

7. “THE MYSTERY OF THIS RESTITUTION OF ALL THINGS”:
ISAAC NEWTON ON THE RETURN OF THE JEWS¹

For I would not, brethren, that ye should be ignorant of this mystery, lest ye should be wise in your own conceits; that blindness in part is happened to Israel, until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in. And so all Israel shall be saved: as it is written, There shall come out of Sion the Deliverer, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob. For this is my covenant unto them, when I shall take away their sins (Romans 11:25–7)

In one of his early eighteenth-century manuscripts, under the heading “Of y^e ... Day of Judgm^t & World to come,” Isaac Newton declares that “the mystery of this restitution of all things is to be found in all the Prophets.” To this he adds: “which makes me wonder wth great admiration that so few Christians of o^{ur} age can find it there.”² What was this prophetic “mystery” that such a small number of his contemporaries could discover? He goes on to explain:

For they understand not that y^e final return of y^e Jews captivity & their conquering the nations < of y^e four Monarchies > & setting up a ~~peaceable~~ righteous & flourishing Kingdom at y^e day of judgment is this mystery. Did they understand this they would find it in all y^e old Prophets who write of y^e last times as in y^e last chapters of Isaiah where the Prophet conjoyns the new heaven & new earth wth y^e ruin of y^e wicked nations, the end of ~~all troubles~~ weeping & of all troubles, the return of y^e Jews captivity & their setting up a flourishing & everlasting Kingdom.

Newton then bolsters this expression of prophetic faith by writing out a small *florilegium* of supporting texts from the Hebrew prophets.³

In this paper I detail Newton’s belief in the return of the Jews to the land of Israel.⁴ This subject has long remained an under-researched aspect of Newton’s prophetic thought, but the 1991 release of the bulk of his theological manuscripts now allows a comprehensive survey of his thinking on this theme.⁵ The utility of this paper will, I hope, manifest itself in two different ways. First, and

more generally, I use Newton as a source of insight into his period's culture of prophetic interpretation – particularly with respect to belief in the Jewish Restoration. Second, and more specifically, the return of the Jews was for Newton one of the central themes of prophecy and this study demonstrates both the fervency of his belief in this apocalyptic event and how it formed an integral part of his overall prophetic scheme. In addition to outlining what Newton held in common with contemporary exegesis, I also show that he departed from the standard trends at two especially telling junctures. Moreover, I analyze Newton's understanding of the divine causes of the Jewish captivity and how he linked these with repeating patterns of apostasy among both Jews and Christians. Other crucial considerations that I explore are Newton's attitudes toward the Jewish people, their unbelief in Jesus as the Messiah and their pivotal place in salvation history. Finally, I reconstruct Newton's prophetic time-scale of the Jewish captivity and Restoration to Israel. It is here that we encounter one of the most distinctive aspects of Newton's belief in the return of the Jews: its temporal location in history.

SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY EXPECTATIONS OF THE CONVERSION AND RETURN OF THE JEWS

Two dynamics converged in seventeenth-century Britain to bring about a heightened expectation among many Christians of the conversion and return of the Jews. The first was a rise in literal and (pre)millenarian prophetic exegesis. This trend extended across the social spectrum from scholars such as Cambridge's Joseph Mede to the radical sects of the English Civil War.⁶ With this new hermeneutical current came also a more literal approach to biblical prophecies concerning the Restoration of the Jews.⁷ And this Restoration was seen as much more than simply evidence of God's providential activity in history. For many prophetic exegetes, passages such as Romans 11 and Matthew 24 taught that the conversion and return of the Jews was a necessary preliminary to the completion of "the times of the Gentiles" – the period in which grace is extended to non-Jews – and hence the end of this age and beginning of the Millennium. Thus this particular sign was a pivotal apocalyptic marker for many millenarians, as it still is today.

Previous to the seventeenth century, Protestant theologians (including Philipp Melancthon and John Calvin) had followed the Augustinian interpretation of Romans 11, which held that Jews would only be converted and saved as *individuals* – but never as a nation.⁸ Prophetic references to Israel were interpreted of "spiritual" Israel, that is to say, Christians. However, by the turn of the seventeenth century, some exegetes began to accept first the eventual conversion of the Jewish people to Christianity and then even their Restoration to the land of Israel.⁹ Emblematic of this new hermeneutic is Sir Henry Finch's 1621 work *The worlds great restauration or calling of the Jews*, in which he argued against allegorical interpretations of Israel and linked the return and calling of the Jews with the salvation of the Gentiles.¹⁰ Although he never wrote extensively on the Jewish Restoration, the celebrated Mede also added

his authoritative name to exegetes who accepted this interpretation.¹¹ As we will see, Newton, too, aligned himself with this exegetical school. This is not to say that all Protestants accepted this position. As Nabil Matar has shown, the period from the mid-seventeenth to the mid-eighteenth century saw strong disagreement between Restorationist and anti-Restorationist exegetes.¹² Nor did the premillenarian paradigm, which espouses that Christ returns at the beginning of the Millennium to establish the Kingdom of God, attract universal assent. Many of the more orthodox and conservative scholars retained Augustinian amillenarianism and its variants.¹³

The second factor to raise expectations was the discussions surrounding the readmission of the Jews to England during the Commonwealth of the 1650s. For many Christians and even some Jews, the readmission of the Jews to England was a necessary precursor to their return to Israel, since it would complete their dispersion to all nations. But not all agreed and discussions about the status of the Jews in England and in prophecy continued up to the controversial Naturalization Bill of 1753 and beyond. Although the drive to readmit (and later, naturalize) the Jews was heavily colored by mercantilist and political motivations, this dynamic nonetheless converged with the prophetic hopes to create a climate of general expectancy in Britain by the mid-seventeenth century – the world of Newton’s youth.

NEWTON AND THE JEWS

Newton had a profound interest in things Jewish. His library alone supplies ample evidence of this.¹⁵ Newton owned five of the works of Maimonides,¹⁶ and makes numerous references to them in his manuscripts. He also possessed Christian Knorr von Rosenroth’s *Kabbala denudata* (1677–84), which shows extensive signs of dog-eating,¹⁷ along with an edition of the first-century Jewish philosopher Philo.¹⁸ His writings reveal that he used the Talmud, the learning of which he accessed through Maimonides and other sources in his library.¹⁹ Although he never acquired a competency in the language, Newton picked up a smattering of Hebrew and armed himself with an array of Hebrew lexicons and grammars.²⁰ He also owned and used a Hebrew Bible.²¹ Much attention is given in Newton’s writings to studies of the Jewish Temple and its rituals.²² His fascination with these things was motivated in large part by the importance of understanding both the complexities of Jewish ritual and the design of the Temple for the interpretation of prophecy.²³ Newton owned a number of works on these subjects as well.²⁴ A further testimony to his research on the Temple exists in the physical evidence of his octavo Bible, the pages of which are heavily soiled in the section detailing the Temple of Ezekiel’s prophecy.²⁵

This study also bore its fruit. Several scholars have pointed to Newton’s appropriation of elements of Jewish theology. John Maynard Keynes famously characterized Newton as a “Judaic monotheist of the school of Maimonides.”²⁶ While I would argue that other theological traditions – such as Socinianism – were equally or even more important in shaping his view of the One God, three important studies on Newton and Maimonides help fill out Keynes’ character-

ization.²⁷ To this we can add Matthew Goldish's recent monograph, which presents a thorough treatment of Newton's engagement with Jewish theology.²⁸

Evidence for Newton's interest in Jewish antiquities also exists in his library, which included several histories of the Jews, including two editions of the Jewish historian Josephus.²⁹ References to Josephus occur throughout Newton's manuscripts and Frank Manuel has argued convincingly that Newton drew much inspiration from Josephus' defence of the ancient Jews.³⁰ Indeed, Newton's posthumously-published *Chronology of ancient kingdoms amended* is an extended attempt to demonstrate the priority of ancient Hebrew civilization over that of the pagan nations.³¹ Additionally, among his collection of travel literature are four contemporary accounts of the Levant and Palestine.³² To these titles we can add Lancelot Addison's *The present state of the Jews* (1675).³³ These sources would have given Newton contemporary data on the state of both the Promised Land and the Jewish diaspora (even if this information may not have been always accurate).

On the other hand, the relative paucity in Newton's library of prophetic commentaries and other general books on prophecy – let alone works specifically devoted to the return of the Jews – is striking. It seems that once he obtained his prophetic footing from Mede's classical works (and to a lesser extent Henry More), he set out largely on his own.³⁴ Newton's one-time disciple William Whiston, in a published review of the former's *Observations*, made a similar comment.³⁵ While direct references to other prophetic expositors are rare in Newton's papers, it is clear, as we will see, that he had strong disagreements with many contemporary exegetical trends. Also, despite the evidence for interest in Jewish theology, ritual and history, I have yet to encounter anything to suggest that Newton sought out or had significant contacts with Jews, even though this was not uncommon for Protestant millenarians and intellectuals in this period.³⁶ Newton's association with the Jews – as with so many elements of his life, including his theology, his apocalyptic writings and even to a large degree his natural philosophy – was an intensely private affair.³⁷

The first thing we can say about Newton's private prophetic studies is that they place him as a firm advocate of the premillenarian exegetical tradition. Newton was an exponent of literal prophetic hermeneutics *par excellence*. Second, he was an equally ardent Restorationist. Third, it is clear that Newton worked on his interpretation of the return of the Jews throughout his entire active period of prophetic study. The earliest examples come from his first apocalyptic treatise of the 1670s and continue thereafter to the end of his life.³⁸ Fourth, Newton devotes no single treatise exclusively to the return of the Jews, but rather writes expositions on this theme throughout his manuscripts, ranging from small and often-repeated comments to detailed expositions of several folios' length – a dynamic that has made an extensive survey of his writings essential. Finally, Newton believed that prophecies relating to the return of the Jews abound in Scripture – particularly in the Hebrew Prophets. Accordingly, in several places in his manuscripts, he writes out long lists of biblical references to prophecies concerning the return of the Jews.³⁹ He asserts

in a manuscript from the late seventeenth century that both the conversion and the return of the Jews are described in "almost all y^e Prophets,"⁴⁰ and states even more confidently in a later writing that such predictions occurred in "all the old Prophets."⁴¹ Occasionally, he expands the range of prophecy beyond the Protestant canon to include apocryphal works like Tobit and even pseudepigraphal writings like the Sibylline Oracles.⁴² For Newton, the greater the number of prophecies concerning the return of the Jews, the stronger the case for Providence.⁴³ We will now turn to examine the nature of his faith in the Jewish Restoration.

THE ABRAHAMIC COVENANT AND THE SPECIAL STATUS OF THE JEWS

Newton believed that the Jews are God's chosen people, unique among the nations and special recipients of divine grace,⁴⁴ referring to them as "{God's} people the Jews."⁴⁵ Not only did he believe that the Jews as a nation were called and chosen, but he extended their uniqueness to include the centrality of their role in prophecy. Commenting on Christ's Olivet Prophecy in Matthew 24, Newton declares that "{t}his generation (γενεα the nation of y^e Jews shall not pass till all these things are fulfilled vers 34 because their fulfilling depens {sic} on y^e nation of y^e Jews."⁴⁶ The role of the Jews as captives of Rome in AD 70 also helped secure the identification of the apocalyptic Babylon as Rome, since it was the Romans who "beseiged Jerusalem burnt the Temple & captivated the Jews as ~~B~~ old Babylon had done before."⁴⁷ In another place, Newton outlines that the Jews, along with their captors and the nations within the territory of the four monarchies, were the primary subject of Old Testament prophecy, while the nations through which the Gospel was preached were the subject of the New.⁴⁸ He also saw evidence of the Jews' special place in their continued existence as a distinct people during their final captivity. For, although "God has rejected them from being his people or kingdom, & dispersed them into all nations as at this day so that at present they are no ~~body politique~~ or people or body politique but a scattered servile race of men without any government of their own," nevertheless it was also true that they "in a wonderfull manner continue numerous & distinct from all other nations: which cannot be said of any other captivated nation whatever, & therefore is the work of providence."⁴⁹ For Newton, the survival of the Jewish people was nothing short of a miracle.

Newton based his conviction in the Jews' unique status particularly on the Abrahamic Covenant, which affirms the special blessed position of Abraham and his seed (Genesis 12:1–3), as well as the promise to them of the land of Canaan (Genesis 13:14–17). After telling him to survey the land, God tells Abraham: "For all the land which thou seest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed for ever" (Genesis 13:15). Unlike anti-Restorationist expositors like Pierre Allix, who argued that God's covenants with the Jews were conditional,⁵⁰ Newton was convinced that the Covenant was everlasting. Characterizing the Covenant as prophecy, he refers to "y^e promise to Abraham to give y^e land of Canaan (y^t land w^{ch} he then beheld, & walked through) to him & his seed for ever Gen. 13.16 for an everlasting possession by an everlasting covenant wth his

seed in their generations chap. 17.7, 8.”⁵¹ In his treatise on Church history, he compiled a list of Old and New Testament references corollary to the Abrahamic Covenant under the heading “Of the promis to Abraham & his seed.”⁵² Similarly, in the manuscript entitled “Prophesies concerning Christs 2^d coming,” he wrote out a series of verses relating to this Covenant, including both passages that emphasize God’s promise to Abraham of “y^e inheritance of Palestine,” and those that stress the everlasting and irrevocable nature of this inheritance.⁵³ As is clear from the juxtaposition of the verses, his select glosses on them and his underlining of key words and phrases, Newton believed the covenants would be fulfilled in the future.⁵⁴

So highly did Newton regard the importance of the Abrahamic Covenant, that he goes so far as to say that the foundations of Judaism are laid on it. Speaking of “God’s covenant with Abraham when he promised that his seed should inherit the land of Canaan for ever,” he claims that “on this ~~promise~~ covenant was founded the Jewish religion as on that is founded the Christian; and therefore this point is of so great moment that it ought to be considered and understood by all men who pretend to the name of Christians.”⁵⁵ The Abrahamic Covenant thus served as a pivotal component of Newton’s prophetic beliefs in the return of the Jews; it ensured that God’s rejection of the Jews was only temporary. Because the Covenant was everlasting and the Jews were not in the land in his time, the final Restoration was a prophetic imperative.

“THE DOUBLE RETURN”: THE FUTURE APPLICATION OF THE RESTORATION

There is no shortage of Old Testament prophecies that predict the return of the Jews from exile. But since most of these prophecies antedate the Babylonian captivity, from which many Jews did return, it was necessary for prophetic exegetes who accepted a latter-day Restoration to provide justification for a second application of the predictions. This was particularly pertinent for a passionate advocate of the prophecy argument like Newton, since sceptics and even many Protestant exegetes insisted that these prophecies either found their completions in the sixth through fifth centuries BC under Ezra and Nehemiah or, where parallels to this period are not evident, were conditional.⁵⁶ Newton was not unaware of this and, as the next quotation exemplifies, at times dialogues with this stance in his prophetic expositions. Newton’s hermeneutical strategy to contend with the opposing view is twofold. First, he wants to show both a qualitative and quantitative difference between the first return from the Babylonian exile and the second from the Roman dispersion. He tackles these issues in one of his earlier manuscripts on the Apocalypse. After citing some passages from the Hebrew Prophets, he concludes:

’Tis not y^e return from y^e Babylonian captivity here spoken of, ffor they were then soon pluckt out of their land again, but after y^e return here spoken of they shal be pulled out no more. Nor did they then possess y^e remnant of

Edom, & of all y^e heathen as they do now, & therefore we are here to understand y^e universal & eternal kingdom of God & Christ spoken of by John & Daniel.⁵⁷

Since the Jews were led into captivity again in AD 70, and because the Old Testament prophecies speak of a permanent return, Newton believed that the predictions demand a second application. Moreover, he notes that Israel possessed neither the land of the Edomites nor that of the other nations at the time of their first return. Citing generally from Micah 4:1–7, Newton takes up this territorial argument again in the same treatise:

’Tis in y^e last days y^l this is to be fulfilled & then y^e captivity shall return & become a strong nation & reign over strong nations afar off, & y^e Lord shall reign in mount Zion from thenceforth for ever, & many nations shall receive y^e law of righteousness from Jerusalem, & they shall beat their swords into plow-shares & their spears into pruning hooks & nation shall not lift up a sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more; all w^{ch} never yet came to pass.⁵⁸

Here is it clear that Newton sees the final return in the context of the millennial Kingdom of God on earth – a fulfilment much broader in scope than the first application.⁵⁹ In addition to these factors, the prophets had predicted a return that would be accompanied by no further apostatizing. This condition, too, was not fulfilled with the first return.⁶⁰ Lastly, Newton also believed that Romans 11 – manifestly written after the first return – spoke of a latter-day Restoration.⁶¹

Newton’s second strategy was to turn to the words of a standard prophecy of the Kingdom, which he wrote out in one place as follows:

And in that day there shall be a root of Jess{e} w^{ch} shall stand for an ensign of the people, to it shall y^e Gentiles seek <(Rom 15. 12)> & his rest shall be glorious. And it shall come to pass in that day that the Lord shall set his hand again the second time to recover the remnant of his people w^{ch} shall be left, from Assyria & from Egypt.⁶²

As Newton himself indicates, these words, including those he underlined, are from Isaiah 11:10–11. Thus, with the imprimatur of this pivotal *locus biblicus*, he refers elsewhere to the “double return” of Israel to their land.⁶³ Significantly, this paraphrase from Isaiah 11:11 even made it into his published *Observations*.⁶⁴ With the foundation principles and implications of the Abrahamic Covenant and the double return laid down, Newton could then go on to build an elaborate prophetic edifice detailing the causes, conditions and fulfilment of the Jewish captivity and Restoration.

THE IGNORANCE OF PROPHECY: CAUSES OF THE FINAL
JEWISH CAPTIVITY

At a number of points in his writings, Newton explicates the causes of the final captivity of the Jews. First, he pointed to the curses Moses prophesied would descend on Israel if they disobeyed God.⁶⁵ These Mosaic curses are itemized in Deuteronomy 28 and include foreign invasion and captivity.⁶⁶ For Newton the history of the Jews was one of repeating patterns of apostasy and reformation, and breaking and renewing the covenant. When the Jews rebelled against their God the Mosaic curses were unleashed on them. Twice this resulted in the fulfillment of the curse of captivity: first under the Babylonians and then under the Romans. God, however, gave the Jews ample warning through a series of prophets, of whom the Messiah was the last.⁶⁷ The Jews were thus given their last opportunity with the coming of Christ, and the final blow came when they rejected his preaching:

But when this doctrine had been preached to the nation of the Jews about seven years & they received it not, but rejected their Prince the Angel of the covenant, God began to reject them from being his people, & to call the Gentiles without obliging them to observe the Law of Moses, & soon after caused the Jewish worship to cease, & the Jews to be dispersed into all nations.⁶⁸

This, of course, was a common Christian position and is repeated in Newton's writings, including his published *Observations*.⁶⁹ Also not particularly unique is Newton's reference to the Jew's failure "to love God with all their heart & soul & their neighbours as themselves, to be just & merciful, temperate meek & humble & content wth their present condition."⁷⁰ Two dynamics of Newton's account, however, are less standard. The first is the absence of a strong focus on the Jew's involvement in the crucifixion.⁷¹ The second is the almost exclusive stress Newton placed on the *prophetic* nature of the Jewish failure.

In the opening folios of his early treatise on Revelation, Newton makes it clear that it was specifically because the Jews failed to understand the Messianic prophecies that God brought judgment down on them. The harshest statement of this belief has him concluding: "in a word it was y^e ignorance of y^e Jews in these prophesies w^{ch} caused them to reject their Messiah & by consequence to be not onely captivated by the Romans but to incur eternal damnations. Luke 19. 42, 44."⁷² While the judgmental sentiment expressed in this summation appears to have softened in later years, the core position that the chief defect of the Jews was a failure to understand prophecy did not. This deficiency in prophetic understanding also had negative practical outworkings, and even led, Newton claimed, to the uprising of the Jewish Zealots during the Jewish Wars. Commenting on the general Messianic expectation engendered by Daniel's Prophecy of the Seventy Weeks, he wrote: "This Prophecy w^{ch} had for some time put y^e Oriental nations in continual expectation of a temporal

Potentate out of Judæa, & w^{ch} y^e Jews understood of y^e Messiah wth that confidence of temporal dominion as to rebell against y^e Romans & begin that war w^{ch} caused their ruin.” Christians, on the other hand, know that this prophecy was meant of Christ.⁷³ Once again it was a misinterpretation of prophecy and this time the results were even more direct and immediate. Newton also implies that they brought their own destruction on themselves; thus the result was just and could not be blamed on God.

But Newton is not satisfied with simply identifying the prophetic failure of the Jews: he also wants to draw a moral lesson from it. First, he emphasizes that God’s people are His people only so long as they keep His covenants. Both Jews and Christians have failed in this and so covenant breaking among the Jews is mirrored by covenant breaking among Gentile Christians.⁷⁴ Newton has the highest degree of respect for divine covenants, and the lowest opinion of those who abrogate them. More specifically, Newton links the breaking of covenants with the failure of the trial of prophecy. Speaking of Christ’s use of difficult parables to test the Jews, Newton admonishes his reader: “Therefore beware that thou be not found wanting in this tryall. For if thou beest, the obscurity of these {prophetic} scriptures will as little excuse thee as y^e obscurity of o^{ur} Saviours Parables excused the Jews.”⁷⁵ Furthermore, punishments awaited Christians who neglected the sure word of prophecy: “how knowest thou that the christian church if they continue to neglect, shall not be punished even in this world as severely as ever were the Jews? Yea will not y^e Jews rise up in judgment against us?”⁷⁶ Newton adds power to these assertions later in the same manuscript, proclaiming that “greater judgments hang over the Christians for their remissness then ever the Jews yet felt.”⁷⁷ Newton, therefore, was by no means singling out the Jews; Christians who failed the trial of prophecy would have it even worse.

“ALL ISRAEL SHALL BE SAVED”: THE THEOLOGICAL RATIONALE OF THE
JEWISH CAPTIVITY AND RESTORATION

Like many Protestant writers of the literalist, non-Augustinian school, Newton had carefully worked out a theological rationale for the Jewish captivity and Restoration. Also like these expositors, Newton spent much time rehearsing the Restorationist interpretation of Romans 11.⁷⁸ The Apostle Paul in this chapter depicts the people of God as an olive tree. Some of the branches (the Jews) were cut off this tree and wild olive shoots (the Gentiles) were grafted into it (Romans 11:17). But Paul goes on to emphasize that the Jewish branches would one day be grafted in again, with the result that “all Israel shall be saved” (Romans 11:26). This event, in turn, is linked with the Second Coming of the Messiah, when the sins of the Jews shall be taken away (Romans 11:26–27).

Newton had no doubt that Romans 11 spoke of the ultimate conversion of the Jews as a *nation*, and not simply as individuals. While Newton agreed with other Christians that God had cut off the Jews for disobedience, he differed from many in asserting that God would restore them again. In his interpreta-

tion of this passage, Newton explicitly rejects the Augustinian line and writes that:

y^e restauration of y^e Jewish nation so much spoken of by y^e old Prophets reflects not y^e few Jews who were converted in y^e Apostles days, but y^e dispersed nation of y^e unbelieving Jews to be converted in y^e end when y^e fulness of y^e Gentiles shal enter, y^t is when the Gospel (upon y^e fall of Babylon) shal begin to be preached to all Nations.⁷⁹

Second, noting that Paul in Romans 11 alluded to the prophetic text Isaiah 59:20–21, he reasons that the Apostle’s argument reflects “y^e time of y^e future conversion & restitution of y^e Jewish Nation.”⁸⁰ Third, he also reflects on the moral message to Gentile Christians, noting that “y^e humour w^{ch} has long reigned among y^e Christians of boasting our selves against y^e Jews, & insulting over them for their not beleiving, is reprehended by y^e Apostle for high-mindedness & self-conceit, & much more is our using them despihtfully, Pharisaiically & impious.”⁸¹ Thus once again Newton does not isolate Jewish unbelief and hypocrisy, choosing rather to lay the blame on Christians as well. For while the Jewish rejection of the Messiah allowed the calling of the Gentiles, the Jews retained their priority: “The churches of the gentiles were a branch of a wild olive grafted into the stock of the Jews, & were not to boast themselves against the natural branches.”⁸² As is evident from his extensive works on the Christian apostasy, Newton saw nothing special about Gentile obedience. Besides, he believed that Paul taught that both Jews and Gentiles alike were to be converted *en masse* when the Gospel was preached at the time of the end.⁸³ Finally, as we will discover in the next section, Newton saw the period of Jewish captivity as inextricably linked to the times of the Gentiles.

THE MYSTERY OF GOD AND THE LATTER DAYS

Before we consider some of the intricacies of Newton’s eschatology, it will be important to clarify some of the terminology and concepts he employs in his discussion of the return of the Jews. In his treatise “Of the Church,” Newton reveals how he understands some of the language of the prophet Daniel in relation to the Jewish people. First, he explains that the Jews “being in a state of affliction persecution dispersion & captivity is by Daniel called The indignation against the holy covenant & in general The indignation.”⁸⁴ Newton goes on to explain that “the last end of the indignation is the last end of the dispersion & captivity of the Host of heaven.” On the same folio Newton identifies the “Host of heaven” in the first instance as the Jews, but later expanding to include the believing Gentiles as well.⁸⁵ Newton’s own exposition of “the indignation” is crucial, since he uses the term elsewhere without explaining its meaning.⁸⁶ Newton also adds that “the transgression of desolation & abomination of desolation is the worship set up by the transgressors in the room of the true daily worship exercised by the Host of heaven.”⁸⁷ Another key concept is Newton’s identification of resurrection in prophecy as a symbol

for "the revival of a dissolved dominion."⁸⁸ This is almost certainly a gloss on Ezekiel 37, the prophecy of the valley of dry bones, commonly interpreted as a symbol for the rebirth of the Jewish nation.⁸⁹

We have already noted that the Jews and their return to Israel in the latter days were central to Newton's overall prophetic scheme. Locating the time of the Restoration in relation to the series of other prophetic events in Newton's exposition is vital, as the return of the Jews acts as a sign of synchronous and subsequent apocalyptic happenings. Here it is most important to stress that Newton links the return of the Jews with the sounding of the seventh trumpet of Revelation, which for him signals the return of Christ, the Resurrection, the Judgment, Armageddon and the beginning of the Millennium.⁹⁰ It is difficult to determine, however, whether Newton ever settled on more precise associations. In one place, he simply links the time of the resurrection with the return of the Jews without being more specific.⁹¹ In his "Of the Church," he links the conversion and return of the Jews (events he appears to see as simultaneous, or near simultaneous) with the Second Coming, the end of the times of the Gentiles and the first Resurrection.⁹² In other places Newton moves beyond mere juxtaposition and appears to suggest ordered sequences. Thus in one manuscript he links the Restoration, the Resurrection and end of the saints' tribulation, and then places after these events the fall of the kingdoms and the return of Christ.⁹³ In his manuscript on the Second Coming, he concludes that the return would occur after the resurrection (which will include the Jews to whom the promise of the land was first made) and at the sound of the seventh trumpet.⁹⁴ In another writing, he reverses this and states that the resurrection and judgment would occur immediately after the tribulation and return of the Jews from captivity.⁹⁴ In an earlier manuscript, he comes to what appears to be the same conclusion, and states that the Kingdom of God and Christ "commences at y^e sounding of y^e seventh Trumpet, & is founded by y^e conversion of y^e Jews & their return from captivity."⁹⁶ An even more specific chronology from two early eighteenth-century manuscripts has the call to return and rebuild Jerusalem occurring forty-nine years before the resurrection and the Second Coming, with the fulfillment of the return beginning about three or four years after the call to rebuild and apparently continuing up to the appearance of Christ.⁹⁷ Thus, while the exact sequence of events is not always easy to determine, it is clear that in Newton's premillennialist scheme, the conversion and return of the Jews serve to usher in the Millennium.

Newton does seem certain, however, that the conversion and return of the Jews would begin before Armageddon. In one place he lists a series of verses from the Major and Minor Prophets that he believes predict that this great battle would occur shortly after the conversion and Restoration of Israel.⁹⁸ This is in line with Mede, who argues that the Jews had to be converted before Armageddon, or else "they should be destroyed (with the rest of the enemies of Christ amongst whom they yet remain) in that great Day of universall revenge and judgment."⁹⁹ Newton also believed that the Turkish Empire would remain until the end of the Jewish captivity,¹⁰⁰ suggesting therefore that one could look for evidence of the demise of the former as a sign of the latter.¹⁰¹

Like Mede before him, Newton was particularly concerned with sorting out prophetic synchronisations. With this in mind, it is important to note that he was confident that the period of the Jew's captivity was synchronous with two crucial apocalyptic time periods. First, he saw the "times of the Gentiles" as coextensive with the captivity. For Newton the captivity of the Jews was the negative corollary of the times of the Gentiles: both periods are synchronous and the Restitution will bring the Jews back into favor and establish harmony. At the end of this combined period there is to be a great harvest, for he believed that the conversion of the Jews would be accompanied by the conversion of "the fullness of y^e Gentiles."¹⁰² Second, Newton saw both these periods as spanning the same time period as the apostasy, claiming that the Man of Sin (that is, the papacy) would prosper until "the indignation [against y^e Jews] be accomplished."¹⁰³ In fact, Newton goes so far as to say that Daniel's phrase "the latter days" was exactly synchronous with "all the time of the Jewish captivity" from AD 70.¹⁰⁴ And so all three of these great time periods run and end together, converging at the great and universal apocalyptic restitution, which Newton sees as the "mystery of God" that will be finished at the voice of the Angel of the seventh trumpet, as confirmed in Revelation 10:7.¹⁰⁵ All of this adds meaning to Newton's quotation of Peter's speech in Acts 4:19, which speaks of Christ remaining in heaven "until the times of restitution of all things."¹⁰⁶

The Millennium was thus to be a time of general Restoration. This also included the Promised Land itself. Newton specifically refers to the land of Israel being emptied in AD 70 and remaining "desolate" to his own day¹⁰⁷ – a view he may have derived from anecdotal testimony and his travel accounts of the Holy Land. This desolation was to last until the command to return and rebuild Jerusalem.¹⁰⁸ The Jewish Temple was also to be rebuilt,¹⁰⁹ and the Jewish people were to become mortal inhabitants of the Kingdom of God on earth.¹¹⁰ Following the Hebrew Prophets, Newton also believed that the rebuilt Jerusalem would be the center of world rule during the Millennium.¹¹¹

"AND THEN SHALL THE END COME": THE TIME OF THE RESTORATION OF THE JEWS

Having reconstructed the nature of Newton's belief in the Restoration of the Jews, it will be valuable to consider in more detail its projected timing in history. But attempting to determine the exact time Newton felt the Jews would return should not be viewed simply as an exercise in intellectual voyeurism. Instead, such knowledge reveals much about Newton's perceptions of world and political events, along with his own actions or inactions concerning his preaching to others.¹¹² We will begin with his general characterizations of the length of the period, and then move on to consider some more specific chronologies.

Newton believed that the period of the Jewish captivity would be of a very lengthy duration. More than once, he speaks of the "long captivity" of the Jews.¹¹³ In one place he is more exact, and writes that the period of the Jewish

captivity was to last “almost 2000 years.”¹¹⁴ Newton also cites the ancient Jewish and Christian tradition that this world would continue for six millennia and links the end of this period with the creation of the new heaven and earth, the “renovation regeneration or restitution of y^e world,” along with “y^e second coming of Christ <the first resurrection & judgment of y^e saints.>”¹¹⁵ Likewise, Newton saw a long time frame for the times of the Gentiles and the duration of the apostasy. The largest portion of this time would also see the reign of the ten kingdoms arising after the fall of the Roman Empire, which Newton posited would endure for “a long time,” until “Ægypt should have a king of y^e Greek stock, & y^e Jews be converted; neither of w^{ch} we see yet come to pass.”¹¹⁶ In his treatise “Of the Church,” the full period of the apostasy extends all the way from the time of the Apostles to the Second Coming of Christ.¹¹⁷ Thus, Newton saw both a long period for the captivity and a lengthy duration for the apostasy – periods already shown to be synchronous in Newton’s scheme.

Daniel’s Prophecy of the Seventy Weeks (Daniel 9:24–7) was crucial to Newton’s end-time calculations. The normal pattern for expositors was to calculate seventy weeks (490 years according to the day-for-a-year principle) from the call to rebuild Jerusalem under the Persians and the return from the Babylonian captivity to the first coming of Christ. Several different chronologies were suggested (arriving at either Christ’s birth or crucifixion) and Newton himself settled on one in which the 490 years of Daniel 9:24 concluded with 33 or 34 AD.¹¹⁸ However, Newton also isolated the seven weeks (forty-nine years) of Daniel 9:25 as referring to the time immediately before Christ’s Second Coming.¹¹⁹ He thus believed that there would be an interval of forty-nine years between the future call “to restore and to build Jerusalem” and the Second Coming of the Messiah. And because the command to return and rebuild Jerusalem occurs forty-nine years before the Messiah comes again, he also conjectures that “it may perhaps come forth not from the *Jews* themselves, but some other kingdom friendly to them.”¹²⁰ Newton integrates this interval into Daniel’s other periods of 1290 and 1335 days (Daniel 12:11–12). In his “Of the Church,” he conjectures one scenario in which the 1290 days (that is to say, years) conclude “when God shall have accomplished to scatter the power of his holy people.” This completion of the dispersion, he speculates, could occur about three or four years after the command to return and rebuild Jerusalem. This gives him the full forty-nine years (seven prophetic weeks of years) between the command to return and the coming of “Messiah the Prince,” which, as he correctly points out, is the duration of a Jewish Jubilee.¹²¹ Thus, with the call to rebuild going out around the prophetic year 1286 or 1287, the addition of a forty-nine-year Jubilee brings him to “the blessedness of the Saints & resurrection of Daniel at the end of the 1335 prophetic days.”¹²² This allows Newton to harmonize his forty-nine year period with the forty-five year gap between the 1290 and 1335 years.¹²³ In an early eighteenth-century treatise on Revelation, Newton suggests a starting point for the 1290 and 1335 years, writing that they seem to begin either with 609 AD “or perhaps a little later.”¹²⁴ In this scenario, the call to return and rebuild Jerusalem would go out in 1895

or 1896 AD, and the 1335 years conclude in 1944. While he believes that these dates commence with the taking away of the “daily sacrifice”, it is evident that in this case he is referring to the rise of the papacy. His *Observations* give slightly later starting dates and suggest that the end will come between 2000 and 2050 AD.¹²⁵

Newton also saw a place for the 2300 days of Daniel 8:15. After arguing that the 2300 days of the profanation of the Temple under the “little horn” (Daniel 8:9) were not fulfilled in literal days in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes (a position held by preterist interpreters), he places this period within the context of the final Jewish captivity, arguing that the little horn (which for him was the papacy) was to act until “the last end of the indignation” that was not yet complete, and that during this period “[t]he sanctuary continued cast down 2300 days before it was cleansed, & days in sacred prophesy are put for years.”¹²⁶ When did these 2300 days (years) begin? Newton lists four suggestions in the *Observations*. First, he gives the tumultuous event of the destruction of the Temple by Vespasian in AD 70. Second, he offers “the pollution of the Sanctuary” with the construction of the Temple to Jupiter Olympius in 132. Third, he gives the slightly later “desolation of *Judea*” after the Bar Kochba revolt of 135–6. Finally, he suggests “{s}ome other period which time will discover.”¹²⁷ Thus, the sanctuary could be cleansed sometime between 2370 and 2436 AD.¹²⁸ In his early eighteenth-century commentary on the Apocalypse, Newton states that the Jewish captivity began when the Romans took away the daily sacrifice, which he explicitly identifies as the Jewish War under the reigns of Nero and Vespasian.¹²⁹ This forced cessation of the sacrifice is Daniel’s “abomination of desolation.”¹³⁰

These multiple prophetic chronologies suggest that Newton may have never settled on a definite date for the end of the Jewish captivity. This would, of course, be in keeping with his general reluctance to set dates.¹³¹ Nor was he always concerned about every detail, commenting in one place: “The manner I know not. Let time be the interpreter.”¹³² But the exact time is not important for our purposes. For someone living in the early eighteenth century, the years to which Newton points were all abstract dates in the distant future. Whatever the exact time, it was far enough in the future to have little immediate impact on Newton’s own life and actions.¹³³

ISAAC NEWTON ON THE RETURN OF THE JEWS

This study has shown that Newton had worked out an elaborate theology and eschatology of the Jewish Restoration, and he offers a rich example of such millenarian beliefs in his period. His conclusions were based on a thorough reading of all the relevant biblical texts, and he believed that the return of the Jews was not only a central theme in biblical prophecy, but that it linked with all of the major apocalyptic events to come. Compelling testimony of his belief in the importance of understanding prophecy is seen in his identification of the major cause of the Jewish captivity as a failure to interpret prophecy correctly. Aside from serving to open a window on the motivations behind his own

intense, decades-long prophetic investigations, this position reveals the distinctive way he viewed prophecy. For Newton, it was a divine challenge, a test to try the faithful. Prophecy acted as a standard with which to distinguish the sheep from the goats. Newton wrote that “God has so ordered the Prophecies, that in the latter days *the wise may understand, but the wicked shall do wickedly, and none of the wicked shall understand*, Dan. xii.9,10.”¹³⁴ Christians, too, could and did fail in this test – all the while with punishments and damnation hanging over their heads. Corrupt and enervated prophetic hermeneutics were the cause of Israel’s failure and a crucial reason why Christians of Newton’s own time could and did fail as well. While other Christian expositors tended to emphasize the Jewish rejection of the person of the Messiah and their implication in his crucifixion as the direct cause of their rejection, Newton focused on their inability to understand prophecy. This notion of the need for adeptness is all very typical of a man who once declared that he made his *Principia* “abstruse” because he had no time for “little Smatterers in Mathematicks.”¹³⁵ Nor did he, we can add, have much respect for triflers in hermeneutics.

Yet while Newton believed that very few of his own degenerate age would fathom the depths of prophecy, he also maintained that the time of the end would realize a blossoming of such understanding. Here we see one final great significance the return of the Jews plays in Newton’s scheme. In a manuscript fragment from the early eighteenth century, Newton wrote that prophecy would be “better understood” at the end of the “the time times & half a time” (1260 years). Moreover, he added that it would be understood

still better at the ~~<going forth of the commandment to cause>~~ return of the Jews from their long captivity predicted by Moses & the Prophets And if there shall then go forth a commandment to restore Jerusalem to its old inhabitants, ~~the truth will fully appear within seven weeks after~~ this will make the interpretation ~~worth considering~~ ~~<here proposed>~~ still more plausible & worth considering.¹³⁶

Although lacking a context, this isolated jotting suggests that Newton believed the return of the Jews would be a decisive event that would usher in an age of prophetic understanding. To underscore the miracle of this prophecy, Newton stressed that the captivity had been predicted by Moses a full 3000 years before and by Isaiah more than 2400 years before his own time. The fulfillment of the second aspect of these prophecies (the return) was thus “<made probable> by the expulsion of the Jews from their own & land & their ~~<very long>~~ dispersion into all nations.”¹³⁷ For Newton, who held that unfulfilled prophecy remained obscure, but when completed served as a “convincing argument” for providence,¹³⁸ the return of the Jews would act as the ultimate evidence for the validity of biblical prophecy.¹³⁹ But the opening quotation of this paper also makes it clear that Newton believed the truth should already have been evident to those who had eyes to see. Newton, like Whiston, found it incredible that the anti-Restorationists would not submit to

the weight of the testimony of Scripture.¹⁴⁰ This opposing viewpoint helps provide a controversial backdrop to much of Newton's writings on the Restoration, including the example cited at the beginning of this paper. As with other examples from the life of the great man, this opposition likely presented a powerful stimulation to study, write and demolish the arguments of his exegetical enemies.

The temporal distance of Newton's conception of the Jewish Restoration from his own time is startling. While Finch thought the conversion of the Jews would begin in 1650, Mede at a date no later than 1715,¹⁴¹ William Lloyd by 1736,¹⁴² and his own erstwhile protégé Whiston by 1766,¹⁴³ Newton saw it as centuries away. There can be no doubt that his vision of the return of the Jews was strong. Few intellectuals of Newton's day could match the vigor of his faith in this prophetic event. Nevertheless, there is no sense of apocalyptic urgency. While the otherwise similarly-minded Whiston preached the nearness of the end, the imminence of the Jewish Restoration and toured the English resort towns with a model of the Millennial Temple, Newton stayed at his desk, communed with his books and worked and reworked prophetic treatises that few in his own lifetime would read.¹⁴⁴ However, while he did not think apocalyptically about his present, he did see an intensely apocalyptic period focused at the end of time. Implicit in this eschatological profile one can also see Newton's inherent religious radicalism. By contending that the true Gospel would not be widely preached until the end, he marginalizes the Reformation and distances himself from the mainstream Protestantism of his day. This belief even leads Newton to read Romans 11 differently: the time when "all Israel shall be saved" was not the time when the converted Jews would be added to already believing Gentiles. Rather, for Newton this referred to the moment at the end when all Israel – Jew and Gentile alike – would convert together to true Christianity.¹⁴⁵ Unlike many other Christians, Newton refused to place Jewish faithlessness over Gentile Christian unbelief. Moreover, Newton's prophetic world was a very private one. Unlike so many others of his age, there is no direct political context for his belief in the return of the Jews, no discussion of mercantile interests and no evidence of involvement in efforts to convert the Jews in his time.¹⁴⁶

It is difficult to estimate the impact of Newton's published writing on the return of the Jews. While it would be wrong to argue that his influence was great, conservative Protestants nevertheless saw him as an important prophetic authority and recent scholarship has demonstrated that his published *Observations* – which includes a detailed section on the return of the Jews – was a chief source for fundamentalist exegetes of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.¹⁴⁷ And, while it is not overly lengthy, the section on the return of the Jews in the *Observations* is one of the fullest and most detailed articulations of his views on this subject.¹⁴⁸ Nor must we overlook the secondary (albeit likely more important) influence he exerted through theological disciples such as Whiston, who published several works that deal with the Jewish Restoration.¹⁴⁹ In both cases Newton's exegesis merged with a prophetic tradition that helped create during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries the religious and

political climates that paved the way for the resettlement of Jews in Palestine – the longed-for vision of the Restoration.¹⁵⁰ Newton would have approved.

Cambridge University

NOTES

1. Research for this paper was made possible by a Queen Elizabeth II British Columbia Centennial Scholarship and a Commonwealth Scholarship for the United Kingdom. I would like to acknowledge the kind permission of the Jewish National and University Library, Jerusalem; the Provost and Fellows of King’s College, Cambridge; Fondation Martin Bodmer, Geneva; the Warden and Fellows of New College, Oxford; and Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Michigan for permission to quote from manuscripts in their archives. I would also like to thank Matt Goldish and Scott Mandelbrote for their kind assistance.
2. Jewish National and University Library (Jerusalem) Yahuda MS 6, f. 12r. Transcriptions given herein represent deletions as strike-outs, while insertions are enclosed within angle brackets and (since Newton himself uses square brackets) my own editorial expansions are placed within braces.
3. Yahuda MS 6, f. 12r.
4. Although there exists no previous extended study of this subject, see Franz Kobler, “Newton on the Restoration of the Jews,” *Jewish Frontier* (March 1943), 21–3; Frank E. Manuel, *The Religion of Isaac Newton* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1974), 67; and David Castillejo, *The Expanding Force in Newton’s Cosmos* (Madrid: Ediciones de Arte y Bibliofilia, 1981), 37–8, 54–5.
5. See the microfilm collection released by Chadwyck-Healey of Cambridge, along with the catalogue *Sir Isaac Newton: A Catalogue of Manuscripts and Papers Collected and Published on Microfilm by Chadwyck-Healey*, ed. Peter Jones (Cambridge: Chadwyck-Healey, 1991). A new project to publish Newton’s theological manuscripts, under the direction of Rob Iliffe and Scott Mandelbrote, promises to provide even greater access.
6. On Mede and his crucial role in introducing premillenarian exposition in England, see Robert G. Clouse, “The Rebirth of Millenarianism,” *Puritans, the Millennium and the Future of Israel: Puritan Eschatology 1600 to 1660*, ed. Peter Toon (Cambridge: James Clarke, 1970), 42–65. On Protestant apocalyptic thought in the seventeenth century, see Richard H. Popkin, ed., *Millenarianism and Messianism in English Literature and Thought 1650–1800* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1988); Katherine R. Firth, *The Apocalyptic Tradition in Reformation Britain 1530–1645* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979); Paul Christianson, *Reformers and Babylon: English Apocalyptic Visions from the Reformation to the Eve of the Civil War* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1978); and Bryan W. Ball, *A Great Expectation: Eschatological Thought in English Protestantism to 1660* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1975). The importance of millenarian thought to many intellectuals in this period is demonstrated in Popkin’s seminal “The Third Force in Seventeenth-Century Thought: Skepticism, Science and Millenarianism,” *The Prism of Science: The Israel Colloquium*, ed. Edna Ullmann-Margalit, vol. 2. (Dordrecht: D. Reidel, 1986), 21–50.
7. This development was one legacy of what historian George H. Williams calls the “acute Hebraicization” of the Reformation (Williams, *Radical Reformation*, 3rd ed. [Kirkville: Sixteenth Century Journal Publishers, 1992], 12). Several helpful studies that treat belief in the return of the Jews during the early modern period include Avihu Zakai, “The Poetics of History and the Destiny of Israel: The Role of the Jews in English Apocalyptic Thought During the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries,” *Journal of Jewish Thought and Philosophy* 5 (1996), 313–50; Nabil I. Matar, “John Locke and the Jews,” *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 44 (1993), 45–62; “The Controversy over the Restoration of the Jews in English Protestant Thought, 1701–1753,” *Durham University Journal* 80 (1988), 241–56; “Milton and the Idea of

- the Restoration of the Jews,” *Studies in English Literature* 27 (1987), 109–24; “The Idea of the Restoration of the Jews in English Protestant Thought: Between the Reformation and 1660,” *Durham University Journal* 78 (1985), 23–35; “The Idea of the Restoration of the Jews in English Protestant Thought, 1661–1701,” *Harvard Theological Review* 78 (1985), 115–48; Christopher Hill, “‘Till the Conversion of the Jews,”” *Millenarianism and Messianism*, 12–36; Regina Sharif, “Christians for Zion, 1600–1919,” *Journal of Palestine Studies* 5 (1976), 123–41; Mayir Vreté, “The Restoration of the Jews in English Protestant Thought 1790–1840,” *Middle Eastern Studies* 8 (1972), 3–50.
8. Vreté, “The Restoration of the Jews,” 15.
 9. Important works in this genre include Andrew Willet, *De universali i novissima Iudaeorum vocatione* (Cambridge, 1590); Thomas Draxe, *The worldes resurrection or the general calling of the Jewes* (1608); and Thomas Brightman, *Apocalypsis Apocalypseos* (Frankfurt, 1609). See Vreté, “Restoration of the Jews,” 15–16, 45–6.
 10. [Finch], *The worlds great restauration or calling of the Jews, and (with them) of all nations and kingdoms of the earth to the faith of Christ* (London, 1621).
 11. Mede presented the influential interpretation that the drying up of the Euphrates during the sixth vial stood for the collapse of the Turkish Empire, which would allow “the kings of the east” (the Jews) to return to their land (Mede, *The key of the Revelation*, tr. Richard More [London, 1643] part 2, 118–20 and “Compendium” sigs. Ss2v, Ss3r, Ss4r; see also the comments in the preface by William Twisse, who argues that the return of the Jews to Israel would so enrage the Turks as to set in motion the battle of Armageddon [*Key*, sigs. B2r, a3r]). For additional background on Mede’s views, see Vreté, “Restoration of the Jews,” 17–18.
 12. Matar, “Restoration of the Jews, 1661–1701”; and “Restoration of the Jews, 1701–1753.” Thus, Newton’s acceptance of the literal, Restorationist view must be placed against the backdrop of his own period, as from 1660 increasing numbers of exegetes involved in the conservative theological reaction of the Restoration opposed the idea of a literal return of the Jews to Israel (this is not to say that opposition did not exist earlier as well). Matar concludes that this anti-Restorationist movement was at its strongest in the 1690s (Matar, “Restoration of the Jews, 1661–1701,” 134–46).
 13. One illustrative example of this is Pierre Allix (on whom, see Matt Goldish, “The Battle for ‘True’ Jewish Christianity: Peter Allix’s Polemics against the Unitarians and Millenarians,” unpublished typescript).
 14. See David S. Katz, *Philo-Semitism and the Readmission of the Jews to England 1603–1655* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1982) and the studies by Matar cited above in note 7.
 15. For a fuller treatment of this, see Matt Goldish, *Judaism in the Theology of Isaac Newton* (Dordrecht: Kluwer, 1998), 26–32.
 16. John Harrison, *The Library of Isaac Newton* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978), items 1018, 1019, 1020, 1021 and 1022.
 17. Harrison, *Library of Newton*, item 873. On Newton and the Kabbalah, see Goldish, “Newton on Kabbalah,” in *The Books of Nature and Scripture: Recent Essays on Natural Philosophy, Theology, and Biblical Criticism in the Netherlands of Spinoza’s Time and the British Isles of Newton’s Time*, James E. Force and Richard H. Popkin, eds., (Dordrecht: Kluwer, 1994), 89–103.
 18. Harrison, *Library of Newton*, item 1300.
 19. The mere possession of such works, or course, does not necessarily imply assent with their content on the part of the owner. Newton often used his books simply as historical sources and it is clear that in the case of the Kabbalah he saw its teachings as metaphysical, paganized corruptions (King’s College [Cambridge], Keynes MS 3, p. 33; Fondation Martin Bodmer [Geneva] MS, 4, f. 4r; 4A, ff. 40r–41r; where no consistent foliation exists in this manuscript, I number folios from the inserted type-written chapter divisions). Newton also rejected the emanationist philosophy presented in the Kabbalah (see Manuel, *Religion of Newton*, 46, 68–71).
 20. Harrison, *Library of Newton*, items 321, 322, 351, 888, 937, 1148, 1230, 1389, 1470.
 21. Harrison, *Library of Newton*, item 206. This Bible shows signs of dog-earing and contains Latin annotations in Newton’s hand (Trinity College, Cambridge, shelf mark NQ.8.22).

22. See especially Babson College MS 434; Babson MS 435 (both now held at MIT); Harry Ransom Humanities Research Center (University of Texas at Austin) MS HRC 132; Yahuda MS 2.4 and portions of the Bodmer MS, Andrews University (Berrien Springs, Michigan) ASC MS.N47 HER; Public Record Office (London) Mint Papers 19/3 and Yahuda MSS 10, 13.2, 14, 15, 28. A portion of Newton’s writings on the Temple was published as a chapter in his *Chronology of ancient kingdoms amended* (London, 1728), 332–46. All of this is in addition to the material on the Temple and Jewish ritual in Newton’s prophetic manuscripts, including Yahuda MS 1 and Keynes MS 5. See also the summary of Jewish, Mishnaic and Christian Hebraist sources cited in Newton’s works given in Frank E. Manuel, *Isaac Newton, Historian* (Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap, 1963), 268. Manuel also discusses Newton’s use of Christian Hebraist sources (Manuel, *Religion of Newton*, 85–6). Newton shared his interest in the Jewish Temple with men such as Henry More, John Locke and William Whiston (see Matar, “Locke and the Jews,” 61).
23. In his interpretations of prophecies, Newton believed that the Temple was the scene of the visions of Revelation (Yahuda MS 7.3c, f. 6r; Keynes MS 5, ff. Vr, 6r); in his millenarian beliefs, he held that the Jerusalem Temple would be rebuilt in the Kingdom age (Newton, *Observations upon the Prophecies of Daniel, and the Apocalypse of St. John* [London, 1733], 133).
24. Harrison, *Library of Newton*, items 673, 842, 945, 1295, 1454, 1469, 1470, 1482, 1484, 1521, 1545, 1713 and 1714. Newton also possessed a work on Jewish coinage (item 467).
25. Ezekiel 40–48. See Trinity College, Cambridge, Adv.d.1.10² (Harrison, *Library of Newton*, item 188).
26. Keynes, “Newton, the Man,” *Newton Tercentenary Celebrations* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1947) 30.
27. Richard H. Popkin, “Some Further Comments on Newton and Maimonides,” in *Essays on the Context, Nature, and Influence of Isaac Newton’s Theology*, James E. Force and Richard H. Popkin, eds., (Dordrecht: Kluwer, 1990), 1–7; “Newton and Maimonides,” in *A Straight Path. Studies in Medieval Philosophy and Culture*, ed. Ruth Link-Salinger, et al (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1988), 216–29; José Faur, “Newton, Maimonides, and Esoteric Knowledge,” *Cross Currents: Religion and Intellectual Life* 40 (1990), 526–38.
28. Goldish, *Judaism in the Theology of Newton*. This work appeared as I was preparing my final draft and I was gratified to find general agreement between my paper and Goldish’s discussion of the relevant issues in his very valuable study. While I have not had time to assess Goldish’s book in detail, I have included some updates in my footnotes in light of his work.
29. Harrison, *Library of Newton*, items 132, 133, 461, 749, 861, 862, 1348.
30. Manuel, *Isaac Newton, Historian*, 92–3.
31. The best study of Newton’s *Chronology* remains Manuel’s masterful *Isaac Newton, Historian*.
32. These include Jean de la Rocque, *Voyage dans la Palestine* (Amsterdam, 1718); Paul Lucas, *Voyage du Sieur Paul Lucas au Levant* (Paris, 1704), Henry Maundrell, *A journey from Aleppo to Jerusalem* (Oxford, 1721); and Joseph Pitton de Tournefort, *Relation d’un voyage du Levant* (Lyon, 1717). See Harrison, *Library of Newton*, items 918, 987, 1041 and 1322.
33. Harrison, *Library of Newton*, item 11.
34. Newton refers to Mede with approbation in his early treatise on Revelation, which dates from the 1670s (Yahuda MSS 1.1a, ff. 8r (bis), 28r (bis); 1.1b, f. 1r; 1.3, f. 51r; 1.4, f. 36v). Newton also refers to More and Hugo Grotius in Yahuda MS 1.1a, f. 28r, and further acknowledges his debt to Mede in Yahuda MS 14, f. 85r and Keynes MS 5, ff. Ir, 2r and to Grotius in Yahuda MS 1.1a, f. 33v and Keynes MS 2, 21, 22 and 91. Further to these examples, Newton mentions (in a positive light) the prophetic exposition of William Lloyd, Bishop of Worcester, in Yahuda MS 7.1c, ff. 2r, 4r, 5v, 8r.
35. Perhaps wishing he had found references to his own prophetic works in the *Observations*, Whiston said of Newton that other than using Mede, he “seems to have digged long in the deepest Mines of Scripture and Antiquity for his precious Ore himself; and very rarely to have condescended to make use of others on these Occasions” [Whiston, *Six dissertations* (London, 1734), 270].

36. For example, in 1736 Whiston acted as an agent for a Protestant benefactor sending financial relief to the community of Jews in Duke's Place, by Aldgate in London [Whiston, *Memoirs of the life and writings of Mr. William Whiston*, 2nd ed. (London, 1753), 1:298]. Earlier, in 1729, Whiston had raised money for a converted Jew named Abraham Elias (British Library, Add. MS. 28, 104, f. 28). Goldish shows that another of Newton's disciples, John Theophilus Desaguliers, enjoyed close personal contact with the London Portuguese Jew Jacob de Castro Sarmiento (Goldish, *Judaism in the Theology of Newton*, 36). Goldish also notes that many of Newton's Protestant associates had contact with Jews and that Newton's lack of such contact appears atypical (Goldish, *Judaism in the Theology of Newton*, 33–4).
37. Moving beyond Newton's circle to a wider phenomenon, Matar argues that very few of the Restorationist exegetes of seventeenth century ever personally encountered Jews (Matar, "Restoration of the Jews, 1661–1701," 116). Nevertheless, Goldish is probably correct to suggest that Newton, who lived into an age that saw increasing numbers of Jews in London, represented "an extreme of dissociation from living Jews" (Goldish, *Judaism in the Theology of Newton*, 34).
38. See the early intimations in Yahuda MS 1.1a, f. 30r; Yahuda MS 1.1b, f. 4r; Yahuda MS 1.2, ff. 25r, 27r; Yahuda MS 1.4, f. 106r. For the later period, see the note on Daniel's 2300 days scribbled on the back of a letter from George Needham dated 16 May 1725 (Mint Papers, 19/5, f. 12v).
39. See for example ASC MS.N47 HER, 10–24 and Bodmer MS, "Sketches, notes and outlines for 'Of the Church,'" f. 7r;
40. Yahuda MS 9.2, f. 145r.
41. Yahuda MS 6, f. 12r (cited at the beginning of this paper). Accordingly, the number of references to the return of the Jews in Newton's manuscripts is too numerous to cover exhaustively in this paper.
42. Newton, *Observations*, 133; Yahuda MS 1.4, f. 106r. It must be stressed, however, that such use of the apocrypha and pseudepigrapha is a rare occurrence in Newton's writings.
43. Whiston also followed his one-time mentor in using this inductive, quantitative argument for prophecy. See my "The Argument over Prophecy: An Eighteenth-Century Debate between William Whiston and Anthony Collins," *Lumen* 15 (1996), 195–213.
44. Yahuda MS 7.1e, f. 27r; Yahuda MS 7.1f, f. 3r.
45. Keynes MS 5, f. 137r, 138r; Yahuda MS 1.8, f. 5r.
46. Yahuda MS 8.2, f. 7r.
47. Keynes MS 5, f. 32r (see also ff. 35r–36r).
48. Keynes MS 5, f. 29r.
49. Bodmer MS, 1, f. 8r (see also Bodmer MS, "Additional Chapters," f. 50r and Yahuda MS 7.2g, f. 2r).
50. Allix, *An examination of several Scripture prophecies, which the Reverend M.W. hath applyed to the Times after the coming of the Messiah* (London, 1707), 45, in Allix, *Two treatises. I. A confutation of the hopes of the Jews concerning the last redemption. II. An answer to Mr. Whiston's late treatise on the Revelations* (London, 1707). Newton owned a copy of this work (Harrison, *Library of Newton*, item 30).
51. Yahuda MS 9.2, f. 157r.
52. Bodmer MS, "Sketches, notes and outlines for 'Of the Church,'" f. 7r.
53. ASC MS. N47 HER, 4–7 (quotation from page 4). On page 4 of this manuscript, Newton concludes that "God's covenant with {Abraham, Isaac and Jacob} extends to y^c resurrection".
54. ASC MS. N47 HER, 6, 4.
55. Yahuda MS 6, f. 15r. Newton makes a similar assertion in Yahuda MS 10, f. 1r–v.
56. This is the position taken by Allix in his *Examination of several Scripture prophecies*, 27–40.
57. Yahuda MS 9.2, ff. 142r–143r; see also Yahuda MS 7.1j, f. 24r.
58. Yahuda MS 9.2, f. 143r.
59. See also Yahuda MS 9.2, f. 144r.
60. Yahuda MS 9.2, ff. 144r–145r.
61. Yahuda MS 7.2g, f. 2r; Yahuda MS 9.2, f. 158r; New College Oxford MS 361.3, ff. 89r–v; ASC MS.N47 HER, 13.

62. ASC MS.N47 HER, 10.
63. Yahuda MS 7.1c, f. 4v.
64. “The *Israelites* in the days of the antient Prophets, when the ten Tribes were led into captivity, expected a double return; and that at the first the *Jews* should build a new Temple inferior to *Solomon's*, until the time of that age should be fulfilled; and afterwards they should return from all places of their captivity, and build *Jerusalem* and the Temple gloriously” (Newton, *Observations*, 132–3).
65. See the list of scriptural texts in ASC MS.N47 HER, 9.
66. Newton was particularly struck by the forty-ninth verse of this chapter, which speaks of a foreign army coming against Israel “as swift as the eagle flieth.” In one place Newton wrote out this passage and underlined the word “eagle” (ASC MS.N47 HER, 9), which he identifies elsewhere as the Roman Empire. Newton’s reasons for this identification included the fact that “a flying Eagle was the standard of a {Roman} Legion” and that the apocryphal work Esdras uses the eagle as a symbol of Rome (Keynes MS 5, f. 31r; see also f. 19v).
67. Newton, *Observations*, 13.
68. Bodmer MS, 1, ff. 1r–2r.
69. Bodmer MS, 1, f. 22r, 22v; Bodmer MS, 7, f. 2r; Newton, *Observations*, 13–14.
70. Bodmer MS, 1, f. 8r. Newton gave almost identical lists of deficiencies in his exposure of the failings of Christianity (see, for example, Keynes MS 3).
71. While it never appears as a major theme in his writings, Newton does nevertheless occasionally speak of the Jews crucifying Christ (Bodmer MS, 1, f. 8r; Keynes MS 9, f. 1r, fragment Br). He also refers to the Jews as “Christ’s enemies” (Keynes MS 5, f. 64r; Yahuda MS 7.2a, f. 3r).
72. Yahuda MS 1.1a, f. 2r.
73. Yahuda MS 1.4, f. 168r. On the Jews mistaking the Messiah at his first coming for a temporal king, see also Bodmer MS, 1, f. 8r.
74. Newton, *Observations*, 13–14.
75. Yahuda MS 1.1a, f. 2v.
76. Yahuda MS 1.1a, f. 3v.
77. Yahuda MS 1.1a, f. 5r.
78. Bodmer MS, 1, f. 8r; Bodmer MS, 7, f. 3r; Bodmer MS, “Additional chapters,” f. 49r; Bodmer MS, “Sketches, notes and outlines for ‘Of the Church,’” f. 7r; Yahuda MS 1.2, f. 25r; Yahuda MS 9.2, ff. 123r–124r, 152r, 158r; ASC MS.N47 HER, 4,13.
79. Yahuda MS 9.2, f. 158r.
80. Yahuda MS 9.2, f. 158r.
81. Yahuda MS 9.2, f. 158r.
82. Bodmer MS, 1, f. 8r.
83. Yahuda MS 9.2, ff. 123r–124r.
84. Bodmer MS, 1, f. 1r. These references to the indignation are found in Daniel 8:19, 11:30 and 11:36.
85. Bodmer MS, 1, f. 1r.
86. For example, the term appears three times in Keynes MS 5 (ff. 137r–v) and in each case is not specifically defined. Many other examples could be cited.
87. Bodmer MS, 1, f. 1r. This same material is presented again in Bodmer MS, 1, f. 22v.
88. Keynes MS 5, ff. Iv–r, 6r.
89. We know that Newton interpreted this chapter in this way, since he includes it in at least two lists of verses describing the Restoration of the Jews to their land (Bodmer MS, “Sketches, notes and outlines for ‘Of the Church,’” f. 7r; Newton, *Observations*, 134). The chapter also appears in Yahuda MS 6, f. 12r.
90. Bodleian MS Locke c.27, f. 88r; Yahuda MS 8.2, f. 7r.
91. Keynes MS 5, f. 138r.
92. Bodmer MS, “Sketches, notes and outlines for ‘Of the Church,’” f. 7r.
93. Yahuda MS 9.2, f. 19r.
94. ASC MS. N47 HER, 6, 4.
95. Yahuda MS 6, f. 8r.

96. Yahuda MS 9.2, f. 145r.
97. Yahuda MS 7.2g, f. 3v (*cf.* f. 4r); Bodmer MS, 1, f. 23r.
98. Newton's heading for these verses is: "Contingit hæc gentium congregatio et perditio proxime post conversionem & reductionem filiorum Israel de captivitate" (Yahuda MS 8.2, f. 6r; *cf.* Yahuda MS 9.2, ff. 124r, 147r). In this same place he also specifies that Armageddon would occur before all the Jews had returned (Yahuda MS 8.2, f. 6r). Newton appears less interested in establishing whether the Jews' conversion or return would come first. His follower Whiston, however, clearly states that he believes the Jews would return first in unbelief (Whiston, "Of the Restoration of the Jews," *Sermons and Essays upon Several Subjects* [London, 1709], 224), thus providing an exception to Matar's conclusion that for Protestant Restorationists, "[t]he Restoration was predicated on the Jews' renunciation of their faith and their ethnic identity" (Matar, "Restoration of the Jews, 1701–1753," 242).
99. Mede, *Key*, Part 2, 118.
100. Yahuda MS 7.1k, ff. 8r–9r.
101. Newton believed that the Turks were the prophetic "King of the North," the power that would invade the land of Israel in the latter days (Keynes MS 5, f. 137r).
102. Yahuda MS 9, f. 123r.
103. Bodmer MS, "Additional Chapters," f. 53r.
104. Keynes MS 5, f. 137r.
105. Yahuda MS 6, f. 11r.
106. *Ibid.* (underlining as in original).
107. Yahuda MS 7.1c, f. 4v; Yahuda MS 7.1k, 5r; Yahuda MS 7.1n, f. 23v; Bodmer MS, 7, f. 2r.
108. Bodmer MS, 7, f. 2r.
109. Newton, *Observations*, 133.
110. See Yahuda MS 6, ff. 12r–19r, which is also the most detailed account of the Millennium in Newton's writings.
111. Yahuda MS 6, ff. 10r, 13r–19r; Yahuda MS 9.2, f. 143r.
112. On this, see also my "Caution, Conscience and the Newtonian Reformation: The Public and Private Heresies of Newton, Clarke and Whiston," *Enlightenment and Dissent* 16 (1997), 151–84.
113. Yahuda MS 7.1f, ff. 1r, 3r, 4r; Yahuda MS 7.1i, ff. 6r, 8r; Yahuda MS 7.2g, ff. 2r, 4r; Yahuda MS 9.1, f. 44r; Yahuda MS 9.2, ff. 144r, 145r; Keynes MS 5, f. 137r; New College Oxford MS 361.3, f. 89r–v.
114. Yahuda MS 10.2, 1r.
115. Yahuda MS 6, f. 11r. True to his premillenarianism, Newton sees a literal resurrection at the beginning of the thousand years.
116. Yahuda MS 1.4, f. 106r.
117. Bodmer MS, 4A, f. 2r. Elsewhere in this manuscript Newton states that the purity of the primitive Church lasted only until the reign of the Roman Emperor Trajan, that is, the beginning of the post-Apostolic age (Bodmer MS, 5, f. 2r; 8, f. 2r).
118. Bodmer MS, 1, f. 2r; Newton, *Observations*, 130–1.
119. Newton, *Observations*, 132–3.
120. Newton, *Observations*, 133–4.
121. Bodmer MS, 1, f. 23r; Yahuda MS 7.2g, f. 3v; Newton, *Observations*, 133.
122. Bodmer MS, 1, f. 23r.
123. Castillejo, who did not take into account this three to four year overlap of the 1290 and forty-nine year periods, adds the latter period onto the former and thus in his reconstruction the forty-nine years spill over the end of the 1335 year period by a margin of four years. Based on this framework, Castillejo interprets Newton's apocalyptic scheme as forecasting the call to rebuild in 1899, "the end of the great tribulation of the Jews" in 1944, and the "revival of a dissolved dominion" in 1948 (Castillejo, *Expanding Force*, 54–5). As historian of scepticism Richard Popkin astutely observed, modern prophetic exegetes "might be struck by how close these Newtonian calculations have been to crucial modern events in Jewish history." Popkin then goes on to list the publication of Theodor Herzl's *Der Judenstaat* in 1898 (the date is

- actually 1896), the Holocaust and the founding of the modern State of Israel in 1948 (Popkin, “Newton and Fundamentalism, II,” *Essays on Newton’s Theology*, 176.
124. Keynes MS 5, f. 138v.
 125. Newton, *Observations*, 113–14.
 126. Mint Papers 19/5, f. 12v (written on the back of a letter from George Needham dated 16 May 1725).
 127. Newton, *Observations*, 122. In his early treatise on Revelation, Newton mentions the 135–6 AD Bar Kochba revolt and that he sees the subsequent suppression of the rebellion as part of the dispersion into captivity. In the same place he also transcribes a quotation from a Latin author who treats the establishment of a temple to Jupiter on the ruins of the Jewish sanctuary. Newton believes these events are alluded to in the second seal of the Apocalypse (Yahuda MS 1.8, ff. 4r–5r).
 128. See also Castillejo, *Expanding Force*, 37. While Newton almost always only gave the starting dates for prophetic time periods, on the back of an undated letter he recorded 2132, 2370 and other dates for the end of the 2300 years (Yahuda MS 7.3o, f. 8r).
 129. Keynes MS 5, f. 137r.
 130. Keynes MS 5, f. 137v.
 131. On this, see Yahuda MS 7.2j, f. 19r; Yahuda MS 7.3g, f. 13; Yahuda 7.3i, f. 54r; Yahuda MS 7.3l, f. 5r.
 132. Newton, *Observations*, 134.
 133. That his suggested dates for the end begin in the twentieth century, may be explained in part by his references to the duration of world history as 6000 years and his summation of the Jew’s captivity lasting 2000 years. Newton, who often looked for symmetry, may have been thinking of the balance of periods suggested by 2000 years of the Jews from Abraham to AD 70, and 2000 years for the Gentiles – an idea that has certainly gained in popularity among Protestant prophetic exegetes in the twentieth century. Also, his firm conviction that the Church – both Catholic and Protestant – was still deep in an apostasy that would not be remedied for some time, suggested to him a long time period.
 134. Newton, *Observations*, 14.
 135. Keynes MS 133, 10. See also Rob Iliffe, “Cambridge and London: Private Liberty, Understanding and the Public World of the *Principia*,” unpublished typescript.
 136. New College Oxford MS 361.3, f. 89v. See also the similar material in Yahuda MS 7.2g, ff. 2r, 4r.
 137. Yahuda MS 7.2g, f. 2r. Whiston also used such probabilistic arguments of fulfilled prophecy guaranteeing the completion of as yet unfulfilled prophecies (Whiston, *The accomplishment of Scripture prophecies* [Cambridge, 1708], 6).
 138. Newton, *Observations*, 249–53.
 139. On Newton’s commitment to the prophecy argument, see James E. Force, “Newton’s ‘Sleeping Argument’ and the Newtonian Synthesis of Science and Religion,” in *Standing on the Shoulders of Giants: A Longer View of Newton and Halley*, ed. Norman J.W. Thrower (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990), 109–27. Many intellectuals like Newton and Robert Boyle were concerned about combating the perceived rise in unbelief through the development of a series of apologetic arguments. For Newton, the Restoration, though far away in time, formed an important part of his arsenal against deism and infidelity. The later premillenarian Joseph Priestley also saw the Jewish Restoration playing this important prophetic and apologetic role. In citing the example of the dispersion of the Jews, predicted throughout the Old Testament starting with Moses, Priestley notes that “if this remarkable people should be restored to their own country, and become a flourishing nation in it, which is likewise foretold, few persons, I think, will doubt of the reality of a prophetic spirit” (Priestley, *Letters to a philosophical unbeliever*, 2nd ed. [Birmingham, 1787], 192). The confidence that eighteenth-century expositors such as Newton, Whiston and Priestley showed in the special importance of this great prophetic sign offers an early example of what has become, with the passage of time and the subsequent events of history, a wider phenomenon. In 1998, fifty years after the modern establishment of the State of Israel and the realization of the hopes of many

- millenarians, the Restoration is firmly fixed as a leading element of the prophetic culture of large numbers of Protestants and Jews.
140. Whiston, in his reply to the Anti-Restorationist and anti-premillenarian Allix, wrote: “I observe that the Restoration of the *Jews* to their own Land in general, and the Rebuilding of their Temple, with the Restoration of their Sacrifices, according to Ezekiel’s Description and Model, is not a thing of Doubt or Uncertainty in the Prophetick Writings, but the thing that above all others they every where foretell and describe, in the plainest and most emphatical Words imaginable. ’Tis not want of undoubted Proof and Evidence, but want of firm Belief of, or of careful and impartial Enquiries into the Sacred Writings hereto relating, that can occasion Christians or *Jews* to disbelieve, or once hesitate about this Point in general” (Whiston, “Of the Restoration of the *Jews*,” 222).
 141. Ball, *Great Expectation*, 118.
 142. W.G. Hiscock, ed., *David Gregory, Isaac Newton and Their Circle: Extracts from David Gregory’s Memoranda, 1677–1708* (Oxford: Printed for the editor, 1937), 16.
 143. Whiston, *Essay on the Revelation* (London, 1744–50), 319–22.
 144. Certainly allowances must be made for the different temperaments of the two, including Newton’s professed irenicism, but the logic of Newton’s own prophetic chronologies meant that open preaching would be pointless, as Whiston himself observed (Whiston, *Historical memoirs of the life of Dr. Samuel Clarke* [London, 1730], 157). See also my “Caution, Conscience and the Newtonian Reformation,” 157–9, 166–8, 177–84.
 145. Yahuda MS 9.2, ff. 123r–124r.
 146. This is to be compared with the fact that Newton in the late 1710s and early 1720s provided material support to a charity devoted to French Catholic converts to Protestantism (Mint Papers 19/2, f. 106v; New College Oxford MS 362.2, f. 68v; *An account of the establishment for relieving poor proselytes*, 5th edn, [London, 1722], 31).
 147. Popkin, “Newton and Fundamentalism, II,” *Essays on Newton’s Theology*, 165–80; “Newton and the Origins of Fundamentalism,” *The Scientific Enterprise. The Bar-Hillel Colloquium: Studies in History, Philosophy, and Sociology of Science*, ed. Edna Ullmann-Margalit, vol. 4 (Dordrecht: Kluwer, 1992), 241–59.
 148. Writing in 1943 against the poignant backdrop of emerging revelations about the Holocaust, Kobler not only presents Newton as an early example of a believer in the Restoration, and suggests that Newton saw Britain as playing a role in this, but he also provides two examples of later prophetic works on the Restoration that cite Newton’s *Observations*. Kobler shows that both Samuel Collet’s *Treatise of the Future Restoration of the Jews and Israelites to Their own Land* (1747) and James Bicheno’s *The Restoration of the Jews: The Crisis of All Nations* (1800) use the material on the Restoration in the *Observations*. Bicheno’s work includes an appeal to Great Britain to assist in this Restoration (Kobler, “Newton on the Restoration of the *Jews*,” 23).
 149. The Newtonians Whiston and Samuel Clarke both followed the Restorationist approach of their mentor. See Whiston, *An essay on the Revelation of Saint John, so far as concerns the past and present times* (Cambridge, 1706), 303–95; *The accomplishment of Scripture prophecies*; “Of the Restoration of the *Jews*,” 222–34; and *Memoirs*, vol. 2, passim; Samuel Clarke, *A discourse concerning the connexion of the Prophecies in the Old Testament and the application of them to Christ* (London, 1725), 20, 23, 26–7, 41, 46–7. See also Robert Clayton, *An enquiry into the time of the coming of the Messiah, and the restoration of the Jews* (London, 1751). Clayton, the Bishop of Clogher, had come under the theological influence of Newton and Clarke.
 150. On the role of prophetic expectations in the British sponsorship of Jewish settlement in Palestine in the nineteenth century, see Vreté, “Restoration of the *Jews*.” For more on the place of the Newtonian Restorationists Whiston, Clarke and Clayton in this history, see Matar, “Restoration of the *Jews*, 1701–1753,” 242–4).