

1

Swift's political character

... the modern Question is only, Whether he be a *Whig* or *Tory* ...
The Sentiments of a Church-of-England Man (1708; published 1711)

If possible, to learn his Story,
 And whether he were *Whig* or *Tory*? ...
 In State-Opinions *a-la Mode*,
 He hated *Wh*—*n* like a Toad;
 Had giv'n the *Faction* many a Wound,
 And Libell'd all the *Junta* round ...
Part of the Seventh Epistle of the First Book of Horace Imitated (1713)

But, I confess, that after I had been a little too copious in talking of my own beloved Country; of our Trade, and Wars by Sea and Land, of our Schisms in Religion, and Parties in the State; the Prejudices of his Education prevailed so far, that he could not forbear taking me up in his right Hand, and stroaking me gently with the other; after an hearty Fit of laughing, asked me whether I were a *Whig* or a *Tory*.

Gulliver's Travels, II, iii (1726)

Swift's politics is a large, complex and controversial subject upon which there is a considerable corpus of commentary. This chapter considers briefly some of the contested issues in interpretation of Swift's political biography and writing.

The exegesis of Swift's political principles and party-political allegiance is a matter of continuing disagreement in modern Swift studies. A complexity in the case is that Swift was reputed to be a Whig at the beginning of Queen Anne's reign but a Tory by the end of it. An apparent public change of parties in 1710 is reflected in his private correspondence. Tory names start to replace Whig names in the list of Swift's English correspondents after 1710.¹ However, modern scholars

¹ *Corr*, I, xxi–lxx; W. A. Speck, 'From Principles to Practice: Swift and Party Politics', in *The World of Jonathan Swift: Essays for the Tercentenary*, edited by Brian Vickers (Oxford, 1968), pp. 69–86 (p. 69).

find an integrity and coherence in Swift's mature political convictions. What is contested is the precise nature of his ideological identity, which remained essentially unchanged during his adult life, and the topical meaning of his political principles and language.

Essentially there are three basic and contradictory accounts of Swift's politics in the critical commentary. One position is that Swift is a post-Revolution Tory who was temporarily associated by circumstance with the Whigs. The case for Swift as a Tory in politics and ecclesiology has been advanced in detail in the work of F. P. Lock.² Swift's break with the Whigs and public 'conversion' to a Tory party-political position in 1710 is seen as an ideological homecoming rather than an apostasy in the 'Tory' reading of Swift's politics. A second position in Swift studies tends to see Swift as a paradoxical, idiosyncratic political figure whose political attitudes include elements from Tory and Whig extremes of contemporary political argument; that there are reactionary and libertarian strands in his political ideology. This second position argues that it is probably a futile exercise to try to site Swift in the terrain of post-Revolution party politics or that both 'Whig' and 'Tory' descriptions of Swift are appropriate. Swift is represented as a political nonconformist in the Age of Party.³ A third view is that Swift is essentially a Whig in state politics and remained so despite his 'conversion' to the predominantly Tory administration of 1710–14. This view, which can be found stated or expounded in the work of many Swiftians, is a modern scholarly orthodoxy.⁴ The Whig case for Swift

² F. P. Lock, *Swift's Tory Politics* (London, 1983).

³ Daniel Eilon, *Factions' Fictions: Ideological Closure in Swift's Satire* (Newark, London, Toronto, 1991), esp. pp. 15–20, 94–122, 160–4. Eilon's analysis of the Whig and Tory cases for Swift accepts a final verdict of 'Tory by temperament and a Whig by principle' (p. 114); David Nokes, 'The Radical Conservatism of Swift's Irish Pamphlets', *British Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies*, 7 (1984), 169–76.

⁴ For some modern studies that, despite other differences, identify Swift's fundamental Whig politics: Arthur E. Case, *Four Essays on Gulliver's Travels* (Princeton, 1945; rpt. Gloucester, Mass., 1958), pp. 107–9; Ricardo Quintana, *Swift: An Introduction* (London, 1955; rpt. Oxford Paperbacks, 1962), pp. 7–8; J. C. Beckett, 'Swift as an Ecclesiastical Statesman', in *Essays in British and Irish History in Honour of James Eadie Todd*, edited by H. A. Cronne, T. W. Moody and D. B. Quinn (London, 1949), rpt. in *Fair Liberty Was All His Cry: A Tercentenary Tribute to Jonathan Swift 1667–1745*, edited by A. Norman Jeffares (London, 1967), pp. 146–65 (pp. 150, 152, 159); Kathleen Williams, *Jonathan Swift and the Age of Compromise* (Lawrence, Kansas, 1958), pp. 100–3; James A. Preu, *The Dean and the Anarchist* (Tallahassee, 1959), esp. pp. 33, 99–102; Bertrand A. Goldgar, *The Curse of Party: Swift's Relations with Addison and Steele* (Lincoln, Nebraska, 1961), pp. 63–67, 83, 169; Basil Hall, "'An Inverted Hypocrite': Swift the Churchman", in *The World of Jonathan Swift*, pp. 38–68 (p. 60); W. A. Speck, 'From Principles to Practice: Swift and Party Politics', in *ibid.*, pp. 69–86 (pp. 80–1); Speck, *Society and Literature in England 1700–60* (Dublin, 1983), which sees *Gulliver's Travels* as reflecting 'Country more than Tory attitudes'. Political

squares with a literal reading of Swift's repeated profession that he was 'a Whig in politics' although a 'High-churchman' in religion; that he was 'of the old Whig principles, without the modern articles and refinements' (*PW*, VIII, 120; *Corr*, IV, 100). Swift's hostility to 'modern whiggery' and particularly to the Walpolean regime, it is argued, reflects his fundamental Whig principles rather than disaffected Tory politics. Irvin Ehrenpreis's biography of Swift represents him as an 'Old Whig' in politics but Tory with regard to the Church. At one point Ehrenpreis implies that Swift's politics in the last four years of Anne's reign were an aberration from a Whig humanism. Swift 'defends a Lockean view of the limits of good government. When his friends stood on top, he forgot this view. One benign effect of defeat, for Swift, was that it recalled him to humanity.' It is observed during an exposition of the Drapier's third letter that 'Swift has in effect accepted his new rulers, the Hanoverian Whigs, and seems to urge them to judge their Irish conduct by their English ideals.'⁵ The argument for Swift as a true Whig opposed to Tory ideology and Hanoverian Court Whiggism has been put in detail by J. A. Downie. He sees a continuity in Swift's political writings from *A Discourse of the Contests and Dissentions Between the Nobles and the Commons in Athens and Rome* (1701), defending Whig lords, through his tracts of 1710–14, to his alliance with the Whig Archbishop King in Ireland during the affair of Wood's halfpence, *The Drapier's Letters* and *Gulliver's Travels*. Downie concludes that in *Gulliver's Travels* Swift

refers to the way in which old Whig ideals have been allowed to become corrupted since the Revolution by men like Walpole. Swift, in *Gulliver's* conversations with the King of Brobdingnag (and elsewhere), compares Modern Whig government with Old Whig political ideology ... In this, his

attitudes in the work are labelled 'Country Whig' and 'Country Tory' (see pp. 27, 67, 82); Donald Greene, 'Swift: Some Caveats', in *Studies in the Eighteenth Century II: Papers Presented at the Second David Nichol Smith Memorial Seminar 1970*, edited by R. F. Brissenden (Canberra, 1973), pp. 341–58 (pp. 341–7). Like W. A. Speck, J. A. Downie (*Robert Harley and the Press: Propaganda and Public Opinion in the Age of Swift and Defoe* (Cambridge, 1979), pp. 127–9 and *Jonathan Swift: Political Writer* (London, 1984), esp. pp. 259–60) presents the argument that Swift straddled the contemporary party division between Whig and Tory. His anachronistic political ideology was Old Whig or Country. Swift is seen as essentially a Whig in political principle by Frank H. Ellis in his edition of *The Examiner* and *The Medley* (Oxford, 1985). J. G. A. Pocock ('*The Machiavellian Moment Revisited: A Study in History and Ideology*', *Journal of Modern History*, 53 (1981), 49–72) remarks 'the presence in opposition of Tories of the style of Swift, Bolingbroke, and Pope, whose ideology differed surprisingly little from that of the Old Whigs' (p. 63). Swift's 'Old Whig principles' have become a truism in Swift studies.

⁵ *Swift*, II, 4, 46, 118, 252–4; III, 142, 243.

greatest statement on politics, Swift, through implication, outlines his ideal political system. And this turns out to be not Tory in inspiration, but Whig.⁶

It is a measure of the complex nature of the issues involved in historical criticism of Swift's political writings, and the effect on Swift criticism of current historiographical controversy about the nature of party politics and ideology after the Revolution, and especially in the early Hanoverian period, that there should be such opposed interpretations of Swift's political allegiance. Two authoritative scholars working on Swift's politics who appear to share a Hirschian critical methodology, who rehearse much the same evidence in their historical criticism of Swift's texts and who are in agreement about the 'Country' critique informing Swift's political satire in *Gulliver's Travels*, have arrived at spectacularly opposed verdicts on Swift's politics. For F. P. Lock, Swift is a natural Tory. For J. A. Downie, Swift is an unreconstructed Revolution Whig.

There is at least nominal inconsistency and contradiction in Swift's party-political alignment. In the early 1690s he wrote Pindaric odes to both King William III and the deprived Archbishop of Canterbury, William Sancroft. Swift's first political tract, *A Discourse of the Contests and Dissentions . . .*, was published in a specific Court Whig political cause, although Swift's Tory answerers were able to demonstrate unwhiggish tenets in the work.⁷ *A Tale of a Tub* (1704) is dedicated to the Junto Whig Lord Somers, but hostile contemporaries remarked that the ironic and parodic 'Bookseller's Dedication' to Somers was disrespectful.⁸ The Dedication remained in the fifth edition of 1710. *A Tale of a Tub* was identified with the productions of heterodox radical Whigs, such as John Toland, and regarded as profane and irreligious by many.⁹ Yet, as pointed out in chapter 3, Swift clearly thought that

⁶ J. A. Downie, 'Swift's Politics', in *Proceedings*, pp. 47–58 (p. 58).

⁷ See the excerpts from *The Source of Our Present Fears Discover'd* and from Charles Leslie, *The New Association. Part II* (London, 1703) and 'Supplement' reprinted as appendices in *Discourse*, pp. 228–51. Leslie, who assumed the work was by the eminent Whig polemicist Bishop Gilbert Burnet, triumphed at one point: 'Ah! Doctor, Doctor, Was this *Always* your Doctrine? Are you come to see it at last? And yet never *Mend!*' (p. 247). See the extended study of the pamphlet in F. P. Lock, *Swift's Tory Politics*, pp. 146–61, esp. pp. 160–1.

⁸ William King, *Some Remarks on The Tale of a Tub* (1704) in *The Original Works of William King, LL.D.*, 3 vols. (London, 1776), I, 215; William Wotton, *Observations upon The Tale of a Tub* (1705), reprinted in *Tale*, pp. 313–28 (p. 327).

⁹ For a contemporary analysis of the *Tale* as the irreligious production of a libertine, see BL Add. MSS, 29, 612 fols. 15–25 (esp. fol. 25), the Letter-Book of Silvester Jenks 1703–1707. See also *Brief Remarks On the late Representation of The Lower House of Convocation: As the same respects the Quakers only* (London, 1711), pp. 13–14 where Swift duly appears in the company of those convicted of heterodoxy, heresy or irreligion. On the reception of the *Tale* as a profane, deistical and irreligious work, see William John Roscelli, 'A *Tale of a Tub* and the

authorship of the *Tale* made him welcome to the Church party, the book was admired by the High Church Tory, Francis Atterbury, and was regarded as the work of a 'violent Tory' by the Tory satirist William King. Swift's opposition to Whig ecclesiastical policy is well documented and well known, and in 1710 for principled and personal reasons Swift began to write for what he later described as 'the immortal Tory Ministry' (*PW*, V, 265) of the last four years of Queen Anne's reign. He emphatically wrote of the Whigs on 13 October 1710: 'I have done with them, and they have, I hope, done with this kingdom for our time' (*PW*, XV, 55). By the end of Anne's reign Swift was a famous Tory party publicist and a suspected Jacobite. In May 1715 the Tory printer, John Barber, wrote to Swift: 'We have 20 frightfull Accounts of your being sent for up, and your papers seized, for you are the reputed Author of every good thing that comes out on our side' (*Corr*, II, 168).

Swift's own statements about his political principles and party allegiance in the first Age of Party might seem to illustrate a Swiftian 'Thought': 'How inconsistent is Man with himself!' (*PW*, IV, 245).¹⁰ Regularly charged in the Whig press after 1710 with venal political apostasy, and clearly sensitive to charges that he had deserted the Whigs for the Tories in 1710, Swift frequently claimed personal political consistency, representing himself as that idiosyncratic figure, a High Church Whig, and as a consistent if anachronistic 'old Whig'. Sometimes Swift averred that there was no real difference between the essential principles of Whig and Tory and that he was moderate and bipartisan.¹¹ It was only circumstantial and personal reasons, Swift claimed in *The Sentiments of a Church-of-England Man* (probably written in 1708 but published in 1711) that had associated him with one party (the Whigs) more than another:

I converse in full Freedom with many considerable Men of both Parties; and if not in equal Number, it is purely accidental and personal, as happening to be near the Court, and to have made Acquaintance there, more under one Ministry than another.

"Cavils of the Sour", *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, 64 (1965), 41–56, and Frank T. Boyle, 'Profane and Debauched Deist: Swift in the Contemporary Response to *A Tale of a Tub*', *Eighteenth-Century Ireland*, 3 (1988), 25–38.

¹⁰ Swift also wrote: 'If a Man would register all his Opinions upon Love, Politicks, Religion, Learning, and the like; beginning from his Youth, and so go on to old Age: What a Bundle of Inconsistencies and Contradictions would appear at last?' (*PW*, I, 244). There may not be a unified subject to reconstruct out of Swift's corpus. On Swift's inconsistency, see Patrick Reilly, *Jonathan Swift: The Brave Desponder* (Manchester, 1982), pp. 28, 120.

¹¹ See, for example, *Corr*, I, 212; *PW*, II, 13–14; VIII, 71–2; *Exam*, pp. 34–7 (*Examiner*, 16 November 1710); pp. 313–14 (*Examiner*, 22 March 1711); pp. 450–8 (*Examiner*, 31 May 1711).

He admits 'it seems every Man's Duty to chuse one of the two Sides', the course of 'the latter Cato', although 'before Things proceed to open Violence, the truest Service a private Man may hope to do his Country, is by unbiassing his Mind as much as possible, and then endeavouring to moderate between the Rival Powers' (*PW*, II, 2). The passages quoted here from the *Sentiments* may be Swift's oblique response to the 'Supplement' (dated 25 March 1703) of Charles Leslie's *The New Association. Part II*, an extremist High Church work in which Swift would have found his own nominally Whig *Discourse* of 1701 singled out for hostile attention. At the conclusion of the 'Supplement' Leslie looked with some charity on those good men who find themselves listed among the Whigs: 'Allowances must be made for the *Prejudices of Education, of Acquaintance and Friendship* contracted, which have *Byass'd* many *Well-meaning and Good Disposed Men* on the side of this, as of other *Wicked Parties*.' But the time has come for those good men to 'Examine the *Truth*' to 'shew themselves *Men*, to Examine *Impartially*; And then Judge as they find'.¹² Swift accepts in the *Sentiments* that it is 'every Man's Duty' to unbias his mind but to choose sides. Swift aligned with the Tories.

In his *Memoirs, Relating to that Change which happened in the Queen's Ministry in the Year 1710* (written in 1714 although not printed until 1765) Swift states that in 1702 'I first began to trouble myself with the difference between the principles of Whig and Tory.' The formulation of his position is careful:

I talked often upon this subject with Lord Sommers; told him, that, having been long conversant with the Greek and Roman authors, and therefore a lover of liberty, I found myself much inclined to be what they called a Whig in politics; and that, besides, I thought it impossible, upon any other principle, to defend or submit to the Revolution: But, as to religion, I confessed myself to be an High-churchman, and that I did not conceive how any one, who wore the habit of a clergyman, could be otherwise.

(*PW*, VIII, 120)

Despite the strong inclination he expressed to Somers to be a Whig in politics, and thus to make his adherence to the Revolution settlement unquestionable, the High Churchman attempts to vindicate himself in the *Memoirs* from the charge 'by several of those poor pamphleteers, who have blotted so much paper to shew their malice against me, that I was a favourer of the low-party'. He instances several tracts written

¹² Charles Leslie, *The New Association. Part II*, 'Supplement', p. 22, N.B.

(although not all 'published' as Swift misleadingly claims) in opposition to the Whigs 'during the highest dominion of that faction' – 'A Project for the Reformation of Manners, in a letter to the Countess of Berkeley; The Sentiments of a Church-of-England man; an Argument against abolishing Christianity; and, lastly, a Letter to a Member of Parliament against taking off the Test in Ireland' (*PW*, VIII, 122; see also *Corr*, I, 100). A Tory government propagandist between 1710 and 1714, Swift had credit and acquaintance with a remarkable number of important and prominent Jacobite Tories. His friends included men and women who were either committed or sometime Jacobites, among others, Francis Atterbury, John Barber, Lord Bathurst, Viscount Bolingbroke, Charles and Mary Caesar, Sir John Hynde Cotton, Lord Lansdowne, the Duke of Ormonde, the Earl of Orrery and the second Earl of Oxford.¹³ Swift wrote to Alexander Pope in 1723: 'I have often made the same remark with you of my Infelicity in being so Strongly attached to Traytors (as they call them) and Exiles, and State Criminalls' (*Corr*, II, 464; a passage omitted in Pope's own texts of the correspondence). During the Hanoverian period Swift was a bitter, public critic of Whig political measures, especially of the government's Irish and ecclesiastical policies. Yet in his post-1710 correspondence he professed to have always been a member of the Whig party in politics.¹⁴ The inquest into his party-political identity imagined in *The Life and Genuine Character of Doctor Swift* is in disagreement about him:

He was an *honest man* I'll swear ---:
 Why Sir, I differ from you there,
 For, I have heard another Story,
 He was a most *confounded Tory* ---!

(*Poems*, II, 547)

Historical criticism of Swift's writings seeks to disclose the meanings of a particular text at the moment of its composition and reception, and needs to register the full complexity of contemporary polemical and ideological contexts within which Swift's texts and statements are to be situated and their meanings determined. It is my contention that the current received views of Swift as a Whig or at least an Old Whig (an

¹³ See, for example, the list of persons in Swift's letter to Mrs Barber of 23 February 1731, *Corr*, III, 439–40.

¹⁴ For descriptions of himself as a Whig to Whig correspondents see: *Corr*, I, 359 (27 May 1713, to Richard Steele); II, 236 (22 December 1716, to Archbishop King); III, 138 (7 July 1726, to Thomas Tickell); III, 484 (27 July 1731, to the Countess of Suffolk); IV, 100 (8 January 1733, to Lady Elizabeth Germain); IV, 230 (23 March 1734, to Francis Grant). And see *Corr*, IV, 346 (8 June 1735, to Lady Elizabeth Germain).

identity Swift liked to project from time to time) and as a non-Jacobite Tory are oversimplifications of a complex and extremist political writer. Despite the Whig associations and influences of his period in the household of Sir William Temple, and of his early political career and intellectual inheritance, Swift may be recognized as, ontologically, a 'naturalized' Tory of the Queen Anne and Hanoverian period. The consonance of Swift's political and ecclesiastical attitudes with identifiable Tory party-political positions can be noted in his attack on Dissent and occasional conformity in *A Tale of a Tub* (1704); in his hostility to the Union with Scotland expressed, for example, in his 'Verses Said To Be Written on the Union' (1707); in his support for the Lower House of Convocation; in his commitment to an exclusive Anglican monopoly of public office and resistance to any extension of religious toleration; in his hostility to Protestant immigration and the Naturalization Act; in his support for a non-interventionist foreign policy; and revealingly, in his animus against the Dutch.

On the decisive question of political obligation, Swift's official ideological position is that the private subject owed allegiance and passive obedience to the powers-that-be – the sovereign legislature of king in possession with the consent of parliament. He propounds this conservative quietism in letters to friends suspected of Jacobitism, such as Alexander Pope, Knightley Chetwode and Thomas Sheridan (*Corr*, II, 213; II, 384; III, 67). The *Sentiments* affirms that it is not lawful to resist the legislative power which is 'absolute and unlimited' (*PW*, II, 16, 23). This view has impeccable High Church Tory polemical provenance.¹⁵ Swift's doctrine of unlimited passive obedience to the legislature of king, lords and commons in settled possession of the government according to present law in force aligns him with the contemporary view influentially expounded by the High Churchman and former nonjuror William Higden against Jacobite indefeasible divine hereditary right doctrine and Whig contractual resistance theory.¹⁶ As the paper war occasioned by Higden's *A View of the English*

¹⁵ See, for example, Charles Leslie, *The Case of the Regale and of the Pontifical Stated* (n.p., 1700), pp. 127–8: 'Civil Government, which it is Necessary shou'd be Absolute and Un-Controulable; as the Supreme Power is in all Governments, wherever it is Lodg'd, whether in One, or in Many . . . The Supreme Legislative Power cannot Make it self not to be Absolute.'

¹⁶ Swift possessed a copy of Higden's *A View of the English Constitution, with Respect to the Sovereign Authority of the Prince, and the Allegiance of the Subject, &c. The Third Edition. With a Defence of the View, by way of Reply to the several Answers that have been made to it* (London, 1710); see LeFanu, p. 20; SC, no. 423. Higden's work went through several editions and prompted attacks and defences. For witness of Higden's influence see: BL Add. MSS, 45,512, fols. 192–3 (Robert Nelson collection); Charles Leslie, *A Battle Royal Between Three Cocks of the Game Mr. Higden,*

Constitution, with Respect to the Sovereign Authority of the Prince, and the Allegiance of the Subject (1709) and his *Defence* (1710) makes clear, this Swift–Higden view is ideologically neither Jacobite nor Revolution Whig. It regards post-Revolution government as a legal settlement and prescribes submission to the established legislature. Higden's case of allegiance, the Jacobite Tory Thomas Hearne remarked, 'resolves all into Possession, and makes all Usurpers have a title to Allegiance'.¹⁷ While it provoked Jacobite legitimists, Higden's theory hardly satisfies Revolution Whigs, for it leaves a residual ambiguity about the constitutional legality of the Revolution itself and continues to insist on the Anglican Tory doctrine of non-resistance.

In the *Sentiments*, Swift contrives to suture adamant adherence to the Tory doctrine of absolute non-resistance with acquiescence in the cessation of James II's right at the Revolution in 1689. Swift's Tory politics are disclosed in his desire in the argument of the *Sentiments* to preserve intact the doctrine of absolute non-resistance, that under no 'Pretence whatsoever' was it 'lawful to resist the supreme Magistrate' (*PW*, II, 16). The Church-of-England Man argues that for most subjects the question of passive obedience is not concerned in the events of 1688–9. As for the 'Abdication of King James' which nonjurors regard as 'forcible and unjust, and consequently void in it self', the Church-of-England Man thinks 'a Man may observe every Article of the *English Church*, without being in much Pain about it'. Whether James II's 'Removal were caused by his own *Fears*, or other Men's *Artifices*' (there is an innuendo against 'the Prince of *Orange*' in the passage), it was the supposition of 'the Throne to be vacant, which was the Foot the Nation went upon' at the Revolution (*PW*, II, 20). The Tory High Churchman, Henry Sacheverell, had made the same insistence in the notorious sermon, *The Perils of False Brethren both in Church and State* (1709) which had provoked a Whig government prosecution:

How often must they be told, that the *King Himself* solemnly *Disclaim'd* the Least Imputation of *Resistance* in his *Declaration*; and that the *Parliament* declar'd, That they set the *Crown* on his *Head*, upon no other *Title*, but that of the *Vacancy of the Throne*? And did they not Unanimously condemn to the *Flames*, (as it justly Deserv'd) that *Infamous Libel*, that would have *Pleaded* the

Hoadley, *Hottentote. As to the State of Nature and of Government* ... appended to *The Finishing Stroke* ... (London, 1711), pp. 125–239.

¹⁷ Thomas Hearne, *Remarks and Collections of Thomas Hearne*, edited by C. E. Doble, Oxford Historical Society, 11 vols. (Oxford, 1885–1921), II, 297 (2 November 1709). See also II, 284, 290, 293, 398; III, 93.

Title of Conquest, by which *Resistance* was suppos'd? So *Tender* were they of the *Regal Rights*, and so averse to infringe the least Tittle of Our *Constitution!*¹⁸

When in polemical combat with Whig ideologists, Jacobites as well as conforming Tories insisted that the Convention in 1689 went upon the supposition of vacancy in the throne and abdication, not the principle of resistance and deposition.¹⁹ In the Church-of-England Man's casuistical account of James's 'Abdication' or 'Departure', which preserves the Church party principle of passive obedience, Swift is officially subscribing to that contemporary conservative Anglican Tory interpretation of the events of 1688–9 which claimed that James had not been forcibly resisted by his subjects.²⁰ Tories who conformed to the Revolution settlement could be discomfited by the rigorous legalism of nonjurors, who argued that only the king, lords and commons in parliament could make and repeal law and that the Convention at the Revolution which transferred the crown did not constitute the supreme legislature. When directly confronting the problem of the legality of the deposition and alteration of the succession in the *Sentiments* (*PW*, II, 21–3) and in the *Examiner* (*Exam*, pp. 5, 317), Swift capitulates to a Grotian conservative natural rights position of resistance *in extremis* – that non-resistance is the rule but an exception can be allowed in an extreme case of necessity.

Despite Swift's compliance with the Revolution settlement and his recorded opposition to a popish successor to the crown of England, he can be legitimately understood in various places to be saying what some Jacobite political writers were saying. This does not make Swift a Jacobite, of course, but it does reveal him to be a more unsettling, less domesticated political animal than the conservative Old Whig repre-

¹⁸ Henry Sacheverell, *The Perils of False Brethren both in Church and State: Set forth in a Sermon Preach'd before The Right Honourable, The Lord-Mayor, Aldermen, and Citizens of London, at the Cathedral-Church of St. Paul, On the 5th of November, 1709* (London, 1709; reprinted by The Rota at the University of Exeter, 1974), pp. 20–1.

¹⁹ See, for example, Charles Leslie, *A View of the Times, Their Principles and Practices in The Rehearsals*, second edition, 6 vols. (London, 1750), I, 14–15; II, 94, 108, 126–7; V, 256–7, 262; Leslie, *The Best Answer ...* (London, 1709), pp. 1–2; Leslie, *Best of All ...* (London, 1709), pp. 12–13, 18; [Matthias Earbery], *The Universal Spy or, The Royal Oak Journal Reviv'd* no. 9 (2 September 1732), Public Record Office, State Papers Domestic (hereafter cited as PRO SP) 36/28, fols. 90–1.

²⁰ For Anglican Tory argument, see Mark Goldie, 'Edmund Bohun and *Jus Gentium* in the Revolution Debate, 1689–1693', *The Historical Journal*, 20 (1977), 569–86; Goldie, 'The Revolution of 1689 and the Structure of Political Argument: An Essay and an Annotated Bibliography of Pamphlets on the Allegiance Controversy', *Bulletin of Research in the Humanities*, 83 (1980), 473–564; Goldie, 'The Political Thought of the Anglican Revolution', in *The Revolutions of 1688*, edited by Robert Beddard (Oxford, 1991), pp. 102–36.