

THE QUAKERS AND THE RELIGIOUS IDENTITY OF MAJOR-GENERAL JOHN LAMBERT

Although Major-General John Lambert presented Cromwell with the Protectorate in December 1653, and remained a central political figure until the Restoration, much of what motivated his actions has eluded retrieval. In particular a central question, the nature of Lambert's religious stance, has yet to be addressed in any detail. Part of the reason for this is the perceived limited nature of the source material. For Lambert there is no one extensive body of material to turn to and certainly not one that reflects his importance in the 1650s. Despite, or perhaps because of, his time in power and twenty-four year imprisonment after 1660 there are no memoirs, diary, collection of letters or even a will. We are therefore necessarily reliant on the information that can be retrieved from a variety of other sources. There is little in Lambert's own words that sheds light on his religious beliefs while contemporaries differed widely in their assessments of the nature of his stance.¹ Denounced as holding views ranging from Catholicism to Quakerism some took the ambiguities in Lambert's actions and comments to be evidence of his disregard of religion. Described as a "Saint", "man of God" an "Anabaptist", whilst others saw Lambert as the hope of Catholics, Mordaunt was one who struggled to detect any religious belief in him claiming that "Lambert, if anything, is a Catholic".² That Lambert had no religion was a frequent claim. To the Swedish delegation Lambert had "pretty well no religion" though he wished to appear as a man of "great piety, and as very anxious for the liberty of religion against the papists".³ Yet it is precisely the confusion and inability to categorise Lambert, alongside a lack of clear evidence from Lambert himself that, whilst making a reconstruction of his religious position difficult, can possibly be interpreted as reflection of his outlook. Trying to pin a label on Lambert ignores the context of the forces that shaped him and as such risks distorting the complexity of Lambert's views by trying to impose an easy solution. An examination of Lambert's relationship with Quakerism in particular can, however, help us in attempting to reconstruct his probable religious outlook. Furthermore the confusion as to Lambert's actual stance and his links with radicals, especially the Quakers, was to have a real impact in 1659-60, contributing directly to the Restoration.

I

Little can be retrieved with regard to Lambert's early religious leanings.⁴ As a twenty-two year old taking up arms for Parliament he appears to have shared the godly perceptions of some of his close kinsmen and army colleagues.⁵ Commenting in Parliament in 1659 on the origins of the war Lambert outlined what he saw as the religious difference between the two sides.

For the King, it is plain that Papists, prelates and delinquents, all such as had places or titles, pluralists of honour or profit, and generally all debauched people, ran with that stream. For the Parliament's party, an honest, sober, grave people, that groaned under oppressions, thirsted after grace, the reformed party of the nation, that owned their country's service, that had no by-ends, and expected no advantage from King or from the court.

He further stated that

I will not ask who had the justice of the cause. I will not judge it myself, when God himself seems to have determined the cause. I observed once, from a minister, that the Parliament had got the prayers of a fanatic people, which had got together an army, fit for God Almighty to do miracles with....⁶

Although this speech must be considered within its political context there can be no doubt that it was to be Lambert's time as part of the army, both the Northern Association and the New Model, that was crucial in the development of his political and religious views and the foundation of his relationship with Quakerism.

Professor Gentles' work has re-established the importance of religion as a factor in the army and its influence on the men who served. In a wider sense what his work has also shown is how a shared experience and loyalty grew up amongst many who served.⁷ The importance of the shared experience of army service in terms of religion was knowledge and first hand experience of diverse views. Part of the reason for the dramatic reports of the religious radicalism of the army in such works as Thomas Edwards' *Gangraena* came from ignorance of its activities and the daily life of a soldier.⁸ This fostered in the army a sense of alienation from the rest of the population and consequently hardened the bond between soldiers of diverse backgrounds and religious views. This was the atmosphere Lambert was subjected to from the age of twenty-two. The result of such an experience, without a first hand testament, is of course impossible to

quantify. Yet given Lambert's continued service and relationship with men of diverse opinions he appears to have accepted the religious nature of the army. Indeed in 1647 Lambert and his officers included in their regimental return of grievances a direct attack on Edwards' book.⁹ Lambert may not have shared the religious views of soldiers who were seen by some as radicals in the 1640s, and were later to become Quakers, such as James Nayler, John Hodgson, Amor Stoddart, Mark Grime and Robert Lilburne, but his outlook was tolerant enough to allow him to work closely with them, as well as establishing good personal relationships with some of them. The experience of army service must have had some impact on such men's religious development.¹⁰ In turn Lambert's close and open relationship with these men had an impact on how he himself was perceived but would also, probably, have influenced his response to Quakerism.

II

John Hodgson, like Lambert a native of Yorkshire, served as a captain and surgeon under him. When Hodgson arrived at a Quaker position is unclear but by the 1650s the nature of his beliefs were known to Lambert and others. Yet Lambert and Hodgson were clearly still on very good terms in the 1650s. Indeed Hodgson wrote one letter to Lambert appealing on the behalf of a fellow Quaker soldier, Captain Siddall, who was also under Lambert's command. Hodgson suggested to Lambert that Siddall was being hounded directly because of his Quaker beliefs. As well as suggesting an open relationship between the two officers Hodgson would be unlikely to have done this if he knew Lambert was unfavourable to Quakers.¹¹ This coupled with Hodgson's obvious admiration of his commander helps us in shaping a general picture of Lambert's own religion. If Hodgson could speak in such terms concerning Lambert and receive his protection and, in his words, "love & Moneys", it suggests that Lambert did not disapprove of his, or others, Quaker leanings.¹²

As with Hodgson Lambert came into contact with Captain Adam Baynes through their shared service in the Northern Association army. Baynes came to be one of Lambert's closest agents as well as a friend. Lambert would not be shocked by Baynes' views as they had known each other a long time and appear to have had a close relationship which presumably, given what we know of both men's inquiring minds, included the discussion of such issues. Baynes certainly consulted Lambert's wife, Frances, with regard to "devotiones" and some of their other correspondence implies wider reference to religious issues.¹³ Like Lambert Baynes' religious

position was regarded with suspicion by contemporaries. His own mother had serious misgivings about his religious beliefs and Baynes was actually accused of atheism by his uncle.¹⁴ Baynes was regarded by some contemporaries, and by most historians, as having no religion and close links to various Quakers. Professor Gentles has noted that by 1655 Baynes was listed as one of those "loving to the friends."¹⁵ The Quakers Baynes was in "friendly" contact with included men who Lambert also had numerous contact with, Captains John Hodgson, Amor Stoddart and John Leavens.¹⁶ Baynes was certainly regarded by the "Quakers" as more sympathetic to them than most local magistrates".¹⁷ In Parliament he responded to a call that all Quakers should be whipped home as vagrants by stating that he "had discourse with Quakers..." and that "I move to clear them, and make them innocent persons..."¹⁸

How far Baynes' religion did actually reflect on Lambert is however difficult to quantify. Professor Hirst was certainly of the opinion that there was some correlation of religious views between the two men. He has outlined the Presbyterian opposition to Baynes in Leeds and stated that

Baynes is best known to history as a follower of the ungodly Lambert, and as a Harrington republican opposed to a lordly interest in the Parliament of 1659; and there is some evidence to suggest he shared the undoctinaire religious views of his patron.¹⁹

Lambert clearly believed that Baynes' views would be seen by many as a reflection of his own, and was aware of the link contemporaries made between Baynes' opinions and of his own position. One of Lambert's agents William Walker informed Baynes that

It is spoken here that some thinge hath passed from you at London (I meane wch they call herisy or blasphemie) of the same nature that was for wch you was blamed here and that you did frequently discourse or speke offensivly of such things as tender judgements could not well digest To heare wch the Maior Generall He as sure you was exceedingly troubled & answered surely you would nether wrong your selfe nor him soe much...²⁰

What can be said at the very least is that if Lambert did not share Baynes' religious leanings he did not sufficiently object to them to dismiss him from the army, remove him as his agent or put an end to

their close personal relationship. Indeed, far from alienating Baynes, Lambert specifically encouraged his marriage to one of his own kin. However Lambert was well aware of the political danger to him posed by his close links with men such as Baynes. Writing to Baynes he asked if he would

walke tenderly humbly & sutable to yor professions as a lover & seeker of peace...you may doe well (nay ought) to make it a caution to walke wisely, & so as those who are not so freindly as ye ought to bee may have their mouths stopped, & in doeinge so you shall vindicate yor selfe & mee who in some measure, must beare part of that dislike & blame you drawne upon yor selfe...²²

As with Hodgson and Baynes another religious radical Lambert was associated with was another fellow Yorkshireman John Webster, who had also served in the Northern Army. John Webster was born in Thornton, Craven. In 1634 Webster was curate of Kildwick-in-Craven, formerly the base of Roger Brearley and close to Lambert's estate. Here he was converted by Brearley's followers. Webster was also noted to actually preach in Grindleton itself "out of good will butt Receiveth noe profitt there".²³ The religious influences of the Craven area in Yorkshire, particularly Grindletonianism, on both Webster and Lambert have been commented on by Marchant.

It was of the essence of this type of religion that it was completely tolerant of all opinions, and its influence may be seen in the life of John Lambert...who maintained the cause of religious freedom during the Commonwealth.²⁴

From Grindletonianism Webster moved closer to Quaker views.

John Webster had some influence on those who became Quakers and was closely associated with another religious radical, William Erbery, whose works were also said to have influenced Quakers.²⁵ Erbery himself had been with Lambert's regiment in 1647, although it is possible that he was with them for longer.²⁶ Lambert's approval of Erbery is further suggested by his encouragement to the antinomian Elizabeth Avery to attend his preaching in Oxford.²⁸ At this time Lambert was governor of the town and although he was probably not present at Erbery and Kiffin's famous debate with some of the Oxford Presbyterians the "chairman" was Lambert's close political ally and deputy, Lieutenant-Colonel Mark Grime, who was later to join the Quakers.²⁹ Lambert's relationship with such men as Erbery and Webster in the 1640s probably helped to shape his own

outlook and his reaction to the Quaker movement in the 1650s.

Lambert's known reading matter in the 1640s and 1650s, such as Giles Randall and the German mystic Jacob Boehme, both who have been seen to have influenced Quakers, must also have had some impact on how he viewed the movement.³⁰ Lambert appears to have owned a copy of the 1647 edition of Boehme's *XL Questions Concerning the Soule* which concerned the light of the soul in its freedom.³¹ The Randall work was his 1648 translation of *Theologia Germanica* which had been attacked as unorthodox being the "breviary of certain communities of Waldenses and of other groups of dubious orthodoxy". Calvin rejected the work because it was opposed to institutionalism. In the context of the 1648 edition Randall had previously been brought before the Star Chamber for preaching "anabaptism", "familism" and "antinomianism".³² Clearly there was much besides that Lambert read that we are not in a position to recover. His reading, although not necessarily a reflection of his outlook, alongside his relationship with such men as Baynes and Hodgson, does suggest his general openness to those with views that others saw as extreme and not deserving of any kind of toleration. It is likely that Lambert received his copy of *Theological Germanica* during the campaign against Charles II in Scotland in 1651. At that time we also know he was reading Juan de Valdes whose work Samuel Rutherford had claimed, in 1648, was one of the "poysonable" sources of "Familisme, Antinomianisme and Enthusiasme".³³ Such reading also provides more context for some of the army declarations of the early 1650s. One from May 1653, signed by Lambert, again clearly equated the army with the work of Christ in the most strident terms and made plain the necessity of intervention in government if there was any deviation from the path of the army's cause.³⁴

In 1653 John Webster dedicated one of his most important works, *Academiarum Examen*, to Lambert.³⁵ Lambert was noted as having approved this work in manuscript. In his dedication to Lambert, Webster plainly saw Lambert as an instrument of religious toleration.

...That seeing divine Providence hath made you (with the rest of those faithfull and gallant men of the Army) signally instrumental, both in redeeming the English Liberty, almost drowned in the deluge of Tyranny and self interest, and also unmanacling the simple and pure truth of the Gospel, from the chains and fetters of cold and dead Formality, and of restrictive and compulsary Power, two of the greatest blessings our Nation ever yet enjoyed, I hope the same Providence will also direct you

to be assistant to continue the same, against all the bitterness and cruelty of those, who, having obtained liberty for themselves, care not though others be bound up and persecuted. And moreover guide you to set to your hand and endeavour for the purging and reforming of Academies, and the Advancement of Learning, which hitherto hath been little promoted or look'd into. And I am more imboldened in this confidence, having experimental knowledge and trial, not onely of your Honours Abilities that way, but also of your sincere affection and unparalleled love to Learning, and to all those that are lover and promoters thereof;...³⁶

In *Academiarum Examen* Webster called for the reform of the universities to provide for the better expression of religion. In direct relation to such an idea Lambert played a central role in the establishment of Durham College which elicited some Quaker support in the area for its "pronouncedly utilitarian tendencies".³⁷ Webster's relationship with Lambert was such that in November 1657 he appealed to the Major-General for help in a prosecution that had been brought against him. Elmer commented with regard to Webster that "by 1653 he was a vociferous opponent of state-supported religion, be it episcopal, presbyterian, or independent, and an equally committed advocate of comprehensive religious toleration".³⁸ Lambert's endorsement, and political actions in the 1650s, suggest that he agreed with this. Part of the reason for such a stance in the 1650s must have been due to his time as part of the army and serving with men such as Webster, Hodgson and Baynes. Although he may not have gone as far as they, in terms of their positions by the 1650s, his own position had clearly evolved. The evidence of his continuing relationship with them during the 1650s is in itself testimony to that. Unlike the men Webster attacked, Lambert, having secured his own liberty, appears to have been genuinely willing to extend it to others.

III

In 1673 whilst he was imprisoned on St. Nicholas Island, Plymouth, Lambert was visited by the Quaker Myles Halhead who questioned him with regard to why he had permitted Quakers to be persecuted during the 1650s.

Then John answered and said, "Friend, I would have you to know that some of us never made nor consented to laws to persecute you, nor none of your friends, for persecution we ever

were against....Although you and your friends suffered persecution, and some hardships in that time, your cause therein is never the worse for that...³⁹

Lambert's answer to Halhead rings true. Lambert's willingness to extend toleration is clear from two documents that are central expressions of his, and some of the army officers', thinking. In the Heads of the Proposals of 1647, constructed by Ireton and Lambert, the main points dealing with religion were in clauses XI to XIII. The Heads outlined that all coercive power, authority and jurisdiction should be taken from bishops, that no one should be forced to use the Book of Common Prayer, take the Covenant or attend the state church and that there would be no penalties for attending services elsewhere. Another method of maintenance, other than tithes, was also to be introduced⁴⁰

More significantly in December 1653 Lambert presented Cromwell with the title of Lord Protector. The Protectorate was based on Lambert's written constitution the Instrument of Government. The Instrument was even more "liberal" in its religious clauses than the 1647 Heads. Again no one was to be compelled by penalties to attend services and tithes were to be replaced by another method of maintenances. The Instrument reflects the toleration that was the mark of Lambert's personal relationships with men such as Hodgson and Baynes. Clause XXXVII was the central religious expression of the Instrument. It stated that

such as profess faith in God by Jesus Christ (though differing in judgement from the doctrine, worship or discipline publicly held forth) shall not be restrained from, but shall be protected in, the profession of the faith and exercise of their religion; so as they abuse not this liberty to the civil injury of others and to the actual disturbance of the public peace on their parts: provided this liberty be not extended to Popery or Prelacy, nor to such as, under the profession of Christ, hold forth and practice licentiousness.

It might be no coincidence that clause XXXVII of Lambert's Instrument mirrors very closely Webster's statement in *The Saints Guide* of 1653.

the civill Magistrate hath not any positive power to punish any man, or restrain any for their light, judgement, conscience, opinion or way of worship, if so be they act or speak nothing that is distractive or destructive to the civill power or tending to the

breach of the peace, or to injure one another.⁴¹

Indeed it is possible that the two men discussed the Instrument, either in London or Yorkshire. The tone of Webster's dedication to *Academiarum Examen*, dated 21 October 1653, might suggest some foreknowledge of the establishment of the Protectorate through Lambert's military coup in December 1653.⁴² However the test of clause XXXVII, and Lambert's idea of settlement, came with the case of, probably, the leading Quaker of the 1650s, James Nayler.

IV

Nayler was the same age as Lambert and was also from the West Riding of Yorkshire. His home town of Dewsbury was close to Woodkirk where John Webster had come under the influence of Brearley. Nayler's Quakerism seems to have developed out of the same religious influences in the area.⁴³ Nayer was known to Lambert from their time together in Parliament's armies. Nayler had first fought under Fairfax in the north and then directly under Lambert. Indeed Nayler undertook the important work of being Lambert's quarter-master. Significantly Nayler was the quarter-master to Lambert's own troop. That Lambert was prepared to appoint him as quarter-master to his own troop suggests the possibility that he was also regimental quarter-master.⁴⁴ He accompanied Lambert during the invasion of Scotland. Here Lambert would have had further notice of Nayler through his preaching. A soldier who had served under Lambert commented he was more afraid of the "qualing" effect that Nayler's preaching had on him than the Scots at Dunbar. Whilst in Edinburgh Lambert requisitioned the East Kirk, and, as Bittle suggests, it is very possible that Nayler was one of Lambert's soldiers who took advantage of it.⁴⁵ Their knowledge of each other, apparent in Lambert's defence of Nayler, is confirmed by Nayler's appeal to Adam Baynes that indicates, as Professor Hirst has pointed out, "extensive previous contacts".⁴⁶ Although he had left the army Nayler's link with Lambert was specifically referred to in a petition of early 1653 to the Parliament, Cromwell and Lambert from the Westmorland Friends.

... our dear brother James Nayler lies in prison in Appleby, who served the Parliament under the command of Major General Lambert between eight and nine years, as we believe some of the Army can witness...⁴⁷

Dr. Gaunt has seen the debates on Nayler in Parliament in two phases. He argues that "Fleetwood and Lambert, having said

surprisingly little during the early debates, were active when the constitutional issues were discussed".⁴⁸ Yet it was not that Lambert was uninterested in the religious issue but that he believed that the right approach was to make sure that the requisite constitutional context was in place to support the religious state he desired. For Lambert the constitutional issues, especially the jurisdiction of Parliament, crucially underpinned the religious issues. The political framework of Lambert's Instrument was the safeguard for a tolerant religious approach. By defending his concept of the constitution he was also defending his idea of the religion set out in it.

When he came to address the issue of Nayler before Parliament Lambert stated that

It is a matter of sadness to many men's hearts, and sadness also to mine, especially in regard of his relation sometime to me. He was two years my quarter-master, and a very useful person. We parted with him great regret. He was a man of a very unblameable life and conversation, a member of a very sweet society of an independent church.

Lambert was willing for action to be taken against Nayler if he was found to have blasphemed.

How he comes (by pride or otherwise) to be puffed up to this opinion I cannot determine. But this may be a warning to us all, to work out our salvation with fear and trembling. I shall be as ready to give my testimony against him as anybody, if it appear to be blasphemy.⁴⁹

Yet he was anxious that the proper proceedings were adhered to in considering the case. With such an approach Nayler should not have been found guilty of blasphemy. As Professor Damrosch has argued "Nayler's testimony, though guarded at times, should have convinced any fair-minded observer that he clearly distinguished between himself and Christ".⁵⁰ Unfortunately for Lambert, but more particularly for Nayler, the proceedings concerning his actions were anything but approached in a balanced manner. Lambert's aid to Nayler also involved speaking with petitioners in his favour and proposing that the second half of Nayler's punishment should be postponed so that he could be treated by physicians. Yet it also appears as if Lambert had tried to see Nayler in prison. His care can be seen compared to the vindictive approach of Members of Parliament such as Luke Robinson.⁵¹

Adam Baynes, who by this stage was Member of Parliament for Leeds, outlined more openly Lambert's wish to have the Nayler case dealt with according to the law then in operation.

However others look upon Nayler, I look upon him as a man, an Englishman. I would have him so tried as to bring in a bill of attainder against him, or leave him to the law. It is below you to honour him with a trial here; but if it must be otherwise, let him be called to the bar, and proceed judicially against him, less the precedent be of dangerous and ill consequence to other persons, whose lot it may be, in other cases.

Given Lambert's admonishment of Baynes' statements in Parliament concerning Algernon Sydney it is very unlikely that Baynes would have made these statements with his patron present without his support. They can be taken as a general reflection of Lambert's opinion, especially in relation to his concerns with regard to the actions of future Parliaments.⁵² Another close associate of Lambert, Colonel Sydenham, who Wilson and Merli have seen as a representative of his in parliament, commented that

If Nayler be a blasphemer, all generation of them are so, and he and all the rest must undergo the same punishment. The opinions they hold, do border so near a glorious truth, that I cannot pass my judgement that it is blasphemy, I shall choose rather to live in another nation, than where a man shall be condemned for an offence done, by a subsequent law...⁵³

Baynes directly made the point "for the Instrument of Government says, all shall be protected that profess faith in Jesus Christ, which I suppose, this man does..."⁵⁴ Those who opposed Nayler also saw his case in the context of Lambert's Instrument. Major-General Skippon argued that "Quakers, Ranters, Levellers, Socinians, and all sorts" bolstered themselves under articles thirty-seven and thirty-eight of the Instrument. Major-General Goffe stated that he would "not entertain an irreverent thought of The Instrument of Government. I shall spend my blood for it. Yet if it hold out anything to protect such persons I would have it burnt on the fire".⁵⁵

The debate concerning another set of petitioners on Nayler's behalf suggests, in part, how far Lambert's position could be interpreted by some as supportive of Nayler. Lambert stated that

I know none of the petitioners, but I perceive they are very honest men, and faithful to the interest all along. We ought not to

forejudge the petition. I believe they are far from favouring of the Quakers.⁵⁶

In response to the petitioners desire to remit the remainder of Nayler's punishment Downing exclaimed whether

...any man call this liberty of conscience, a permission to commit such high blasphemy and impiety. Are these your honest men, that petition for a horrid blasphemer, an imposter, and a seducer?

Downing, whose military experience had been limited to a spell as scoutmaster-general in Scotland in 1650, proclaimed that if ten thousand petitioners arrived at the door he would die upon the place. Probably rankled by Downing's manner Lambert's reply hints at a possible link with the petitioners he had previously denied any knowledge of.

It is not the number of petitioners that should work with you. I speak not of the person before you; but of the petitioners. I know few of them, but I understand them to be very honest, godly persons, who, I am confident, disown the crime; yet think themselves obliged to bear their testimony for their liberty & c.⁵⁷

Unfortunately there is no record of who these thirty petitioners were. The only one recorded was Joshua Sprigg. Lambert may have been aware of Sprigg as a former army chaplain or through John Webster. In 1654 Sprigg had, with two others, penned the dedication to Webster's *The Judgement Set, and the Bookes Opened*, thus presumably like Lambert having contact with Webster to consult his work in manuscript.⁵⁸

The essence of the Nayler case for Lambert was that he did not want Parliament to have unlimited judicial power. He was worried that future Parliaments might prosecute those who had acted in the name of past Parliaments.⁵⁹ Nevertheless his pronouncements in relation to Nayler should be placed in the context of the eagerness of the bulk of Members of Parliaments to see the destruction of Nayler and the Quaker movement. Such a public stance clearly shaped many contemporaries' views of Lambert who was already seen as the symbol of army rule and all that that was judged to entail. The debates concerning the offer of the crown to Cromwell that followed from the Nayler crisis reinforced Lambert's position as a symbol of army rule. Although his personal role in influencing Cromwell to

decline the title of king was important the introduction of the Humble Petition and Advice marked the eclipse of Lambert by moderates and civilians and forced him to consider alliances with more radical groups. Indeed Thomas Hobbes saw Lambert's part in the Nayler dispute as part of such a process.

Lambert, a great favourite of the army, endeavoured to save him, partly because he had been his soldier, and partly to curry favour with the sectaries of the army; for he was now no more in the Protector's favour, but meditating how he might succeed him in his power.⁶⁰

IV

In the political crisis of 1659-60 it was widely believed that Lambert's regiment was rife with Quakers and such belief was clearly reflected in perceptions of Lambert's own position.⁶¹ More importantly the belief in the radical religious nature of Lambert's support, with its implied threat of social revolution, contributed to the apathy in the face of Monck and the return of Charles II.

The perception of Lambert's troops as a radical force was in part true. The actions of Lambert's army in crushing Sir George Booth's Cheshire rising, who had declared that the gentry had been subjected to "the meanest and most fanatick Spirits of the Nation", reinforced the picture of a radical army.⁶² During the campaign against Booth a local minister noted how Lambert's soldiers espoused the Quakers' cause and kept their hats on in church.⁶³ The Quakers were taking up positions in civil and military affairs aided by the change of rule in London. John Hodgson who had left the army in 1657, re-enlisted in 1659. Quaker support for Lambert also went as far as to organise support for him in parliamentary elections.⁶⁴ The Quakers before the Restoration were not averse to political action and Lambert was seen by many of them as the most favourable of those in power. Indeed in May 1659 it was the "English Armie" that Edward Burrough believed would do great work by the sword.⁶⁵ Professor Cole saw Quakerism as "a movement of protest against the suppression of the 'good old cause'".⁶⁶ It is no wonder that for many Lambert was equated with the cause of the Quakers in this period and that some thought that through them he would seek to emerge as the new Protector. In his poem *Iter Boreale* Robert Wild wrote

Drunk with their Cheshire triumphs straight they had
New lights upreared, and new resolves they take,
A single person once again to make.

Who shall he be? Oh! Lambert, without rub,
 The fittest de'il to be Beelzebub.
 He, the fierce fiend cast out of the House before,
 Returned and threw the House now out of door;
 A legion then he raised of armed sprites,
 Elves, goblins, fairies, Quakers, and New Lights,⁶⁷

The problem for Lambert was that the increasingly radical shift in the nature of his support base within the army brought a greater reaction against him and ensured his political defeat. His relationship with Quakers and other religious radicals was not a direct reflection of his own religious stance. He saw them as no substantial threat to his main priority, the establishment of a civil government based around the concepts that had been evident in his Instrument.

By 1659-60 Lambert had been pushed to the political fringes. Lambert's main remaining constituency lay with groups, such as the Quakers, that were diametrically opposed to the nation's traditional elite. As Reay has shown the Quaker movement contributed significantly to an intense reaction in 1659-60.⁶⁸ Given his individual link with such men as Hodgson and Nayler it is no wonder that many of them saw him as the most favourable of the possible governors. Perhaps he was more aware than some of his contemporaries that the movement was not "the dregs of the common people" but had a substantial following among the "middling sort"?⁶⁹ The comments concerning Lambert and Sir Henry Vane forming an alliance were part of the same trend. Vane was also seen as favourable to the Quakers.⁷⁰ Whether their concept of Senatorial rule would have included the Quakers as Baynes' one time associate Samuel Duncon called for is unclear.⁷¹ Such however was the splintering within the groups that had over a decade earlier defeated the king that Monck was the the public face of many who, horrified by the religious radicalism of Lambert's forces, saw the Restoration of monarchy as the necessary protection of their interests. Even the Baptist Colonel William Packer, who had served alongside Lambert, could comment that "before ye Quakers should have there liberty hee woulde draw his sworde to bring in Kinge Charles".⁷² More significantly Lambert's old commander and friend Sir Thomas Fairfax helped pave the way for Monck in securing control of Yorkshire with the gentry rising under him to prevent an alliance between Lambert and the Quakers.⁷³ Lambert could only prevent reaction by establishing a military dictatorship that would be dependent on its more radical supporters. Such a realisation is suggested by some of his comments in Parliament. In the context of the crisis of 1658-60 such a stance

appeared to be justified and Lambert does appear to have seen the choice as a stark one "between light and darkness".⁷⁴ Yet it had been the very threat of this since 1657 that had been a central spur to that reaction.

Lambert's religious position was essentially derived from his political stance. In the context of the seventeenth century they were not two distinct identities but part of an overall outlook. Lambert believed that the right political framework would provide the necessary protection for, and against, many of perceived radical views. Lambert appears to have increasingly been forced to countenance a limited ruling oligarchy and limits on parliament because of his experiences in the late 1640s and the late 1650s. His actions on behalf of his Catholic and Cavalier kin suggest that this does not appear to have also encompassed a social revolution.⁷⁵ Yet such was his public persona that his actions during the crisis of 1659-60 could only but mark him in the eyes of the traditional gentry as the antithesis of their England.

Although it was said Lambert "neither had the spirit of prayer nor preaching",⁷⁶ part of the mist surrounding the nature of Lambert's faith was, and is, due to the source material. No will, no diary and his own measured and ambiguous statements makes any reconstruction very difficult. Yet that mist was a very deliberate part of his character for Lambert had a broad religious outlook. This is reflected in the diverse contemporary accounts of his religion. Lambert seems to have willingly accepted a diversity of beliefs. Such an approach would, in part, explain his relationships with the Quaker Hodgson, the godless Baynes and Catholic John Belasye. Their beliefs did not effect Lambert's political or personal relationship with them. Dr. David Smith in reconstructing the Earl of Dorset's religion quoted Sir Thomas Browne.

I could never divide my selfe from any man upon the difference of an opinion or be angry with his judgement for not agreeing with mee in that, for which perhaps within a few dayes I should dissent my selfe.⁷⁷

This "attitude" seems just as applicable to Lambert. Yet while it can be argued that Lambert had a similar "ecumenical outlook" to Smith's Earl of Dorset the fact that Lambert's "toleration" went further stems from the differing influences to which both men had been subjected. Dorset "reached maturity in the England of Elizabeth I and James". Lambert turned thirty in 1649. Lambert's religion was

shaped by the bonds of kinship that could allow him to cooperate with Catholics like Belasyse but it also developed through the shared experience of war and political upheaval in the broad church of parliament's armies. Such a stance was also in danger of being interpreted in terms of hypocrisy and ambition charges that, as Trotsky was to find in the 1920s, were not easily dispelled. John Price, one of Monck's chaplains wrote of Lambert, "I never heard that he listed himself in any religious faction but being a Latitudinarian to all, he might with less opposition have ruled the most."⁷⁸

Lambert's faith was not the sort of religion that formed a separate or isolated part of his persona or the driving dominant force in his life. It was but only part of his overall approach. As such it allowed him to believe that limited toleration of Quakers would not threaten his perception of political settlement. Yet such a stance alienated the bulk of the traditional political nation who had increasingly reemerged under the Protectorate and by Lambert's fall in 1657 were, for the first time since the late 1640s, confident of reasserting themselves. In such a context the political radicalism forced upon Lambert by his isolation, coupled with the explosion of Quakerism, were both central features of why many ultimately welcomed the return of the Stuarts.

David Farr

NOTES

- ¹ From the Lambert letters that survive, scattered through various collections, it is clear that in some printed versions Lambert's religious phases have been edited out. These omissions are mainly Lambert's comments on Parliament's victory through God's favour or providence. For example see the difference between, Bodleian Library, Dep. c. 164 fol.434 and *Historical Manuscripts Commission, Thirteenth Report, Portland MSS*, (London, 1891), 1, p.474.
- ² *Calendar of Clarendon State Papers*, 5 vols., (Oxford, 1869-1932), IV, p.222. This is from Bodleian Library, Clarendon Mss 61 fols. 116-7; Bodl. Lib., Clarendon Mss 68 fol. 167v; *Cal. Clar. S.P.*, IV, p.631; Bodl. Lib., Clarendon Mss 65 f. 206; *Cal. Clar. S.P.*, IV, p.408; Bodl. Lib., Clarendon Mss 66 f. 75; *Cal. Clar. S.P.*, IV, p.424; *Cal. Clar. S.P.*, IV, p.671, *H.M.C. 5th Report*, (London, 1876), p.181; British Library (hereafter B.L.), E457(12), *Mercurius Pragmaticus*, No.19, (1-8 Aug. 1648), no pagination; B.L., E419(9), *A Paire of Spectacles for the Citie*, (1647), p.5.
- ³ M. Roberts, 'Swedish Diplomats at Cromwell's Court, 1655-1656. The missions of Peter Julius Coyet and Christer Blonde', *Camden Society*, 4th series, 36, (London, 1988), p.70.
- ⁴ D. Farr, 'The Education of Major-General John Lambert', *Cromwelliana*, (2000), pp.8-23.
- ⁵ D. Farr, 'The Shaping of John Lambert's Allegiance and the Outbreak of the Civil War', *Northern History*, 36:2, (2000), pp.247-66

- ⁶ J.T.Rutt, (ed.), *Thomas Burton's Diary*, 4 vols., (London, 1828), III, pp.185-90
- ⁷ I. Gentles, *The New Model Army in England, Ireland and Scotland, 1645-53*, (Oxford, 1992).
- ⁸ T.Edwards, *Gangraena*, (1646).
- ⁹ Worcester College, Clarke Mss XLI fol.123-5
- ¹⁰ For Quakers and the army see, B.Reay, *The Quakers and the English Revolution*, (London, 1985), p.18.
- ¹¹ B.L., Add. Mss 21423 fol.58.
- ¹² For a fuller consideration of Hodgson and reference to Siddall see, D.Farr, 'John Hodgson. Soldier, Surgeon, Agitator and Quaker?', *Journal of the Friends' Historical Society*, 58, no.3, (1999), pp.220-34.
- ¹³ B.L., Add. Mss 21426 fol.175, 178. Frances also appears to have been on good terms with the Quaker Captain John Leavens, see B.L. Add. Mss 21419 fol. 253 Frances was described by Aaron Guerdon as a women of 'a large Soule, and as full of the Spirit as any I ever met with; I professe I never knew a women more endowed with those Heavenly blessings of love, meaknesse, gentlenesse, patience and long suffering; nay even with all things that may speake her every way deserving the name of a Saint;', see A.Guerdon, *A Most Learned, Conscientious, And Devout-Exercise; Held Forth The Last Lords-Day, At Sir Peter Temples, In Lincolnes Inne-Fields; By Lieut-Generall Cromwell. As It Was Faithfully Taken In Characters*, (1649).
- ¹⁴ B.L., Add. Mss 21419 fols.102-3; 21426 fol.229. The specific reference to atheism should be seen in the seventeenth century context of "ungodly" which fits closely with many contemporary impressions of both Baynes and Lambert.
- ¹⁵ I.Gentles, 'The Debentures Market and Military Purchases of Crown Land, 1649-1660', London, Ph.D, 1969, p.124; *Cal. S.P. Domestic*, 1655-6, p.64.
- ¹⁶ B.L., Add. Mss 21417-26 passim. For Stoddart generally see, H.Barbour and A.O.Roberts, (eds.), *Early Quaker Writings 1650-1700*, (Michigan, 1973), p.611.
- ¹⁷ G.E.Aylmer, *The State's Servants: The civil service of the English Republic 1649-1660*, (London, 1973), p.234.
- ¹⁸ *Burton's Diary*, IV p.338, 442; Yorkshire Archaeological Society, Leeds City Archives, B36. Two versions of Baynes' will survive. However they tell us very little as they contain no religious prologue whatsoever and just deal with his worldly estate.
- ¹⁹ D.Hirst, 'The Fracturing of the Cromwellian Alliance: Leeds and Adam Baynes', *English Historical Review*, 108, (October, 1993), p.877.
- ²⁰ B.L., Add. Mss 21426 fol.354.
- ²¹ B.L., Add Mss 21419 fol.206; W.H.Chippendall, 'The Baynes Family of Sellet Hall in Whittington', *Cumberland and Westmorland Antiquarian and Archaeological Society*, n.s., 28, (1928).
- ²² B.L., Add. Mss 21426 fol.189.
- ²³ Lambeth Library Mss Comm.XII a/18fol.187.
- ²⁴ R.Marchant, *The Puritans and the Church Courts in the Diocese of York 1560-1642*, (London, 1960), pp.289-90.
- ²⁵ P.Elmer, *The Library of Dr. John Webster: The Making of a Seventeenth Century Radical*, *Medical History Supplement* no.6, (London, 1986), p.31; R.L.Greaves and R.Zaller, (eds.), *Biographical Dictionary of British Radicals in the Seventeenth*

- Century*, 3 vols., (Brighton, 1982-84), II; Reay, *Quakers*, p.16-17. It was to be Erbery's daughter Dorcas that alleged that James Nayler had raised her from the dead.
- ²⁶ A.Laurence, *Parliamentary Army Chaplains 1642-51*, (London, 1990), pp.124-5; Public Record Office (hereafter P.R.O.), E121/4/no.30.
- ²⁷ W.Erbery, *Armies Defence*, (London, 1648).
- ²⁸ For an examination of the case of Elizabeth Avery and her relationship with Lambert see, D.Farr, 'The Military and Political Career of John Lambert, 1619-57', Cambridge PhD, 1996, pp.179-82.
- ²⁹ For Grime as a Quaker see Reay, *Quakers*, pp.88, 90; For Grime's political link with Lambert and his role in the army petitioning campaign and presentation with Robert Lilburne, another close colleague of Lambert's and also later a Quaker, of *A New Found Stratagem Framed in the Old Forge of Machivilisme*, (1647), see A.Woolrych, *Soldiers and Statesmen. The General Council of the Army and its Debates, 1647-8*, (1987) pp.37, 40, 83; D.Farr, 'Lambert', pp.229-30.
- ³⁰ B.Reay, *Quakers*, p.16.
- ³¹ J. Boehme, *XL Questions Concerning the Soule*, (1647); A copy of the book signed by Lambert is now in Cambridge University Library, Syn.7.64.145 no.1. Although Lambert's signature is clear on the first, now loose, page within the book, before the title page, there are unfortunately no notes in his, or any, hand within the actual text. However bound after that work is *The Clavis, or Key. or, An Exposition of some principall Words, and Matters. How God is to be considered, Without Nature, and Creature*, which on its first four pages has some notes in a very neat seventeenth century hand; A.Weeks, *Boehme: An intellectual biography of the seventeenth-century philosopher and mystic*, (London, 1991).
- ³² *Theologia Germanica*, (London, 1950); R.M. Jones, *Spiritual Reformers in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, (London, 1914); C.Kirchberger, *A Catalogue of Bodleian Manuscripts Relating to Mystical Theology*, (1949); Bodleian Library, Rawlinson Mss C610.
- ³³ Jones, *Spiritual Reformers*, p.238.
- ³⁴ Clarke Mss 25 fol.48-51.
- ³⁵ The dedication also reflects Lambert's prominent position amongst the leaders of the Protectorate.
- ³⁶ J.Webster, *Academiarum Examen*, (1653), dedication.
- ³⁷ C.Webster, *The Great Instauration: Science, Medicine and Reform 1626-1660*, (London,1975), pp.233, 238.
- ³⁸ Elmer, 'Webster', p.4; W.Self Weeks, 'John Webster, Author of "The Displaying of Supposed Witchcraft"', *Transactions of the Lancashire and Cheshire Antiquarian Society*, 39, (1921), pp.55-107; W.Self Weeks, 'Further Information about Dr. John Webster', *Transactions of the Lancashire and Cheshire Antiquarian Society*, 48, (1932), pp.30-59.
- ³⁹ Myles Halhead, *A book of some of the sufferings*, (London, 1690), pp.24-5. Halhead states that he visited Lambert on the instructions of "the Word of the Lord". It is possible that given Halhead's northern roots and his tour through Yorkshire in 1653 that they may have had some knowledge of each other, although Halhead would naturally be aware of Lambert. For a short biography of Halhead see, R.S.Ferguson, *Early Cumberland and Westmoorland Friends*,

- (London, 1871), pp.55-60. For Lambert during his imprisonment, 1660-84, see D.Farr, 'New Information with regard to the imprisonment of Major-General John Lambert, 1662-84', *Cromwelliana*, (1998), pp.44-56; D.Farr, 'John Blackwell and Daniel Cox: further notes on their activities in Restoration England and British North America', *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, (1999), pp.227-33.
- ⁴⁰ S.R.Gardiner, (ed.), *Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution 1625-60*, (Oxford, 1958), 316-26. For Quaker opposition to tithes see, B.Reay, 'Quaker Opposition to Tithes 1652-1660', *Past and Present*, 86, (1980); M.James, 'The Political Importance of the Tithes Controversy in the English Revolution, 1640-1660', *History*, 26, (1941).
- ⁴¹ J.Webster, *The Saints Guide*, (1653).
- ⁴² Although Lambert was clearly the principal drafter of the Instrument he did not construct it in isolation. The exact nature of its composition remains blurred. Lambert was preparing the Instrument from mid-October at the latest. Whilst at Wimbledon he was noted as having been visited by some of the northern gentry, although at some point he left for Yorkshire, returning to London on 19 November. Webster appears to have been in London from 23 June to 12 October at the latest. C.H.Firth, (ed.), *Ludlow's Memoirs*, 2 vols., (Oxford, 1894), I, 369; A.Woolrych, *Commonwealth to Protectorate*, (Oxford, 1982), pp.353-4; D.Farr, 'Lambert', pp.269-72.
- ⁴³ Lambert's sole biographer in 1938 unfortunately failed to grasp the significance of Nayler or the Nayler case, W. H. Dawson, *Cromwell's Understudy, The Life and Times of General John Lambert* (London, 1938). For Dawson's incomprehension of Nayler, apart from referring to him as John, see his comment that, "At the time of his amazing hallucinations Naylor (as spelt in extract) was unquestionably a typical mental case. Had he lived to-day he would have been promptly handed over to a skilled psychiatrist, instead of being fiendishly tortured. Later the poor fellow recovered his reason, probably knowing little about the pranks he played." W.H.Dawson, 'Cromwell and the Jews', *Quarterly Review*, 268, no.522, (Oct., 1934), p.270.
- ⁴⁴ B.L., Add Mss 21427 fol.100; E.Fogelklou, *James Nayler. The Rebel Saint 1618-1660*, (London, 1931), pp.42-3.
- ⁴⁵ W.G.Bittle, *James Nayler 1618-1660. The Quaker Indicted by Parliament*, (York, 1986), p.6; D.Laing, (ed.), *A Diary of Public Transactions and other occurrences, chiefly in Scotland, from January 1650 to June 1667*, (Edinburgh, 1836), pp.68-9.
- ⁴⁶ D.Hirst, 'The Fracturing of the Cromwellian Alliance', p.877.
- ⁴⁷ H.Barbour & A.O.Roberts, (eds.), *Early Quaker Writings 1650-1700*, (Michigan, 1973), pp.386-88, quotation from p.388.
- ⁴⁸ P.Gaunt, 'The Councils of the Protectorate, From December 1653 to September 1658', London PhD, 1969, p.199.
- ⁴⁹ For Lambert's terms of expression here refer to James Nayler, *A Caution to all who shall be found Persecutors*, (1653), "Did ever any strive against God and prosper? He will break you with a rod of iron and dash you in pieces like a potter's vessel. Be wise, take heed, fear and tremble before the Lord, lest his wrath kindle against you, and you be consumed in his anger...".
- ⁵⁰ L.Damrosch, *The Sorrows of the Quaker Jesus, James Nayler and the Puritan Crackdown on the Free Spirit*, (London, 1996), p.190.

- ⁵¹ *Burton's Diary*, I, pp.181-2. Robinson's stance was illustrative of the divisions caused by the Nayler dispute. Although fervent in his desire to see Nayler punished Robinson was firmly alongside Lambert during the Humble Petition and Advice debates in opposition to kingship.
- ⁵² B.L., Add Mss 21426 fols.3, 189.
- ⁵³ *Burton's Diary*, I, p.86; T.A.Wilson and F.J.Merli, 'Nayler's Case and the Dilemma of the Protectorate', *University of Birmingham Historical Journal*, 10, no.1, (1956), pp.53-4.
- ⁵⁴ *Burton's Diary*, I, p.59.
- ⁵⁵ *Burton's Diary*, I, pp.49-50, 61, 63, 108-110.
- ⁵⁶ *Burton's Diary*, I, p.215.
- ⁵⁷ *Burton's Diary*, I, p.217-8.
- ⁵⁸ *Burton's Diary*, I, p.216; B.L., E805(13), John Webster, *The Judgement Set, and the Bookes Opened*, (1654); Bittle, *Nayler*, pp.136-37.
- ⁵⁹ *Burton's Diary*, I, p.281.
- ⁶⁰ F.Tonnes, (ed.), *Behemoth of the The Long Parliament by T.Hobbes*, 2nd edition, (London, 1969), p.187.
- ⁶¹ Reay, *Quakers*, p.89.
- ⁶² Reay, *Quakers*, p.94.
- ⁶³ M.H.Lee, (ed.), *Diaries and Letters of Philip Henry*, (London, 1882), p.69.
- ⁶⁴ The candidates they supported were seen as as sympathetic in their opposition to tithes. Reay, *Quakers*, p.38. Also see J.Morrill, *Cheshire 1630-60: County Governement and Society during the English Revolution*, (Oxford, 1974), p.298 for John Bradshaw. Such support reinforces the other evidence of Lambert's ambivalent attitude to tithes. As an army commander he refused attempts to use his troops as tithe collectors. R.Ashton, *Counter-Revolution. The Second Civil War and its Origins, 1646-8*, (London, 1994), p.252.
- ⁶⁵ Reay, *Quakers*, p.42.
- ⁶⁶ W.A.Cole, 'The Quakers and the English Revolution', in T.Aston, (ed.), *Crisis in Europe*, (London, 1970), p.348.
- ⁶⁷ Robert Wild, *Iter Boreale*, (1660), lines 172-193.
- ⁶⁸ J.F.McGregor and B.Reay, *Radical Religion in the English Revolution*, (Oxford, 1984), p.163; B.Reay, 'The Quakers, 1659 and the Restoration of Monarchy', *History*, 63, (1978).
- ⁶⁹ Reay, *Quakers*, p.25.
- ⁷⁰ For Vane and the Quakers as well as his alliance with Lambert see, B.L., E2109(1), *Metamorphosis Anglorum*, (1660), pp.61-65; E1923(2), *The Mystery of the Good Old Cause Briefly Unfolded*, (1660), p.35; E1080(15), *The True Character of the Education, Inclinations and Several Dispositions of all and every one of those Bloody and Barbarous Persons, who Sate as Judges upon the Life of our late Dread Sovereign King Charles I of ever Blessed Memory*, (1660), p.6; J.F.Maclear, 'Quakerism and the end of the Interregnum: A chapter in the domestication of radical Puritanism', *Church History*, 19, (1950), no.4, pp.240-70; A.Woolrych, 'Introduction' in *Complete Prose Works of John Milton: VII (1659-1660)*, (New Haven, 1980), pp.110, 120-1; L von Ranke, *A History of England Principally in the Seventeenth Century*, 6 vols., (Oxford, 1875), III, p.261; J.H.Adamson and H.F.Folland, *Sir Harry Vane : His Life and Times 1613-1662*, (London, 1973),

p.401; V.A. Rowe, *Sir Henry Vane the Younger*, (London, 1970), pp.223-4; W.A.Cole, 'The Quakers and Politics, 1652-1660', Cambridge PhD, 1955, pp.156-7, 160, 193.

- ⁷¹ Duncon appears to have become connected to Baynes through his role as a collector of the assessment in Suffolk. Their relationship appears to have broken down due to Duncon's belief that Baynes had defrauded him, see B.L., Add. Mss 21418 fol.328; 21419 fol. 40; 21420 fols. 32, 74; P.R.O., C6/153/49, C6/133/218; S.Duncon, *Several Proposals*, (1659), postscript.
- ⁷² N.Smith, *George Fox. The Journal*, (London, 1998), p,267.
- ⁷³ Reay, *Quakers*, p.98; A.H.Woolrych, 'Yorkshire and the Restoration', *Yorkshire Archaeological Journal*, 39, (1956-8); H.M.C. *Fifth Report*, (1876), 193-4.
- ⁷⁴ *Burton's Diary*, I, p.319; Damrosch, *Quaker Jesus*, pp.220-1.
- ⁷⁵ D.Farr, 'Kin, cash, Catholics and Cavaliers: the role of kinship in the financial management of Major-General John Lambert', *Historical Research*, 74, no.183, (2001), pp.44-62.
- ⁷⁶ H.C.Jones, 'The Correspondance of Henry Cromwell, 1655-59, and other papers from the British Museum Lansdowne Mss 821-823', M.Litt. thesis, Lancaster University, 1969 p. 293, Lansdowne Mss 821 No.115, fol.212-13.
- ⁷⁷ D.L.Smith. 'Catholic, Anglican or Puritan? Edward Sackville, Fourth Earl of Dorset and the Ambiguities of Religion in Early Stuart England', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 6th series, II, (1992), p.120.
- ⁷⁸ John Price, *The Mystery and Method of his Majesty's Happy Restauration laid open to the publick view*, (London, 1660).