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In the early months of 1660 many Englishmen were expecting news from abroad. For the first time since Charles I's execution in January 1649 there seemed to be a real possibility that his son might be recalled from exile. In September 1658 the Protector Cromwell had died; in May 1659 his son and successor had resigned the title, quite unequal to either the demands of high office or the challenge of ambitious army officers. Even as Richard Cromwell was drafting his resignation and the officers were squabbling among themselves at the prospect of spoil, the Rump, which had not met since 1653 when Oliver had declared the Protectorate, reassembled at Westminster. The succeeding Summer and Autumn were marked by increasing conflict between the restored members of the Rump and the Council of army officers, by devious political designs, uneasy truces, even an abortive royalist rising and then, in October, by an attempt of the officers to eject the Rump and rule on their own. By early Winter the members of the Rump, aided by divisions within the army, increasing popular discontent and a public distaste for military rule, gained the upper hand and reconvened. Not the least among the authors of the Rump's renewed good fortune was General Monck, commander of the army in Scotland, whose protests to his fellow officers, calls for a free parliament, and decision to bring his own forces south in order to secure civilian rule, had prompted the Council to withdraw the armed guards barring the doors of the House and permit the Rump to reassemble. In late December the Rump met; on 1 January Monck's troops crossed the border into England; in early February they and the General arrived in London. A few days later the members of the Rump were joined by the Secluded Members, those who had been barred from their seats in Pride's Purge for suspected monarchist leanings. In March this enlarged House dissolved itself and called new elections. The new parliament or convention, scheduled to meet late in April, was widely expected to call in the exiled Charles II.
There were still some Englishmen who hoped to revive the Commonwealth. In April General Lambert led a brief and unsuccessful last ditch defence of the republican cause. But he found few followers, even among his own troops. Most of his countrymen had come to distrust republican generals and to tire of political turmoil; they wanted peace and to achieve it they were willing to seek, or perhaps to settle for, the re-establishment of the old constitution. After all the changes of nearly twenty years the restoration of the crown now seemed to offer Englishmen the brightest, possibly the only, prospect of the stability and quiet they had newly learned to value. Monck, Parliament’s saviour from the north, by every account the only general officer still capable of commanding both the obedience of his soldiers and the respect of his compatriots, was the only likely or possible heir to the authority and position Cromwell had once enjoyed. And, as he refused to encourage those who talked of making him Protector, or even king, expectations were centred on young Charles II, living impecuniously, if not exactly quietly, in Brussels.

Whether Charles was to return to England, and if so upon what terms, were not matters to be settled by public debate. At the direction of Hyde (later Earl of Clarendon), the king’s chief minister-in-exile, agents were sent to negotiate secretly with men of influence, including Monck and even, at one point, Lambert. Still, not only great men were concerned for the future. The prospect of Charles’s restoration was a matter of interest to many; what word might come from his court was news eagerly awaited.

There were serious questions in the minds of Englishmen. What sort of man was the exiled king? They knew little about him. What were his views in matters of religion? Would he seek to impose them upon his subjects? Was he a just man? Did he respect the law? Was his a forgiving nature? Now he negotiated with men who had fought against his father and himself. Once restored might he or his followers insist upon revenge? Would he be willing to grant pardon, even favour, to his enemies? Would he agree to pay off army arrears? What terms could be arranged? Would he seek to reclaim royal lands, to restore church properties, to reward loyal Cavaliers who had lost or sold estates in his father’s cause? At whose expense? The prospect was not clear. Through the Winter and early Spring of 1659/60 writers in England addressed these questions. And among the tracts, pamphlets and broadsides which appeared in print were a number said to have been written
and, in some cases published, in France or Flanders, where the king was.

Such word as came, or was said to come, from abroad was not the king's. For the public Charles had nothing to say. He was repeatedly urged to speak out and on occasion drafts of proposed statements were drawn up. But the situation was uncertain and he knew that he had little to gain by making promises he might later have to retract. Until April, when he made his famous Declaration from Breda or, to be more exact, early May, when Sir John Grenville delivered it to the Convention at Westminster, he made no public or official statement.

The king himself did not speak, but others were eager to speak about and for him. The "news from abroad" which was sold on the streets of London was theirs. Some of the writers supported restoration, some warned against it. But whatever their various ends, they all spoke to the same purpose. They meant to persuade. Some of what was said was intended for men of affairs, who might expect to have a hand in shaping the prospective settlement. Some was addressed to a broader public who, though not directly involved in matters of state, might yet, if hostile, undermine the projected régime or, if enthusiastic, offer useful support. And some seemed designed for the king himself and his advisers, who might, through a telling argument in print, be brought to consider favourably one or another set of terms, political strategies or courses of action, or to reflect upon the hopes, concerns and apprehensions with which his subjects looked to his return.

The writers spoke in two ways; their "news" appeared in two shapes or forms. The first was that of a private letter, said to be from someone near the king, a privileged observer who might be thought to know the king's mind. The second was "official", a declaration, proclamation, speech or letter said to come from Charles himself. The claim to foreign provenance was plainly meant in all cases to lend weight and authority to what the writer had to say. But just how that claim was meant to be taken or read is not in any case so plain.

The private letters, of which there are some eight examples, are private only in the sense that they are not official. It is possible that some among them were in fact derived from private corres-

---

1 There were, in addition, the brief notices or news reports printed in the various weekly intelligencers.
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pondence, but the printed versions of the letters were all edited, if not actually written, for publication. With one exception the writers are anonymous. This exception is said to be by a M. de l'Angle, minister of the Protestant church at Rouen who may be identified as Samuel de l'Angle, pastor of the city's Reformed congregation. But five other writers are identified only by initials, which cannot certainly be traced to any known active political figures or writers of the day. Still, these writers, if anonymous, did not wish to remain entirely unknown. Two describe themselves as persons of quality, two as persons of honour, and a fifth as a person of "great honour". A seventh author, lacking initials, declares himself to be "neer attendant upon the king's person". Further, though again no names are revealed, two of the eight letters are addressed to noblemen ("My Lord"), three to "a friend", one to "a private friend", and one to "a person of honour in England". It is plain that these writers meant to be considered as men of status and privilege whose views might be regarded by readers as informed, trustworthy and deserving of respect.

Why, then, the masked identities? It was not really dangerous in the early months of 1660 for Englishmen to speak or write their minds and many did. In any case, surely anyone writing from abroad had already, in seeking exile, declared his point of view? Why not name the writer and stamp the letter authentic? Perhaps the initials and the descriptive identities may be said to argue for the "private" origins of the letters, but they do not lend credence to the claim that what they report is in fact word "from abroad".

Were the letters written abroad? Four of the eight were said to have come from Brussels, one from Flanders, one from Breda and two from France. But, with one possible exception, there is little in the substance of any of them to suggest that their writers had special knowledge of either the king or his affairs. Their interests and concerns appear to be those of Englishmen in England rather

---

2 A Letter Farther and More Fully Evidencing the Kings stedfastnesse in the Protestant Religion, Written by Mounsier de l'Angle Minister of the Protestant Church at Rouven in France to a Friend of his in London (London, 1660); the copy in the Thomason collection (British Library, London) is dated 2 June, but the letter itself appears to predate the Restoration. The printed version is in English. De l'Angle, a nephew of the noted theologian and controversialist Pierre du Moulin, was also himself active in the controversies which divided the French Reformed church in the late 1630s. See Brian G. Armstrong, Calvinism and the Amyraut Heresy (Madison, Wisconsin, 1969), pp. 92, 96, 111.
than of exiles abroad. The tone of their comment is curiously impersonal and, for what purports to be private correspondence, formal; their arguments lack the force and energy one might expect from men really in the king's circle; their accounts lack particularity of detail and observation. It seems likely that the anonymity of the authors is meant to cover the simple fact that they were not, as they claimed, abroad at all. At least six of the letters, probably all eight, were printed in London; at least six were very likely written there as well.

This may be beside the point. For it appears that, except for the de l'Angle letter, which may or may not actually have been written by the French clergyman to whom it is attributed, the styling of a letter from "abroad" was meant as a matter of form rather than description. It appears that the claim to foreign provenance was made in a figurative not a literal sense. It was meant and employed, not to establish the authenticity of what might be called the author's credentials, but instead as an invention or fiction intended to lend an air of significance to what he said. If the device was transparent it was nonetheless useful, and to a degree effective. A letter from "abroad" catches the eye and invites attention; the "foreign" provenance does lend weight and importance, however specious or artificial, to the "information" and opinions it offers. Further, it establishes at once the writer's sense and direction. It gives force, definition and emphasis to his argument. It was a device clearly enough understood to define or establish a convention clearly enough accepted to be, in one remarkable letter of the eight, turned against itself in irony.

Within the group of eight there are certain differences. Some of the letters are printed as broadsides, others as pamphlets. Six are chiefly defences of Charles's character or policy. Though subtypes within this group are not clearly distinct, one might perhaps be called a letter of news, a second a religious tract, and three testaments or apologies. The sixth is a straightforward encomium

3 Only three of the eight letters identify printers or publishers.

4 These are in order T.R., An Extract of a Letter from a Person of Quality at Brussels of the 5. of March S.N. to a Private FRIEND (London, 1660), a broadside printed for Thos. Bassett, Thomason date 8 March; Letter ... by de l'Angle; W.S., True and good News from Brussels (London, 1660), Thomason date 2 April; T.L., Comfortable Newes from Breda, In a Letter to a Person of Honour (London, 1660), a broadside, dated 26 April 1660, N.S.; and B.T., Policy No Policy: or the Devil Himself Confuted. Being an Answer to a Clause of a Letter
or laudation. A seventh is a defence of monarchy in general and an appeal for its restoration in England, answering, in the words of its sub-title, "Some Objections made against the late King [Charles I] and his posterity". The eighth is an effective and none-too-subtle exercise in irony, a biting attack by a self-styled "royalist", "neer attendant" on the king, upon his supposed master. This last letter, not surprisingly, bears no further identification at all of the writer and no imprint of a place of publication.

All eight letters address questions then in Englishmen's minds. What was the king like? What of his character, morals, sagacity, judgment and principles? What might he demand of his people if restored to his kingdom and what, as their king, might he offer them?

One leading cause for concern had to do with the steadiness of Charles's devotion to the Church of England. After the failure of Booth's royalist uprising in Cheshire in the summer of 1659, the disappointed young king had travelled to Spain in search of money and support. News of this journey, together with reports of the activities of his mother, the Catholic Henrietta Maria, at the court of France had given rise to serious misgivings in England. There were fears that Charles might be enlisting foreign aid in a new attempt to regain his crown, that he might be raising a foreign, Catholic, army or, worse, that he might be turning

---

Written to a Person of Quality at Brussels; wherein the King and his Court there are Fully and Plainly Discovered (1660), dated at Brussels, 28 March S.N. The last begins as a laudation extolling the king's virtues but then goes on to larger political matters.

5 S.G., A Letter Out of Flanders, From a Person of Honor, Who lately transported himself purposely to kiss the hands of His Sacred Majesty King Charles the Second, To a Noble-man in England: Wherein divers Observations of his Majesties Personal Deportments, both Private and Publick are Declared (London, 1660), printed for Miles Thatcher, Thomason date 2 April.


7 [Marchamont Nedham], News from Brussels In A Letter From a Neer Attendant on His Majesties Person. To A Person of Honour Which casually became thus publique (1660), dated itself at Brussels, S.V. 10 March 1659.

Catholic himself. Two broadsides, T.R.’s *Letter from ... Bruxels* and T.L.’s *Comfortable Newes from Breda* spoke to these fears and testified to the king’s constancy to the Church of England, his devotion to his people and his independence of foreign courts. As its title implies, “Mounsier de l’Angle’s” *Letter Farther and More Fully Evidencing the Kings stedfastnesse in the Protestant Religion* also affirmed Charles’s heartfelt allegiance to Protestantism and further declared current reports of his conversion to Rome to be nothing but Jesuit plots.\(^9\)

Misgivings about the king’s reliability in matters of religion were real, but there were broader concerns as well. In February there appeared in print E.S.’s *Letter From ... France* which spoke less of the monarch himself than monarchy in general. E.S. was by his own account “a Person of Honour”. He was certainly a royalist and may perhaps have been an exile, though, if so, both the Paris “origin” and the substance of the letter suggest a possible relationship to Henrietta Maria’s circle at the French court rather than to her son’s at Brussels. E.S. spoke of recent events in England. Some had said that the English would never return to the “primitive practice of worship in Religion” or to kingly government “by reason of present Interests”. This, declared E.S., was not true. These “present interests” had themselves failed. In 1648 they had barred the prospect of peace; they had then forced parliament “to comply with their rude and undigested models of government”, models which had cost England’s people ten years of troubles and “many millions” of pounds. There was clearly no hope that such interests could ever establish any rule “but what is arbitrary and perfectly destructive to the whole”, or offer anything but a sad comparison to monarchy, which in ten thousand years of history had imposed in contrast so few grievances. The order of God in heaven and earth, the order of nature and, “since the Creation of Families”, the order of every nation and people, was monarchical. “A Common-wealth is consistent with and most

splendid under Regal Government”, E.S. declared, and “restitution is the one great mark of the people of God”. The Stuart king would be restored.\textsuperscript{10}

These arguments were not original. It was widely believed in the seventeenth century that the design of God, the order of nature and the society of men consistently reflected the principle of monarchy. It was widely observed that in ten years the various experimental models of government had failed to establish in England either stable rule or an effective claim to legitimacy. And it was true that taxes had been heavy. As for religion, though E.S. does not make clear whether it was the Church of England or the Church of Rome whose primitive worship he wanted restored, there was no doubt that the king’s return would mean the re-establishment of a state church. In part, E.S.’s letter is a brief summary of the most widely held arguments for monarchy’s restoration current in England in the early weeks of 1660.\textsuperscript{11}

But E.S. went beyond this to plead for Charles. Here he spoke out against members of the Rump. It was foolish, he said, to expect settlement by men “of corrupt principles laden with spoiles, (by which they continue the force put upon their Fellow members by the violence of Armies) … We cannot tolerate Armies (which are but Servants) to be Lawgivers, or impose them upon the Rulers”. Perhaps E.S. did not realize how tenuous was the bond of cooperation between the Rump and the army that Winter; perhaps he meant only to urge the admission of the Secluded Members of the House of Commons; the point is not clear. But his next argument was. He appealed to Monck, then newly arrived with his army in London and as yet apparently uncommitted to any cause other than that of the Rump. Monck, he feared, might be persuaded to speak out for a revival of the Commonwealth; word maliciously spread of the exiled king’s supposed failings might cause the General to distrust the king rather than the ambitious, greedy and unprincipled men and officers who had brought England low. I hope, wrote E.S., that the “victorious General consulting with his Army, [and] the expectations of the World, will conclude, that bare suppositions against a King, is no

\textsuperscript{10} E.S., Letter.
solid Argument for a Common-wealth". "Hence therefore let England sing out the praises of God for their lawfull King, who with his Royall Father prayed for, and loved them in the dayes of their extremity".12

E.S. urged Englishmen to sing in praise for Charles II who, in his view, was not only their legal king but was also most favourably disposed toward his subjects, at least to those among them whose corrupt ambitions did not lead them to offer objections to His Majesty's speedy restoration. Naturally, there were doubts. What retribution might Charles seek if he did regain crown and country? Already in England fierce royalists talked of revenge. Was the king only pretending to be conciliatory? The exiles were anxious lest such doubts mar the king's prospects.13

The publication in March of the startling News from Brussels increased apprehensions; the King Charles it depicted, no less than his vindictive followers in England, only awaited opportunity to set upon his enemies.

The News from Brussels was said to come from someone near the king. In fact it was written by Marchamont Nedham. Nedham was a journalist, able, clever, imaginative and prolific, if something less than constant in his views. In the early 1640s he had spoken for parliament, but by 1647 he was writing for Charles I. Then, in 1649, he became editor of the Commonwealth's official newspaper, Mercurius Politicus; in 1656 he wrote The Excellencie of a Free State and in 1659 Interest Will Not Lie, republican tracts which have earned him a place in the "canon of Real Whig Doctrine".14 Wisely he left England at the Restoration; but soon he was back, ingratiating himself with the king's party. He lived to write tracts against the Shaftesbury Whigs in the late 1670s. His News from Brussels is an ingenious, amusing, quite openly malicious attack upon the exiled Charles II, and a cunning attempt to dim the prospect of a royal restoration.15

12 E.S., Letter.
15 On 28 March the Council of State issued a proclamation for the arrest of Livewel Chapman, printer of the News, "for causing seditious books and
The News is ironic both in tone and in substance. Assuming what might best be characterized as a spirit of high glee, Nedham counts the rewards and advantages to be enjoyed by triumphant royalists on the king’s return to England or, from another point of view, the excesses to be suffered by their enemies. The language is broad, the wit less than subtle; but the message was direct. Englishmen could expect little good from King Charles and less from his followers.

Nedham’s News was addressed to “dear Jack”, a “person of honour” in England. The “writer” was, by his own description, friendly to Catholics, scornful of Anglicans and hostile to Calvinists. Moreover, his morals were loose, his ways devious. And he was bent upon revenge. The king, he said, also was; those who hoped for mercy had best beware. “Canst fancy, that our Master can forget he had a Father, how he lived and died, how he lost both crown and life, and who the cause thereof”? The royalists might talk of reconciliation, but they spoke only “by Necessity, not Choice”. “Hug them you cannot Hang, at least until you can”, was the watchword at the king’s court, he warned. Charles would talk of terms, but he would not be bound. “Remember the blessed line … in Machiavil; he’s an Oafe that thinks an Oath … can tame a Prince beyond his Pleasure”. “Tis a Romance … to think that Revenge can sleep, but like a Dog, to wake at Will”. The king’s passion for vengeance needed no spur. “We rather use all the Art and Argument we can to Rein him in”.16

For those who hoped for a speedy restoration, Nedham’s News from Brussels was bad news indeed. The king had no army of his own and as yet few active supporters in England. The possibility of his return was premised upon his drawing to his interest the very rebels who had sent him into exile and his creating in the public mind confidence in his honour and good-will. The army

pamphlets to be published”. According to Miles Barton, writing to Hyde at Brussels on 30 March, a reward of £20 was offered for the discovery of its author. Alderman Jo. Robinson wrote to the king the same day reporting the capture and imprisonment of Chapman; “the author would have persuaded the people, that the king had vowed a revenge, and how bloody hee would be & that hee was turned Roman Catholic” (Robert Steele, A Bibliography of Royal Proclamations of the Tudor and Stuart Sovereigns and of others published under authority, 1485-1715 (1910; repr. New York, 1967), i. 382, No. 3175; Clarendon MS. (Bodleian Library), 71, ff. 107r, 112r).

16 Nedham, News, pp. 4, 5.
was now divided, the House of Commons, in which the Secluded Members had just joined the members of the Rump, still undecided. Was the king to be trusted? Did his apparently conciliatory attitude toward his erstwhile enemies hide an appetite for revenge? Did his outward conformity to the Church of England conceal a private devotion to the Church of Rome? Nedham played broadly upon the fears of his countrymen. Should the News from Brussels be true, they knew, Englishmen had reason to temper their growing enthusiasm for the king's restoration.

Charles's defenders answered the alarm. If the tone of the News was ironic, its message was nonetheless serious. The pretended letter came from London, not Brussels, declared N.P.; it was the work of no royal courtier but rather of "vile monsters whose desperate fortunes and affrighted consciences begin now to lash them" at the brightening prospect of the king's return. These vile monsters, he said, "contrive by all artifice and means they can, to sow Tares in the beautiful Field they see springing, and to discompose the happy union and blessed Settlement of these Miserable Nations, by lying, and scandalous reproaches". King Charles had no thought of revenge. Rather, he was known to those about him for his "innate, religious and severe propensity to lenity, moderation, friendliness and whatsoever may denomi-nate a virtuous Prince". And as "for his fidelity, his word is as a Law of the Medes and Persians; whosoever shall obtain it, has an assurance, irrefragable". Englishmen of whatever past or persuasion need have no misgivings.  

The noted royalist writer and diarist John Evelyn said much the same thing in language less temperate. He was astonished, he said, on reading the News from Brussels to find "that such exquisite Malice, should still have its continuance". Charles was a "meek and gentle" prince; the News's report of him was a "bold and impudent lye", the "filthy foam of a black and hellish mouth, arising from a viperous and venomous heart". The guilty author should count himself lucky to escape heaven's dart. His fell purpose, said Evelyn, was to do "industriously and maliciously ...
what cursed mischief lies within the sphere of his cashiered power”
to disappoint the nation’s hope of peace, his aim to “catch the
common & vulgar apprehensions, & draw them again into such
amaze and delusion, As they may yet once more ... fall under
the worrying power of him, and such like Ravenous Beasts of
Blood, Prey and Rapine”. Young King Charles, declared Evelyn,
was “transcendentally illustrious”, “noble”, “amiable”, “lovely”,
“graceful”, “well accomplished”, “constant”, “Fitted and adap-
ted for moderate Government”, and above all “firmly and
irremovable fixed, to the profession of the true Protestant
Religion”.18

In a letter “from a person of great quality” in Brussels to a
friend in England, W.S. joined in the attack upon what he called
the calumnies and poisons spread against the king. And G.S.
wrote from Flanders of Charles’s virtues, his “dignified counte-
nance”, and “Lovely beauty, Black and Comely”, his love of
“Truth, Uprightnesse and Mercy” and his sincere “devotion to the
Common Prayer in the English Tongue”. The royal exile governed
his household with “Oeconomique Ordinances ... excellently
proportioned to his condition”; his servants were “indisputably
happy” to be in his service; he forbade his courtiers to duel.19 In
language rather less formal and certainly less pious, B.T. made the
same points. His master the king, he said, was “a person in
nothing Defective, in nothing Redundant”. In appearance he was
“Tall, of an excellent Symmetry, and grave Aspect, so that you
may read KING in every Lyniament”. He was blessed with “a
serene Soul ... a most piercing apprehension, nimble wit [and]
sound Judgement”. He was “Mercyful”, “Amiable”, “Chast and
Temperate”, a man of “constant resolution, and undaunted

18 [John Evelyn], The Late News or Message from Bruxets Unmasked, and His
Majesty, Vindicated from the Base Calumny and Scandal therein fixed on Him
(London, 1660), for Richard Lowndes, pp. 1, 3. The tract is sometimes attributed
to Sir Edmond Peirce. In November Evelyn had published An Apologie for the
Royal Party (see above, n. 13). On Evelyn’s political views and career, see D.N.B.
19 W.S., News, p. 1; G.S., Letter, pp. 3, 4, 7. G.S.’s “black and comely” is an
allusion to The Song of Solomon, 1: 5. This Biblical reference, together with the
reference to “the Common Prayer”, perhaps suggests that G.S. may have been
an Anglican clergyman. The view of Charles II is much like that expressed in a
number of sermons of thanksgiving preached (and printed) in the weeks
preceding the king’s return. See Carolyn A. Edie, “Right Rejoicing: Sermons on
the Occasion of the Stuart Restoration, 1660”, in Bulletin lxii (1979-80), esp.
pp. 80-82.
Courage ... and withal, so Religiously Devout and so Piously Constant in all Divine Worships, and Services, that he may truly be called a good Church-Man as well as a good King". The Brussels exiles, living under his influence, counted themselves happy to sacrifice fortune, land, even lives, in the service of "their Angelicall Master". So effectively had his example "calm'd and temper'd" their spirits, that now they were ready to "embrace even their greatest Enemies"; all they desired was an end to violence, their country's good and, rather ominously, expiation of "the sins of the three Nations".20

N.P., Evelyn, W.S., G.S., and B.T. attacked the veracity of the News from Brussels, whose author they quite rightly took to be no friend to the king. In answer to its witty thrusts they offered praise indeed, but curiously impersonal praise. That Charles was a tall, dark man was common knowledge, as were his efforts to keep his quarrelsome entourage from killing each other.21 Beyond this the writers had very little particular to say about him. Their approach was that of the panegyricist rather than the delineator of character. G.S.'s style of expression was stodgy, B.T.'s lively, but what they said was essentially the same. The picture they drew was idealized. This may have been in part because they really knew very little of the king's character. Very likely it was in even larger part because they wrote less to inform their fellow Englishmen than to answer their hopes and expectations. Young King Charles was declared to have every grace and beauty appropriate to a Christian prince, every virtue one could hope for in a king of England. But his virtues were in sum those of temperance and constancy, reflective rather than active, moral rather than political. Much was said of calmness, mercy and moderation; the king was depicted as the exemplar, the leader of his people. Nothing was

20 B.T., Policy No Policy, pp. 1, 2, 4.
21 Sir Samuel Tuke's A Character of Charles the Second Written by an Impartial Hand, and Exposed to Publick View for the Information of the People (London, 1660) included a picture of the king as a frontispiece. According to Christopher Hatton, writing to Hyde from London on 30 March, the king's picture was hung in the streets. A person who declared that the king himself was less handsome than his picture was "soundly beaten" (Clarendon MS. (Bodleian Library), 71, ff. 101-102, also 350-351). For Charles's declaration against duelling see Sir George F. Warner, The Nicholas Papers, Correspondence of Sir Edward Nicholas Secretary of State, IV, Camden Society 3rd Ser., xxxi (London, 1920), p. 263).
said of any aggressive or warlike qualities; he was depicted as the conciliator of his country, as the man of peace. Moreover, in contrast to his father and perhaps to more recent governors too, the young king was said (quite falsely) to live carefully within his income. He was, indeed, a ruler whose subjects could only count themselves fortunate. Nedham's aside, the letters' "news" was meant to be encouraging. If indeed, as seems likely, it did not come from abroad, nevertheless it was meant to serve the exiled king.22

The various proclamations, declarations, letters and speeches attributed directly to the kind himself are even more obviously supposititious than the private letters "from abroad".23 Charles did carry on an extensive correspondence with agents and friends in England, some of it in his own hand. On occasion, public letters and declarations were drafted, but none was ever put into print.24

22 The emphases upon moral virtues in the picture of the Christian prince were, of course, not new. For a useful discussion, see Quentin Skinner, The Foundations of Modern Political Thought (Cambridge, 1978), i. 213-214, 228-236. See, too, Charles I's advice "To the Prince of Wales", the future Charles II, in Eikon Basilike The Portraiture of His Sacred Majesty in His Solitudes and Sufferings, ed. by Philip A. Knachel (Ithaca, New York, 1966), pp. 158-171. These views of the king contrast sharply with the picture of Monck which appears in contemporary printed praise. The General is portrayed as "brave", and "valiant", a great "hero", "statesman", and "Adjutator" (agitator), a "Hercules" who has cleansed the Augean stable of politics and, above all, as England's "St. George" whose sword has slain the dragon of discord. See, for example, The Noble English Worthies (1659), The Second Part of Saint George for England ([1660]), The Noble Monk (1660), and Richard Farrar, A Panegyrick to His Excellency The Lord General Monck (1660).

23 The catalogue of the British Library lists these and a number of others published earlier as "doubtful or supposititious". There is also a lengthy list of documents falsely attributed to Charles I. There is no such listing for James I or Elizabeth I. It appears that the genre may have been a new one or, more exactly, an old one adapted to new uses and purposes under the pressures of civil war.

24 See, for example, "The Declaration Sent in January 1660", in the Nicholas Papers, B.L., Egerton MS. 2542, ff.328r-329r, of which sections written, according to marginal comment, by Hyde closely parallel the king's April Declaration of Breda. The January version may have circulated in England, but there is no evidence that it was printed. See, too, the statement of the king's affairs sent by Lord Mordaunt, dated 2/12 January 1659/60 (Clarendon MS. (Bodleian Library), 68, f. 76), and two copies of a "Proclamation of the King", (ibid. 71: ff. 358-361, 362-365). Routledge calls this "probably a preliminary draft" of the Breda declaration and dates it March (?) 1659/60, but its phraseology and substance are quite unlike that of the Breda text. It may instead be simply a copy (in Henry Hyde's hand, according to Routledge) of a proposed
The king was careful to make no public pronouncement he might later regret.

Others did not hesitate to speak in his name. The false pronouncements have for the most part an air of pretension rather than conviction; their form, content and import at once belie their supposed royal origin. The language tends to be grandiose, the tone condescending, the printing and spelling not of the high quality to be expected in a document actually coming from the king. One "proclamation", for example, published "by His Majesties Special Command" and printed "Cum Privilegio", declares Charles "Defender of the true Ancient Catholique and Apostolick Faith", something of a fanciful embroidery upon the traditional, if plainer, usage, Defender of the Faith. Another, "Signed by Our Self at Our Pallace of Brussels", speaks rather gracelessly of the "ambition, fury and malice" of the king's enemies, the "fair pretences of disloyal persons" and "the meanest of Our Subject^". To the credulous or ignorant such proclamations might look official, but to the knowledgeable they would certainly appear at best doubtful.

The question of deception may again be irrelevant. The authors of the supposititious pronouncements had to know that the king could easily deny anything put forth falsely in his name. If the credulous took the printed word to be the king's, then perhaps so much the better, but the strength of the writer's argument did not rest upon the assumption. It is likely that the "king's" voice was meant from the first to be a fictive one, a device adopted by writers hoping to attract public attention and draw support to their own views, to give added weight to what they said and, just possibly, to press upon the king himself some particular course of action which appeared, to the writer's eye, promising.

draft intended for the king's consideration by one of the persons or factions then in correspondence or negotiation with him. It was apparently never printed (F.J. Routledge, Clarendon State Papers Preserved in the Bodleian Library, iv (Oxford, 1932), p. 633).

25 By the Kings Most Excelent Majestie, A Proclamation (Antwerp, [1659]), Steele, op. cit., i. 377, No 3131; and CR By the Kings Most Excellent Majesty, A Proclamation (Antwerp, 1659), Steele, op. cit., i. 379, No. 3148. The Antwerp imprint of these and other "declarations" is very likely false. They were probably printed secretly in London. Steele's bibliography lists supposititious works with authentic ones without differentiation or comment.
These "royal" documents argued several policies, depending in part upon the particular intentions of each writer and in part upon the circumstances he addressed. A series of four, including two proclamations, one declaration, and a message to Monck and the Council at Edinburgh, all apparently by the same hand, were printed in the Autumn and early Winter of 1659/60, when the prospect of a royal restoration was still quite dim. Together the four present an interesting preface and contrast to the letters and declarations which appeared in March and April, when hopes had brightened. By the Kings Most Excelent Majestie, a Proclamation, dated at Brussels 2 October 1659 (S.N.), printed at Antwerp, and addressed generously to "Our Trusty and Well-beloved Justices of the Piece, Mayors, Sheriffs, Bayliffs, Constables, Churchwardens, and to all other Officers as well spiritual as temporal", sets forth ten propositions, terms of settlement designed to bring peace between the Rump and the army and to bring in the king. The king, once restored, was to offer a general pardon; the army was to be paid arrears and disbanded; no new army was to be raised, no new taxes imposed, except by law; purchasers of crown and church lands, having recovered their purchase prices through profit, were to return these lands to crown and church; the "three estates" in parliament were to meet to settle religion, draw up an act of pardon and regulate and manage the affairs of the land."If these condescensions of ours shall have ... freedome of passage in England ... we are confident that all of understanding, that are not willfully blinded, or not over-swayed with present self-interest, thereby knowing our large Offers, must needs be fully convinced of the amplitude thereof". There were no special provisions for the king’s friends, but, as things stood in England, "he" said, it was not possible to offer more without the risk of a "bloody and hazardous war".

If his language was extravagant, what the writer proposed was not. His tone was irenic, his attitude conciliatory and his suggestion that only a restoration of king, lords and commons could

26 Kings Excelent Majesty; this was printed as a broadside. See also A Proclamation Touching the Election of fit Persons to serve in Parliament. By the King (London, 1660), for M.B., also a broadside, dated "at our court" 6 November, Thomason date 14 March, 1659/60, which speaks to the question of impending elections, urging Englishmen to choose only men of the "gravest, ablest and best affected minds" to sit, and certainly no "Banckrupts". This proclamation is not listed in Steele's bibliography.
effectively stop illegal exactions, restore lands, settle religion, disband the army and secure the peace, an appealing one. The terms proposed were, in fact, very much like those the true King Charles offered not six months later.

But in November the pretended Charles, losing patience and presumably disappointed by the lack of reaction to his published "terms", spoke more aggressively. In Scotland, Monck was writing to London demanding that the Council of army officers readmit the Rump, reorganizing his own corps of officers, and preparing his own army to march south in defence, he said, of the liberties of parliament. From "Orleance" in France, the pretended king wrote to Monck and the Edinburgh Council. Addressing Monck hopefully, if inaccurately, as "Commander in Chief of his Majesties Army in Scotland", "King Charles" declared that he had made clear his good intentions in the Brussels propositions. Now he promised that if the Scots would rise in his favour, he would provide for their assistance 15,000 horse and foot, having obtained from the kings of France and Spain the arms, ammunition and provisions necessary. He did not seek to secure his own advantage, he said, "so much as the Interest, Rights, Privileges, Lawes, Liberties, and Freedoms of our long enslaved Subjects, under the Egyptian bondage of Taxes, Excise, unusual Customs, Assessments, and Free-quartering of a Mercenary Army, imposed on them by tyrannous Usurpers".

This time the "king" proposed military action to restore to Englishmen their lost laws, rights and liberties, to deliver them from the heavy taxes illegally imposed and collected by the rebel army and, in a nice echo of the 1628 Petition of Right, to stop the exaction of unusual customs, imposts, assessments and free

---


28 CR His Majestys Gracious Message to General Monck, Commander in Chief of his Majesties Army in Scotland, and to the Lords, Knights, Gentlemen, &c. sitting in Council at the City of Edinburgh (Paris, 1659), a broadside, dated itself 29 November 1659 at "Orleance", Thomason date 15 December (Steele, op. cit., i. 378, N°. 3135, also 3136). The "Egyptian bondage" figure is Biblical (Exodus 1: 14).
quarter. Apparently, if Englishmen would not see the reason of his appeal, this king would bring in Scots, French and Spaniards to save them from themselves.

By January patience had worn even thinner. In *CR By the Kings Most Excellent Majestie, A Proclamation*, dated at Brussels 25 January 1659/60 and published at “Anwerpe”, the supposed king again “weighed the present Sad Distractions” and spoke of redeeming his subjects from their intolerable bondage. He hoped to restore the happy prosperity and to renew the flourishing trade and commerce which, he said, Englishmen “did enjoy many years before the cruel, bloody and unpresidented Martyrdom of Our Royal Father the KING”. The counterfeit Charles agreed to stand by his former propositions and repeated the offer of a general pardon. But now he added something else. All subjects, “being convinced in their Consciences of their horrid offence against God and ourself, in assisting in the late Rebellion” were commanded to return by 21 February to their allegiance and duty. Within ten days after that date this Charles expected to land in Cornwall or the north of Scotland; subjects were advised to repair to his assistance at his landing. Soldiers and officers who joined his cause were promised liberal rewards; laws and liberties were to be preserved from the arbitrary power of ambitious persons; the “true Protestant Religion (now in ... danger of being rooted out by Anabaptists, Quakers and Athe[i]sts)” was to be restored and protected; the “king” sought no revenge. Nor, he said, would he put confidence in the pretences and promises of “some disloyal persons” who had “several times almost ensnared him”. He would trust only in Almighty God to overcome the force and power of his enemies.

Then, in February, he wrote again, this time a declaration “To all his Maiesties Loving Subjects in His Kingdoms of England,

---

29 The illegality of the army’s attempts to impose and collect taxes was a recurrent theme in the many public declarations and addresses demanding the calling of a full and free parliament which appeared in print during the Winter and Spring of 1659/60. A number of these are reprinted in *A Happy Handfull, OR Green Hopes in the BLADE: In order to a Harvest, OF THE Several SHIRES, humbly Petitioning, or heartily Declaring for Peace* (London, 1660).

30 It is interesting that this “proclamation” makes no direct reference to Monck, whose forces were at the time approaching London. The disloyal persons referred to may be those who had betrayed Booth’s rising in Cheshire the previous Summer.
Scotland, and Ireland". In England the situation was changing. At Westminster the Rump talked ineffectively of settling the nation; the Secluded Members were pressing for re-admission. Monck's army had marched south and entered London, acknowledging still the authority of parliament, but whether loyal to the Rump's interest, the General's, or even the exiled king's, no one could yet be sure. Now the supposed Charles claimed to have received "an overture from Parliament". He would, if necessary, invade, as he had declared in his proclamation of 25 January, he answered, but he would also be open to propositions of peace. His supporters had suffered much; amends must be made. If returned to his kingdom, he would restore justice, religion and a flourishing free trade. The tone of desperation was giving way to one of hope.31

Who this writer may have been is a puzzle. He was certainly a royalist. His interest in church lands implies that he may have been an Anglican, but he was willing to draw Presbyterian support against the Anabaptists, Quakers and atheists. He seems embittered; possibly he may have been an exile, living too long in poverty and disappointment. Like many another royalist he looked back with nostalgia to what he remembered as the halcyon days before the wars. Like many Englishmen of various political stripes, he distrusted and feared the army, protested against the destruction of law and justice, and objected to the heavy taxes raised without the sanction of parliament. This was the Egyptian bondage from which the king must deliver his suffering people. The counterfeit Charles hoped for help from Spain and France and dreamed of a royal descent upon England, with loyal subjects flocking to the Stuart standard. But he knew of betrayals and disloyalties, danger and the limits of possibility, and he preferred peaceful settlement and accommodation to war. He believed that the king could return to England only upon terms, terms acceptable to all but the most obstinate of rebels, terms, in fact, very like those Charles II did at last offer.32 But even as late as February, though he had hope, he had no great confidence that monarchy would in fact be soon restored.

31 C.R. By the Kings Most Excellent Majestie. A Declaration to all His Majesties Loving Subjects in His Kingdoms of England, Scotland, and Ireland & etc. (Antwerp [1660]), signed at "Our Court at Brussels February 13, 1659" (Steele, op. cit., i. 379, No. 3150).

32 These should be compared with the terms published in the Declaration of Breda and also with those of the January draft in the Egerton MS.
Then, in late February, the Secluded Members took their seats with the members of the Rump. In mid-March the Long Parliament was dissolved; elections were called for a new House (or Convention) which, it was widely expected, might treat with the king. Royalist hopes grew. Late in March there appeared in London yet another missive from the “Anwerp” press, this a speech supposed to have been made by Charles to six eminent persons who had come from England to Brussels to negotiate terms of settlement. This “king” declared himself still “sensible of the new calamities and miseries” brought on his subjects “by the late unnatural war”; he rejoiced that now they saw at last “the cruelty of those Task-masters who aspers’d Us their lawful King”. He had himself only a “pious desire of the Publick good” and of right understanding and true peace between himself and his people. To this end he had already offered several propositions; he would agree to any which might contribute to the glory of God, the maintenance of the Protestant religion, the rights of the crown, the privileges of a full and free parliament, and the liberties and rights of his subjects. The “king” now spoke of settlement; he had no thought of revenge; moral judgments he left to God. Further, he did not intend to enter his kingdom with a “Foreign Force”; it had never been his purpose, he said, to take any such course. He looked forward only to “an happy union” with his “Loving Subjects”. His was a spirit of expectation, confidence and good will.33

Two other writers in the king’s name whose works appeared at about the same time as the speech were less conciliatory. One, a letter purportedly addressed by the king to the peers in England, is an exercise in irony, in style rather like its contemporary News from Brussels but less broad, more subtle and more judicious. The letter can be read as a straightforward appeal to the nobility for the restoration of the old social order. The peers who, in this “king’s” words, his ancestors had long ago “clarified from the common sort”, were reminded that upon the king’s status depended their own. The streams of their lordships’ “Honour

33 CR King Charles His Speech to the Six Eminent Persons who lately arrived at Brussels, to Treat with His Majesty touching His Restoration to the Royal Throne and Dignity of his Father (Antwerp, 1660), a broadside, dated itself Brussels, 18 March, Thomason date 26 March (Steele, op. cit., i. 381, N°. 3164). The six persons are not identified.
must necessarily faile, when the Fountain which should feed them is diverted". The rebellion had indeed swept away not only the crown but also the House of Lords. The peers had "this Worlds Wealth", continued the "king", but in recent years, "not the Priviledge to use it". Reflect, he advised the peers, upon "the Felicities which all your Ancestors have enjoyed under the raynes of our Predecessors". How sad the case was now. Moreover, "For want of lawful Sovereignty" England's trade had declined; foreign princes once her friends had turned to enmity. When once again the king sat on his throne, the world turned upside down should be turned again right. Then the peers should once more enjoy the privileges and authorities to which their wealth and status naturally entitled them.\(^3\)

But the letter can be read another way. There were still in England several lords who might count themselves rebels and a number more who, if they did not oppose the king's return, yet hoped to impose strict limits upon his powers.\(^4\) But they were few and in any case neither Charles nor his partisans could reasonably expect to draw them to the royal interest through so public an appeal. Certainly there were Englishmen of lesser rank who might be expected to welcome the restoration of the social order, members of the gentry who had found their accustomed claims to precedence overridden by new-sprung politicians and army officers of dubious social origin, merchants who hoped to bolster the profits of their trade, Anglican clergymen thinking to regain their lost livings. But "King Charles" went too far. Few but noble royalists, certainly none of moderate stamp, could have regarded with much enthusiasm the "king's" vision of the future. For, as he promised the delights of high privilege to the peers of England, he did so plainly at the cost of what lesser men had come to regard as their own. He seemed to have nothing but scorn for parliament's cause, no idea why so many of his subjects had turned against Charles I, no sympathy for, much less understanding of, the

\(^3\) A Letter from his Maty. King Charls II. To his Peers the Lords in England ([London], 1660) for Charles Gustavus, a broadside, dated itself 24 March (N.S.), Thomason date 20 March (Steele, op. cit., i. 382, No. 3172). The letter seems to argue for the restoration of the old Court party of James I's reign and Charles I's early years, rather than more recent royalist views.

dilemmas now facing his people. His "meanest subjects ... do now feel the fruits of their follies", the "king" crowed. The "inferior sort", he said, had been duped into "following their ambitions and avaritious blinde conductors" to their own ruin, "beyond their wisdome and power to redeem". Their lordships this "king" saw "shining as Tapers to our blinded Subjects ... as Light-Houses" to their misguided and "unpiloted Rovings". Englishmen might agree that they had been duped and misled by ambitious men; this was at once a truth and a commonplace, a kind of popular adaptation of the old "evil counsellor" argument, long used in defence of kings. But even royalists might not agree that there had been nothing at all to parliament's cause. Peers were by definition men of privilege, but the House of Commons had privileges too, as Charles I had himself acknowledged. The supposed king spoke of meekness and clemency, but he spoke as well of "such amazements and assaults upon our Patience" as he had repeatedly endured. He promised peace and he promised social stability, but he appeared bent on restoring the worst as well as the best of the old order. This "Charles II" seemed to be very much like Charles I; he had no royal patience for any of his subjects who did not see the world as he did. It is possible that his creator was simply an unreconstructed Cavalier. It is more likely that he was no royalist at all; he meant Englishmen to take alarm.36

A "royal" declaration "Given at Our Court at Brussels" on 30 March, was less equivocal but no more conciliatory. Its "King Charles" cried the danger of "desperate" and "blood-thirsty" men who, "like Cockle amongst Corn", attempted to "hinder the growth and pervert the Judgements of such [of] Our good People, as are willing to recover their lost Duty and Obedience to Us". He spoke of his readiness to pardon once wilful and wandering subjects who would now receive and defend him against the "Unchristian Attempts of such" as might "continue or combine further to resist Our Lawfull Claim". But should the disobedient persist in their obstinate and misguided ways, the "king" declared,

36 Letter to Peers. The second reading is no doubt the correct one, though the attack is so carefully phrased that the intent would be difficult to prove, which may be exactly the point. However, "Charles Gustavus" was known as a publisher of radical and republican tracts; despite its judiciously veiled language, it is unlikely that the Letter would be regarded by knowledgeable readers as a defence of the royalist cause.
he would then be provoked to "use those helps which Our Royal Consanguinities do daily offer ... the charge thereof", he added pointedly, "your Estates must compensate". This was a revival of the Franco-Spanish threat, with a price-tag tacked on. Once restored, this "King Charles" would ease the decay of manufactures, husbandry and trade of which, he said, he heard daily complaints; he would assure such a liberty to tender consciences as parliament "together with your most Learned Divines shall advise"; he would pay army arrears. The question of disputed royal and royalist lands he would leave to "the Judicature". As the "Lawfull Deputy of God", this "king" promised he would "study and endeavour to Imitate Him in Mercie and Justice, to as many of You as acknowledge Us your True and Undoubted Soveraign".

The message was straightforward and clear. This "king" was severe, but just. Those of his subjects who would readily accept him could expect his mercy; those who meant to stop or delay his restoration, could not. The writer of the speech to the peers was probably not a supporter of the king; the author of the declaration of 30 March may well have been a loyal, if stiffnecked, one. It makes little difference; the effect upon the reader must be much the same. The speech, the declaration, and the News from Brussels could only have aroused in the hearts of erstwhile rebels a lively apprehension of the king and stiffened their resistance to his restoration.

Perhaps to offset this, the writer of CR A Letter from the King to F.M. took another tack. He said that he knew there waited in England many loyal subjects zealous "to redeem their religion and Liberties from prophaneness and oppression". But he knew as well that there were still some so "irreconcileable ... to the Nations settlement" that they maliciously, falsely and odiously declared him [the exiled king] to be "Popish, revengeful, debauch'd, and what not"? He knew, too, that there were others no less odious who pretended to be his friends, dangerous men who "threaten all with fire and sword who are not of their own wild opinions, to proscribe men by names, confiscate their estates, dispose of officers, and endeavour to perswade the World" that he had

37 CR The Kings Declaration to all his loving Subjects (London, 1660), for Richard Parker, a broadside, dated itself at Brussels 30 March S.N. 1660, Thomason date 27 March (Steele, op. cit., i. 382, No. 3173).
nominated them to be "sole directors" of the kingdom's affairs. "The Phanatiques of both Parties" this "king" denounced; their "fool and madness" he abhorred. He spoke of forgiveness, duty, judgment and vindication. He said nothing of foreign kings, invasions or seizure of estates.38 It appears that this "king" recognized that the excesses of the more extravagant among his own royalist following might cost him dearly, but he knew as well that not all the danger came from his own camp. There were able men in England still bent upon resisting his return, and willing to turn any argument, any invention, to that end. In the face of this, this "king" was moderate but firm, conciliatory but independent. Though there is no evidence to suggest that this letter any more than the other documents actually came from Charles's court, it does reflect his outlook and his policy. It is possible that it was written by someone who knew his mind.

Then at last news came from Charles himself. The Declaration of Breda was brief and to the point. It lacked the defensive, sometimes querulous, tone of the private letters, the pretentiousness, excesses and rather pettish belligerence of the false addresses which preceded it. Charles II spoke straightforwardly. He hoped, he said, for an end to his people's "long misery and sufferings; for himself he wanted "possession of that right which God and Nature had made [his] due", quietly, peaceably, "with as little blood and damage to our people as is possible". The king promised justice and mercy and offered a free and general pardon to all who would return to "loyalty and obedience", with only such exceptions as parliament might make. He declared a "liberty to tender consciences"; the religious settlement he left to parliament. Also left to parliament were the questions of disputed lands and army arrears. Monck's army was brought under royal command. Charles desired "the restoration both of king, peers and people to their just, ancient and fundamental rights".39

38 CR A Letter from the King to F.M., a broadside, dated itself Brussels, 10 April 1660 (New Style), Thomason date 3 April (Steele, op. cit., i. 382, No. 3177). This may have been written in answer to Nedham's News from Brussels, or perhaps in response to the situation reported in a letter from W.H. (in London) to Brussels, dated 9/19 March (1659/60): "ye Royalists were gone very high, had threatened some of ye Parlement party of being revenged in a short-time, doe weare their swords and are very busy carrying on ye present affairs" (Warner, Nicholas Papers, iv. 201. See also n. 13 above).

39 King Charles II his Declaration To all His Loving Subjects of the Kingdom of
Sir John Grenville and John Mordaunt left Breda for England with copies of the king's declaration and letters for the Speaker of the House of Commons, the Lords, General Monck, Admiral Montague and the Mayor, Aldermen and Common Council of London. On 26 April, a Thursday, they arrived in London, only one day after the newly-elected Convention had first met. On Tuesday, 1 May, the letters and declaration were received and read. All London, all England, celebrated. With this good news, Grenville returned speedily to the Hague, to which city the king had meanwhile removed in preparation for the expected crossing to England. On 23 May, in the afternoon, the king embarked. On the 25th he landed at Dover; four days later, on his thirtieth birthday, he entered London. Now he spoke from his own capital; there was no more need for "news from abroad".

The letters, declarations and messages had served several purposes. For one thing, they had kept before the reading public the possibility of a royal restoration, the idea of the king as a political force to be reckoned with, perhaps called upon, certainly willing to treat with his subjects. Whatever their authors' point of view, they presumed the king and his court-in-exile to be worth speaking of or for. For another, they explored matters of real concern to Englishmen. The king's religion, his reliance upon foreign interests—these were real worries. Army arrears, pardons, "tender consciences"—these were real issues; a settlement had to deal with them. If the king hoped not only to be recalled to his kingdom but also to rule it effectively, they had to be dealt with in

---


40 The letters to the House of Lords, to the Mayor and Council of London, and to the Speaker of the House of Commons are calendared in Steele, op. cit., i. 383, Nos. 3177b and 3177c.


42 For an excellent, detailed, presumably eyewitness, account of the king's journey from Breda to England see Sir William Lower, _A Relation In the Form of Journal, of the Voyage and Residence Which the most Excellent and most Mighty Prince Charls the II King of Great Britain, &c._ Hath made in Holland from the 25 of May, to the 2. of June, 1660 (Hague, 1660). The engraved illustrations are especially notable.
a manner acceptable not only to men of substance and influence, but also to the wider population, whose good-will and acquiescence could do as much to smooth what promised to be at best a difficult way. The letters and declarations aired the possibilities and also the pitfalls. They sent up trial balloons, set up targets and spelled out threats. By invoking the king's own name or association, they did so with urgency and weight. In April 1660 King Charles II could profit in drawing up the Declaration of Breda; in May his subjects could rejoice in having at last true and satisfying news from abroad.