

Mediating Cultural Memory: Ireland and the “Glorious Revolution”

(later published as “Cultural Memory and Cultural Amnesia: Ireland and the ‘Glorious Revolution’” in *Studies in Eighteenth-Century Culture* 47 (2017), 185-205. Copyright Leith Davis 2017.

On 5 November 1688, William of Orange landed his force of forty thousand men at Torbay in Devonshire. Over the following month, he marched his troops to London, assuming control of the government as James II fled to France. This “Dutch invasion,” in Jonathan Israel’s phrase,¹ would in time be reconceived as the “Glorious Revolution.” It would become, in other words, a powerful *lieu de mémoire*, a term coined by French historian Pierre Nora to designate “any significant entity, whether material or non-material in nature, which by dint of human will or the work of time has become a symbolic element of the memorial heritage of any community.”² According to Nora, *lieux de mémoire* “emerge in two stages.” First, “moments of history” are “plucked out of the flow of history,” then are “returned to it,” but in an altered state so that they are “no longer quite alive but not yet entirely dead, like shells left on the shore when the sea of living memory has receded.”³ The 1688 Revolution was plucked out of then returned to history in such a way that it became a “symbolic element” not only of “the memorial heritage” of the English nation but of the British empire as well,⁴ as it was credited with saving the English nation from tyranny, establishing the rights of individual subjects, and bolstering British power overseas.⁵ As G.M. Trevelyan famously pronounced, the “Glorious Revolution” was a “turning-point in the history of our country and of the world.”⁶

While the Revolution has been the subject of a long and complex historiography, recent work has provided new perspectives on the imperial aspects of 1688, examining,

among other issues, its repercussions in British, Atlantic, and European contexts.⁷ This article contributes an archipelagic context to this wider approach to the Revolution by focusing on the Williamite wars in Ireland. Although William and Mary were proclaimed monarchs in England in February 1689, the conflict in Ireland, known in Gaelic as *Cogadh an Dá Rí*, or the “War of the Two Kings,” dragged on for nearly three years after William’s landing in Torbay. During this time, as I will suggest, Ireland moved front and centre into the sights of the citizens of the metropolis. I begin by considering the way Irish events were initially mediated in newspapers and examining how Ireland itself became represented in space and time through maps and printed works like Richard Cox’s *Hibernia Anglicana* which were advertised in the newspapers. I focus next on how the first government victory in Ireland, the relief of the siege of Derry on 29 July 1689, served as a crucial point in shaping the conflict in Ireland for the English population. The representation of the siege of Derry drew on articulations of a previous Irish *lieu de mémoire*, the 1641 Rebellion, reframing them into a template which constructed the rest of events in Ireland as a providential narrative for both Irish and English Protestants. I conclude by arguing that the construction of the 1688 Revolution as a *lieu de mémoire* subsequent to William’s victory necessitated the erasure of the inconvenient matter of Ireland.⁸ Instead of appearing as an important theatre of war determining the fortunes of William’s Protestant cause, the “War of the Two Kings” was decoupled from the story of the “Glorious Revolution,” as Ireland itself became a foil to the English and British modernizing project. This writing and re-writing and un-writing of Ireland within the context of the 1688 Revolution thus tells us much about the relationship between cultural memory, cultural amnesia, and empire.

Information regarding the conflict in Ireland was initially represented in England on the pages of the six unlicensed newspapers which sprung up shortly after William's arrival in London in December, 1688; the *Orange Gazette* paid particularly close attention to Irish affairs.⁹ With their periodic style of reporting, the newspapers gave the war in Ireland "a precise location in space and in time," shaping the messy confrontation into what John Sommerville calls "the language of fact" for a population that had already developed a taste for news during earlier lapses in pre-publication censorship in the Civil War and the Exclusion Crisis.¹⁰ This "language of fact" proved useful in managing the uncertainty of the government's efforts in Ireland. But the "language of fact" used to describe Ireland was also heavily inflected with the language of affect. The 17 January 1689 edition of the *Orange Gazette*, for example, included praise for the "Associate [sic] Inhabitants of the Northern Counties" at "*Iniskelly*" [Enniskillen] who banded together to take up arms in defense of their "Religion," "Government" and "Laws and Liberties."¹¹ The newspaper report included the full statement of the association, including their assessment of "*the great Hazards and Dangers threatening . . . this Kingdom of Ireland*" and their warning that "if any attempt be made, by Roman Catholics upon Protestants," they will "with Gods Assistance" prosecute them "with the utmost Rigour and Severity." While it celebrated the bravery of the Protestants in Ireland, the newspaper also ridiculed the Catholic Irish forces. A report from a "Gentleman coming lately" from Dublin described the state of one of the "New Rais'd" companies:

they had two blind Harpers instead of Drums, their Colours part of a woman's strip'd Petticoat, their Officers such, as had purchased their Commissions. For a Captain at four Cows, and two Sheep. The Lieutenant for Three Cows. And the Ensign two Cows and a Pig. And say, that divers of the Soldiers are such Miserable dispirited wretches, that being drawn up to Exercise, some trembled, and turned away their Faces at the

discharging their Muskets. And when Order'd to the *Right*, or *Right About*, would move the Contrary way round, and could hardly be brought to be taught.”¹²

Such depictions confirmed the superiority of the well-disciplined and masculine Protestant troops and implied that the conflict would be easily won. Despite its ridicule of Irish military prowess, however, the paper also conveyed the danger of the situation, reinforcing the need for “English Succors” and noting that “if the *English* do not hasten their coming, the *Papists* may get into such a body, as to be able to perform Considerable damage.”¹³ Accordingly, the *Orange Gazette* also included periodic updates reassuring readers that William was in the process of organizing troops and settling a “Fund to carry on the Expedition design'd for *Ireland*.”¹⁴

After William re-established pre-publication control over printed works in January 1689, the new newspapers vanished, and information regarding Ireland was only available through the official *London Gazette*. As the conflict continued and more Irish Protestants fled the country, the *Gazette* began to include more eye-witness reports from refugees who had arrived in the “Western Parts” of England. A report sent from Bristol on 6 March 1689 noted, for example, the arrival of

great Multitudes of distressed *English* Protestants from *Ireland*, whose Condition is most deplorable; From whom we have an account that at *Dublin* the Protestants were all disarmed, and their Horses taken from them, and many of them plundered and cruelly treated by the Soldiers, who had likewise seized both the Cathedrals and the Colledge; and all Ships and Passengers bound for *England* were stopt, and their Goods and Plate that was found on board taken away.¹⁵

The report indicated that things were similar in “Munster, Leinster and Counnaught” [sic] where the Protestants were “disseized of their Inheritances, as well as plundered of their Arms, Horses and Goods, and may of the Chiefest of them Imprisoned.” The report concluded by drawing attention to “the sad and lamentable Condition of the Protestants” in

Ireland, noting that “the Violences of the *Irish*, who not only Quarter upon them, but Rob and Spoil them of their Money, Goods, and Cattle, exceeds all the Relation that can be given of it.”¹⁶

The arrival of King James with French troops in Kinsale, Ireland on 12 March 1689 prompted further accounts of Catholic Irish outrages. The 25 March 1689 issue of the *London Gazette*, for example, noted, “The condition of the poor Protestants [in Drogheda] is most miserable,”¹⁷ while the 6 May 1689 issue discussed the “pretended Parliament” that James called in Dublin, noting his plans to restore “all the Popish Clergy to their Churches and Abbeys” and to confiscate the estates of all who had been in arms against him.¹⁸ Despite representing the situation in Ireland as dire, the *London Gazette* in fact under-reported the extremities faced by those defending the city of Derry. The first report after the actual commencement of the siege on 18 April 1689 appeared in the 9 May 1689 issue and indicated optimistically that: “There are letters from Londonderry, of the 19th past, which give an Account, that the Protestants there were furnished with Provisions for three or four Months, and resolved to defend the place to the last; Which is confirmed by several Persons lately come from thence.”¹⁹ A report from Chester included in the 20 May 1689, issue presented a similar positive account, asserting that “the Protestants in Londonderry continue to make a very vigorous Defence.”²⁰

The “facts” on the Irish situation provided in the *London Gazette* worked in different ways. On the one hand, information about the desperate situation in Ireland justified William’s increase of taxes in order to pay for the campaign to “subdue” Ireland. The 20 May 1689 edition of the *London Gazette* featured William’s proclamation regarding the “Nominating and Appointing Commissioners for putting in Execution the Act of Parliament

lately Passed for Raising Money by a Poll, and otherwise, towards the Reducing of Ireland.”²¹

In addition, by presenting the brave resistance of the Protestant Irish groups like those of Derry against the unscrupulous and bloody-minded Catholics, the paper also created a sense of sympathy and common cause between the Protestant Irish and the citizens of London, drawing attention to that nation as a vital part of the crusade for the Protestant religion. The *London Gazette* focused the public’s attention on Ireland, but in a controlled manner, walking a fine line between justifying the necessity for English intervention in Ireland and not blaming the government for procrastinating in sending troops there.

At the same time that it began to occupy more space in the main columns of the *London Gazette*, Ireland also began to appear more regularly at the end in the advertisements section of the paper as the subject of other works of print culture. In her study of eighteenth-century “things,” Barbara Benedict suggests that advertisements “could literally ‘turn the mind’ (*ad + verito*) toward a topic, propel an event or a thing into public notice, and make it a subject of culture.”²² The advertisements concerning Ireland turned the minds of metropolitan readers westward, working in a dynamic relationship with the news reports and further channelling the way in which the Irish nation was understood and explained. While the reports on specific events gave metropolitan readers a sense of the particulars of the war, the advertised items familiarized them with the larger contours of the space and time of Ireland.

Advertisements for maps of Ireland began to appear in the *London Gazette* soon after the arrival of King James in Kinsale, starting with the advertisement of 25 March 1689 by Robert Morden for *A Large Map of Ireland, in one Sheet*. In *Bibliography and The Sociology of Texts*, D.F. McKenzie argues that maps “can function as potent tools for political control or express political aspirations.”²³ Theorists of cartography confirm Mackenzie’s claims,

examining how maps serve instruments of power in constructing knowledge.²⁴ In Ireland, in particular, maps have historically been used as an instrument of English governmental and economic control.²⁵ Accordingly, the most extensive mapping of Ireland was done by William Petty after the Cromwellian conquest, when Petty organized “the mapping of nearly 8.4 million Irish acres” for the 1656–58 Down Survey, which measured and commented on each parish in painstaking detail.²⁶ Petty’s map was an important tool in the displacement of Irish Catholics and the redistribution of the lands of all those who had been active in the Irish Rebellion to government supporters and the adventurers who had funded the reconquest.²⁷ Morden draws on the authority of Petty to generate interest in his own map, noting that it is “drawn from the late Survey made by Sir William Pettie.”²⁸ Similarly, Philip Lea, who advertised in the 13 May 1689 edition of the *London Gazette*, refers to his map as “An Epitome of Sir Will. Petty’s Large Survey of Ireland.”²⁹ In referencing the earlier survey, both mapmakers recall Petty’s project of rendering Ireland a product of English measurement. The 1 April 1689 advertisement for *A New and Exact map of the Kingdom of Ireland* further encouraged a view of Ireland as an object of English political control, as it represented the nation “divided into all its counties, Cities, Towns, Castles, Harbours, and Bays, &c,” a perspective that emphasized Ireland economic utility and fortifications.³⁰ Maps of Ireland created an image of the nation for English readers, allowing them to pinpoint and follow the events of the war and providing an illusion of containment by referencing earlier English conquests.

As Ireland was being represented in space, it also became the object of mapping through time. The 6 May 1689 issue of the *London Gazette*, the same edition which announced the expected arrival of King James in Dublin, included an advance notice for the

first volume of Richard Cox's "Hibernia Anglicana; Or, the History of Ireland, from the Conquest thereof to this present time," which was currently "in press" and expected to be available by 15 April.³¹ The son of a royalist soldier, Cox was born in County Cork, but educated at Gray's Inn and called to the bar in London.³² He served as Recorder of Kinsale from 1680-1687, but left Ireland during its re-Catholicization period under Tyrconnell and took up residence at Bristol where he became a supporter of William's cause. Cox had presented his *Aphorisms Relating to the Kingdom of Ireland* to the Convention parliament of William in January 1689 to "show the position of Ireland constitutionally, her importance to England, and the measures necessary for her recovery."³³ *Hibernia Anglicana*, which is dedicated to William and Mary and addressed to "the People of England" as well as "the Refugees of Ireland, especially at this Juncture, when that Kingdom is to be re-conquered," is similarly designed to encourage the "speedy Reduction" of Ireland by pointing out the importance of Ireland to England in the past.³⁴ Cox suggests that despite the fact that Ireland is "reckoned among the Principal Islands in the World," it has remained so obscure that "not only the Inhabitants know little or nothing of what has passed in their own Country; but even *England*, a Learned and Inquisitive Nation, skilful beyond comparison in the Histories of all other Countries, is nevertheless but very imperfectly informed in the Story of *Ireland*, though it be a Kingdom subordinate to *England*, and of the highest importance to it."³⁵ Cox asserts that he is the first to provide an "Entire and Coherent" account of Ireland's past. In order to make that claim, however, he has to dismiss previous histories of the nation done by "Irish Historians."³⁶ He suggests that their accounts are "of no Credit" because "the very Truths they write do not oblige our Belief, because they are so intermixt with Impossible Stories and Impertinent Tales."³⁷ Emphasizing the "the great Pains" he has taken "in collecting and

methodizing” the “perplexed History” of Ireland, he replaces Irish fiction with English fact.³⁸ Like the maps listed in the *London Gazette*, *Hibernia Anglicana* interprets Ireland from an English point of view; the work is divided into chronological sections based not on Irish events, but on the reigns of the monarchs of England.

In the opening chapter, “An Apparatus or Introductory Discourse to the History of Ireland Concerning the State of that Kingdom before the Conquest thereof by the English,” addressed to William, Cox analyzes the long history of conflict in Ireland, suggesting that, “the Natives have managed almost a continual War with the English, ever since the first Conquest thereof; so that it has cost Your Royal Predecessors an unspeakable Mass of Blood and Treasure to preserve it in due Obedience.”³⁹ The initial chapter concludes with Cox’s assessment that the Catholic Irish have now “gotten the whole Kingdom of *Ireland* into their Possession; and by wheedling some and frightening [sic] others, they have expelled the Body of the English out of that Island.”⁴⁰ Lest this be interpreted as a deterrent to William’s plans to retake Ireland, however, he notes that the Irish can be reconquered: “their *Nature* is still the same, and not to be so changed, but that they will again vail their Bonnets to a victorious English army.”⁴¹ Moreover, he asserts that the Irish are indeed worth conquering because they can be taught Protestant ways: “I do avouch, that even the common sort are not only capable, but also very apt to learn any thing that is taught them, so that I do impute the Ignorance and Barbarity of the Irish meerly to their evil Customs.”⁴² Cox’s *Hibernia Anglicana* raises concerns regarding the current state of the conflict in Ireland, but attempts to channel those concerns into support for William’s endeavours across the Irish Sea.

During the uncertain period after William assumed power in England in December 1688 and before he finally sent over troops in June 1689, works of print culture circulating in

the metropolitan center made subject of Ireland familiar to English readers. While the newspaper reports provided a sense of the day-to-day events in the conflict, the maps offered a comprehensive geographical survey of the Irish nation for English readers, and *Hibernia Anglicana* represented the historical and cultural landscape of Ireland. Ostensibly rendering Ireland more comprehensible, these works can be read as “colonialist representations,” which, according to Clare Carroll, work to “enact the colonizers’ appropriation of the memory, language, and space of the colonized, at once recording and destroying what they describe.”⁴³ Additionally, as material goods sold in the nation’s capital, these works of print culture also made Ireland consumable for English readers. Morden’s map was designed not just “for all Officers” but also for “private Gentlemen to carry in their Pocket-books without damage.” It was sold for one shilling but it could also be “Pasted upon Cloth, with Descriptions &c.” for five shillings, according to the taste and pocketbook of the consumer.⁴⁴ Ireland came to occupy a place not just in English readers’ minds but also in the English marketplace.

The relief of the siege of Derry on 29 July 1689 constituted a crucial turning point in the war. The siege had begun shortly after King James landed in March, 1689. James had marched to Derry on April 18, 1689, expecting to take the city, but finding it resistant, he left his commanders to lay siege to it. The siege lasted 105 days until finally Major-General Kirk managed to break through the boom on the Liffey. After months of concern about government plans for Ireland, the lifting of the siege constituted the first victory in the Irish conflict for the Williamite forces, and it was eagerly celebrated throughout the nation’s capital. The news of Derry’s relief appeared first in the Aug. 5, 1689 issue of the *London Gazette*. In the weeks to come, a host of narratives focusing on Derry went to press. Map-makers capitalized on the situation as well, producing visual representations of the sites of the

conflict which were subsequently advertised in the pages of the *Gazette*. While earlier newspaper reports, maps, and works like *Hibernia Anglicana* had given English citizens a general understanding of the conflict in Ireland up to this point, the siege provided a specific focal event that shaped subsequent public understanding of the conflict in Ireland. It served as what Nora refers to as a “spectacular” *lieu de mémoire*, an occasion that was “immediately invested with symbolic significance” and treated, even as it was “unfolding,” as if it were “being commemorated in advance.”⁴⁵ The author of *An Exact Account of the Affairs in Ireland* summed up the situation when he indicated that, “the state of *Ireland* in general, and the condition of *London-derry* in particular is now become the subjects [sic] of most Mens Discourse and Conversation.” In fact, the lifting of the siege constituted what William Warner has identified in the context of the response to Samuel Richardson’s *Pamela*, as a “media event” that generates discourse that “feeds upon itself, producing a sense that this media event has become an ambient, pervasive phenomenon.”⁴⁶ Moreover, this media event drew powerfully on a previous Irish *lieu de mémoire*, the Irish Rebellion, refurbishing it in the present context into a narrative of Protestant testing and triumph that appealed both to Irish and English Protestants.

Chief among those shaping the new narrative regarding Irish events was George Walker, an Episcopalian minister who had served as joint Governor of Derry during the siege.⁴⁷ Walker himself travelled to London via Scotland soon after the end of the siege. On 22 August 1689, he attended William and Mary at Hampton Court, where he was rewarded with five thousand pounds for his services, and was invited to wait on William in the afternoon. While at Hampton Court, Walker delivered a public address to the King from the “Governors, Officers, Clergy, and other Gentlemen in the City and Garrison of

Londonderry.” The Address praises God and King William and thanks Major General Kirk for coming “at the very nick of time” and saving those citizens of Derry who “were just ready to be cut off, and perish by the hands of barbarous, cruel, and inhuman wretches.”⁴⁸ The Address vilifies the Catholic forces, who, it claims, “no sooner saw the delivery and that could not compass their wicked designed against this Your Majesties City, and our Lives (for which they thirsted) immediately set all the Country round us on fire; after having plunder’d, robb’d and stripp’d all the Protestants therein, as well those Persons they themselves granted Protection to as others.” Kirk’s arrival is attributed to “Divine Providence,” the same providence which was responsible for William’s ascension to the throne: “we do therefore most sincerely rejoyce with all our Souls, and bless GOD for all his singular and repeated mercies and Deliverances; and do forever adore the Divine Providence for Your Majesties Rightful and Peaceable Accession to the Imperial Crown of these Kingdomes.” The Address represents Derry as a site of testing for Irish Protestants, staging William and his forces as “Glorious Instruments” of divine providence. Walker’s “Address” was printed in the *London Gazette*, helping to disseminate his message to a wider audience.

Walker also expanded upon his views in a narrative that he published while in London, *A True Account of the Siege and Famous Defence made at London-Derry*.⁴⁹ Like the printed works on Ireland advertised earlier in the *London Gazette*, Walker’s *True Account* aims to sketch out the contours of a place unfamiliar to readers.⁵⁰ But the specificity of the event and Walker’s subjective perspective demand a different experience of the reader, one that invites closer identification with Protestant Irish subjects. Walker’s account begins by focusing on the geographical location of the confrontation, with its “Description of the City of London-Derry” including detailed measurements of the length and depth of the walls as well

as the location of prominent towers and buildings. Having given his readers a sense of the spatial parameters of the siege, Walker provides a condensed recent history dating back to December 9 when the Derry first refused entry to the troops of the Earl of Antrim. Walker gestures to the exceptionalism of Derry, noting how remarkable it was that the city “came to be out of the Hands of the *Irish* when all places of the Kingdom of any strength or consideration were possessed by them.”⁵¹ His narrative then offers a more detailed account of events from 14 March to the lifting of the siege on 29 July 1689. Although it represents the unfolding of the siege in diary form, the narrative slips between different tenses. Utilizing the present tense, for example, the entry for 5 May 1689 indicates, “This Night the Besiegers draw a Trench cross the *Wind-Mill Hill*, from the Bog to the River, and there begin a Battery,” but it shifts mid-sentence to the past tense as it considers retrospectively the outcome of this attempt: “from that they endeavour’d to Annoy our Walls, but they were too strong for the Guns they us’d.”⁵² The narrative stance also alternates, at times adopting a first-person plural perspective (“At this time we took three pairs of Colours”⁵³), but at other times referring in objective language to “the Besieged.” Further complicating the narrative stance is the fact that when he recounts specific personal actions that he undertook, Walker refers to himself in the third person as “Mr. Walker” or “the Governor.” Walker describes his rescue of Colonel Adam Murray in the third person, for example, noting that the officer was under such fierce attack that “Mr. *Walker* found it necessary to mount one of the Horses and make them rally, and to Relieve Col. *Murry*, whom he saw surrounded with the Enemy.”⁵⁴ The ambiguous narration positions Walker and the reader both as participants in the unfolding of the action and also as distant observers of the larger arc of the narrative.

The *True Account* is written in terse, factual language, employing what Walker referred to as “natural Simplicity, Sincerity and plain Truth.”⁵⁵ The diary presents a precise statistical account of the weaponry employed as well as lists detailing the number of military companies in the garrison and the reduction of the population of the garrison from July 8 (5520) to July 25 (4892). In the midst of the calculations and lists giving readers a sense of the day-to-day losses and deprivations, however, Walker also provides his interpretation of the wider religious narrative behind the siege. In the entry for 18 April 1689, for example, the official beginning of the siege when the city refused to surrender to King James’s troops, Walker pauses in his account to reflect on the circumstances in which the citizens of Derry find themselves:

our Enemies all about us and our Friends running away from us; a Garrison we had compos’d of a number of poor people, frightned [sic] from their own homes, and seem’d more fit to hide themselves, that to face an Enemy; . . . few Horse to Sally out with, and no Forage; no Engineers to Instruct us in our Words; no Fire-works, not as much as a Hand-Granado to annoy the Enemy; not a Gun well mounted in the whole Town; . . . so many Mouths to feed, and not above ten days Provision for them” facing an “Enemy . . . so Numerous, so Powerful and Well appointed an Army, that in all human probability we could not think our selves in less danger, than the *Israelites* at the *Red Sea*.⁵⁶

Walker reads Derry as a scene of Old Testament testing, with its citizens characterized as Hebrew slaves escaping from bondage. Despite the great odds that Derry faces, however, Walker comments retrospectively at this moment that “the Resolution and Courage of our people, and the necessity we were under, and the great confidence and dependance [sic] among us on God Almighty, that he would take care of us, and preserve us, made us overlook all those difficulties. And God was pleased to make us the happy instruments of preserving this Place, and to him we give the Glory.”⁵⁷ Walker himself plays the role of Moses within his

narrative, as he suggests in recounting the sermon he preached to keep up the spirits of his people:

The Governour [Walker] being with good Reason apprehensive, that these Discouragements might at length overcome that Resolution the Garrison had so long continued, considers of all imaginable methods to support them, and finding in himself still that confidence, That God would not (after so long and miraculous a Preservation) suffer them to be a prey to their Enemies, Preaches in the Cathedral, and encourages their Constancy, and endeavours to establish them in it, by reminding them of several Instances of Providence given them since they first came into that place, and of what consideration it was to the Protestant Religion at this time; and that they need not doubt, but that God would at last deliver them from the Difficulties they were under.⁵⁸

The *Account* concludes with a similar exhortation to the reader: “Thus after 105 days, being close besieged by near 20000 Men constantly supplied from *Dublin*, God Almighty was pleased in our Extremity to send Relief, to the Admiration and Joy of all good People, and to the great disappointment of so powerful and inveterate an Enemy.”⁵⁹ Walker’s *True Account*, like his “Address,” which was reprinted in the *True Account*, represents the citizens of Derry as an elect group protected from savage Catholic hoards only through God’s mercy.⁶⁰

Walker’s *True Account* sparked a lengthy and heated pamphlet war.⁶¹ He was taken to task by John Mackenzie, a Presbyterian chaplain to one of the regiments during the siege, in his *A Narrative of the Siege of Londonderry or, The Late Memorable Transactions of that City Faithfully Represented, To Rectify the Mistakes, and Supply the Omissions of Mr. Walker’s Account*. Mackenzie accused Walker of minimizing the role of Presbyterians in his *Account*. Walker’s case was argued by the author of *Mr. John Mackenzys Narrative of the Siege of London-Derry a False Libel: In Defence of Dr. George Walker*, to which Mackenzie responded with his *Dr. Walker’s Invisible Champion Foyl’d*. Further works included *An apology for the Failures Charged on the Reverend Mr. George Walker’s Account of the Late Siege of Derry, in a Letter to the Undertaker of a More Accurate Narrative of that Siege* and

Reflexions on a Paper Pretending to Be an Apology for the Failures Charged on Mr. Walker's Account of the Siege of Londonderry. Finally, in *The Vindication of the True Account of the Siege of Derry, by Mr. George Walker*, Walker himself responded to the accusations levelled against him. While they differed in their interpretation of the specific details of events, accounts of the siege of Derry confirmed the general story of trial and providential delivery.

In relaying their interpretation of the siege of Derry as a providential narrative, these accounts drew affectively upon an earlier Irish *lieu de mémoire*: the 1641 Rebellion. While the representation of a superior and vulnerable English population surrounded by barbaric native Irish hoards was common in colonial discourse from Giraldus Cambrensis onward, as Claire Carroll notes, it took on a particularly providential resonance in the wake of the traumatic events of the Irish Rebellion of 1641 during which the dispossessed and disenfranchised Catholic population had risen against the Protestant colonists.⁶² Stories of Catholic atrocities and Protestant providential delivery at the time of the Rebellion were widely circulated in the form of huge number of popular, cheap pamphlets, printed in London but based on letters allegedly “sent over” from Protestants in Ireland.⁶³ These works professed to give that latest “newes” of the Rebellion and confirmed the notion that Catholic Ireland was the “Mother of all treachery and Nurse of Treason.”⁶⁴ Irish government authorities at set up a “Commission for the Despoiled Subjects,” after the Rebellion, which, as Eamon Darcy notes, “recorded 8,000 witness testimonies from Protestant settlers and a small number of Irish Catholics.”⁶⁵ The perspective of these printed tracts and official accounts was further reinforced in the influential history published by John Temple five years after the outbreak of the Rebellion: *The Irish Rebellion: or, An History of the Beginnings and*

*First Progresse of the Generall Rebellion Raised within the Kingdom of Ireland*⁶⁶ to monumentalized in particular “the horrid cruelties most unmercifully exercised by the Irish Rebels upon the British; and Protestants within this Kingdome of Ireland.”⁶⁷ As James Kelly observes, “following the defeat of the Catholic Confederation and the restoration of the Protestant establishment in church and in state, [Protestant Irish] were anxious to give thanks to God for their delivery from ‘a conspiracy . . . inhumane, barbarous and cruel.’”⁶⁸ Together, these works shaped Irish Protestants’ perspective “that they had narrowly escaped total destruction in the 1640s.”⁶⁹

Ann Rigney has commented that cultural memory “is continuously performed by individuals and groups as they recollect the past selectively through various media and become involved in various forms of memorial activity, from narrating and reading to attending commemorative ceremonies or going on pilgrimages.”⁷⁰ In addition to being shaped by textual sources, the cultural memory of the 1641 Rebellion was kept alive in Ireland by the annual commemorations on October 23, marking the day in 1641 when the Catholic attempt on Dublin Castle was discovered and the Rebellion began in Ulster. As Tony Barnard observes, the sermons preached in Church of Ireland services created a particular kind of cultural memory, “emphasiz[ing] what the Protestants of Ireland regarded as unique in their historical experience: the belief in being a chosen, if not *the* chosen people, who, like the Israelites of the Old Testament, had been refined in the fires of persecution and had survived to be owned with special marks of God’s favour.”⁷¹ These annual commemorations combined with and reinforced the textual accounts found in the ephemeral pamphlets and the more substantial histories, consolidating the identity of Irish Protestants around the collective memory of the 1641 Irish Rebellion.

This earlier Irish Protestant collective memory was reactivated in the context of the Williamite conflict in accounts like that of Walker and the pamphlets that responded to it. The connection with the 1641 Rebellion was further encouraged by other mediations of the earlier cultural memory. Printed works concerning the 1641 Rebellion began to re-appear on the market in 1689. In her *A Full and True Account of the Inhumane and Bloody Cruelties of the Papists to the Poor Protestants in Ireland in the Year 1641*, Lady Lettice Digby indicates the use she is making of the memory of the past, suggesting that she is publishing her account “now to Encourage all Protestants to be Liberal in their Contribution for their Relief, and speedy Delivering them now out of the hands of the Bloody-minded People.”⁷² *A Relation Of The Bloody Massacre in Ireland Acted by the Instigation Of The Jesuits, Priests, and Friars*, published in December 1689, similarly focused on “those horrible murders, prodigious cruelties, barbarous villanies, and inhuman practices executed by the Irish papists upon the English Protestants.”⁷³ *The State of the Papist and Protestant proprieties in the kingdom of Ireland in the year 1641* drew attention to the issues of land-ownership during and after the Rebellion, concluding by focusing on “how the proprieties stand this present year 1689, with the survey, loss cost and charge of both parties by the aforesaid war.”⁷⁴ The author implies that lands appropriated by Protestants would be in danger of reverting to Catholics should the war in Ireland not be successful. Reinforcing the effect of these works of print culture, the annual October 23 celebration was transplanted to a London location by Irish Protestant refugees. As the notice in the *London Gazette* of 17 October 1689 announced: “the Protestants of Ireland, at present in and about the City of London, intend to meet . . . upon Wednesday the 23th of this instant October, at ten of the Clock in the Morning, in pursuance of an Act of Parliament in that Kingdom to give Thanks to Almighty GOD for the

Deliverance from the Bloody Massacre and Rebellion, begun by the Irish Papists the 23rd of October, 1641.”⁷⁵

As Astrid Erll suggests, “What is known about a war, a revolution, or any other event which has been turned into a site of memory . . . seems to refer not so much to what one might cautiously call the ‘actual events,’ but instead to a canon of existent medial constructions, to the narratives and images circulating in a media culture.”⁷⁶ The discourse surrounding the siege of Derry circulating in contemporary newspaper stories, advertisements, works of print culture and embodied commemorations in the metropolis translated the providential narrative generated by Protestants in response to the events in 1641 across time and space to the citizens of London in 1689. The story of Derry, much of which was articulated by actual survivors of the siege who had travelled to London, would subsequently come to influence the narrative of the conflict in Ireland from Fall 1689 until the conclusion of the war in 1691, resonating with William’s own promotion of himself as the saviour of the Protestant cause in Europe.⁷⁷ The subsequent victories at the Boyne (July 1690), Aughrim (July 1691), and Limerick (October 1691) in which the Jacobite forces were finally vanquished only served to reinforce the sense of the Irish conflict as a providential narrative.

At the same time, the re-animation of earlier cultural memory by commentators on Ireland also encouraged a peculiar representation of Irish temporality, one which would ultimately impact the way in which Ireland came to be positioned in the story of the Glorious Revolution. In contemporary accounts, Ireland was identified as the site of an endlessly repeating cycle of colonization, violence and re-colonization. *The History of the Kingdom of Ireland*, published in 1693, commences by remarking that “The Kingdom of *Ireland*, has for

several Ages been an Aceldama, or Field of Slaughter, watered with the Blood of *English* Men; occasioned by their Repeated Rebellions, and inveterate aversion to the *English* Nation.”⁷⁸ In previous eras, the rebellions were begun “under pretence of Recovering their Liberty,” notes the writer, but “since the Reformation,” the unruliness has been “upon account of Difference in Religion, which made them very Troublesom [sic] to the Renowned Queen *Elizabeth*, and as one Chief occasion of the Horrid and Bloody Massacre in *1641*.”⁷⁹ As commentators drew parallels between past and present and warned either obliquely or directly of future possible atrocities, they reinforced a representation of time in Ireland as repetitive rather than progressive. “Once, at least,” the author of *A Short View of the Methods Made Use of in Ireland for the Subversion and Destruction of the Protestant Religion and Interest*, “in Forty years there breaks forth there some cruel and bloody Rebellion, to the Subversion of all Law and Government.”⁸⁰ *The History of the Wars in Ireland* draws an even closer connection between the 1641 and the 1689 conflicts, noting that arms were taken from the Protestants and “put into the hands of the Off-spring of the Bloody Murtherers of *Forty One*; nay, not only the Off-spring, but many of the very hands that committed those Massacres, were Arm'd by Authority.”⁸¹ To employ Nora’s terms, it is as if the same “moment of history” is “plucked out of the flow of history” in an Irish context and “returned to it,” not in an “altered” but in an identical state, almost fifty years later.

The death of William in 1702 and the assumption of Queen Anne to the throne resulted in a rewriting of the narrative of the 1688 Revolution during which time Ireland’s role shifted yet again.⁸² The representation of Ireland as a colony chronologically on repeat mode and the memories of the savagery of the Catholic Irish may have served to justify the implementation of Penal Laws in the wake of the Williamite wars, but they ill-suited the new

shaping of the role of the Glorious Revolution in the development of modernity.

Accordingly, in the re-creation of the memory of the Revolution as a “bloodless” regime change, the Williamite wars in Ireland were necessarily decoupled from events on mainland Britain. Instead of being an important part of the theatre of war that enabled William’s assumption of power, Ireland was pushed to the sidelines. The erasure of Ireland from the story of the Glorious Revolution can be seen, for example, in 1705 play, *Ireland Preserv’d*, by John Michelbourne. In his Prologue, Michelbourne, who had served as joint Governor with Walker at the end of the siege, recalls how news of the lifting of the siege of Derry was fêted initially in London:

Derry Preserv’d! Oh, how it Rung at Court!

What great Rewards promis’d for its Support:

*To those who for our Cause, so Nobly Fought . . .*⁸³

Despite the celebrations and promises of reward, however, Michelbourne suggests the way the event and its participants have been unduly forgotten in 1705:

But how soon was it made a thing of Nought?

Honour, Reward and Favour, quite forgot,

*Neglect and Disesteem’d their only Lot.*⁸⁴

Michelbourne’s attempt to revive interest in the defence of Derry as an important moment not just in Irish but in British history fell on deaf ears. His play was never performed, and he himself struggled for years to obtain compensation for his services during the siege. Ultimately, in the reconstruction of 1688, Ireland, as a place of repeating violent uprisings, came to be perceived as an anomaly, a foil to English and British liberty and modernity.⁸⁵ The siege of Derry in particular shifted from being a

part of the story of the 1688 Revolution to being a contested *lieu de mémoire* of sectarian conflict in Ireland.

In “Travelling Memory,” her assessment of the contemporary state of memory studies, Astrid Erll argues that in the conflicted world in which we currently live, “we cannot afford the luxury of not studying memory.”⁸⁶ If we want to understand the various crises of the present, she asserts, “we must naturally look at certain mental, discursive, and habitual paradigms that were formed in long historical processes – via cultural memory, as it were.” This article has suggested the important role that media play in how that “long historical process” unfolds – from the initial articulation of an event to its later dissemination. As I have argued here, the original printed mediation of the Williamite wars, particularly the representation of the siege of Derry, re-activated Protestant memories of 1641, memories that had themselves been fixed in a specific narrative and made portable through earlier processes of print publication and performance. Ironically, however, the same images that made those memories so compelling for an English public during the course of the wars also enabled the subsequent “Neglect” of Ireland from British imperial cultural memory as it constructed itself around a “Glorious” Revolution.

¹ Jonathan Israel, “The Dutch Role in the Glorious Revolution” in *The Anglo-Dutch Moment: Essays on the Glorious Revolution and Its World Impact*, ed. Jonathan Israel (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1991), 105. See also Lisa Jardine, *Going Dutch: How England Plundered Holland’s Glory* (London: Harper Press, 2008).

² Pierre Nora, *Realms of Memory: Rethinking the French Past*, ed. Lawrence D. Kritzman (New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1996), xvii). *Realms of Memory* is the English translation of Nora’s monumental *Les lieux de mémoire* which was originally a seven volume work involving close to 120 contributors and written over nearly a decade from 1984-92. For a condensed version of his ideas, see Pierre Nora, “Between Memory and History: Les lieux de mémoire,” *Representations* 26 (1989): 7-25.

³ Nora, 7.

⁴ According to Dale Hoak, the 1688 Revolution was represented in “textbooks on both sides of the Atlantic” until “well into the twentieth century” as a “formative stage in the development of liberal democracy, that distinctive contribution of Anglo-Saxon civilization to Western political culture.” See Dale Hoak, “The Anglo-Dutch Revolution of 1688-89,” in *The World of William and Mary: Anglo-Dutch Perspectives on the Revolution of 1688-89*, ed. Dale Hoak and Mordechai Feingold (Stanford: Stanford Univ. Press, 1996), 2.

⁵ For succinct overviews of the complex historiography of the Glorious Revolution, see Steve Pincus, *1688: The First Modern Revolution* (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 2009), 11-29, and Frédéric Herrmann, “The Glorious Revolution (1688-1701) and the Return of Whig History,” *Études Anglaises* 68.3 (2015): 331-344.

⁶ G. M. Trevelyan, *The English Revolution, 1688-89* (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1965). Trevelyan contrasted England’s inclination for “government by discussion” with the “absolutist governments of a new and more formidable type” currently in existence in Europe (131).

⁷ Tim Harris and Stephen Taylor, *The Final Crisis of the Stuart Monarchy: The Revolutions of 1688-91 in their British, Atlantic and European Contexts* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2013). See also Tim Harris, *Revolution: The Great Crisis of the British Monarchy, 1685-1720* (London: Penguin, 2006), and Owen Stanwood, *The Empire Reformed: English America in the Age of the Glorious Revolution* (Pittsburgh: Univ. of Pennsylvania Press, 2011). A recent issue of *Restoration* examines the legacy of 1688: *Restoration: Studies in English Literary Culture, 1660-1700* 39:1-2 (2015).

⁸ On Ireland’s complicated role within the British Empire, see, for example, David Armitage, *The Ideological Origins of the British Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ.

Press, 2000) and Kevin Kenny, ed., *Ireland and the British Empire* (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 2004).

⁹ See R. B. Walker, “The Newspaper Press in the Reign of William III,” *The Historical Journal* 17:4 (December 1974): 695.

¹⁰ John Sommerville, *The News Revolution in England: Cultural Dynamics of Daily Information* (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1996), 11. See also Joad Raymond, *The Invention of the Newspaper: English Newsbooks, 1641-1649* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), and Carolyn Nelson and Matthew Seccombe, “The Creation of the Periodical Press, 1620-1695” in *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain*, Volume 4, ed. Lotte Hellinga et al. (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2002), 533-552.

¹¹ *Orange Gazette* (London, England), 17 January 1689.

¹² *Orange Gazette* (London, England), 26 January 1689.

¹³ *Orange Gazette* (London, England), 26 January 1689.

¹⁴ *Orange Gazette* (London, England), 21 January 1689.

¹⁵ *London Gazette* (London, England), 6 March 1689.

¹⁶ *London Gazette* (London, England), 6 March 1689.

¹⁷ *London Gazette* (London, England), 24 March, 1689.

¹⁸ *London Gazette* (London, England), 6 May 1689.

¹⁹ *London Gazette* (London, England), 9 May 1689.

²⁰ *London Gazette* (London, England), 20 May 1689.

²¹ *London Gazette* (London, England), 20 May 1689.

²² Barbara M. Benedict, “Encounters with the Object: Advertisements, Time, and Literary Discourse in the Early Eighteenth-Century Thing-Poem,” *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, 40:2 (2007): 193-207; 199.

²³ D. F. McKenzie, *Bibliography and The Sociology of Texts* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1999), 47; 45.

²⁴ See, for example, Brian Harley and Alan MacEachren, *How Maps Work: Representation, Visualization, and Design* (New York and London: Guilford Press, 1995), and Jeremy Black, *Maps and Politics* (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1997).

²⁵ See William J. Smyth, *Map-making, Landscapes and Memory: A Geography of Colonial and Early Modern Ireland, c. 1530-1750* (Cork: Cork Univ. Press, 2006).

²⁶ Adam Fox, "Sir William Petty, Ireland, and the Making of a Political Economist, 1653-87," *Economic History Review*, 62, no. 2 (2009): 389.

²⁷ See "The Down Survey of Ireland: Mapping a Century of Change," accessed 20 August 2016, <http://downsurvey.tcd.ie>.

²⁸ *London Gazette* (London, England), 25 March 1689.

²⁹ *London Gazette* (London, England), 13 May 1689.

³⁰ *London Gazette* (London, England), 1 April 1689.

³¹ *London Gazette* (London, England), 6 May 1689.

³² Richard Cox, *Autobiography of the Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cox, Bart.*, ed. Richard Caulfield (London: J. Russell Smith, 1860).

³³ F. Elrington Ball, *The Judges in Ireland, 1221-1921* Vol. 2 (London: J. Murray, 1926; rpt. Clark, New Jersey: The Lawbook Exchange, 2005), 5. *Aphorisms Relating to the Kingdom of Ireland Humbly Submitted to the Most Noble Assembly of Lords & Commons at the Great Convention at Westminster* (London, 1689) was printed for Joseph Watts.

³⁴ Cox, "To the Reader," Richard Cox, *Hibernia Anglicana; Or, the History of Ireland, from the Conquest thereof to this present time With a large Introduction concerning the Ancient State and Religion of that kingdom* (London: Printed for Joseph Watts at the Angel in St. Paul's Churchyard, 1689), n.p.

³⁵ Cox, n. p.

³⁶ Cox, n. p.

³⁷ Cox, n. p.

³⁸ Cox, n. p.

³⁹ Cox, n. p.

⁴⁰ Cox, n. p.

⁴¹ Cox, n. p.

⁴² Cox, n. p.

⁴³ Clare Carroll, “Barbarous Slaves and Civil Cannibals” in *Circe’s Cup: Cultural Transformations in Early Modern Ireland* (Cork: Cork Univ. Press, 2002), 12–13.

⁴⁴ *London Gazette* (London, England), 25 March 1689.

⁴⁵ Nora, 18.

⁴⁶ William Warner, *Licensing Entertainment: The Elevation of Novel Reading in Britain, 1684-1750* (Berkeley: U of California P, 1998), 178.

⁴⁷ Walker was chosen joint governor in April 1689, along with Major Henry Baker. After Baker’s death in June 1689, John Mitchelburne assumed the office of joint governor with Walker. Walker was one of very few survivors who received financial rewards from William.

⁴⁸ *London Gazette* (London, England), 2 September, 1689.

⁴⁹ *London Gazette* (London, England), 2 September, 1689.

⁵⁰ Walker himself became a celebrity, an embodiment of the victory, as the 2 September 1689 edition of *London Gazette* indicates: “The applauses of the People as he passes, are very troublesome to him, for his Modesty is as great, and as deservedly admired, as his Courage and Conduct, and both render him . . . esteemed by all sorts of Persons, that wish well to their Majesties, and the Protestant Interests.” Walker’s effigy was done by Godfrid Kneller, “Painter in Ordinary to Their Majesties,” and was engraved by Peter Vandrebane and “Sold at his House in Prince’s-street near Leicester-fields.” This image of Walker also appeared in *A True Account of the Siege and Famous Defence made at London-Derry* (London, 1689), title page.

⁵¹ George Walker, *A True Account of the Siege and Famous Defence made at London-Derry* (London, 1689), 11.

⁵² Walker, 25.

⁵³ Walker, 25.

⁵⁴ Walker, 24.

⁵⁵ Walker, 8.

⁵⁶ Walker, 22.

⁵⁷ Walker, 23.

⁵⁸ Walker, 40.

⁵⁹ Walker, 33-34.

⁶⁰ The title page of the work also advertises *A new and exact map of London-Derry, and Culmore Fort by Captain Macullach, who was there during the Siege*, which could be bound with Walker's account, providing additional visual information for purchasers.

⁶¹ For more on the differences between Walker's and Mackenzie's perspectives, see Karen Holland, "Disputed Heroes: Early Accounts of the Siege of Londonderry," *New Hibernia Review* 18, no. 2 (2014): 21-41.

⁶² See Carroll, "Barbarous Slaves and Civil Cannibals," 11-27. For accounts of the 1641 Rebellion, see Nicholas Canny, *Making Ireland British, 1580-1650* (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 2003), Eamon Darcy, *The Irish Rebellion of 1641 and the Wars of the Three Kingdoms* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2013), and Jane Ohlmeyer, *Ireland from Independence to Occupation, 1641-1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1995).

⁶³ In *The Irish Rebellion of 1641*, Darcy examines "how Irish politicians manipulated the news and intelligence that they sent to England" (14), comparing the representation of violence in Ireland with accounts of massacres in the North American colonies.

⁶⁴ *More Newes From Ireland, Or, The Bloody Practicos [Sic] And Proceedings Of The Papists In That Kingdome At This Present* (London: printed for F. Coules, 1641) is typical of these pamphlets in reading the violence as the Catholic population's desire for the complete extirpation of Protestants: "There are thousands of *English Families* with other Protestants which are ruin'd in their estates, and many force to flye form their Habitations, divers put to the Sword, some imprisoned, which puts the Kingdome into great feare, and unless some helpe and ayd be sent to relieve and rescue us, we shall utterly be destroyed and rooted out of the Kingdome, for they surpasse us in strength and number, being ten to one, besides many supplyes from divers Papists in *England, Spain, and France*, to the utter subversion and overthrow of the Protestants here, their estates, wives, and Children" (2).

⁶⁵ Darcy, *The Irish Rebellion of 1641*, 12.

⁶⁶ Temple had been a Lord Justice and Master of the Rolls in Ireland during the time of the conflict. The Earl of Clarendon also produced a *History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in Ireland* that circulated in manuscript, but was not published until 1720. Portions of it were included, however, in Edmund Borlase's *The History of the Execrable Irish Rebellion Trac'd from many Preceding Acts, to the Grand Eruption the 23 of October, 1641* (London, 1680).

⁶⁷ John Temple, *The Irish Rebellion: or, An History of the Beginnings and First Progresse of the Generall Rebellion Raised within the Kingdom of Ireland* (London, 1646).

⁶⁸ Kelly, 26.

⁶⁹ James Kelly, "The Glorious and Immortal Memory': Commemoration and Protestant Identity in Ireland 1660-1800" in *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy* 94:2 (1994), 26. See also David Frederic Greder, "Providence and the 1641 Irish Rebellion" (PhD thesis, Univ. of Iowa, 2015), accessed 21 August 2016. <http://ir.uiowa.edu/etd/1613>.

⁷⁰ Ann Rigney, "Plenitude, Scarcity and the Circulation Of Cultural Memory" *Journal of European Studies* 35, no. 1 (2005): 15.

⁷¹ Tony Barnard, "The Uses of 23 October 1641 and Irish Protestant Celebrations" *The English Historical Review* 106:421 (October, 1991): 889-920; 890.

⁷² Lady Lettice Digby, *A Full and True Account of the Inhumane and Bloody Cruelties of the Papists to the Poor Protestants in Ireland in the Year 1641* (London: Printed for Peter Richman, 1689), 1. Contemporary works circulating about atrocities committed in France against Huguenots also resonated with the anti-Catholic rhetoric of the accounts of the 1641 Rebellion in Ireland.

⁷³ *A Relation of the Bloody Massacre in Ireland Acted by the Instigation Of The Jesuits, Priests, and Friars* (London, 1689).

⁷⁴ *State of the Papist and Protestant proprieties in the kingdom of Ireland in the year 1641* (London: printed for Richard Baldwin, 1689).

⁷⁵ *London Gazette* (London, England), 17 October, 1689. The sermon preached on the occasion was duly printed by Robert Clavel, the same printer who had published Walker's work, further circulating the effect of the embodied commemoration.

⁷⁶ Astrid Erll, "Literature, Film and the Mediality of Cultural Memory" in *A Companion to Cultural Memory Studies*, ed. Astrid Erll and Ansgar Nünning (Berlin and New York: De Gruyter, 2010), 392.

⁷⁷ See Tony Claydon, *William III and the Godly Revolution* (Cambridge, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1996) and Abigail Williams, *Poetry and the Creation of a Whig Literary Culture, 1681-1714* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2005). The parallel between the Irish Protestants and the Old Testament Israelites that was referenced in several accounts also resonated with the perspective put forward in Protestant discourse from the Exclusion Crisis onward.

⁷⁸ R. B., *The History of the Kingdom of Ireland* (London: printed for Nathaniel Crouch, 1693), 1.

⁷⁹ R. B., 1.

⁸⁰ *A Short View of the Methods Made Use of in Ireland for the Subversion and Destruction of the Protestant Religion and Interest* (London, printed for D. Newman, 1689), 1.

⁸¹ An Officer of the Royal Army, *The History of the Wars in Ireland, Between Their Majesties Army, and the Forces of the Late King James* (London: printed for Benjamin Johnson, 1690).

⁸² On the construction of the 1688 Revolution, see J. R. Hertzler, ‘Who Dubbed it ‘the Glorious Revolution?’” in *Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies* 19 (1987), 579–85; Ulrich Niggemann, “Some Remarks on the Origins of the Term ‘Glorious Revolution,’” *The Seventeenth Century*, 27:4, 477-487; and Pincus, *1688*, 11–29.

⁸³ John Michelbourne, *Ireland Preserv’d: or the Siege of Londonderry* (London, 1705), n.p.

⁸⁴ Michelbourne, *Ireland Preserv’d*, n.p.

⁸⁵ See David Lloyd, *Anomalous States: Irish Writing and the Post-colonial Moment* (Durham: Duke Univ. Press, 1993).

⁸⁶ Astrid Erll, “Travelling Memory ” in *Parallax*, 17, no. 4 (2011): 5.