

# A Rhetorical Convergence: Rump Ballads and Official Propaganda (1660-1663)

Benjamin Cohen

In October 1649, following the defeat of King Charles I in the English Civil War (1642-1649) and his execution, a series of republican regimes ruled England. In 1653 Oliver Cromwell's Protectorate regime overthrew the Rump Parliament and governed England until his death in 1659. Cromwell's regime proved fairly stable during its six year existence despite his ruling largely through the powerful New Model Army. However, the Protectorate's rapid collapse after Cromwell's death revealed its limited durability.

England experienced a period of prolonged political instability between the collapse of the Protectorate and the restoration of monarchy. Fears of political and social anarchy ultimately brought about the restoration of monarchy under Charles I's son and heir, Charles II in May 1660. The turmoil began when the Rump Parliament (previously ascendant in 1649-1653) seized power from Oliver Cromwell's ineffectual son and successor, Richard, in spring 1659. England's politically powerful army toppled the regime in October, before the Rump returned to power in December 1659. Ultimately, the Rump was once again deposed at the hands of General George Monck in February 1660, beginning a chain of events leading to the Restoration.<sup>1</sup> In the following months Monck pragmatically maneuvered England toward a restoration and a political

---

<sup>1</sup> The Rump Parliament refers to the Parliament whose membership was composed of those Parliamentarians that remained following the expulsion of members unwilling to vote in favor of executing Charles I and establishing a commonwealth (republic) in 1649.

situation that made Charles II's triumphal return to London May 29<sup>th</sup> 1660 all but inevitable.

The power dynamics and tensions of the post-Restoration settlement can be understood through a comparison of the two emerging centers of power: the conservative upper-class proponents of the Restoration and the monarchy itself. The unofficial propaganda of Charles II's ultra-conservative, elite supporters, the dominant force in the Cavalier Parliament (1661-1679), and works sanctioned by the King himself during the 1660s present invaluable resources for understanding the post-Restoration political statement. Comparing these works sheds light on Charles's initial goals in 1660 and how conflict and compromise with Parliament affected his political ambitions and public presentation in the following years.

The predominance of the positions revealed in tracts produced for an elite audience in 1660-1663 in shaping post-Restoration power demonstrates the growing ascendancy of this socio-political group. The power of the conservative elite steered Charles II away from the promises of national reconciliation he issued in the months leading up to his Restoration in 1660. Printed works from this period illustrate the shift in Charles II's official rhetoric from the language of moderation toward the rigidly conservative political and religious line of his new power base.

During the months surrounding the Restoration in April/May 1660, a large number of publications known as 'Rump Ballads' were composed and later assembled in a 1662 compilation. Scholars dispute whether the Rump Ballads possessed popular currency or represented pervasive attitudes. Social and cultural historian Mark Jenner depicts the Rump Ballads as a manifestation of a manufactured popular conservatism.<sup>2</sup> Angela McShane, in her work on the material culture of early English popular politics, has developed a contrasting view of the ballads as an upper-class satire of the popular press.<sup>3</sup> While bodily humor and abusive language toward perceived religious and political enemies permeate the majority of the Ballads, it would be anachronistic to impose modern or Victorian cultural standards on them and interpret this

---

<sup>2</sup> Mark Jenner, "The Roasting of the Rump: Scatology and the Body Politic in Restoration England," *Past and Present*, 1, no. 177 (2002): 90-107, <http://past.oxfordjournals.org/content/177/1/84> (accessed December 12, 2012).

<sup>3</sup> Angela McShane, "Debate-The Roasting of the Rump," *Past and Present*, 1, no. 196 (2007): 253-272, <http://past.oxfordjournals.org/content/196/1/253> (accessed December 12, 2012).

tactlessness as a sign of the works' low social origins or as an attempt to appeal to lower-class sensibilities.<sup>4</sup>

Religion and unflinching support for monarchy represented the most significant factor in how the Rump Ballads' authors differentiated themselves from not only republicans, but also Presbyterian Royalists and those who had backed Charles largely out of opportunism. While most English people could not sincerely identify themselves with the deeply conservative Cavaliers' twenty years of unbroken loyalty to the Royalist cause, most still possessed deeply conservative religious views. England (particularly outside of London) continued to have a sizable conservative Anglican majority.<sup>5</sup> Despite their potential appeal to much of the population, members of the socio-economic elite composed these ballads, which would have likely only been accessible to the wealthy and educated. Furthermore, since this particular segment of society would later dominate the Parliamentary politics of the Cavalier Parliament under Charles II the opinions of this social stratum must be accorded particular significance.

The similarities in sentiments expressed in the Cavalier Parliament to the positions espoused in the ballads show a common ideology between the authors of the ballads and the social constituency that would dominate Charles II's Parliament. The Rump Ballads' vitriolic discourse concerning the destruction of the Church and the establishment of a Presbyterian and Independent clergy strongly resembled the spirit of the rigidly anti-nonconformist bills (known collectively as the Clarendon Code) that the Parliament would later pass in the early 1660s.

The language of the Rump Ballads radically differed from the conciliatory tone found in the officially sanctioned propaganda that Charles II and his press agent, Roger L'Estrange, published in the months leading up to Charles's return to London in late May 1660.

---

<sup>4</sup> The bawdy verse of contemporary elite poets such as the Earl of Rochester readily demonstrate the perils of applying modern associations between class, behavior, and culture to seventeenth century works. See John Wilmot, Earl of Rochester, 'A Satyr on Charles II', <<http://andromeda.rutgers.edu/~jlynch/Texts/charles2.html>> (4 Apr. 2012).

<sup>5</sup> The term Cavalier originally referred to the most fervent supporters of Charles I during the English Civil War. Cavalier continued to be applied to ultra-Royalists after Charles I's execution and particularly referred to Royalists of high social status; The Anglican Church or Church of England was England's state-sponsored church before the Royalist defeat in the Civil War. After the war, England adopted Presbyterian and Independent models of church governance. The Restoration of the Anglican Church (headed by the king) constituted a consistent plank in the Royalist program. See Tim Harris, *Restoration* (2006), 46-67.

However, as widespread non-Anglican support for the Restoration settlement became increasingly unrealistic, a conservative religious settlement took shape and official propaganda shifted away from its moderate position on religion and increasingly resembled the Cavalier line. As early as 1661 official propaganda had retreated from any suggestion of toleration or a more flexible latitudinarian church settlement as hinted at in the April 14<sup>th</sup>, 1660 Declaration of Breda's support for a potential "liberty to tender consciences."<sup>6</sup>

Exploring this shift represents a powerful method to retroactively examine official late-Interregnum rhetoric.<sup>7</sup> Charles's reasons for aligning his policies with those of the Cavalier Parliament cannot be directly determined due to the opacity of royal governance and all governments' (particularly monarchies) tendency to retroactively depict new policies as extensions of old ones. Still, it appears that Charles tactically abandoned his religious policies once it became clear that toleration would not be a necessary or profitable measure. Charles instead used an orthodox religious settlement to bargain with Parliament on revenues, the Acts of Indemnity and Oblivion, and subsequent land settlements that he considered substantially more important for maintaining his rule. The royal propaganda's clear willingness to make dramatic shifts in rhetoric shows that Charles initially postured himself to pursue an unrealistic policy based on assumptions developed on the basis of his father's reign and then subsequently revised it to reflect new realities. Following his failure to engage Presbyterian royalism, he reneged on most of his earlier rhetoric and instead focused on building political capital in a predominantly conservative and Anglican Parliament. He used this goodwill to secure the passage of acts that Parliamentarians found lacking or distasteful.

Analyzing discrepancies between works apparently written by Cavaliers for Cavaliers and the more widely distributed royal proclamations and works of official propagandist Roger L'Estrange creates a useful framework to investigate various aspects of early Restoration politics. The differences between Cavalier Rump Ballads and early government propaganda and the rapid shift in Charles's positions in official proclamations intended to pressure Parliament and inform the public of the king's positions shed light on the relationship between King

---

<sup>6</sup> Charles II, *His Majesties Declaration from Breda in Holland*, April 14, 1660, retrieved through Early English Books Online (EEBO) [Wing C2985]. Latitudinarian church settlements advocated religious policies that would accommodate a wider range of Protestant religious beliefs (Presbyterian, possibly some Independents) within English law and the Church of England.

<sup>7</sup> Interregnum refers to the period between the execution of Charles I in 1649 and Charles II's restoration in 1660.

and Parliament. This emerging interplay between Charles and the conservative elite also marks the beginning of the rollback of popular political participation in an era of growing elite domination in politics. A detailed reading of Rump Ballads and official publications allows for an effective commentary on the veracity of Charles's 1660 self-characterization and the power dynamics between the King and Parliament.

Historians have almost universally regarded the Restoration as a popular event.<sup>8</sup> However, the extent to which popular or elite sentiment shaped the subsequent events of the early 1660s has received little attention. Exploring how official propaganda differed from the Cavalier line offers insight into which social groups and views shaped the Restoration's religious and political settlements. Comparing the rhetoric of official and unofficial Royalism and the resulting legislative outcomes creates a vivid image of how shifting power dynamics within England altered the line of official propaganda, particularly regarding religion.

The language of the Rump Ballads was inflammatory and deeply embittered. The ballads employed divisive religious, class, and political rhetoric in stark contrast to Charles's conciliatory 1660 propaganda. Charles's propaganda attempted to appeal to a more diverse base of support through offering widely agreeable promises like a return to peace and order. It also attacked only the most unpopular aspects of the Interregnum, particularly the breakdown of law and order during 1659-1660. L'Estrange attempted to paint the Rump as a lunatic fringe, "*that, by an Insolence, praevious to the murther of his Sacred Majesty, threw out the major party of their Fellow-Members*" in no way representative of Parliament or the nation at large.<sup>9</sup> Depicting the Rump as a non-representative lunatic fringe also played into royal propaganda's attempts to appeal to a variety of key interest groups in 1660. To the extent that such works appealed to or needed to appeal to a mass audience (the objective conditions at the time in London likely bad enough on their own to prompt demands for a new government), they targeted individuals within religious and political constituencies which Charles's regime-in-exile viewed as potentially receptive to a restoration. It remains unclear whether this early rhetoric represented a sincere attempt to build the widest possible base of support and governing consensus (which in itself would not be without advantages for the King in subsequent Parliaments) or a cynical ploy to

---

<sup>8</sup> George Southcombe, "What was Restored in 1660?" *Restoration Politics, Religion and Culture*, (Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 7; Tim Harris, *Restoration*, (New York: Penguin Books, 2005), 43.

<sup>9</sup> Roger L'Estrange, *Rump Enough*, 1660, 1-6, retrieved through EEBO (Wing L1300).

smooth England's transition from a Commonwealth partially under martial law back to a monarchy through false promises.<sup>10</sup>

The perfusion of intolerant, poor-fearing, and politically vengeful language in Alexander Brome's comprehensive 1662 collection of the Rump Ballads make the ballads inherently unpalatable to many groups (almost certainly all minorities) within London's population, particularly Presbyterians. However, this does not necessarily mean that the tone of the Rump Ballads could not have appealed to a lower and middling sort audience just as hateful of nonconformists and latitudinarianism as the ruling class, as bitter over the eleven year Interregnum, and as fearful that people of their own socio-economic class would upset the social balance.<sup>11</sup> Nonetheless, to fully utilize the Rump Ballads as an analytical tool one must go beyond finding which audiences they *may* have appealed to and determine whom they were written for and which people actually read them.

Examining the content and context of Brome's collection of Rump Ballads confirms the works' uncompromisingly Cavalier tone. While the government actively pursued a general amnesty through the Acts of Oblivion and Indemnity at the time of Brome's 1662 publication, the chosen works show a clear scorn not only for committed Republicans and opponents of Charles I in the Civil Wars, but also those perceived to have wavered in their support for Royalism. Brome implies that those who shifted their support back to the King in 1659-1660 or on the eve of the Restoration cannot be trusted and may still harbor ill-will toward the monarchy. He backhandedly extolled, "...we have liv'd to that day, that there is no Cavalier, because there is nothing else, and 'tis wondrous happy to see how many are his Majesties Faithfull Subjects, who were ready to hang the authors of these ballads." Using this language Brome identifies himself and the ballads with the Cavalier cause while attacking those whom he sees as opportunistic or uncommitted Royalists.<sup>12</sup>

Nonetheless, Brome's introduction includes no outright criticism of the King's policy, instead wishing him well in his hopes that "no one Enemy lives unreconciled," characteristically adding "nor any false Friend be undiscovered."<sup>13</sup> Since he and other likeminded Royalists would have doubtlessly found it unseemly to criticize the monarch, his

---

<sup>10</sup> Commonwealth was an English term for a non-monarchical government, essentially equivalent to the term republic.

<sup>11</sup> A term used to refer to England's seventeenth century proto-middle class. The middling sort largely consisted of tradesmen, artisans, and small-scale merchants.

<sup>12</sup> Alexander Brome, "Introduction" in *Rump, or, An exact collection of the choicest poems and songs relating to the late times by the most eminent wits from anno 1639 to anno 1661*, 1662, A4-A5, retrieved through EEBO (Wing B4851).

<sup>13</sup> Brome, "Introduction", A5.

less-than-subtle grumbings indicate both an awareness of official policy and an awareness that his own views did not entirely conform to his monarch's.

Even ballads complimentary to those who helped bring about the Restoration show a degree of skepticism toward anyone associated with a post-Regicide regime. One ballad compares General Monck to Saint George slaying the dragon of the Rump. Though superficially complimentary the work implies a certain amount of ineffectual buffoonery on Monck's part. Monck knocks down "men, women, posts, and gates" before failing to kill the dragon through force of arms until he "shot at him [the Rump/dragon] a flaming Letter" and "wipe'd the Rump away with a Paper."<sup>14</sup> Emphasizing Monck's invitation of Charles to return and Charles's support among London's populace, rather than Monck's direct actions as the cause of the Restoration reflects the Cavalier contempt for neutrals. This treatment of the universally lauded figure of George Monck suggests that the Ballads' authors and readership existed outside of the conciliatory strain of thought that Monck epitomized.

Charles' propaganda pieces focus on so-called fanatics, suggesting that the regime's main opposition came from radical Independents and sectarians. In contrast, the Rump Ballads direct their vitriol almost exclusively toward the Presbyterians and the religious settlement and church reforms which Parliament instituted in the late 1640s.<sup>15</sup> Their writings pay far less attention to the more recent half-decade long Cromwellian religious settlement or popular perceptions of an alarming growth in sectarianism. As with politics, the Cavalier authors of the Rump Ballads re-fought the religious battles of the 1640s. Despite England not having had a Presbyterian religious settlement since the end of Second Civil War in 1649, the Rump Ballads seem more intent on wiping out the last twenty years of English history than emphasizing the present or any prospect of compromise.

References to wrongs going back to the early Civil War appear in works originating from the 1659-1661 period. One 1660 song expresses anger about how under the Commonwealth "The Orthodox Clergy were forc'd to fly," "guilty of Popery the Book of Common Prayer was

---

<sup>14</sup> "Sir Eglamor and the Dragon" in Brome, *Rump Ballads*, Vol. 1, 371-374. This verse, and the others appearing in this paper, were written anonymously and collected by Brome in *Rump Ballads*.

<sup>15</sup> Independency was a loosely defined religious movement that grew out of 1640s Puritanism and was the dominant religious ideology under Oliver Cromwell in the 1650s. Break away Protestant sects proliferated between ~1640 and 1660 and became a source of scorn and concern for a large portion of English society.

damn'd/and with all kinds of News-books the Churches were cram'd," and "the Ancient Order of Bishops went down."<sup>16</sup> It then bemoans how "In whole stead we planted *Elders and Presbyters*" and later mixes its criticism of the Presbyterian religious settlement with religious and political contempt for how English Presbyterians "combin'd with the *Scots* to bring in a *Directory*."<sup>17</sup> These grievances epitomize the virulent anti-Presbyterian sentiments that widely informed the religious opinions of the Rump Ballads. The ballads make few if any references to fanatics, sectarians, Quakers, Anabaptists, Fifth-Monarchists, or any of the other groups that stoked public anxieties in 1659-1660. Instead, the Ballads consistently suggest that Presbyterians and to a lesser extent Puritans and Independents destroyed England's church and remain the foremost threat to the true religion.

This lack of engagement with recent developments is the most striking feature of even 1659-1661's ballads. Many comments in the ballads could have originated just as easily in 1651 as 1660. This importantly reveals that Cavaliers at least initially had no interest in restoring England in the context of its 1660 reality, but instead wished to return to the pre-1642 status quo.

Though not quite as reactionary as the ballads' religious views, their political mindset remained firmly focused on regicide and dispossession of Royalist property. Unlike contemporary complaints over the Rump's inability to enforce the laws or maintain the level of stability needed for prosperous trade, the ballads' particular scorn for the Rump stemmed from the fact that it constituted a direct continuation of the Parliament of the Regicide. The particular emphasis on punishing "that Assembly that did maintain/ 'T'was lawful to kill their Sovereign" reflects a view that the Regicide still constituted the single most critical political issue in 1660.<sup>18</sup> The verses' particularly focus their scorn on Generals Lambert and Fleetwood, Henry Marten, Henry Vane, the preacher Hugh Peters, and others who voted for or whom the authors perceived as facilitating the execution of their king. This similarly backward-looking near obsession with the Regicide, undoubtedly an incredibly traumatic event to any Royalist, may indicate an unwillingness to accept that a king's own people could depose and murder him, and furthermore that a reasonably stable regime (the Cromwellian Protectorate) could emerge in his absence. The focus on past wrongs also substantially explains Brome's deep displeasure with the generosity of the King's amnesty and the less than complete restoration of the political and property status quos.

---

<sup>16</sup> "The Rump Served with a Grand Sallet" in Brome, *Rump Ballads*, Vol. 2, 119-125.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, 119-125.

<sup>18</sup> "Arsy Versy, or the Second Martyrdom of the Rump," in *Ibid.*, 53.



Though the viewpoints of the ballads have fairly consistent positions, one must explore the context from which they emerged and who made up their probable readership to determine their full significance. Assumptions of readers' suspicion and an overall defensiveness concerning the ballads' authorship and popular currency dominate Brome's introduction. This glaring sense of insecurity supports McShane's doubts over whether Rump Ballads circulated widely among a popular audience. It cannot be ruled out that Brome's statements may have simply reflected the concerns of a meticulous curator afraid that his readers would mistakenly assume that he wrote all the ballads himself. Given the anonymity of the works, stating in advance that the ballads 'came not hither all from one Author' seems quite reasonable.<sup>19</sup>

However, many of Brome's other claims appear unnecessary or highly evasive. His claim for "many Songs here, which were never before in Print" with tunes for each work to be sung, implies that his audience would have previous familiarity with the songs. However, this supposed familiarity makes his earlier warning that "if thou read these poor Ballads (and not sing them) the poor Ballads are undone' seem particularly unnecessary."<sup>20</sup> The statement juxtaposing the dubious-sounding assertion that "we need not tell you whose these are; but we have not subjoyned any Authore Names," insinuating that the audience would have supposedly had knowledge of the authors identities with the convenient adjunct that names should not be attached to works because "heretofore it was unsafe, and now the Gentlemen conceive it no so proper' further raises suspicions."<sup>21</sup> While one cannot necessarily levy a conclusive or specific charge on the basis of Brome's introduction alone, it nevertheless questions the veracity of his characterization of the book.

References to relatively obscure aspects of classical history and myth, long-form relatively recently published foreign literature and epics, Continental history, and the pervasive use of Latinate, Romance-derived, and to a lesser extent, Greek terms, appear throughout the ballads.<sup>22</sup> The

---

<sup>19</sup> Brome, *Rump Ballads*, "Introduction," A3.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, A3-A4.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, A4. Brome's statement "We need not tell you whose these are; but we have not subjoyned any Authore Names" contains space for interpretation and could also be potentially viewed as two clauses, one saying they feel no need to tell their audience the names because they find it improper and the other describing their resulting action. However, I have chosen interpret this as implying that the audience would largely already know and therefore was not at a great loss for not being told.

<sup>22</sup> Terms including: *cicatrize* [Lat./Esp.], *ephemerides* [Gr.], *anti-podean* [Gr.], *tergo mantica* [Lat./It.], *truss-a-fayle* [Fr.], *querpo model* [Esp.], etc.

ubiquity of this content strongly indicates that the author, or more likely authors, of the ballads came from educated backgrounds.<sup>23</sup>

While this does not preclude a less educated audience singing or reading these ballads, the authors' apparent facility in producing foreign words and references would have required a strong educational background.<sup>24</sup> Most would likely know the basic outlines of European heroic epics and well-known classical figures such as Caesar and Alexander the Great, whom General Monck is compared to in one work. This is likely due to expanded post-Renaissance reference to the ancient in cultural and governmental symbolism.<sup>25</sup> Still more people could likely identify references as classical or literary even if they did not understand their meaning. However, one has difficulty believing someone with a basic grammar school education would know 'Romes Sejanus' or 'Mesaleen,' let alone feel comfortable referring to them in his writing.<sup>26</sup>

Myriad references to foreign works such as Cervantes's *Don Quixote* and the writings of "Old Machiavel[*i*]" further increase the likelihood that the authors came from educated backgrounds. While Machiavelli and particularly *Don Quixote* could have had a degree of popular currency, an educated author would have been more likely to refer to them.<sup>27</sup> Similarly, references to "Orlando" and his sword "durindana" probably refer to one of two at the time recently published Italian epics and not what may have been a fairly well-known folk-story, which would have almost certainly used the Old French name of Roland for Charlemagne's paladin and Durendal for his sword.<sup>28</sup> Multiple

---

<sup>23</sup> The more recent Rump Ballads (Volume II) seem to have a far greater diversity of imagery and content than the historical ones.

<sup>24</sup> Whether words were being used simply to create rhymes (regularized endings doubtlessly contributed to the predominance of Spanish and Italian terms among Romance words) or for content is an essentially irrelevant distinction. Since, the poems have a basic coherency, for the author to have used these for whatever reason would have required a certain breadth and depth of knowledge that those with basic literacy would not have possessed.

<sup>25</sup> Brome, *Rump Ballads*, Vol. 2, 112, 60.

<sup>26</sup> Sejanus being a first century Praetorian Prefect accused of conspiring against Emperor Tiberius and 'Mesaleen' referring to Valeria Messalina the wife of Emperor Claudius.

<sup>27</sup> Brome, *Rump Ballads*, Vol. 2, 124-125, 128, 158.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, 48. The twelfth-century Old French epic, *The Song of Roland*, would have almost certainly entered English culture through the Normans. It seems likely that the terms 'Orlando' and 'durindana' come from either Boiardo's *Orlando Innamorato* or most likely Ariosto's *Orlando Furioso*, both published in the fifteenth century. It seems far more likely a person with little education would use the French terms than the Italian term, even if a popularized English version of Ariosto had existed.

references to the predominantly upper-class disease of gout further suggest that the Rump Ballads emerged from that cultural milieu.<sup>29</sup> While the density and relative obscurity of the songs' references convincingly suggests elite authorship, this would not in itself preclude a non-elite audience from singing or enjoying these works.

However, McShane's suggestion that contemporary observers did not regard the ballads as intended to be sung and ample textual evidence disputing the meaningfulness of Brome's tune recommendations suggest that the ballads lacked the potential to enter popular culture.<sup>30</sup> In addition to the multiple songs "to the tune of Cook Laurel" without consistent rhyme schemes, it also appears that Brome applies the assertion that a ballad should be "sung to the tune of the blacksmith" to more than a half dozen tunes all of which follow the same rhyme scheme. The suggestion that all authentically sung and more or less organically popular songs with the presumably common AAA/BBB/... rhyme scheme would be sung to the exact same tune is absurd.<sup>31</sup> Furthermore, in an era before the standardizing effects of widely available and consistently notated sheet music, it would be unthinkable that these songs would all be recognized by the same name among people of different social backgrounds, areas of London, and regions of England. If the Rump Ballads were ever sung they probably would not have spread widely among the general public because of these discrepancies.

Nonetheless, lack of tune did not necessarily exclude general public from reading Brome's book. However, the sheer size of the book ultimately constitutes a clear indication that the works' intended elite audience likely exclusively read Brome's publication. Short printed works such as pamphlets and newsheets may have cost only a few pence at most and likely stood within the reach of nearly all literate Englishmen.<sup>32</sup> Given the length of Brome's work and no references to the possibility of it being sold in broken-up sections or individual purchases of ballads, the

---

<sup>29</sup> Brome, *Rump Ballads*, Vol. 1, 135, Vol. 2, 44.

<sup>30</sup> Angela McShane, "Debate-The Roasting of the Rump," *Past and Present*, 260.

<sup>31</sup> Brome states the proper tune to accompany the printed lyrics at the beginning of most of the Rump Ballads. All songs which Brome claims should be sung to the "Tune of the Blacksmith" contain stanzas with three consecutive rhyming lines followed by a repeated verse (See Brome, *Rump Ballads*, Vol. 1: 336, 357 and Vol. 2: 1, 69, 89, 115, 119 for examples of ballads that Brome recommends singing to the "Tune of the Blacksmith").

<sup>32</sup> David Cressy, *England on Edge: Crisis and Revolution, 1640-42* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 299-300. Cressy anecdotally describes one or two pence in 1640 as being slightly greater than the price of a drink (drinking often being a necessity of life rather than a leisure activity during this time due to sub-sanitary urban water supplies).

purchase was likely a major investment beyond the reach of the vast majority of the English population.

Paper costs made up approximately three-fourths of total printing costs, furthering doubts that most Londoners possessed the discretionary income needed to afford Brome's nearly six-hundred-page work.<sup>33</sup> Few contemporary books with reliable retail price or price-per-page information possessed anything approaching the length of Brome's collection. Nonetheless, the per-page prices of shorter book-form compilations of poetry and verse put the price of Brome's collection well beyond the means of those outside of the upper classes or upper echelons of the emerging commercial classes. Most verse compilations during the late 1630s ran from about 0.6 to 1.0d per page.<sup>34</sup> Given this, and even assuming an economy of scale, Brome's collection may have cost in excess of sixty shillings (i.e. 360d).<sup>35</sup> Likewise, given the staggering risk and large capital investment a printer would have to undertake to sell even a modest run of these compilations, one probably could not acquire Brome's Rump Ballad collection from a bookseller on the open market. The opinions expressed in the ballads likely reached an exclusively elite audience, not because they would not have connected with a popular conservative base, but because the public simply could not afford Brome's collection.

Consequentially, the views expressed in the Rump Ballads appear to have been created by elites for elite consumption, providing insight into the positions and discontents of the Cavalier elite during this period. Though Brome himself appears to have never left England, a more comprehensive study could fruitfully explore whether the prolonged exile of many elite Royalists played a role in the 1660 Cavalier position's

---

<sup>33</sup> Joad Raymond, *Invention of the Newspaper*, (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2005), 233.

<sup>34</sup> 'd' was the symbol for pence at the time.

<sup>35</sup> Francis R. Johnson, "Notes on English Retail Book-Prices, 1550-1640," *Library 2*, no. 5: 83-112. Though both Cressy's estimate of equivalent value and Johnson's catalogues refer to a period preceding the Restoration by twenty years (I attempted to use similar works published in the late 1630s to the greatest extent possible), both refer to essentially the same period. Assuming print prices and cost of living increased due to inflation at comparable rates Cressy's comparison of print prices to that of a basic good would remain more or less applicable in 1660. While print did become cheaper and more widely available in the intervening years, this was likely due to a more open market, a wider availability of presses, and better distribution networks rather than a dramatic increase in the supply or price of paper. Therefore, despite the lack of data specifically pertaining to this period, it can still be assumed fairly conclusively that Brome's collection would have been prohibitively expensive to most.

apparent lack of engagement with recent events.<sup>36</sup> Given that these views likely represented the elites that would have predominated in the Cavalier Parliament, one may now examine the King's propaganda in comparison to these reactionary calls for a return to the conditions of 1640.

Charles' Declaration from Breda, the best known of his pre-Restoration communiqués, epitomizes the royal propaganda machine's efforts to build moderate support in April and May of 1660. Not only does it contain various widely agreed-upon generalities, but it targets key factions of potential supporters. Its promise of fair arbitration on the "many Grants and Purchases of Estates...made too and by many Officers and Soldiers, and others who are now possessed of the same... upon several Titles" intended to appeal to those who may have benefited from the republican regimes but have since grown dissatisfied.<sup>37</sup> The Declaration offer of a "Free and General pardon" available to "all our Subjects of what degree or quality soever... excepting onely such Persons as shall hereafter be excepted by *Parliament*" *constituted an attractive offer to many republicans given their status as traitors*. While this wording could have theoretically accommodated regicides within the amnesty, it remains unclear what levels of criminality most republicans expected Parliament to exclude from the amnesty. Nonetheless, the generous offer of amnesty in exchange for an oath of loyalty undoubtedly gave lower-ranking republican officeholders, New Model Army officers, and others a way to officially remove themselves from potential legal culpability and the threat of state violence under the new regime. Without amnesty, fear of retaliation could have pushed many former Commonwealth supporters to violence out of concern over the prospect of losing their lives and property should Charles succeed his father's throne.

Though they wrote for Parliamentary consumption, Charles's agents produced many copies of the Declaration for the general public. Though focusing largely on the concerns of the Parliamentary classes, gentry, and landholders, the Declaration shows some willingness to acknowledge the king's responsibility to the people at large. Charles's call for the "full satisfaction of all arrears due to the Officers and Souldiers of the Army, under the Command of General *Monck*" shows a keen interest in Londoners' complaints that military occupation had paralyzed commerce and economic activity within the city.<sup>38</sup> In satisfying the

---

<sup>36</sup> Roman Dubinski, "Brome, Alexander," in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2008, <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/3501>> (accessed December 14, 2013).

<sup>37</sup> Charles II, *Declaration From Breda*, April 14, 1660.

<sup>38</sup> Charles II, *A Proclamation Concerning His Majesties Gracious Pardon*, June 15, 1660, retrieved through EEBO (Wing C3254).

soldiers garrisoned in England's capital Charles would have likely also secured the support of a force that could assist in maintaining order in the period leading up and following his May 29<sup>th</sup> coronation.

Most famously the Declaration from Breda states "that no man shall be disquieted or called in question for differences of opinion in matters of Religion, which do not disturb the Peace of the Kingdom." Nonetheless, the offer of liberty of conscience made no effort to define what constituted a disturbance (a significant omission given that many at that time viewed Protestant nonconformity as inherently subversive). Furthermore, Charles creates no direct monarchical mechanism for defining the scope of amnesty, fostering equitable property distribution, or enforcing religious liberty. In fact he only promises that he will "consent to such an Act of Parliament" that would establish toleration and offer amnesty to anyone not retroactively labeled a criminal. He further declares that "grants Sales and Purchases [of land], shal be determined in Parliament." Despite creating a generous baseline framework for a new era, Charles left these bold proposals with no extra-Parliamentary enforcement mechanism.

Interpreting the lack of an enforcement mechanism depends on what intentions one ascribes to Charles at this time. This lack of an enforcement mechanism may be a calculated attempt to appear magnanimous and disarm potential opponents with full knowledge that a coming Royalist Parliament would never permit the enforcement of these policies. Or, Charles's desire for Parliamentary consent may have reflected a hope to form a broad base of support among Presbyterian Royalists and moderate Anglican Royalists within the Convention Parliament-elect and subsequent Parliaments. This pluralistic coalition could have endowed his policies with something resembling a popular mandate, though this did not happen due to the large Royalist majorities in the Convention Parliament and preponderance of reputedly more conservative Royalists in the Cavalier Parliament.

A distraught March 1661 letter addressed to King Charles from the Quaker Edward Borrough indicates that liberty of conscience probably never existed at all for Quakers, or likely for any radical religious movements. Certainly ten months after Charles took the throne, and a full two months before the convocation of the Cavalier Parliament, persecution had resumed in earnest. Bourrough's repeated and invariant use of the phrase "liberty of conscience" for an end to persecution constitutes a conscious allusion to Charles' previous statements.<sup>39</sup> Borrough further makes no reference to any intermission in the cycle of anti-Quaker persecution, and vigorously attacks the justification that

---

<sup>39</sup> Edward Borrough, *The case of free liberty of conscience in the exercise of faith and religion*, March 1661, 1-14, retrieved through EEBO (Wing B5986).

“Liberty of Conscience in Religion is inconsistent with the safety and peace of the King and these Kingdoms.”<sup>40</sup> The apparent government intransigence toward Borrough’s supplications likely implies that the King never entertained the possibility of providing more radical religious nonconformists the hinted at toleration.

It appears that Presbyterians, rather than Quakers and other Sectarians, were the intended recipients of Charles’s ultimately insincere offer of toleration. Sectarians made up only a small percentage of the population; most of their members came from low to middle socio-economic strata, and the rest of England almost unanimously reviled them. Moreover, the most dangerous of the Sectarians, the violently millenarian Fifth Monarchy men, likely existed beyond the pale of compromise and negotiation. Therefore, one can see no advantage in Charles ever applying toleration to Sectarians or even the staunch Independents strongly associated with the Cromwellian regime.

Charles instead attempted to appeal to Presbyterian Royalists based on their support for his father during the Second Civil War. L’Estrange’s mild rhetoric toward Presbyterians in 1660 illustrates a concerted attempt to curry their favor. A “fanatique” pro-Rump character’s claims that he “must... hinder an *Agreement* with the *King*’ *which* ‘The *Presbyterian party* (I’m afraid) enclines to’t.” The same republican states that “The *Cavalier* must be perswaded, that the *Presbyter* only designs to set up for himself” and that “The *Nation* is united gainst us; the *Presbyterian* *abhors* us, as much as the *Royal Party* does.”<sup>41</sup> This willingness to include Presbyterianism under the Royalist umbrella constituted a concerted effort to win over Presbyterian support. Unlike Cavalier depictions, in 1660 the royal propaganda machine attempted to paint Presbyterians as loyal allies, rather than the destroyers of monarchical prerogative and the True Religion. However, when Charles found himself dealing with a predominantly conservative Anglican Parliament with little Presbyterian support, he saw little reason to keep his promise of toleration (technically an acceptable act given his declaration’s vague wording). This placed the King essentially in line with ultra-Royalists regarding England’s religious settlement by 1661.

Charles’s late 1662 address “to his loving subjects” further proves the prospect of toleration offered in April 1660 to have been a highly-conditional and narrow mirage couched in language that could easily release him from offering liberty of conscience.<sup>42</sup> Charles

---

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*, 14.

<sup>41</sup> Roger L’Estrange, *Treason Arraigned*, 1660, 15, retrieved through EEBO (Wing L1318A).

<sup>42</sup> Charles II, *His Majesties Declaration to All His loving Subjects, December 26, 1662*, 8-16, retrieved through EEBO (Wing C2985).

vigorously defends the Act of Uniformity as necessary for national unity and explicitly notes the Declaration of Breda's exact language on toleration before launching into a point-by-point rebuke of those who claimed he had violated his word.<sup>43</sup> As he almost certainly intended through the language of the Declaration, Charles notes that no basis for toleration existed, "since that Parliament, to which those Promises were made in relation to an Act, never thought it fit to offer us any..."<sup>44</sup>

*Toleration discuss'd by Roger L'Estrange*, published in 1663, represents a far more codified version of the King's justifications for not allowing liberty of conscience. The work employs allegorical characters to illustrate "the Three Grand Parties, ORTHODOX, PRESBYTERIAN, and INDEPENDENT."<sup>45</sup> L'Estrange insists that toleration would ultimately result in "Our Churches Prophan'd; Monarchy Subverted; the Free-born People of *England* Pillag'd, and Enslav'd."<sup>46</sup> Furthermore, When given the example of France's Edict of Nantes, his orthodox character counters that no nation has "Toleration of *several sorts of Roman-Catholiques*; Neither do Those of the *Religion* admit of any *Sub-division* among *Themselves*... They have been often *Press'd* to't, and *Refus'd* it."<sup>47</sup> Rather than simply depicting the lack of toleration as a procedural matter due to Parliament's lack of taste for such a measure, by 1663 royal rhetoric outwardly declared that toleration would weaken English society. The passage of the 1661 Corporation Act requiring local officials to take Anglican Communion, the 1662 Quaker Act requiring oaths of allegiance for office holders, the 1662 Act of Uniformity making Anglican Book of Common Prayer Compulsory, and the 1664 Conventicle Act banning unsanctioned religious meetings all reflect this hardening of attitudes. After 1660 the monarchy not only increasingly saw no reason to grant toleration, but also began to adopt, or at the very least indulge the Cavalier Parliament's belief that nonconformity gravely threatened to the state.

Political conflicts over the Acts of Indemnity and Oblivion primarily resulted from a disjunction between the restored Charles's interest in preserving stability among the powerful (including large landholders in possession of confiscated estates) and his followers' desire for the King to restore their former properties. A 1661 work by

---

<sup>43</sup> The 1662 Act of Uniformity required officeholders and clergy to follow Anglican ceremony and the Anglican Book of Common Prayer.

<sup>44</sup> Charles II, *His Majesties Declaration to All His loving Subjects*, December 26, 1662, 8-9.

<sup>45</sup> Roger L'Estrange, *Toleration Discuss'd by Roger L'Estrange*, 1663, A3v, retrieved through EEBO (Wing L1315).

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid.*, 29.

<sup>47</sup> *Ibid.*, 103.



L'Estrange in response to a Cavalier publication decrying the government's unwillingness to restore the fortunes of loyal Cavaliers after "Twenty years persecution, to *Blood, Beggery, and Bondage*."<sup>48</sup> While claiming to sympathize with the grievances of afflicted Cavaliers by identifying himself as among their ranks, L'Estrange also stresses the Acts higher importance for preventing "MALICIOUS *Revival* of past differences" and "*burying of all Seeds of Future Discords*."<sup>49</sup> *Despite this clear strain of Royalist discontent in opposition to the King's policies*, Charles largely succeeded in ignoring these pressures. He managed to force the 1661 Acts upon which "our Quiet and Good depended" through a Parliament that would have preferred a bill more amenable toward the recovery of Royalist property.<sup>50</sup> In his recommendations on the Acts of Indemnity and Oblivion, Charles congratulates Parliament for having passed "some very good Bills" and explicitly states that "we cannot but tell you, that though we are enough concerned to expedite those Bills, We have no minde to pass them till the *Act of Indemnity* be likewise presented to Us."<sup>51</sup> This language and the implication that he could indefinitely delay the passage of bills popular among the Parliament demonstrate Charles's continued agency and ability to shape policy during the early Cavalier Parliament. While a considerable level of politicking and compromise surely occurred, it seems likely that Charles had sufficient constitutional recourse and political capital to get the laws he desired and hold up the passage of others that he opposed. Because of this, it appears that Charles willfully moved to these more conservative positions out of self-interest rather than coercion from his ultra-Royalist Parliament.

Nonetheless, the Cavalier and Convention Parliaments also had their own means of forcing the already conservative monarch to conform more closely to their brand of Royalism. Despite Charles's substantial and recently increased powers, he needed Parliamentary approval for revenues and depended on the Cavalier Parliament to confirm the various taxes and revenues passed in the earlier Convention Parliament.<sup>52</sup> While both King and Parliament had their respective paths for shaping policy, all of these trends point to politics occurring more exclusively at the elite

---

<sup>48</sup> Roger L'Estrange, *A caveat to the cavaliers, or, An antidote against mistaken cordials dedicated to the author of A cordial for the cavaliers*, 3, retrieved through EEBO (Wing L1213).

<sup>49</sup> *Ibid.*, 15.

<sup>50</sup> Charles II, *His Majesties Gracious Letter to the House of Commons To Pass the Bill For confirming the Act of Oblivion and Indemnity*, 1661, 5, retrieved through EEBO (Wing C3032).

<sup>51</sup> *Ibid.*, 5.

<sup>52</sup> Through the re-vesting of the militia under royal control, abolition of the enforcement mechanism of the Triennial act, and general abolition of the constraints that Charles I had been forced to agree to before the Civil War.

level (a trend further reinforced through attempts to reign in seditious behavior and the press) in the early 1660s.<sup>53</sup>

Charles's overall acceptance of Cavalier policies, except when considered contrary to stability or the continued flow of revenue, reflect some combination of an acceptance that conservative Anglicans constituted his powerbase, and would continue to for the foreseeable future, as well as a genuine ideological alignment with the loyal supporters of himself and his father. Like many of the Rump Ballads, the April 14<sup>th</sup> Declaration of Breda, despite being generally thought of in reference to 1660, very much appealed to a religio-political climate that had not existed in ten or fifteen years. In the absence of support from Presbyterians or more recently ascendant religious groups, Charles and the Cavalier Parliament went about more or less trying to restore the monarchy to its 1640 powers and to suppress religious sects, which they had less latitude to ignore once in power.

Both the verse ballads and widely published royal proclamations, despite canonical popularity in media, did not target the lower and middle social strata; they instead focused on reaching powerful pockets of elite interests. The Rump Ballads reflect the position of one of the most influential of those interest groups. While the Restoration may have been a popular event, Charles II seemed far more interested in attempting to generate support for his policies at the Parliamentary level than indirectly influencing politics through public opinion. Therefore, Rump Ballads and royal propaganda represent not opposing strains of thought, but a growing junction between two ideologically similar interests.

---

<sup>53</sup> Tim Harris, *Restoration*, Ch. 1.

## Sources

PRIMARY SOURCES<sup>54</sup>

- Brome, Alexander. *Rump, or, An exact collection of the choicest poems and songs relating to the late times by the most eminent wits from anno 1639 to anno 1661*. 1662.
- Burrough, Edward. *The case of free liberty of conscience in the exercise of faith and religion*. March 1661.
- Charles II. *A Proclamation Concerning His Majesties Gracious Pardon*. June 15, 1660.
- . *His Majesties Declaration from Breda in Holland*. April 14, 1660.
- . *His Majesties Declaration to All His loving Subjects, December 26, 1662*.
- . *His Majesties Gracious Letter to the House of Commons To Pass the Bill For confirming the Act of Oblivion and Indemnity*. 1661.
- Roger L'Estrange. *A caveat to the cavaliers, or, An antidote against mistaken cordials dedicated to the author of A cordial for the cavaliers*. 1661.
- . *Rump enough: or, Quaere for quaere, in answer to a pamphlet, entituled, No nev Parliament, or, Some quaeres, or considerations, humbly offered to the present Parliament-members*. 1660.
- . *Toleration Discuss'd by Roger L'Estrange*. 1663.
- . *Treason arraigned, in answer to Plain English; being a trayterous, and phanatique pamphlet, which was condemned by the Counsel of State, suppressed by authority; and the printer declared against by proclamation. It is directed to the Lord General Monck, and the officers of his army, &c.* 1660.

## SECONDARY SOURCES

- Cressy, David. *England on Edge: Crisis and Revolution, 1640-42*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Dubinski, Roman, ed. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2008. s.v. "Brome, Alexander." <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/3501> (accessed December 14, 2013).
- Harris, Tim. *Restoration*. New York: Penguin Books, 2005.

---

<sup>54</sup> Accessed through the database Early English Books Online.

- Jenner, Mark. "The Roasting of the Rump: Scatology and the Body Politic in Restoration England." *Past and Present*. 1. no. 177 (2002):84-120.<http://past.oxfordjournals.org/content/177/1/84> (accessed December 12, 2012).
- Johnson, Francis R. "Notes on English Retail Book-prices, 1550—1640." *Library*. 2. no. 5 (1950): 83-112.
- McShane, Angela. "Debate-The Roasting of the Rump." *Past and Present*. 1. no. 196 (2007): 253-272.  
<http://past.oxfordjournals.org/content/196/1/253> (accessed December 12, 2012).
- Raymond, Joad. *Invention of the Newspaper*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Southcombe, George, and Grant Tapsell. "What was Restored in 1660?" in *Restoration Politics, Religion and Culture*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.