

Introduction

Laurent Currelly and Nigel Smith

The chapters in this volume study the presence of radical ideas in Britain from the period of the English Civil Wars in the mid-seventeenth century to the Romantic revolution in the nineteenth century. They explore the modes of articulation and dissemination of radical ideas in the period by focusing on actors ('radical voices') and a variety of written texts and cultural practices ('radical ways'), ranging from fiction, correspondence, pamphlets and treatises to petitions presented to Parliament and toasts raised in public. They analyse the way these media interact with their political, religious, social and literary contexts.

Radicalism is an evasive concept that does not lend itself to easy categorisation. The word itself, which is used to mean a thorough transformation of a system from the root upwards according to its Latin etymology, is a fairly recent coinage. *The Oxford English Dictionary* records the first usage of the substantive 'radical' in a political sense as 1802, and has 1819 as the first recorded use of the term 'radicalism'. The French, German, Italian and Spanish languages seem to have borrowed their respective *radicalisme*, *Radikalismus* and *radicalismo* from the English word 'radicalism' and gradually extracted it from of its British context to describe domestic political and social realities. While the term accompanied the revolutions and emancipation movements of nineteenth-century Europe, its usage in the British context of late eighteenth-century political agitation, notably during the French Revolution, is conveniently accepted; however, applying it

to religious, political, social and cultural phenomena that emerged in mid seventeenth-century England in defiance of the existing order of things is certainly problematic and raises questions that will be addressed in this chapter.

Historians and literary scholars over the last forty years, in fact since the publication of Christopher Hill's article 'From Lollards to Levellers' in 1978,¹ have taken renewed interest in the word and the realities it encapsulates, debating whether radicalism is a heuristically innocuous and methodologically feasible historical concept. Some of them have expressed their doubts that such a notion is effective in any way.² They ask whether it makes sense at all to use the word before it was coined and whether its usage really helps early modern scholars to have a clearer understanding of the British Isles during the Civil Wars. There is a fair chance, they argue, that students of the period may run the risk of grafting their own ideological constructs, interpretations, even prejudices, onto a society in which the majority of the people had no apparent desire for groundbreaking change, one in which even those who later came to be labelled as 'radicals' had no intention of turning the world upside down³ but only wanted England to go back to what they assumed were its religious and/or political roots.

The contributions to this volume challenge the 'nominalist' view that writing about radicals before the word even came into existence is dangerously anachronistic. However, the linguistic debate should not be evaded altogether; one should arguably go beyond merely claiming that the absence of a word to describe phenomena does not mean that these phenomena are nothing but a figment of the observer's imagination. Instead, one should concentrate on the linguistic evidence pointing to the existence of radicals and radical movements in seventeenth-century England. These individuals and groups were clearly identified by their contemporaries, not least by their opponents, as when heresiographers reviled the 'sectaries', 'heretics' and 'schismatics' of their time,⁴ or when the term 'Levellers' was bandied around in pamphlets and newsbooks to cast opprobrium on political objectors. The fact that these labels were intrinsic to propagandistic scare stories aimed at preserving the religious or political *status quo* at a time when it was under serious attack need not lessen the scope of such assaults or preclude our name-tagging sectaries and Levellers 'radicals'. Despite their desire to return to an ideal or imagined *status quo ante*, many radical

groups did have a programme of reform – Levellers, Diggers, Fifth Monarchists and Quakers, to mention but a few.

Implied by the fortunes of the word ‘Leveller’ in the late 1640s is the fact that this very term became an apposite label as well as a convenient benchmark of radicalism. While Lilburne and his friends denied being Levellers, Winstanley and his Digger acolytes insisted on being named ‘True Levellers’ and the Ranter Abiezer Coppe dismissed ‘sword levelling, or digging levelling’ as thoroughly inconsistent with what he considered to be ‘the prime levelling’, by which he meant ‘spiritual, inward levelling’.⁵ Thus, Coppe was anxious to distance himself from Leveller levelling, as symbolised by the ‘power of the sword’ motif of Leveller tracts, and from Digger levelling; instead he meant to promote his Antinomian brand of levelling, an obvious sign that members of these groups were in fact self-conscious actors of change, be it of a political, social or religious nature, and that they sought to outperform one another in terms of attracting public attention, even if this entailed bearing the brunt of repression. They were involved, it seems, in some sort of self-fashioning that allowed them to promote their programme of reform.

There may have been more than one signifier to refer to radicals in seventeenth-century England, possibly indicating various strands of radicalism coming from individuals who were no longer happy with the political, social, religious or cultural norms that prevailed in a certain place and at a certain time. The ‘nominalist’ hypothesis is not sustainable, in that it is shaped by a static approach to historical phenomena and ignores the fluctuating and dialogic essence of these phenomena. Radicalism is a labile concept, and the prominence that it achieves depends on historical circumstances, in the same way as those whom we label radicals may change over time. This goes some way towards explaining why the Leveller leader William Walwyn, for example, adopted a radical stance in the 1640s before moving into the more settled field of medicine in the 1650s and penning medical treatises, which were published well into the restoration of the Stuart monarchy.⁶

The terms of the scholarly debate about the appropriateness of using the ‘radical’ label in an early modern context should be briefly stated before a tentative definition of the word ‘radicalism’ is suggested. In his ‘Introduction’ to *English Radicalism 1550–1850*, Glenn Burgess identifies three distinct approaches that he argues

have characterised scholarly work on radical groups in early modern England since the 1970s: the ‘nominalist’, the ‘substantive’ and the ‘functional’ approaches.⁷ The ‘substantive’ approach gained currency in academic circles as a result of Marxist historians in post-war Britain, especially under the influence of the Communist Party Historians’ Group, developing an interest in the lives and ideas of the plebeians that Whig grand historical narratives had somewhat left out of their descriptions of Britain’s march forward towards full democracy. Marxist teleology constructed radicalism as a continuous ideological tradition stretching back to the peasants’ revolts of the Middle Ages and construed mid seventeenth-century radicals as fully-fledged, if disempowered, actors in a narrative that linked them to their radical predecessors and successors.⁸

The study of radicalism from a Marxist perspective was given fresh impetus in the ideologically fraught climate of post-war Europe, in the same way as the Cold War political context affected the historiography of the English revolution at large. So-called ‘revisionist’ historians rejected that perspective, which resulted in marginalising those that Christopher Hill and other Marxist scholars had brought centre stage in an attempt to write ‘history from below’ by recovering the voices of mid seventeenth-century plebeians. Revisionists criticised Marxist historians’ overdependence on printed materials and favoured some manuscript sources instead in an effort to portray English society as it truly was during the revolution, not as it was perceived to be by those who had access to print.⁹ The existence of Ranters was even dismissed as a propagandistic fabrication.¹⁰ Revisionist scholars especially rehabilitated religion as a key explanation for what led individuals to embrace a particular cause, and kept a keen eye out for contingencies as factors of change instead of the overpowering structural dynamics of Marxist historians’ theories. Revisionist historiography rejected the radical canon as being unrepresentative of a society that was by no means animated by any sense of class war but rather by a desire for consensus. ‘Post-revisionist’ historians challenged these theories and made use of Christopher Hill’s influential appreciation of the events affecting England in the mid-seventeenth century as a wide-ranging cultural revolution. They turned their attention to new areas of enquiry, such as print culture and book history, to make sense of the English revolution, which they came to regard as a historical object with a literary expression of its own. They borrowed from

the work of literary scholars in the process, thus making a strong case for interdisciplinary research.

This relatively recent historiographical trend has affected studies of radicalism and influenced scholars who are willing to take a broad view of historical phenomena without falling back into the highly readable but somewhat too systematic grand narratives of yesteryear. This volume makes a case for adopting a ‘functional’ approach to seventeenth- and eighteenth-century radicalism, as opposed to the over-restrictive ‘nominalist’ approach and the all-embracing ‘substantive’ construct, and recognises that radicalism is a situational category best understood in its historical context.¹¹ What is lacking, though, is a conceptual framework associated with the ‘functional’ approach to make it effective, one that will allow a definition of radicalism to emerge. We suggest four distinguishing features.

First, radicalism is of an oppositional quality and, as a result, evolves through time. Ariel Hessayon is right to argue that it is a relative concept and that what is perceived to be radical at one time may be the norm at another time.¹² Radicalism may thus be defined from an axiological perspective as a process that consists in individuals or groups challenging existing political, social, religious or cultural norms. It represents a minority position, whether it is real or only perceived to be so, while by the majority we mean those who occupy positions of authority and defend the normative status quo, as well as the vast body of the population who accept the established order and manifest no need for change. Radicalism has ‘mainstream’ rather than ‘moderate’ as an antonym. It is precisely its oppositional character that makes it volatile and susceptible to change over time. The Independents in the English Civil Wars, for instance, emblematised the radicalisation of English politics in the 1640s, both at Westminster and in the New Model Army. Their demands for religious toleration based on the coexistence of autonomous congregations were certainly anathema to the proponents of a religious settlement, members of the Church of England and of the Presbyterian church alike, who defended the idea of a national church as a bulwark against sectarianism. In the autumn of 1648, the Independents’ radicalism expressed itself mainly in political terms. The Independents opposed the Treaty of Newport as a mere diversion on the part of the King to outmanoeuvre Parliament, and their criticisms both of Charles’s procrastination and of the

Presbyterians' irresoluteness reflected their defiance of the constitutional *status quo*, as in Ireton's *Remonstrance of the Army* of 16 November,¹³ a radical stance that resulted in Pride's purge of Parliament and the subsequent trial of the King. The Independents' growing impatience with the King and the New Model Army officers' fear of being robbed of their victory over the royalist army possibly explain why their concerns and those of the Levellers as well as of the Army rank and file seemed to coincide in the later months of 1648. This short-lived community of purpose, however, need not blur the lines between Independent leaders and Army officers, on the one hand, who came to embody the political *status quo* in the wake of the regicide, and the Levellers and the Army soldiers, on the other, who continued to challenge the political norms imposed on the nation, an opposition conducive to Army mutinies in the spring of 1649. Nor need the relative consensus between Army officers and the soldiers in the autumn of 1648 obscure the confrontation between those who had accepted political traditions at Putney in October and November 1647, and those who had railed against the political disenfranchisement of the masses and argued for an alternative to the constitutional settlement. The New Model Army soldiers and their supporters in the Leveller movement were radical voices. So were Independent leaders and Army officers, at least at a particular time of the Civil Wars, in that they opposed the existing religious and political norms, even if a degree of self-serving expediency may account for their posture in the autumn of 1648. After the execution of Charles I and the abolition of monarchy, their authority as guardians of the new norms – some of which did not entirely differ from the previous ones – came under growing criticism from those who felt excluded from the post-regicide political settlement and thus adopted an oppositional stance.¹⁴

Closely related to the oppositional nature of radicalism is its second distinguishing feature, namely the fact that radicalism is temporary in essence. One should think of it as consisting of a series of short-lived manifestations rather than as being woven into some long-lasting radical tradition.¹⁵ These manifestations, however, need not be isolated phenomena. Hessayon goes some way towards accepting the recurrent nature of radicalism as he calls for the adoption of a 'functional' approach with some of the 'substantive' put back in, albeit 'in emasculated form',¹⁶ thus cautioning against hastily associating seemingly disparate historical phenomena. He

and Burgess¹⁷ reject the radical tradition of British Marxist historians and the radical canon that comes out of it as part of an ideological construct based on causation and dismissive of historical contingencies and coincidences. Burgess argues for a comparative history of radical moments rather than a continuous history of a broad radical tradition. We wish to go one step further than Burgess's tracing of an intellectual lineage between radical voices as well as remove the caveat from Hessayon's methodological perspective. The very volatility of radicalism and its temporariness, we argue, do not make resurgences impossible. Nor do they make investigating them an unacceptable and impractical scholarly enterprise. Some of the contributions to this volume find the parallels between a number of eighteenth-century radical manifestations and the radical writings and practices of the English Civil Wars to be more than fortuitous echoes and distant reminiscences of a past that had been laid to rest.¹⁸ Mapping continuities makes sense, if only because this can help us to determine how far eighteenth-century radicals modelled their own identities on those of their seventeenth-century predecessors and, thus, have a clearer picture of both the eighteenth- and the seventeenth-century radical scene. Admittedly, the appropriation of seventeenth-century radical figures and ideas by later radicals may have resulted in somewhat romanticised or fantasised reconstructions of the past. However, the study of the influence of Civil War radicalism on eighteenth-century radical thought and discourse as well as of its presence in later radicals' memories need not be dismissed as a historical fabrication, although of course it is by no means the only content of that later radicalism. We concur with Edward Vallance that one should reassess the 'degree of intellectual sympathy and continuity between the radicalism of the seventeenth century and that of the eighteenth'.¹⁹ We wish to build on the work of Timothy Morton and Nigel Smith who, in their *Radicalism in British Literary Culture 1650–1830*, insist that the scholarly concern with the transmission and re-emergence of radical texts does not entail reviving the Marxist vision of a radical tradition but leads to a better understanding of late eighteenth-century radicalism's reinvention of seventeenth-century radical issues.²⁰ Through the example of Richard 'Citizen' Lee and his radical publishing circle, Jon Mee, for example, discusses the influence of Ranterism and seventeenth-century heterodoxy on late eighteenth-century enthusiasts, thus highlighting the professed familiarity of the latter

with the former.²¹ Continuities can clearly be traced from the appropriation by eighteenth-century radicalism of the energies unleashed by religious dissent in the English Civil Wars. Thus, it is possible to talk about some degree of the transmission of radical materials through time and across generations, but always within a broader context where there were also far more discontinuous phenomena. It is no surprise that contemporaries turned to the metaphor of metempsychosis to explain something that appeared to leap from place to place, from time to time, but with no obvious direct connection between each occurrence:

The first broacher of the Presbyterian Religion, and made it differ from that of *Rome* and *Luther* was *Calvin*, who being once banished *Geneva*, was revok'd, at which time he no less petulantly than prophanely applyed to himself that Text of the Holy Prophet which was meant of Christ, *The Stone which the Builders refused is made the head stone of the corner, &c.* Thus *Geneva* Lake swallowed up the Episcopall *See*, and Church Lands wer made secular, which was the white they levell'd at. This *Geneva* Bird flew thence to *France* and hatch'd the *Huguenots*, which make about the tenth part of that people; it took wing also to *Bohemia* and *Germany* high and low, as the *Palatinate*, the land of *Hesse*, and the Confederat Provinces of the States of *Holland*, whence it took flight to *Scotland* and *England*; It took first footing in *Scotland*, when King *James* was a child in his Cradle, but when he came to understand himself, and was manumitted from *Buchanan*, he grew cold in it, and being com to *England* hee utterly disclaim'd it, terming it in a public Speech of his to the Parliament a *Sect* rather than a *Religion*: To this Sect may bee imputed all the scissures that have happen'd in Christianity, with most of the Wars that have lacerated poor *Europe* ever since, and it may be call'd the source of the civill distractions that now afflict this poor Island.²²

From the idea that radicalism is oppositional and temporary, if potentially resurgent, stems the notion of radicalism as a polymorphous category – this being its third distinguishing feature. In the same way as there is no such thing as a radical tradition, a monolithic conception of radicalism is clearly not an effective hypothesis as it fails to account for the various modes of radical expression. It is worth identifying them and proposing an acceptable analytical framework, however daunting the challenge. Jonathan Scott views the development of mid seventeenth-century radicalism as a three-phase process: religious, republican and Restoration radical-

ism, which burgeoned respectively in the 1640s, the 1650s and the 1670s.²³ The problem with this linear pattern is that it lacks flexibility, making little allowance for any amount of interaction or relatedness between the contiguous phases that it describes. We prefer a paradigmatic perspective that identifies different brands of radicalism rather than stages and which accepts the possibility of overlap between them. Nicholas McDowell thus distinguishes between prophetic radicalism – as exemplified by the Ranters or the Quakers – stemming from the Puritan tradition, and rational radicalism – as typified by the Levellers – deriving from the humanist belief in man’s capacity for self-improvement; although not all Levellers fit this category, and Winstanley was both prophetic and in his terms ‘rational’.²⁴ Burgess names three strands of radicalism: religious, constitutional and republican radicalism, the last two brands corresponding closely to McDowell’s ‘rational’ label;²⁵ these can be simultaneous or successive, isolated or connected. We would like to add a fourth category to Burgess’s typology, which offers an apt definition of Leveller radicalism, Harringtonian radicalism and Ranter radicalism, but appears to overlook Digger radicalism. The fact that the Diggers styled themselves ‘True Levellers’ unmistakably reflected their desire to level social differences, tamper with private property and redistribute wealth – a far cry from the Levellers’ constitutional radicalism – but their communistic agenda had much in common with the Ranters’ vindication of communalism against private property as an overbearing symbol of domination.²⁶ Social radicalism may smack of Marxist class struggle rhetoric, but it is certainly a useful category to describe Digger attitudes – and also Ranter attitudes, for that matter – and may overlap with the other modes of radicalism, such as religious radicalism, which apply to the Diggers as well. By suggesting a workable taxonomy of radicalism we run the risk of exposing ourselves to charges of oversimplification and sweeping systematisation. On the other hand, it would not help much to maintain that there were as many radicalisms as there were radicals or groups of radicals and thus eschew any attempt at definition, for, in that case, the radical label would become so fissiparous as to lose almost all of its relevance. We thus identify four varieties of early modern radicalism – constitutional, religious, republican and social – while acknowledging that some individuals or groups fit equally into several of these categories, each of which accommodates nuances and singularities.

The fourth distinguishing feature of radicalism is that it allows idiosyncratic voices to express themselves. Individuals should be given as much attention as groups; personal trajectories matter as much as collective posturing. For all their achievements in terms of political organisation and communication, the Levellers, for example, did not speak with just one voice. The distinctive identities and modes of thought of Lilburne, Overton and Walwyn need not be diluted in or subsumed under their collective enterprise as they continued to express themselves in their writings.²⁷ Studying their lives and their texts separately certainly helps us to have a better grasp of the Leveller movement as a whole.²⁸ Similarly, the New Model Army is known to have been a hotbed of radicalism, with radical figures in some places appearing as part of a group, as in the petitions or in the engagements they penned, in others expressing themselves singularly, as when Edward Sexby or Thomas Rainborough stood up to their officers during the Putney Debates. This is not to say that theirs were isolated voices; after all, as representatives of their regiments, they spoke on behalf of the soldiers who had chosen them and voiced their concerns. Yet, the fact that historians still debate whether Sexby was a Leveller or not indicates that his radical identity still evades us and that it was probably more of a personal than of a collective nature.²⁹ We argue that these seventeenth-century radical figures should be recovered or rediscovered separately, much as their late eighteenth-century radical successors have been; they should be regarded not as participants in a grand narrative in which the plural prevails over the singular or the collective dominates over the personal, but as personal voices – even if not disconnected from significant historical events and movements involving many actors – that truly give us an insight into the complex essence of early modern radicalism.

Owing to its polymorphic nature, radicalism allows for multifaceted scholarly approaches that draw upon a variety of methodological tools. This volume makes a strong case for an interdisciplinary approach to the study of radicalism. Building upon the work of Nigel Smith on mid seventeenth-century religious enthusiasts, *Perfection Proclaimed*, literary scholars have shown special interest recently in recovering radical voices.³⁰ The variegated conceptual approaches that we propose in this volume fit into the global scholarly picture of mutual enrichment and cross-fertilisation as promoted by wide-ranging publications like *The Cambridge Companion to Writing of*

the English Revolution, *The Oxford Handbook of Literature and the English Revolution* and *The Cambridge Companion to British Literature of the French Revolution in the 1790s*.³¹ We believe that a literary discussion of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century materials, one that brings texts and contexts together, can shed new light on the history of the period and thus revitalise its historiography. Most literary students of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries have now challenged the post-structuralist paradigm regarding the instability of meaning and have benefited a great deal from historians' work as they endeavour to revive contextual studies.

It seems to us that literary approaches too can enhance the study of radicalism in two ways. First, they help to bring printed texts back into focus in this post-revisionist age of ours. Modes of radical expression may thus be analysed as literary productions *per se* that interact with their historical context. A fruitful approach is to examine how motifs, imagery and rhetoric are used in texts pertaining to different literary genres or transposed from one type of text to another type of text in the same context or in a different context. It does not make much sense, for instance, to isolate Marvell the oppositional pamphleteer of the 1670s from the earlier Marvell, the poet of the 1640s and 1650s, whose verse is today much more celebrated than his prose, even if recent editions of his polemical writings opportunely add to the knowledge we have of the man and the poet.³² Similarly, John Milton's and George Wither's polemical pamphlets should not be divorced from their poetry. Studying textual resonances between Marvell's, Milton's and Wither's poetry and their prose may help not only to identify rhetorical and stylistic idiosyncrasies but also to determine how these authors engaged with their political and cultural environment. Another potentially successful approach consists in assessing how much radical texts were affected by canonical literary genres and how much they deviated from them, thus making it possible for radical voices to be recovered in terms of their interaction with the cultural norms of their time. We agree with McDowell that the literary evidence that can be garnered from a close study of texts may point to the existence of an English radical imagination, which developed from the interface between elite and popular language.³³ McDowell defines seventeenth-century radicals as 'sophisticated writers and readers who were not excluded from mainstream culture but rather appropriated aspects of that culture in a moment of historical crisis to

develop languages of subversion, opposition and reform'.³⁴ This observation tallies with our characterisation of radicalism as an oppositional, polymorphic and idiosyncratic category. It is the object of this volume to map the English radical imagination of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, partly at least, by focusing on the media used by radicals.

The second way in which literary approaches contribute to the study of radicalism is that they provide tools with which to examine radical discourse. We reject the notion that there exists a radical language that transcends historical epochs and territorial boundaries as a fantasy which tends, if not to obliterate time and space categories, at least to downplay their significance. However, it would be just as preposterous to deny that radical ideas are conveyed through language; thus, early modern radical speech acts need to be revisited as providing insights into how radicals accommodated, travestied or subverted linguistic conventions in an attempt to challenge cultural and political norms.³⁵ Language is the most tangible part of the communicative practices that make up radical discourse. We support an interdisciplinary approach that studies early modern radical discourse in context and interrogates the media through which it communicated itself to its audience. We argue that seventeenth- and eighteenth-century radical discourse was shaped by the interaction of three factors, each of which is best understood in relation to the other two, namely intention, language and reception. These factors apply both to oral and textual manifestations of radical expression, although the only evidence we have of oral interaction in an age which did not leave behind any sound archives is bound to be skewed and partial as it necessarily relies upon written sources. An effective examination of radical discourse thus requires a conceptual framework that borrows methodological tools from various scholarly approaches: biographical and contextual studies; linguistic and semiotic analysis; book history. Analysing how various media, such as pamphlets, newspapers and petitions, became the loci of radical expression in early modern Britain, and how radical texts were disseminated and read, matters as much as the ideas they promoted.

Print culture as a scholarly object opens new avenues for the study of early modern radicalism. The print explosion of the 1640s is not exactly uncharted territory; it has inspired a fair amount of academic work in recent years, with a number of historians and lit-

erary scholars variously probing into cheap and ephemeral materials such as pamphlets and newsbooks.³⁶ They have drawn upon the Habermasian theory of the emergence of a public sphere in seventeenth-century Europe while largely divesting it of its Whiggish systematisation.³⁷ Print culture in seventeenth-century England is now commonly seen as a dynamic process, informed both by historical circumstances and by factors that are intrinsic to its very nature as popular and accessible literature. We wish to extend these findings to our appreciation of radical texts. First, radical literature catered to specific readers who may not be readily identifiable to contemporary eyes but whose concerns and expectations were clearly reflected through the printed medium. Just like writing, reading was a political act whereby disenfranchised individuals symbolically became empowered citizens. Second, radical print was influenced by two major constraints: topicality and regulation. Printing and disseminating material swiftly was a necessity; evading pre-publication censorship was a prerequisite for such material to be circulated.³⁸ Third, the materiality of texts should not be overlooked as printing and transmitting them involved several actors, sometimes whole networks, participating in the economy of the book trade. Printers, like Giles Calvert in the 1640s and Nathaniel Ponder in the 1670s, played a crucial role in diffusing radical texts.³⁹ Therefore, understanding the dynamics of radical communication cannot be divorced from the study of radical discourse.

We think this is best achieved through the meticulous study of cases, which may allow us to draw far-reaching conclusions regarding radical ideas and practices. The following reflections on the mid-seventeenth-century newsbook the *Moderate* will serve to demonstrate how, by paying close attention to a printed medium, we may form a clearer picture of radicalism in the English Civil Wars. The *Moderate* is commonly associated with the Leveller movement as it included Leveller pamphlets and Leveller-inspired petitions. Our contention is that it was not a Leveller newspaper from the outset but developed into one as it seemed to adjust to evolving political circumstances.

Although the birth of the *Moderate* appears to be shrouded in mystery, examining facts regarding publication as well as external and internal textual evidence raises interesting possibilities. There is scant material evidence as to who first took it upon himself to produce this new weekly, and just as little evidence of the

editor's motives for it. What is known for certain is that – in June 1648 – this person appropriated the title and the features, such as numeration and layout, of a long-running news-sheet, the *Moderate Intelligencer*, together with the date of publication; both he and the printer, Robert White, thus collaborated in producing the first issue of this alternative newsbook. The *Moderate* was the first counterfeit Civil War newspaper to develop into a full-blown publication with a distinct identity.⁴⁰ Thus, on Thursday 22 June, there came out two newsbooks entitled the *Moderate Intelligencer* and numbered 170, the logical numeration for the original. Unfortunately, the forged issue has not been found, and the original was just its own true self, with no apparent sign that its editor, John Dillingham, was aware that he was being robbed of his title. Had the forged copy survived, would it have made the conundrum of its origins easier to solve? After all, the first issues of many Civil War weeklies included programmatic statements that spelled out their editors' objectives and, sometimes, made their political bias clear. The first number of the *Moderate Intelligencer*, for example, contained one such expository editorial comment.⁴¹

Is the forger of the *Moderate Intelligencer* likely to have imparted his editorial intentions to his readers, assuming he had some intentions to impart, just as Dillingham had done in the first number of his own newsbook? Only wild guesses can be made: if he did state his purpose in the first issue, this would lend further credence to the political manoeuvre hypothesis whereby its alleged editor, the state censor Gilbert Mabbott, refused to license the newsbook in order to teach Dillingham a lesson in political behaviour. However, the odds are high that the author of the forgery may have wished to operate undercover, keeping as low a profile as possible, and, should this have been the case, he is unlikely to have provided his readers with a programmatic statement. This assumption would certainly substantiate the claim that the *Moderate* was born out of a commercial intrigue as there was good money to be made from journalism, but need not invalidate the political option since both theories are not mutually exclusive.

There is a fair chance that readers were confused by a forgery that was only partly redressed. The editor of the *Moderate* went to great lengths to authenticate his newsbook, first claiming that it was genuine, not counterfeit,⁴² and then giving it a somewhat different shape that would make it more than one of two peas in a pod: it

had a new numeration and pagination, its size was reduced from twelve to eight pages made out of one sheet of paper instead of two, and its day of publication changed from Thursdays to Tuesdays. The editor justified the last two changes with this introductory address: ‘Reader, I am desired by many to change my day from Thursday to Tuesday, because the Kingdom hath much wanted a satisfactory sheet to send that day by the Post into the severall parts thereof; which I have consented unto, for the better Information of all. And because it should not be too voluminous, I have reduced it into one sheet.’⁴³ Taking advantage of the Tuesday postal service indeed made it possible for him to cater for provincial readers at a time when the market for news in the metropolis was especially tight, even if the demand was high. Lack of fortune with insufficient funding and poor sales probably accounted for the emergence of a leaner Tuesday *Moderate*, together with the need for it to show itself as a viable alternative to the *Moderate Intelligencer*, similar enough in outlook for it to claim authenticity but slightly different, all the same, so that it could not be mistaken for its twin publication.

It was only late in August 1648 that the *Moderate* began to diverge from its *alter ego* as a significant innovation was introduced – editorials – which were to crown virtually every issue and give the newsbook its distinct flavour. This innovation was probably part of the editor’s strategy to gain a competitive edge over his business rival Dillingham since the *Moderate Intelligencer* had been running short editorials for two weeks, implicitly calling for compromise and the appeasement of passions as a way out of the civil war. There is clearly some irony in the fact that by trying to emulate his competitor and carving out a niche for himself in the news market the editor of the *Moderate* ended up cutting a thoroughly different political figure, a far cry from its sibling the *Moderate Intelligencer*. The reasons why the *Moderate* evolved into a radical weekly which came to support hard-line parliamentarians against the Presbyterian majority and began to speak for the Levellers may only be guessed at. Possibly the need to penetrate a new market, at a time when sales may not have allowed the newsbook to outperform its rival the *Moderate Intelligencer*, justified a renewed editorial line. Maybe political developments in the summer of 1648, when a negotiated settlement with the King was high on the agenda, made for a different approach to news. Perhaps one should think of the *Moderate* as having acquired its radical character instead of having been born with it.

A close examination of how the editorials of the *Moderate* – for which the publication has received posthumous acclaim – are integrated into the cheap print economy reveals a more inclusive political stance than is commonly accepted. The leading articles in the autumn of 1648 voiced concerns over the Presbyterians' compromising attitude with the King and enunciated principles that were common to both leading Independents and Levellers. They were not only shaped by Leveller identification, for most of them were fiercely anti-royalist, to a greater degree perhaps than Leveller leaders would have acknowledged for themselves, and resolutely defended popular sovereignty in much the same terms as the *Remonstrance of the Army*, inspired by the Independent officer Ireton. Some of the October editorials provide examples of texts that were circulated in the New Model Army as pamphlets or collections of news.⁴⁴ Only after the regicide and the establishment of the republic did the *Moderate* tread an exclusively Leveller path and throw all its weight behind those who found fault with the ruling oligarchy. In addition to editorials which criticised the Commonwealth elite it included seditious Leveller pamphlets. It also proved to be sensitive to the plight of the poorer part of the population, who especially suffered from the severe economic crisis besetting England, and was the only newsbook to show some sympathy for the Diggers, whose occupation of communal land on St George's Hill in Surrey in April 1649 gave Commonwealth authorities cause for concern.⁴⁵ The Levellers, it should be recalled, expressed reservations about the Diggers' social radicalism⁴⁶ and, as a result, might have disapproved of the *Moderate's* reasonably benign treatment of Winstanley's digging community.

All these remarks on the birth of the *Moderate* as well as some of its content imply that it was not a 'Leveller organ',⁴⁷ in that it was not the official, institutional publication of the Levellers as an organised group, but of course this does not mean that it was not radical. Its radical identity, precisely, contributed to the denigration of the *Moderate* as 'the most infamous periodical that had yet appeared', unlike the *Moderate Intelligencer*, authored by Dillingham, 'a moderate Presbyterian to whom the idea of any personal attack on the King was abhorrent'.⁴⁸ The *Moderate* thus reflected the views of a composite radical scene during and immediately after the second Civil War, one that was occupied by the Levellers and the New Model Army, including its officers in the

autumn of 1648, and shaped by the course of events. The *Moderate* was a vehicle for radical discourse: studying the medium as integral to the popular print culture of seventeenth-century England cannot be separated from a thorough examination of the content conveyed by this medium.

It is essential to discover how radical voices, whether they were individual or collective, were mediated through print; in other words, in what ways they engaged with their political, religious, social and cultural environment. It is just as important to appreciate what made specific media, chiefly pertaining to the cheap print economy, effective means of diffusing radical ideas. Our efforts at defining radical communicative practices should be directed towards a better understanding of how widely ideas travelled. The historiography of seventeenth-century English radicalism has been mostly Anglocentric so far and has tended to overlook transnational contiguities, with the possible exception of transatlantic exchanges with New England.⁴⁹ The influence of the French Revolution on eighteenth-century British radicalism is well documented, although some work still needs to be done on how ideas and men circulated before a full picture of radical networks, however fluid, emerges. Seventeenth-century radicals lacked the unity of purpose and the organisation to operate Europe-wide networks. There was no public endorsement of the English revolution in Europe, probably because the English revolution was originally a civil war that degenerated into a regicide accompanied by a change of state. There was no founding popular event in England on the scale of the storming of the Bastille in Paris to encourage copycat actions elsewhere on the continent. This is not to say, however, that what we have described as radical ideas and texts did not cross the Channel at all. Exchanges of radical ideas between Britain and the European continent did take place, but in a low-key fashion which makes European radical influences and connections rather difficult to detect.

We argue that British radicalism is best appreciated in its transnational context, and that this principle applies as much to the British Isles in the seventeenth century as to eighteenth-century Britain. The need to trace cultural transfers between Britain and Europe in the early modern period has given rise to an expanding field of research which studies the mutual recuperation of ideas as well as the role played by *passeurs* or transmitters, for example Quirinus Kuhlmann – a Silesian millenarian with an influence in England and

right across northern Europe. We still need to explore how radical ideas were intermediated, that is to say who passed them on, what media were used for their diffusion and how these media were employed. We should look into the dissemination, reception and modes of radical communication between Britain and the continent; this includes the study of translations of radical texts into English or European languages and the adaptation of these texts to contexts for which they were not intended.⁵⁰

We wish to build on such recent scholarly works as Gaby Mahlberg and Dirk Wiemann's *European Contexts for English Republicanism* and Ariel Hessayon and Sarah Apetrei's *An Introduction to Jacob Boehme: Four Centuries of Thought and Reception*.⁵¹ The former collection of essays offers a two-dimensional perspective on the circulation of republican ideas as it brings to the fore how English republican ideas were shaped by contemporary European republican thought and how they impacted on it. It notably studies cultural transfers between the English Commonwealth and the Dutch Republic.⁵² The latter book seeks to map European heterodox networks by focusing on the publication, dissemination and influence of the writings of Jacob Boehme, the illiterate shoemaker turned millenarian prophet who is shown to have had a significant impact and enjoyed a long afterlife across Europe. In his own contribution to his edited volume, Hessayon studies the translation of Boehme's writings into English and discusses their influence on English radicals, notably the Diggers and the Ranters, only to conclude that there were relatively few English Behmenists and that Boehme's texts made no major contribution to political and religious debates in revolutionary England and had a muted impact on heterodox thinkers, save for a handful of individual figures. Nigel Smith offers a contrasting view and has different conclusions on the influence of Boehme on English radical sects.⁵³ Boehme's thought possibly contaminated English heterodox cosmologies indirectly more than it informed them, and undoubtedly came to have a lasting influence in England.

England did not just accommodate teachings from the continent but also exported its own radical ideas, whether they were home-bred or reworked from continental writings. It is certainly of interest to look beyond the official diplomatic high game to retrieve underground connections from oblivion. The influence of the English revolution on France during the Fronde, for example,

and the impact of radical transfers in particular, ought to be measured with greater accuracy. We wish to stress the pivotal role played by Edward Sexby, the New Model Army radical, as a vector of ideas, one who helped to promote English radical ideas in France.

The Council of State as the executive body of the Commonwealth commissioned Sexby to visit France in the autumn of 1651 in order to secure precise information about the political situation there and capitalise on the revolt against chief minister Cardinal Mazarin, a highly unpopular and contested figure, to destabilise the country even further.⁵⁴ The Fronde spread to regions other than Paris, notably Bordeaux and the province of Guyenne, where several rebellious factions were at play. One of them was the radical Ormée, named after a square planted with elm trees and described in a condescending manner by the French nineteenth-century historian Victor Cousin in his *Madame de Longueville* as ‘sortie du bas people, ou du moins de la très petite bourgeoisie, quoiqu’elle eût aussi des adhérents dans les rangs les plus élevés’ (‘grown out of the masses or, at least, out of the very lowest orders of the bourgeoisie, although some of its members came from the upper ranks of society’), as opposed to the ‘petite Fronde’, which included ‘ce qu’il y avait de mieux dans le parlement, l’hôtel de ville et la bourgeoisie, par la naissance, les lumières, la fortune’ (‘the best men among Parliament members, town officials and the bourgeoisie, in terms of birth, education and wealth’).⁵⁵ Both the Ormée and the Prince de Condé, the leader of the Fronde of the Princes, sent emissaries to England so as to secure the support of Cromwell. All they got in the end was some timid public backing which fell far short of their expectations but had the advantage of not alienating French authorities and leaving diplomatic options open.⁵⁶ Meanwhile, Sexby advertised English republican ideas with Ormée members as he encouraged them to adopt a translated version of the Leveller manifesto *The Agreement of the People* whose style Cousin disparaged as betraying the work of a foreign hand.⁵⁷

A comparison of the translated version, poor and sloppy though it may be, with the original text yields interesting results. The most obvious observation is that Sexby translated the third and last version of *The Agreement of the People*, which the Leveller leaders drafted while they were in gaol in the Tower of London and rolled off the radical printer Giles Calvert’s press on 1 May 1649.⁵⁸ Its publication accompanied a spate of radical agitation within the

New Model Army, caused by growing dissatisfaction with the new republic as unheeded grievances were left to simmer, and was instrumental in fostering Army mutinies in the spring of 1649. A close examination of both the original and the translated texts reveals that the French translation generally follows the English version, except for a few unimportant emendations meant to accommodate local linguistic and political realities.

Two seemingly minor changes were made to the specifics of the text, but these are revealing of Sexby's intentions and political positioning. First, article XXVI in the English manifesto, which calls for liberty of conscience and provides that none shall be disabled from 'bearing any office in the Common-wealth, for any opinion or practice in Religion, excepting such as maintain, the Popes (or other forraign) Supremacy',⁵⁹ is absent from the French translation, reproduced by Cousin in *Madame de Longueville*. Article X, which defends religious toleration in the most general terms as a constitutional right and makes it illegal for Parliament to interfere with matters of conscience, duly appears in the French text. This shows that the principle of religious toleration as defended by the Independents and the Levellers alike is enshrined in this constitutional document, which in a French context probably meant that Huguenots should be guaranteed the right to practise their faith and be protected from persecution. In addition to that, the French translation of the Agreement provides a sound example of *realpolitik* or practical adaptation to contingencies as it does not explicitly exclude Catholics from any political settlement, if only because the Ormée faction was a motley assortment of Catholics and Protestants. It is very likely, therefore, that Sexby was a keen political observer. Either he was given significant leeway by Commonwealth authorities for the compiling of his translation, assuming that he had not taken it upon himself to produce the text, or religious concerns were only second to political priorities.

The second major change that Sexby introduced in his translation concerned political institutions, and more specifically the distribution of power between the executive body of the Commonwealth and the Representative of the People, as the legislative assembly was named in the text. Article VIII in the original version establishes the absolute supremacy of Parliament and rejects the Council of State as an illegitimate body: 'in times of adjournment [the next & al future Representatives] shall not erect a Council of State but refer

the managing of affairs in the intervals to a Committee of their own members, giving such instructions, and publish them, as shall in no measure contradict this agreement'.⁶⁰ The wording of the French translation is ambiguous: 'durant le temps d'adjournement ils [les représentatives] erigeront un conseil d'Etat, ou comitté, de ceux de leurs corps, leur donnant telles instructions qui ne contreviendront point à cest accord et le feront publier'⁶¹ ('in times of adjournment [representatives] shall erect a council of state, or committee, of their own members, giving such instructions, and publish them, as shall in no measure contradict this agreement'). The phrase 'council of state' may have been intended as a convenient synonym for the word 'committee' or as a straightforward reference to the Council of State as it was in 1653 when Sexby translated the *Agreement of the People*. We will never know whether, by supplying an imprecise translation of the Levellers' text, Sexby, the former opponent of the Army Grandees in the Putney debates, was doing his utmost to ingratiate himself with the Council of State, at a troubled time when Cromwell had dismissed the Rump Parliament, or whether he was simply eluding the ire of Commonwealth authorities who might have resented an attack on their prerogatives, even in translated form, had the caveat regarding the Council of State in the original Leveller text remained untouched.

In any case, Sexby's attempt to import the English revolution into France by fanning the flames of rebellion in Bordeaux and encouraging popular revolt was unsuccessful, for the Frondeurs, with the exception of the members of the Ormée faction, had no intention of subverting political or social norms. As Philip Knachel claimed, 'the English example aborted rather than stimulated the growth of republican sentiment among most Frondeurs'.⁶² According to Wilbur Abbott, the impact of the translated *Agreement of the People* on the Bordeaux rebels was minimal: 'This [translation of the *Agreement of the People*] found little acceptance among those in charge of the Fronde, and though Sexby and his colleagues remained in the south of France for more than a year, they did not accomplish much in the way of an agreement between the Commonwealth and the opponents of French monarchy.'⁶³ They may have had a lasting subterranean influence, though, which would need further analysis.

Yet, on the other side of the Channel, there was hope that the English model would be copied in France and that the Fronde would end in an all-out revolution, if the reports on French events

given in the official Commonwealth and Protectorate newsbook *Mercurius Politicus* are anything to go by. While the contributors to the newspaper consistently voiced prejudices against the French, whom they vilified as ‘those Monkees of Mankind’,⁶⁴ and seemed to find amusement in the Fronde, which they compared to a mere game of tennis, they expressed admiration for the ‘brave Bourdelois’⁶⁵ and especially praised their tireless resistance to royal power, as embodied by Mazarin, combined with an unflinching resolve to secure liberty.⁶⁶ The encouragements Marchamont Nedham, the principal author of *Mercurius Politicus*, gave to the rebels in Bordeaux were possibly a ploy to fashion a positive image of the Commonwealth by striking a patriotic chord with readers and, thus, to ward off any risk of political instability at home. They may also have reflected the English Government’s satisfaction with the idea of having a weakened France at its door, considering that France harboured English royalist exiles and that they still posed a threat to the Commonwealth.

The French translation of the *Agreement of the People* illustrates the fortunes of this Leveller text, which was adapted to a different context from the one for which it was intended. It shows that there was a breeding ground for radical activity in south-western France in the early 1650s, but Sexby’s ultimate failure to generate support for it indicates that the form of radicalism associated with the Levellers could not find its way into French society as a whole; it remained epiphenomenal and peripheral. It also shows that such a radical text could be recuperated by the unofficial agent of a government that had gone to great lengths to suppress radical groups of all stripes. The fact is that the English Government is unlikely to have been unaware of Sexby’s doings in Guyenne, given that, some time after his return to England, the ex-Agitator received payment to cover the expenses he had incurred during his mission in France. It cannot be ruled out that the Commonwealth intended to get rid of Sexby in the first place by sending him abroad. Perhaps it should be accepted that, of all radicals, Sexby was the most capable of achieving two different aims at the same time: standing by the Commonwealth, whose leaders he had once opposed, while not renouncing his radical ideas altogether, hence his translation of the *Agreement of the People* into French. A plausible option is that Sexby was in fact involved in double-dealing, pretending to be serving his government while pursuing his own political agenda.

His case is a fitting illustration of what popular radicalism is all about. His personal trajectory offers an insight into the global picture that caused radical energies to circulate from one context to another at the time of the English revolution. As an Army Agitator in the Putney debates, Sexby took an active part in promoting the principles of equal representation and quasi-universal suffrage as enshrined in the 1647 Leveller constitutional text *The Agreement of the People*, thus challenging the political norms of his time. He was instrumental in diffusing these principles, albeit on a limited scale in Bordeaux, by translating the *Agreement* into French. The Leveller manifesto was part and parcel of the cheap print economy that was shaping up in mid seventeenth-century England and made it possible for radical ideas to travel, including across borders.

In 1657 Sexby drew up an apology for tyrannicide, *Killing No Murder*, explicitly targeted at Cromwell and evidently influenced by anti-monarchical writings of the sixteenth century, as well as by Machiavelli's thought. This pamphlet is a particularly apt example of cultural transfer between England and France. It was translated into French almost immediately after its publication by Jacques Carpentier de Marigny.⁶⁷ It survived the Restoration in England as a new edition of it came out in Edinburgh in 1745, which may have been commissioned and circulated by Jacobites. Another French edition of the original text was published in revolutionary France and a new translation into French, with a dedication to Napoleon instead of Cromwell, was completed in 1804, the very year Napoleon was crowned Emperor.⁶⁸ Following the peregrinations of Sexby's tract on both sides of the Channel helps to measure the fluidity and porosity of English radicalism, as well as its adaptability to other contexts than the one which produced it. Looking out for continuities and resurgences need not imply that we are losing track of original contexts, but it does help to cast new light on them. A study of radicalism in early modern England should therefore not ignore transnational continuities.

It has been shown that the study of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century English radicalism will benefit from multifarious approaches. Transnational and transhistorical explorations which avoid the pitfalls of systematisation have been duly lauded. It has been argued that methodological approaches developed by literary scholars are well suited to this study as they offer renewed perspectives that are fully compatible with and complement historical

analysis. We have insisted that radical communicative practices need to be investigated further, which is precisely what this volume purports to do, by focusing on the expression of radical voices and their interaction with various media. Contributors were given leeway to use their own methodological tools and approaches with a view to studying various aspects of radical communication in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Britain.

Part I of this volume explores the language and motifs used by some seventeenth- and eighteenth-century radicals. Jean-Pierre Cavaillé in Chapter 1 discusses the ‘community of goods’ motif permeating Digger and Ranter writings, a theme he studies from an axiological perspective which draws upon the notions of acceptability and unacceptability. While borrowing from Christopher Hill’s analysis of seventeenth-century radical plebeians the idea that the ‘community of goods’ theme is rooted in English history, he acknowledges that this motif owes as much to literary culture as to popular culture and argues that the context in which it developed should not be overlooked. According to Jean-Pierre Cavaillé, the fact that community of goods as a political motif was publicised through print in the late 1640s and early 1650s reflected the attempt of hitherto marginal radical voices to enter the public sphere. The motif was taken up by some early Quakers but they soon developed a more acceptable form of public discourse.

In her Chapter 2, Carine Lounissi studies Thomas Paine’s ‘democratic style’ as being part and parcel of his inherently republican and democratic radicalism. She argues that in his writings Paine sought to deconstruct the discourse of the political elite of his time, associated with the trappings of royalty, and promoted the language of common sense instead as an instrument of resistance premised on the universality of human nature. She shows that Paine’s relentless attack on monarchy borrowed from different anti-monarchical motifs and forms of language, including the ‘Norman Conquest’ and ‘Norman Yoke’ motifs as used by the Levellers and the Diggers. Paine thus tried to uncover the earlier language that he thought monarchy by conquest had erased and replaced by a usurped form of language that did not produce any sensible discourse. One should be careful not to overplay the linguistic parallels between Paine and seventeenth-century radicals, but one cannot ignore them either. It is fair to argue that linguistic norms as symbols of political and social domination posed a challenge to a number of radicals, as

exemplified by the Levellers' and the Diggers' unflagging denunciation of the language of lawyers, which they associated with the Norman Conquest. Political usurpation cannot be divorced from its linguistic manifestations.

Catie Gill in Chapter 3 discusses early Quakers' unease with language and the written word as expressed by their attitudes towards unlearnedness. She contends that the Quakers' position on learning is not as clear and monolithic as appears at first glance. The way Quakers described inward learning changed from writer to writer and was expressed in a variety of writings, such as conversion narratives, poetry and polemical tracts. Various case studies underpin her analysis: she analyses Edward Burrough's and William Dewsbury's conversion narratives, and examines other Quaker writings, such as a poem by Susanna Bateman which stages the ontological divide between reason and faith, to establish how Quakers responded to the debate about whether the Bible encouraged learning and knowledge. She contrasts this poem with Quaker writings that are not so averse to outward learning and that hint at the limits of experiential knowledge. From Catie Gill's analysis it becomes clear that a study of seventeenth-century heterodoxy, and early modern radicalism at large, cannot dispense with a close examination of the modes of expression used by individual voices, apprehended in their sheer diversity. Her chapter is an illustration of the practical and demotic nature of radicalism.

Part II of this volume examines radical exchanges and networks, as well as transfers between Britain and Europe, essentially France. Patrick Müller in Chapter 4 examines a personal trajectory, that of the third Earl of Shaftesbury, against the backdrop of post-Restoration politics. He asks whether a new interpretation of Shaftesbury as a radical political theorist is justifiable and whether the term 'radical' can be applied to a man who has traditionally been regarded as an aesthete and a moralist rather than a political writer, and whose political identity has been thought to be Whig. To answer this question he proposes a chronological survey of Shaftesbury's development as an actor on the political scene. He first reviews Shaftesbury's early political career and shows the influence of his grandfather, who helped to forge a distinctively Whig ideology in Shaftesbury's political stance. He then discusses Shaftesbury's early years as a parliamentarian who conversed with a number of radical figures, especially Toland, with whom he wrote

The Danger of Mercenary Parliaments, a detailed reckoning with Charles II. Shaftesbury's correspondence provides evidence that he had a hand in new editions of classical English republicans, including the writings of James Harrington, John Milton and Algernon Sidney. Patrick Müller studies Shaftesbury's *Characteristicks* as a utopian text which makes a case for dispensing with the political influence of the Church and all established forms of religion and promotes religious toleration. It is likely that Shaftesbury's radicalism was the result of his rubbing shoulders with radical thinkers but, as Patrick Müller argues, it was counterbalanced by his pragmatism, so that the radical implications of his thought are constantly held in check by a contrary impulse.

Nicholas Treuherz in Chapter 5 explores radical networks and investigates transnational continuities as he appraises the impact of the French *philosophe* Baron d'Holbach's works on eighteenth-century British radicals. Drawing upon the resources offered by the digital humanities he analyses bibliographical data regarding d'Holbach in terms of translations, sales and circulation of his works in Britain as well as press reactions to them. He finds evidence of the diffusion of d'Holbach's texts in the library holdings of canonical figures, such as David Hume and John Wilkes, as well as in private correspondence. He concludes that multiple intellectual networks and friendships could have potentially allowed d'Holbach's texts to penetrate British markets. Finally, Nicholas Treuherz examines how d'Holbach's texts were read by describing four case studies of British radicals whose reading of the French philosopher's works was instrumental in circulating his ideas in Britain: William Godwin, Dr John Jebb, Joseph Priestley and William Hodgson. His review of these radical voices allows him to not only to map transnational networks of radical thought but also to consider how French notions of radicalism were made to adjust to a British context. Both Patrick Müller's and Nicholas Treuherz's chapters establish that any effective study of radicalism will benefit from a careful examination of exchanges made possible by coteries and social circles as well as national and transnational networks.

Part III of this volume discusses media and practices used by seventeenth- and eighteenth-century radicals. Civil War petitions and eighteenth-century toasts as vehicles for radical expression receive attention in two chapters. In Chapter 6, Jason Peacey studies the relationships between Parliament, print and petitioning in revo-

lutionary England. He explores the tension between the potential for political participation at Westminster and the problems related to this practice, and argues that this tension allows for a better understanding of political radicalism in the English revolution. His chapter rests on two foundations: first, the idea that an information revolution relating to Parliament developed in the seventeenth century, which made political information affordable; second, a sense that Parliament was extremely useful, hence citizens' increased participation in its proceedings, not least through petitioning. Jason Peacey highlights the radicalisation of petitioners' rhetoric stemming from their frustration with Parliament's handling of their petitions and concludes his chapter with the contention that radicalism was forged by forces that brought together individuals who became disappointed with participatory politics.

Rémy Duthille in Chapter 7 studies how another cultural practice, the raising of toasts, was adopted by eighteenth-century English radicals as a political act in its own right, one that was integral to the repertoire of practices deployed during ritualised dinners. He argues that it is possible to reconstruct the thought pattern of those present at these dinners from the toasts they raised and that the toasts could fail, thus provoking strife instead of unifying reformers. Drawing upon archival evidence, in particular the minute books of the Society for Constitutional Information, he analyses toasts as speech acts and as rituals of interaction, for toasting performed an integrative function in radical societies, fostering solidarity and mobilisation. He shows that toasts were often used as rituals of remembrance that helped to build a sense of historical continuity with seventeenth-century England and, through an analysis of their linguistic structure, proves that toasts reflected evolving thoughts rather than set ideas, and consequently helped to redefine political vocabulary. Rémy Duthille finally looks into responses to controversial toasting, from prosecution to fighting, and proves that toasting was often used by radicals to test one another's loyalties, sometimes begetting violence.

The final Part IV of this volume studies fiction as a mode of radical expression, thus illustrating the interdisciplinary approach that has been advanced in this Introduction. Catherine Vigier in Chapter 8 discusses the diffusion of radical ideas from the perspective of a captivity narrative, *Ebenezer; or, A Small Monument of Great Mercy, Appearing in the Miraculous Deliverance of William Okeley*,

published by the radical printer Nathaniel Ponder. Her premise is that the captivity narrative is best apprehended as a literary text constructed in the light of the political and ideological debates of its age since it offers a veiled criticism of domestic events under the guise of a remote setting and plot. The publication of Okeley's narrative is to be interpreted as an act of militant Protestantism in a culture of dissent at a time – the post-Restoration era – which witnessed increased repression against dissenters. Catherine Vigier argues that Okeley's narrative should be understood as part of a corpus of work published by Ponder in defence of nonconformist ideas and, by examining the themes and imagery running through the narrative, she establishes links with some of Andrew Marvell's poems and prose works, in particular *The Rehearsal Transpros'd*. She analyses biblical and mythological references in both Okeley's narrative and Marvell's pamphlets to support her claim that the Okeley text carried the polemical debate surrounding *The Rehearsal Transpros'd* to a wider public, and that publishing this captivity narrative, a popular literary genre, allowed Ponder and his collaborators to make a further case for freedom of speech.

Marion Leclair's Chapter 9 studies the novels of Godwin, Holcroft and Bage from the perspective of novelistic conventions. She argues that these eighteenth-century British radical novelists subverted the prevailing novelistic order – style, plot and narration – and that their radical challenge to established authority is reflected in the form of their novels. They found fault with contemporary novels glossing over truth and using ornament as a truth-distorting device, this being associated with Burke and conservative politics. In return, they had an embryonic stylistic programme for their novels which rejected the conventional style of such highly popular and marketable publications as sentimental novels and gothic romances. Marion Leclair then examines the three novelists' treatment of plot and shows them to challenge the conventional types of plot – romantic, picaresque and gothic – which they levelled from a social perspective, from a structural point of view, and from a moral angle. She then discusses narration and mentions the disappearance of a clearly identifiable moral voice, the narrator's authority being challenged as the dividing line between character and narrator became blurred. She concludes that novelistic conventions underwent more substantial changes at the hands of these radical writers than is usually acknowledged.

The last chapter of this volume, Chapter 10, provides an interdisciplinary analysis that reaches across historical and national boundaries. Its author, Edward Vallance, studies the representation of three English regicides, John Dixwell, William Goffe and Edward Whalley, in early nineteenth-century British fiction via the treatment made of them in late eighteenth-century histories and biographies. The three of them escaped to New England in the 1660s and their fate remained largely unknown until the late eighteenth century, as dissenting historians were not comfortable about tackling this topic because of the connections made between nonconformity and republicanism by High Church critics. Edward Vallance examines the histories of Thomas Hutchinson and Ezra Stiles, whose story of the ‘Angel of Hudley’, thought to be the ghost of Willam Goffe, was a fruitful source for authors of fiction, ranging from Sir Walter Scott to James Fenimore Cooper and Nathaniel Hawthorne, as well as poets like Robert Southey. Edward Vallance then raises the question of what provoked this flurry of literary interest in the three regicides and suggests that the story of Dixwell, Goffe and Whalley had a wide appeal in the Romantic period. Edward Vallance then explores the impact of historians’ accounts of the three regicides on the Romantic imagination. By presenting the regicide as an act of madness, early nineteenth-century writers of fiction – such as Ebenezer Elliott and Robert Southey – ultimately diminished its political threat.

From the Diggers to the Ranters and the Quakers, from Shaftesbury to d’Holbach and Paine, from Okeley to Godwin, Holcroft and Bage, from seventeenth-century English regicides to eighteenth-century British radicals, a diversity of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century radical voices beckon to us. From pamphlets to correspondence and fiction, from ritual toasts to petitions to Parliament, these voices expressed themselves in a variety of media, thus interacting with their contemporaries and communicating themselves to those who came after them; they still speak from bygone ages. By exploring the ways in which radical voices engaged with forms and means of expression the chapters collected in this volume offer a sense of the complexity of radical communication in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century England.

The editors of this volume make a case for a broad definition of radicalism, one that eschews prescriptive categorisation and includes descriptive accounts of what it actually was. We wish to

end this Introduction with a suggestion that, we hope, will foster further debate. Our definition of radicalism may apply to groups that are not, and have not been, commonly described as radicals, for example Roman Catholics after 1588, royalists after the 1649 regicide or Jacobites after 1688. It is certainly no coincidence that part of the English Jesuit Robert Persons's tract *A Conference about the Next Succession to the Crown of England* (1596), written in support of tyrannicide, found its way into the *Moderate* in the winter of 1648–49 after it had been reprinted by the radical printer Robert Ibbitson.⁶⁹ This example ties in with our definition of radicalism as an oppositional and temporary phenomenon as well as expressing a minority position. We trust that this volume will open up new avenues of research and lay the foundations for successful explorations and fresh discoveries.

Notes

- 1 C. Hill, 'From Lollards to Levellers', in M. Cornforth (ed.), *Rebels and their Causes: Essays in Honour of A. L. Morton* (London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1978), pp. 49–68.
- 2 C. Condren, 'Radicals, Conservatives and Moderates in early modern political thought: a case of the Sandwich Islands Syndrome?', *History of Political Thought*, 10 (1989), 525–42; C. Condren, *The Language of Politics in Seventeenth-Century England* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1994); C. Condren, 'Afterword: Radicalism revisited', in G. Burgess and M. Festenstein (eds), *English Radicalism 1550–1850* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), pp. 311–37; J. C. D. Clark, *Our Shadowed Present: Modernism, Postmodernism and History* (London: Atlantic, 2003); J. C. D. Clark, 'Religion and the origins of radicalism in nineteenth-century Britain', in Burgess and Festenstein (eds), *English Radicalism*, pp. 241–84.
- 3 This phrase refers to the Marxist historian C. Hill's seminal work *The World Turned Upside Down: Radical Ideas during the English Revolution* (London: Maurice Temple Smith, 1972). Hill took the term from a contemporary pamphlet of a hostile kind.
- 4 For example, Thomas Edwards, *Gangraena: Or A Catalogue and Discovery of many of the Errours, Heresies, Blasphemies and pernicious Practices of the Sectaries of this time, vented and acted in England in these four last years* (London, 1646).
- 5 *The True Levellers Standard Advanced* (London, 1649); Abiezer Coppe, *A Fiery Flying Roll: A Word from the Lord to all the great Ones of the Earth, whom this may concerne: Being the Best Warning*

- Piece at the dreadfull day of Judgement* (London, 1650), p. 4. On the issue of naming radical sects, see Nigel Smith's introduction to his new edition of Ranter writings: *A Collection of Ranter Writings – Spiritual Liberty and Sexual Freedom in the English Revolution*, ed. Nigel Smith (London: Pluto Press, 2014), pp. 1–31. See also Jean-Pierre Cavaillé's Chapter 1 in this volume.
- 6 This does not mean that Walwyn had renounced his ideas altogether but that he did not publicise them in polemical pamphlets the way he had in the 1640s. On Walwyn's later career as a physician, see Derek Hirst, 'A happier man: the refashioning of William Walwyn', *The Seventeenth Century*, 27:1 (2012), 54–78.
 - 7 G. Burgess, 'Introduction', in Burgess and Festeinstein (eds), *English Radicalism*, pp. 1–16; G. Burgess, 'A matter of context: "Radicalism" and the English Revolution', in M. Caricchio and G. Tarantino (eds), *Cromohs Virtual Seminars: Recent Historiographical Trends of British Studies (17th–18th Centuries)* (2006–7). www.cromohs.unifi.it/seminari/burgess_radicalism.html (accessed 29 August 2015).
 - 8 H. Kaye, *The Education of Desire: Marxists and the Writing of History* (New York, N.Y.; London: Routledge, 1992), pp. 98–115.
 - 9 For a survey of revisionist approaches to the English revolution, see G. Burgess, 'On revisionism: an analysis of early Stuart historiography in the 1970s and 1980s', *Historical Journal*, 33 (1990), 609–27.
 - 10 J. C. Davis, *Fear, Myth, and History: The Ranters and the Historians* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986).
 - 11 For a defence of the 'functional' approach, see J. C. Davis, 'Radicalism in a traditional society: the evaluation of radical thought in the English Commonwealth 1649–1660', *History of Political Thought*, 3 (1982), 193–213; J. C. Davis, 'Afterword: reassessing radicalism in a traditional society: two questions', in Burgess and Festeinstein (eds), *English Radicalism*, pp. 338–72.
 - 12 A. Hessayon, 'Reappraising early modern radicals and radicalisms', in A. Hessayon and D. Finnegan (eds), *Varieties of Seventeenth- and Early Eighteenth-Century English Radicalism in Context* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2011), pp. 6–7.
 - 13 *A Remonstrance of His Excellency Thomas Lord Fairfax, Lord Generall of the Parliaments Forces and of the Generall Councell of Officers Held at St Albans the 16. of November, 1648. Presented to the Commons assembled in Parliament, the 20. instant and tendred to the Consideration of the whole Kingdome* (London, 1648).
 - 14 As expressed in their later tracts, the Levellers would have been happy with a monarchy rather than the Commonwealth oligarchy, but a mixed, not an absolutist, monarchy which accommodated democratic principles.

- 15 See J. C. Davis, 'Afterword: reassessing radicalism', p. 364.
- 16 A. Hessayon, 'Fabricating radical traditions', in Caricchio and Tarantino (eds), *Cromohs Virtual Seminars*.
- 17 G. Burgess, 'A matter of context', in Caricchio and Tarantino (eds), *Cromohs Virtual Seminars*.
- 18 See, for example, chapters 2 and 7.
- 19 E. Vallance, 'Reborn John? The Eighteenth-Century Afterlife of John Lilburne', *Historical Workshop Journal*, 74:1 (2012), 21. Also see his Chapter 10 in this volume.
- 20 T. Morton and N. Smith, 'Introduction', in T. Morton and N. Smith (eds), *Radicalism in British Literary Culture, 1650–1830 – From Revolution to Revolution* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), p. 10.
- 21 J. Mee, 'The strange career of Richard "Citizen" Lee: poetry, popular radicalism and enthusiasm in the 1790s', in T. Morton and N. Smith (eds), *Radicalism in British Literary Culture*, p. 155.
- 22 James Howell, *Additionall Letters Of a fresher Date, Never Publish'd before, And Composed by the same Author*, in *Epistolae Ho-Eliaanae. Familiar Letters Domestic and Forren; Divided into sundry Sections, Partly Historical, Politicall, Philosophicall, Vpon Emergent Occasions* (1650), pp. 5–6.
- 23 J. Scott, *England's Troubles – Seventeenth-Century English Political Instability in European Context* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), pp. 37–8.
- 24 N. McDowell, 'Writing the literary and cultural history of radicalism in the English revolution', in Caricchio and Tarantino (eds), *Cromohs Virtual Seminars*.
- 25 Burgess, 'A matter of context', in Caricchio and Tarantino (eds), *Cromohs Virtual Seminars*.
- 26 Coppe, *A Fiery Flying Roll*, p. 21. See L. Curelly, 'The Diggers and the Ranters: eccentric bedfellows?', in S. Aymes-Stokes and L. Mellet (eds), *In and Out: Eccentricity in Britain* (Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2012), p. 99.
- 27 R. Foxley, 'The Levellers: John Lilburne, Richard Overton, and William Walwyn', in L. L. Knoppers (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Literature and the English Revolution* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), pp. 272–86; R. Foxley, *The Levellers: Radical Political Thought in the English Revolution* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2013).
- 28 L. Borot, 'Richard Overton and radicalism: the new intertext of the civic ethos in mid seventeenth-century England', in Burgess and Festenstein (eds), *English Radicalism*, pp. 37–86; R. Foxley, 'John Lilburne and the Citizenship of "Free-Born Englishmen"', *Historical Journal*, 47:4 (2004), 849–74; A. Sharp, 'John Lilburne and the Long Parliament's

- Book of Declarations: a radical's exploitation of the words of authorities', *History of Political Thought*, 9:1 (1988), 19–44; William Walwyn, *The Writings of William Walwyn*, ed. Jack R. McMichael and Barbara Taft (Athens, G.A.: University of Georgia Press, 1989), pp. 1–51.
- 29 A. Woolrych, 'The debates from the perspective of the army', in M. Mendle (ed.), *The Putney Debates of 1647—the Army, the Levellers and the English State* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), pp. 53–78; J. Morrill and P. Baker, 'The case of the armie truly re-stated', in Mendle (ed.), *The Putney Debates of 1647*, pp. 103–24; J. Holstun, *Ehud's Dagger: Class Struggle in the English Revolution* (London; New York, N.Y.: Verso, 2000), pp. 305–66.
- 30 N. Smith, *Perfection Proclaimed: Language and Literature in English Radical Religion, 1640–1660* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1989).
- 31 N. H. Keeble (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Writing of the English Revolution* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001); L. L. Knoppers (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Literature and the English Revolution*; P. Clemit (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to British Literature of the French Revolution in the 1790s* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011).
- 32 *The Prose Works of Andrew Marvell*, eds A. Patterson *et al.*, 2 vols (New Haven, C.T.; London: Yale University Press, 2003).
- 33 McDowell, *The English Radical Imagination*, pp. 19–20.
- 34 McDowell, 'Writing the literary and cultural history of radicalism in the English revolution', in Caricchio and Tarantino (eds), *Cromohs Virtual Seminars*.
- 35 For examples of radical language and radical speech acts, see chapters 2 and 7.
- 36 J. McElligott, *Royalism, Print and Censorship in Revolutionary England* (Woolbridge: Boydell, 2007); J. Peacey, *Politicians and Pamphleteers: Propaganda during the English Civil Wars and Interregnum* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004); J. Peacey, 'News, Pamphlets, and Public Opinion', in Knoppers (ed.) *The Oxford Handbook of Literature and the English Revolution*, pp. 173–89; J. Raymond, *The Invention of the Newspaper: English Newsbooks, 1641–1649* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996); J. Raymond, 'The newspaper, public opinion and the public sphere in the seventeenth century', in J. Raymond (ed.), *News, Newspapers and Society in Early Modern Britain* (London: Frank Cass, 1999), pp. 109–40; J. Raymond, *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering in Early Modern Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003); J. Raymond (ed.), *The Oxford History of Popular Print Culture – Volume One: Cheap Print in Britain and Ireland to 1660* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011).
- 37 J. Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*,

- trans. T. Burger (Cambridge, M.A.: Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1991). See S. Pincus, 'The State and civil society in early modern England: capitalism, causation and Habermas's bourgeois public sphere', in P. Lake and S. Pincus (eds), *The Politics of the Public Sphere in Early Modern England* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007), pp. 213–31; D. Zaret, *Origins of Democratic Culture: Printing, Petitions and the Public Sphere in Early Modern England* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2000).
- 38 J. McElligott, *Censorship and the Press, 1640–1660* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2009); J. McElligott, 'The book trade, licensing, and censorship', in Knoppers (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Literature and the English Revolution*, pp. 135–53.
- 39 A. Hessayon, 'Calvert, Giles (bap. 1616, d. 1663), bookseller', in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004); M. Caricchio, 'News for the new Jerusalem: Giles Calvert and the radical experience', in Hessayon (ed.), *Varieties of Seventeenth- and Early Eighteenth-Century Radicalism*; pp. 69–86; F. Mott Harrison, 'Nathaniel Ponder', *The Library*, 15:3 (1934), 257–94; B. Lynch, 'Ponder, Nathaniel (1640–1699)', bookseller, in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Catherine Vigier in Chapter 9 studies a captivity narrative published by Nathaniel Ponder.
- 40 Many newsbooks had established distinct identities, both Parliamentary and royalist but, unlike the *Moderate*, they were not counterfeit publications to begin with.
- 41 *Moderate Intelligencer*, no 1 (27 February – 6 March 1645), p. 1.
- 42 He inserted the inscription 'This is the true *Moderate Intelligencer*' at the end of number 173, possibly leaving readers in greater confusion than before. *Moderate Intelligencer*, aka *Moderate*, no 173 (6–13 July 1648), p. 1444.
- 43 *Moderate*, no 1 (11–18 July 1648), p. 1. This comment was reproduced in the next six issues of the newsbook, ending with number 7 (22–29 August 1648), p. 41.
- 44 Jürgen Diethe identifies three versions of the editorial in number 14: *New Articles for Peace*, dated 18 October 1648, which is closest to the *Moderate* text, except for the fact that it leaves out the first seventeen lines and a whole paragraph; *New Propositions of the Army*, dated 24 October by Thomason, and *A Bloody Fight at Pontefract Castle in York-shire*, a collection of news dated 27 October. See J. Diethe, 'The *Moderate*: politics and allegiances of a revolutionary newspaper', in *History of Political Thought*, 4 (1988), 247–94. For a study of the *Remonstrance of the Army* in comparison with the Levellers' political agenda, see I. Gentles, *The New Model Army in England, Ireland, and Scotland, 1645–1653* (Oxford; Cambridge, M.A.:

- Blackwell Publishers, 1992), pp. 272–6, and G. Burgess, ‘Radicalism and the English Revolution’, in Burgess and Festenstein (eds), *English Radicalism*, pp. 72–3.
- 45 *Moderate*, no 41 (17–24 April 1649), p. 425.
- 46 See, for example, their vindication of private property and rejection of communalism in *A manifestation from Lieutenant-Colonel John Lilburne, Mr William Walwyn, Mr Thomas Prince, and Mr Richard Overton (now prisoners in the Tower of London), and others, commonly (though unjustly) styled Levellers* (London, 1949), pp. 4–5.
- 47 H. Brailsford, *The Levellers and the English Revolution* (Nottingham: Spokesman, 2nd edn, 1983), p. 402.
- 48 J. B. William, *A History of English Journalism to the Foundation of the Gazette* (London; New York, N.Y.: Longmans, Green, & Co, 1908), pp. 104–5. Also see A. N. B. Cotton, ‘John Dillingham, journalist of the Middle Group’, *The English Historical Review*, 93 (1978), 817–34. Brailsford calls the *Moderate Intelligencer* a ‘commonplace’ newsbook: Brailsford, *The Levellers and the English Revolution*, p. 403.
- 49 See for example D. Lovejoy, *The Glorious Revolution in America* (Hanover, N.H.: University Press of New England, 1972); M. and J. Jacob (eds), *The Origins of Anglo-American Radicalism* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1984). Chapter 10 is a further contribution to the study of transatlantic exchanges.
- 50 See, for example, Gaby Mahlberg’s study of the transmission of English republican ideas in French-speaking Europe through the translation into French of a pamphlet that included miscellaneous texts of the English regicides: G. Mahlberg, ‘*Les Juges Jugez, Se Justifians* (1663) and Edmund Ludlow’s protestant network in seventeenth-century Switzerland’, *Historical Journal*, 57:2 (2014), 369–96.
- 51 G. Mahlberg and D. Wiemann (eds), *European Contexts for English Republicanism – Politics and Culture in Europe, 1650–1750* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2013); A. Hessayon and S. Apetrei (eds), *An Introduction to Jacob Boehme: Four Centuries of Thought and Reception* (New York, N.Y.; Abingdon: Routledge, 2014). For an overview of cultural transfers at the time of the English Revolution, see N. Smith, ‘England, Europe, and the English Revolution’, in Knoppers (ed.) *The Oxford Handbook of Literature and the English Revolution*, pp. 29–43.
- 52 A. Weststeijn, ‘Why the Dutch didn’t read Harrington: Anglo-Dutch republican exchanges, c. 1650–1670’, in Mahlberg and Wiemann (eds), *European Contexts for English Republicanism*, pp. 105–20; H. W. Blom, ‘Popularising government: democratic tendencies in Anglo-Dutch republicanism’, in Mahlberg and Wiemann (eds), *European Contexts for English Republicanism*, pp. 121–37. See also Charles-Édouard Levillain’s study of the reception of Tacitus as a guide to differences

- between Dutch and English republicans: C.-E. Levillain, ‘William III’s military and political career in neo-roman context, 1672–1702’, *Historical Journal*, 48:2 (2005), 321–50.
- 53 A. Hessayon, ‘Jacob Boehme’s writings during the English Revolution’, in Hessayon and Apetrei (eds), *An Introduction to Jacob Boehme*, pp. 77–97. For Nigel Smith’s argument, see J. F. McGregor, B. Capp, N. Smith, B. J. Gibbons, ‘Fear, myth and furore: reappraising the “Ranters”’, *Past and Present*, 140 (1993), 171–8.
- 54 On Sexby’s involvement in France, see L. Curelly, “‘Do look on the other side of the water’”: de la politique étrangère de Cromwell à l’égard de la France’, *E-rea*, 11:2 (2014), <https://erea.revues.org/3751> (accessed 29 August 2015).
- 55 V. Cousin, *Madame de Longueville: études sur les femmes illustres et la société au XVII^e siècle: Madame de Longueville pendant la Fronde: 1651–1653* (Paris: Didier, 1859), p. 266.
- 56 T. Venning, *Cromwellian Foreign Policy* (London: Macmillan; New York, N.Y.: St Martin’s Press, 1999), p. 5.
- 57 Cousin, *Madame de Longueville*, p. 282.
- 58 For further details on the various drafts of the text, see I. Gentle, ‘The *Agreements of the People* and their political contexts, 1647–1649’, in Mendle (ed.), *The Putney Debates of 1647*, p. 148–74.
- 59 John Lilburne, William Walwyn, Thomas Prince and Richard Overton, *An Agreement of the Free People of England. Tendered as a Peace-Offering to this distressed Nation* (London, 1649), p. 7.
- 60 Lilburne *et al.*, *An Agreement of the Free People of England*, p. 4.
- 61 V. Cousin, *Madame de Longueville*, p. 467.
- 62 P. Knachel, *England and the Fronde – The Impact of the English Civil War and Revolution on France* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1967), p. 106. This opinion is shared by a number of Fronde historians. For example, see C. Vicherd, ‘La “République” dans les mazarinades: à propos des événements anglais contemporains de la Fronde’, in Y.-C. Zarka (ed.), *Monarchie et république au XVII^e siècle* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 2007), p. 228; P. Goubert, *Mazarin* (Paris: Fayard, 1990), p. 306; and C. Giry-Deloison, ‘Le rôle de l’Angleterre dans les événements de la Fronde bordelaise 1649–1653’, in A.-M. Cocula and M. Boisson-Gabarron (eds), *Adhésions et résistances à l’État en France et en Espagne 1620–1660* (Bordeaux: Presses Universitaires de Bordeaux, 2001), pp. 132–5. For Sexby’s involvement in the Ormée, see also H. Kötting, *Die Ormée 1651–1653* (Münster: Aschendorff, 1983), pp. 159–65, 194–225, 230–43; S. Westrich, *The Ormée of Bordeaux: a Revolution during the Fronde* (Baltimore, M.D.: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1972), p. 56.
- 63 W. C. Abbott, *The Writings and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell*

- (Cambridge, M.A.: Harvard University Press; New York, N.Y.: Russell & Russell, 1937–1947), vol. 2, pp. 524–5.
- 64 *Mercurius Politicus* (hereafter MP), no 1 (6–13 June 1650), p. 10. For a discussion of the way the French Fronde was represented in this newsbook, see L. Curelly, “‘The French, those monkies of mankind’: the Fronde as seen by the newsbook *Mercurius Politicus*”, *Revue de la Société d’Études Anglo-Américaines des XVIIe et XVIIIe siècles*, 69 (2012), 29–50.
- 65 For example MP, no 2 (13–20 June 1650), p. 29; no 12 (22–29 August 1650), p. 187.
- 66 MP, no 6 (11–18 July 1650), p. 89.
- 67 *Traité politique, composé par William Allen Anglois, Et traduit nouvellement en François, où il est prouvé par l’exemple de Moysse, et par d’autres, tirés hors de l’écriture, que tuer un tyran, Titulo vel exercitio, n’est pas un meurtre* (Lugduni, 1658), reproduced in O. Lutaud, *Des révolutions d’Angleterre à la Révolution française – Le tyranicide et Killing No Murder* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1973), pp. 411–42. *Killing No Murder* was in fact published by Sexby in Holland under the name of his former fellow Agitator William Allen.
- 68 Lutaud, *Des révolutions d’Angleterre à la Révolution française*, pp. 367–70.
- 69 For a discussion of how some of the winter editorials of the *Moderate* plagiarised and recycled this pamphlet, see L. Borot, “‘Vive le Roi!’ ou ‘Mort au tyran!’? Le procès et l’exécution de Charles Ier dans la presse d’information de novembre 1648 à février 1649”, in F. Laroque and F. Lessay (eds), *Figures de la royauté en Angleterre de Shakespeare à la Glorieuse Révolution* (Paris: Presses de la Sorbonne Nouvelle, 1999), pp. 143–64. Although authorship of this tract is still disputed, it is generally attributed to Persons (or Parsons). Its first part was reprinted by Ibbitson in 1648 under the title *Severall Speeches Delivered at a Conference concerning the Power of Parliament, to proceed against their King for Misgovernment*.