CHAPTER 1

"A mind to turn Play'r"

Irish Protestant Patriotism and the Tamerlane *"Riot" of 1712*

We think it were fit,
You should stay in the Pit,
Unless each has a mind to turn Play'r.
Think not to invade
Our Privilege and Trade,
As you would the Prerogative Royal.

A New Song on the Whiggs Behaviour at the Play House . . . (1712)[1]

On November 4, 1712, before a performance of Nicholas Rowe's *Tamerlane,* a band of Irish Protestants jumped onto the stage at Smock Alley and their leader Dudley Moore recited Samuel Garth's prologue, a text that had been forbidden by the government for two years in succession. Some members of the audience applauded this unorthodox performance while others hissed it, and the disturbance died down only when six armed soldiers appeared on the scene. A few days after this event, Moore and several of his supporters were charged with "Riotous and Seditious Practices" at the playhouse, and shortly before they were due to appear in court, the lord chancellor himself made a public pronouncement on the gravity of their offense. At a specially convened meeting in Dublin Castle, Sir Constantine Phipps informed the lord mayor, aldermen, and magistrates that

the recital of the prologue was both a "Defiance of Authority" and an attempt to "rob her Majesty of that Part of her Prerogative[,] . . . The Power of Making Peace and War," and he urged the city officials to "single out the most flagrant Offender" and "prosecute him with the utmost severity of the Law."[2]

What happened in the next two years, however, was that Irish Protestants put the government itself on trial. When the case came to trial on February 5, 1713, the court quashed the indictment against the "rioters," and when the attorney general filed a new information against Moore alone and ordered the jury to be struck according to an English precedent, Moore's lawyers turned the hearing into a constitutional debate, arguing, among other things, that the legal proceedings constituted an infringement on the liberties of the subject.[3] Later the same year, the Irish House of Commons also took this matter up as part of a general inquiry into what it felt was Phipps's mishandling of a number of political matters during his years in office. The Irish Commons agreed by a substantial majority that Phipps had tried to "pre-judge the Merits of the Cause then depending between her Majesty and *Dudley Moore*, *Esq*," and this finding became part of a petition, made to Queen Anne in December 1713, asking for the removal of the lord chancellor from office.[4]

Some members of the Irish House of Lords also weighed in against the government in this theatrical matter. The lords conducted their own investigation into Phipps's alleged misbehavior in office, and the majority voted to exonerate him. But seven lords, including the archbishop of Dublin, William King, and the head of Ireland's most prominent family, Lord Kildare, issued a protest, arguing, among other things, that the lord chancellor had prejudged the theatrical case "by declaring what passed in the Play-House, on his late Majesty's Birth-Day, to be a great Riot, the Issue then to be tried in Court being, as we conceive, whether it was a Riot or no." They also disputed Phipps's claim in his speech to the city officials that the prologue had been legally prohibited for two years or that it sought to "impeach" the queen's right to wage war or make peace. Speaking of the alleged prohibition, the protesters wrote: "[I]t is put in the Speech, as an Aggravation, that the Prologue spoken in the Play-Houses had been forbid by the Government two Years successively; whereas we know of no such Prohibition, nor do we conceive that the Subjects are generally obliged to take Notice of any Prohibition as from the Government, or to be construed to act in Defiance of Authority, where the said Prohibition is not made public by Proclamation or Declaration, and we know of none

issued in this Case."[5] Informal government prohibitions, this argument suggested, carried no weight in the playhouse or elsewhere.

Twentieth-century commentators have tended to view these acts of defiance in the playhouse, courthouse, and Parliament as expressions of Irish Protestant hostility toward a Jacobite-leaning, Tory ministry in the uncertain closing years of Queen Anne's reign,[6] and in these accounts the *Tamerlane* riot emerges as a reactionary, anti-Catholic, and anti-Irish act. Irish Protestants themselves also explicitly portrayed the event in this light in the self-exculpatory pamphlets they prepared for their somewhat alarmed English contemporaries. The writer of *The Conduct of the Purse of Ireland in a Letter to a Member of the Late Oxford Convocation*, *Occasioned By their having conferr'd the Degree of Doctor upon Sir C—— P——* (1714), for example, goes to great pains to represent Phipps's opponents as "English and *North British* Protestants" who "look upon this Kingdom [England] as their Mother and Protectress" and who have no "Interests separate from it,"[7] and he emphasizes that the Williamite rituals of these Protestants were entirely loyalist and conservative. If this "Protestant Nobility and Gentry used to celebrate the Days of King *Williams'* Birth, and of the Battel at the *Boyne*," it was entirely out of gratitude to William for having "redeem'd them from Imprisonment, from Poverty, from Persecution . . . and from certain Death" and for having "restored to them their Estates, their Laws and Liberties, their *Churches* and their *Colleges*" (19–20). And similar sentiments, this writer suggests, motivated this nobility and gentry to request the *Tamerlane* performance and the Garth prologue at the playhouse:

> Such hath been their Sense of that great Deliverance, and Gratitude towards their Deliverer, that they delighted in the Representations and Repetitions of whatsoever hath been written, or designed to do Honour to his Memory. For this Reason such of them as met, upon that Occasion in *Dublin*, constantly bespoke the Play called *Tamerlane*, and the Prologue to it, written by Dr. *Garth*. These they thought to be innocent and grateful Expressions of that Sense which they ought to have of so great a Deliverance; as such they took great Delight in them; and in so doing they had before this Person's [Phipps's] Government, being encourag'd and countenanc'd by the Presence or Approbation of their former Governors. (20)

The criminalization of these "innocent and grateful Expressions" by Phipps's regime, this writer then argues, was part of a larger attempt to

displace loyal Protestants from power and to replace them at every level with Jacobites, Catholics, and new converts of native Irish extraction (15), and he cites the involvement of Sir Toby Butler, Mr. Cornelius O'Callagan, Mr. Garratt Burker, and Mr. Swiny in the prosecution of Moore as evidence of this plan. The first of these men was the "Sollicitor-General to the late King *James*" and "a known and profess'd Papist," the second was "a new Convert Lawyer, bred at St. Omers," and the last two had Irish-sounding names that sufficed to prove their disloyalty. "I shall content my self," this writer states, "with the mention of their Names only" (30).

The author of *The Resolutions of the House of Commons in Ireland, Relating to the Lord-Chancellor Phips* [*sic*], *Examined; With Remarks on the Chancellor's Speech* (1714), who identifies himself as "a Member of the House of Commons in Ireland," gives an almost identical explanation as he works to justify the Irish Commons' resolutions censoring Phipps. Again it is argued that the Whigs are "Honest, Loyal, Protestants, firm Sticklers for the present Establishment both in Church and State," and that Phipps's administration worked to displace these loyalist Protestant subjects with disloyal Irish Catholics: "The Race of men whom he [Phipps] discourages, are all of English Extraction; while the O[h]s, the M[ac]ks, and the Descendants from the Murderers of Forty One meet with his Encouragement and Favour; and from thence take all Opportunities to insult the English Protestants." And again there is an insistence that the Protestant custom of honoring the memory of King William takes its meaning exclusively from the Protestant people's past struggle with their internal Catholic enemy; if Protestants were "Lovers of the Memory of *King William*," it was because that king had delivered them from a Jacobite era when "their Lives, their Estates were in the hands of the Destroyers, their Persons imprisoned, and their Estates seiz'd by the old Popish Proprietors." Responding to the opinion in some quarters in England that it was the Protestants, not the Catholics, who were being disloyal, this writer also states emphatically: "I would lay my Life that there is not a Protestant in that Kingdom [Ireland], that . . . would not readily spend the Last Drop of his Blood in the Defence of her present Majesty, whilst the favour'd new Coverts and Papists, with their boasted *Loyalty*, would to a Man turn Recreants to the Government, and join with the Pretender."[8]

What is repressed in these accounts is the Irish Protestant history of conflict with Her Majesty's government that produced this productive confusion between Irish Protestants and Irish Catholics and that necessitated these protests of Protestant loyalty, and when that other history is reinstated, as I demonstrate in this chapter, the 1712 *Tamerlane* "riot" and Irish Williamite performances in general take on a more complex, proto-nationalist meaning. As the author of the *Conduct of the Purse* pamphlet implicitly acknowledged when he wrote that the Protestants "look upon this Kingdom as their Mother and Protectress," the orthodox view of the English-Irish relationship was that it was a parent-child relationship. This view assigned agency exclusively to the English partner in the governing Anglo-Irish Protestant alliance; as the "Mother" kingdom, it was England's role to decide policy and to provide protection for Ireland, and it was Protestant Ireland's duty to gratefully accept these rulings and this protection. Since the end of the seventeenth century, however, members of the Protestant community in Ireland had represented themselves as brother-sharers in the legacy of the 1688 "Glorious Revolution," and through various acts of self-assertion, they had indicated they were trying to shake off this dependent "child" role with all its decidedly colonialist connotations. Like other political struggles, too, Irish Protestants carried on their struggle within a network of symbolic practices and material spaces, and Williamite performances and the playhouse, I argue, were at the heart of this mesh. If Williamite performances served to reinscribe Catholic exclusion from the body politic (and there is no doubt they did), they also served to map a new subversive kind of Irish Protestant imagined community onto the Irish landscape.

The first Williamite celebration took place on College Green on November 4, 1690, and its intent was clearly anti-Jacobite and anti-Catholic. It was, in effect, the Protestant community's response to the triumphalist, native Irish Catholic street theater that had greeted James II the previous year. In March 1689 James II had landed in Kinsale, and as he made his way along the road from County Cork to Dublin, he was hailed by enthusiastic native Irish crowds. The lanes and hedges were lined with "the Half-pike and Bayonet Rabble, called Raparees," a hostile Protestant witness stated, and in Carlow, the same writer notes, the king had to beg to be protected from the kisses of "rude Country Irish Gentlewomen."[9] When James reached the outskirts of Dublin, there were more elaborate celebratory displays, some of which had distinctively Catholic elements. As he made his "first entrance into the Liberty of the City," the same source reported, "there was a Stage built covered with Tapestry, and thereon two playing on Welch-Harps; and

below a great number of Friars, with a large Cross, singing; and about 40 Oyster-wenches, Poultry and Herb-women, in White[,] . . . dancing, who thence ran along to the Castle by his side, here and there strewing Flowers; some hung out of their Balconies Tapestry, and Cloath of Arras; and others imitating them, sewed together the Coverings of Turkey-work Chairs, and Bandle-Cloth Blankets, and hung them likewise on each side of the Street" (26–27). These populist demonstrations of support were complemented by the more scripted pageantry of Dublin Castle and Dublin Corporation officials. At the city limits the king was met by the lord mayor, aldermen, and other dignitaries, and after receiving the sword and the keys of the city and hearing welcoming speeches, he and the viceroy, Tyrconnell, processed to the castle, accompanied by troops of dragoons, coaches, gentlemen on horseback, heralds, and servants of the castle household (27). "As he marched thus along," a contemporary writer noted, "the Pipers of the several Companies played the tune of *The King enjoys his own again,* and the People shouting and crying, *God Save the King:* And if any Protestants were observed not to shew their Zeal that way, they were immediately revil'd and abus'd by the rude Papists" (28).

When King William III marched into Dublin on July 5, 1690 (O. S.), four days after the victory at the Boyne, the scene was reversed. As another observer remarked, the Protestants now "ran about shouting and embracing one another and blessing God for his wonderful deliverance as if they had been alive from the dead; the streets were filled with crowds and shouting and the poor Roman Catholics now lay in the same terrors as we [Protestants] had done some few days before."[10] A Protestant king now rode through the city "in great splendour" to St. Patrick's Cathedral to hear a Te Deum, and an alternate Protestant group of castle and city officials accompanied him.[11] The street theater that occurred on William's birthday on November 4 of the same year, then, was a kind of replaying of this July victory celebration. During the day, J. T. Gilbert reports in his *History of the City of Dublin,* the militia consisting of "2500 foot, troops of horse, and two troops of dragoons, all well clothed and armed were drawn out and gave several vollies," and in the evening the new Williamite elite as well as Dublin's humbler Protestant citizens gathered to celebrate on College Green. The "Nobility and Gentry," Gilbert writes, were invited by the lord justices "to a splendid entertainment and banquet" in Clancarty House, while in front of the house, the "people drunk in their Majesties' health" from a hogshead of claret and watched "a very fine firework" on the Green.[12] In locating their celebration in and around this house on the

Green, the Protestant community was also setting the stage for the larger remapping and recoding of native Irish places and estates that would occur in the aftermath of the Williamite victory. Clancarty House was the home of the sister of the earl of Clancarty, a Jacobite leader and a member of one of Ireland's most distinguished and ancient Gaelic families. When the Williamite forces took over Dublin, they took possession of this Gaelic family's house on College Green and made it the headquarters of the new government, and a year later the earl of Clancarty himself was sent to the Tower and his vast Cork estates seized.[13]

The parliamentary drama that was enacted at Chichester House (also located on College Green) two years later, however, revealed that the Protestants of Ireland also equated the Williamite victory with the right to share equally in the legacy of the Glorious Revolution, and Williamite celebrations were also soon invested with this more subversive political meaning and desire. Chichester House was the home of the Irish Parliament, a legislative body that, on the surface, looked like its counterpart in England. In effect, though, it was a far less independent entity. Poynings' Law, which was passed in 1494–95, ensured that no bills could be introduced in the Irish Commons without the prior approval of the Irish and English councils, and it mandated that for a bill to be enacted, it had to be in the same form in which it had passed the great seal of England.[14] In the first contentious parliament after the victory at the Boyne, Irish House of Commons members made it clear that they had every intention of challenging this law and any other English law that interfered with their interests. They launched a bitter attack on royal officials who had appropriated forfeited lands or returned these lands to Catholics; they threw out a mutiny act; they rejected a revenue bill; and they passed a daring resolution saying that they had the sole right to prepare heads of bills for raising money.[15] This last act caused the viceroy, Viscount Sydney, to describe the Irish Commons, privately, as "a company of madmen" who "talk of freeing themselves from the yoke of England, of taking away Poynings' law,"[16] and he publicly showed his displeasure for this behavior by proroguing parliament and delivering a formal protest to its members. He was "troubled," he told the Irish Commons, "that you who have so many and so great obligations . . . should so far mistake yourselves, as to intrench upon their Majesties' prerogative and the Rights of the Crown as you did on 27 October last, when by a declaratory vote you affirmed that it is the sole and undoubted right of the Commons of Ireland to prepare heads of bills for raising money."[17]

William Molyneux's *The Case of Ireland's being Bound by Acts of Parliament in England, Stated* (1698) also explicitly articulated the Protestant aspiration for political equality and domestic self-governance, and in this seminal work of Irish Protestant nationalism, William III is also explicitly reconfigured as an Irish Protestant patriot. Molyneux dedicates his controversial *Case* to William III, a gesture that is itself appropriative, and he continues his transvaluation of the Williamite sign on the first page of this dedication. True, he first praises William for rescuing "these Nations from Arbitrary Power, and those Unjust Invasions that were made on our Religion, Laws, Rights and Liberties"—thus for his role in delivering England and Ireland from the encroachments of the native Irish and French enemy in 1688–91.[18] But when he implores William to defend "those *Rights* and *Liberties* which we have Enjoy'd under the Crown of *England* For above Five Hundred Years, and which some of late do Endeavour to Violate" (17), he is referring to the contemporary struggle between the English and Irish Parliaments, and in this reconceptualization William is cast as the hero of the "Poor Subjects of Ireland" (18) against the encroachments of a specifically *English* enemy. By representing the Irish subject as a younger brother who is entitled to the same Williamite heritage as his older English brother—"Your most Excellent Majesty is the *Common Indulgent Father* of all your Countries; and have an *Equal* Regard to the *Birth-Rights* of all your *Children;* and will not permit the *Eldest* because the *Strongest* to Encroach of the Possessions of the *Younger*" (17–18)—the *Case* also implicitly rejects the mother-child colonial paradigm and ascribes the same political and economic rights to the "Subjects of Ireland" as to the subjects of England.

The case for Irish constitutional equality that Molyneux goes on to construct under the aegis of William III—the dedication ends with the phrase "At your Majesty's Feet . . . I throw it" (19)—further complicates the Williamite signifier. Molyneux's refusal of the colonial paradigm is built, in the first place, on the notion of inherited rights based on a common English ancestry, an argument that if exclusively pursued would have made the *Case* a defense solely of the liberty of the Irish Protestant community. It is this limited kind of nationalism, for example, that Molyneux advocates in the following passage, in which he refutes the notion that England assumed the right to govern Ireland through conquest: "Now 'tis manifest that the great Body of the present People of *Ireland*, are the Progeny of the *English* and *Britains,* that from time to time have come over into this Kingdom; and there remains but a meer handful of the Antient *Irish* at this

day; I may not say one in a thousand: So that if I, or any body else, claim the like Freedoms with the Natural Born *Subjects* of *England*, as being Descended from them, it will be impossible to prove the contrary" (35). Once again, it appears, a colonial English subject is asserting his rights and privileges by erasing the native Irish other from the landscape, even if this time the ethnic cleansing is done by the stroke of the pen rather than the sword. However, Molyneux also makes the claim that Ireland should not be bound by the English Parliament on the very different grounds of natural rights and contractual agreement, and this argument works to blur the boundary between native and settler, thus giving a wider nationalist import to this text. In keeping with his Lockean argument that the consent of the people is the only basis for legitimate government—"All Men are by Nature in a state of Equality" until "by their own *Consent* they give up their Freedom, by entring into Civil Societies for the Common Benefit of all the Members thereof" (116–17)—Molyneux has recourse to the myth of an ancient contract between the native Irish people and an English king, a myth that implicitly suggests that the native Irish population are part of the five-hundred-year-old "Nation" (88) he is defending. Of the "Original Compact" that the "People of Ireland" received after Irish kings, princes, bishops, and abbots all voluntarily submitted to Henry II in the twelfth century, Molyneux writes: "I am sure 'tis not possible to shew a more fair Original Compact between a King and *People*, than this between *Henry* the Second and the *People of Ireland*, *That they should enjoy the like Liberties and Immunities, and be Govern'd by the same Mild Laws, both Civil and Ecclesiastical, as the People of England*" (46). "The People of Ireland" here are not "the Progeny of the *English* and *Britains,*" as implied earlier, but the native Irish or Gaelic inhabitants of Ireland, and, in this conceptualization, the nation of Ireland originated at the moment when native Irish and English subjects entered into a social contract. A contractual, ethnically diverse model of the Irish nation, in other words, substitutes for the earlier kin- or blood-based model that worked to erase the native Irish people from the national scene. This other, more inclusive form of nationalism, too, is suggested by the nature of the sexual relationship between Richard Strongbow, a leader of the "First Expedition of the *English* into *Ireland*," and the daughter of Dermot, King of Leinster (26–27). In noting that this marriage occurred through "Compact" (27) and not through conquest or rape, Molyneux underlines his claim that from the beginning Ireland existed on terms of equality with England. But in recalling this marriage, he also implicitly

suggests that the five-hundred-year-old "Nation" he is defending is a hybrid nation, the product of an interracial union.

The cult of William in eighteenth-century Ireland, then, took shape in the context of the Irish Protestant community's continued effort to realize Molyneux's goals as well as in the more obvious context of its continued attempt to assert dominance over the internal Irish Catholic enemy, and if this other patriotic meaning of the Williamite ritual was repressed, it was undoubtedly because of the overwhelmingly negative English response to this first political overture. Molyneux's work was denounced by the English Commons as being "of dangerous consequence to the crown and people of England by denying the authority of the king and parliament of England to bind the kingdom and people of Ireland, and by denying the subordination and dependence that Ireland hath, and ought to have, upon England as united and annexed to the imperial crown of this realm."[19] And as if to remove any further doubt about what they thought of this Irish bid for constitutional equality and liberty, the English Commons passed the Woolen Act the following year (1699), a bill that restricted one of Ireland's most important industries. John Cary, a Bristol merchant who took a prominent part in the campaign to restrict the Irish wool trade, articulated the imperial attitude behind the Woolen Act when he stated, "[U]nless Ireland was bound up more strictly by laws made in England it would soon destroy our woollen manufactures here; wherefore I proposed to reduce it (with respect to its trade) to the state of our other plantations and settlements abroad."[20] The merchant class that was the main beneficiary of the Glorious Revolution in England thus made it very clear to Irish Protestants that it was not prepared to share the spoils of this Williamite victory. To the merchants, Ireland was not, as Molyneux had argued, a sibling nation with equal political and economic rights but a bastard colony that had to be "bound up more strictly by laws" in the interest of the mother country.

That Irish Protestant patriots refused to give up their struggle is clear from the ceremony that marked the unveiling of the statue of William III on College Green on July 1, 1701. This large equestrian statue, which was erected at the expense of the Dublin Corporation, served, at one level, as an expression of the city fathers' fierce anti-Catholicism. When Protestants resumed control of city hall in 1690, one of their first acts was to pass a municipal bylaw disenfranchising Catholic freemen, and during the 1690s, as Jacqueline Hill notes, they passed other measures to ensure that only Protestants held civic posts.[21] The statue of William, sitting high on his

prancing horse, embodied this Protestant will to dominance. Dressed as a victorious Roman general, with a truncheon in his hand, the monument configured the Williamites as masters and the Jacobites and the Irish Catholics as a beaten and defeated people. The inauguration rituals on July 1, the anniversary (O. S.) of the Battle of the Boyne, would also have worked to further underscore the monument's militaristic and anti-Catholic overtones. When local Irish Protestant leaders joined with the English Dublin Castle officials in a parade around the statue on this occasion, they symbolically re-created the victorious Anglo-Irish Protestant alliance that had won the 1688–91 war, and as Gilbert's account reveals, the presence of the militia and the noise of the gunfire would have provided additional visual and aural reminders of the victory:

> The Lord Mayor, aldermen, sheriffs, masters, wardens, and common councilmen of the city, having assembled at the Tholsel at 4 p.m., walked thence in formal procession to College-green, preceded by the city musicians and by the grenadier companies of the Dublin Militia. Some time after the city officials had reached College-green, the Lord Justices arrived, and were conducted through a line, formed by the grenadiers, to the statue, round which the entire assembly, uncovered, marched three times; the kettle-drums, trumpets, and other music playing on a stage erected near the front of the monument. After the second circuit, the Recorder delivered an eulogy on King William, expressing the attachment of the people of Dublin to his person and government, and at the conclusion of this oration a volley was fired by the grenadiers, succeeded by a discharge of ordnance. At the termination of the third circuit round the statue, the Lord Justices, the Provost and Fellows of the University, with numbers of Williamite noblemen and gentry, were conducted by the Lord Mayor, through a file of soldiers, to a large new house on College-green for their reception, where they were entertained.[22]

A closer look at the precise syntax of the 1701 inaugural ceremony and at the statue itself suggests that there was also another kind of power play going on at the interior of this Williamite street drama. From the account above, it is clear that it was city officials, not government officials, who were the producers and lead players in this performance. It was they who "conducted" the lord justices around the monument; it was they who provided the script for the Williamite eulogy; and it was they who provided all

the entertainment (the College Green reception mentioned above was only the first of the day; at the end of the evening, the lord mayor and city officials prepared another entertainment for the lord justices in the lord mayor's house). This appropriation of the role of principal player took its meaning, I suggest, from the other ongoing struggle of the city fathers: namely, their struggle to protect the city's charters and municipal rights and privileges against Dublin Castle encroachment. Even though the Dublin Corporation had set aside the Jacobite charter in 1690 and even though city officials could speak of the city reverting to its "auncient Protestant government," the viceroy and privy council still exercised considerable control over this body as they had to approve all the chief civic officials. Thus, as Hill notes, "regardless of which monarch or dynasty was on the throne, the danger of royal encroachments on local liberties had not vanished."[23] The Williamite ritual described above was also structured, I suggest, in the consciousness of this kind of threat. Behind the public show of hospitality and solidarity, the city fathers were tacitly signaling that they, not the London-appointed officials, ruled Dublin. The Williamite monument itself also articulated this other kind of political message through the engraved and gilt inscription on the white marble tablet on the statue's pedestal:

> Gulielmo Tertio;
> Magnae Britanniae, Franciae et Hiberniae
> Regi,
> Ob Religionem Conservatam;
> Restitutas Leges,
> Libertatem Assertam,
> Cives Dublinienses Hanc Statuam
> Posuere.

If William was the preserver of religion, he was also the restorer of laws and liberty, this inscription implied, and it was this constitutional heritage of laws and liberty, too, that the Protestant citizens of Dublin were claiming or "possessing" when they erected the statue in the middle of their city, just outside the doors of their parliament.

If there was a need for repeated rituals around this statue in the decades that followed, it could be argued, it was also because Irish Protestant overtures for equal rights and liberties in parliament were repeatedly rebuffed. Every November 4 after 1701, the viceroy (or in his absence,

the lord justices) held a levee in the castle for the lord mayor, city officials, nobility, and gentry. This whole group then paraded as far as St. Stephen's Green and back, stopping on the way to pay respect to the monument on College Green; as in the 1701 ceremony, the parade circled the statue of William three times, and again the troops discharged their volleys of musketry.[24] In the first decade of the century, these parades would have included participants such as the Speaker of the Irish House, Alan Brodrick, and the faction in parliament and city hall who supported his ongoing struggle for constitutional equality. Brodrick had been one of the most outspoken advocates of a strong anti-Catholic policy in the 1690s but he had been also one of the leaders of the "madmen" who had opposed Viscount Sydney in the 1692 Parliament, and in the 1703–4 parliamentary session, for example, he went on the offensive again. He and Robert Molesworth, another Irish Protestant who was a known defender of commonwealth principles, led the House of Commons to draft a resolution that expressed concern over Ireland's economic hardships and the recent attacks on her constitution, and this petition called on the queen either to permit "a full enjoyment of our constitution" or provide a union between the two countries.[25] As Hill notes, there were signs that the Dublin Corporation shared these sentiments; the same month that the 1703 Commons resolution was passed, the Corporation granted honorary freedom to Molesworth.[26] The queen's reply to the Commons resolution in 1704, was not encouraging, however, and in the spring Brodrick was dismissed from office for no other reason but, as a colleague wrote, "your hearty espousing your country's interest and appearing as became a true patriot."[27]

For such "true patriot[s]," then, the circling of the Williamite monument on November 4 would have functioned as a compensatory ritual, providing a symbolic way to reiterate claims to Irish liberty and equality that they were repeatedly failing to actualize in Parliament. In *Cities of the Dead*, Roach discusses the *effigy* as something that, like performance itself, "fills by means of surrogation a vacancy created by the absence of the original," and he notes the special importance of the effigy of the dead king in providing a sense of continuity and affiliation to a community that has suffered loss.[28] The annual November 4 parade around the Williamite effigy was such a ritual of surrogation, driven by the Irish Protestants' need not only to reinscribe the defeat of the Jacobite enemy but also to restore their failed dream of sharing in the legacy of the Glorious Revolution.

The Theatre Royal at Smock Alley, located just outside the gates of Dublin Castle and about a half mile from the House of Parliament and the monument on College Green, was another site where these patriots performed Williamite rituals of surrogation, though the Williamite performances in that location, I suggest, also took their meaning from an internal struggle for hegemony that had been going on in that institution (Ireland's only professional theater) since the 1689–91 war. As William Chetwood relates, the first performance at Smock Alley after the war was made possible only by the assistance of Dublin Castle; when the playhouse opened in winter 1691, Chetwood notes, the first play (Shakespeare's *Othello*) "was acted by Officers mostly about the Castle" as the regular company had been dispersed during the "Troubles." [29] In the two decades that followed, successive viceroys also continued to treat Smock Alley as if it were a court institution, as indeed it had been in the period before the war. During the stormy parliamentary season of 1692, for example, Viscount Sydney reportedly tried to deploy the playhouse to distract his political opponents; after he prorogued the rebellious Irish Parliament, it was later said, he "promoted Plays, Sports, and Interludes for the Amusement of the Plundered People."[30] In summer 1698 the second duke of Ormond also took the Smock Alley troop with him to Ormond Castle in Kilkenny to entertain his guests, just as his grandfather, the first Duke of Ormond, had taken "his players" from Dublin to entertain the university at Oxford some twenty years earlier.[31] And in 1709 the earl of Wharton himself recruited players in London to ensure that he and his entourage were well entertained while in Ireland. A friend of Wharton's in London wrote at this time, "I dined with him [Wharton] the other day, and he told me he had got a set of Players to go over into Ireland in May next, so what with Parliament at Chichester House, Balls in the Castle and Comedies at the Theatre, I hope we shall pass our time well this summer in Dublin."[32] As in the prewar period, too, the viceroy and his circle continued to act as important patrons of the stage, supplying many of the material needs of the company. From the documents relating to a dispute between the English player John Thurmond and the Smock Alley patentee and sharers in 1713, we learn that the viceroy and high-ranking military officers (Lord Cutts and General Ingoldsby) donated their "birthday suits" to the players and that officers of two regiments subscribed a day's pay to permit the indigent Thurmond to remain in the country.[33] More important, successive viceroys and their administrations continued to appear at the theater and, in so doing, attracted crowded houses. When the duke of Ormond honored the performance of George Farquhar with his presence in 1704 (Farquhar was appearing in his own play *The Constant Couple*), for example, the actor-playwright netted one hundred pounds instead of the usual fifty.[34]

In the decade after the war, however, a more socially diverse crowd also began to compete with the court for control over this symbolically significant institution, and this crowd was "Irish" in the sense that it was made up of men and women who were born in Ireland or who thought of Ireland as their permanent home. The signs of this shift occurred during the Restoration when Dublin's wealthy citizens began to express an interest in the theater for the first time. In 1678 a prominent Dublin citizen, Robert Ware, urged the mayor and aldermen to attend the "*Kings Theatre* in their own Persons" on holidays and festivals as a means of encouraging the "Freemen" of the city to attend, and he suggested that these freemen also provide an allowance of twelve pence to apprentices "to recreate themselves at these times at the *Theatre,* in lieu of these sportes this Cittie was bound to entertain them with."[35] By the 1690s, too, it is clear that such nonelite Dubliners were turning up at the Theatre Royal. When John Dunton, a London bookseller, visited Dublin in 1698, he noted that the Dublin Theatre Royal "is free for all Comers and gives entertainment as well to the broom man as the greatest Peer," and he also remarked that the "Spectators" were not "one degree less in *Variety* and Foppery, than those in another Place [London]."[36] The archbishop of Dublin also tacitly revealed this "Variety" when he wrote in 1694 complaining that "the young men of the metropolis . . . attended more to the Play-house than to their studies" (39). [37] These "young men" were Trinity College students, and most of them would have come from an Irish Protestant professional or country gentry background.

Changes in the management of the Irish theater also meant that, for the first time, Ireland's professional, commercial, and landed classes could become patrons of the Theatre Royal. During the 1690s, the practices of offering "benefit nights" for specific actor or playwrights and raising subscriptions for the support of the players were introduced in the Irish theater.[38] These innovations, potentially at least, allowed anyone with money to patronize and thus exercise some influence over the theater. When the playhouse was dark for the death of William III in 1702, for example, "Ladys of Quality" raised a subscription to support the company,[39] and although these "Ladys" could have been part of the castle coterie, they could also have been "Ladys" from an Irish Protestant or (though this is

less likely) from an Irish Catholic or "convert" background. The shift to a shareholding model in the management of the theater similarly opened up an opportunity for more local control. The theater continued to be managed, as it had been before the war, by Joseph Ashbury, an Englishman who had close ties with the castle (he had served as a member of the King's Guard of Horse, for example, while the duke of Ormond was viceroy).[40] But in the 1690s, following the practice of the London theaters, Ashbury permitted some of the leading actors at Smock Alley to become "sharers" in the annual profits in the company, and as Irish-born players were beginning to assume leading roles in the company at about this time, this innovation also served to localize the theater. Thomas Griffith, for example, is listed as one of the first shareholders, and he was a native Dubliner.[41]

By the turn of the century, too, Irish Protestant patriots had begun to use performance to remap this location as their own, as is evident from *St. Stephen's Green, or, The Generous Lovers*, a comedy produced on the Smock Alley stage in 1699. Captain William Philips, the play's author, was a descendant of Elizabethan planters in Ulster, and his father had earned a place of honor in Irish Protestant history as the governor who urged the Apprentice Boys to shut the gates of Derry against Jacobite forces in 1688.[42] In dedicating his play to William O'Brien, third earl of Inchiquin, however, Philips signaled that he was part of that small group of Irish Protestants who were now identifying with an Irish rather than an English interest. O'Brien was a Protestant who had served with distinction in King William's army, but he was also a descendant of one of the most famous Gaelic kings (Brian Boru) and a member of a prestigious Irish family that continued to patronize native Irish arts and culture throughout the eighteenth century. As Eileen MacCarvill notes, the Gaelic poet and historian Aodh Buí Mac Cruitín dedicated his *Brief Discourse in Vindication of the Antiquity of Ireland* (1717)—the first work in English to attempt to refute anti-Irish histories—to William O'Brien, and fourteen other members of this Thomond family also subscribed to this work.[43] By dedicating his work to an O'Brien, then, Philips imaginatively aligned himself with this circle of Irish poets and historians; as he explicitly states in the first line of his dedication, it was a shared nationalist as well as theatrical interest that attracted him to this patron: "This Play had a double Reason for seeking Shelter under your Lordship; I Writ it, and for our *Irish* Stage, and You are the chief Friend which either has."[44]

The first Smock Alley spectators who saw *St. Stephen's Green* would also have had the experience of looking at a specifically "*Irish* Stage," and by creating this sense of shared space, this play was already engaged in the process of nation making. In *Imagined Communities* Benedict Anderson argues that the newspaper played a central role in the evolving nationalism of the eighteenth-century Americas because of its ability to refract daily comings and goings, marriages, and economic news into "a specific imagined world of vernacular readers"; the newspaper, he states, created "an imagined community among a specific assemblage of fellow-readers, to whom *these* ships, brides, bishops and prices belonged."[45] But the theater, as the case of *St. Stephen's Green* illustrates, has an even more powerful capacity to refract worlds for a specific assemblage of fellow observers because it can work simultaneously in many different semiotic systems. From the opening scene of this play, for example, Smock Alley spectators would have found themselves gazing on a world that was recognizably their own; the setting for many of the scenes is St. Stephen's Green, a fashionable park that had been developed in the early Restoration period, and a new piece of scenery—the first ever of an Irish landscape—had been painted to depict this setting.[46] This sense of being in an Irish landscape also would have been reinforced by the dialogue. Characters talk of taking "the Air on the *Strand*" (1.1.55) or of meeting at "Chappellizard" (Epilogue, 17) (two fashionable meeting places on the outskirts of Dublin); of not giving someone "the value of a Rapparee Fathing" (5.1.86) (worthless Jacobite currency); of begging "an Estate of Forfeited Lands" (5.2.177) (an allusion to the recent Williamite confiscations). As an orderly, pleasant, and artfully designed public space, St. Stephen's Green is also a synecdoche for an Irish society that is culturally sophisticated and rational, and by recoding Irish space in this positive way, this play continued the struggle that Molyneux had begun in his *Case*. In the opening pages of his work, Molyneux had implicitly invited others to imitate his "Performance" (24) in arguing against English encroachment on Irish rights and liberties. England, he disingenuously argued, would never think "of making the least Breach in the *Rights* and *Liberties* of their *Neighbours*, unless they thought they had *Right* so to do; and this they might well surmise, if their Neighbours quietly see their Inclosures Invaded, without *Expostulating* the Matter . . . and shewing Reasons, why they may think that Hardships are put upon them therein" (23–24). *St. Stephen's Green*, I suggest, was the first dramatic work to respond to this call, though it makes its case against English encroachment not by expostulating on the hardships caused by such an invasion but by emphasizing the already existing order and civility of the Irish "Inclosure." There is only one direct reference to recent political events in

this play, and that occurs when the Irishman, Bellmine, tells the Englishman, Freelove, that he dreads marriage "as much as our Farmers do the Wool-Bill" (1.1.126–27). But by establishing the civility and refinement of Irish life, the play consistently undermines the ideological premise that was behind this "Wool-Bill" and behind all English legislation relating to Ireland: namely, that Ireland was a wild and savage land that needed (and deserved) to be bound and restrained by laws made in the metropolitan center.

The play begins its attack on hegemonic English attitudes with the following exchange between Freelove, who has just arrived in Ireland for the first time, and his friend, Bellmine:

FREELOVE: (*Looking about*) A pleasant place this! The Name of it?
BELLMINE: *St. Stephen's Green*.
FREELOVE: I like the Air.—I am glad your House has the benefit of it. (1.1.98–102)

The unspoken countertext here is the English traveler's account of Ireland—an account that, from the time of Giraldus Cambrensis on, had emphasized the barbarity and wildness of Ireland and (implicitly) the superiority of English civilization and culture.[47] In the exchange between Freelove and the fop, Vainly, the play also continues this transvaluation of Irish space, this time attacking the Irish elite themselves for their unpatriotic attitudes. Vainly, an Irishman, displays his anti-Irish bias when he states that he is "forced to go to *England* once a year, to refine [his] understanding" and to enjoy "pleasures" and "Conveniences" that are not to be had in Ireland (3.1.236–38, 3.1.248–50). But in the following exchange, these assumptions about England's superiority and Ireland's inferiority are interrogated and revealed to be intellectually bankrupt:

FREELOVE: I have been told you have all those [conveniences] here.
VAINLY: Oh not one, Sir, not one.
FREELOVE: You have good Wine?
VAINLY: Yes, yes, that's true, I had forgot that.
FREELOVE: Plenty of all sorts of Fish and Flesh.
VAINLY: Phoo, they are perfect Drugs. Plenty of Meat and Drink: but nothing else.
FREELOVE: The People are Civil and Obliging.
VAINLY: Especially to Strangers.

FREELOVE: And Hospitable.
VAINLY: To a fault, Sir.
FREELOVE: The Air is good, a temperate Climate.
VAINLY: Much the same as in *England*.
FREELOVE: The Soil is Rich.
VAINLY: Oh, 'tis too Rank.
FREELOVE: What necessaries then, or what pleasures do you want? You have fine Women.
VAINLY: They are kind I suppose. (3.1.251–68)

Unable to restrain himself, another Irishman, Sir Francis Feignyouth, interrupts at this point and condemns Vainly as a "Worthless Contemptible Wretch" for "entertain[ing] Strangers with your aversion to your Country, without being able to give one Reason for it" (3.1.273–76), a statement that sums up the play's attitude to those who remain prejudiced against the country of their birth.

In identifying English metropolitan culture as the greatest source of danger and disruption to the Irish world, *St. Stephen's Green* also displays its Irish patriot sympathies and its ideological alignment with Molyneux's *Case*. Lady Volant, the play's chief villain, is an Englishwoman who has settled in Ireland (she says at one point that she had done "tolerably well, since my being *Naturaliz'd*" [3.1.139–40]). But far from exercising a beneficial effect on her adopted country, as the standard myth of English imperialism claimed, this newcomer from London threatens to undo the whole fabric of society by her fraudulent marriage to Sir Francis Feignyouth. Timothy, the steward who assists Lady Volant in her scheme to cheat Sir Francis out of his estate, adds another layer of anti-English satire to the plot as he is, in many ways, a parody of Teague in Sir Richard Howard's *The Committee; or the Faithful Irishman*, a play that had been staged at Smock Alley two years before.[48] The relationship between the two characters is suggested by their common name—Timothy is the English equivalent of the Gaelic name "Teague"—and by the similarity of their histories; when Lady Volant first met Timothy in London, we are told, this servant, like his Teague counterpart, was also "half Starv'd, and in Rags" (3.1.14). In a direct inversion of *The Committee* plot, however, this Timothy finds prosperity and an improved standard of living in Ireland rather than England. As he tells his old friend and fellow servant, Trickwell, he "thrive[s] very well in this Country"; if he is fat, it is because "Ease and Plenty have made this Alteration, Eating well, and Lying soft" (4.1.12–14). Even the Timothys or

"Teagues," this play suggests, are thriving in present-day Ireland. By resolving the conflict of the play with the marriage of Freelove and Amelia, too, *St. Stephen's Green* implicitly dramatizes Molyneux's notion that Ireland and England are equal partners in a "Compact." Over the course of the play, the principal lovers, Freelove, an Englishman, and Amelia, an Irishwoman, test each other's sincerity and virtue by each pretending to be penniless, seeking through this subterfuge to determine if there is a moral deficiency in the other. The resolution of this tension, then, comes with the discovery of economic and moral equality, and it is on this basis that the Anglo-Irish marriage finally takes place. Remarking on the similarity of the lovers, Bellmine states, "Fate design'd you for each other. . . . [Y]ou are not more alike in Tempers than in Fortune" (5.2.275–77). This discovery of moral and economic parity also resonates on the political plane. If Irish and English subjects are social, moral, and economic equals, then they are also political equals and consequently should not exist in a relation of "subordination and dependence," as the English Parliament had suggested in its defense of the Woolen Act.

By 1699, then, Irish Protestant patriots like Philips were using the drama to remap the Irish playhouse as an Irish institution, and through the drama they were expressing their desire for greater political equality for themselves if not their native Irish counterparts (Timothy or Teague, the representative of the native Irish in this play, as we have seen, is still consigned to the servant's role). If Nicholas Rowe's Williamite drama *Tamerlane* became an instant favorite with this group in the opening years of the new century, I suggest, it was because it was available for similar ideological investment, despite its distinctly English political origin. *Tamerlane* was first performed in London in 1701, and it was immediately recognized in its own day as a piece of political propaganda. The eponymous hero was an idealized figure for the reigning English monarch, William III, and in showing the righteousness and success of Tamerlane's war against the tyrannical Bajazet, Rowe and his Whig friends hoped to move the English Parliament to unite behind the war effort against Louis XIV. Victory "is yet to come," Rowe wrote in the dedication to the play, "but I hope we may reasonably expect it from the Unanimity of the present Parliament, and so formidable a Force as that Unanimity will give Life and Vigor to."[49] The play's longevity on the London stage, however—between 1716 and 1776, for instance, *Tamerlane* was performed at least once every year[50]—can best be explained by its apparent ability to reconcile the expansionist aims of the post-1688 fiscal-military state with an older English tradition of

personal and constitutional liberties.[51] I suggest it was the play's ability to work simultaneously on both these ideological fronts—to glorify conquest *and* constitutional liberties—that also made it particularly ripe for Irish Protestant appropriation.

Tamerlane was first performed in Dublin soon after it appeared in London and quickly became the standard entertainment for the evening of November 4.[52] After the parade around the statue on College Green, the Irish Protestant community would gather at Smock Alley for a performance of this play and, as the writer of the *Conduct of the Purse* pamphlet pointed out, until the coming of Phipps, these performances were generally "encourag'd and countenanc'd by the Presence or Approbation of their . . . Governors" (20). One reason for *Tamerlane*'s popularity with this audience undoubtedly was its apparent ability to legitimate Protestant conquest and Catholic subjection by providing antithetically evaluated representations of the Williamite hero and the Williamite foe. In Rowe's play Tamerlane's attack on his enemy is justified by repeatedly demonstrating Bajazet's extreme violence. Not content with piling up anecdotal evidence of Bajazet's past savagery—he is a destroyer of land and crops (1.1.84–88), a "League-Breaker" (2.1.150), a rapist (2.2.337–41)—the play continually puts Bajazet's "native Fury" (1.1.55) on display for the audience. On one occasion, for example, Bajazet orders his men to strangle the Greek prince, Moneses, in his presence (5.1.185–86) and on another occasion he tries to murder his daughter, Selima, with his own hands (5.1.273). When Tamerlane and his forces finally draw their swords to prevent this last murder, then, their intervention appears entirely defensible; as Tamerlane himself comments, the "rank World," as represented by Bajazet, "asks" to be disciplined: "'Tis a rank World, and asks her keenest Sword, / To cut up Villainy of monstrous growth" (5.1.335–36). For a London audience, such evidence of the world's "Villainy" could serve as a rationale for the creation of Britannia, the nation that felt it was providentially ordained to rule the world, and in this context Bajazet would configure not only the Catholic French enemy but also the colonial populations that Britain came to see as its hostile other. As Linda Colley points out, Britons increasingly defined themselves not only against the Catholic French but also against "the colonial peoples they conquered, peoples who were manifestly alien in terms of culture, religion and colour."[53] For a Dublin audience, however, these scenes would also have served to legitimate the creation of the sectarian Irish Protestant state, much like the sermons that were preached in Protestant churches every October 23, the anniversary of the 1641 uprising.

As noted, October 23 commemorative services generally rehearsed the reputed atrocities committed by the native Irish against the settler community during the 1641 uprising, and in these sermons and in the Irish Protestant histories that supplied their material, the image of the "savage Turk" was often used to convey the inhumanity of a people under the sway of Catholicism. In an October 23 commemorative sermon in 1690, for example, one preacher argued that "[t]he plotting, contriving and mischievous spirit is the very spirit that rules and influences popery at this day which religion (if it deserves so good a name) exceeds all other (the Turkish not excepted) in barbarous bloodshed and cruelty. "[54] And in arguing for the legitimacy of the Protestant acceptance of the government of William and Mary in his highly influential and frequently reprinted *The State of the Protestants of Ireland under the late King James's Government* (1691), Archbishop King wrote: "If a Christian Army should go at this time into *Greece* to redeem the Christians there from the slavery of the *Turks,* I would enquire of any indifferent Casuist, whether it were lawful for the oppressed *Grecians* to accept of that deliverance, and to join heartily with and recognize their Redeemers."[55]

The rationale that *Tamerlane* offers for the final "caging" of Bajazet would also have been familiar and comforting to an audience who knew the arguments of King's *State of the Protestants of Ireland*. That Tamerlane should decide to cage his enemy at the end of this play is itself not surprising as this caging was part of the general lore about the Tamerlane-Bajazet conflict (Marlowe, for example, also uses it). In this play, however, Rowe also builds in an additional justification for his hero by showing that the idea for this cruel punishment originated first with the Turkish king, and this kind of preemptive strike logic would have resonated in a particularly meaningful way with Irish Protestants. Though there were no massacres during the Jacobite period, King justified subsequent Protestant oppression of Catholics on the grounds of what *might* have happened had James and the Catholics won the war. Like a "hungry Wolf," "they had devour'd us in their Imaginations," King states, and he suggests that Catholics admit as much: "Many of them make no scruple to confess, That there was no medium, but that either we or they must be undone, and when that was the unavoidable choice, that they, according to their own confession, had put on us, I assure my self the World will not only excuse us, but will think it was our Duty to have done what we did, since they had left us no other visible way but this, to avoid certain and apparent Destruction."[56] In justifying Bajazet's caging, this play uses a similar logic. At an early point, Tamerlane

asks Bajazet, "What had I to expect, if thou had'st conquer'd?" (2.2.133), to which Bajazet responds, "I would have cag'd thee, for the Scorn of Slaves" (2.2.144). When Tamerlane then decides to inflict this brutal humiliation on his enemy—Bajazet is "Clos'd in a Cage, like some destructive Beast," and "born about, in publick View" (5.1.347–48)—he appears to be reacting defensively rather than aggressively. The Protestant subject's violence in the aftermath of conquest, *Tamerlane* would have suggested, is the product of the Catholic subject's own evil and destructive character.

If this play served to justify the Protestant state's penal laws—its way of "caging" the enemy—it also served to articulate the frustrated Irish Protestant desire for constitutional and economic parity with their English neighbors, their desire to become brother-sharers in the Williamite heritage of the Glorious Revolution. As John Loftis notes, Rowe's *Tamerlane* is not only "a call to arms" but also a dramatization of "the Whig constitutional position"; in two key scenes—the first between Tamerlane and Bajazet and the second between Tamerlane and the Turkish holy man—Lockean principles of constitutional government and religious liberty are explicitly expounded and defended.[57] As a counter, for example, to Bajazet's political absolutism, his defense of the rights of kings to satisfy their "Ambition" and "Noble Appetite" (2.2.82, 84), Tamerlane advocates a politics governed by "Leagues," "cool Debates," and a regard for "the People" (2.2.66, 64, 105). And in opposition to the Turkish dervish's religious absolutism—the demand that the emperor "Drive out all other Faiths" but Islam—Tamerlane defends the rights of individuals to worship as they please:

> . . . to subdue th' unconquerable Mind,
> To make one Reason have the same Effect
> Upon all Apprehensions; to force this,
> Or this Man, just to think, as thou and I do;
> Impossible! Unless Souls were alike
> In all, which differ now like Human Faces. (3.2.77–82)

Such speeches were included in this text, I suggest, to reassure audiences in the London metropolitan center that their own hard-fought political and religious liberties would not be jeopardized by the kind of buildup of military powers that was happening in the post-1688 state. But in the process of legitimating its own imperialism, this text also supplied arguments for less advantaged subaltern subjects like the Irish Protestants. Tamerlane's

statement to Axalla, for example, that nature owns "An Equal Right in Kings and common Men" (2.2.33) would have served to confirm the Irish Protestant patriot's belief in the righteousness of his struggle for parliamentary equality, and Tamerlane's reminder to Bajazet that he should remember "The Common Tye, and Brotherhood of Kind" (2.2.171) would have served as a reminder of the broader political "Brotherhood" that this Protestant patriot sought to build.

At a deeper structural level, too, through the mechanism of the Tamerlane-Axalla plot, the play effectively tropes the triumph of an imagined community of brothers over an imperial monarchy, thus dramatizing the kind of shift in political paradigms that Irish Protestant patriots desired. As Anderson argues, the nation, "regardless of actual inequality and exploitation," is always conceived as a "deep, horizontal comradeship" and as a "fraternity."[58] In the first act, the play establishes that the relationship between Tamerlane and Axalla is this kind of horizontal, fraternal one. Even though Tamerlane is king, he greets Axalla as a partner and with the name of chosen brother and friend:

> Welcome! thou worthy Partner of my Laurels,
> Thou Brother of my Choice, a Band more Sacred
> Than Nature's brittle Tye. By Holy Friendship!
> Glory and Fame stood still for thy Arrival,
> My Soul seem'd wanting in its better half. (1.1.121–25)

We are also given a verbal image of this sacred "Band" that is based on "Choice," not blood ties, when the Turkish dervish describes the fighting men—"Bright Troops" who "from thence/ On either Hand stretch far into the Night" (5.1.224–25)—who accompany Tamerlane and Axalla to Bajazet's tent to rescue Selima. And this militant brotherhood is fully realized dramatically on the stage at that climactic moment in the last act when Tamerlane and his troops burst in and "drive Bajazet and the Mutes off the Stage" (5.1.321–24). For an Irish audience, this climactic moment when a vertical, authoritarian form of government is displaced by a horizontal, egalitarian form of power could function as a dramatization of their wished-for desire to substitute the status of nation for the status of colony.

The very quality, then, that made *Tamerlane* politically useful in England—its apparent ability to reconcile an older English discourse of liberty with a new discourse of empire—made it potentially dysfunctional

from the point of view of English power in Ireland, because the Irish Protestant audience who viewed it did not stand in the same relation to liberty as their counterparts on the mainland, and this dysfunctionality, I suggest, became apparent in the playhouse in 1712. In *Imagined Communities* Anderson also argues that European imperial powers became unwitting disseminators of nationalism in their colonies in the nineteenth century when they tried to frame their political ambitions in a national rhetoric borrowed from America and France. To make empire appear more attractive, Anderson suggests, these powers (including Britain) appeared in "national drag" on the world stage, but in so doing they inadvertently supplied modular forms of the nation to their own colonial subjects who then formed breakaway nations of their own.[59] The case of the Smock Alley riot suggests, however, that this ironic drama of national dissemination occurred at a much earlier stage in the history of empire. At a time when the Dublin Castle administration proved particularly autocratic, as it did between 1710 and 1714, Irish Protestant patriots could find a script for rebellion in English Williamite texts such as *Tamerlane* and the Garth prologue, and these scripts brought the hitherto concealed image of the Irish Protestant nation on to the stage of the Theatre Royal.

As we have already seen, two pamphlets written after the theatrical disturbance located this event in the framework of renewed Protestant-Catholic, Williamite-Jacobite tensions, and there is no doubt that these tensions were very real during the last years of Anne's reign because of uncertainty about the succession. There is also no doubt that the English Tory ministry's choice of ministers for Ireland did little to alleviate Irish Protestant anxiety on this score. The viceroy, the duke of Ormond, was a member of a distinguished Irish Protestant family (the Butlers) and a man who had the admiration and respect of many Irish Protestants, but Sir Constantine Phipps, who served as Ormond's lord chancellor and later as a lord justice, was an Englishman and a "highflying" Tory, who had made his reputation by defending Dr. Sacheverell during his famous trial.[60] The lord chancellor's appointment of "converts" to political office and positions of power also did little to calm Irish Protestants' fears; as we have seen, Protestants would also later accuse Phipps of surrounding himself with "the O[h]s, the M[ac]ks, and the Descendants from the Murderers of [Sixteen] Forty One."

The disturbance in the playhouse, however, can also be read against the background of renewed English-Irish tensions created by the government's attempt to reassert its control over political institutions and significant sites of assembly that Irish Protestants were beginning to think of as their own. Sir John Brodrick, the son of the M.P. Alan Brodrick, was arrested in a Dublin coffeehouse, for example, for having criticized the administration, and another Irish Protestant was prosecuted for having "treated her majesty in a public company with great disrespect."[61] To cite the author of *The Conduct of the Purse*, "Gentlemen were informed against for Words of little or no Signification. . . . [T]he whole seem'd as it were design'd to convince Protestant Gentlemen, that the Government had no Mind to let them meet together at all" (24–25). More seriously, the Dublin Castle administration, led by Phipps, made a serious attempt to assert control over the Tholsel, the city hall. Between 1711 and 1713, Dublin city election results were repeatedly disapproved by the privy council in an effort to impose a Tory mayor on the Whig-dominated Dublin Corporation, and Robert Molesworth spoke for many when he complained that "that devil the chancellor" was being given the freedom "to run about like a roaring lion . . . devouring the liberties and privileges of the City."[62] Attempts to question this exertion of executive power also brought accusations of disloyalty and, indeed, of collusion with the Irish Catholic enemy. A pamphlet entitled *Her Majesty's Prerogative in Ireland; The Authority of the government and Privy-Council There: and the Rights, Laws, and Liberties of the City of Dublin Asserted and Maintain'd* (1712) argued that "Factious Protestants" as well as Catholics were to blame for the 1641 rebellion and went on to suggest that a similar unholy alliance was behind the city controversy and behind Williamite commemorations: "[S]ome of their [Factious Protestants] Posterity at this Day drink to the *pious Memory of Oliver Cromwell;* and have the Impudence to join it with the *glorious Memory of King William*. The Principles of the Ancestors are rooted in the Progeny; and the Occasion of this very Controversy, which we are now upon, is one blessed Effect of so hopeful a Plantation. Nor is it at all strange that Papists and *such* Protestants should unite in this cause."[63] These antagonisms also soon spread to Parliament. Early in the 1711 parliamentary session, Archbishop King wrote to Jonathan Swift that he feared that "the business of the city of Dublin" would "beget ill blood, and come into Parliament,"[64] and his fears proved well founded. The 1711 parliamentary session was again a highly contentious one, marked by controversies over the powers of the lord lieutenant and privy council, and it ended, significantly, with the Irish Commons proclaiming, in an address to the lord lieutenant, "their steady adherence to the principles of the late Revolution."[65]

The stage of the Theatre Royal, a half-mile walk from College Green, then, was another platform on which Irish Protestants could proclaim this commitment to Revolution principles. This platform became particularly significant in the light of the government's refusal to celebrate King William's birthday in 1711 and 1712. In 1711 the viceroy refused to lay on the customary banquet on November 4, and that year also the government forbade the speaking of Garth's prologue for the first time.[66] The following year, Phipps, acting as lord justice in place of the absent viceroy, again forbade the prologue, discouraged the annual custom of dressing William's statue for the November 4 birthday celebration, and, more important, refused to join in the procession around the statue on College Green.[67] In thus neglecting to honor the birthday, Phipps effectively cast himself as the enemy of William and the Irish Protestant nation that had established itself under the aegis of the Williamite sign, and it was to play Tamerlane to this English Bajazet, I suggest, that Dudley Moore (himself the younger brother of an Irish M.P.) turned up at the Theatre Royal on the evening of November 4, 1712.

Moore's unorthodox performance also had a populist dimension, if we are to credit the account of the "riot" that appeared in the progovernment newspaper, *Lloyd's News-letter*. The opposition originated at a midday dinner in honor of King William at the Tholsel, this newspaper sarcastically reported, when those who preferred "the memory of a dead Prince before the Duty they owe to their living Sovereign" drank Williamite healths and "Fired . . . Liberty and Property Guns," and it gained strength after these Williamite supporters spent the afternoon in Lucas's, Eustace's, and other coffeehouses and gaming rooms in the city.[68] *Lloyd's News-letter* described the "Box Ladies" who applauded Moore and his supporters in the playhouse (see below) as "s[luts]" who later met to "play a Game at Putt" according to an "Original Contract" with the protesters after the performance,[69] thus implying that these women supporters were whores whom these men had linked with during their afternoon's carousing. But such a contemptuous characterization can also be read as an indication that the Moore faction had a populist component; it drew its support from below as well as from above. When Moore and his supporters burst on the stage, then, they brought this new kind of imagined community into view, much as Tamerlane does when he

and his "Troops" burst in and displace Bajazet and his mutes in Rowe's play, and the incendiary nature of the prologue that Moore spoke on this occasion would have added a further subversive edge to the staging. Garth's prologue begins with a call to arms and invokes the memory of William in the interest of renewing the war against France and her Jacobite allies:

> Today, a mighty Hero comes to warm
> Your curdl'd blood and bids you Britons arm.
> To Valour much he owes, to Virtue more;
> He fights to save and conquers to restore.[70]

But the prologue also reminds audiences of the Williamite legacy of "Freedom," and when delivered by the brother of an Irish member of Parliament, this reminder could also be interpreted as a call to "pull down Tyrants" like Phipps who were undermining Irish Protestant authority:

> His generous Soul for *Freedom* was Design'd,
> To pull down Tyrants, and unslave mankind;
> He broke the Chains of Europe; and when we
> Were doom'd *for Slaves,* he came and *set us free.*[71]

The other, anti-English connotation of this disruptive performance was also apparent to government supporters. *A New Song on the Whiggs Behaviour at the Play House on the 4th of this Instant, November 12, at a Play call'd TAMERLAIN,* which appeared in *Lloyd's News-Letter* a few days after the playhouse disturbance, purports to express the dissatisfaction of the Smock Alley players who were displaced when Moore and his supporters invaded the stage. But it is clear that this song also expresses the dissatisfaction of the metropolitan English power, threatened by the political and economic ambitions of its Irish Protestant subalterns:

> You Whiggs of Renown
> Both of Country & Town,
> Who of late in our Play-House were seen;
> And mounted the Stage
> With Fury and Rage,
> As if a Great Hero had been:
> How comes it about,
> You now grow so stout!
> Thus quite to run out of your sphere:
> We think it were fit,
> You should stay in the Pit,
> Unless each has a mind to turn Play'r.
> Think not to invade
> Our Privilege and Trade,
> As you would the Prerogative Royal;
> At this rate to be sure,
> We must soon shut our door,
> If we strive to be Honest or Loyal.[72]

The stage and the pit correspond, respectively, to the space of a "Privilege[d]" English "we" and an economically and politically subordinate Irish "you," this song suggests, and in mounting the stage, Moore and his supporters had run "out of [their] sphere," signaling their ambition or "mind" to be central players in the Irish political and economic drama. *Lloyd's News-letter* also implied that the "riot" that followed Moore's staging had this protonationalist significance, even as it gives the following derogatory account:

> [T]he Show began, and 6 Grenadeers [*sic*] appearing with Guns and broad Swords, our Worthies were very quiet, only by the by, cast some Reflections on Sacheverell, struck a Fellow of the College for hissing at their indecent Behaviour, as did the Ladies in the Galleries, who these valiant, sensible Gentlemen abused with their Tongues, in a bitter manner, because as 'tis said, the Gallery Ladies chose to wear red Roses, in Honour to the English Nation, as the Box Ladies did Oranges, who clapped their Friends again and again, which so animated the P[uppies] that it is thought they will scarce be able to open their Eyes in 9 Days, the usual time allowed to W[helps] to see.[73]

The puppy imagery here was clearly meant to insult and belittle Moore and his supporters by portraying them as arrogant upstarts. Indirectly, however, it also admits a kind of birthing had taken place at the Theatre Royal that evening, and the allusion to the ladies' symbolic decorations gave this birthing an implicitly nationalist significance. If "the Gallery Ladies chose to wear red Roses, in Honour to the English Nation," then it is clear

that "the Box Ladies" who wore "Oranges" and who applauded "the P[uppies]" did so in honor of an Irish Protestant nation that, though still unnamed, was already challenging English hegemony.

When the conflict shifted from the theatrical to the legal and parliamentary domains in the next two years, Irish Protestants themselves also framed it as a conflict about Irish rights and liberties, though this nationalist discourse tends to surface only in texts that were prepared for internal Irish consumption. *A Defence of the Constitution: or, An Answer to an Argument in the Case of Mr. Moor; Lately publish'd by One of her Majesty's Council* (1714), an anonymous pamphlet that was published only in Dublin, is a case in point. This pamphlet is a response to a 1713 pamphlet that defended the government's use of English legal precedent to strike the jury in the Moore trial, and it begins in a seemingly conciliatory way by acknowledging that Ireland received her laws and constitution from England: "those Securities for our Lives, Persons, and Estates . . . are warranted to us by the *Constitution* or Original Compact, of which the Commons in Parliament Assembled, are Guardians or Conservators." In language that leaves little doubt about his anti-English sentiment, however, this writer then goes on to add that "[t]his *Constitution* is the only thing that *Ireland* is beholding to *England* for, as *England* and many other Nations have been to their Conquerors, for their Laws and Civilities, " and he suggests, further, that the unconstitutional behavior in relation to Moore's trial has struck at the very heart of Ireland's newfound national liberty:

> *Ireland* has had of late as great an Eclaircissement as any Nation ever had before. From the utmost Barbarity and Obscurity, it has become considerable, both for Arts and Arms; and has adorn'd the Age with some of the most celebrated Wits, as well as the most renowned Heroes.
>
> But the thing wherein it shines most, is that Spirit of *Liberty*, which is inherent in great Minds and illuminated Understandings.
>
> *Liberty*, which has deserted most parts of *Europe*, seems to have chose *Ireland* for its Seat at last, which always has been attended with Credit, Riches and Glory.[74]

The patriot fervor that animates this text is like that which animates Molyneux's *Case* and Philips's *St. Stephen's Green*, and it seems to be born not just from abstract political principle but from a love of place as well.

A similar pride in Irish places and institutions marks *The Speaker. A Poem inscribed to Alan Brodrick, Esq. Speaker to the Honourable House of Commons Met at Dublin, November 25, 1713. Before his Grace the Duke of Shrewbury*, another text that was printed only in Dublin. This poem uses the conceit of a walk on College Green to celebrate the reelection of Alan Brodrick as Speaker of the Irish House of Commons in 1713, an event that marked the beginning of the final act in the showdown between Phipps and the patriot faction in Parliament. The duke of Shrewsbury, the new viceroy, was sent to Ireland in 1713 to resolve this conflict between Phipps and the Irish Protestants, but he met his first defeat on November 25, 1713, when the Commons elected Brodrick Speaker over the court nominee. Brodrick had been a key player in opposition politics since the 1690s, and, significantly, he was also the attorney general who had led Moore's defense in 1713. Under Brodrick's leadership, too, the Commons began its investigation into Phipps's behavior, and when the viceroy failed to follow its recommendation to remove the lord chancellor, the Speaker and his supporters forced the shutdown of Parliament in spring 1714. By turning "Play'r," Irish Protestants, no less than Moore, made a shocking spectacle of their contempt for Her Majesty's government in Ireland, an analogy that the new viceroy himself gestured at when he wrote, "I have made the figure rather of a viceroy in a play than of one who had the honour of her majesty's patent."[75]

The writer of *The Speaker* suggests that, like Moore, Brodrick and his supporters were acting out a specifically Williamite script when they made a farce of Her Majesty's government, and as this poem makes clear, this script was as much about Irish Protestant patriotism as it was about anti-Catholicism. In his imaginary walk "towards the *Colledge-Green*" [*sic*], the poet's attention is caught first by the statue of William, and in describing this "Effigy," the poet initially portrays the Williamite subject as the hero of a conquest narrative:

> Father we went, and saw an Effigy,
> On Marble Pedestal, 'twas mounted High.
> 'Twas Great *Nassau*, bridling his Prancer strong,
> As He's described in *Garth's* Immortal Song.
> 'Twas he I saw that Truncheon in his Hand
> Fierce Armies, and great Nations could Command.
> 'Twas He—The Verdant Laurel wreath'd around,
> The mighty Conqueror's Sacred Temples bound:

Laurels at *Boyne* and at *Namure* he won;
And ne're before the Victory put on.[76]

When the poet turns from contemplating "Great *Nassau*" mounted high on his equestrian pedestal to "Great *Brodrick*" mounted high in the Speaker's chair, however, the emphasis shifts and the tone becomes more rhapsodic, and it is clear that in this context the Williamite hero is also a figure for the Irish patriot, the one who speaks and acts on behalf of "*Ireland's* Sons and Patriots":

We walkt, the Crowd grew thick, we saw the Dome
Where *Ireland's* Sons and Patriots wont to come . . . ;
Three Hundred Men from all the parts Select,
To make good Laws, and Villanies detect. . . .

High o're the rest Great *Brodrick* mounts the Chair,
Mysterious was his Countenance and Air:
He Spake, the listen'ing and admiring Throng
Hung on the Charming Musick of this Tongue.
Great Storm of Wit! Full Tide of Eloquence!
Bold and Clear Spirit! Bright Fire! And finisht Sense![77]

Dudley Moore was another such patriot figure, I have been arguing, and by mounting the stage of the Theatre Royal on November 4, 1712, he, like Brodrick, served to define a new imagined community of "*Ireland's* Sons and Patriots."

In *The Early Irish Stage*, William Smith Clark states that the Irish stage's first recorded "riot" had no long-term consequence; after the indictment against the "rioters" was quashed, he suggests, the whole affair soon blew over and "the commotion which might have involved the Dublin Theatre Royal in a *cause celebre* was quickly forgotten."[78] The 1712 theatrical event, however, was not quickly forgotten. Some sixty years later, as I show in chapter eight, other patriots who wanted to use the Irish stage as a site of protest would recirculate the arguments of the Irish lords who had supported Dudley Moore in 1712, and more immediately in the 1720s and 1730s, other Protestant "Sons and Patriots" of Ireland would continue this patriot counterdrama through such transgressive practices as wearing Irish "stuff" and singing "native tunes." Because the significance of this kind of Irish Protestant counterdrama was not limited to the conscious

intentions of its authors and actors, this "riot" can also be regarded as a defining moment in the struggle to create a stage for *all* the people of Ireland. In *Nation and Narration* Bhabha points out that the nation as a discursive construct is always struck in its interior by a productive ambivalence: it "reveals, in its ambivalent and vacillating representation, the ethnography of its own historicity and opens up the possibility of other narratives of the people and their difference."[79] The "riotous performances" of Ireland's Protestant "Sons and Patriots," like Molyneux's seminal *Case*, were similarly ambivalent productions, and as I demonstrate in the next two chapters, they opened up a space for the return of other kinds of Irish Catholic "players" and another kind of Irish Catholic nationalism.