

### CHAPTER THREE

## 'YOU WILL SEE WHO THEY ARE THAT REVILE, AND LESSEN YOUR... GLORIOUS DELIVERANCE'. THE 'MEMORY WAR' ABOUT THE 'GLORIOUS REVOLUTION'

Ulrich Niggemann

Revolutions tend to create new pasts, or, in the words of Melinda Zook: 'Revolutionaries of modern times often imagine themselves not only as creators of a new future, but also as constructors of a new past'.<sup>1</sup> In fact, revolutionaries often legitimate their breach with the past by reshaping memories. This applies not only to modern times but also to earlier revolutions such as the 'Glorious Revolution' in England when King James II was dethroned in 1688–89. Memories of the Revolution itself and of the events immediately preceding it soon became the subject of memory politics and of controversy. The newly established regime of William III and Mary II sought legitimacy by influencing memories. At the same time, groups and factions tried to establish competing memories to achieve their own political aims and to forge new identities.

This article analyses the attempts of the state as well as several pressure groups to shape the public memory of the Glorious Revolution. It examines how distinct narratives of the Revolution refer to different political and/or religious identities. Moreover, in the course of a 'memory war' that began during the reign of Anne (1702–14), memories of 1688–89 were used as political weapons by rival parties. It is important to note that this development took place within the camp of the supporters of the Revolution. The controversy concerned not the legitimacy of the event (that was a separate issue) but the right of the contending parties to appropriate the Revolution. 'Memory war' as understood in the present article, therefore, deals with the struggle over assigning meanings to and exercising control over public memories of the Glorious Revolution. Naturally, the scope of the present article is limited, and it will, therefore, focus on how, after the Glorious Revolution, the English state established patterns for narratives

---

<sup>1</sup> Melinda Zook, '“The Bloody Assizes”. Whig martyrdom and memory after the Glorious Revolution', *Albion* 27 (1995), 373–396, there 373.

of the Revolution and how different actors used these narratives. It also gives some examples of the struggle over meaning and appropriation, but it cannot offer a broader discourse analysis of the controversies concerning the Revolution and its consequences.<sup>2</sup>

### I. *The Role of the State*

Attempts to shape memories and to give meaning to the events from October 1688 onwards can be observed even during the interregnum after James' flight in December 1688. At that moment, the Crown was weak and government control of the press nearly collapsed. However, William III and his nearest entourage tried to influence public opinion through intense propaganda efforts. Immediately after William's landing, his printed declarations distributed images and interpretations of what was happening.<sup>3</sup> After 22 January 1689, the Convention, too, contributed to the establishment of an official view of the Revolution stating that James had abdicated his position, leaving the throne vacant. Although a contract between James and the people was mentioned, the breach of this contract was not offered as the rationale on which the abdication was based.<sup>4</sup>

Even before the meeting of the Convention, additional strategies were developed. One of the key figures of the propaganda efforts was the future bishop of Salisbury, Gilbert Burnet, who not only participated in drafting William's 'Declaration of Reasons' but also organised a service of thanksgiving in Exeter Cathedral when William arrived there. After William's arrival in London, Burnet preached in St James' Palace, where he, according to Tony Claydon, 'set the tone' for sermons on the Revolution for the next couple of years.<sup>5</sup> In his sermon, Burnet argued that William's intervention was brought about by divine providence to rescue

---

<sup>2</sup> A book on the memory and use of the 'Glorious Revolution' in early eighteenth-century England is in preparation by this author.

<sup>3</sup> The 'Declaration of his highness William Henry, by the grace of God, prince of Orange, etc., of the reasons inducing him to appear in arms in the Kingdom of England' (1688) is edited as, *The eighteenth-century constitution 1688–1815. Documents and commentary*, ed. Ernest N. Williams (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1960), 10–16.

<sup>4</sup> David L. Jones, *A parliamentary history of the Glorious Revolution* (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1988), 20–38.

<sup>5</sup> Tony Claydon, *William III and the Godly Revolution* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 102; and generally on the role of Burnet *ibid.*, 24–63; Tony Claydon, 'William III's Declaration of Reasons and the Glorious Revolution', *The Historical Journal* 39 (1996), 87–108.

England from Roman Catholicism.<sup>6</sup> This line of argument was further developed in sermons given on the thanksgiving days ordered by the Convention for 31 January and 14 February 1689.<sup>7</sup> For these services of thanksgiving, a Form of Prayer was composed by some of the bishops, stressing how God's favour advanced the Revolution and characterising William as God's instrument.<sup>8</sup> Furthermore, later in 1689, when the new monarchs were seated on the throne, an extraordinary liturgy for the 5th of November 1689 was inserted into the Book of Common Prayer, focusing on the landing of William of Orange in England on that day and stressing the coincidence with the date of 'deliverance' from the Gunpowder Plot.<sup>9</sup> This thanksgiving was perpetuated in 1690, thus establishing the 5th of November as the central commemoration day of the Glorious Revolution.<sup>10</sup>

Thanksgiving days, fast days, prayers and sermons remained a central part of government propaganda, but additionally a broad range of media such as pamphlets, prints and medals were used to stress the legitimacy of the reign and to promote compliance with the new regime.<sup>11</sup> These media helped to shape images of the new king and queen as well as of the revolutionary events of 1688–89. It is, however, remarkable that these images were by no means unambiguous. Government propaganda did not provide any single way of depicting the Revolution—the constitutional language of William's declaration was used side-by-side with the providential and other languages.<sup>12</sup> By providing a platform for a negotiation

<sup>6</sup> Gilbert Burnet, *A sermon preached in the chappel of St. James's, before his highness the prince of Orange, 23d of December, 1688* (London, 1689). Cf. Claydon, *William III*, 31–32.

<sup>7</sup> Order of the House of Lords, 22 January 1689, *Journal of the House of Lords, beginning anno primo Jacobi Secundi, 1685*, 64 vols. (London, 1767–1832), vol. 14, 102.

<sup>8</sup> Church of England, *A form of prayer and thanksgiving to Almighty God, for having made his highness the prince of Orange the glorious instrument of the great deliverance of this kingdom from Popery and arbitrary power* (London, 1689).

<sup>9</sup> Church of England, *Additional prayers to be used together with those appointed in the service for the Fifth of November* (London, 1689).

<sup>10</sup> See David Cressy, *Bonfires and bells. National memory and the Protestant calendar in Elizabethan and Stuart England* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1989), 185–186; James Caudle, *Measures of allegiance. Sermon culture and the creation of a public discourse of obedience and resistance in Georgian Britain, 1714–60*, PhD thesis, Yale University (1995), 255–258; James R.R. McConnel, 'The 1688 landing of William of Orange at Torbay: numerical dates and temporal understanding in early modern England', *The Journal of Modern History* 84 (2012), 539–571, there 547.

<sup>11</sup> Kai Nürnberger, *Die Kunst der Information. König Wilhelm III. und die Medien seiner Zeit*, *Britannica et Americana* 3/21 (Heidelberg: Winter, 2003); Craig Rose, *England in the 1690s. Revolution, Religion and War*, A history of early modern England (Oxford: Blackwell, 1999), 18–62.

<sup>12</sup> This range of discourse was also reflected in the funeral sermons delivered after King William's death in 1702; cf. Ulrich Niggemann, 'Divine right, 'courtly reformation'

of what was acceptable, these languages and media helped to compose a canonical narrative of events. William's 'Declaration of Reasons' as well as the resolution of the Convention or the 'Declaration of Rights' became central texts for the defenders of the Revolution, referred to in a large variety of political pamphlets and sermons.

However, the state seems to have remained quite tolerant of ambiguity. Even with regard to preaching on the thanksgiving days, there was remarkable latitude for preachers to speak about the Revolution.<sup>13</sup> It seems that the government offered only patterns, which could be used for a wide range of utterances concerning the Revolution.

Undesirable interpretations were nonetheless suppressed. This suppression applied not only to Jacobite pamphlets but also to a 'Pastoral Letter' by Bishop Burnet, who was well known as a supporter of the government. Burnet had argued that William's coming to the throne was the result of a successful conquest, and obedience was due to him because he was king *de facto*.<sup>14</sup> Strikingly, it was not the court, but Parliament, which ordered the book to be burnt by the common hangman.<sup>15</sup> Despite such spectacular acts of suppression, a wide range of interpretations was possible, and various versions of the memory of the Revolution were allowed to be circulated. The expiration of the Licensing Act in 1695 further widened the opportunity to speak about the Revolution in various ways.<sup>16</sup>

## II. Pressure Groups, Factions, Parties

This relative tolerance concerning differing interpretations of the Revolution allowed room for contention. Different groups and parties began

---

or contractarianism? Political and theological languages in the funeral sermons on King William III', *Barok* 18 (2011), 115–127.

<sup>13</sup> With regard to the Hanoverian period cf. Caudle, *Measures*, 205–211. Generally for such observations, Kevin Sharpe, *Selling the Tudor monarchy. Authority and image in sixteenth-century England* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2009), 5–34.

<sup>14</sup> Gilbert Burnet, *A pastoral letter writ by the right reverend father in God Gilbert, lord bishop of Sarum, to the clergy of his diocess, London 1689*; William Sherlock, *the case of allegiance due to sovereign powers, stated and resolved, according to scripture and reason, and the principles of the Church of England* (London, 1691).

<sup>15</sup> Mark Goldie, 'The Revolution of 1689 and the structure of political argument. An essay and an annotated bibliography of pamphlets in the Allegiance Controversy', *Bulletin of Research in the Humanities* 83 (1980), 473–564, there 515–517; John P. Kenyon, *Revolution principles. The politics of party, 1689–1720* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977), 31.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. Karl T. Winkler, *Handwerk und Markt. Druckerhandwerk, Vertriebswesen und Tagesschrifttum in London 1695–1750* (Stuttgart: Steiner, 1993), 35.

to develop rival interpretations of the Revolution. As early as the Convention, much of the discussion was dedicated to the question of how to interpret the situation caused by William's invasion and James' flight. In the end, the discussion centred on the word 'abdication', which could mean a voluntary resignation as well as a forced deposition.<sup>17</sup>

In the first phase of the 'memory war', beginning during the negotiations of the Convention, the front line, however, was mainly between those approving of the Revolution and the Settlement, and those rejecting it. The battle intensified in the so-called 'Allegiance Controversy' after the introduction of the new oath of allegiance when some of the bishops and many of the lower clergy refused to take the oath. These nonjurors became bitter enemies of the new regime and publicly denied its legitimacy.<sup>18</sup>

At the same time, the official view of the Convention left room for a variety of interpretations. As Mark Goldie has demonstrated, there was indeed a wide range of arguments defending the Revolution, from radical contract theories to divine right of providence or a conquest by William.<sup>19</sup> This variety points clearly to the ideological differences below the surface of the consensus reached by the Convention. During the first few years after the Revolution, however, these differences seemed less important than the defence and justification of the events of 1688–89.

It is striking that most of the early accounts of the reign of James II were more or less composed along the lines given in the 'Declaration of Reasons' and the 'Declaration of Rights'. Key elements, for example, included James' fair promises in the beginning of his reign, his 'pulling off the mask' by introducing Roman Catholic mass, the 'Bloody Assizes' after the rebellion of the duke of Monmouth, the introduction of an Ecclesiastical Commission and the suspension of the Bishop of London, the keeping of a standing army, the prosecution against the Seven Bishops and, as a climax, the illegitimate birth of a Prince of Wales. The story was composed not only alongside the 'Declaration', but also followed narratological patterns that make for a good story.<sup>20</sup> It begins with a fair prospect of harmony, followed by the first signs of a conflict, which was then developed to a

<sup>17</sup> Cf. Kenyon, *Revolution principles*, 5–20; Thomas P. Slaughter, "“Abdicate” and “contract” in the Glorious Revolution", *The Historical Journal* 24 (1981), 323–337.

<sup>18</sup> William Gibson, *The Church of England, 1688–1832. Unity and accord* (London: Routledge, 2001), 35–40; Rose, *England*, 152–160.

<sup>19</sup> Goldie, "The Revolution of 1689", 486–489. See also Kenyon, *Revolution principles*, 21–60.

<sup>20</sup> Monika Fludernik, *Erzähltheorie. Eine Einführung*, (3rd ed., Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2010).

climax, after which the downfall began. As part of this downfall and change for the better came William's preparations. The storm, driving back the invasion force, as well as James' last-minute attempt to reverse some of his measures worked as obstacles delaying the hoped-for result and providing suspense. The bloodless march of William towards London and the collapse of James' army, however, were recounted in most accounts as the last steps to the happy ending of James' flight and William and Mary's coronation.<sup>21</sup>

Of course, interpretations of James' intentions, his flight to France and the character of the Revolution as a whole differed. The mainstream of memorial texts depicted William as England's providential deliverer, and this was also the official version presented, for example, in the Forms of Prayer for the services of thanksgiving on 31 January, 14 February and 5 November.<sup>22</sup> The people of England had a quite passive role in these accounts. James' flight to France was interpreted in many accounts of the Revolution as a voluntary desertion, abdication or resignation, leaving the throne vacant for William.<sup>23</sup> A few accounts differed from this version. Samuel Johnson, for example, accused the authors of such stories of being liars, whose stories served to keep up the passive obedience doctrine of the Anglican clergy, which condemned every form of resistance, even against tyrants.<sup>24</sup> In Johnson's version, James was driven out of the country by the people aided by William. For him the people had a right to defend themselves against tyranny and oppression.<sup>25</sup> For others, William

---

<sup>21</sup> Just a few examples out of many: Guy Miège, *The new state of England under their majesties K. William and Q. Mary*, (2nd ed., London, 1694); John Sellar, *History of England. Giving a true and impartial account of the most considerable transactions in church and state, in peace and war, during the reigns of all the kings and queens, from the coming of Julius Caesar into Britain* (London, 1696), 638–655; Abel Boyer, *The history of King William the Third*, 3 vols. (London 1702–1703), vol. 2.

<sup>22</sup> For the image of William cf. Rose, *England*, 18–62; Nürnberger, *Kunst*; Ulrich Niggemann, 'Der mediale Umgang mit dem Tod eines umstrittenen Herrschers. Die Memoria Wilhelms III. zwischen 'Glorious Revolution' und Hannoverscher Thronfolge', in Christine Roll, Frank Pohle and Matthias Myrczek (eds.), *Grenzen und Grenzüberschreitungen. Bilanz und Perspektiven der Frühneuezeitforschung*, Frühneuezeit-Impulse (Cologne, Vienna, Weimar: Böhlau, 2010), vol. 1, 299–312.

<sup>23</sup> E.g. [Edmund Bohun], *The history of the desertion, or an account of all the publick affairs in England, from the beginning of September 1688 to the twelfth of February following* (London, 1689), 0,153.

<sup>24</sup> Samuel Johnson, *An argument proving, that the abrogation of King James by the people of England from the regal throne, and the promotion of the prince of Orange, one of the royal family, to the throne of the kingdom in his stead, was according to the constitution of the English government, and prescribed by it* (London, 1692), 11.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*, 11–12, 16, 33–35.

was a victor in a just war between two sovereign princes. James' throne came into William's possession because William had conquered James in battle.<sup>26</sup>

It is obvious, therefore, that different memories and different narratives of the Revolution were in play and that the consensus reached in the Convention was fragile. However, the breakup of consensus and the beginning of a 'memory war' within the camp of the supporters of the Revolution became obvious only towards the end of William's reign and during the reign of Anne. The sharp conflict among different groups approving of the Revolution marks a second phase of the 'memory war', which reached its climax during the pamphlet war between Benjamin Hoadly, Francis Atterbury and Offspring Blackall as well as in the course of the Sacheverell affair.

The controversy over memories of the Revolution had its origin in the conflicts within the Church of England about the Church's relationship to King and State. One of the main tenets of the High Church party within the Anglican Church was its doctrine of passive obedience and non-resistance, a doctrine driven by a nostalgic view of the Laudian and Caroline Church and by the condemnation of the regicide of 1649. 30 January, the commemoration day of the beheading of Charles I, was the central day of fasting and prayer for the High Church. This day was used for zealous preaching against those doctrines which seemed to justify resistance and regicide.<sup>27</sup>

Although Low Church clerics were normally not radical asserters of resistance theories, they admitted that resistance in extreme cases could be justified. And although they might be readier than their High Church counterparts to submit the Church to the State, they at the same time were more open to toleration of Dissent and to a more relativistic view of State and Church. For them, Church and State were not universal and untouchable powers but institutions liable to human reason. Thus, doctrines of parliamentary sovereignty and right of resistance in the people were accepted by most Low Church clerics.<sup>28</sup>

The sermons by Offspring Blackall from 1705 onwards stressed the 'subject's duty' to submit to earthly governments and were strong confirmations

<sup>26</sup> E.g. Burnet, *Pastoral letter*.

<sup>27</sup> Caudle, *Measures*, 240–247. Generally for High Church doctrines Gareth V. Bennett, *The Tory crisis in church and state, 1688–1730. The career of Francis Atterbury bishop of Rochester* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975).

<sup>28</sup> Overview by Gibson, *Church of England*, 70–86.

of the doctrines of passive obedience and non-resistance.<sup>29</sup> On the opposite side, Benjamin Hoadly, a Low Church cleric and Whig, derived Queen Anne's right to the throne solely from the Revolution and the Protestant Succession established by King William.<sup>30</sup> For him, the Revolution was founded upon resistance, and this resistance had saved England 'from utter ruine'.<sup>31</sup> In a spectacularly new interpretation of St Paul's thirteenth letter to the Romans, he stated that obedience is due only to rulers acting for the common good.<sup>32</sup> It was this interpretation of St Paul that Francis Atterbury sharply attacked, arguing that Hoadly's doctrine of resistance was essentially popish because it was first used by Jesuits in the sixteenth century and could be held responsible for the English Civil Wars of the 1640s.<sup>33</sup>

Thus, we have two lines of argument, one stressing resistance and the other stressing non-resistance, but both attempting to justify the Revolution. The same pattern of argument can be observed in the Sacheverell crisis. Henry Sacheverell, a parish priest in Southwark, in his sermon on 5 November 1709, fiercely attacked the Low Church clerics, accusing them of propagating rebellious doctrines and undermining the foundations of the Church of England.<sup>34</sup> The Whigs, in contrast, argued that the Revolution could be defended only by resistance theories.

In the course of these struggles over the memory of the Revolution, the canonical narrative established in the early years of King William's rule became brittle. William's bloodless victory, for example, was now questioned not only by Jacobites but also by Whig writers. Hoadly, for

<sup>29</sup> Offspring Blackall, *The subjects duty. A sermon preach'd at the parish-church of St. Dunstons in the West, on Thursday, March the 8th 1704/5* (London, 1705).

<sup>30</sup> Benjamin Hoadly, *A sermon preach'd on the eighth of March, 1704-5. Being the anniversary day of Thanksgiving for the queen's accession to the crown* (London, 1705). For the life and work of Benjamin Hoadly see William Gibson, *Enlightenment prelate. Benjamin Hoadly, 1676-1761* (Cambridge: Clarke, 2004); Stephen Taylor, 'Benjamin Hoadly', in *The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, 60 vols. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), vol. 27, 340-348.

<sup>31</sup> Benjamin Hoadly, *The measures of submission to the civil magistrate consider'd. In a defence of the doctrine deliver'd in a sermon preach'd before the rt.hon. the lord mayor, aldermen, and citizens of London, Sept. 29, 1705* (London, 1706), 70-71, 79-83.

<sup>32</sup> Benjamin Hoadly, *A sermon preach'd before the right honourable the lord mayor, and aldermen, livery-men, of the several companies of London* (London, 1705).

<sup>33</sup> Francis Atterbury, *An enquiry into the nature of the liberty of the subject, and of subjection to the supreme powers* (London, 1706). For Atterbury see Bennett, *Tory crisis*.

<sup>34</sup> Henry Sacheverell, *The perils of false brethren, both in church, and state. Set forth in a sermon preach'd before the right honourable the lord-mayor, aldermen, and citizens of London, at the cathedral-church of St. Paul, on the 5th of November, 1709* (London, 1709); Geoffrey Holmes, *The trial of doctor Sacheverell* (London: Eyre Methuen, 1973).

instance, stated with regard to the doctrine of the right of resistance that the Revolution was 'begun upon the foundation of this doctrine', and one of his defenders asserted: 'Now 'twas resistance which brought about the late happy Revolution'.<sup>35</sup> In that context, even battles and skirmishes in the course of William's march towards London were mentioned as arguments against the non-resistance doctrine.<sup>36</sup>

Another example of the shift of argument concerns the birth of James' son. Whereas Jacobites had stressed his legitimacy from the beginning,<sup>37</sup> the consensual view was that he was an 'imposture', who had not been borne by the Queen but had been smuggled into the Queen's bedchamber to perpetuate Catholic rule in England. Therefore, James Francis Edward could not have any claims to the throne of his abdicated father. In contrast to this view, Daniel Defoe, for example, stressed in 1705, 'that the true divine right of the crown, is in the person of King James III, as they count him'.<sup>38</sup> The following year Robert Fleming stated that Queen Anne's title to the crown could not be contested, 'even upon the supposition, that they could prove the legitimacy of the birth of a certain Prince'.<sup>39</sup> The main line of argument against the 'Pretender', for these authors, was not his illegitimacy but his being educated in French and 'popish' principles.<sup>40</sup>

For these changes of strategy, one can cite at least two obvious reasons. The first is that, even if the coronation of William and Mary as well as that of Anne could be represented as maintaining hereditary monarchy, the succession of the House of Hanover caused difficulties because at least some authors denied the hereditary right of the Elector.<sup>41</sup> Divine hereditary right, therefore, was a weak foundation for the Protestant succession. To solve this problem, stress was laid on the sovereignty of the people

<sup>35</sup> Hoadly, *Measures*, 83; *Bess o'Bedlam's love to her brother Tom: with a word in behalf of poor brother Ben Hoadly* (London, 1709), 12.

<sup>36</sup> E.g. John Dunton, *The bull-baiting: or, Sach—ll dress'd up in fire-works. Lately brought over from the Bear-Garden in Southwark; and expos'd for the diversion of the citizens of London, at six pence a-piece* (London, 1709), 17.

<sup>37</sup> Cf. e.g. [Charles Leslie], *Remarks on some late sermons; and in particular on Dr. Sherlock's sermon at the Temple, Decemb. 30.1694. In a letter to a friend* (2nd ed. London, 1695), 29.

<sup>38</sup> Daniel Defoe, *Review of the affairs of France*, no. 82, 11 September 1705, ed. John McVeagh (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2004), vol. 2, 580.

<sup>39</sup> Robert Fleming, *Seculum Davidicum redivivum; or, the Divine right of the revolution evinc'd and apply'd: in a discourse, occasion'd by the late glorious victory at Ramilly* (London, 1706), 25.

<sup>40</sup> *Reasons against receiving the pretender, and restoring the Popish line* (London, 1710), 4; Fleming, *Seculum*, 39; Defoe, *Review*, no. 79, 4 September 1705, 563; *Reasons prov'd to be unreasonable: or, an answer to the reasons against a war with France* (London, 1702), 10–11.

<sup>41</sup> Very strongly put forward by the anonymous author of *Reasons against receiving*, 10.

and the right of Parliament to alter the succession, if necessary to avoid tyranny. Daniel Defoe, again, pointed out, ‘that parliamentary authority has a superior right to that of primogeniture or inheritance, and can, and may lawfully limit succession’.<sup>42</sup>

The second reason is that the right of resistance became a central theme for Whigs as well as Low Church clerics. By focusing on that theme, they could not only challenge the established narrative but also attack their Tory and High Church counterparts. That means that the targets of their attacks were no longer the nonjurors and Jacobites but their opponents within the Revolution camp, who still maintained that the ‘Pretender’ was an ‘imposture’ and that the Revolution had been brought about by James’ abdication without any relevant changes in the constitution.

Thus, opposing groups used the memory of the Revolution to stress their political doctrines—non-resistance and passive obedience, on the one hand, parliamentary sovereignty and resistance against tyranny, on the other. Remarkably, both parties insisted that they approved of the Revolution. The ‘memory war’ about the ‘Glorious Revolution’ during the reign of Anne, therefore, was not about whether the Revolution could be justified or not but about its meaning and the ways of justifying it. There were competing interpretations of the Revolution already established in the early years of William and Mary and leading to deep divisions during the reign of Anne. The anniversaries and services of thanksgiving provided by the state were used by opposing groups who attempted to implement their interpretation of the event. By this means, they tried to shape memories according to their political doctrines.

### III. *The Use of Memory*

In this struggle between the church parties and their political equivalents, both sides attempted to sharpen their positions and their political identities. Even more important, they also tried to position themselves as the best and most loyal asserters of the Revolution. Both sides were keen to accuse their adversaries of ‘blackening’ the Revolution. From the point of view of Whiggish authors, Blackall, Atterbury and Sacheverell had tried to condemn the Revolution by rejecting resistance and maintaining Divine Right.<sup>43</sup> An anonymous author wrote, ‘that by upholding the doctrine of

<sup>42</sup> Defoe, *Review*, no. 82, 11 September 1705, 580.

<sup>43</sup> E.g. Hoadly, *Measures*, 20.

passive obedience to the will of a prince, he [Blackall] might cast a slur upon the justice of the late happy Revolution, and make void the principle upon which it was grounded'.<sup>44</sup> Other writers accused their adversaries of 'making the late Revolution a damnable rebellion and usurpation' and of 'blacken[ing] all the glorious instruments of our deliverance'.<sup>45</sup> Benjamin Hoadly, in an 'Election dialogue' in 1710, used the argument against the Tories: 'You will see who they are that revile, and lessen your glorious deliverer, and glorious deliverance'.<sup>46</sup>

Tory and High Church authors, however, denied that they had any intention of vilifying the Revolution. On the contrary, they accused the Whigs of casting odium on the Revolution by their attempts to justify it through their doctrine of resistance. It was not only the known Jacobite Charles Leslie who accused Whig authors of 'blackening and aspersing' the Revolution, 'by making it coercion and consequently rebellion'.<sup>47</sup> Atterbury also denied that he or Blackall had ever rejected the Revolution. They had only tried to cleanse it of any association with unlawful rebellion. The anonymous pamphlet *The Revolution no Rebellion* makes this point very clearly: The Revolution, the author argued, cannot be derived from any resistance by the people but only from the abdication of King James. James had not been deprived by reason of his mal-administration, but he himself had voluntarily resigned his throne and left the government in a state of anarchy. On these grounds, the Convention had offered the Crown to the next heirs.<sup>48</sup>

The same arguments were applied in the Sacheverell affair. The Whigs condemned Sacheverell's sermon as an attack against the Revolution. By condemning resistance, they argued, Sacheverell and others rejected the Revolution as utterly illegal.<sup>49</sup> Even in the 'Articles of impeachment'

<sup>44</sup> *Bess o'Bedlam's love*, 6.

<sup>45</sup> *Vox populi, vox Dei: being the true maxims of government* (London, 1709), 26–27; Samuel Johnson, *An answer to the history of passive obedience, just now reprinted under the title of A defence of Dr. Sacheverell* (London, 1710), 1.

<sup>46</sup> [Benjamin Hoadly], *The election-dialogue, between a gentleman, and his neighbour in the country, concerning the choice of good members for the next parliament* (London, 1710), 8–9.

<sup>47</sup> [Charles Leslie], 'The rehearsal, No 9', in *A view of the times, their principles and practices. In the fourth volume of the rehearsals* (London, 1709), unpag.

<sup>48</sup> *The revolution no rebellion; or, serious reflections offered to the reverend Mr. Benjamin Hoadly, occasion'd by his considerations on the bishop of Exeter's sermon* (London, 1709).

<sup>49</sup> *Chuse which you please: or, Dr. Sacheverell, and Mr. Hoadly, drawn to life* (London, 1710); *An appeal from the city to the country, for the preservation of her majesty's person, liberty, property and the protestant religion* (London, 1710); [John Toland], *Mr. Toland's reflections on Dr. Sacheverell's sermon preach'd at St. Paul's, Nov. 5, 1709* (London, 1710).

against Henry Sacheverell, the preacher was charged with denouncing the Revolution.<sup>50</sup> Sacheverell, however, denied any intention to condemn the Revolution. On the contrary, during the impeachment launched against him in the House of Commons by the Whigs, he insisted that his intention had been 'to clear the Revolution and His Late Majesty, from the black and odious colours which their greatest enemies had endeavoured to cast upon both'.<sup>51</sup>

For Tory and High Church authors, non-resistance was an indispensable part of their political creed and identity. Therefore, it was of vital importance for them to distinguish between the Revolution, which was brought about without any resistance and coercion against the King, and the Rebellion of the 1640s, which was unlawful and had ended in regicide.<sup>52</sup> The allegation, therefore, that the Whigs by justifying resistance in the Revolution also legitimised the Rebellion and Civil War of the mid-century, played a central role in Tory propaganda. Even in popular ballads and poems, the accusation against the Whigs was: 'Again they play the Game of Forty One'.<sup>53</sup> Thus, Whigs were accused by their Tory counterparts of being republicans, whereas the Whigs charged the Tories with being Jacobites.

#### IV. Conclusion

The controversies over the memory of the 'Glorious Revolution' did not end in 1714 when Georg Ludwig of Hanover, as George I, ascended the throne of Great Britain. It is not easy to say who at that time had won this 'memory war' although it may be tempting to say that the long period of one-party government by the Whigs could at least partly be explained by their successful 'self-fashioning' as the real asserters of the Revolution, whereas the Tories were suspected of being disloyal to the Revolution settlement. At the end of Queen Anne's reign, at least two positive versions of a narrative about the Revolution existed. In terms of composition and narrative patterns, they were quite similar and thus strengthened the canonical elements of the narrative. But they differed in many points of

---

<sup>50</sup> *The answer of Henry Sacheverell D.D. to the Articles of Impeachment, exhibited against him by the honourable House of Commons etc.* (s.l., 1710), 5.

<sup>51</sup> *Ibid.*, 9.

<sup>52</sup> *The revolution no rebellion.*

<sup>53</sup> *A collection of poems, for and against Dr. Sacheverell* (London, 1710), 3.

interpretation and referred to different value systems and political creeds. However, two important results of the struggle over memory during the reign of Anne can be named:

- 1.) One main result was the development of distinct party identities, which were often simplified and popularised in printed dialogues and comparisons. The two political and church parties could now be identified by sets of ideological statements, which allowed a broader public to position the actors in the political landscape. For both parties the Revolution was a common point of reference, and both parties had to develop their political creeds with regard to the Revolution. But they could easily be identified by their associating the Revolution either with resistance or with the idea of a voluntary abdication of King James.
- 2.) However, what at first sight seemed to have deepened the ditches between opposing groups and to have heightened ideological antagonisms, in fact contributed greatly to the 'growth of political stability'.<sup>54</sup> Because the two most important political currents in post-revolutionary England attempted to build up their political identities on the Revolution, they, thereby, accepted the Revolution Settlement and propagated it to different target groups, some of which could be suspected to be potentially hostile to the Revolution. The differing opinions, in spite of their harsh confrontation, had a common point of reference, which became normative in the course of the debates. That does not mean that there was universal, whole-hearted acceptance of the Revolution, but by the repeated utterances in favour of the Revolution, it became more and more difficult to ignore the dominant discourse. By the end of the century, especially during the centenary celebrations of the Revolution in 1788, it became clear that the 'Glorious Revolution' had become a canonical episode in the national memory and an important part of British national identity.<sup>55</sup>

---

<sup>54</sup> Term by John H. Plumb, *The growth of political stability in England, 1675–1725*, reprint (London: Macmillan, 1982).

<sup>55</sup> For the 1788 celebrations see Lois G. Schworer, 'Celebrating the Glorious Revolution, 1689–1989', *Albion* 22 (1990), 1–20; Kathleen Wilson, 'Inventing revolution. 1688 and eighteenth-century popular politics', *The Journal of British Studies* 28 (1989), 349–386.