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The *Pisgah-Sight of Palestine*¹ is not much read these days because of the decline of Thomas Fuller's literary reputation from the heights on which it stood in Coleridge's day. But Miltonists have cause to notice from time to time the genial, large-minded, learned, witty, and prolific Thomas Fuller, divine and man of letters, who was Milton's exact contemporary and a student at Cambridge during Milton's years there, who as a young curate buried Hobson the university carrier, and who in 1642 was one of the earliest writers to allude (disapprovingly) to Milton's first pamphlet, *Of Reformation*. The Miltonist may be led to the *Pisgah-Sight* in particular by annotations to *Paradise Lost*, which point to Fuller's book as a contemporary authority for biblical topography and especially for the appearances, habits, and haunts of those Canaanite idols who seduced the Israelites from their allegiance to the true God. Merritt Hughes, in his edition of the poem, included two of the maps from the *Pisgah-Sight* to make the point that for Milton's readers the names of these gods were matched with places "familiar in geography and terrible in history."

But it turns out that Fuller himself is not enamored of the topic of the Canaanite gods. In the *Pisgah-Sight* he gives the necessary information, happily admitting that he has left out many more obscure deities and referring the reader who wants more to Selden's *De Deis Syris* as the eminent authority in the field: "For never was Rebecca more weary of conversing with the daughters of Heth, then we of describing these heathen Gods. Enough therefore of nothing, for so all idols are termed by

¹ Thomas Fuller, *A Pisgah-Sight of Palestine and the Confines Thereof, with the History of the Old and New Testament Acted Thereon* (London, 1650). It had been entered in Stationer's Hall nearly a year before (Apr. 15, 1649), as "a booke called a Choragraphicall Comment on the History of the Bible, or the description of Judaea, by Thomas Fuller, B.D." Since there is more than one series of pages in the volume, it will be cited by book and page, usually by parenthetical references in the text. I am grateful to the Folger Shakespeare Library for the research fellowship that enabled me to write this article.
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the Apostle" (IV, 137). Or again, "seeing long since the service of the true God hath confuted and confounded all worship of false Idols, I list not to trade in the curiosities of distinctions betwixt them" (II, 64). For the rest of his subject, however, Fuller has no such reservation on the score of obsolescence but lays out vast information with unflagging enthusiasm, apparently convinced that while the historical events and geographical localities he describes may appear remote, they have something to do with the present era of the Gospel and with England in the middle of the seventeenth century.

The essay that follows, then, is an endeavor to place the Pisgah-Sight in relation to its own time and particularly to the issues of church and state which occupied Fuller no less than Milton in those tumultuous decades. Fuller's views command attention not only because they come from an intelligent and well-stocked mind but because they represent a position that is apt to be neglected. Recent scholarship on the period has concentrated, understandably, on the parties that contributed to the Revolution—Puritans of various dyes, Independents, Levellers, and "saints"—often setting them against their polar opposites, the believers in the divine rights of bishops and kings. Such a procedure, playing off the two extremes, overlooks the position of the majority who adhered to neither, but were moderates in matters of church and state, and whose qualified support of Cromwell explains much about the character of the Commonwealth and Protectorate. Fuller was a leader of the moderates in the Commonwealth church and in the negotiations for the Restoration, his influence secured by a remarkable range of contacts in society, by his sermons, distinguished equally for their topicality and restraint, and by an impressive series of books. Much in demand with the reading public, these were at once scholarly, exemplary in their moral attitudes, and graceful in style.

Like his political views, Fuller's prose is an expression of moderation. In a time of diverse and hostile opinions, it is calculated to appeal to the common ground, to find a formula for truth wide enough to accommodate various partial truths, to make distinctions without giving gratuitous offense, and to disarm ill-will by reasonableness and particularly by humor. Fuller's witticisms were a favorite choice for nineteenth-century anthologies, but have more point in their original context, where "humor" (in the sense of puns and sallies) serves to indicate a good "humor" or temperament or intellectual balance, and thus a writer who can be not only enjoyed but also trusted when other minds of the age have been drawn off into zeal, despair, and other humorless states.

Among his books, the Pisgah-Sight of Palestine (1650) turns out to be particularly interesting for its unexpected contribution to the discussion of the restoration of the Jews, a matter which was to become a cause
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célèbre of the Cromwellian government. One is apt to assume that those who worked for the readmission of the Jews to England in the 1650's were motivated either by religious zeal, which desired the fulfillment of one of the essential conditions of the Millennium; or (in the case of more mercenary minds) by a desire to draw off from the Netherlands some of the benefit of Jewish commercial experience and contacts. But Fuller also gave his support to the readmission of the Jews; the terms of that support were clearly implied at the end of the *Pisgah-Sight*, published five years before Manasseh ben Israel came to London. Neither millenarian nor mercenary, Fuller's discussion is likely to have appealed to the wider religious community, which did indeed eventually accept the readmission of the Jews when millenarianism was long since discredited.

Since there is no notice at the beginning of the *Pisgah-Sight*, or even further into the book, that the subject of the present-day Jews is to be a significant part of his topic, one can surmise that Fuller came to his new views on the subject in the very course of writing the book—perhaps even at the end, when most of the sheets were already in the printer's hands. And while these views are novel in their time and may have surprised even Fuller himself, they follow logically enough from the stand that he has taken on the major issues of church and state—a stand reflected in the *Pisgah-Sight* in his treatment of church and state in ancient Israel. It is necessary, then, to turn to the book itself and to establish the place that it occupies in Fuller's own development.

*A Pisgah-Sight of Palestine and the Confines Thereof, with the History of the Old and New Testament Acted Thereon* is a large and opulent folio, containing nearly six hundred pages of elegant print and numerous engraved plates. In format it follows pretty closely the *Theatrum Terrae Sanctae* of Adrichomius (1590), the standard work on the subject, with chorographical descriptions of the land of Canaan, the sites being identified by the biblical events that occurred there. (Both Fuller and Adrichomius draw their information not only from the Bible itself but from Josephus and the Early Fathers, from more modern authorities such as Bochart and Villalpandus, and from the accounts of recent travelers.) Fuller's book, however, offers a narrative as engaging as it is informative and far outdoes Adrichomius in the matter of illustration, with twenty-seven foldout maps and designs covering the territories of all the tribes of Israel together with surrounding areas, such as the wilderness of Paran. In addition to Jerusalem itself, they show the ground plan, elevations, and furniture of the Temple, the tabernacle, the clothes and ornaments.

---

3 Christianus Adrichomius [Christiaan van Adrichem], *Theatrum Terrae Sanctae et Bibliinarum Historiarum* (Cologne, 1590). The middle section of the book, "Descripicio Urbis Hierosolymitanae," published as a separate work, was translated into English as *A Briefe Description of Hierusalem and of the Suburbs Thereof, as It Florished in the Time of Christ*, tr. Thomas Tymme (London, 1595).
of the Jews, and the celebrated "Pantheon sive Idola Judeorum." The reader is constantly reminded of the expense and superiority of the production by the presence on each engraving of the name and coat of arms of the subscriber.

Furnished with these attractions, the Pisgah-Sight made its way with the reading public, and a second edition was required in 1662. In the Appeal of Injured Innocence (1659), Fuller noted complacently that the book had "met with general reception, likely to live when I am dead; so that friends of quality solicit me, to teach it the Latine-Language."  

Yet the publication of the Pisgah-Sight in 1650 had been in a sense a diversion in his literary career. For some time he had been collecting the voluminous biographical and historical materials that were to result in the History of the Worthies of England (1662) and the long-promised Church-History of Britain (1655), but these projects had suffered in the disruptions of the Civil Wars. Even now, as he finished the Pisgah-Sight at Waltham Abbey, "True it is we have no Wars at this instant, yet we have Rumours of wars; and though the former onely doth destroy, the latter also doth distract." He has not abrogated his promise of the Ecclesiastical History, he says, only postponed it, hoping for quieter times. Meanwhile, will the reader be pleased to accept "a book of a far different kind," a Leah for a Rachael (I, "To the Reader"). It might be assumed from this that the Pisgah-Sight is being presented as a recreation, an escape from the political crises of the day which the Ecclesiastical History must necessarily confront. Yet when attacked by Heylyn, the "Animad-vertor" on the Church-History, Fuller was quick to defend the pertinence of the Pisgah-Sight: "though I confess it be no part of Church-Building, yet it is the clearing of the floore or Foundation thereof, by presenting the performances of Christ and his Apostles in Palestine."  

Leah, after all, was Rachael's sister, and for Jacob an instalment on her in the marriage contract.

It is in the present instance useful to pick out of the Pisgah-Sight those passages which make explicit the range and consistency of Fuller's views on contemporary issues; but one does so with regret, since in the book itself much of their forcefulness lies in their having been cleverly concealed as if in ambush, springing up to capture the mind of the reader when he has been waylaid by Fuller's lively account of the doings of the ancient Israelites and by his intriguing maps, lists, and conjectures. Nevertheless, there are such explicit passages; Fuller in 1650 can even find a way to express his loyalty to the house of Stuart by dedicating his book to young Esme Stuart, then an infant, the one member of the house

---


5 Appeal, Pt. I, p. 25.
to whom dedication of a book could not be construed as treasonable: “Though you cannot by your Power, yet you may by your Innocence be an excellent Patron to protect our ensuing Work” (I, “Epistle Dedicatory”). He shows the misgivings of Caroline churchmen over a hundred years of church plundering in the name of Reformation, when he makes a wry comment on the defilement and destruction of the vessels of the First Temple: “Indeed some hold, that under the Gospell the sin of sacriledge cannot be committed. If so, it is either because nothing under the Gospell hath been given to Gods service; or, because God hath solemnly disclaimed the acceptance of any such donations; which, when and where it was done, will be hardly produced. If this their position be true, . . . we may silently smile, to see how Satan is defeated, having quite lost one of his ancient baitez” (III, 403-404).

The undisclosed fate of the Levitical (or, as one might read, clerical) holdings in Israel, the cities with their “glebe land,” causes him to speculate, in view of English experience under the Tudors, whether the blame for sequestration should be attached to greedy king, greedy gentry, or both: “Whether Jeroboam himself seised on them, converting them into demeans of his Crown, or whether he suffered them to revert to those respective Tribes, from whom they were taken: so fastning his subjects affections unto him with nailes of gold of their own profit. Either course may be conceived a cause to hasten the captivity of the people; it being just that those, who swallow Gods morsels, should be spewed out of their own possessions” (II, 57). He can get in a few thrusts at the prevailing fashions of zeal: we are to notice that he has refrained from calling the country in which “our Saviours Passion was acted” the Holy Land (“lest whilst I call the Land holy, this Age count me superstitious”), and has fallen in with the current preference for “Palestine,” a name taken ironically enough from the Philistines (I, 4). And while the Canaanite idols, long superseded, do not interest him, there is still a point to be made about idolatry in this present age of antinomianism, for “Idolatry may sprout out of the detestation thereof; when men (like Jehu rooting out Baal, and erecting his own opinion of merit therein) shall detest, damn, and destroy all images, and worship their own imaginations (IV, 138).

But, beyond any question of party, it is Fuller’s contention that in the very process of polarization between two extremist groups, Laudians and sectaries, each determined to vindicate Christianity at the other’s expense, Christianity itself has been lost sight of. The Laudians had been fond of threatening excommunication for those who disagreed with their style of ritual; more recently, the saints of the New Model Army had been proving their zeal in the manner of Joshua, by slaughtering Canaanites to the glory of the Lord; but Christianity, to Fuller’s mind, presented to
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each the challenge of recognizing that those whom they fought were neither heretics nor Canaanites but fellow Englishmen and Christians. Though the Israelites in the days of Joshua may have been under a divine injunction to wage war and root out the Canaanites from the land, Fuller is anxious to limit the scope of that injunction to what he calls the "lesser," as distinct from the "greater" Canaan. True, where God commands destruction of the Canaanites, destroy them one must, "but first let us be sure that God commands us to destroy."6 Direct commands from God were harder to prove in these later centuries and Canaanites harder to find in England, where all were one people. A timely and congenial moral, then, is provided by the story of the altar Ed, also in the Book of Joshua. Like the two parties in the English Civil War, contending the merits of altar as against communion table, two sections of the tribe of Reuben had charged each other with idolatry in connection with the altar. "But when the matter came to be disputed in the military way, the controversie was ended by the right stating of the question, and a seasonable distinction well applied, that it was an Altar onely of memorall, and not for any burnt meat or Peace-offering. O that all differences between brethren might winde off, in so welcome a conclusion!" (II, 60).

Incidental comments apart, the very plan of Fuller's book, covering the historical and geographical Israel, implies a certain political orientation, as Fuller himself is aware. In his opening chapter he handles, among other objections to his enterprise, the charge that it "is altogether uselesse, and may be somewhat superstitious." There are those who say that "describing this Countrey is but disturbing it, it being better to let it sleep quietly, intombed in its owne ashes. The rather, because the New Jerusalem is now daily expected to come down, and these corporall (not to say carnall) studies of this terestriall Canaan, begin to grow out of fashion, with the more knowing sort of Christians." One might expect Fuller is about to argue that the historical has a subsidiary usefulness in the apprehension of the mystical. "Though these studies are not essentiall to salvation, yet they are ornamentall, to accomplish men with knowledge," he begins—and then turns the argument into a tautology—"con- tributing much to the true understanding of the History of the Bible." Thus he ends, as he began, in history (I, 3).

Fuller, the intellectual, is offended by the brash ignorance of the antinomians in their assumption that the historical condition has been abro-
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gated (that the literal Palestine is "dead"), just as, in his capacity as moralist and casuist, he is offended by their stance that the moral law is no longer in force. (While they would charge his own subject with superstition, a "sinne always detestable to God, but now adayes grown odious to man, . . . well it were if the edge of their Zeal were equally whetted against Profanenesse": I, 3.) And, as the antinomian uses the mystical New Jerusalem of Ezekiel or the Book of Revelation as his model for the reformation of the English church in the middle of the seventeenth century, so Fuller will counter that "absurd, and dangerous mistake" by providing the model of the literal and historical Jerusalem which, so far from being dead, continues to define the achievements and limitations of the human condition in time.

What Fuller, in his exasperation with the antinomians, had come to think of the mystical sense is evident later from his rough handling of "Ezekiel, his Visionary Land of Canaan." "Perusing the nine last Chapters of Ezekiel's prophesie (invited thereunto with the mention of many places in Palestine) whilst I hoped to find, or feel a Solid body, I onely grasped the flitting aire, or rather a meer spirit; I mean in stead of a literal sense I found the Canaan by him described no Geography, but Ouranography, no earthly truth, but mysticall prediction." So far from treating the historical sense as the handmaid of the mystical, Fuller is complaining of the mystical that it is useless to the historical: Ezekiel's arrangement of the tribes is altogether misleading, and his miraculous unfading fruits bear no resemblance to the actual vegetation of the country, as Fuller can affirm from his research! Moreover, the City of Jerusalem,

as presented by the Prophet, was fairer, finer, slicker, smoother, more exact, more uniforme then any fabrick the earth afforded. This Triumphant Jerusalem (as I may term it) was a compleate square of four thousand five hundred reeds, with a just jury of gates, three on each side, according to the names of the twelve Tribes, with most regular suburbs, reaching two hundred and fifty reeds every way, so terse, so trim, that not an house started out of its due proportion. Whereas the literal Jerusalem [was] built by parcels at severall times, on abrupt precipices, ranged about with the wals rather for strength, then beauty, being on the East and South suburbless, and without such correspondency, either in the number, or position of the gates thereof.

Since it is clear that the only Jerusalem Ezekiel can tell of is a celestial one, "high time . . . to leave the measuring of this vision, and survey the dimensions of our own Graves" (V, 189-191).

Fuller's distrust—not to say, adamant incomprehension—of mystical sense is part of his strength as a historian, for this confusion between the
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PLAN OF JERUSALEM, FROM ADRICHOMIUS' THEATRUM TERRAE SANCTAE (1590). THIS ILLUSTRATION AND THE ONE ON THE FACING PAGE ARE REPRODUCED BY PERMISSION OF THE FOLGER SHAKESPEARE LIBRARY, WASHINGTON, D.C.
PLAN OF JERUSALEM, FROM FULLER'S PISGAH-SIGHT OF PALESTINE (1650)
geographical and the "ouranographical" Jerusalem he must have detected not only in the antinomians of his time (and in the prophet Ezekiel) but also in the historians themselves. His downright description of the literal Jerusalem with its irregular growth over irregular terrain explains why, for instance, he had discarded in his own map any vestige of the symmetrical design of Adrichomius, and it contrasts markedly with Adrichomius' own description of the city, which had shown too much susceptibility to the traditional idealization and to the hyperbole of the Psalms: "Jerusalem, the elect Cittie of God, holy and glorious, built upon the holy mountaines, . . . was situated in the midst of the whole world, and of Judaea, as it were the very center and heart of the earth . . . A cittie of perfect beautie: the virgin of the worlde, the paragon of all the Easte, and the joye and rejoicing of the whole earth." Such perfection belongs to the city's being "a figure not only of every faithfull mans soule, but also of the elect Church of Christ militant upon earth, and of that blessed triumphant Church in heaven" (my italics). If, from Fuller's point of view, the error of the antinomians was to abrogate the present, terrestrial, imperfect church under the illusion that it had been replaced here and now by the celestial and triumphant church, the likely error of the Romanist—Adrichomius had been an Augustinian prior—was to assume that the perfection of the celestial church belonged also to the terrestrial. Fuller, maintaining against both positions the distinction between earth and heaven, is committed in this life to an imperfect church, which must constantly strive for reform but can never claim to have achieved, or even to be about to achieve, perfection.

Such an inference is borne out by examination of the celebrated Sermon of Reformation which Fuller had preached in London in July of 1643. In the sermon he had laid out once and for all, for the benefit of extremists on both sides, Laudians and "Anabaptists," what he considered to be the only firm basis for a national reformation. Thereby he had burned his bridges behind him and rendered himself suspect to those on both sides. Shortly after, he had been obliged to leave the city (where his benefice was sequestered), and at the court at Oxford found that he was given the cold shoulder.

But the sermon had come directly to the point—that Reformation was not, in this temporal dispensation, a once-and-for-all affair. In the absolute sense there had been a Reformation when Christianity superseded the dispensations of paganism and Judaism, but the absolute reformation

7 A Briefe Description of Hierusalem, pp. 1-2.
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of Christianity itself was not to be expected short of the world to come. Meanwhile, there was always room for amendment, purification, and repair—for such reformation "whereof we are capable, \textit{pro statu vi\ae\torum}, made with all due and Christian moderation."\textsuperscript{9} For the situation of the 1640's the particular relevance of the historical Jerusalem was that it was a city built once by David, thereafter rebuilt, reformed by Nehemiah; as the Temple, built once by Solomon, was rebuilt by Zerubbabel. Those born in the later times need, like Nehemiah and Zerubbabel, the grace to recognize the essential shape and nature of the historical institution they inherit, if they would be called reformers.

There were, Fuller had said in the sermon, certain sectarian "Reformers" who, disregarding the existence of a church in England "built long since therein, time out of mind," were "ambitious to entitle themselves to be founders, as covetous of credit, and counting it more honour to make a thing then mend it." If the papist dishonored the British church by assuming that it owed its existence solely to Augustine's mission and because of that must remain forever in childish obedience to Rome, how much more dishonor was done by the Protestants of the new style who, by their "pens and preachings . . . make their addresses unto us, as unto pure Pagans where the word is newly to be planted."\textsuperscript{10} One can at least plead for an "honourable reservation" (which is not to say an uncritical devotion) to the Fathers and to the "memories of our first Reformers. Reverend Cranmer, Learned Ridley, Downright Lattimer, Zealous Bradford, Pious Philpot, patient Hooper, men that had their failings, but worthy in their Generations: These bare the heat of the day, indeed, which were burnt to ashes; and though we may write a fairer hand then they, yet they affixed a firmer Seal, that dyed for their Doctrine."\textsuperscript{11}

Among those of the present day who failed to render such honorable reservation, Fuller may have had in mind particularly the author of the pamphlet \textit{Of Reformation}, whom, in the previous year, he had reproved for a lack of charity on this score. In \textit{The Holy State and the Profane State} (1642), Fuller had protested in his "Life of Bishop Ridley," against the slander to which the bishop-martyrs were nowadays subjected: "For some who have an excellent facultie in uncharitable Synecdoches, [do] condemn a life for an action, & taking advantage of some faults in them do much condemn them. And one lately hath traduced them with such language, as neither beseemed his parts (whosoever he was) that spoke it, nor their piety of whom it was spoken. If pious Latimer, whose bluntnesse was incapable of flattery, had his simplicity abused with false informa-

\textsuperscript{9} \textit{Sermons}, I, 302.

\textsuperscript{10} Ibid., I, 308.

\textsuperscript{11} Ibid., I, 307.
tions, he is called another Doctour Shaw, to divulge in his Sermon forged accusations. Cranmer and Ridley for some failing styled, the common stales to countenance with their prostituted gravities every politick fetch which was then on foot, as oft as the potent Statists pleased to employ them." If in 1642 Fuller was concerned that in their intellectual arrogance the new radicals were not only failing in Christian charity and discretion ("spoiling the Wheat for the Tares' sake") but also missing the point of the Acts and Monuments tradition and the English Reformation, he can hardly have been reassured in the years that followed. Nor, watching the career of John Milton, would he have been impressed by the fact that strident polemic against the bishop-martyrs had been succeeded by strident polemic for the regicide.

It is instructive to note how Fuller's adherence to an unsymmetrical Jerusalem, an imperfect church, and reformation "with all due and Christian moderation" had been tested in the intervening years when he had served as chaplain in the royalist army commanded by Hopton. In 1646, preaching in Exeter just before that city's capitulation to the parliamentary forces, he delivered his sermon "Feare of Losing the Old Light" on a text from Revelation ii.5: "And will remove thy Candlestick out of his place except thou repent." That God should remove his candlestick meant nothing less, as he explained, than the withdrawal of the benefit of the Gospel, and it was significant that the warning had been addressed to the Angel of the Church of Ephesus, the best of all the seven churches. The prophecy had certainly been fulfilled, since Ephesus, then the shining light of the church, had since grown "notoriously erronious in doctrine and vicious in manners" until, in its present miserable condition, "the Alchoran hath banished the Bible." The "application" of course was to England herself, favored by the Gospel as much as Ephesus, and equal to Ephesus in her sins, especially those "which have caused this war, and which this war hath caused." "I shew the danger likely to cease [seize] on us, if not providently diverted by speedy repentance. Plainly tis this: I feare we shall be like Ephesus in future punishment, and that the candlestick will be removed out of his place."  

Plainly, also, the analogy pointed to the prospect of despair when Fuller's worst fears were realized—when instead of a general and speedy repentance, the return of peace, and the restoration of the bishops, the liturgy, and other concomitants of the old light, there were only the triumph of the New Model Army and the political ascendency of the Independents, leading to the regicide and the Instrument of Government.

13 Sermons, I, 433-458.
14 Ibid., I, 452-454.
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It seems that Fuller faced despair indeed (“dogg'd with Gods *terrous* at his heele’s”) in the later months of 1646. In January 1646/7 he was recuperating from mental depression at Boughton House, the Northamptonshire estate of Edward, Lord Montagu, and addressing to others in like distress his new book, *The Cause and Cure of a Wounded Conscience*, recommending as specific cures not only prayer and Bible reading but also the avoidance of solitariness and the industrious pursuit of one’s calling.\(^\text{15}\) No one could be more gregarious and hard-working than Fuller himself.

Even then he was hardly braced for the news of the regicide, which came to him, so the anonymous seventeenth-century biographer recounts, while he was at work upon the *Worthies*: “Then indeed such an amazement struck the Loyal pious Doctor, when he first heard of that execrable Design intended against the Kings person, and saw the villany proceed so uncontrollably, that he not onely surceased, but resolved to abandon that lucklesse work, (as he was then pleased to call it.) For what shall I write said he of the *Worthies of England*, when this Horrid Act, will bring such an infamy upon the whole Nation as will ever cloud and darken all its former, and suppresse its future rising glories?”\(^\text{16}\) Fuller was one of the few who not only preached but dared to publish in London that year a funeral sermon for Charles, handling the event as a problem in theodicy.\(^\text{17}\) The most intimate and moving account of the king’s death and burial comes from his pen, bringing to a close the *Church-History of Britain*—an account that moved Coleridge to rapturous admiration. Fuller was, as he averred to Heylyn publicly in 1659, a royalist to the end.\(^\text{18}\)

Yet by 1650, the year of the publication of the *Pisgah-Sight*, Fuller had accommodated himself to the regicide settlement. More particularly, when many other sequestered churchmen were convinced that under the Commonwealth God’s candlestick had indeed been removed from England, he accepted a living at Waltham Abbey. He had kept friends and benefactors on both sides—among them the regicide Sir John Danvers and his family, and also James Stuart, the duke of Richmond and cousin to Charles, who had accompanied the body to the grave (later, one supposes, giving Fuller his account) and died of grief a few months later, leaving as his heir the infant Esme, the “patron” of the *Pisgah-Sight*. Presumably each side suspected him for associating with the other; both suspected the soundness of his definition of the church;


16 *The Life of That Reverend Divine and Learned Historian, Dr. Thomas Fuller* (London, 1661).

17 “The Just Mans Funeral,” *Sermons*, I, 507-533. The allusion to Charles I is clear, although he is not named.

and Fuller, like any moderate, had to defend himself against the asperssion of “lukewarmness,” that notorious fault for which, in the text from Revelation iii.16, the Laodiceans were to be “spewed out.”

To give Fuller his due, his statements are consistent with each other and with his behavior. In accordance with his definition of moderation in The Holy State and the Profane State, he had to clarify his mind as to which things were “absolutely necessary to salvation to be done and believed” and which were “of a second sort and lower form, wherein more liberty and latitude is allowed.” Issues of church government and liturgy fell into the latter category. And—though his detractors might say that they saw little difference in the outward result—he must have examined his motives to ensure that, especially in the matter of accepting a living, he did not pursue “only his own ends, and particular profit” but “the good of others, and unity of the Church.” Whereas the trimmer rides every wave, the true moderate, he had stated then, is “commonly crush’d betwixt the extreme parties on both sides,” and such he surely felt himself to be in the church of the Commonwealth as much as in the previous decade. Yet he could enjoy the consolations of moderation—among them a good conscience, and a religion “more constant and durable”; for the moderate man, “being here, in via, in his way to heaven, . . . jogging on a good Travellers pace . . . overtakes and out-goes many violent men, whose over-hot ill-grounded Zeal [is] quickly tired.”  

More particularly, for the situation of the 1650’s, Fuller saw it as the churchman’s primary duty, after years of war and division, to help and heal, not exacerbate wounds, and to match the moral stance of charity with an intellectual stance for unity. Since the “candlestick” sermon of 1646, he had apparently retrieved from the crisis the essential meaning of the “moderate” ecclesiastical position he had always espoused. For Jewel, Parker, and Hooker it had been the mark of the church in England that it derived its origins not from Henry VIII but from St. Augustine of Canterbury, and behind him the apostolic founders of the British church. Though later in medieval times the church in England had been marred by “Romish” accretions, the foundations had been truly laid, and it was therefore the business of the Tudor reformer to clear away the accretions so that the true lineaments of the building might be better seen. Fuller, applying the same “moderate” perspective to the church of his own day, must have seen it deformed in the 1630’s by Laudian accretions and now in the 1640’s and 1650’s by sectarian dismantlings. Nevertheless, she was the Church of England still—holy in her way, though an institutional structure and one which shared the corruptions of the age.

He tackles the question in a sermon published in 1652, in connection

with the application of the phrase "holy city" to the Jerusalem of Jesus' time:

**Question:** How can a material citie, being but a heap of houses, be accounted holy?

**Answer:** As there is none good but one, God himself; so none holy but he, by original inherent holiness: none holy but Angels and Men, with derivative inherent holiness. But a relative holiness belongs to places and things consecrate or set apart from civil or profane to religious or pious uses.

**Question:** But how could Jerusalem now be accounted holy, seeing the complaint, Isai. 1.21, was now truer then ever, How is the faithful city become an harlot? . . . Abominable corruptions swarmed therein. . .

**Answer:** It was so; because, notwithstanding these corruptions, the vitals of God's service and mans salvation were therein still continued. There was the holy Altar (the heart of Religion); holy, because it held the holy Sacrifices; and they holy, because they were Types of Christ, the Truth, the holy One of God. Separation therefore may be made from the corruptions, not from the fundamentals of a true, though sick Church (such as Jerusalem now was), much depraved, but still the holy citie of God.20

His duty, therefore, was not to disavow the church, but to exercise his calling in the church as he found her, exposing corruptions as he had occasion and continuing to point to the foundations.

He was still more explicit in his declaration in *The Triple Reconciler* (1654) of his preference for episcopacy but his willingness to work within the present Presbyterian structure, particularly since moderate Anglicans had always allowed the legitimacy of Presbyterian church governments on the Continent and admired the religion and learning that had flourished under them.21 In the *Reconciler*, where Fuller is anxious to be the arbitrator among factions in the ministry, he emphasizes his willing conformity; but in the same year, to the congregation of St. Clements near Eastcheap, he preaches on a text which allows him to admit the extent of his reservation: "If the Foundations be destroyed, what can the Righteous doe?" (Ps. xi.3).22 At the outset, he suggests that the foundations may not be so utterly destroyed as appears to the eye of despair; for even Elijah, thinking himself the only follower of God left in Israel, had to learn that there were seven thousand beside him who had not bowed the knee to Baal. Nevertheless, the foundations may certainly appear to have been destroyed, and what then are the righteous to do? Fuller proposes

21 Ibid., II, 317-318.
three courses of action. First, they are to enter in the Court of Heaven a “Silent Protestation” of their innocence, each confessing, “I have not been active in the destroying of the Foundations of Religion, but opposed it as much as I might; and when I could doe no more, was a Mourner in Sion for the same.” And while they excoriate those who have desired and worked for the destruction, they must not fail to except such “as have been fraudulently circumvented, . . . as erroneously conceiving they supported the Foundations, when really they destroyed them”; for such God forgives upon repentance. (Sir John Danvers presumably fitted into this category.) Secondly, they must keep up the destroyed foundations in their own houses. (Here Fuller cites the example of a certain Meshullam, not even a homeowner but only a lodger, who contributed to the rebuilding of Jerusalem in the days of Nehemia by repairing his own room.) Thirdly, they must remember past blessings and pray heartily to God “in his owne due time to worke out his owne Honour, and settle the Foundations on their true Basis againe.” The final comfort is to understand that, all appearances to the contrary, “God is not un-Lorded, this Lord is not un-Templed, this his Temple is not unhallowed; and notwithstanding all wicked mens endeavours to destroy the Foundations, the Lord is in his holy Temple.”

It is time to consider how Fuller’s literary productions of the early 1650’s accord with his duty to point to the foundations. There is, first of all, his participation in the Abel Redevivus project, a collection of biographies of the prominent ministers of the Protestant and particularly the English Tudor church, to which Fuller contributed several Lives and a Preface. However dubious a publishing venture the book later appeared to be, Fuller insisted that his own hands were clean, and his motives are clear from his polemical Preface: against their detractors, the self-styled “saints” of the present day, he was coming again to the defense of the true saints of the modern church—Latimer, Ridley, and the other heroes of the Reformation. In this book their lives were to be presented as patterns for imitation, especially for those virtues for which the present “saints” were not conspicuous; for here one would see “excellent Preachers, who first reformed themselves” and confessors who stood constant amid the “concussions and commotions of Church and State, wherein all was almost turned upside-downe.” (Fuller himself had kept his feet only with difficulty, finding a foothold in that “almost.”) In such circumstances most in the present age were “at a losse, how to behave themselves.”

23 Ibid., 270-275.
FULLER'S *PISGAH-SIGHT OF PALESTINE*

Fuller's sustained endeavor, however, was the *Church-History*, finally published in 1655. Partly the work is a tribute to the *Acts and Monuments*, for which he always professed admiration—a book whose presence he must have felt all the more keenly when writing at Waltham Abbey, where Foxe had preceded him. Yet *Acts and Monuments* was now nearly a century old, and its style of apocalypticism must have seemed to Fuller not only obsolete but, in view of later events, misleading. In any case, as a church historian he himself comes closer in spirit to Parker among Elizabethan scholars, or Ussher in his own age. In the course of his research and writing, Fuller had invoked the aid of eminent scholars of various persuasions in church politics, including Somer, who had given him access to the registers of Canterbury, and Selden, who had reviewed his account of the first four centuries; but he had also consulted with “the best Antiquaries of England,” specifically with “the Archbishop of Armagh,” who was the authority on most matters, especially the early British church. Fuller was in fact an associate of Ussher during these years, and one of the translators of the *Annales* on which the revered primate worked during his retirement in London.25 The *Church-History* must have appealed to Ussher in the comprehensiveness of its design, in its devotion to the historical tradition accompanied by judicious skepticism regarding particular pieces of historical data, and in the moderation of its ecclesiastical stance.

The tone of the book, however, was Fuller's own, and it surprised and even offended some who were sympathetic to the enterprise, if Burnet's and Warburton's reactions are indicative.26 Despite the fact that it comes to a conclusion in the execution of Charles I, despite the legend “Resurgam” under the engraving of the ruins of Lichfield Cathedral, despite the pathos of certain statements (“And blessed be God, the Church of England is still . . . in being, though disturbed, distempered, distracted; God help and seal her most sad condition”)27—despite all this,

25 The moderate, or, more specifically, Augustinian outlook of the *Church-History* is discussed in Florence Sandler, “The Temple of Zerubbabel: A Pattern for Reformation in Thomas Fuller's *Pisgah-Sight* and *Church-History of Britain*,” SLJ, X (1977), 29-42. On Fuller's association with Ussher, see John Eglington Bailey, *The Life of Thomas Fuller, D. D.* (London and Manchester, 1874), pp. 400-403.

26 Burnet's complaint against Fuller as a church historian is that, “being a man of fancy, and affecting an odd way of writing, his work gives no satisfaction” (Hist. Reform., Preface, viii). Warburton describes the book as “worked on a slight fantastic ground, and in a style of buffoon pleasantry altogether unsuitable to so grave and important a subject” (Works, ed. 1811, "Directions for the Study of Theology," X, 371). Both comments are quoted by Bailey in Life, p. 558. It may be claimed for the *Pisgah-Sight* that it avoids the facetiousness complained of in the *Church-History*, presumably because of an accountability to the biblical material; likewise, it avoids the overflow of digressions, the chorographical description providing a tighter format than the chronicle.

the book is gay and amusing, having somewhat the tone of a rollicking family history told by an uncle who spins a good yarn. And a good-humored family history is surely what Fuller intended the book to be. It was salutary to present the official church in times past as neither perfect and sacrosanct, as the high churchmen were apt to assume, nor deluded and "Babylonish," as Independents asserted. Its members were as mixed as their present-day descendants, each imperfect, yet each experiencing and presenting God in his own way. Even in Abel Redevivus, Fuller had found the fascination of Cranmer's martyrdom to lie in the fact that such a man, by no means faultless, could yet become the direct vehicle of grace. This, says Fuller, is the church, as she has always been and ever will be—her deformity a stop to presumption, her viability a stop to despair.

In this context, the Pisgah-Sight of Palestine also assumes the character of a tract for the times, and constitutes, as Fuller said, the "floore or Foundation" of the building which was the Church-History. To talk of Israel, Jerusalem, and the Temple was to presuppose England and the church. Accepting the essential connection between England and Israel, the Tudor reformers had been concerned to root out what they saw as the false application of the type (based on the superstitious uses of consecration, as in the matters of relics and pilgrimages) in order to implement the "true" application, based on a historical rather than a mystical connection and employing a more secular definition of the church. England was to be the Holy Land by her political, moral, and doctrinal achievement. Fuller's and Milton's was perhaps the last generation for which the typology remained essential—in the next year after the publication of the Pisgah-Sight, Hobbes in his treatment "Of the Christian Commonwealth" in the Leviathan was to carry the Reformers' method of historical exegesis ad absurdum, reducing "God's Kingdom of Israel" to a period piece. In the Pisgah-Sight itself, however, the typology holds, so that Fuller's comments on the state of the Reformation in England are not merely incidental but germane to his theme. Accordingly, at a time when he saw the urgency of the task of rebuilding the church upon its foundations, Fuller designed his book so as to give prominence to that same event to which he would recur in the sermon of 1654, namely, the reconstruction of Jerusalem in the days of Nehemiah. In the biblical account there was much to his purpose. In particular, although the reconstruction took place at a time when Israel had lost the monarchy, it was an orderly business, undertaken by the whole people under the direction of the priests and the magistrate.

Fuller, after he had listed the gates and towers of Jerusalem according to the information in the Book of Nehemiah, indicating in each case which citizens undertook the restoration, devotes a chapter of the Pisgah-
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Sight to “Observations on the repairers of the walls of Jerusalem, in the days of Nehemiah,” presenting first the example of “Eliashih the high Priest, with the Priests his brethren,” who began the work and built the Sheep-gate (a "gate ministeriall unto the Temple")—an example which shows that “Ministers oughte to leade the Van” (III, 325). This is a note that Fuller sounded insistently during those years, having heard too much irresponsible lay preaching and having seen enough of the results of lay initiative in reformation of the church. In his Second Reconciler, for instance, he was to come out flatly for the position that for those who would preach, ordination was as necessary as the calling itself.²⁸ This was not to deny a part to the laity. In the Pisgaht-Sight Fuller is quick to add that the rebuilding of Jerusalem gives work for all—for men and women, for those of all ages and professions. Not only were public projects undertaken, but “many men repaired onely against their own houses. This,” he observes, “though at the first sight it may seem the fruit but of a narrow soul, and private spirit, yet effectually advanced the work. . . . Oh, if order were observed for every one to mend his own heart, or house, how would personall amendment by degrees quickly produce family-city-countrey-kingdome-reformation?” (III, 327).

Above all, in 1650, in the new circumstance of the republic, interest would center on the figure of Nehemiah himself, governor but not king of Israel, and a model for the Christian magistrate in a time of reformation. Nehemiah’s own “zeal was active and exemplary in Gods work”: he not only chose to forgo the salary of governor but from his own purse supplied meals for the workers (III, 328). Later in the book Fuller praises also King Hezekiah, whose piety and public spirit led him to construct the water conduit into the city, and shows that he will discriminate between a good king and an inferior one, his example for the latter being Solomon himself; for, “to speak plainly, many of Solomons projects, were but voluptuous essays for his own personall (not to say carnall) contentment” (III, 332).

To what extent then, one may ask, had Fuller, in holding up the example of Nehemiah, trimmed his sails to catch a republican wind? The answer: very little. In his plain-speaking Sermon of Reformation of 1643 when England was a monarchy, he had presented his picture of the ideal Christian magistrate and reformer, who should be pious, public-spirited and not self-seeking, knowledgeable, courageous enough to root out bad customs, and “discreet” enough neither to spare the tares for the wheat’s sake (this, by implication, was the failing of Charles I) nor to spoil the wheat for the tares’ sake (the fault of the would-be reformers, this “generation of Anabaptists”).²⁹ However much he found Charles wanting, it

²⁸ Sermons, II, 328-352.
had been plain to Fuller in 1643 that it was on the king, as having supreme power in the state, that the task of reformation devolved. Yet the terms of his argument then were such that they would apply equally well seven years later when England had become a republic.

Now, the Supreme power alone hath a lawfull calling to Reforme a Church in those respective places wherein it is supreme. Where this supreme power is seated, the Statists of the several places may judge; the Divine goeth no farther, but to maintaine that where the Supreme power is, there alone is the power of Reformation; as it plainly appears by the Kings of Judah in their Kingdome. . . . Meane time meere private men must not be idle, but move in their Sphare till the Supreme power doth Reforme. First, they are dayly to pray to God to inspire those who have the power and place with Will and Skill, courageously to begin, constantly to continue, and happily to conclude such a Reformation. Secondly, they are seriously to reforme themselves: He needs not to complaine of too little worke, who hath a little world in himselfe to amend. . . . Thirdly, he may Reforme the Church in his house, . . . carefully looking to his owne Family.30

The language is that of the Erastian who sees the working partnership imperiled on the one side by the intransigence of the king and on the other by the anarchy of a section of the populace. In the cooperation of magistrate and people—in the ability of a Nehemiah to channel the reforming energies of the people and, conversely, the people's willing acceptance of his leadership—Fuller discerned what was lacking in the turbulence, hostility, and division of the English Reformation of his day. It is worth noting the significance for the Anglican Erastian position of that allusion to the power of “the Kings of Judah in their Kingdome.” Hooker, asserting in England as in ancient Israel the identity of church and state, had used the analogy of the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the Jewish magistrate to assert a similar jurisdiction on the part of the English monarch, and Bancroft's Canons of 1603 had made a liberal opinion into a necessary belief: “Whosoever shall hereafter affirm, That the king's majesty hath not the same authority in causes ecclesiastical, that the godly kings had amongst the Jews and Christian emperors in the primitive church . . . let him be excommunicated ipso facto.”31 If in Hooker's generation the argument had been advanced to rebut the Presbyterian position of Cartwright that within the church the queen was but a lay person and therefore subject to ecclesiastical discipline and even excom-

30 Ibid., 303-304.
munication, the threat was the more urgent in 1643, when the Westminister Assembly had embarked upon the Presbyterian reconstruction of the English church.

Fuller’s Erastianism, with its reference to the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the kings of Judah in their kingdom, should be distinguished, however, from the position of Coleman and Lightfoot, those who within the Westminster Assembly “maintained the tenets of Erastus,” and, being both of them skilled Hebraists, “often produced the Hebrew original for the power of princes in ecclesiastical matters”—a position which, as Fuller in his capacity as church historian noted, lent itself to exploitation by “other parliament-men,” who, “hearing their own power enlarged thereby,” made “use of these Erastians for a check to such who pressed conformity to the Scotch kirk in all particulars.” The difference between the two “Erastian” positions lies in the relationship posited between Israel and England. Coleman and Lightfoot assumed that the magistrate must have such powers in England because the magistrate had such powers in Israel, God’s own commonwealth; Fuller’s and Hooker’s position (if not Bancroft’s) was rather that, on the historic evidence, the English constitution vested supreme power, civil and ecclesiastical, in the crown; and it was all to the credit of the English constitution that in this respect it was similar to the Hebrew.

The Erastian position as propounded by Hooker held, however, that the English magistrate in exercising these powers was accountable to the constitution itself and to the people as a whole. In short, it left room for criticism of any high-handed dealing on the part of the crown or the bishops, and thereby failed to satisfy even Elizabeth, let alone Charles I. Moreover, the argument from the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the Jewish magistrate is not tied to the House of David—or Stuart. Discussing in the Pisgah-Sight the relative strengths of the kingdoms of Israel and Judah, of which only the latter claimed divine election and dynastic continuity, Fuller observes that in “the absoluteness of their Kings power . . . the upper hand must be adjudged to Judah. The Kings whereof in administration of justice (or rather revenge) often exercised arbitrary power, making use of their prerogative above law. As appears by Solomons proceedings against the lives of Shimei, Joab, and Adoniah; and more plainly in Jehoram’s executing his own brethren, by his peremptory pleasure without legall conviction of them. Whereas no monument is extant, of such arbitrary proceedings in the kings of Israel,” the case of Naboth’s vineyard being the exception that proves the rule. And absolute power, even with divine sanction, had proved to have some practical disadvantages. “This is assigned by a judicious Author as a principall cause why Israel never returned to their former subjection to Davids family,

32 Church History, VI, 286-287.
because the scepter of Judah was too heavy for them, and they lived under more liberty in their own kingdom" (I, 32). With such language the cap has been fitted squarely on the royal Stuart head, and by whom has it been fitted? Fuller's "judicious Author" is none other than Sir Walter Ralegh in the History of the World—a name that in the 1620's had rallied the loyal parliamentary opposition to abuses of the prerogative. Long before 1650 Fuller would have found him a congenial author.

If Fuller's views on ecclesiastical government and monarchy demonstrate no essential change, in another respect the Pisgah-Sight shows the impact of contemporary events. It will be remembered that 1649 was the year in which a millenarian petition was presented at Whitehall from an Englishwoman and her son in Amsterdam, to the effect that England along with the Netherlands should facilitate the Jews' return to Palestine. When, in the mid-1650's, Manasseh ben Israel conducted his mission to London to ask for the readmission of the Jews to England, Fuller is reputed to have been one of his supporters and correspondents, and there is a note of a sermon by Fuller in 1655, "occasioned by a motion of bringing in of the Jews to England." Meanwhile, in 1650, the Pisgah-Sight runs to its remarkable conclusion in its treatment of the Jews and of Jewish hopes for restoration.

It was, after all, a Christian commonplace that Jerusalem and the Jews labored under an eternal curse as a result of the Crucifixion; this is one that Fuller himself had exploited in his early work, the Historie of the Holy Warre (1639). There he had prefaced his account of the Crusades with Josephus' story of the fall of Jerusalem to Titus in the first century, and from this had led into the abortive attempt by Julian to be another Cyrus when he gave the Jews the means to build their temple again, "hoping by raising it to ruine the truth of Christs prophesie." But while the Jews were clearing the foundation, they were visited by a "sudden tempest . . . which carried away their tools and material, with balls of fire which scorched the most adventurous of the builders." Afterwards, indeed, "the Christians in the place where Solomons temple was, built a stately church," but Fuller had had his doubts about even a Christian enterprise in that place: "Yea, God seemeth not so well contented with this their act, the Christians often being beaten out of that church; and at this day whosoever (though casually) entreth therein, must either forfeit his life, or renounce his religion." Thereby Fuller had set the scene for the failure of the Crusaders to regain Palestine for Christendom, and behind all the more sophisticated political and economic reasons he later gives for that failure lurks the idea that God "stamped on it [that land] an


34 The Historie of the Holy Warre (Cambridge, Eng., 1639), pp. 5-6.
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indelible character of desolation." If confirmation were needed, one had only to look at the subsequent fate of Jerusalem and its wretched condition—to which travelers attested—under the Turkish empire.

On the opening pages of the Pisgah-Sight, the sentiments are similar, but the emphasis falls on the other side of the paradox: though barren now, the land was then fruitful, as the persons of the Jews, though nowadays degenerate, were then "handsome and proper," their spirits "bold and valiant," their behavior "comely and courtly." And this contention as to the natural fruitfulness of the land Fuller will maintain not only against pagan writers such as Strabo ("who were always out to disparage the Jews and therefore their country") but against St. Jerome himself: "This Father did decry the literal, to raise the mysticall Canaan; and they that know S. Hierome, know that when he intends to praise or dispraise, he will doe it to the purpose" (I, 15-16). Clearly, Fuller's own intention not to disparage the Jews comes from his respect for the literal Canaan. It is a land that he imagines as being—at least before the days of Titus, and even now in patches—rather like England. This in spite of all that mention of desert in the Old Testament. The word "desert," he admits, "sounds hideously to English eares: it frights our fancies with apparitions of a place full of dismal shades, salvage beasts, and dolefull desolation, whereas in Hebrew it imports no more then a woody retiredness from publick habitation; most of them in extent not exceeding our greater Parks in England, and more alluring with the pleasure of privacy, then affrighting with the sadnesse of solitariness" (I, 15). The idea, however implausible, has at least provided Jesus or Elijah in meditation with an arboreal environment suitable for a Caroline gentleman.

One might expect that the former fruitfulness of Canaan and the former dignity of the Jews will be used to strengthen the contrast with the miserable condition of both after the Crucifixion and the fall of Jerusalem. Certainly Fuller's format requires him to treat that subject, for the story of the building of the Temple by Solomon and its rebuilding by Zerubbabel and Herod leads to its destruction by Titus. But, coming to the section where he lists the "Actions of Jesus in the Temple" (the prelude to the end), Fuller appears to miss many opportunities of pointing out the pride and recalcitrance of the Jewish priests and worshippers in the Temple who closed their minds to Jesus' mission and identity. He mentions Jesus' purging the Temple of the money changers, but uses that action not to inveigh against the mercenariness of the Jews but to point out a precedent for reformation in the church. He makes nothing of the Jews' thinking it blasphemy in Jesus that he would vow to destroy the Temple and rebuilt it in three days. And in the chapter where he speculates on the whereabouts of the sacred vessels of the Temple since Titus

35 Ibid., p. 15.
removed them to Rome, his shafts are directed not against the Jews but the Pope. Finally, after a diversion into dialogue with an imaginary “Objector” and a description of the tabernacle in the wilderness, Fuller returns to his theme of the subsequent fate of the Jews by way of the unsatisfactory Ezekiel. If Ezekiel’s description of the Temple is useless to the literal sense, something might still be salvaged from the mystical; and Fuller will interpret this mystical sense as indicating—not the imminence of the New Jerusalem in England, but—the “great enlargement and dilation of the Church under the Gospell” (V, 191), when Gentiles and Jews both come into their inheritance. Thereupon he proceeds to discuss, in favorable and compassionate terms, the prospects for the Jews’ restoration to their spiritual relationship with God (by way of conversion) and even the reestabishment of their commonwealth in the land of Palestine.

One can only guess what lies behind this. Fuller’s conviction is not an aspect of the millenarianism of the day, which saw the restoration of the Jews (to England or to Palestine) as one of the essential conditions for the imminent arrival of Christ’s personal kingdom, since he leaves it an open issue as to whether any such event can be expected. His attitude cannot even be explained as the natural result of liberal scholarship. Indeed, says Fuller, “most learned Divines are of a contrary opinion,” expecting no restoration for the Jews, “because totall and finall desolation is in Scripture, so frequently denounced against their Countrey, and Cities therein” (V, 194-195). Lightfoot, the eminent Hebraist of his generation and a man not otherwise uncharitable, had lent his authority to that opinion, concluding that the great spiritual mystery of which Paul had spoken in Romans xi was not at all the “universal conversion” of the Jews, but rather that “they, that had always had the light, and only seen of all the nations of the world, —should now sit in darkness and be blind.” Simply, the Jews had turned down too many chances and were as full of the antichristian spirit now as in New Testament times.36 (Lightfoot had forgotten about the “seventy seven.”)

But if it was neither millenarianism nor the trend of scholarship that had brought Fuller to this view, there is another possibility. In the months of 1649-1650 when he was finishing the Pisgah-Sight, he was confronted by strident propaganda on the part of the extreme royalists, pointing to the parallel between the execution of God’s anointed king (i.e., “Messiah”) of England and the Jews’ execution of their Messiah, brooding over Josephus’ account of the fall of Jerusalem and the devastation of the country under Titus, God’s scourge, and calling down on the heads of the regicides the same kind of divine vengeance. “For,” as James Howell
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would write, "if the natural branches were not spared how can the wild olive think to escape the fire of his displeasure?" This sentence was penned in 1652 in one of the nastier pieces of writing occasioned by the prospect of the return of the Jews to England, Howell's Epistle Dedicatory for the reissue of "Yosippon," a somewhat dubious redaction of Josephus, usually claimed as an independent authority.\textsuperscript{37} As for the Jews, says Howell, exploiting the common prejudice, they carry a "rankish kind of sent no better indeed then a stinck. . . . And I wish that England may not be troubled with that sent again." It is not surprising to Howell that Jews and sectaries could meet on common ground, since (as one reads between the lines of his Preface) everything that makes the Jews despicable—their pride, their rebellion against God, their sacrilege, not to mention the "giddinesse of their brains" (he means their addiction to Cabalism)—is equally chargeable against the sectaries.

Fuller would have found Howell's Preface as distasteful as any modern reader—it was by a stroke of irony, or perhaps humanity, that the 1684 edition of "Yosippon" was to be enlarged by material from Fuller's own works.\textsuperscript{38} But it is perhaps this very conjunction of topic one sees in Howell (regicide and Jewish restoration) that led Fuller to an entirely different conclusion. He had been confronted by the parallel between regicide and Crucifixion—and had rejected it; despair and execration were temptations that he had overcome; and he had had time since writing the Historie of the Holy Warre to outgrow the fascination of the idea of the eternal curse and to ponder more deeply the implications of the injunction to charity. And if he, Fuller, had not cut off his regicide friend, Sir John Danvers, who needed his understanding and moral counsel, would God cut off England? Had God indeed cut off Israel? The analogy between Israel and England, when looked at in the light of charity, pointed to a different conclusion—not England's doom but Israel's regeneration.

Granted the oddity of a situation in which humaneness in the matter of the Jews would be expressed in terms of the prospect for their general con-


\textsuperscript{38} The additional material, headed "A Short View of the Matter" and attributed to Fuller as "Th. F.," was a redaction of material from the Holy Warre and the Psgah-Sight. (See Sermons, II, App. A, pp. 568-575.) I have found 19th-century American editions of "Yosippon" still carrying both Howell's Epistle at the beginning and Fuller's "Short View" and Prayer at the end, without attributions, but with only slight alteration to the text.
version to Christianity, Fuller's statement at the end of the *Pisgah-Sight* is a considerable achievement. Unlike those who needed the conversion of the Jews to prove the advent of the Millennium, Fuller is not interested in setting a date for the fulfillment of his expectation, and his chief concern is with the mental obstacles and moral shortcomings on the part of Christians that have so far prevented the Jews from entering into their inheritance:

First, our want of civill society with their nation. There must be first conversing with them, before there can be converting of them. . . .

Second, the cruel usage of them in the Papall, and Imperiall dominions, . . . where publick authority doth not endeavour to drop, and distill piety into them; but to squeeze and press profit out of them. Especially, whilst that merciless law stands in force, that on their conversion, they must renounce all their goods as ill gotten. . . .

Thirdly, the constant offence given them by the *Papists* their worshipping of images, the present *Jews* hating idolatry with a perfect hatred, whose knees may sooner be broken, then bended to such superstitious postures. . . .

Lastly, the difference in judgments, distance in affections, dissoluteness in lives among the *Christians* themselves. (V, 199-200)

Only then does he come up with the idée fixe that was even for Lightfoot the beginning and end of the matter, namely, the inner blindness of the Jews themselves. "But though these obstacles, and obstructions were moe, and mightier then they are, should God but give the word, they are instantly removed, . . . [the Jews'] hearts turned in the turning of an hand" (V, 200). Meanwhile, Christians ought to incline their hearts and minds in charity toward this end, and the Prayer which he composes for the purpose is a piece worthy in sentiment to be set beside Herbert's "Poore nation, whose sweet sap and juice."39 In such divided times, when he has bent his mind to find a unity and charity that would embrace all the factions of the Church, Fuller has apparently seen the prospect of mending an even older and larger division.

Thus the *Pisgah-Sight of Palestine* comes to its conclusion. Fuller has kept his feet on the ground and his eyes on "this terestriall Canaan," as he had promised, presenting the model of patient pilgrimage with all the more determination since others, impatient with foot-slogging, were gazing at the skies daily expecting the New Jerusalem to descend to them. Nevertheless, he had not denied himself a vision of how England and the human community might be transformed by the full enjoyment of charity, which was the real earnest of the celestial Jerusalem. The man who goes by foot may still see a long way if he climbs to the top of a
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mountain, especially when the mountain is Pisgah, from which Moses had seen the Promised Land. Christian exegesis had insisted that the full meaning of the Promised Land and of its city Jerusalem was nothing less than a universal brotherhood and sanctification in Christ. Fuller himself was impressed by the fact that between Deuteronomy and Revelation, between the account of Moses' prophetic vision and that of the full achievement of the vision, there stretched the history of Israel or, as it might be, of England—a confrontation with an actual terrain and a heritage of actual events and personalities, with their glories and deformities. The task of Israel or England in history was always the building and rebuilding of Jerusalem, the unsymmetrical and yet holy city—a matter of entering into one's actual heritage (even the regicide settlement), and transforming it in patience and charity by such reformation "whereof we are capable, pro statu viatorum, made with all due and Christian moderation."

Moderation was to be Fuller's note to the end. In 1660, on the eve of the Restoration, he was to attach his proof text to his new book, _Mixt Contemplations in Better Times_: "Let your moderation be known to all men. The Lord is at hand." The book was dedicated to Lady Monck in gratitude for the influence she was exerting for the royalist cause, and the text which for two decades had been a comfort in calamity was beginning to assume the character of a caution in victory.