Jaddus the High Priest and Alexander the Great – Fact or Fiction? Religion, Politics and Historiography in Late 17th Century England

Meir Ben Shahar
Hebrew University

While little blood was shed during the Glorious Revolution, ink - used to pen many dozens of pamphlets and counter-pamphlets - flowed freely.[1] The stormy disputes over religion and politics pertained to many areas of political theory and religious thought. In the following I will discuss one of the peripheral offshoots of this controversy: did Josephus' story of the encounter between Jaddus the high priest and Alexander occur or not? Though this was a marginal issue, it was debated with passion and intellectual acumen that is instructive regarding the nature of the disputants but even more profoundly regarding the realms of faith and philosophy during the century following the Scientific Revolution and before the 18th century Age of Reason.

Historical Background: The Glorious Revolution and the Nonjurors

On November 5th William of Orange, invited by leading members of the English public, landed at Torbay to wrest the throne from the Catholic monarch, James II. After less than two weeks, James arrived at the conclusion that he could stay in England no longer and on November 23 set sail from its shores, hoping to return in the not too distant future.[2] England then possessed two kings: James the II, legally crowned as king, who never surrendered hope of resuming power, and William III, invited by prominent members of Parliament to assume power and who did, in practice, rule England. England

[1] In the years between 1688-1694, over 2000 pamphlets on various topics related to the Revolution were printed. Of them, about 200 dealt exclusively with the question of the allegiance requirement.(M. Goldie, 'The Revolution of 1689 and the Structure of Political Argument', Bulletin of Research in the Humanities, 83 (1980),p. 478). Schwoerer contends that a large number of the pamphlets circulated by William and Mary were intended to drum up public opinion in their support and forestall the need for a violent engagement of James' forces (L. G. Schwoerer, 'Propaganda in the Revolution of 1688-89', *AHR* 82 [1977], p. 845).

[2] Many accounts of the events of the final months of James II's regime have been written. See, recently: T. Harris, *Revolution: The Great Crisis of the British Monarchy, 1685-1720*, London 2006, pp. 239-363

was thrust into a constitutional crisis.[3] The solution proposed by a few Parliament members was to declare the English throne "vacant" and to declare William and Mary regents. Yet William and his supporters insisted on being recognized as king in full with all the ensuing constitutional implications.[4] The country's leaders, the nobility and senior clergy, were required to swear oaths of allegiance to the new king and queen. This stipulation was, in the eyes of the Archbishop of Canterbury, William Sancroft, incompatible with his oath of allegiance sworn to James II. Sancroft, along with eight other bishops and about 400 clerics from all over England announced that they were unable to take the oath of allegiance to William and Mary. On February 1, 1690, upon the expiration of the time period Parliament had allotted the leaders of state and church to take the oath of allegiance, all those who refused to take the oath were deprived of office, William Sancroft chief among them.[5] This resignation engendered a schism within the Church of England, between Jurors and Nonjurors and sparked a pamphlet war.

Sancroft, Overall, and Josephus

William Sancroft published no document elucidating his position,[6] but in early 1690 he published the manuscript of the Convocation Book.[7] This book was the work of Bishop

[3] The Earl of Rochester was extremely alert to the severe constitutional implications of James II's decampment and as early as the 12th of December he convened an assembly at London's Guildhall to discuss the judicial implications. Regarding the constitutional imbroglio see: Harris, Revolution (above n. 2), pp. 311-328. Regarding the assortment of confused responses to the constitutional crisis, see: H. Nenner, *The Right to be King: The Succession to the Crown of England 1603-1714*, Basingstoke 1995, pp. 184-186.

[4] On this issue see: Harris, Revolution (above n. 2), pp. 320-325.

[5] Sancroft's resistance was already articulated on December 26th (a week after William's entry into London and three days following James second and final abscondment) when he raised the possibility of approaching James, requesting he reassume power. At the onset of the new year, Sancroft and a number of other bishops proposed appealing to William to petition James to return to England as it's lawful sovereign. (Harris, Revolution [above n. 2], pp. 320-319). On the chain of events leading to Sancroft's removal see: W. Gibson, *The Church of England 1688-1832: Unity and Accord*, London 2001, pp. 34-38.

[6] On the whole, Sancroft tended toward passivity and lacked leadership qualities as apparent from his attempt to avoid an encounter with Parliament. His actions were confined to stubborn resistance to the oath of allegiance, making no effort to generate public support for his stance. See: P. Collinson, *From Cranmer to Sancroft: Essays on English Religion in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, London 2006, pp. 190-196.

[7] John Overall, *Bishop Overall's Convocation book MDCVI*, London 1690. The book's title page bears the imprimatur 24/6/1689, while it was published in 1690. Sancroft was acutely aware of the need for haste in producing a church document that might bolster his position. Henceforth quotations of the Convocation

John Overall and a number of other senior Anglican clerics who had convened by order of James I. The goal was to formulate a constitutive document that would comprehensively elaborate the doctrines and precepts of the Anglican Church.[8] The book is composed of chapters that depict historical events, followed by canons that spell out the legal inferences. Despite the intense labor invested in the compilation of the document, over many years (1606-1610), it was never published. The reason for this was James I's objection to certain canons in the document that he felt did not provide immediate recognition of the principle of hereditary succession.[9] That said, the document, in its entirety calls, in many places, for complete submission to the existing regime and prohibits any attempt at rebellion. This is what informed Sancroft's decision to publish the manuscript. Canon 28 states:

> If any man therefore shall affirm, either that the subjects, when they shake off the yoke of their obedience to their Sovereigns, and set up a form of government among themselves, after their own humours, do not therein very wickedly… he doth greatly err.[10]

The canon emphatically supports the principle guiding Sancroft and the other Nonjuror's stance. Subjects are utterly forbidden to revolt against the existing government. Subsequently, the canon imposes additional prohibitions on monarchs, forbidding them to impair the rule of their neighboring counterparts. However, the canon concludes as follows:

Book are given from J. H. Parker (ed.), *The Convocation Book of MDCVI: commonly called Bishop Overall's Convocation Book*, Oxford 1844

[8] Though Sancroft's attribution of the book to Overall is commonly accepted, it was actually a joint effort and not Overall's work alone. A. Milton, '"Anglicanism" by Stealth: the Career and Influence of John Overall', K. Fincham and P. Lake (eds), *Religious Politics in Post-Reformation England: Essays in Honour of Nicholas Tyacke*, Woodbridge 2006, p. 175, n. 69

[9] James I dispatched a letter to George Abbot, a future Archbishop of Canterbury, in which he explained that he could not authorize the book since it included a number of canons that opposed the principle of hereditary succession (canon 28 in particular in the first book, that will be discussed herein), see: C. H. McIlwain (ed.), *The Political Works of James I*, Cambridge MA. 1918, pp. xxxvi-xxxvii; L. L. Peck, 'Kingship, Counsel and Law in Early Stuart Britain', J. G. A. Pocock et. al. (eds.), *The Varieties of British Political Thought 1500-1800*, Cambridge 1993, pp. 87-88. The letter appears at the beginning of the 1844 edition of the book (Convocation Book, pp. 7-8). For an additional discussion of the book's principles, especially the central role of Divine providence in the direction of history see: J. C. D. Clark, *The Language of Liberty 1660-1832: Political Discourse and Social Dynamics in the Anglo-American World*, Cambridge 1993, pp. 158-160.

[10] Convocation book, canon 28, p. 59

> [If any man therefore shall affirm…] or that when any such new forms of government, begun by rebellion, are after thoroughly settled, the authority in them is not of God … he doth greatly err.[11]

At first glance, the sentence seems to contradict the first sentence that prohibits rebellion - though once installed, the new ruler rules by Divine right and is entitled to complete obedience. Effectively, both sentences emanate from the same position: the existing regime, i.e., the de facto regime, is the one endowed with Divine providence.[12]

The same ambivalence recurs a few chapters later. Chapter 30 summarizes the events of the post-exilic period, from the time of Zerubbabel until the conclusion of the Persian regime. The narrative is based on the book of Ezra and Nehemiah and on the works of Josephus. To assist the forthcoming discussion I will briefly recount Josephus' story of the last years of the Persian period. The brothers Jaddus and Manasses quarreled over the high priesthood. After Manasses wed the daughter of Sanballat the Samaritan (according to Josephus), Jaddus exiled him to Samaria. According to Josephus, these events occurred towards the beginning of Alexander the Great's Eastern expedition. Following the Battle of Issus, Alexander advanced toward Tyre. Sanballat, appreciating the political significance of Alexander's victory, rode at the head of his troops to offer Alexander his support. When Alexander arrived at Tyre, he dispatched a request for assistance from the high priest in Jerusalem. Jaddus, the high priest, refused his request on the grounds that: "[H]e had given his oath to Darius not to bear arms against him; and he said that he would not transgress this while Darius was in the land of the living" (Ant. 11.318). Alexander waited nine months longer, until after the siege of Gaza, and then marched on Jerusalem, seeking retribution against the high priest. Jaddus, greatly fearful of the confrontation that lay ahead, beseeched God for deliverance along with the entire populace. That night, God instructed Jaddus to ceremoniously greet Alexander and his army and to throw open the gates of the city before him. When Alexander saw Jaddus the following day, he knelt before him, explaining to his cohorts that a number of years previously he had beheld Jaddus' image bestirring him to depart on his conquest of the Persian Empire. Alexander offered sacrifices and bestowed various privileges upon the

---

[11] Ibid.

[12] For further articulations of this conception during the reign of James I see: C. H. McIlwain (ed.), *The Political Works of James I*, Cambridge MA. 1918, pp. xxxv-xxxvi.

Jews of Jerusalem and the Babylonian Jewish community as well.[13] The Convocation narrates the story in this fashion:

> The said Jaddus lived till the monarchy of the Grecians began ; who when Alexander, having overthrown Darius the king of the Persians, sent unto him, that he should assist him in his wars, and become tributary to the Macedonians, as he had been to the Persians ; returned for his answer, that he might not yield thereunto, because he had taken an oath for his true allegiance unto Darius, which he might not lawfully violate whilst Darius lived, being by flight escaped, when his army was discomfited.[14]

Consequently, the 30th canon advises as follows:

> [If any man therefore shall affirm…] or, that Jaddus the high priest did amiss in binding his allegiance to king Darius by an oath; or, that he had not sinned, if he had refused, being thereunto required, so to have sworn; or, that having so sworn, he might lawfully either have borne arms himself against Darius, or have solicited others, whether aliens or Jews, thereunto, he doth greatly err.[15]

The authors of the book, however, were fully aware that Alexander ultimately triumphed over Darius. The succeeding chapter, along with its ensuing canon addresses this victory:

> Alexander, by God's providence, having vanquished the Persians, the Jews, amongst many other nations, became his subjects. He dealt favourably with them, released them of some payments, granted them liberty to live according to their own laws, and left their government, in every point, as he found it; their duties, ordinary tributes, and some of their royal prerogatives, always reserved to the Macedonians, as they had been before to the Persians.[16]

The Convocation asserts that Alexander's rise to kingship was an act of Divine providence. Now that the Jews had become his subjects, all the taxes and levies that they had owed the Persians were henceforth to be rendered to Alexander and his successors. The canon that follows the chapter stresses the requirement of Jewish allegiance to the Greek ruler:

---

[13] Ant. 11.297-347. There are many problems and questions concerning the sources of Josephus' story see: M. Ben Shahar, 'Alexander, Jaddus and Simeon', T. Ilan and V. Noam (eds.), *Josephus and the Rabbis: A Literary-Historical Investigation into the Parallel Traditions Regarding Second Temple History in the Writings of Josephus Flavius and in Rabbinic Literature*, (forthcoming). See also: R. Pummer, *The Samaritans in Flavius Josephus*, Tübingen 2009, pp. 129-135.
[14] Convocation Book, Chapter 30, pp. 54-55.
[15] Ibid., Canon 30, pp.55-56.
[16] Ibid., Chapter 31, pp. 56-57.

> If any man therefore shall affirm either that the Jews, generally, both priests and people, were not the subjects of Alexander, after his authority was settled amongst them, as they had been before the subjects of the kings of Babylon and Persia; or, that they might lawfully have borne arms against him; or, that they were not all bound to pray for the long life and the prosperity, both of Alexander and his empire, as they had been bound before, to pray for the life and prosperity of the other said kings and their kingdoms, whilst they lived under their subjection… he doth greatly err.[17]

Here too, as in the historical depiction, the emphasis is on the fact that as soon as Alexander's monarchy was consolidated, the Jews became his subjects and thus all the obligations they were bound to under the Babylonian or Persian regime, were incumbent upon them. This also leads to the conclusion that no justification existed to rebel against Alexander and his successors' regimes. The canon goes one step further and relates not only to the economic obligations (taxes and levies) but to religious obligations as well, claiming that the Jews were duty-bound to pray for the welfare of Alexander and his successors and for the wellbeing and prosperity of the kingdom.

These conclusions are consistent with the final statement of canon 28 – that when the new regime 'settles', the duty of loyalty is transferred to that regime. The underlying principle behind this legal, historical conception is that the king or regime that is successful in consolidating its rule has proven itself a worthy ruler, elected by God, thus obligating its subjects to complete compliance.[18] It is readily apparent how these assertions might be translated into justification of de facto regimes, including William and Mary's. Indeed, some of William and Mary's most conspicuous supporters did precisely that.

William Sherlock and the Duty of Allegiance

[17] Ibid., Canon 31, pp. 57-58.
[18] The conclusion of the chapter and the canon contain explicit treatment of the Hasmonean Revolt. The canon determines outright that the Jews were prohibited from revolting against the regime of Mattathias the Hasmonean, after it 'was settled'. Ibid., p. 58.

The Convocation garnered a great deal of attention promptly upon its publication, particularly canon 28 and the story of Alexander and Jaddus.[19] Jurors found explicit corroboration of their cause in both the book's canons and in the historical account itself. Zachary Taylor (1653-1705), then Vicar of Ormskirk, indicated canon 28 as the legal basis for the transfer of loyalty from one ruler to the next, even when transfer is the result of insurrection. Taylor makes no mention of the historical event itself but rather suffices with the legal implications cited in Canon 30,[20] according to which allegiance is owed only to the ruler who holds the 'authoritative right and title'. Thereupon he qualified: "because the Case may so happen, that these being separated, the Claim of Right without the Authority, cannot Challenge our Allegiance".

Taylor circulated the pamphlet between April and October 1690 and his words created a significant stir. One person who assimilated Taylor's arguments and elaborated upon them was William Sherlock (1639/40-1707), who devoted special attention, not only to the legal implications of the Alexander and Jaddus story but to history itself. Sherlock was a rising star in the Church of England in London. In 1686 he was appointed chaplain to James II and held the office of 'Master of the Temple Church in London'. At the time, he was already an accomplished polemicist in the areas of theology and politics.[21] Sherlock was, at first, a member of Sancroft's group and resisted the oath of allegiance to William and Mary. However, on Feb. 2nd 1690, one day after the suspension of the Nonjurors came into effect, Sherlock prayed for the joint sovereigns' health at St. Dunstan's and in August 1690 he took the oath of allegiance to King William III and

---

[19] Henceforth, the discussion will revolve around different authors' understanding of the Convocation regarding Alexander and Jaddus, and on the affinity between the Convocation and Josephus' story. It is, however, important to note that even prior to the book's publication, at the very onset of the dispute between Jurors and Nonjurors, Edward Stillingfleet wrote in October 1689 (the Convocation was published only in early 1690) that the transfer of Jaddus' allegiance from Darius to Alexander elucidates that the duty of allegiance pertains to whomever Providence has granted de facto authority. (E. Stillingfleet, *A Discourse Concerning the Unreasonableness of a New Separation, on Account of the Oaths with an Answer to the History of Passive Obedience, so far as relates to them*, London 1689, pp. 36-37).

[20] Z. Taylor, *Obedience and Submission to the Present Government, Demonstrated from Bishop Overall's Convocation-Book*, London 1690, p. 5.Though in the pamphlet itself it is referred to as canon 36, Wagstaffe, who responded to the assertion, assumed the reference was to canon 30 ([T. Wagstaffe], *An Answer to a Late Pamphlet, entituled, Obedience and Submission*, London 1690, pp. 3-4) which was corroborated by Taylor in his response (Z. Taylor, *The Vindication of a Late Pamphlet [entituled Obedience and Submission to the Present Government, Demonstrated from Bp. Overal's Convocation-book]: From the False Glosses and Illusive Interpretations of a Pretended Answer*, London 1691, p. 10.

[21] Z. Taylor, *Obedience and Submission To the Present Government, Demonstrated from Bishop Overall's Convocation Book*, London 1690, p. 5

Queen Mary II. On April 25th 1691, Sherlock was appointed "Dean of St. Paul's".[22] Not surprisingly, Sherlock's sharp transition – from impassioned rhetorician protesting the oath of allegiance to highly placed cleric at the court of William and Mary (the same year he was also named chaplain to William), elicited a wave of rumors and slander amongst Nonjurors and the public at large.[23] An experienced polemicist, Sherlock published a pamphlet as early on as the 3rd of November, 1690 entitled *The Case of the Allegiance Due to Sovereign Powers, Stated and Resolved, According to Scripture and Reason, and the Principles of the Church of England*, in which he justifies his oath to William and Mary. In the introduction he writes that it was Overall's book, published only a few months earlier that actually convinced him to take the oath to the joint sovereigns.[24] In the beginning of the pamphlet, Sherlock quotes extensively from canon 28 of the Convocation, inferring that even if the public is forbidden to depose the existing regime, once the new ruler is already installed and governing, he does so by God's authority and he must be obeyed.[25] Further on, Sherlock discusses various biblical precedents cited in the Convocation, arriving, finally, at the Alexander and Jaddus story. Sherlock addresses this account in relative detail, situating it at the end of the historical discussion – a fact that is instructive regarding the importance he attached to the episode.[26] Sherlock treats the apparent contradiction between the two accounts and their ensuing canons, concluding that Jaddus was obligated to swear allegiance to whoever gained power and retained the monarchy. He made a point of demonstrating that Jaddus swore allegiance to Alexander while Darius still lived:

---

[22] Though the date might actually be a bit later, see:s.v. http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=34690.

[23] On the harsh comments from both sides (Jurors and Nonjurors) see: C. F. Mullett, 'A Case of Allegiance: William Sherlock and the Revolution of 1688', *Huntington Library Quarterly* 10 (1946), pp. 83-103. On popular and vulgar comments see: M. S. Zook, 'Turncoats and Double Agents in Restoration and Revolutionary England: The Case of Robert Ferguson, the Plotter', *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 42 (2009), pp. 367-368.

[24] W. Sherlock, *The Case of the Allegiance Due to Sovereign Powers, Stated and Resolved, According to Scripture and Reason, and the Principles of the Church of England*, London 1690, preface, [p. iv]. However it seems that the actual historical event which caused Sherlock to change his mind was the James II' defeat at the battle of the Boyne (July 1690), see: K. Padley, 'Rendering unto Caesar in the Age of Revolution: William Sherlock and William of Orange', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 59 (2008), p.681.

[25] Sherlock, The Case of the Allegiance, p. 3.

[26] Padley, Rendering (above n. 24), p. 693.

> for he (=Jaddus) immediately submitted to Alexander, as soon as he came to Jerusalem, before he had given the last fatal overthrow to Darius, when Darius in his flight was murdered by his own servants.[27]

The obvious, ensuing conclusion is that the oath, rather than being personal, to a particular person, pertains to the authority that rules de facto. One important detail is worth noting in our context. Sherlock's argument is predicated chiefly upon the premise that Jaddus swore allegiance to Alexander during Darius' lifetime, though this was never stated in the Convocation Book. Towards this argument, Sherlock proposes the following historical reenactment: Alexander reached Jerusalem upon which Jaddus became his de facto subject and then swore allegiance to him as well. These events occurred "before he had given the last fatal overthrow to Darius". None of this appeared in the Convocation Book; Sherlock filled in the details according to his grasp of history culled from the works of Josephus and Alexander's historians.

Thomas Wagstaffe: Jaddus, Josephus and the Historic Truth

Immediately upon the publication of Taylor's and Sherlock's pamphlets, Thomas Wagstaffe (1645-1712), the deposed Chancellor of Lichfield unsheathed his pen to compose a detailed rebuttal undermining Jurist reliance on the Convocation as a basis for their position.[28] Wagstaffe's response was directed at Taylor; he subsequently appended arguments against Sherlock too. The first part of Wagstaffe's argument is a reinterpretation and counter-argument against Taylor's interpretation of the Convocation and his ensuing conclusions. He explains that the Convocation's determination in chapter 30, that Jaddus' response to Alexander that he is obligated by oath to Darius 'whilst Darius lived', should be taken at face value. He asserts that Taylor's distinction between 'authoritative right and title' is spurious; loyalty to the king appertains to him personally, not to the authority that he holds. After rejecting Taylor's interpretation of the

[27] Sherlock, The Case of the Allegiance, p. 6.
[28] Wagstaffe, Aanswer (above n. 20). Though anonymous, the pamphlet's ascription to Wagstaffe is certain (Padley, Rendering [above n. 24], p. 681, n. 3). Later, Wagstaffe became one of the prominent leaders of the Nonjurors. In 1694 he was nominated bishop of Ipswich by William Lloyd and with the permission King James II. On Wagstaffe's carrier see: R. D. Cornwall, 'Wagstaffe, Thomas (1645–1712)', *ODNB*, online edn, Jan 2008.

Convocation, he returns to the Alexander and Jaddus story. He writes that the story reveals that Jaddus swore allegiance to Alexander "while Darius was alive, and also before he was totally and finally subdued. For Josephus tells us, that after the taking of Tyre, Alexander being displeased with Jaddus's answer, came directly to Jerusalem".[29] Wagstaffe divided his answer into two. First, he explained, in the course of six pages, how the story did not really occur, and is therefore an invalid basis for evidence. Second, he asserts that even were the story true, it would not be a viable precedent for English reality. Wagstaffe exposits three reasons to disqualify Josephus's account: 1. There is no supportive evidence from other historians of Alexander's Eastern expedition.2. Josephus' account does not accord with biblical chronology. 3. Josephus' narrative is beset by internal contradictions. Wagstaffe formulates the first reason in this manner:

> No Author, besides Josephus, and those that had it from him, mentions or takes notice of any such thing. There is not the least footstep of it in Diodorus Siculus, or Plutarch, or Quintus Curtius, or Arian, or Justin, all very good and diligent Historians and (to say the truth of them) every one of them a more creditable author than Josephus.[30]

Beyond the pertinent argument of lack of corroboratory evidence for Josephus, Wagstaffe adds that Josephus is, less credible than his predecessors. He explains that the latter are preferable since some (Diodorus Siculus) preceded Josephus and although they presented a detailed report of Alexander's expedition they did not mention Jaddus or Jerusalem . Though Wagstaffe's rejection is focused and to the point, it is striking on the backdrop of Josephus' popularity in the early modern age.[31]

The second argument against the veracity of Josephus' account pertains to the chronology of the Persian period. As is well known, the chronological problems of the Persian period, the relationship between the biblical sources (book of Ezra and Nehemiah) and Greek sources in particular, were a preoccupation of early modern chronologists.[32] Wagstaffe, relying on his predecessors, contends that it is effectively

---

[29] Wagstaffe, Answer, p. 5.
[30] Ibid, p. 6.
[31] This popularity was manifested mainly in the numerous translations of Josephus that articulated his popularity amongst the wide public that lacked proficiency in Greek. (P. Burke, 'A Survey of the Popularity of Ancient Historians, 1450-1700', *History and Theory* 5 [1966], p. 152).
[32] Some of the chronographers of the period are mentioned by Wagstaffe and his detractors. I hope to devote a separate article to this topic. On Scaliger's attempts to reconstruct the chronology of the Persian

impossible to harmonize Josephus' chronology with the biblical account and other knowledge regarding the period. If we assume that Sanballat, mentioned in Josephus' account as the father of Nixo, wife of Manasses, Jaddus' brother, is the Sanballat of the book of Nehemiah, then he would have to have been 145 years old by the time Alexander's conquests.[33] Wagstaffe continues, over the next few pages, to elaborate the chronological difficulties of Josephus' lecture and their indefensible solutions. As a main support for his contentions on this topic, he brings French chronographer, Sethus Calvisius (1556-1615), who devoted many pages to this contradiction. Wagstaffe does not suffice with a Christian chronographer and he turns to the Latin edition of David Ganz from where he elucidates that the High Priest during the days of Alexander was Simon the Righteous who was Jaddus' great-great grandson.[34]

Wagstaffe then proceeds to take on the internal contradictions in Josephus' account. Here he follows historian James Salian (1557-1640) who points to three anachronisms in the narrative: First, Josephus claims that Alexander's army that besieged Jerusalem comprised Phoenicians and Chaldeans. The presence of Phoenicians is understandable since they had recently been conquered and conscripted into Alexander's army. The Chaldeans were Babylonians and Babylonia had yet to be conquered. Further on, Wagstaffe remarks it would have been impossible for Alexander to exempt residents of Babylonia and Medea from taxes since they had not yet been subjugated. Finally, he notes that the depiction of Alexander bowing to the high priest is puzzling since Alexander did not perceive himself as a god or a son of god until he reached Egypt.[35] Wagstaffe concludes the discussion with the following allegation against Josephus: "When Josephus is so much out concerning these times, who can safely give credit to what he asserts?".[36]

---

period see A. Grafton, Joseph Scaliger: A Study in the History of Classical Scholarship, II, Oxford 1993, pp. 301-312.

[33] Modern scholars are still debating the issue. Although critical methods and archeological findings there is no consensus among historians on the identification of Nehemiah's Sanballat with Josephus' Sanballat, see: D. R. Schwartz, 'On Some Papyri and Josephus' Sources and Chronology for the Persian Period', *JSJ* 21 (1990), pp. 175–199.

[34] Wagstaffe, Answer, p. 10.

[35] Ibid., p. 10.

[36] Ibid., p, 11.

Summing up, Wagstaffe comments that even were we to accept Josephus' account, nothing relevant to the present might be extrapolated from it. According to the narrative, Jaddus acknowledged Alexanders' regime only after God appeared to him in a dream. Wagstaffe is aware of the contention that prophecy ceased at the close of the First Temple period and therefore devotes a paragraph to proving that prophecy, in various permutations, continued to inhere among the Jews during the Second Temple period. Revelation, not historical reality, was what impelled Jaddus to transfer his loyalty from Darius to Alexander. He closes on a sarcastic note: "and if these gentlemen will shew us any express revelation for what they doe, as Iaddus had, then they something; but till they can shew that, this example of Iaddus, if it were true, will do them no service".[37]

Two points are noteworthy for our continued discussion. Wagstaffe is not fastidious regarding his selection of professional authorities upon whom he relies. These might be ancient, pagan historians, contemporary Christian historians and chronographers, and even a Jewish chronographer who draws on Jewish traditions. Nevertheless, Wagstaffe is a cleric who accepts the authority of Holy Scripture and thus, in his view, Josephus must conform to biblical chronology and not vice-versa. Throughout the entire intricate chronological discussion there is not a single mention of the problematic nature of the biblical chronology of the Persian period in and of itself.

William Lloyd and the Politics of Historiography

Taylor and Sherlock were each quick to respond to Wagstaffe and both related explicitly to his historiographic disparagement of Josephus. Taylor, apparently uncomfortable with the dubiousness of the story's authenticity, sufficed with a discussion that relegated the definition of Alexander and Darius' legal situation to the Convocation. Regarding the veracity of the story he says: "if the story to be true (and the Convocation-Book not I, am to answer that)".[38] Sherlock similarly preferred to concentrate on the legal and interpretative aspects. Nevertheless, he did devote a few words to Wagstaffe's historiographic assertions: "I will not engage in this Quarrel, the Vindication of Josephus

[37] Ibid., p. 12.
[38] Taylor, Vindication (above n. 20), p. 10.

as to this Story, being undertaken by a more learned Pen, as I suppose our Author will know, before he will see this".[39] Sherlock, seemingly discomfited by Wagstaffe's historiographic skepticism,[40] turned to his fellow Juror, William Lloyd, Bishop of St. Asaph, to clearly explicate the historical aspect in a pamphlet entitled: *A letter to Dr. Sherlock, in vindication of that part of Josephus's history, which gives an account of Iaddus the high-priest's submitting to Alexander the Great while Darius was living.*

William Lloyd (1627-1717) was one of the 'Seven Bishops' incarcerated in the Tower of London by James II. In contradistinction to most of his colleagues, most prominently William Sancroft, who became leading Nonjurers, William Lloyd declared his support of William and Mary as early as December 1688. It is probable that Sherlock appealed to Lloyd due to the latter's profound interest in history and chronology.[41] Lloyd opens with the contention that Josephus was alone in reporting Alexander's visit. He argues thus:

1. If we discard Josephus' account on this point, then we must also reject his history in all places where his account is unsubstantiated by the Holy Scriptures or the Books of Maccabees.
2. In this specific case, the silence of whom he calls 'Heathen Historians' is uninstructive since "the Heathens generally contemned and hated the Jews, as being not only Revilers of their Gods, but Enemies to all the rest of Mankind?".[42]
3. Should we accept the premise of an 'argument from silence', then we must reject all the miracles recounted in the Gospels since "the Heathen Writers of those times take no notice of any such thing".[43]

These charges respond to the two points noted above regarding Wagstaffe's polemic. On the historiographic level, says Lloyd, no historian is entirely trustworthy. The credibility

---

[39] W. Sherlock, *A Vindication of The Case of Allegiance due to Soveraign Powers: in Reply to An Answer to a Late Pamphlet*, London 1691, p. 18

[40] Immediately following Sherlock's avowal that Wagstaffe's historiographic assertions need not be addressed, he adds: "But this I must say, that if they part with this Story, they lose so glorious a Testimony" (ibid., p. 18), and he proceeds to elucidate why this testimony is so important and central.

[41] In 1683 he published an historical account of the Church of England. Later, in 1701, he would publish the Bible with a revised version of James Ussher's chronology. On his carrier and writings see A. T. Hart, *William Lloyd 1627—1717: Bishop, Politician, Author and Prophet*, London 1952.

[42] W. Lloyd, *A Letter to Dr. Sherlock, in Vindication of that part of Josephus's History, which gives an account of Iaddus the High-Priest's submitting to Alexander the Great while Darius was living*, London 1691, p. 2.

[43] Ibid., p. 2.

of any historian is contingent on his personality and his environment; pagan historians will not report anything positive concerning Jews. In this manner, Lloyd rejects the notion of the superiority of the Greco-Roman historians. On the religious level, Wagstaffe rejected Josephus because his chronology contradicted that of the Holy Scriptures. Regarding this, Lloyd states that discounting Josephus could be conducive to rejecting the Holy Scriptures; if we are to accept the assertion of the requisiteness of corroboratory evidence from pagan authors, then we would have to reject the miracles attested to by the Gospels regarding which pagan historians remained silent.[44]

Both lines of reasoning – historiographic and religious – are further articulated in Lloyd's pamphlet. Wagstaffe relied on Calvisius' chronology to discredit Josephus' credibility. On this point Lloyd says: "He could not have found a fitter Man to take his part. For he had a quarrel of his own against Josephus, for writing such things as would not consist with his Chronology".[45] In a similar vein, Lloyd explains that neither are David Ganz' works or any other Jewish chronographers' works to be relied on: "who are as much the Enemies of Josephus as he is himself; for they have the like quarrel against him, because he breaks all their Measures".[46] Jewish historians' objection to Josephus is neither chronological nor historical; it runs much deeper. Jews view Josephus as having deviated completely from their way of life and their argument with him extends well beyond this particular issue. The work of Salian, who was a Jesuit, is likewise inadmissible. Beyond the historians cited by Wagstaffe, the list of those that he ignored is also redolent of the politics of historiography. Lloyd complains of the fact that while Wagstaffe does not balk at relying on Jewish historians and many others, he makes no reference to James Ussher, "our excellent Primate, who followeth Josephus in every part of this Story".[47] I believe it would not be off base to assume that Lloyd would wholeheartedly embrace the words of a later British historian who advised: "Study the historian before you begin to study the facts".[48]

---

[44] I believe that the religious aspect manifests in the first assertion as well. Lloyd writes that according to Wagstaffe's principles, Josephus may be accepted only when his words are backed by the Holy Scriptures or the Books of Maccabees. Possibly, he is alluding to the fact that a rejection of Josephus is also a rejection of his testimony regarding Jesus.
[45] Lloyd, Letter, p. 18.
[46] Ibid., p. 14.
[47] Ibid., p. 14.
[48] E. H. Carr, *What is History*, Cambridge 1961, p. 12

That said, it is important to note that Lloyd's discussion encompasses more than the personal disqualification of individual historians; he also devotes much attention to the topical assertions raised by Wagstaffe. Most of Lloyd's rejoinders to Wagstaffe's criticism were later proposed by numerous historians who sought corroboration for Josephus' story. Lloyd writes that Diodorus' account suggests that following the siege of Gaza, Alexander remained in the area for a while longer to regroup. During this time period he could have visited Jerusalem. 300 years later the Israeli historian Aryeh Kasher would propose the same solution.[49] Lloyd also suggests emending Josephus' text regarding the presence of Chaldeans and to render it 'Kutim' instead. This emendation would subsequently be accepted by some scholars.[50]

Wagstaffe: The Historian as a Rational Being

Wagstaffe's historical assertions took up 6 pages of the first pamphlet. Lloyd responded in 32 pages, to which Wagstaffe found himself now composing a reply that sprawled over 107 pages![51] Wagstaffe's response is a masterpiece of scholarship, rhetoric and sarcasm. I will focus on the issue of the treatment of historians. Wagstaffe was acutely aware of Lloyd's attempt to dismantle his edifice of proofs and supports by undermining the credibility of the historians and chronographers. This was particularly important to Wagstaffe since his first assertion for rejecting Josephus, that in effect remains the main argument to the present day, is that no other ancient historian of Alexander mentions Jerusalem or Jaddus.

> He [=Lloyd] speaks here (by way of diminution and abatement to their credit) of the silence of Heathen historians; but why Heathen historians? The question is a

[49] Lloyd, Letter, p. 15. A. Kasher, 'Further Revised Thoughts on Josephus' Report of Alexander's Campaign to Palestine (Ant. XI 304-347)', L. L. Grabbe and O. Lipschits (eds.), *Judah Between East and West: The Transition from Persian to Greek Rule (ca. 400-200 BCE)*, London 2011, pp. 140-142.
[50] See: C. Schotanus, *Bibliotheca historiae sacrae Veteris Testamenti, seu exercitationes historicae in sacram Scripturam et Josephum per modum commentarii in historiam sacram Sulpicii Severi distributae duobus tomis*, Franequerae 1664, vol. II, p. 1214. But see also Marcus on Ant. XI 330, n. a (R. Marcus [ed. and tran.], *Josephus VI Jewish Antiquities Books IX–XI*, [LCL], Cambridge 1937).
[51] To this one might also add the 10 pages written by John Milner on the chronological aspect alone: J. Milner, *A Brief Examination of some Passages in the Chronological Part of a Letter, written to Dr. Sherlock in his Vindication*, London 1691.

> Matter of Fact, and no article of religion; and I did not know before that a Right Faith was necessary to make a good Historian.[52]

These sentences encapsulate the essence of enlightenment. A clear distinction is drawn between the personal and the professional. The correct faith - and Wagstaffe was prepared to pay a steep personal price for this - is unconnected to the historian's professional ability. However, if it is possible and necessary to examine the historical and chronological assertions raised by the ancient historians in disassociation from their faith, does this not then mandate that the same critical approach be adopted in relation to the Holy Scriptures? Wagstaffe was well aware of this option and he therefore claimed that a distinction should be drawn between the Holy Scriptures and human historians. Lloyd, conversely, when claiming that the Gospels, like Josephus' writings, require external substantiation, effectively robs the Holy Scriptures of their unique status and grounds belief in the miraculous on human testimony alone. Thus Wagstaffe explicitly states "nor is humane Testimony to stand in competition with divine Testimony".[53] Immediately thereafter he elucidates:

> And now let any Heathen, Turk, or Jew, Friend or Foe, provided he be a rational Creature, make such an Argument, if he can; which notwithstanding is the true state of the case.[54]

To my mind, one cannot fail to detect in this statement reverberations of Paul's words: "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus" (Gal. 3.28). Paul removes national, gender and social barriers to create a new community – the Christian Church. Wagstaffe eliminates religious and political borders to create a community of scholars. That community is predicated, not on religious faith, as implied by Lloyd, but on the innate intelligence and rationalism common to all humans and the desire to embark on the exploration of the Truth. Precisely because of the audacity of this conception, especially when articulated by a cleric, Wagstaffe had no choice but to distinguish unequivocally between the

---

[52] T. Wagstaffe, *An Answer to A Letter to Dr. Sherlock: Written in Vindication of that Part of Josephus's History which Gives the Account of Jaddus's Submission to Alexander Against the Answer to the Piece Entituled, Obedience and Submission to the Present Government*, London 1692, p. 6.
[53] Ibid., p. 14.
[54] Ibid., p. 14.

authority of the Holy Scriptures that is independent and requires no human corroboration and all other historians including Josephus.

Wagstaffe reiterates this argument each time he is called upon to contend with Lloyd's attempts to cast aspersions on the credibility of historians and chronographers. Lloyd argued that Josephus should not be revised to reflect 'Christian chronology'. As might be expected, this phrase provoked Wagstaffe who responded:

> Is Chronology the worse for being Christian', and then continued to the essential determination: 'However, the Chronology that I use is the Scripture Account, and if Josephus cannot be reconciled to that, I think, with our Author's leave, that may correct Josephus, let our Author call it Christian Chronology, or what he please.[55]

On the one hand, it is not correct to talk of Christian or Jewish chronology. Each historian or chronographer operates on his own strength. On the other hand, there is total commitment to the Holy Scriptures. Therefore, the works of historians and chronographs must be rectified or revised to accord with the Holy Scriptures and not vice-versa. Neither does Wagstaffe refrain from defending Salian:

> Well! It must be confessed, that that is a good Answer indeed which will serve all Purposes, Nations, Times and Persons. The Heathens they hated the Jews, and the Jewish Chronologers hated Josephus, and Salian was an Enemy to his very Name, and who would matter what such malicious Folks as they said?[56]

Lloyd argued that Sethus Calvisius, a German Protestant, was unreliable since he sought to posit a chronology divergent from Josephus'. To this Wagstaffe responds on a note of desperation:

> 'I wonder which way I should find a Man our Author's turn, I have named to him, Heathens, Jews, Jesuit and Christians, and yet none of them will go down with him; and I know not how to satisfie our Author, except I could bring a Man that in all points agreed with Josephus'.[57]

Wagstaffe is implying that the religious and ideological question marks Lloyd raises regarding the historians who oppose Josephus derive from Lloyd's own personal tendentiousness that disqualifies any historian who deviates from Josephus. However, as

---

[55] Ibid., pp. 56-57.
[56] Ibid., p. 59.
[57] Ibid., p. 68.

Wagstaffe points out, no historian or chronograph is willing to accept Josephus's account as written. Even James Ussher, who we saw praised and eulogized by Lloyd, rejects Josephus' version according to which Alexander arrived at Jerusalem from Gaza. Ussher, informed by geographic and topical considerations, believed that Alexander arrived at Jerusalem from Tyre and then continued to Gaza from there. Moreover, Wagstaffe goes one step further and asserts that Josephus himself entertained real doubts as to the veracity of the story. In his apologetic composition, *Against Apion*, he brings numerous proofs of the long standing appreciation with which the Greeks and Romans regarded the Jews, yet the Alexander story is entirely absent from this testimonial litany.[58] Essentially, Wagstaffe argues that the story of the encounter between Alexander and the high priest incorporates historical facts and that employing "a little Hellennistical Fancy (of which that Age was full) might easily jumble them together, and confound differing times, to frame a Romantick Story, that never had any real being".[59]

History as Revelation: The Theological Dimension of the Dispute

We have hitherto dealt with the clashes between two historians: Wagstaffe - who values the professional, unbiased historian whose accounts exhibit inner coherence and accord with other historians' works and with historical and chronological information, and Lloyd - the sober, cynical historian who acknowledges the limitations to which historians, constrained by culture and personality, are subject. Both Wagstaffe and Lloyd were, however, clerics for whom the question of God's presence and Divine will were of far greater concern, particularly with respect to this dispute. Indeed, Wagstaffe claims that it is precisely this dimension that precludes Jaddus as a relevant precedent even if we accept the authenticity of the details of Josephus' account. According to Wagstaffe, Jaddus was authorized to forsake his oath to Darius when Alexander reached Jerusalem because God had revealed Himself to him and commanded him to throw open the city gates. Yet if, according to leading Jurors, no such revelation occurred, then Jaddus' story lends them no support.

[58] Ibid., p. 66.
[59] Ibid., p. 66.

Lloyd draws on Malachi in his opening statement, quoting the prophet's prediction that Elijah would be his prophetic successor (Mal. 3:23) as evidence that prophecy, as a prevalent vehicle for conveying God's words, had indeed ceased. Even had Jaddus attributed his acceptance of Alexander to Divine insistence, the populace would not have been convinced. Jaddus succeeded in convincing the people to submit to Alexander on the grounds that he was acting in accordance with accepted law:

> that it is lawful to submit to a Prince that comes in by Conquest, and that it is our Duty to pay Allegiance to him as his Subjects, when he is settled by the general consent of the People notwithstanding an Oath to a former King who is yet living'.[60]

As expected, Wagstaffe rejects this. He speaks judiciously of the cessation of prophecy, and he defines the "bat-kol" – the heavenly voice - as an 'inferiour degree of Prophecy'. The main thrust of his argument is devoted to the problem of conflict between the instructions received by the prophet and accepted law. He cites the laws regarding false prophets (Deut. 13:3-7) to argue that specifically in cases where the prophet advocates idolatry, he is not to be heeded. In other cases, if the prophecy is genuine, the prophet should be obeyed even if his instructions contradict the law. Jaddus acted correctly in opening the city gates to Alexander and transferring his loyalty from Darius to him only on account of the revelation that he experienced. Historic events in and of themselves are insufficient to alter the religious-legal obligations to which people are bound.[61]

The Exegetical Aspect

The pamphlet war was chiefly a battle of texts. Coinhering alongside the previously treated historiographic axis (the veracity or falseness of Josephus' account) and the theological-legal axis (the requisiteness of revelation), there is an exegetical axis: how should the Convocation's use of Josephus be construed? As aforementioned, William Sherlock interpolated various historical details from Josephus' account to infer the Convocation's intention. The main, pivotal detail of Sherlock's argument was Alexander's visit to Jerusalem. Since this visit occurred while Darius still lived and

[60] Lloyd, Answer, p. 28.
[61] Wagstaffe, Answer to A Letter, pp. 85-89.

exercised control over most of his kingdom, Sherlock sought to extrapolate that the Convocation sanctioned the transfer of allegiance from one ruler to another during the overthrown ruler's lifetime, even while the latter still retained vestiges of governance. In the first composition, 'Case of Allegiance', Sherlock does not elucidate his exegetical principles; Wagstaffe's criticism, however, exposes and finds fault with them.

Wagstaffe states that since it is the Convocation's authority upon which Sherlock and the Jurors purport to rely, no historical embellishments or information should be added in order to elicit its authors' intentions: "That their sense is not to be extended beyond their words; nor are they to be made parties to any more of the story, than they have inserted in their Book".[62] Wagstaffe supports limiting exegetical leeway in a twofold manner. First – the text must be interpreted literally, with no expansions. Second – even when the text relies on excerpted material from another source, its exegesis must be limited to what the text that is to be interpreted chose to cite. The text should not be interpreted according to the literary or historical contexts of the excerpted material's source. Sherlock, in his response, admits he supports an expanded exegesis based on our comprehensive knowledge of the sources to which the authors had access

> But this I deny; for if they believed any of the Story upon Josephus's Authority, by the same reason they must believe all; and if they pass their Judgment on a matter of fact, such wise Men ought to be presumed to judge upon the whole matter of fact.[63]

Sherlock presumes the existence of an author behind the text - 'such wise men' - whose words should be construed according to the overall accumulation of knowledge most probably at his disposal.

Responding to Lloyd, Wagstaffe reprises, once again, his fundamentals of correct exegesis:

> I always thought that every author was his own best Interpreter; and it is a strain of Interpretation and fit only to serve ends and purposes, when Men will not take an Author as they find him; but besides his own account will seek out for other matters, to square and measure his fence by.[64]

---

[62] Wagstaffe, Answer, p. 11.
[63] Sherlock, Vindication, p. 19.
[64] Wagstaffe, Answer to A Letter, p. 83.

If Sherlock's literary critical approach could be termed modernist, then Wagstaffe's recalls, to a great extent, 'New-Criticism', according to which the text should be self-explicated without the support of external sources or guidance.

Historiography, History and the Glorious Revolution

The controversy over Josephus is a peripheral offshoot of the dispute between Jurors and Nonjurors; nevertheless, it too embraces the conceptual fundaments of the dispute. Sancroft published the Convocation Book to assert the invalidity of any type of popular intervention in the fashioning of historical reality. Sherlock, at the beginning of the 'Case of Allegiance' accepts the underpinnings of this position but argues that lack of involvement has a flip side - the people must acquiesce to the manner by which God directs history:

> [T]hat Princes, who have no Legal Right to their Thrones when they are placed there by God are invested with God's Authority, and must be reverenced and obeyed by all Subjects, in as full a manner, as any other the most legal and rightful Prince can challenge.[65]

The fact that a ruler succeeds in retaining power is the ultimate proof his regime enjoys Divine sanction; by this process, a regime is transformed from de facto to de jure. The new ruler is doubly endowed with Divine providence and with God's Authority. The manner in which his subjects are made aware of this is through history, once the ruler's regime is 'thoroughly settled'. When it is conspicuous to each and every subject that affairs of state are being conducted in the name of the king, then it is clear that the regime has 'thoroughly settled'.[66]

Wagstaffe rejects the assertion of history as a vehicle for the manifestation of Divine will. He labels the vicissitudes of history 'permissive providence'.[67] God can permit many and varied things, some of which stand in stark opposition to His rules and to His will. A regime receives God's Authority and is considered 'thoroughly settled' only when: "it stands upon the foundation of Right, and becomes Legal".[68] Neither historical

[65] Sherlock, Allegiance, p. 6.
[66] Ibid, p. 6.
[67] Wagstaffe, Answer, p. 3.
[68] Wagstaffe, Answer (postscript), p. 3.

reality nor what is visible to the subjects is the determining factor – rather the ability to provide a legal basis for governance.

The disagreement between Wagstaffe and Lloyd regarding revelation's role in the Jaddus and Alexander story well exemplifies the fundamental dispute. Wagstaffe argues that only when Jaddus experienced the revelation obliging him to transfer his allegiance to Alexander was he authorized to do so. Lloyd, conversely, negates the value of revelation and highlights history as a normative force. The populace, along with Jaddus, perceived the might of Alexander's regime portrayed in his deposal of Darius and subsequent arrival in Jerusalem as conqueror and ruler. History itself enacted the commitment to the new ruler.

The controversy between Jurors and Nonjurors did not pertain solely to the relationship between history and God; rather it addressed the essentiality of history and is thus central to understanding the historiographic and exegetical conceptions of both sides. If history is a manifestation of Divine will, as Sherlock and Lloyd argue, then history is a prism through which the world can be deciphered and explicated. Lloyd's historicist call to understand historians in the context of their cultures, tendencies and ideologies perceives the historian and his work as historical objects, no less than the objects of their research. Similarly, the text cannot be isolated from its authors and therefore correct exegesis relates to all the factors that were formative to the text's creation. To grasp the legal conclusions that the Convocation extracts from the story of Alexander and Jaddus, we must revisit the story itself.

Wagstaffe terms the vicissitudes of history 'permissive providence'. Without affirming the randomness of history outright, the term implies that history cannot be a source of authority. We do not follow a ruler's successes or failures to determine what treatment to accord him; rather we examine the legality of his regime as defined by God. Wagstaffe's discernment between history and law corresponds to the distinction between the historian and history. Historians are not historic objects woven into the tapestry of their epoch; rather they observe history to unveil the 'true state of the case'.[69] The isolating approach that distinguishes between history and other operative and creative realms allows Wagstaffe to establish the autonomy of the text. In the same way that the

[69] Wagstaffe, Answer to A Letter, p. 14.

history of the historian is irrelevant to the acceptance of his work, so the history of the text is not a factor in its interpretation.

It would be remiss to conclude this article without relating to the methodological aspects of the controversy. Though the disputants were indeed eminent clerics, and the historical discussion formed part of a pertinent political and religious controversy, one cannot fail to be impressed by the erudition and scholarship invested therein. Underlying the explicit controversy is agreement regarding the nature of historiography. Daniel Woolf posited the transition of historical thought at the onset of the early modern period, from 'histories' to 'historical'.[70] At the close of the Middle Ages, history was perceived as a somewhat haphazard collection of stories conveyed by classical authors imbued with ancient authority. These accounts comprised a handy reservoir of political, religious and moralistic anecdotes. Few scholars were well acquainted with the works of many ancient authors, yet even those few made no attempt to synthesize the sources to reflect the whole past 'wie es eigentlich gewesen'. Wagstaffe and Lloyd represent - each in his own way - the transformation of historical thought. Conspicuous throughout the entire course of the dispute is the application, in different manners, of critical and rational thinking.[71] Wagstaffe exposes the incoherence and anachronisms of Josephus' own account. To a large degree, this criticism is a direct extension of Renaissance era philological scholarship that raises questions regarding the texts' authenticity. This scholarship is supplemented by criticism based on historical thought concerned with the 'past' as it transpired. Wagstaffe and Lloyd devote many pages to a chronological examination of the Persian period and to the reconstruction of the course of Alexander's expedition based on ancient historians' writings and on the extractible chronological information

[70] D. R. Woolf, 'From Hystories to the Historical: Five Transitions in Thinking about the Past, 1500–1700', *Huntington Library Quarterly* 68 (2005), p. 37.

[71] On the beginning of modern and critical historiography in England see the classical work of F. S. Fussner, *The Historical Revolution: English Historical Writing and Thought, 1580-1640*, New York 1962. Fussner's thesis was adopted be many others for bibliography and critique see D. R. Woolf, 'A High Road to the Archives? Rewriting the History of Early Modern English Historical Culture', *Storia della storiografia* 32 (1997), pp. 33-59. Woolf himself is much more sceptical about the 'revolution' in historiography in the first half of the 17th century (D. R. Woolf, *The Idea of History in Early Stuart England*, Toronto 1990, pp. 261-265). For recent critiques see A. Hadfield, 'Sceptical History and the Myth of the Historical Revolution', *Renaissance and Reformation* 29 (2005), pp. 25-44; D. Womersley, 'Against the Teleology of Technique', *Huntington Library Quarterly* 68 (2005), pp. 91-104.

from these and biblical sources. Neither author perceives himself as a mere exegete seeking to elicit the truth 'of the text'; both are intent on revealing the historical reality, the past itself.[72] Textual criticism – both intratextual and that based on the juxtaposition of various sources and chronological information – is the medium through which the two disputants aspire to reach 'beyond' the text in a reenactment of the historical facts. Reprising Woolf's conceptual construct, Wagstaffe and Lloyd strive to produce a 'historical knowledge of the past' from the individual 'histories'.

The above conforms well to the intellectual landscape of the 17th century – an era marked by the rise of reason and critical thinking.[73] Before closing, however, the ideological currents of the controversy warrant consideration and herein lies an unexpected conclusion. It is well known that critical thinking - knowledge of various and contradictory depictions of the past and the need to harmonize between them - contributed decisively toward the secularization of history. Gone was the perception of the past as sacred: God's design for reality grew increasingly apart from the complex and intricate depiction of earthly history.[74] Yet this is the issue at the core of Sherlock and Lloyd's dispute with Wagstaffe. Sherlock and Lloyd perceive history itself as Divinely ordained, with ensuing religious obligations. According to Wagstaffe, history is not what God desires but rather what He permits, or, in his words, 'permissive providence'. Therefore, historical vicissitudes do not alter the oaths and religious obligations that one has shouldered, or, as another Nonjuror maintained: 'we ought not to make God's providence the rule of our actions but his law'.[75] Nonjurors certainly did not reject

---

[72] Woolf,Histories (above n. 70), pp. 63-67.

[73] See for instance the known quote from Boyle: 'To me 'tis not very material, whether or no, in Physicks or any other Discipline, a thing be prov'd by the peculiar Principles of that Science or Discipline; provided it be firmly proved by the common grounds of Reason' (R. Boyle, 'A Disquisition about the Final Causes of Natural Things' [1688], in *The Works of Robert Boyle*, M. Hunter and E. B. Davis [eds.], 14 vols., London 2000, vol. II: p. 91. On reason in science and natural philosophy see: B. J. Shapiro, *Probability and Certainty in Seventeenth-Century England: A Study of the Relationships between Natural Science, Religion,History, Law, and Literature*, Princeton 1983, pp. 15-27, esp. 22-23. The literature on reason and religion in early modern England is vast. I'm referring again to Shapiro, Probability and Certainty, pp. 74-118, for a recent study see S. Mandelbrote, 'The Uses of Natural Theology in Seventeenth-Century England', *Science in Context* 20 (2007), pp. 451-480. The literature on the Latitudinarians is also relevant see M. I. J. Griffin, *Latitudinarianism in the Seventeenth-Century Church of England*, Leiden 1992, pp. 47-59.

[74] On the transition from sacred history to natural history see P. Harrison, *'Religion' and the Religions in the English Enlightenment*, Cambridge 1990, pp. 126-172 and esp. 126-129.

[75] R. Jenkin, *The Title of a Thorough Settlement Examined; In Answer to Dr. Sherlock's Case of the Allegiance Due to Sovereign Powers*, London 1691, p. 23.

Divine providence or God's immanence, yet the clear distinction between history and revelation – as opposed to Lloyd and his associates' conception of history as revelation – was a further step toward the secularization of history and its establishment as an autonomous field of knowledge.

History would cast the Nonjurors as defenders of the old order.[76] Politically, the Nonjurors defended the monarchy and traditional succession. Jurists equated Vox Dei with Vox Populi, contributing significantly to the theory and practice of popular sovereignty.[77] The Nonjurors, conversely, tended increasingly over time toward Jacobitism and Catholicism until they disappeared and were forgotten.[78] However, the controversy over Jaddus and Alexander reveals a different picture. It was Sherlock and Lloyd who persisted in viewing history as sacred insofar as it manifests Divine will and enacts the legal and religious obligations of subjects. Wagstaffe was the one to secularize history and to bestow on historians of all religions and nationalities a professional republic for their scholarly pursuits.

[76] See for instance G. M. Trevelyan, *The English Revolution 1688-1689*, Oxford 1965, p. 8.
[77] Nenner, Right (above n. 3), pp. 217-218.
[78] The Nonjurors and the Jacobites are, of course, not one and the same. Anyway over time some merged into the Jacobite movement, see: P. K. Monod, *Jacobitism and the English People*, 1688–1788, Cambridge 1989, pp. 139-145. On the demise of the Nonjurists and their heightened affinity with Catholicism, see: G. Rupp, *Religion in England*, Oxford 1986, pp. 16-28.