literature* 28, no. 3 (1993): 186.
[26] Gordon-Grube, "Evidence of Medicinal Cannibalism," 186.
[27] Temkin, 132.
[28] Karl Dannenfeldt, "Egyptian Mumia: The Sixteenth Century Experience and Debate," *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, 16, no. 2 (1985): 173.

"like cures like."[29] For instance, a disease of the blood required a cure associated with blood.[30] In this way, Paracelsian physicians came to include medicine made from human bodies, most prominently mummified human remains.[31] Hence, despite the apparent compatibility between medicinal cannibalism and Galenic theory, it is Paracelsianism that is particularly associated with the practice. Moreover, the few accounts of early modern medicinal cannibalism that exist tend to emphasize Paracelsianism as the crucial reason for the growth of medicinal cannibalism from a small-scale, niche tradition mired in superstition to a mainstream remedy for all manner of ills.[32]

Paracelsus in England

In the early seventeenth century, the Galenic understanding of medicine was dominant in England. By mid-century, Paracelsianism would come to rival it. The rise of Paracelsianism in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries was partially due to physicians'' expanding knowledge of physiology, which came to disprove many of Galen's assertions about the body. For instance, as Temkin describes:

> Galen had attributed so-called idiopathic epilepsy to the accumulation of a cold and viscous humour in the ventricles of the brain. But dissections of epileptics in the sixteenth century failed to reveal the presence of such a humour, and the physicians looked for other causes.[33]

In this way, physicians trained according to Galen's precepts came to be less wedded to his theories. Additionally, the rise of barber-surgeons and apothecaries, who were not generally university-educated and therefore not acquainted with the Latin-language texts explicating Galenism, presented an affordable alternative to the physician.[34] Especially in England, where Galenist physicians "formed a relatively small body of men who… served the upper strata of society" most patients, particularly those outside of London, relied on apothecaries and surgeons for medical treatment.[35] English Paracelsian physicians wanted to make medical knowledge available to practitioners, regardless of their level of formal education, and emphasised practical knowledge and vernacular language to this end.

---

[29] Gordon-Grube, 186.
[30] Ibid.
[31] Dannenfeldt, 173.
[32] Sugg, *Mummies*, 293.
[33] Temkin, 137.
[34] Ibid., 131.
[35] Ibid., 166.

Paracelsianism also resonated with cultural and religious commitments that were prevalent in seventeenth-century England. With its confrontational and iconoclastic approach to medicine and increasing popularity in Protestant parts of Europe, Paracelsianism was associated with radical Christianity, most commonly the Reformed Church and Puritanism more broadly.[36] Where medieval Christian physicians had respected Galen's admiration for Christian piety, Puritans and radical Christians rejected all pagan influence and took issue with the aspects of Galen's philosophy that contradicted Christian doctrine.[37] For instance, Galen denied the immortality of the soul and criticized the Christian practice of faith without proof.[38] Moreover, Galen's emphasized nature as the ultimate curative force behind medicine which struck many Puritan and Reformed readers as idolatrous.[39] Paracelsus, by contrast, had been a practicing Christian, although he remained a Catholic his entire life.[40] Puritan readers seemed willing to overlook this, likely due to his deviation from Catholic orthodoxy, the intensity of his belief that all healing power came directly from God, and his reputation (earned or unearned) as "the Luther of medicine."[41] Thus, in continental Europe and England alike this turned the debate over Paracelsian and Galenic medical practice into a "shibboleth" for the broader issues of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.[42]

Following the English Civil War, Paracelsianism became more acceptable in England.[43] Compared to the gatekeeping practices of Galenic physicians, Paracelsianism was much more accessible to the reading public. Andrew Weeks writes that Paracelsus's emphasis on vernacular medical texts was situated within a context in which "authorship was acquiring a new directness and popularity of appeal and impact."[44] This turn towards authorship was spurred on by innovations in printing and reached its zenith in the Luther's German-language translation of the Bible which made scripture accessible to the literate public—which was growing in response to the availability of print materials—and circumvented the authority of learned clergy.[45] In

---

[36] Gordon-Grube, 186.
[37] Ibid., 56, 168.
[38] Ibid.
[39] Ibid.
[40] Weeks, 2.
[41] Ibid., 14.
[42] Temkin, 132.
[43] Ibid.
[44] Weeks, 55.
[45] Ibid. Lee Palmer Wandel, *The Reformation: Towards a New History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011):

Chapters 1 and 2, we saw the ways the Lutheran doctrine of *sola scriptura* resulted in new forms of Biblical engagement, especially with regards to eschatology, paved the way for English colonial expansion into the Americas, and generated new approaches to Jews and the so-called Old Testament. In similar ways, the directness of Paracelsus's approach gave learned physicians and non-university-educated apothecaries license to ignore the weight of Galenic theory and forge new ways towards medical treatment.

Throughout the seventeenth century, Paracelsian remedies often appeared alongside Galenic ones. Nonetheless, Paracelsians' reputation as iconoclasts and radicals persisted despite their tolerance for Galenic remedies.[46] According to Temkin, Paracelsians made a distinction between humoral cures which might have been effective against some diseases—although not for the reasons Galen suggested—and the institutionalized condescension they saw in the formation and educations of learned physicians.[47] Nicholas Culpeper's 1652 English translation of Galen's *Ars Medica* made Galenic theory accessible to the literate public, including the apothecaries and surgeons who had previously been shut out of medical education, for more or less the first time.[48] Already, this represented a break with the old tradition of reserving Galen for the university dissection theatre. Alongside his translation of Galen's words, Culpeper also treated his readers to his own commentary on Galenic theory, which, while generally complimentary, occasionally notes some differences in opinion.[49] At one point, Culpeper even recalls the proverb "*de mortuis nil nisi bonum,* speak nothing but good of them that are dead" to restrain his criticism of Galen.[50] Culpeper's translation not only introduced Galen to a wider audience than he had previously had in England but also normalized criticism of the great medical theorist. It was through critical interventions like this that Galen's influence over medicine waned and Paracelsianism began to take hold.

The Paracelsian takeover was not complete, however. As we can see from Culpeper's critical translation, many physicians sympathetic to Paracelsus did not dispense with Galen altogether. Likewise, the Royal College of Physicians began gradually integrating Paracelsian remedies alongside the favoured, Galenic ones in 1618. Additionally, while Paracelsianism

---

[46] Gordon-Grube, 203.
[47] Temkin, 167.
[48] Ibid., 166-167.
[49] Ibid. Nicholas Culpeper (trans. and ed.), *Galen's art of physick* (London: Printed for Peter Cole, 1652): 17, 30,
[50] Culpeper, *Galen's art*, 17.

helped usher corpse remedies into the medical mainstream, the practice of using human bodies in medical preparations eclipsed its Paracelsian origins. This becomes clear, for instance, in William Petty's 1649 letter to Henry More, in which he groups Paracelsus alongside Galen, Aristotle, Descartes, and van Helmont as thinkers who have neglected experimental methods in favour of "Imaginary principles" and "frivulous conjectures."[51] Petty acknowledges that he had been "highly taken" with these lofty theorists but found, upon reflection, that experimental approaches were far more rigorous and soon supplanted his interest in theory; he writes, "[I] never knew any man who had once tasted the swetnes of experimental knowledge *that*ever afterward lusted after *the* Vaporous garlick & Onions of phantasmaticall seeming philosophy."[52] However, despite his dismissal of Paracelsian medicine as insubstantial theorizing, Petty believed in the power of mummy as a remedy. John Sanderson's account of his 1586 travels in Egypt and experiences with mummy was among Petty's library collection.[53] Moreover, there is some evidence that Petty used blood as a remedy in 1650 during the course of his treatment of Anne Greene, who survived a hanging and was nursed back to health by Petty and his colleagues.[54] Clearly, a physician's use of medicinal cannibalism did not necessarily entail a commitment to Paracelsianism. At the same time, Paracelsianism is closely associated with the rise of medicinal cannibalism in early modern Europe and especially in England.

Paracelsian Medicinal Cannibalism

The close tie between Paracelsianism and medicinal cannibalism emerged from several places. As we have already seen, the ingestion of blood and other bodily substances significantly predated Paracelsus and was compatible with the Galenic theory he opposed. Moreover, Louise Noble has demonstrated that Tudor-era English authors, such as Shakespeare and John Donne, were familiar with corpse remedies, especially mummy, and included references to them in their works.[55] How then, are we to explain the close tie between Paracelsus's theory and medicinal cannibalism? Several explanations emerge, although they intersect and ultimately revolve around

---

[51] HP 7/123/1a-2b.
[52] HP 7/123/1a-2b.
[53] Dannenfeldt, 169. John Sanderson, *The Travels of John Sanderson in the Levant (1584-1602)*, edited by William Foster (London: Printed for the Hakluyt Society, 1931): x.
[54] Théophile Bonet, *A Guide to the Practical Physician* (London: Printed for Thomas Flesher, 1686): 576. *Newes from the Dead* (Oxford: Printed for Leonard Lichfield, 1651).
[55] Louise Noble, *Medicinal Cannibalism in Early Modern English Literature and Culture* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011): 5-6.

the issues of religion and bodily integrity that form the themes of not only this chapter, but this thesis overall.

Karl Dannenfeldt, in his paper on mummy, the most popular and widespread medicinal cannibalistic remedy, implies one alternative. As he describes, mummy had been used in medicine long before Paracelsus arrived on the scene and found tremendous popularity in medieval Europe. Dating back to late antiquity, *mumia* was a curative substance in North Africa and the Middle East: in this context however, *mumia* referred to bitumen—the word derives from the Arabic for wax.[56] The word eventually referred to the dark, tar-like substance that exuded from mummified corpses and then, gradually, to the flesh itself.[57] The first mummy remedies were corpses looted from temples and sold both to local medical practitioners and on to Venice and other European ports.[58] Demand rapidly outshot supply and purveyors of mummy soon turned to the bodies of travelers who had perished in the desert and whose remains had become desiccated in the hot sun.[59] However, even these alternative mummies were not enough to satisfy the teeming demand for mummy and apothecaries and their suppliers began to make use of fresher bodies, primarily the unclaimed corpses of executed and impoverished people, and mummify them themselves.[60]

Based on Dannenfeldt's description, it appears that mummy integrated easily into Paracelsian medicine because of Paracelsus's own use of the word to refer to a spiritual force inherent to all living things while also prescribing *mumia* to his patients. It seems plausible that existing mummy users became convinced of the merits of a theory which attached great spiritual importance to a word not only familiar to them but already in use as an existing remedy. While Dannenfeldt refers to this double meaning as a "further confusion" in the history of mummy, Richard Sugg instead thinks of Paracelsus's mummy as an innovation on the older remedies.[61] Sugg argues that the Paracelsian spiritual mummy eventually begat a literal mummified corpse remedy.[62] Louise Noble also describes a distinctly Paracelsian mummy, one made from the relatively fresh remains of a man, preferably one who died violently in an execution or a fight,

---

[56] Dannenfeldt, 163.
[57] Ibid., 165-167.
[58] Ibid., 170.
[59] Ibid.
[60] Ibid.
[61] Dannenfeldt, 173. Sugg, *Mummies*, 24.
[62] Sugg, *Mummies* 24.

by exposing the corpse to the moon and stars for a night before curing and drying the flesh.[63] Noble presents the physician Oswald Croll's iteration of a Paracelsian mummy, which first appeared in 1609:

> chuse the Carcase of a red Man (because in them the blood is more sincere, and gentle and therefore more excellent) whole (not maimed) clear without blemishes, of the age of twenty four years, that hath been Hanged, Broke upon a Wheel, or Thrust- through, having been for one day and night exposed to the open Air, in a serene time. This Mumy (that is, Musculous flesh, of the Thighs, Breasts, Armes, and other parts) from the two Luminaries, once illuminate and constellate, cut into small pieces or slices and sprinkle on them Powder of Myrrh, and of Aloes, but a very little (otherwise it will be too bitter) afterward by Macerating, Imbibe them for certain days in Spirit of Wine, hang them up a little, and again imbibe them, then hang them up to dry in the Air, this so dryed will be like Flesh hardned in Smoak, and be without stink.[64]

Noble remarks on the lack of squeamishness in the Croll's method, noting that he scarcely seems to acknowledge that this process of transformation from corpse to remedy is happening to a human being.[65] For Noble, this evidences the commonness of corpse medicine in seventeenth-century England.[66]

Another explanation for the compatibility between Paracelsian approaches to medicine and cannibalistic remedies is that Paracelsian tenets may have made cannibalism more acceptable to physicians. Specifically, according to Karen Gordon-Grube, Paracelsianism devalues the material world by focusing instead on curative spirits.[67] This, she suggests, may make it easier for adherents of Paracelsianism to prepare and ingest medicines made with human flesh.[68] She writes, "it would seem that… Paracelsians dealt with the cannibalism involved in the ingestion of mummy by simply downplaying the importance of the physical substance."[69] Paracelsian medicine treated all things, including human bodies, as mere matter, useful only as a vessel for spirits.[70] This applied not only to the corpse used in medical preparations but likewise

---

[63] Oswald Croll, *Bazilica Chymica and Praxis Chymiatricae or Royal and Practical Chymistry 1609*, trans. John Hartman (London, 1670): 156, cited in Louise Noble, *Medicinal Cannibalism in Early Modern English Literature and Culture* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011): 6.
[64] Croll, *Bazilica Chymica*, 156, cited in Noble, *Medicinal Cannibalism*, 6. It should be noted that, in this context "red Man" refers to a man with red hair as opposed to an Indigenous American man, which, given the topic of this thesis, seems a likely interpretation at first.
[65] Noble, *Medicinal Cannibalism*, 6.
[66] Ibid.
[67] Gordon-Grube, 186.
[68] Ibid., 201.
[69] Ibid.
[70] Ibid., 204.

to the patient ingesting them: living bodies, like the dead, were confined to the temporal, limited material world whereas the spirits within them, including the soul, belonged to the eternal celestial spheres. Gordon-Grube describes that, within Paracelsian theory, "the body as a symbol is *not* holy, the body is merely a worthless piece of matter in which the life-spirit dwells."[71] In this manner, Paracelsian medicine devalued the human body even as it sought to cure patients and prolong their lives through medicinal cannibalism.

The de-emphasis of the body appears to be another foundation of the great affinity between Paracelsianism and Protestantism.[72] We have already seen the ways in which the iconoclasm and intense piety of Paracelsianism appealed to Protestant readers, at the same time as increasing access to print materials spread the theory far and wide. Gordon-Grube also sees a connection between the Paracelsus's belief that the body was a limited, base material thing and the Protestant rejection of transubstantiation. In exposing the worthlessness of human bodies, Paracelsus also "demystified" the body of Christ. Gordon-Grube writes that, for Paracelsus "to dismember the human body, to prepare mummy from it and to ingest it would have been to desecrate not only the human body but the body of Christ Himself."[73] This appealed tremendously to radical Christians who took issue with the Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation and, additionally, took rather a dim view of the material world in which they dwelt. In this way, Paracelsian medicine was highly compatible with early modern radical Christianity's tenets of justification by faith alone rather than by works, metaphorical rather than literal Eucharist, bare church walls rather than splendor and decoration, and a hopefully-imminent end to the sinful, debased world all around them.

---

[71] Ibid.

[72] Jonathan Gil Harris argues that the rise of Paracelsianism in England contributed to the comparison of social outsiders to pathogens that sickened the body politic. For more on this, please see Jonathan Gil Harris, *Foreign Bodies and the Body Politic* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998): 14-15. It seems at first glance that Harris contradicts my argument—whereas I describe Paracelsianism as de-emphasizing the body, he writes that it drew attention to the body as vulnerable to the incursion of disease. However I think the apparent conflict can be reconciled by considering that, as Harris writes, the "seed of disease was in most cases a mineral (from the earth) or a gaseous element (from the stars)" (23-24). As Paracelsus drew physicians' attention to the body's vulnerability to external pathogens, he also maintained the microcosmic/macrocosmic scale of his theory; disease could come from the celestial as well as the terrestrial realm, meaning that its causes and cures far transcended the material world in which patients found themselves. Harris's point about Paracelsianism spurring English xenophobia is well-taken and is discussed later in this thesis. However it seems to me that Paracelsian approaches to medicine devalued the material world in general, even as they gave members of the body politic license to fixate on foreign incursions and the language of pathogenic dehumanization that Harris describes.

[73] Gordon-Grube, 204.

Gordon-Grube finds another religious theme running through the Protestant adoption of Paracelsian medicinal cannibalism. Protestant Paracelsians, she writes, "explained the efficacy of their 'sovereign remedy' in quasi-religious terms which have distinctly Eucharistic overtones."[74] It appears that, while themselves rejecting the doctrine of transubstantiation, and even expressing horror at the idea that Catholics consume Christ's flesh and blood, Protestants were happy to consume the literal flesh and blood of other humans and believed these remedies to hold almost miraculous power.[75] Maggie Kilgour writes that, "in order to delineate themselves as one religious body against another, the Reformers defined themselves in terms of eating, as those who ate spiritually in opposition to the others who ate God literally."[76] Of course, as we have seen, Protestants may have only spiritually consumed God but were happy to literally eat human flesh. Noble also picks up on the "uncanny" resemblance between medicinal cannibalism and the sacrament. Her analysis compares the salvific power of Christ's sacrifice to that of a dismembered and mummified body, concluding that:

> while one is administered to treat the disease of the body and the other the disease of the soul— although the soul is also considered the site of corporeal contagion— both reflect the belief that the essence of a past life has pharmacological power when absorbed into a life in the present… It comes as no surprise then that for those Reformers who rejected the literality of the Eucharist, mummy appeared attractive, not as an alternative to divine matter, but as a food that mediated a special kind of hunger. Transposed in this way, medical corpse matter functions as a trace of that originary body, the *anima* that has never really been present, except as an already multitemporal trace.[77]

Noble's discussion of the "originary body" and "*anima*" clearly and closely relates to the spiritual use of mummy employed by Paracelsus, i.e. a vibrant force that dwelt within all living matter. Her choice of the term "special kind of hunger" requires somewhat more unpacking. It would be a quasi-psychoanalytic oversimplification to suggest that Protestants turned to medicinal cannibalism to fill the void left in the absence of a literal Eucharist, that there was an inherent need to consume human flesh in some form or fashion. Nonetheless, Noble briefly entertains the notion, asking, "is there a discursive overlap between the medical ingestions of corpses and the denial of the Eucharist as corporeal matter that reveals a residual Protestant

---

[74] Ibid., 201.
[75] Gordon-Grube 207.
[76] Maggie Kilgour, *From Communion to Cannibalism: An Anatomy of Metaphors of Incorporation,* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990) 82–83.
[77] Noble, 3.

hunger for the real flesh and blood of Christ?"[78] Noble suggests a better alternative: Protestant patients may have been seeking the curative potential within another human body rather than an insatiable desire to consume that body's flesh.[79] The Protestant antipathy towards matter cut both ways, it both liberated its believers from the superstition of Catholic doctrine but also left them stranded in a cold and debased world, surrounded only by worldly and temporal things. Paracelsian medicinal cannibalism may have provided the opportunity to believe that some material things contained within them a kind of healing power—albeit one connected with celestial spirits rather than physical matter—without contradicting their own dogma, while simultaneously desensitizing practitioners to the grisly nature of what they were doing.

A contradiction remains. Both Louise Noble and Karen Gordon-Grube point out that, despite their own cannibalistic practices, Protestants accused Catholics of being the true cannibals. Noble suggests that Protestants were simply more tolerant of corpse medicine, likely due to their acceptance of Paracelsianism, and notes that even physicians who were dubious of medicinal cannibalism expressed their reservations in terms of uneasiness rather than outright revulsion.[80] However, this is not a satisfying explanation for what seems the obvious hypocrisy. Gordon-Grube unfortunately is not able to provide a better conclusion in her own research. She also leaves unresolved the question of how we are to understand this particular contradiction, remarking that it is "surprising."[81] Additionally, unlike a different hypocrisy which will be discussed later in this chapter, it appears that practitioners of medicinal cannibalism were either unaware or unwilling to comment on the discrepancy between what they accused Catholics of doing and what they did themselves. It seems that we, too, will have to leave the resolution of this contradiction to another time and, perhaps, another scholar.

Types of Remedies

In one of the earliest gestures towards Paracelsian theory in England, the 1618 edition of the *Pharmacopoeia Londinensis*, written in Latin on behalf of the Royal College of Physicians tentatively endorsed mummy as a remedy for certain ailments.[82] The members of the College were learned physicians and, therefore, overwhelmingly Galenic in their approach to medicine.

---

[78] Ibid., 90.
[79] Ibid., 93.
[80] Noble, 101.
[81] Gordon-Grube, 207.
[82] Sugg, *Mummies*, 60.

In fact, Richard Sugg characterizes them as the last hold-outs against the rise of Paracelsian medicine in England.[83] Nonetheless, they, too, began to feel the pressure of Paracelsus's medicine in the early seventeenth century as more and more physicians adopted his theories. In 1618, the Royal College of Physicians reached a compromise: they would publish Paracelsian remedies alongside their preferred, Galenic ones provided the Paracelsian medicines had been tested and found effective by College members.[84] Thus, Paracelsian versions of remedies such as mummy, human skull, and human fat found their way into its pages.[85] The *Pharmacopoeia Londinensis* circulated widely, with an endorsement by King James that:

> we therefore desirous in all things to provide for the common good of our subjects… do hereby signifie and declare our Royal Will and pleasure to be, and hereby straightly require, charge, and command all and singular Apothecaries, within this our Realm of *England* or the dominions thereof, that they and every of them, immediately after the said *Pharmacop. Londin.* shall be printed and published, do not compound, or make any Medicine or medicinable receipt, or prescription… but after the only manner and form that hereby is, or shall be directed, prescribed, and set down by the said book.[86]

Yet the 1618 edition of the *Pharmacopoeia Londinensis* was written in Latin, meaning that, although the book came with the endorsement of the king and his command that it become the standard book of medicine in England, it was accessible only to learned physicians and others who could read Latin. As a result, for the next thirty-one years, the Royal College of Physicians' tacit approval of Paracelsian medical preparations remained largely unknown by physicians and apothecaries who relied on vernacular-language texts as well as interested readers who could not access the Latin edition.

Nicholas Culpeper's 1649 English-language translation, called the *London Dispensatory*, made knowledge of the compromise widely accessible and, according to Richard Sugg,

---

[83] Ibid.
[84] Ibid., Noble, 116.
[85] Nicholas Culpeper (trans.), *A physicall directory, or, A translation of the London dispensatory made by the Colledge of Physicians in London* (London: Printed for Peter Cole, 1649): 71, 151. Note that Galenic remedies involving mummy also appear in this book. Paracelsian versions of mummy are listed variously as a cure for bruises (151), wounds (304, 308), putrefaction, epilepsy, and melancholy (322). Powdered skull dissolved in betony water is supposed to cure epilepsy and palsies, whereas "that small Triangular bone in the Skul of a man" is cited as a Paracelsian remedy for epilepsy as well (71). Human fat is allegedly "exceeding good to anoint such limbs as fall away in flesh" (71).
[86] Culpeper, *A physical directory*, unnumbered page, "A brief of his MAIESTIES Royal Proclamation *Commanding all Apothecaries of this Realm to follow* this PHARMACOPOEIA lately compiled by the Colledg of Physitians of LONDON."

contributed to the spread of medicinal cannibalism as a practice.[87] Further, in his epistle to the reader, Culpeper skewers the Royal College of Physicians for their reticence in making the *Pharmacopoeia Londinensis* available to a wider audience. Culpeper excoriates these physicians as "proud, insulting, domineering Doctors, whose wits were born above five hundred years before themselves" because of their reliance on moribund, unchallenged medical theory.[88] On top of this, these physicians charge exorbitant fees for their medicines, which bring both physical and financial ruin upon patients.[89] These arrogant doctors, he predicts, will likely criticize his translation on the grounds that "it tends to the destruction of the Commonwealth, because thereby ignorat fellows will be induced to the practice of Physick, and therefore they say they wrote it only to the nurslings of *Apollo.*"[90] To this anticipated criticism Culpeper has a characteristically biting response:

> 1. If *Apollo* had served the *nine Muses* so as they serve the *Apothecaries, viz.* hid all his art from them, they would have had no more wit than *nine Geese.* 2. All the Nation are already Physitians, If you ayl any thing, every one you meet, whether man or woman will prescribe you a medicine for it. Now whether this book thus translated will make them more ignorant or more knowing, any one that hath but a rain of understanding more than a horse, may easily judg, 3. All the Ancient Physitians wrote in their own mother tongues, and native language. *Mesue Avicenna, Averrois, Rhazis, Serapio &c.* in Arabick. *Galen, Hippocrates &c.* in Greek. *Paracelsus* in Highdutch; Did these do their countries good or harm think ye? What reason can be given why *England* should be deprived of the benefit of other Nations?

Culpeper suggests that the College's true objection to his translation is not concern for the well-being of the country or the health of its citizenry, but rather a desire to keep knowledge to themselves. He likens the College to the Catholic Church, writing, "I am confident there be those in this Nation that have wit enough to know that the *Papists* and the *Colledg of Physitians* wil not suffer *Divinity* and *Physick* to be printed in our mother tongue, both upon one and the same grounds, and both colour it over with the same excuses."[91] His comparison between the College and the Church is based on the fact that both organizations heavily controlled the generation of research and publication of its findings. It also equates the Royal College of Physicians' criticism of his translation to the objection of the Catholic Church against the proliferation of vernacular

---

[87] Sugg, *Mummies*, 60.
[88] Culpeper (trans.), *A physical directory*, unnumbered page, "The Translator to the Reader."
[89] Ibid. This is opposed to Culpeper's own practice of providing medicine at low cost to vulnerable patients.
[90] Ibid.
[91] Ibid.

Bibles; in both scenarios increasing public access to key texts challenged the singular authority of the organization in question. Culpeper's choice of the Catholic Church for comparison was a knowing one. It played into existing anxieties around the perceived closeness of the Anglican and Catholic Churches and the possible threat of Catholic resurgence in England. This was likely designed to insinuate that the College's membership was more aligned, either in terms of culture or actual belief, with Catholicism than with Protestant England and to provoke a strong anti-College reaction from English readers. Additionally, this quasi-iconoclastic approach to the traditional seats of institutional power was entirely in keeping with Paracelsian attitudes towards medical theory and the Protestant doctrine that canonical texts should be available in vernacular languages for the perusal and interpretation of all.

There is some evidence that Culpeper introduced Paracelsian concepts to a reading audience, including several readers who could have understood the original, Latin-language version of the *Pharmacopoeia Londinensis*. The same year as Culpeper's translation appeared, the intelligencer Samuel Hartlib noted in his Ephemerides that "there is a certain physick to be made out of Mummia intimated by Paracels*us* w*hich* hee saith is to goe bejond all the Miracles of the Vegetable Animal or Mineral Medecins."[92] While Hartlib does not mention Culpeper or the *London Dispensatory* by name, his interest in both Paracelsus and mummy is clear throughout the record of his year.[93] Later in the same document, he repeats the recommendations to use fresh bodies, rather than imported mummies in medical preparations:

> But that of Mum*mia* goes bejonds all the cures of Minerals Vegetables and Animals. The Egyptian Mum*mia's* are counted the best and yet these being long diseased are many way's imperfect… Those are better of People lately executed as of thiefes that the Sun and Moone hath shined upon, w*hich* if the world knew how to make Mum*mias* of them they would never bee suffred to hang in the Gallows 2. or 3. dayes, as now they are.[94]

His own version of this suggestion echoes Croll's recipe for mummy, which was published over twenty years after Hartlib wrote himself this brief note. Hartlib weighs whether European or Egyptian mummy is superior; by the time Croll published his *Bazilica Chymica*, the prevailing

---

[92] HP 31/22/14A-20B, 29A-32B, 25A-26B.
[93] Hartlib marginally notes the Paracelsian Johannes Brun, whose pseudonym was "Unmüssig." Brun was a friend of Hartlib and supplied him with information about new developments in medicine, including, it seems, Paracelsian mummy. John T. Young, *Faith, Medical Alchemy and Natural Philosophy: Johann Moriaen, Reformed Intelligencer, and the Hartlib Circle* (Aldershot: 1998): 84. Accessed via The Newton Project.
[94] HP 31/22/14A-20B, 29A-32B, 25A-26B.

Paracelsian currents had found consensus around the desirability of fresh corpses. In this we see the emergence and coagulation of a specifically-Paracelsian tradition of mummy-making.

Richard Sugg thinks of Culpeper's translation of the *Pharmacopoeia Londinensis* as the point when the practice of corpse medicine became truly mainstream in England. Additionally, Culpeper's fury at greedy, arrogant physicians who did not care if their reliance on outdated theory harmed patients made him a beloved and trusted figure. [95] Culpeper's popularity as an author of medical texts meant that his thoughts on corpse medicine circulated widely and helped enshrine the practice as common.[96] Other medical texts incorporating corpse remedies followed on its heels. John French's 1651 treatise *The art of distillation* lists numerous cannibalistic preparations in a section devoted to animal-derived remedies.[97] For instance, French prescribes, alongside relatively common treatments such as mummy and skull, "Essence of mans braines" as a cure for epilepsy.[98] This remedy was composed of:

> the Brains of a young man that hath dyed a violent death, together with the membranes, arteries, veins, nerves, all the pith of the back, bruise these in a stone mortar till they become a kind of pap, then put as much of the Spirit of Wine, as will cover it three or four fingers breadth: then put it into a large glasse that three parts of foure be empty, being Hermetically closed, then digest it half a year in horse-dung, then take it out & distill it in *Balneo* and cohobate the water till the greatest part of the braines be distilled off.[99]

Again, the theme of a sudden and vicious death appears consistently in Paracelsian corpse medicine. However, French also includes medications that do not require the deaths of the donor; he distills urine "of a young man drinking much Wine" into a cure for gout and the urine of "a boy that is healthy" into another remedy for epilepsy.[100] French's treatise touches on medicinal cannibalism only briefly, as the real emphasis of his book is on the many applications of distillation. This was typical of medical and chemical texts of the early 1650s; at this time, the few corpse remedies that appeared in medical texts were scattered in throughout preparations that made no use of human bodies.

---

[95] Sugg, *Mummies,* 60.
[96] Ibid.
[97] John French, *The Art of Distillation, or the Treatise of the choicest Spagyricall Preparations performed by way of Distillation* (London: Printed by Richard Cotes, 1651): 90-106. The inclusion of remedies derived from humans among those derived from non-human animals is relatively common in medical texts.
[98] French, *The Art of Distillation*, 91.
[99] Ibid.
[100] Ibid., 93-94.

In 1653, an English translation of Andreas Tentzel's *Medicina diastatica* was the first book in the English language to devote itself entirely to medicinal cannibalism.[101] The book, described as a "Mumiall Treatise," begins by providing four definitions for the term mummy: first, a substance made from aloes and other plants and minerals; second, an embalmed corpse extracted from its Egyptian tomb; third, bituminous asphalt; fourth, the desiccated remains of those who perished in Libyan sandstorms.[102] Regarding these four kinds of mummy, Tentzel suggests that, despite their great curative potential, they be used only sparingly lest a patient contract worse ailments from impurities within the preparation.[103] However, he writes, Paracelsus has added "a fift sort of *Mumie, viz.* that which is extracted from some perfect body, not dying of any naturall disease, but of some violent death."[104] This is by far the most preferable kind of mummy because the recent death of the corpse in question is proof that the person did not die of disease or another weakness that could potentially be passed onto the consumer; moreover the violence of their demise preserves the "spirit or *Mumie*" inherent to the body.[105]

In addition to this, Tentzel cites the Biblical prohibition against consuming carrion.[106] Therefore, it is in the best interest of the physician to seek out the freshest corpses possible, in order to preserve both the spiritual essence within the body and the physician's obedience to God. To this end, Tentzel recommends physicians seek out places of execution, writing:

> If Physitians or any other body understood but the right use of this *Mumie,* or what it is good for, not any Malefactors would be left three daies on the Gallowes, or continue on the Wheel, from being stoln away; for they would run any hazard for procuring of these Bodies.[107]

As with Croll's recipe and Hartlib's Ephemerides, there is no trace of discomfort in Tentzel's account of the theft and dismemberment of human corpses.[108] His description of what mummy is

---

[101] Sugg, *Mummies*, 43.
[102] Andreas Tentzel, *Medicina diastatica*, trans. Ferdinand Parkhurst (London: 1653): 2-3.
[103] Tentzel, *Medicina diastatica*, 4.
[104] Ibid.
[105] Ibid. 4-6.
[106] Ibid., 5.
[107] Ibid., 8.
[108] The resemblance between the wording of Tentzel's supposition that, if only physicians properly understood mummy's curative properties, they would steal executed corpses en masse and Hartlib's version of the same prediction strikes me as a coincidence. While it should be noted that Tentzel's book was initially published in 1629, I have found no evidence that Hartlib read it before 1648, when he made his own remarks on mummy. However, Hartlib was definitely familiar with Tentzel's *Medicinia diastatica* by 1658, as is evidenced by his reception of numerous letters referring to it, dated 17 August, 1658 (ROYAL SOCIETY MSS, BOYLE LETTERS 6, 6A-B), 15 October, 1658 (HP 51/29A-31B), 1-5 September, 1659 (16/2/14A-15B), and September-November, 1659 (British Library Add. MSS 15948 ff. 71A-75B).

and how it operates on the body demonstrates the synthesis of Paracelsian spiritual mummy and corpse medicine. Tentzel writes of the effectiveness of mummy in accordance with the Paracelsian belief that "like cures like." While he states that the celestial and spiritual properties of mummy are crucial to its curative potential, he also simplifies the idea of like remedies for like diseases into a much more material version of Paracelsus's initially much loftier theory. Tentzel holds that mummy is effective because "the flesh by the fleshy is preserved and augmented; which is no other then the quality and propriety of the aforesaid *Mumie,* which requireth the proper *Mumie* of another for the conservation of it self, accommodating and applying it to its own use."[109] Simultaneously, just as the flesh is healed by the literal flesh, the spirit is also restored by the mystical properties of mummy. Spirit and matter thus work in tandem to heal the body and soul. In his *Medicina diastatica*, Tentzel demonstrates the detached attitude toward matter and the quasi-Eucharistic approach to mummy that Gordon-Grube and Noble note in their literature. Tentzel seems to attribute salvific power to mummy, while overlooking the humanity of the sources of that healing remedy. This approach was typical of early modern medicinal cannibalism.[110]

Tentzel's book was read carefully among English Protestant intellectuals and their extended networks. Samuel Hartlib received numerous letters discussing Tentzel's ideas in the years following its publication. The earliest of these, dated 17 August, 1658, came from the writer John Beale and mentions Tentzel only to compare his work, unfavourably, to Kenelm Digby's account of mummy.[111] However, Beale wrote again, dated 15 October, 1658, to recommend "all the ayde, w*hi*ch can bee obtained by that mysticall operation of Paracelsus his

---

[109] Tentzel, 15.

[110] The question of bodily resurrection and the fate of the consumed corpse presents itself somewhat obviously at this juncture. Tentzel and related sources have nothing to say on it; however Robert Boyle's 1675 book *Some Physico-theological Considerations about the Possibility of the Resurrection* (London: Printed by T. N., 1675) directly addresses what he calls "the difficulties about the Notion of Identity," or rather the question of whether a resurrected body will be the identical same as the deceased body. In particular, Boyle takes up the question of whether a body that is devoured by cannibals, thus becoming part of two humans at once, can be resurrected exactly as it was (C1, recto). He concludes that whatever particles of the body remain will be extracted from their surroundings in a method analogous to chemical processes and God will, as Ezekiel 37 predicts, clothe them in new flesh (C4, verso). While this does make it impossible for a body to be identically restored, Boyle argues that it is the human soul that is truly essential to the resurrection and that the concept of identical resurrection is also flawed because it would deny God the ability to provide new, beautiful bodies to those who had been ugly in life (D2, recto-D4, recto). For secondary literature on how resurrection functions if a body has been cannibalized, please see Caroline Walker Bynum, *The Resurrection of the Body in Western Christianity, 200-1336* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1995) and Cătălin Avramescu, *An Intellectual History of Cannibalism*, trans. Alistair Ian Blyth (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009).

[111] ROYAL SOCIETY MSS, BOYLE LETTERS 6, 6A-B.

Transplantation, as it is at large explicated by Andreas Tentzelius in his Sympatheticall Mummy."[112] It seems that, although Beale preferred Digby's explanation of how mummy worked, he was nonetheless enthusiastic about the curative potential of Tentzel's remedies. A Latin letter, likely composed to Hartlib by George Horn, is dated September, 1659. This letter discusses Tentzel as Paracelsus's student and describes his work as natural magic that can tame wild animals and bring predator and prey into a loving relationship.[113] Another document from the same autumn, written by an author not known to the historians and archivists who have worked with it, consists of a number of dated extracts from another document. The extracts preserved in the digital collection of the Hartlib Papers concern botany and horticulture; they are directed primarily at John Evelyn who was, at that point, working on the manuscript of his *Elysium Brittanicum*. However, in an entry written in Paris on 25 October, 1659, the author reviews a French book on hunting small game and critiques it for containing nothing on "the manner of taming wilde beasts."[114] By contrast, the author writes, Tentzel provides guidelines for how spiritual mummy can be used to reconcile any animals to human companionship.[115] From these documents we see a lively discourse surrounding the various applications and relative merits of Andreas Tentzel's work on mummy. This kind of discussion is representative of the larger process by which Paracelsian corpse medicine became mainstream in England.

Women were just as enthusiastic about corpse medicine as men. Richard Sugg, citing Elaine Leong's research on household medicines, describes the common practice of women making their own remedies in the home.[116] He has found evidence that corpse remedies were among these homemade preparations by examining the recipe books published by women authors.[117] For instance, Elizabeth Grey, Countess of Kent, wrote *A choice manuall, or, Rare and select secrets in physick and chyrurgery* (published posthumously in 1654). Grey's recipes run the gamut from common-sense recommendations for chicken broth to soothe the long-term effects of consumption to medicinal cannibalism.[118] For instance, she prescribes a cloth soaked

---

[112] HP 51/29A-31B.
[113] HP 16/2/14A-15B.
[114] British Library, Add. MSS 15948 ff. 71A-75B.
[115] British Library, Add. MSS 15948 ff. 71A-75B.
[116] Elaine Leong, "Making Medicines in the Early Modern Household," *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 82, no. 1 (2008): 145-168, cited in Sugg, *Mummies,* 82.
[117] *Ibid.*, 81-82. Sugg notes that, often, while women had authorship of their work, the profits of the publication went to the male publishers.
[118] Elizabeth Grey, Countess Kent, *A choice manuall, or, Rare and select secrets in physick and chyrurgery* (London: Printed by G. D., 1654): 19-20.

in a mixture of plantain juice, breast milk, and rose water as a topical treatment for a sore back.[119] Against epilepsy, she instructs the reader to:

> Take a pennie weight of the pouder of gold, six penny weight of Pearl, six penny weigh of Amber, six penny weight of corall, eight grains of Bezoar, half an ounce of Peony seed, also you must put some pouder of a dead mans scull that hath been an Anatomie, for a woman, and the pouder of a woman for a man, compound all these together and take as much of the powder… as will lie upon a two-pence, for nine mornings together in Endive water, and drink a good draught of Endive water after.[120]

Mary Fissell describes Grey's book as a "bestselling" and its popularity is attested through numerous editions.[121] Sugg notes that Grey's posthumous success with *A choice manuall* demonstrates the acceptance of corpse medicine among both the aristocracy and household remedy-makers because the author occupies both categories at once.[122] Sugg also describes Grey as a self-help author who popularized medicinal cannibalism through her accessible, vernacular advice.[123]

Sugg uses a somewhat macabre phrase to chart the rise in popularity of corpse medicine: "James I refused corpse medicine; Charles II made his own corpse medicine; and Charles I was made into corpse medicine."[124] While Sugg may be exaggerating to some extent—particularly with his claim that the corpse of Charles I was partially consumed by the thronging crowd at his execution—he still nonetheless makes an excellent point regarding the rise of Paracelsian medicinal cannibalism in seventeenth-century England.[125] Within only a few short decades in the first half of the seventeenth century, it went from a recognized, if controversial, practice to a staple cure in physicians' and apothecaries' repertoires. In fact, Richard Sugg characterizes the

---

[119] Grey, *A choice manuall*, 33.
[120] Ibid., 3, cited in Sugg, *Mummies*, 81.
[121] Mary Fissell, "Introduction: Women, Health, and Healing in Early Modern Europe," *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 82, no. 1 (2008): 9.
[122] Sugg, *Mummies*, 83.
[123] Ibid., 90.
[124] Sugg, *Mummies*, 6.
[125] Richard Sugg's evidence for the claim that Charles I was consumed post-mortem comes from Patricia Fumerton's account of royal relics in *Cultural Aesthetics: Renaissance Literature and the Practice of Social Ornament* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991): 3-10. Fumerton, however, does not describe members of the crowd ingesting any part of the king's body. Although she describes how they "clamoured cannibalistically to gather up pieces of the king" (9), it seems that she means it as a metaphor for the greed with which the crowd collected souvenirs. Fumerton counts the dolls made with the king's hair and lockets containing blood-soaked pieces of linen as relics of Charles I (9). Thus, it seems that Richard Sugg either took quite a literal reading to arrive at the conclusion that King Charles I was processed into corpse medicine or has uncited sources outside of Fumerton and the extant primary source evidence (e.g. in Andreas Tentzel's *Medicina diastatica*) that physicians procured fresh bodies from execution sites.

practice of medicinal cannibalism in the early Scientific Revolution as "its height of popularity and scientific refinement."[126] Sugg points to the fact that medicinal cannibalism was practiced and endorsed by élite Europeans—not only royalty but also people who are now understood in historiography as the primary drivers of the Scientific Revolution and Enlightenment.

We have already seen evidence that corpse medicine was the topic of significant scientific interest and discussion. John French's application of distillation techniques to mummy and other corpse remedies suggest an innovative approach to both chemistry and medicinal cannibalism that, according to Sugg, was shared by French's contemporaries.[127] The Hartlib Papers regarding Andreas Tentzel also demonstrate the curiosity of the English intellectual sphere and its networks, both within the country and abroad. Hartlib himself, considered the foremost intelligencer of his time and remembered as the eponymous hub of the sprawling letter network, carefully weighed the merits of Egyptian and Paracelsian mummy and received several documents further exploring mummy's potential properties.[128] It should come as no surprise then to find that the eminent Robert Boyle, often thought of as a central figure in the Hartlib Circle, also and enthusiastically partook of cannibalistic remedies. Much of his writing on the subject came about in the early days of the Restoration, which sets it outside the Interregnum scope of this thesis. Nonetheless, it is worth examining Boyle's approach to medicinal cannibalism as it is, in fact, much the same as the prevailing attitudes of the 1650s. Additionally, while Boyle did not publish much on the subject before 1660, it appears that he was familiar with the practice during the 1650s; Richard Sugg makes a connection between John French and Boyle, noting that French enjoyed Boyle's respect as a physician and chemist.[129]

While, as Sugg notes, Boyle wrote of numerous cannibalistic remedies throughout his career, the earliest appear in his 1663 *Some considerations touching the vsefulnesse of experimental naturall philosophy*. Boyle describes the case of an "Eminent *Virtuoso*" physician who found that the "Mosse growing upon a Humane Skull"—in truth, a kind of mould—could

---

[126] Richard Sugg, "Medicinal Cannibalism in Early Modern Literature and Culture," *Literature Compass*, 10/11 (2013): 825-835.
[127] Sugg, *Mummies*,
[128] For more on Hartlib's centrality to the letter network or the contours and makeup of the network itself, please see Evan Bourke, "Female Involvement, Membership, and Centrality: A Social Network Analysis of the Hartlib Circle," *Literature Compass* 14, no. 4 (2017) or Howard Hotson, "Highways of Light to the Invisible College: Linking Data on Seventeenth-Century Intellectual Diasporas," *Intellectual History Review* 26, no. 1 (2016): 71-80.
[129] Sugg, "Medicinal Cannibalism," 827.

staunch bleeding merely by being held in the patients hand.[130] This is clearly an account of what George Horn, in his 1659 letter to Samuel Hartlib, called the natural magic of Paracelsian medicine; Sugg notes that Boyle repeated this story in 1685 and, once again, stressed the eminence of his sources to counter skepticism, possibly including his own, that simply holding skull moss in one's hand can stop a bleeding wound elsewhere on the body.[131] Boyle's fascination with skull moss, also called *usnea*, persisted. In 1685, he described an incident where:

> I was one Summer, to my great surprize obnoxious to frequent Bleedings at the Nose… I resolv'd to try an unusual Remedy: And having easily obtain'd of my Sister, in whose house this Accident happen'd, some true Moss of a dead Mans Scull, which had been sent her, by a great Person, for a present out of *Ireland,* in which Country, I found it less rare and more esteem'd than elsewhere… I had the curiosity to try, notwithstanding the briskness of my Haemorrhagy, whether the Medicine would produce its effect by being only held in my Hand… I found, to the wonder of the by-standers, that the Blood speedily stopp'd, nor thanks be to God have I been troubled with a Haemorrhagy for some years from that very time.[132]

As in the previous example, Boyle experiments with sympathetic cures and finds them effective through empirical study. There is also another dimension to this account: where other recipes we have seen mention that bodies are best procured from execution sites, Boyle recommends their import from Ireland, specifically, because medicinal cannibalism was more accepted there.[133] Richard Sugg points out that Boyle and his family were heavily involved in the colonization of Ireland—his father, Richard, had been the wealthiest man in Ireland and the family continued to own a great deal of land there. [134] The shipment of human skulls as a gift to Boyle's sister Katherine Jones, Viscountess Ranelagh, therefore constitutes the exploitation and commodification of a colonized population in literal and visceral terms. We have already seen in

---

[130] Robert Boyle, *Some considerations touching the vsefulnesse of experimental naturall philosophy* (Oxford: Printed by Hen. Hall, 1663): 253.
[131] Sugg, *Mummies*, 91.
[132] Robert Boyle, *Of the Reconcileableness of Specifick Medicines to the Corpuscular Philosophy* (London: Printed for Sam. Smith, 1685): 125-126.
[133] Boyle, *Of the Reconcileableness*, 125. Boyle does not say whether medicinal cannibalism was more common among the whole population in Ireland, the Irish inhabitants, or the English colonizers.
[134] Richard Sugg, "Skulls for Sale: English Conquest and Cannibal Medicines," *History Ireland* 19, no. 3 (2011): 23. Sugg also makes the claim that the skulls received by Katherine Jones likely came from the unburied bodies of Irish people who were killed or executed in the struggle against colonization. This is supported by the evidence we have already seen suggesting that the corpses of those who met with violent deaths were particularly useful in medicinal cannibalism.

Chapter 1 how cannibalism was intertwined with the English colonization of America, a process Boyle was heavily involved in as a member and eventual governor of the New England Company.[135] In New England, the alleged cannibalism of the Indigenous peoples was used to fuel English missionary condescension and colonizer violence; in this case, the skulls of colonized Irish people are shipped to the English metropole as gifts to wealthy landowners. In this way, the history of medicinal cannibalism once again connects itself with the history of Atlantic World colonialism.

Hypocrites!

Sugg, along with many other scholars of corpse medicine, clearly takes significant pleasure in revealing that many of the most renowned and best-remembered people in England (and Europe more broadly) were cannibals. However, this glee reveals one of the key problems in medicinal cannibalism research: how are we to understand this practice in light of the fact that European élites consumed cannibalistic remedies even as they perpetrated pogroms against Jews accused of consuming Christian blood and mounted violent colonizing expeditions against Indigenous peoples they claimed ate people? The hypocrisy is obvious to us and only heightened by Karen Gordon-Grube's documentation of the fact that medicinal cannibalism was practiced in North America; her contribution in this respect concerns the mid-seventeenth century physician Edward Taylor, who practiced in New England and maintained a medical dispensatory which included numerous cannibalistic remedies such as menstrual blood, urine, earwax, "*Blood drunk warm and new*," bone marrow, skull, and heart.[136]

Numerous attempts have been made to provide a rationalization for this double standard, not in order to exonerate the hypocrites but rather to recreate their thought process. It is important to note at this juncture that practitioners of medicinal cannibalism understood their activity as cannibalistic. We have already seen numerous physicians readily acknowledge the human sources of their remedies, albeit without any trace of humanization or squeamishness at their own cannibalism. Moreover, through a literature that includes both Michel de Montaigne's "Of the Cannibals" and Robert Boyle's *Occasional Reflections*, we see patients and practitioners

---

[135] Patrick J. Cesarini, "John Eliot's 'A Breif History of the Mashepog Indians,' 1666," *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 65, no. 1 (2008): 103. Boyle served as governor of the Company for the Propagation of the Gospel in New England (the New England Company) between 1662 and 1689. This position brought him into regular epistolary contact with John Eliot.

[136] Gordon-Grube, 192-194.

alike grapple with the ethical content of cannibalism, both as corpse medicine in Europe and as alleged culinary tradition abroad, before ultimately acknowledging their own double standards.[137] It therefore is valuable, not merely in analytic but in actual terms, to consider how the hypocrisy of early modern European cannibalism might be justified or resolved.

Several possibilities suggest themselves. First, there is the idea that early modern medicinal cannibals thought of their form of cannibalism as acceptable because it was for curative purposes rather than for pleasure or spiritual gain. This attempted justification draws from the idea that, for practitioners of corpse medicine, matter was not nearly as important as its effect on the patient. Thus, the argument goes, it may have been totally justifiable to consume mummified human remains for medicinal benefit but not to consume human flesh in any other circumstance, even in the highly-transformed context of Catholic communion. Still, this seems an unsatisfying response because it leaves to the side the Eucharistic overtones of some Paracelsian texts and also elides the related spiritual benefits practitioners of medicinal cannibalism claimed to experience. As Richard Sugg puts it, Paracelsian medicinal cannibalism was, effectively, a physician's attempt at "eating the soul."[138] It seems rather limited, then, to claim that the practice was justified on the grounds that its participants derived little pleasure or spiritual benefit from the medicine they consumed. In another attempt at an answer, Sugg supposes that European medicinal cannibals may have "implicitly recogni[zed]" Claude Lévi-Strauss's distinction between the 'raw' and the 'cooked,' i.e. that they understood their own version cannibalism, heavily-mediated through curing, distillation, powders, and tinctures as it was, as superior to more confronting ways of consuming human bodies.[139] In other words, European cannibals reconciled themselves only to those forms of cannibalism that required a cultural mediation, or rather some kind of scientific transformation from human flesh to curative substance. However, the popularity of fresh blood as a cure, which we have seen attested throughout this chapter, gives the lie to that supposition. In short, there appears to be no obvious path to understanding the hypocrisy of European medicinal cannibalism.

---

[137] Michel de Montaigne, "Of the Cannibals," in *The Complete Essays of Montaigne*, trans. Donald M. Frame (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1943). Robert Boyle, *Occasional Reflections Upon Several Subjects* (London: Printed by W. Wilson, 1665).
[138] Sugg, *Mummies*, 264.
[139] Sugg, "Medicinal Cannibalism," 830.

From the perspective of a historian, the crucial question is that of whether our judgement is merely retrospective or whether these early modern cannibals also recognized themselves as such? I believe that they did, that there was acknowledgement of the hypocrisy of consuming corpse medicine while encouraging and profiting off the colonization of the Americas. As early as Michel de Montaigne's "Of the Cannibals," there is a body of literature that critiques colonial violence in light of medicinal cannibalism, or vice versa. Montaigne's "Of the Cannibals" makes the point that since "physicians do not fear to use human flesh in all sorts of ways for our health, applying it either inwardly or outwardly," Europeans were in no position to judge the Indigenous peoples in what was then known as Antarctic France.[140] Moreover, Montaigne argues that these alleged American cannibals are in all likelihood more noble and praiseworthy than the European colonizers, recommending their "valor against the enemy and love for their wives" in comparison to the European practice of torturing prisoners "as we have not only read but seen within fresh memory, not among ancient enemies, but among neighbours and fellow citizens, and what is worse, on the pretext of piety and religion."[141] Ultimately, he concludes, somewhat sardonically, "truly, here are real savages by our standards, for either they must be thoroughly so, or we must be; there is an amazing difference between their character and ours."[142]

Perhaps it is somewhat startling that Robert Boyle would also write in recognition of the hypocrisy of medicinal cannibalism, given his own repeated endorsements of medicinal cannibalism. In his *Occasional Reflections Upon Several Subjects* (1665), he presents a short dialogue in which the characters reflect on how peculiar it is to consider oysters a delicacy and compare it to other customs that may appear unappealing at first glance. Specifically, Lindamor, one of the participants, brings up the many foods English people judge others for eating, naming, among others, raw flesh, carrion, and insects.[143] However Lindamor points out that English diners prize raw oysters and putrid, mouldy cheeses that are crawling with maggots as the most exquisite foods in direct contradiction of their judgements of others.[144] Lindamor, still in the midst of his monologue, turns his attention to cannibalism:

> Among the Savagest Barbarians we count the Cannabals, and as for those among them that kill men to eat them, their inhumane cruelty cannot be too much

[140] Montaigne, "Of the Cannibals," 156.
[141] Montaigne, 154-155.
[142] Ibid., 158.
[143] Boyle, *Occasional Reflections Upon Several* Subjects, 196-197.
[144] Ibid., 196-197.

> detested; but to count them so barbarous merely upon the score of feeding on man's flesh and bloud, is to forget that woman's milk, by which alone we feed our sucking Children, is, according to the received Opinion, but blanched Bloud; and that Mummy is one of the usual Medicines commended and given by our Physicians for falls and bruises, and in other cases too. And if we plead that we use not Mummy for food, but Physick, the *Indians* may easily answer, that by our way of using man's flesh, we do oftentimes but protract sickness and pain, whereas they by theirs maintain their health and vigour. And there is no reason why it should be allowable to eat Broth, for instance, in a Consumption, and be condemnable to feed upon it to maintain health.[145]

Eugenius, Lindamor's interlocutor, reacts to this short lecture with admiration. He also becomes a mouthpiece for the author of the dialogue to propose a future work of fiction, saying:

> You put me in mind of a fancy of your Friend Mr. *Boyle,* who was saying, that he had thoughts of making a short Romantick story, where the Scene should be laid in some Island of the Southern Ocean, govern'd by some such rational Laws and Customs… an Observing Native… should give an account of our Countries and manners, under feign'd Names, and frequently intimate in his Relations, (or in his Answers to Questions that should be made him) the reasons of his wondring to find our Customs so extravagant and differing from those of his Country.[146]

Lindamor, also a creation of Robert Boyle's imagination, responds, "I dislike not the project" and suggests that revealing the curiosities of custom would be beneficial to propagation of reason.[147] Boyle's recognition that we absorb custom, including the practice of medicinal cannibalism, as unthinkingly as we consume our mother's milk—which, importantly, he notes as another form of cannibalism—adds another troubling dimension to his endorsement of corpse remedies. In particular, his use of mould grown on an Irish skull is recontextualized in light of the evidence that he understood colonization as the imposition of one culture's customs onto another culture. It appears that Boyle was comfortable in the knowledge that, from a neutral position, on cultural custom is as good as any other so long as, in practice, his culture, comfort, and well-being came out on top.

Despite Boyle's recognition that different cultural practices are no more or less civilized than familiar ones, he was an active participant in processes of racialization and colonial exploitation. Likewise, John French's distillation human brains as medical preparations recalls the letter exchange between John Dury and Benjamin Worsley, discussed in Chapter 1, in which

---

[145] Ibid., 197-198.
[146] Ibid., 199-200.
[147] Ibid., 200.

distillation was explicitly linked to the potential of English plantations in the Americas and the possible origins of Indigenous peoples there.[148] Ralph Bauer links colonialism to alchemy; in the Paracelsian impulses of John French, Robert Boyle, and Samuel Hartlib, the transformative powers that shaped colonial settlement return to the metropole, possibly with new materials in tow, as in the case of Katherine Jones's shipment of skulls.[149] Robert Boyle's use of Irish skulls fits perfectly within Margo Hendricks's account of premodern racism and colonial exploitation. It contains both resource extraction and erasure; Boyle's colonizing fervour leaves behind nothing, not even Irish bones are left to stand as evidence of the violence of English plantation. In Boyle and his fellow medicinal cannibals, Maggie Kilgour's metaphor of colonialism as consumption finds a literal expression.[150]

Simultaneously, the formalized processes of medicinal cannibalism, found, for instance, in Oswald Croll's recipe for mummy, with their seasonal, celestial, nigh-Eucharistic dimensions evoke the ritual murder accusation against Jews. The combined physical and spiritual healing attributed to Paracelsian mummy was of course not religious—the strong Puritan prohibition against idolatry ensured that. However, as Karen Gordon-Grube and Louise Noble have noted, there is something powerfully salvific about medicinal cannibalism.[151] While Menasseh ben Israel had to defend Jews against the allegation that they drank the blood of children, the very people mulling over the question of Jewish readmission were themselves implicated in consuming human bodies. Moreover, the preparation of these bodies required a procedure designed to attract curative spirits much in the way that Jewish victims of the blood libel were accused of using Christian blood to placate demons or summon magical powers.[152] The terrible hypocrisy of this points towards Kilgour's wry statement that, to a cannibal, "all exchanges are reduced to the alternatives of 'eat or be eaten.'"[153] To seventeenth-century English medicinal cannibals, then, the choice seems to have been simple: they chose to eat.

---

[148] HP 26/33/4A-5B. HP 33/2/18A-19B.
[149] Ralph Bauer, *The Alchemy of Conquest: Science, Religion, and the Secrets of the New World* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2019): 11.
[150] Kilgour, 145.
[151] Gordon-Grube, 207. Noble, 3.
[152] Temkin, 132. Hsia, *The Myth of Ritual Murder*, 127.
[153] Kilgour, 18.

Conclusion

Robert Boyle's awareness of his own hypocrisy reveals how European medicinal cannibals understood the practice as the consumption of a human being. It also demonstrates that they likely recognized how this practice was not meaningfully different from what they accused Jews and Indigenous peoples of doing. And yet, remarkably, the practice persisted into the nineteenth century by some accounts.[154] This once again reveals numerous possible explanations, each of the much the same as the ones we have seen before. Instead, I would like to suggest a different resolution to the hypocrisy: the acknowledgement that it is, in fact, merely a hypocrisy, complete with all the cruelties and twists of logic that entails. In *The Invention of Race in the European Middle Ages*, Geraldine Heng notes that instances of race-making are not bound by logic, writing, "race is a structural relationship for the articulation and management of human differences, rather than a substantive content."[155] The concept of race-making is highly pertinent to discussions of the hypocrisy of medicinal cannibalism. In trying to come up with a justification for the double standard, scholars are really trying to understand what it is that allows someone like Robert Boyle to consume the bodies of colonized people while maintaining that colonial expansion, be it in Ireland, America, or elsewhere, is just. What logical mechanism must fall into place for a person to fear the cannibals in America and the child-snatching Jews, while also consuming human remains for medical benefit? The answer, quite simply, is that there is no logical mechanism. Instead, a racial hierarchy gradually developed such that Jews and Indigenous peoples were inferior to English Protestants. This process, Heng notes, is never "uniform, homogenous, constant, stable or free of contradictions or local differences."[156] As this thesis has shown, the treatment of Jews and Indigenous peoples at the hands of English Protestants differed significantly. However, the evidence bears out that both groups were clearly racialized and thus subjected to spurious allegations of cannibalism and so-called corrective violence by English Protestants who, themselves, consumed human flesh for medical benefit. This goes to show that medicinal cannibalism was justified not because of the rationale behind it, or the method of its preparation, but because it was done by the right kind of people.

---

[154] Sugg, *Mummies*, 395-399.
[155] Geraldine Heng, *The Invention of Race in the European Middle Ages* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018): 19.
[156] Heng, *The Invention of Race*, 4.

This race-making process is, as described by Margo Hendricks, animated by anti-Indigeneity and a capitalist drive to exert ownership over and exploit all available resources.[157] Hendricks explains how this logic plays out in early modernity:

> the destruction of a relationship to land, a relationship to community, and a relationship to the idea of sovereignty itself… stripping Indigenous peoples of their relationship to the means of production… their labour, and most importantly, land.[158]

Hendricks's emphasis on relationships to land, sovereignty, and labour is valuable throughout this thesis. In the seventeenth-century millenarian Christian imagination, Jews were indigenous to the Holy Land. However, the same eschatology that assigned Jews as the original and rightful inhabitants of the Holy Land also undermined those claims with a view towards the Second Coming of Christ and eventual Christian control over the entire earth. Jews were, for seventeenth-century millenarians, useful as future soldiers in the coming battles where they would destroy the forces of the Antichrist under the belief that this would fulfil Jewish interpretations of Scripture, only to then spontaneously abandon those beliefs in favour of accepting Christianity.[159] For early modern Christians, Jews had been set apart by their rejection of Jesus Christ's claim as the Messiah—some even believed that Jews had lost their status as God's chosen people, whereas others maintained that Jews were still chosen but in a disgraced state until they converted.[160] The distinction between Christians and Jews lent itself to racialization. Geraldine Heng describes Jews as "intimate aliens" in pre-expulsion England whose neighbours found ways to racialize them by accusing them of barbaric practices, such as drinking blood, and alleging that Jews differed from Christians in detectable ways, due to putrid smell or male Jewish menstruation.[161] The belief that perfidy and duplicity were Jewish racial traits survived the English expulsion of Jews in 1290 in the folk memory of Jews and through antisemitic stereotypes on the continent. Jens Åklundh describes how the application of "a curious combination of racial difference with national danger" to Jews by English Protestants posed a particular challenge in seventeenth-century readmission debates.[162]

---

[157] Margo Hendricks, "'Coloring the Past, Rewriting Our Future: RaceB4Race,' opening lecture, RaceB4Race Symposium," September 2019, The Folger Shakespeare Library, Washington, D.C. 23:31.
[158] Hendricks, "'Coloring the Past.'"
[159] Jens Åklundh, "Voices of Jewish Converts to Christianity in late Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century England," *The Seventeenth Century,* 29, no. 1 (2014): 53.
[160] Åklundh, "Voices of Jewish Converts," 53. Harris, *Foreign Bodies*, 81.
[161] Heng, 15, 35, 56.
[162] Åklundh, 56.

Jonathan Gil Harris relates this racializing process to the Paracelsian idea that disease came from without the body.[163] Where Galenists believed that illness was the product of internal imbalances, Paracelsians theorized that external pathogens were the cause of disease. This theory, according to Harris, lent itself to political metaphors and race-making.[164] Harris describes how Jewish physicians in particular became associated with poison, which in Paracelsian medicine can be both a cure and a cause of illness: "as Jews, they were regarded as a poison in the body politic; as Jewish *physicians*, they were a medicinal presence."[165] Jews who were not physicians did not even have the curative potential of their medically-educated brethren and were thus understood simply as poisonous invaders, sickening—sometimes literally—the communities in which they dwelt.[166]

At the same time, the turn towards the so-called Old Testament gave Protestant intellectuals license to take up Jewish texts for Christian ends. While the Hebrew Bible and its commentaries do not constitute a literal piece of land that can be colonized, together they form the bedrock of Jewish tradition. Christian appropriations of Jewish tradition undermined Jewish sovereignty over the Hebrew Bible and took advantage of the labour of rabbis such as Menasseh ben Israel. As we have seen in the case of John Dury, benefiting from rabbinical wisdom did not lead to increasing tolerance; instead Dury incorporated whatever he found useful about Jewish traditional teachings into his own viewpoints while still maintaining a fundamentally distrustful position towards Jews.[167] Part of the reason for this sudden reversal may be the "bifurcated figure" of the Jew, as described in Jonathan Gil Harris's *Foreign Bodies and the Body Politic*.[168] Harris observes that, in early modern England, Jews stood as both a laudable example of obedience to God's law and as "a figure for fallen Christian society."[169] The racialization of Jewish in the early modern period went unchallenged, not even upon years of friendly contact with Jews would the likes of John Dury acknowledge the inaccuracy of antisemitic stereotypes.

All of this mirrors the way Puritan New Englanders denied the complexity of Indigenous foodways and lifestyles as well as the way they appropriated territory from the Algonquian-

---

[163] Harris, 80.
[164] Ibid.
[165] Ibid., 86.
[166] Ibid. 79.
[167] John Dury, *A Case of Conscience, Whether it be lawful to admit Jews into a Christian Common-Wealth* (London: Printed for Richard Wodenothe, 1656): 8. Åkhlund, 54.
[168] Harris, 79.
[169] Ibid., 79-83.

speaking peoples of New England without adequate negotiation or compensation. As Ruth Barnes Moynihan has demonstrated, even some colonizers such as Roger Williams recognized the immoral and exploitative nature of land acquisition in New England.[170] She has also compellingly argued that documentation of this fact was deliberately suppressed by colonial leadership.[171] Missionaries such as John Eliot imposed English Protestant ways of life onto Indigenous people without recognizing the shortcomings of their approach—resulting in disease, death, and conflict for the Algonquian-speaking peoples who were subjected to this proselytism. Eliot dehumanized his flock, referring to them as indolent and childish, ignoring the sophisticated labour that had gone into the traditions he worked to destroy.[172] By inducing Nipmuc and Massachusetts converts to cut their hair, dress and eat as the English, and live monogamously in settled communities under the watchful eye of Puritan church leaders, Eliot deliberately caused a rupture between the Praying Indians and their old kin and allies.[173] Furthermore, in his complaints that the inhabitants of Natick had not yet become adept at agricultural development as the English colonizers practiced it, he failed to report that they were skilled at cultivation and had maintained shellfish and beaver populations for generations before his intervention.[174] Often there is an attempt to justify English colonialism's erasure of Indigenous ways of life: that the colonizers did not know to look to the clam flats and beaver stocks, that they cannot be blamed for not recognizing patterns of land use that were so different to their own. I reject this on the grounds that it is immaterial what the English actually saw, but rather what they wanted to see is crucial. Evidence of careful Indigenous land use surrounded them, as did informants willing to explain it; John Eliot chose to see indolence instead of conservation of both natural resources and human labour. Here again we see what Margo Hendricks was discussing in her keynote: settler-colonialism erases Indigenous reality and replaces it with coercive and exploitative systems that benefit the colonizer at the expense of Indigenous peoples.[175] The racializing process defines whose way of life deserves

---

[170] Ruth Barnes Moynihan, "The Patent and the Indians: The Problem of Jurisdiction in Seventeenth-Century New England," *American Indian Culture and Research Journal*, 2, no. 1 (1977): 8.
[171] Moynihan, "The Patent and the Indians," 8.
[172] Kristina Bross and Hilary E. Wyss (eds.), *Early Native Literacies in New England: A Documentary and Critical Anthology* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2008): 5.
[173] Bross and Wyss, *Early Native Literacies in New England*, 7.
[174] Moynihan, 14.
[175] Hendricks, "'Coloring the Past.'"

comprehension and whose does not deserve even a closer look. It reveals who can displace and who can be displaced.

Seventeenth-century English Protestants believed that they would one day come to supplant the Jews, in both text and practice, just as they were currently supplanting Indigenous people in New England. Here, Hendricks usefully intervenes again, this time alongside Patricia Parker in *Women, "Race," and Writing in the Early Modern Period*:

> "Race" as that term developed across several European languages was a highly unstable term in the early modern period, a period that saw the proliferation of rival European voyages of "discovery" as contacts with what from a Eurocentric perspective were "new" and different worlds, the drive toward imperial conquest and the subjugation of indigenous peoples… At the beginnings of this era, *raza* in Spanish, *raça* in Portuguese or "race" in French or English variously designated notions of lineage or genealogy, as in the sense of a noble (or biblical) "race and stock," even before its application in Spain to Moors and Jews or its eventual extension to paradigms of physical and phenotypical difference that would become the abscess of later discourses of racism and racial difference.[176]

The theme of overcoming difference and supplanting the Other is, as we have seen, integral to colonizing thinking. It is also integral to cannibal discourse. Maggie Kilgour's account of cannibalism reveals the impulse towards "two extremes whose meeting seems very dangerous: a desire for the most intimate possible identification with another and a desire for total autonomy and control of others who are treated there for as food."[177] To cannibalize someone is to quite literally and viscerally overcome the distinction between self and Other by digesting them that they becomes part of the self. Kilgour also notes that cannibalism is associated with a failure in communication: "people who cannot *talk* to each other *bite* each other."[178] In both New England and Old, there were plenty of attempts to speak to the alleged cannibals—be they Jews or Indigenous peoples—but there was, to put it simply, no desire to listen. Instead, whatever useful information was shared became part of English Protestant knowledge and the people behind those utterances were discarded as not Christian and, necessarily therefore, insufficiently civilized.[179] English Protestants gobbled up Menasseh's interpretation of scripture and Montezinos's account of so-called New World Jews; they used them as fuel for their expansion

---

[176] Margo Hendricks and Patricia Parker, "Introduction," in *Women, "Race," and Writing in Early Modern Europe*, eds. Margo Hendricks and Patricia Parker (London: Routledge, 1994): 1-2.
[177] Kilgour, 16.
[178] Ibid.
[179] Moynihan, 9.

in North America where they erased the Indigenous population through colonizing logic and infectious disease. Everything they appropriated was remade in their image and repurposed to their ends of proselytism, colonial expansion, and the coming of the apocalypse. This process of digestion is both anti-Indigenous and constitutive of a process of racialization that privileges settler-colonial logic and English Protestant people over the alleged cannibals, even as English Protestants consumed human flesh in corpse remedies.

In the three chapters of this thesis we have seen cannibalism as it was deployed in accusation and as it was practiced in reality. Throughout that exploration, the concept of race-making has appeared over and over again. We have seen the forging of racial hierarchies in Montezinos's garbled prayer in a Cartagena prison, in John Eliot's condescension towards the so-called "poor Indians," in the pogroms following blood libels and host desecration accusations, in the philosemite John Dury's mistrust of Jews as potential underminers of the state, and, finally, in the hypocrisy of English Protestant cannibals. In the early modern period, cannibalism was thought of as an act that pushed its actor beyond the reaches of human sociability or civilization. It is from the vantage point of that limit that we can, as Cătălin Avramescu has noted, clearly see how in-group is separated from out-group and how a society deploys its products—be they scientific, religious, mercantile, military, and so forth—to solidify those distinctions.[180] Geraldine Heng writes about the "clustered forces and technologies" that come together to forge race; in her case study of blood libel, she highlights the potential for accusations of cannibalism to become a powerful part of that process.[181]

As Lee Palmer Wandel notes, following the Reformation, the cannibal became a far more intimate figure than they had been previously:

> a cannibal no longer rested in the western hemisphere—strange, but remote. A cannibal could be born into one's own home, the person with whom one had grown up, the person to whom one had given birth.[182]

Here she describes the perspectives of Protestants looking upon their Catholic neighbours and relatives with revulsion and anxiety. However, it is difficult, in light of the work of Noble, Gordon-Grube, Dannenfeldt, Sugg, et al, not to read this line with regard to both Catholics at communion and Protestants at the apothecary. Just as easily as one's children and friends could

---

[180] Cătălin Avramescu, *An Intellectual History of Cannibalism*, trans. Alistair Ian Blyth (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009): 130-133.
[181] Heng, 27.
[182] Wandel, *The Reformation*, 138.

turn out to be Catholic, they could also avail themselves of corpse remedies during times of poor health. In this manner, the early modern landscape, across Europe and the Atlantic, was rife with cannibals: Jews, Catholics, Protestants, and Indigenous peoples all can be linked by their often spurious, sometimes credible propensity to cannibalism. The anxiety around the allegation of cannibalism was brought to bear on different groups in different ways; for instance, Interregnum English Protestants rejected the accusation that Jews drank the blood of Christian children while accepting that Indigenous peoples in the Americas did consume human flesh despite the two groups being connected via shared Judaic heritage as proposed by the lost tribes theory. This thesis examines these allegations and contrasts them with the practice of medicinal cannibalism to reveal how the eschatological and territorial aspirations of English Protestant intellectuals guided them in deciding who the real cannibals were.

Works Cited

Digital Archives

Additional Manuscripts. The British Library.
Early English Books Online. Published by ProQuest.
Early Modern Letters Online, Published by Cultures of Knowledge, Oxford University.
Ondertrouwregister. Gemeente Amsterdam Stadsarchief.
Hartlib Papers. Published by The Digital Humanities Institute, University of Sheffield.
Boyle Letters. The Royal Society.
State Papers Online. Published by Gale.
The Newton Project. Published by the Royal Society and Oxford University.

Primary Sources

Acosta, José de. *Natural and Moral History of the Indies*. Translated by Jane E. Mangan. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2002.

Bacon, Francis. *The Essays, or Councils, Civil and Moral, of Sir Francis Bacon*, third edition. London: 1696.

Ben Israel, Menasseh. *The Hope of Israel*, edited by Henry Méchoulan and Gérard Nahon. Translated by Moses Wall. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987.

Ben Israel, Menasseh. *Vindiciae Judaeorum*. London: Printed by R. D., 1656.

Ben Israel, Menasseh. *To His Highnesse the Lord Protector of the Common-wealth of England, Scotland, and Ireland. The humble addresses of Menasseh Ben Israel*. London: 1655.

Ben Israel, Menasseh. *The Hope of Israel*. Translated by Moses Wall. London: 1650.

Ben Israel, Menasseh. *Segunda Parte Del Conciliador*. Amsterdam: Nicolaus de Ravesteyn, 5041 (1642).

Bonet, Théophile. *A Guide to the Practical Physician*. London: Printed for Thomas Flesher, 1686.

Boyle, Robert. *Of the Reconcileableness of Specifick Medicines to the Corpuscular Philosophy.* London: Printed for Sam. Smith, 1685).

Boyle, Robert. *Some Physico-theological Considerations about the Possibility of the Resurrection.* London: Printed by T. N., 1675.

Boyle, Robert. *Occasional Reflections Upon Several Subjects*. London: Printed by W. Wilson, 1665.

Boyle, Robert. *Some considerations touching the vsefulnesse of experimental naturall philosophy*. Oxford: Printed by Hen. Hall, 1663.

Cartenwright, Johanna and Ebenezer Cartwright. *The Petition of the Jewes*. London: Printed for George Roberts, 1649.

Croll, Oswald. *Bazilica Chymica and Praxis Chymiatricae or Royal and Practical Chymistry 1609*. Translated by John Hartsman. London: 1670.

Culpeper, Nicholas (translator and editor). *Galen's art of physick*. London: Printed for Peter Cole, 1652.

Culpeper, Nicholas. *Culpeper's Directory for Midwives: or, A guide for Women.* London: 1651.

Culpeper, Nicholas (translator). *A Physical Directory, or a Translation of the London Dispensatory*. London: Printed for Peter Cole, 1649.

Dury, John. *A Case of Conscience, whether it be lawful to admit Jews to a Christian common-wealth* London: Printed for Richard Wodenothe, 1656.
Eliot, John. *Tears of Repentance, or A further Narrative of the Progress of the Gospel amongs the Indians In New-England*. London: Printed by Peter Cole, 1653.
Eliot, John. *The Glorious progress of the Gospel amongs the Indians in New England*. London: Printed by Hannah Allen, 1649.
French, John. *The Art of Distillation, or the Treatise of the choicest Spagyricall Preparations performed by way of Distillation*. London: Printed by Richard Cotes, 1651.
Grey, Elizabeth, Countess of Kent. *A choice manuall, or, Rare and select secrets in physick and chyrurgery*. London: Printed by G. D., 1654.
Jessey, Henry. *Narrative of the Late Proceeds at White-Hall concerning the Jews*. London: Printed for L. Chapman, 1656.
Massachusetts Bay Colony. 1629. *The Charter of the Massachusetts Bay Colony*.
Milton, John. *Paradise Lost*. London: 1667.
Montaigne, Michel de. "Of the Cannibals." In *The Complete Essays of Montaigne*. Translated by Donald M. Frame. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1943.
Newes from the Dead. Oxford: Pritned for Leonard Lichfield, 1651.
Nicholas, Edward. *An Apology for the honourable nation of the Jews, And all the Sons of Israel*. London: Printed for John Field, 1649.
Prynne, William. *A short demurrer to the Jewes long discontinued remitter into England*. London: Printed for Edward Thomas, 1656.
Sanderson, John. *The Travels of John Sanderson in the Levant (1584-1602)*, edited by William Foster. London: Printed for the Hakluyt Society, 1931.
Tentzel, Andreas. *Medicina diastatica*. Translated by Ferdinand Parkhurst. London: 1653.
Thorowgood, Thomas. *Iewes in America*. London: 1650.
Williams, Roger. *The Bloudy Tenent of Persecution of Cause of Conscience*. London: 1644.
Winslow, Edward. *The Glorious Progress of the Gospel Amongst the Indians of New England*. London: 1649.
Wood, William. *New Englands Prospect*. London: 1634.

Secondary Sources

Åklundh, Jens. "Voices of Jewish Converts to Christianity in late Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century England." In *The Seventeenth Century*, 29, no. 1 (2014): 45-71.
Arens, William. *The Man-Eating Myth: Anthropology and Anthropophagy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979.
Avramescu, Cătălin. *An Intellectual History of Cannibalism*. Translated by Alistair Ian Blyth. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009.
Bauer, Ralph. *The Alchemy of Conquest: Science, Religion, and the Secrets of the New World*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2019.
Benite, Zvi Ben-Dor. *The Ten Lost Tribes: A World History*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2009.
Bourke, Evan. "Female Involvement, Membership, and Centrality: A Social Network Analysis of the Hartlib Circle." In *Literature Compass* 14, no. 4 (2017): n.p.

Bross, Kristina and Hilary E. Wyss. *Early Native Literacies in New England: A Documentary and Critical Anthology*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2008.

Bynum, Caroline Walker. *Wonderful Blood: Theology and Practice in Late Medieval Northern Germany and Beyond*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007.

Bynum, Caroline Walker. *The Resurrection of the Body in Western Christianity, 200-1336.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1995.

Cesarini, Patrick J. "John Eliot's 'A Breif History of the Mashepog Indians,' 1666." In *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 65, no. 1 (2008): 101-134.

Cevasco, Carla. "This is My Body Communion and Cannibalism in Colonial New England and New France." In *The New England Quarterly*, 89, no. 4 (2016): 556-586.

Chaplin, Joyce E. *Subject Matter: Technology, the Body, and Science on the Anglo-American Frontier, 1500-1676*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001.

Charnock, Richard Stephen. "Cannibalism in Europe." In *Journal of the Anthropological Society of London*, 4 (1866): xxii-xxxi.

Cogley, Richard. *John Eliot's Mission to the Indians Before King Philip's War*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999.

Cogley, Richard. "'Some Other Kind of Being and Condition': The Controversy in Mid-Seventeenth Century England over the Peopling of Ancient America." In *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 68, no. 1 (2007): 35-56.

Cogley, Richard. "The Ancestry of American Indians: Thomas Thorowgood's 'Iewes in America' (1650) and 'Jews in America' (1660)." In *English Literary Renaissance*, 35, no. 2 (2005): 304-330.

Cogley, Richard. "The Fall of the Ottoman Empire and the Restoration of Israel in the 'Judeo-Centric' Strand of Puritan Millenarianism." In *Church History*, 72, no. 2 (2003): 304-332.

Crome, Andrew. *Christian Zionism and English National Identity, 1600-1850*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018.

Crome, Andrew (editor). *Prophecy and Eschatology in the Transatlantic World, 1550-1800*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016.

Crome, Andrew. "Politics and Eschatology: Reassessing the Appeal of the 'Jewish Indian' Theory in England and New England in the 1650s." In *Journal of Religious History*, 40 (2016): 326-346.

Dannenfeldt, Karl. "Egyptian Mumia: The Sixteenth Century Experience and Debate." In *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, 16, no. 2 (1985): 163-180.

Fissell, Mary. "Introduction: Women, Health, and Healing in Early Modern Europe." In *Bulletin of the History of Medicine*, 82, no. 1 (2008): 1-17.

Fumerton, Patricia. *Cultural Aesthetics: Renaissance Literature and the Practice of Social Ornament*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991.

Gordon-Grube, Karen. "Evidence of Medicinal Cannibalism in Puritan New England: 'Mummy' and Related Remedies in Edward Taylor's 'Dispensatory.'" In *Early American Literature*, 28, no. 3 (1993): 185-221.

Grafton, Anthony. *New Worlds, Ancient Texts*. Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press at Harvard University Press, 1995.

Gray, Kathryn N. "'How many wee come to serve God?': Spaces of Religious Utterance in John Eliot's *Indian Tracts*." In *The Seventeenth Century*, 24, no. 1 (2013): 74-96.

Gregerson, Linda and Susan Juster (editors). *Empires of God: Religious Encounters in the Early Modern Atlantic*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2011.

Gribben, Crawford. *The Puritan Millennium: Literature and Theology 1550-1682*. Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2000.

Guibbory, Achsah. *Christian Identity, Jews, and Israel in 17th-Century England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Harris, Jonathan Gil. *Foreign Bodies and the Body Politic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Hauptman, Laurence M. and James D. Wherry (editors). *The Pequots in Southern New England: The Rise and Fall of an American Indian Nation*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1993.

Hendricks, Margo. "'Coloring the Past, Rewriting Our Future: RaceB4Race,' opening lecture, RaceB4Race Symposium." September, 2019. The Folger Shakespeare Library, Washington D. C.

Heng, Geraldine. *The Invention of Race in the European Middle Ages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018.

Hotson, Howard. "Highways of Light to the Invisible College: Linking Data on Seventeenth-Century Intellectual Diasporas." In *Intellectual History Review* 26, no. 1 (2016): 71-80.

Hsia, R. Po-chia. *Trent 1475*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992.

Hsia, R. Po-chia. *The Myth of Ritual Murder: Jews and Magic in Reformation Germany*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1988.

Huddlestone, Lee Eldridge. *Origin of the American Indians: European Concepts, 1492-1729*. Institute of Latin American Studies. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1967.

Kaplan, Yosef, Henry Méchoulan, and Richard H. Popkin (editors). *Menasseh ben Israel and his World*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1989.

Kaplan, Yosef. "Jews and Judaism in the Hartlib Circle." In *Studia Rosenthaliana*, 38/39 (2005): 186-215.

Kilgour, Maggie. *From Communion to Cannibalism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990.

Kirby, Ethyn Williams. *William Prynne: A Study in Puritanism.* New York: Russell and Russell, 1931.

Kushner, Tony and Nadia Valman (editors). *Philosemitism, Antisemitism, and 'the Jews'*. London: Routledge, 2004.

Lavezzo, Kathy. *The Accommodated Jew: English Antisemitism from Bede to Milton.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2016.

Leong, Elaine. "Making Medicines in the Early Modern Household." In *Bulletin of the History of Medicine*, 82, no. 1. (2008): 145-168.

Matar, N. I. *Islam in Britain, 1558-1685*. Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press, 1998.

Moog, Ferdinand and Axel Karenberg. "Between Horror and Hope: Gladiator's Blood as Cure for Epileptics in Ancient Medicine." In *Journal of the History of the Neurosciences*, 12, no. 2 (2003): 137-143.

Moynihan, Ruth Barnes. “The Patent and the Indians: The Problem of Jurisdiction in Seventeenth-Century New England.” In *American Indian Culture and Research Journal*, 2, no. 1 (1977): 8-18.

Nadler, Steven. *Menasseh ben Israel: Rabbi of Amsterdam*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2018.

Noble, Louise. *Medicinal Cannibalism in Early Modern English Literature and Culture*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.

Pearce, S. J. “The Inquisitor and the Moseret: *The Invention of Race in the European Middle Ages* and the New English Colonialism in Jewish Historiography.” In *Medieval Encounters*, 26 (2020): 145-190.

Pelham, Lipika. *Jerusalem on the Amstel: The Quest for Zion in the Dutch Republic*. London: Hurst and Company, 2019.

Perelis, Ronnie. *Narratives from the Sephardic Atlantic*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2017.

Pestana, Carla Gardina. *The English Atlantic in an Age of Revolution, 1640-1661.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2004.

Powell, Lindsay. *The Bar Kokhba War AD 132-136: the last Jewish revolt against Imperial Rome.* Oxford: Osprey Publishing, 2017.

Rauschenbach, Sina. *Judentum für Christen*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2012.

Rauschenbach, Sina. “Mediating Jewish Knowledge: Menasseh Ben Israel and the Christian Respublica Litteraria.” In *The Jewish Quarterly Review*, 102, no. 4 (2012): 561-588.

Roth, Cecil. *A Life of Menasseh Ben Israel: Rabbi, Printer, and Diplomat*. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1945.

Rubin, Miri. *Gentile Tales: The Narrative Assault on Late Medieval Jews*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004.

Sanday, Peggy Reeves. *Divine Hunger*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.

Schorsch, Ismar. “From Messianism to Realpolitik: Menasseh ben Israel and the Readmission of the Jews to England.” In *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research*, 45 (1978): 187-208.

Segev, Ran. “Sephardic *Conquistadores* in the New World: Menashe ben Israel on the “Rediscovery” of the Lost Tribes.” In *Journal for Early Modern Cultural Studies*, 18, no. 4 (2018): 124-150.

Smith, Robert O. *More Desired than Our Owne Salvation: The Roots of Christian Zionism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.

Stevens, Laura M. *The Poor Indians: British Missionaries, Native Americans, and Colonial Sensibilities*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006.

Sugg, Richard. *Mummies, Cannibals, and Vampires: The History of Corpse Medicine from the Renaissance to the Victorians*, second edition. London: Routledge, 2016.

Sugg, Richard. “Medicinal Cannibalism in Early Modern Literature and Culture.” In *Literature Compass*, 10/11 (2013): 825-835.

Sugg, Richard. “Skulls for Sale: English Conquest and Cannibal Medicines.” In *History Ireland*, 19, no. 3 (2011).

Temkin, Owsei. *Galenism: Rise and Decline of a Medical Philosophy*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1973.

Teter, Magda. *Blood Libel: On the Trail of an Antisemitic Myth.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2020.

Twersky, Isadore and Bernard Septimus (editors). *Jewish Thought in the Seventeenth Century*. Cambridge: MA, Harvard University Press, 1987.

Wacks, David A. *Double Diaspora in Sephardic Literature: Jewish Cultural Production Before and After 1492*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2015.

Wandel, Lee Palmer. *The Reformation: Towards a New History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

Watson, Kelly L. *Insatiable Appetites: Imperial Encounters with Cannibals in the North Atlantic World*. New York: New York University Press, 2015.

Wear, Andrew. *Knowledge and Practice in English Medicine, 1550-1680*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Weeks, Andrew. *Paracelsus: Speculative Theory and the Crisis of the Early Reformation*. SUNY Series in Western Esoteric Tradition. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1997.

Wolf, Lucien. *Menasseh ben Israel's Mission to Oliver Cromwell.* London: Macmillan and Company, 1901.

Wolfe, Patrick. "Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native." In *Journal of Genocide Research*, 8:4 (2006): 387-409.

Young, John T. *Faith, Medical Alchemy and Natural Philosophy: Johann Moriaen, Reformed Intelligencer, and the Hartlib Circle*. Aldershot: 1998. Accessed through the Newton Project.