

POLITICAL HEBRAISM

ALSO AVAILABLE
FROM SHALEM PRESS:

Essential Essays on Judaism
Eliezer Berkovits

God, Man and History
Eliezer Berkovits

The Documentary Hypothesis
Umberto Cassuto

The Hebrew Republic
Petrus Cunaeus

*The Dawn: Political Teachings
of the Book of Esther*
Yoram Hazony

Moses as Political Leader
Aaron Wildavsky

Political Hebraism

Judaic Sources in
Early Modern Political Thought



EDITED BY
Gordon Schochet, Fania Oz-Salzberger,
and Meirav Jones

SHALEM PRESS
JERUSALEM AND NEW YORK

Copyright © 2008 by the Shalem Center

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, or otherwise, without the prior permission of the publisher, except in the case of brief quotations embodied in critical articles or reviews.

Book and cover design: Erica Halivni
Cover pictures: Copyright © VISUALPHOTOS
Geographical Map of Europe by Pietro de Cortona

Printed in Israel

ISBN 965-7052-44-0
978-965-7052-44-0

∞ The paper used in this publication meets the minimum requirements of the American National Standard for Information Sciences—Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Materials, ANSI Z39.48-1992

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	
<i>Meirav Jones</i>	vii
I. EARLY YEARS	
Political Theology in Renaissance Christian Kabbala: Petrus Galatinus and Guillaume Postel	3
<i>Wilhelm Schmidt-Biggemann</i>	
Machiavelli on Reading the Bible Judiciously	29
<i>Christopher Lynch</i>	
II. THE BIBLE AS A MODEL FOR POLITICS	
Political Hebraism and the Early Modern 'Respublica Hebraeorum': On Defining the Field	57
<i>Kalman Neuman</i>	
Some Thoughts on the Covenantal Politics of Johannes Althusius	72
<i>Alan Mittleman</i>	
Why Draw a Politics from Scripture? Bossuet and the Divine Right of Kings	90
<i>Emile Perreau-Saussine</i>	
III. THE DUTCH REPUBLIC	
"How Wondrously Moses Goes Along with the House of Orange!" Hugo Grotius' 'De Republica Emendanda' in the Context of the Dutch Revolt	107
<i>Arthur Eyffinger</i>	

The Biblical 'Jewish Republic' and the Dutch New Israel in Seventeenth-Century Dutch Thought <i>Miriam Bodian</i>	148
Spinoza's Theological-Political Problem <i>Menachem Lorberbaum</i>	167
IV. SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY ENGLAND	
Rabbinic Ideas in the Political Thought of John Selden <i>Jason Rosenblatt</i>	191
After Machiavelli and Hobbes: James Harrington's Commonwealth of Israel <i>Gary Remer</i>	207
The Political Thought of John Locke and the Significance of Political Hebraism: Then and Now <i>Fania Oz-Salzberger</i>	231
V. THE STATE OF THE FIELD	
The Judeo-Christian Tradition as Imposition: Present at the Creation? <i>Gordon Schochet</i>	259
CONTRIBUTORS	283

Introduction



Meirav Jones

1. The Question

Key political thinkers at the onset of modernity—those who formulated ideas such as national sovereignty, the modern social contract, international law, and republicanism—often extensively referred to the Hebrew Bible and later Jewish sources. Incidences of such citations have been noted by scholars of political history and early modern political thought. In the absence of a framework such as that provided in this volume, however, the scope of these uses of Hebraic sources could hardly be appreciated.

A brief survey of previously acknowledged examples reveals the following: in Holland in 1617, the chair of politics at Leiden University—later noted by Bayle as one of the greatest thinkers of his time—wrote a seminal work of political theory entitled *De Republica Hebraeorum* (On the Polity of the Hebrews).¹ In 1651 Jacob Cats opened the Great Assembly of the States of the Netherlands with the words “Ye Children of Israel,”² and in the same period the painting chosen for Holland’s senate building was Ferdinand Bol’s *Moses with the Tablets of the Law*, representing the victory of the rule of law over the rule of the church.³ Even Hugo Grotius, the Dutch scholar condemned in his time for atheism and hailed to this day as the father of modern international law, invoked the authority of “the Jews Philo and Josephus” and of Maimonides throughout his major work, *On the Laws of War and Peace*.⁴ In the same years in England, the

writings of such important thinkers as Bacon, Milton, Hobbes, Harrington, and Locke were permeated with Old Testament models and examples that often met or exceeded these authors' similar dependence on the Greco-Roman legacy.⁵ Throughout the English Civil War, sermons and parliamentary discussions were shot through with the image of Israel,⁶ and Cromwell justified his actions by analogizing himself to Old Testament figures.⁷ England's most remarkable legal thinker, John Selden, scattered hundreds of rabbinic—and mostly talmudic—references throughout his major work, *Of the Laws of Nature and of Nations According to the Teachings of the Hebrews*.⁸ The French theorist Jean Bodin was absorbed in both Testaments and included in his works scores of citations from Philo, Josephus, the Talmud, the Zohar, Rashi, Maimonides, Gersonides, the Aramaic paraphrasts (targums), David Kimhi, and Abraham ibn Ezra.⁹ In Catholic Italy, in his list of ideal founders of states, Machiavelli included Moses alongside Cyrus, Romulus, and Theseus. In Germany, radical Anabaptists transformed Münster into a quasi-Utopian city, dubbed “the New Jerusalem,”¹⁰ and in secular political thought, Althusius found the earliest application of the federalist model, which he advocated, in the federation of biblical tribes.¹¹

The conference that produced this volume, which took place in Jerusalem in August 2004, was the first-ever concentrated effort by scholars from across the globe to recover the meaning and extent of Hebraism in the politics and political thought of early modernity.

In December 2003, when the Shalem Center contemplated holding an international colloquium on political Hebraism, cautious optimism surrounded the effort. The goal would be to gather scholars from around the world who had researched or reflected on the Hebraic foundations of such works as John Selden's *De Jure Naturali et Gentium Juxta Disciplinam Hebraeorum Libri Septem* and others described above, and to explore together the various roles played by Jewish sources in early modern political thought. The target was to reach between seven and twenty scholars from different countries. When the initial call for papers produced over sixty proposals representing scholars from seven countries and from a range of fields including literature, political science, history, philosophy, Jewish studies, and more, it seemed that the subject at hand, which had received relatively little concerted scholarly attention, was waiting to be addressed.

But why had the role of Hebrew sources in the history of political thought never before been the subject of concentrated scholarly inquiry?

Perhaps the fact that the most obvious sources of early modern political Hebraism were never translated from Latin should be considered. More important, though, is probably that modern scholarship, having been shaped by the Enlightenment, tends to relegate religious texts to separate “religious” fields and is uncomfortable with their integration into “rational disciplines.” This may even explain why the texts were not translated: as part of an effort to “hide the evidence” of Hebraism in early modern political thought. One striking example of this is that many editions of Hobbes’ *Leviathan*—as early as the eighteenth century and as late as the twenty-first—contain only the first two books of the work, ignoring the third and fourth, which lean on traditional religious sources.¹² This is particularly pronounced in the State of Israel, where to date there is still no full edition of *Leviathan* in Hebrew. Rather than considering the Old Testamentism of the second half of *Leviathan* as placing Hobbes within a mode of seventeenth-century political discourse that read religious and especially Hebraic sources in a certain way, scholarship has for the most part isolated the more “religious” books of *Leviathan* from his political theory. Not only is much of the evidence for Hobbes’ reliance on Hebraic sources and images thereby lost, and his argument in *Leviathan* left incomplete, but some of his critique of the religious politics of his time is lost as well, together with aspects of his connection to Harrington, Selden, and arguably even Puritans who also relied on Hebraic models.

While *Leviathan* may have an irrefutable connection to the Old Testament, would it be correct to call the Bible as Hobbes conceived of it a “Jewish” text? Should we really consider a thinker such as Hobbes, who may not have known any Hebrew at all,¹³ a Hebraist? More than it intended to answer questions such as these, the conference that yielded the papers in this compilation sought to place them on the table and to encourage debate and discussion among scholars. The standard histories of political thought would have no such debate.¹⁴ If ancient sources of secular political ideas were to be found, they would be discovered in Greece and Rome. Religion, and certainly Christianity, contains ideas about how people are to live, but it was never intended to be the foundation of nations or sovereign states. Christianity was to overcome considerations of politics and nationality and to work, sometimes through politics, toward salvation. But did all Christians read their tradition this way? Certainly in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, in the aftermath of the Reformation, it seems not. There was a variety of readings: some read into the eschatological concept of the “new Israel” ideas that

were explicitly political, and others—without necessarily eschatological or even theological motivations—looked back to ancient Israel for a political model. Post-biblical Jewish writings shed light on Hebrew political models, as did the Hebrew language itself, which allowed firsthand access to the original text. The Reformation recovered the Hebrew Bible from the control of the church, and, just as had happened when Aristotle was recovered three centuries before, the newly available body of work served as a source of humanism for some, whereas for others it corroborated and enriched existing theological positions.

And so the question of this compilation, which was also that posed at the conference “Political Hebraism: Judaic Sources in Early Modern Political Thought,” is: What were the Hebrew language, Old Testament images, rabbinic sources, and Jewish themes doing in the political thought of early modern Europe? And it seems, as the papers in this compilation demonstrate, that there is no simple answer.

2. The Answers in this Compilation (and the Questions They Raise)

We begin with anecdotes from the earliest years of the period under consideration. The first of these papers, by Professor Wilhelm Schmidt-Biggemann of the Free University of Berlin, depicts a brand of sixteenth-century Christian political theology in which Hebrew learning and close readings and interpretations of Jewish texts were used by Christian thinkers to advance their theology and to justify employing political means to that end. This piece also illustrates the intricate relationship between Jews and Christians in the context of early modern German Hebraism and political theology: while Hebrew learning and Hebrew books were highly valued by Christians, some of whom fought to preserve the Talmud, the Kabbala, and other Jewish or quasi-Jewish books, at the same time, the attitude toward contemporary Jews was anti-Semitic. This tension was found elsewhere in Europe in this period to a greater or lesser degree. Schmidt-Biggemann’s essay stands apart from others in this compilation for its focus on a political theology where the direction of the thinkers at hand, in writing and in endorsing political action, is Christian and eschatological. The paper raises a methodological issue that lingers as the field of political Hebraism continues to be defined

and entered into: is all Hebraism associated with politics in a single period to be studied under the same banner, or should Hebraism that has a clearly defined Christian theological end somehow be separated out from Hebraism directed toward the worldly and political? Then again, are these strands of thought at all separable?

In the article that follows, Christopher Lynch identifies a strikingly different application of Hebrew sources in the political context. Machiavelli's use of the Bible is not messianic, theological, or religious at all. Rather, he reads the Bible as one of the histories, where ancient histories are held in high esteem. Hence, while in the past historians of political thought tended to ignore Machiavelli's treatment of biblical events and figures, Lynch suggests that the author both took the Bible seriously as a source of ideas and wisdom and recommended that others read it in a similarly serious and "judicious" way. The idea that a serious reading of the Bible may in a certain sense be "secular"—in this case meaning "worldly"—even in its ends, persisted into the seventeenth century, when readings of the Bible and later Hebrew and Jewish sources for political purposes took place within largely religious societies.

The next section of the book transports us to Reformation Europe. The increased accessibility of the Hebrew Bible, and the humanist political thought that still dominated the republic of letters and relied upon ancient models, facilitated the biblical text itself's being viewed as one such model and arguably the best of them. Kalman Neuman takes us into this world, looking at the genre of writing termed "the literature of the *Respublica Hebraeorum*." In this genre, which developed from the late sixteenth until the late seventeenth centuries and spread throughout Europe, antiquarians and others set out to reconstruct the constitutional history of the Hebrews by interpreting the biblical text with the increasing array of tools available to them. In their studies of the political institutions of the Hebrews, writers in this genre anticipated Hobbes, Spinoza, and later thinkers, who would draw on them.

Emile Perreau-Saussine's article on Bossuet's thought illustrates an interesting extension of—or deviation from—the predominantly Protestant tradition of reading the Bible for politics. *Politics Drawn from the Very Words of Holy Scripture* is a work by a Catholic thinker in which the Old Testament, or Hebrew Bible, very much in the spirit of *sola scriptura*, was employed to construct a political alternative to the traditional Catholic relationship between church and state. This was not an antiquarian reading but a deeply political one. What motivated Bossuet—a Catholic

bishop—to break with traditional readings of the Bible and to find in the Old Testament a polity in which church and state are a single power and pope and church seem humiliated? Ennobling the state through Hebraic imagery, Bossuet comes to far-reaching and contentious conclusions that place him comfortably within the context of early modern political thought and show him to have employed a brand of Hebraism in which one might least expect to find bishops taking part.

The Calvinist bastion of Reformation Holland and the heart of seventeenth-century England are the next sites for our analysis of political Hebraism. Although English and Dutch societies differed significantly in their attitudes toward contemporary Jewry—the Netherlands' being home to an open Jewish community that interacted with Christian society, while England prohibited Jews from entering until the late seventeenth century—both societies displayed similar respect for biblical Hebrews and Hebrew learning. A self-identification as the “new Israel” pervaded both English and Dutch national consciousness, and while this “new Israel” identity was for the most part associated with Christian eschatology and salvation theology, the image of Israel in its simplest form and other Hebraic images entered every aspect of social life, politics, and even political thought and philosophy.

By the seventeenth century, post-biblical Jewish authors had gained legitimacy in the minds of various classes of writers and thinkers and were widely read. Jews were thought to have privileged access to the biblical text due to their knowledge of Hebrew, and for some thinkers the post-biblical Jewish tradition was itself a model, with certain rabbis and institutions revered. Maimonides' *Guide*, already known to medieval Christian philosophers, appeared in new translations in this period, and numerous other accessible editions—including tractates from the Mishna and from Maimonides' code of Jewish law, the *Mishneh Torah*—found their way into the hands of scholars, theologians, and politically aware individuals seeking relevant meanings in Jewish texts.¹⁵ Sometimes these meanings were used to inform Christian theology and millenarianism, sometimes they informed political thought, and they even served as sources of political ideas with lasting import in the modern world.

On the Dutch scene, the key political players on whom new light can be shed by focusing on their Hebraism are no doubt Hugo Grotius and Petrus Cunaeus. The former is dealt with extensively though not exhaustively in Arthur Eyffinger's article in this volume, whereas the latter is more extensively treated in introductions to the English and Italian

translations of *De Republica Hebraeorum*.¹⁶ Eyffinger portrays the extent to which certain Dutch thinkers turned to Hebraic sources in search of long-term resolutions of urgent political crises, focusing on Hugo Grotius and on an aspect of his thought and works often neglected by scholars of international law, namely his intense interest in the parallel between the Hebrew and Dutch peoples, which so captured the Dutch popular imagination of his period.¹⁷ Grotius' biblical plays and political writings both attest to this interest, and Eyffinger finds Grotius' Hebraism in both these genres to be in response to pressing political issues. For Grotius, the Hebrew example was not an ancient model of antiquarian interest but a close-to-home source of viable political ideas for which there was a dire need in the United Provinces.

Miriam Bodian's article returns us to the tensions between European—in this case, Dutch—identification with the people of Israel and attitudes toward contemporary Jews. Bodian shows the way in which different Hebraisms—some of which were more humanist and political, others more Calvinist and theological—incorporated different attitudes toward Jews, the former being more tolerant, whereas the latter were less so. For the most part, the Jews of the Dutch Republic did not respond to the Hebraism of the time, but Bodian focuses on an exception: the *ex-converso* litterateur Daniel Levi de Barrios, who, in the introduction to his *Triumpho del gobierno popular* (1684), refuted some of the Hebraists' claims regarding Jewish political organization and sought to re-possess the tradition, there being no “new Israel” but only a continuation of the old or ancient Israel—the Jews.

In the context of widespread political Hebraism, Spinoza may be seen as arguing with and responding to not only a Jewish tradition but a Hebraic trend. Indeed, in his contribution, Menachem Lorberbaum identifies Spinoza's main interlocutors as Maimonides, Machiavelli, and Hobbes, all of whom are significant participants in the discursive setting presented in this volume. Moreover, Spinoza advocates a rational reading of the Bible reminiscent of Machiavelli's “judicious” reading, as expounded earlier in the volume by Lynch. In his *Theological Political Treatise*, however, Spinoza goes beyond Machiavelli and Hobbes and into political theology, as Lorberbaum terms it. Politics for Spinoza is a science learned from experience. As such, it must find a way to deal with religion, the permanent form of human response to fortune. Politics, therefore, if it is to hold, has a permanent need for political theology.

English Hebraism has been far less acknowledged than Dutch, yet the idea of England as the “new Israel” is pronounced already in John Foxe’s *Acts and Monuments (Book of Martyrs)*, first published in 1563 and in its eighth edition in 1641. More famous, perhaps, is the Hebraism of the Puritans who landed on American soil, as is the incorporation of Hebrew in emblems of American universities, in curriculums, and in the résumés of university founders.¹⁸ Our study of English political Hebraism takes us a generation earlier to the time of Hobbes, Selden, Harrington, and Locke—when the theoretical foundations of America, England, and much of the modern West were laid.

The section on England begins with an essay by Jason Rosenblatt, presented at this conference as work in progress on his book, *Renaissance England’s Chief Rabbi: John Selden*, since published by Oxford University Press. John Selden was widely acclaimed in his own time as the most learned man in seventeenth-century England, highly regarded even by Hobbes, who rarely quoted his contemporaries favorably.¹⁹ Selden’s impact on contemporary politics was considerable: he was blamed for preventing Presbyterian government in Scotland;²⁰ famous for his parliamentary orations criticizing the Puritan version of the Hebrew Bible;²¹ co-participant with Hugo Grotius in the founding debates of modern international law;²² and chosen by Cromwell to draft England’s constitution. Inseparable from Selden’s political activity, and noted as such by his allies as well as his critics, was his Hebraism. Israel’s first chief rabbi, Isaac Herzog, published an evaluation of Selden’s talmudic scholarship and concluded that while Selden largely misinterpreted the Talmud, it was astonishing that a non-talmudist—and moreover, a non-Jew—could have arrived at such insights and erudition.²³ Rosenblatt focuses on Selden’s masterpiece, *De Jure Naturali*, in which the author accepts the validity of the Noahide laws, which serve for him as universal natural law and, though found in the Talmud, date back to God’s utterance in the Bible. Selden cites dozens of rabbinic sources, including the Talmud and such *Rishonim* and *Aharonim* as Rashi, Maimonides, Radak (R. David Kimhi), Abravanel, and many others. Selden sees continuity from a pre-Israel Noahide state, where natural law presided over the Jews and all men, through the revelation at Sinai to the Jews as a people, right down to contemporary Jewry. Moreover, he sees the development of Jewish law from principles of natural law to particular *halachot* as a model that the English can and should follow in their own legislation and understanding of their common law.

Gary Remer's contribution focuses on another English Civil War thinker, James Harrington, and his *Commonwealth of Oceana*. Making the case that this work should be read in the light of Machiavelli's and Hobbes' readings of the Bible for political ideas, Remer shows where Harrington differs from both these thinkers yet participates in the same discourse and employs the same approach to the Bible and Hebrew sources. Harrington's unique and somewhat critical attitude toward the biblical Hebrews does not prevent him from drawing what he considers to be most valuable political lessons from their experiences.

Fania Oz-Salzberger, co-editor of this volume, ends the section on England with an essay on John Locke's political thought in the context of early modern European political Hebraism. This was one of the keynote lectures at the 2004 conference. Oz-Salzberger acknowledges that, for the last three decades, scholarship has taken Locke's use of biblical references quite seriously but has attributed them to his Christianity or to the fact that these served as common ground in his debates with Robert Filmer. Oz-Salzberger suggests that New Testamentism should be seen rather as theism, and highlights the fact that in Locke's *Two Treatises on Government*, neither Jesus nor Paul is mentioned, whereas Old Testament figures such as Aaron, Abel, Abimelech, Abraham, Adam, Adonizedek, Ahaz, Cain, Esau, Eve, Isaac, Ishmael, Jephthah, Moses, and others not only appear but are discussed at length. For Locke, the Bible is a historical record of a people in history—the Israelites—with a constitution and in many senses a model system of law and governance. Locke famously stated that “in the beginning all the World was America,” yet it is far less well-known that Locke's America is actually Genesis-like and that the Old Testament actually informs his ideas of natural and early society as well as the positive statements of political morality in the *Two Treatises*.

The compilation ends with a state-of-the-field analysis by coeditor Gordon Schochet, who, in an elaboration of the other conference keynote address, revisits the notion of the “Judeo-Christian” tradition said to lie at the foundation of the modern West. Schochet uses the history of political thought and autobiographical narrative to attack the notion of Judeo-Christianity. The papers in this volume, and the area of political Hebraism introduced by them, challenge this notion by pointing out that political thinkers at the onset of modernity conceived of Judaism as distinct from Christianity. They consciously borrowed and appropriated from Jewish tradition *rather than* from Christian traditions, though the latter would have been more accessible to them. “Judeo-Christianity”

would do away with this distinction and, in a single construct, distort the history of ideas. Our challenge, as we work to uncover political Hebraism and its significance, is twofold: To remain conscious of how a reader's Christianity affects his reading of Jewish sources and of the fact that learning from Jewish sources does not imply tolerating Jews or even respecting contemporary Judaism; and to re-insert the reliance upon Jewish sources and its significance for the modern West into the history of political thought.

3. The Larger Project

Each of the articles in this volume is the result of the independent research of an individual scholar. The fact that these essays, conceived by thinkers isolated from one another and from others studying Jewish sources in early modern political thought, could come together into a single coherent volume, says something for the field waiting to be born.

In retrospect, it is difficult to pinpoint the "founding moment" of political Hebraism. And yet the field has certainly been founded. It has produced a peer-reviewed quarterly journal, *Hebraic Political Studies*, as well as a subsequent conference entitled "Political Hebraism: Jewish Sources in the History of Political Thought" in December 2006, and it will go on to produce further articles, books, conferences, courses, and more.

Part of the project of political Hebraism is the defining and redefining of the field. We have no need to arrive at conclusive definitions, but we hope to continue to ask and argue about key questions: What is a Jewish source? What is Hebraic? When is something to be considered political thought? Is the shift in perspective to the Hebraic a meaningful exercise? Does the discursive context of political Hebraism add anything to our understanding, and if so, what? Does the field add to each of the disciplines from which it borrows, or does it dilute them?

As we embark on the next chapter in the story of the field of political Hebraism, we once again invite our readers to join us on what we believe will be an exciting adventure, a quest for a new old world. We do not know just what we will find there, but we are confident that it will be refreshing and important.²⁴

Notes

I would like to thank my coeditors Gordon Schochet and Fania Oz-Salzberger; my mentors and colleagues at the Shalem Center, Yoram Hazony and Ofir Haivry; and Gadi Weber for his comments on a draft of this introduction.

1. Lea Campos Boralevi, “Introduzione,” in Petrus Cunaeus, *De Republica Hebraeorum (The Commonwealth of the Hebrews)* (1617; in English, 1653) (Florence: Centro Editoriale Toscano, 1996), pp. vii–viii. See also Richard Tuck, *Philosophy and Government 1572–1651* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993). Tuck considers Cunaeus’ work to be “one of the most remarkable pieces of political theory to come out of the early-seventeenth-century United Provinces” (p. 167).

2. Simon Schama, *The Embarrassment of Riches: An Interpretation of Dutch Culture in the Golden Age* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1987), p. 100.

3. *Ibid.*, pp. 117–121.

4. See Hugo Grotius, *De Jure Belli ac Pacis; Book 1: The Translation*, trans. Francis Kelley (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925), in which the index cites Maimonides 26 times and Philo 114 (pp. 913, 917–918). The use of Maimonides and other rabbinic authors by Cunaeus and Grotius has been considered by scholars. For example, see Phyllis S. Lachs, “Hugo Grotius’ Use of Jewish Sources in On the Law of War and Peace,” *Renaissance Quarterly* 30:2 (1977), pp. 181–200; Arthur Eyffinger, “Introduction,” in Petrus Cunaeus, *The Hebrew Republic*, trans. Peter Wyetzner (Jerusalem: Shalem Press, 2007), p. lv n. 43; Aaron Katchen, *Christian Hebraists and Dutch Rabbis: Seventeenth-Century Apologetics and the Study of Maimonides’ ‘Mishneh Torah’* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1984), pp. 39–65. The employment of Philo, on the other hand, has not yet been studied. In fact, while the text refers to “the Jews Philo and Josephus” (Grotius, *De Jure Belli*, p. 450), the footnote heading is “Philo Judeaus, Greek Philosopher” (Grotius, *De Jure Belli*, p. 917). On the Hebrew sources of Dutch Republican discourse, see Eco Haitsma Mulier, “The Language of Seventeenth-Century Republicanism in the United Provinces: Dutch or European?” in Anthony Pagden, ed., *The Languages of Political Theory in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), pp. 179–195.

5. Fania Oz-Salzberger, “The Jewish Roots of the Modern Republic,” *Azure* 13 (2002), pp. 88–132 (esp. p. 103); J.G.A. Pocock, “Time, History, and Eschatology in the Thought of Thomas Hobbes,” in Pocock, *Politics, Language, and Time* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press), pp. 148–201 (esp. p. 153). It is notable that Pocock makes this point about Hobbes but not about Harrington. Cf. Mark Goldie, “The Civil Religion of James Harrington,” in Pagden, *The Languages of Political Theory*, pp. 197–222, where Harrington’s thought is labeled “Hebraic civic humanism” (p. 211).

6. Adam Sutcliffe, *Judaism and Enlightenment* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), p. 46. William Haller comments that “the life and poetry of Israel were easier to naturalize in common English life than those of Greece and Rome.” Haller, *The Rise of Puritanism* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1938), p. 133.

7. John Morrill and Philip Baker, "Oliver Cromwell, the Regicide, and the Sons of Zeruiah," in Jason Peacey, ed., *The Regicides and the Execution of Charles I* (Basingstoke, England: Palgrave, 2001).

8. See Richard Tuck, "The Ancient Law of Freedom: John Selden and the Civil War," in John Morrill, ed., *Reactions to the English Civil War 1642–1649* (Oxford: Macmillan, 1982); Jason P. Rosenblatt, *Renaissance England's Chief Rabbi: John Selden* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006). As noted later in this introduction, work in progress on Rosenblatt's book appears in this volume.

9. Frank E. Manuel, *The Broken Staff: Judaism Through Christian Eyes* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1992), pp. 55–56.

10. Similarly, Thomas Muentzer set up a covenanted community of the elect patterned after the Old Testament model. On this and on Luther's criticism of these readings of the Bible, see John M. Headley, "Luther and the Problem of Secularization," *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 55:1 (1987), pp. 21–37.

11. Daniel J. Elazar, "Althusius and Federalism as Grand Design," in Karl Engisch, H.L.A. Hart, Hans Kelsen, Ulrich Klus, and Sir Karl R. Popper, eds., *Rechtstheorie* 14:16 (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 1997).

12. See Goldie, "The Civil Religion," p. 300: "Who now reads the third and fourth books of *Leviathan*?" Goldie notes Pocock as an exception. Cf. Pocock, "Time, History, and Eschatology."

13. Fania Oz-Salzberger has claimed that Hobbes was a "dedicated Hebraist," basing this claim on the fact that "two of *Leviathan's* four books rely heavily on the ancient Israelite model." Oz-Salzberger, "The Jewish Roots," p. 97. Menachem Lorberbaum has since claimed that "Leviathan does not reflect knowledge of Hebrew." Lorberbaum, "Making Space for Leviathan," *Hebraic Political Studies* 2:1 (2007), p. 80. At the same time, it is clear that Hobbes was influenced by Selden's Hebrew scholarship. On this see Rosenblatt, *Renaissance England's Chief Rabbi*, p. 169. Standard curriculums in English schools and universities during Hobbes' period included some Hebrew, but actual programs of study varied widely. See Roger Kimball, *Orators and Philosophers: A History of the Idea of Liberal Education* (New York: Teachers' College Press, 1986), pp. 99–102.

14. For a survey of standard histories of political thought and the extent of their acknowledgment of the role of Hebraic sources in the history of ideas, see Yoram Hazony, "Judaism and the Modern State," *Azure* 21 (2005), pp. 33–51.

15. Katchen, *Christian Hebraists and Dutch Rabbis*, esp. pp. 11–13, 95.

16. See note 1, above. See also Eyffinger, "Introduction."

17. For more on the Dutch popular imagination, see Schama, *The Embarrassment of Riches*.

18. Conrad Cherry, *God's New Israel* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1998); Shalom Goldman, ed., *Hebrew and the Bible in America: The First Two Centuries* (Hanover, Mass.: University Press of New England, 1993).

19. According to Pocock, Selden's *Titles of Honor* (1614 and 1631) is almost the only contemporary work mentioned with respect in *Leviathan*. Pocock, "Time, History, and Eschatology," p. 149 n. 3. Cf. *Leviathan*, book 1, ch. 10.

20. On Baillie's attack of Selden and his Hebrew learning as preventing Presbyterian government in England, see William Haller, *Liberty and Reformation in the Puritan Revolution* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1963), p. 222.

21. One famous anecdote from Selden in the Westminster Assembly (1643) is his "perhaps in your little pocket-bibles with gilt leaves the translation may be thus, but the Greek or the Hebrew signifies thus and thus." Cited in Tuck, *Philosophy and Government*, p. 218.

22. Abraham Berkowitz, "John Selden and the Biblical Origins of the Modern International Political System," *Jewish Political Studies Review* 6:1–2 (1993), pp. 27–47.

23. Isaac Herzog, "John Selden and Jewish Law," *Journal of Comparative Legislation and International Law*, 3rd ser. 13:4 (1931), pp. 236–245.

24. This invitation first appeared in "From the Editors," *Hebraic Political Studies* 1:1 (2005).

Contributors

Miriam Bodian is a professor of Jewish history at the Graduate School for Jewish Studies of Touro College. Her first book, *Hebrews of the Portuguese Nation* (Indiana University, 1997), received both a National Jewish Book Award and the first Koret Book Award in History. Her second book, *Dying in the Law of Moses: Crypto-Jewish Martyrdom and the Iberian Inquisitions*, was published by Indiana University Press in 2007.

Arthur Eyffinger holds a Ph.D. in classics from Amsterdam University. From 1970 to 1985 he was a research fellow of the Grotius Institute of the Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences; subsequently, he became head librarian of the International Court of Justice of the UN in The Hague. Upon his retirement in 2002, he launched Judicap, a center for publications and presentations in the domains of international law and peace studies. Dr. Eyffinger is a cofounder of the Grotiana Foundation and has published extensively on the life and works of Hugo Grotius, on seventeenth-century Dutch issues, and on the history of internationalism and the international courts in The Hague. He is the editor of *The Hebrew Republic* by Petrus Cunaeus (Shalem Press, 2006) and coeditor of *Hebraic Political Studies*. His current projects include a biography of the Russian internationalist F.F. Martens and an edition of Latin poetry by Hugo Grotius on behalf of the Huygens Institute in The Hague.

Meirav Jones is an associate fellow in the Institute for Philosophy, Politics, and Religion, and directs the Shalem Center's Project on Jewish Ideas in the West. She is also associate editor of *Hebraic Political Studies*. In August 2004, Jones organized Shalem's first international academic conference, entitled "Political Hebraism: Judaic Sources in Early Modern Political Thought." In December 2006 she ran an additional conference exploring political Hebraism from biblical times to the present, which was attended by over 100 scholars and graduate students from 10 countries. Jones holds a B.A. in political science and philosophy and an M.A. in political science from the Hebrew University of Jerusalem. She is writing a doctoral dissertation on "The Image of Israel and the Development of Political Ideas in England, 1640–1660."

Menachem Lorberbaum is chair of the department of Hebrew culture studies at Tel Aviv University and a research associate at the Shalom Hartman Institute in Jerusalem. He is the author of *Politics and the Limits of Law: Secularizing the Political in Medieval Jewish Thought* (Stanford, 2001), and coeditor with Michael Walzer and Noam Zohar of *The Jewish Political Tradition*, vol. 1, *Authority* (Yale University Press, 2000), and vol. 2, *Membership* (Yale University Press, 2003).

Christopher Lynch is program director of Great Ideas: Intellectual Foundations of the West and professor of political science at Carthage College. His first book, a translation of Machiavelli's *Art of War* with an introduction, notes, and commentary, was published by the University of Chicago Press in 2003, and he is currently writing a book on war in the works of Machiavelli.

Alan Mittleman is the director of the Louis Finkelstein Institute for Religious and Social Studies and a professor of Jewish philosophy at the Jewish Theological Seminary. He is the author of three books: *Between Kant and Kabbalah* (SUNY Press, 1990); *The Politics of Torah* (SUNY Press, 1996); and *The Scepter Shall Not Depart from Judah* (Rowman & Littlefield, 2000). He is also the editor of *Jewish Polity and American Civil Society* (Rowman & Littlefield, 2002); *Jews and the American Public Square* (Rowman & Littlefield, 2002); and *Religion as a Public Good* (Rowman & Littlefield, 2003). His many articles, essays, and reviews have appeared in such journals as *Harvard Theological Review*, *Modern Judaism*, *The Jewish*

Political Studies Review, *The Journal of Religion*, *First Things*, and *The Notre Dame Journal of Law, Ethics and Public Policy*. He is a contributor to *The Cambridge Companion to American Judaism* and is writing a book on politics and hope under contract with Oxford University Press.

Kalman Neuman holds a Ph.D. in history from the Hebrew University of Jerusalem. His dissertation, written under the supervision of Professor Michael Heyd, was on “The Literature of the *Respublica Hebraeorum*: Depictions of the Ancient Israelite State in Early Modern Europe.” He is an ordained rabbi and an alumnus of the Mandel Jerusalem Fellows program. In addition to early modern political Hebraism, his interests include questions of philosophy of halacha as well as the religious Zionist application of halacha to contemporary political questions.

Fania Oz-Salzberger is a senior lecturer in history at the University of Haifa and the director of its Posen Research Forum for Jewish European and Israeli Political Thought at the Faculty of Law. Professor Oz-Salzberger is Leon Liberman Chair of Modern Israel Studies at Monash University in Melbourne. Her books include *Translating the Enlightenment: Scottish Civic Discourse in Eighteenth-Century Germany* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995) and *Israelis in Berlin* (Jerusalem: Keter, 2001 [Hebrew]; Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 2001 [German]). She recently coedited, with Eveline Goodman-Thau, *Das jüdische Erbe Europas* (German and English, Berlin: Philo, 2005). Professor Oz-Salzberger has published essays on the Scottish and the German Enlightenments, on the history of political thought, and on the role of history in current Israeli-European Relations.

Emile Perreau-Saussine received his *diplôme* (B.A.) from L’Institut d’Études Politiques in Paris, and then studied for his Ph.D. at L’École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales (Centre Raymond Aron), spending time as a visiting scholar at King’s College, Cambridge, and as an Olin Fellow at the University of Chicago (Committee on Social Thought). Since 2001, he has been a fellow of Fitzwilliam College, lecturing at the University of Cambridge on the history of political thought. His two latest articles—the first on Raymond Aron and Carl von Clausewitz, the second on liberals and revolutions—were published in *Commentaire*. His first book, *Alasdair MacIntyre, une biographie intellectuelle. Introduction*

aux critiques contemporaines du libéralisme, with a foreword by Pierre Manent, was published in September 2005 by Presses Universitaires de France.

Gary Remer is an associate professor of political science at Tulane University and was a visiting scholar at the Center for American Politics and Citizenship at the University of Maryland in the fall of 2005. He is the author of *Humanism and the Rhetoric of Toleration* (Pennsylvania State University Press, 1996) and coeditor of *Talking Democracy: Historical Perspectives on Rhetoric and Democracy* (Pennsylvania State University Press, 2004). He has published numerous articles in journals such as *Political Theory*, *History of Political Thought*, *Journal of Political Philosophy*, *Review of Politics*, and *Polity*.

Jason Rosenblatt is a professor of English at Georgetown University. He has also taught at Brown University, the University of Pennsylvania, and Swarthmore College. His publications include *Torah and Law in 'Paradise Lost'* (Princeton, 1994); *Renaissance England's Chief Rabbi: John Selden* (Oxford, 2006); and, as coeditor, *"Not in Heaven": Coherence and Complexity in Biblical Narrative* (Indiana University Press, 1991). He is preparing a critical edition of *Milton's Selected Poetry and Prose* for W.W. Norton. Professor Rosenblatt's awards include fellowships from the John Simon Guggenheim Foundation, the Folger Shakespeare Library, and the National Endowment for the Humanities. He is a past president of the Milton Society of America (1999) and recipient of its Hanford Award (1989).

Wilhelm Schmidt-Biggemann is a professor at the Institute for Philosophy of the Free University of Berlin, and a founding member of the International Society for Intellectual History. His many publications include *Topica universalis* (Meiner, 1983); *Theodizee und Tatsachen* (Suhrkamp, 1988); *Geschichte als absoluter Begriff* (Suhrkamp, 1991); *Blaise Pascal* (C.H. Beck, 1999); *Sinn-Welten, Welten-Sinn* (Suhrkamp, 1992); *Philosophia perennis* (Suhrkamp 1998; English version, Kluever/Springer, 2004); and *Politische Theologie der Gegenaufklärung* (Akademie-Verlag, 2004).

Gordon Schochet is a professor of political science at Rutgers University and a founder and codirector of the Center for the History of British

Political Thought at the Folger Shakespeare Library. He is the author of *Patriarchalism in Political Thought* (Blackwell, 1975; 2nd ed., 1988), *Rights in Contexts* (forthcoming), *From Reformation to Revolution: Western Political Thought in the Early Modern Period* (forthcoming), and numerous articles on political philosophy and its history and is coeditor of *Hebraic Political Studies*. His current research and writing deals with the political thought of Hobbes, Locke, Filmer, and Mandeville, politics and patriarchy, religious liberty, Western concepts of conscience, and Hebraism in early modern political and legal philosophy.

