HENRY PARKER AND THE ENGLISH CIVIL WAR

The political thought of the public's "privado"

MICHAEL MENDLE
University of Alabama

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

PUBLISHED BY THE PRESS SYNDICATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE
The Pitt Building, Trumpington Street, Cambridge, United Kingdom

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 2RU, UK
40 West 20th Street, New York NY 10011–4211, USA
477 Williamstown Road, Port Melbourne, VIC 3207, Australia
Ruiz de Alarcón 13, 28014 Madrid, Spain
Dock House, The Waterfront, Cape Town 8001, South Africa

http://www.cambridge.org

First published 1995
First paperback edition 2002

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication data
Mendle, Michael, 1945–
Henry Parker and the English civil war: the political thought of the
public's "privado" / Michael Mendle.
p. cm. – (Cambridge studies in early modern British history).
ISBN 0 521 48227 5
1. Great Britain – Politics and government – 1642–1649.
2. Parker, Henry, 1604–1652.
3. Political science – Great Britain – History – 17th century.
4. Great Britain. Parliament – History – 17th century.
5. Pamphlets – Authorship – History – 17th century.
I. Title. II. Series.
DA415.M46 1995
941.06'092–dc20 94-43021 CIP

ISBN 0 521 48227 5 hardback
ISBN 0 521 52131 9 paperback

CONTENTS

1

The public's privado

Amongst his other activities, Henry Parker was a political writer. He was celebrated in his own day (though anonymously) as the Observator, the author of *Observations upon Some of His Majesties Late Answers and Expresses* of June 1642, a widely read and attacked reply to recent royalist declarations.[1] Parker's reputation today is much the same. To notice just a few recent and more or less interchangeable remarks, Parker was "the most formidable parliamentary apologist of the First Civil War," "the most important of parliament's proponents," and "the most original and daring of all Parliament's pamphleteers in grasping the fundamental issue of sovereignty."[2] *Observations* was "perhaps the most influential pamphlet of the entire civil war."[3]

Then and now, pamphleteering gained Parker much the greater part of the regard he had in the world. Yet for Parker's own day this is necessarily a sardonic comment. Much of what Parker wrote appeared anonymously, and not many people seem to have been well informed of the particulars. Apparently none of the many critics of *Observations* knew the baptismal name of the Observator. And although there was at least one published revelation of the Observator's identity in 1649,[4] Parker (like John Locke with respect to the *Two Treatises*) never admitted his authorship. Indeed the fullness of Parker's contribution to political thought might not have come to light, were it not for the accidents of Parker's friendship with the publisher and collector

[1] [Henry Parker], *Observations upon Some of His Majesties Late Answers and Expresses* [London, 1642], repr. in William Haller, ed., *Tracts on Liberty in the Puritan Revolution, 1638–1647*, 3 vols. (New York, 1934), II, pp. 167–213. For ease of reference to any text, the original page numbers will be used.

[2] J. G. A. Pocock, *The Machiavellian Moment: Florentine Political Thought and the Atlantic Republican Tradition* (Princeton, 1975), p. 368; Lois G. Schwoerer, *"No Standing Armies!" The Anti-Army Ideology in Seventeenth-Century England* (Baltimore, 1974), p. 39; Austin Woolrych, "Political Theory and Political Practice," in C. A. Patrides and R. B. Waddington, eds., *The Age of Milton* (Manchester, 1980), pp. 44–5.

[3] Tuck, *Natural Rights Theories*, p. 146.

[4] "*Henry Parker* the Observator is Returned from *Hamborough*," in Clement Walker, *Anarchia Anglicana or, the History of Independency. The Second Part* (London, 1649), p. 199.

George Thomason, and, to a lesser extent, his Oxford degrees, which made him a target of the antiquarian labors of Anthony à Wood.[5] Had his friendships or his university been different, Parker might be remembered primarily for a different sort of achievement. Scholars of Stuart administrative history would briefly note Parker as one of the indispensable though replaceable minor men who make government work, a mechanic of the wheels of state.[6] His pamphleteering, to the extent that it would have come to light, would have made him a bit more interesting, a reversal of the situation obtaining with Milton and Marvell, men of letters who also engaged in political and bureaucratic activities.

The reason for this state of affairs – the indirect cause of tumescent bitterness in Parker's later years – is not hard to find. In the seventeenth century, men of Parker's social rank left shallow footprints, unless deeds supplied what fortune did not. The achievement certainly was not lacking; nearly whatever Parker did, he did well. But by a cruel stroke, Parker's non-literary activity conspired against his fame and, for that matter, his fortune. Parker's functions in the world of affairs, both public and private, were precisely those of a man called on to be nameless and faceless to the outside world. Often his literary efforts were an extension of his semi-secret career; sometimes Parker was simply a ghost-writer or an anonymous spokesman. In each case, revelation of Parker's authorship would have been embarrassing, counter-productive, or even dangerous. Thus not only did many of his most valuable pamphlets appear anonymously; that fact also reduced Parker's literary visibility, even with respect to writings Parker initialed, signed, or later acknowledged. The Observator was famous; Parker was not.

Parker's two masks – the quiet behind-the-scenes doer, the public, though often anonymous, writer – should not obscure from us the single mind behind them. One way or another Parker managed to have his say, even in his most mercenary efforts; part of the price of his pen was that Parker used the occasion to pursue his own agenda. However, it would be insensitive simply to look for the "real" Parker lurking in the shadows of his hired quill, or to dismiss some of what he said on the grounds that he was only doing

[5] Thomason's contribution can be gauged by comparing his bibliography of Parker with Wood's. For an approximation, see G. K. Fortescue, ed., *Catalogue of the Pamphlets, Books, Newspapers, and Manuscripts Relating to the Civil War, the Commonwealth, and Restoration, Collected by George Thomason, 1640–1661*, 2 vols. (London, 1908), index *sub* Parker, Henry; compare that with Anthony à Wood, *Athenae Oxonienses*, ed. with additions by Philip Bliss, 5 vols. (London, 1813–20), III, pp. 451–2. Some of the Parker bibliography is deducible from title pages, prefaces, and occasional self-references. It is not clear, however, that the whole would ever have been put together from its very scattered parts without Thomason's guidance. For a list of Parker's writings, see the Appendix.

[6] In this context see the biographical sketch in G. E. Aylmer, *The State's Servants: The Civil Service of the English Republic, 1649–1660* (London, 1973), p. 261. Professor Aylmer, of course, cannot divorce his treatment from his knowledge of Parker's importance as a writer.

somebody else's business. In some respects we are never closer to his heart; it turns out that the political thought of a professionally inconspicuous man was at times hauntingly personal. Parker's work as counsellor, secretary, agent, or – to use a favorite exoticism – "privado" provided the spectacles of his political vision, the lens that mediated his views of king, of parliament, of the people. It would not be a complete caricature to suggest Parker fashioned his concept of parliament (or more generally, government) in his own image, the image of the counsellor. So it is best to begin with Parker's life, albeit a life about which we sometimes know little and must infer much. Yet the historian's disappointing little hoard of fact and supposition may be larger than nearly any of Parker's contemporaries thought he merited.

I

Henry Parker was born in 1604. It is symptomatic of Parker's natural lack of consequence and of the general obstacles to the study of Parker that the authorities disagree amongst themselves about the next line of the infant's *curriculum vitae*. Some say Parker was the fourth, others the fifth son of Sir Nicholas Parker, of Ratton, Sussex. At least this inconsequential yet revealing puzzlement can be resolved – Henry was the fifth (and last) son, by his father's reckoning.[7]

The Parkers were one of those Sussex families who had turned out for Jack Cade and later became the very essence of the ranking county gentry.[8] Henry's father, Sir Nicholas Parker, was a distinguished man in the county and his heir, Sir Thomas, a prominent one. Sir Nicholas had a long career as deputy lieutenant, and also served his county as a sheriff and a shire knight. Sir Thomas sat for Seaford in the Long Parliament and more or less continuously involved himself in county affairs from the 1620s through the Restoration, no matter the regime, save for a fit of scruple after the death of Charles

[7] Fourth son: William Berry, *Pedigrees of the Families in the County of Sussex* (London, 1830), p. 12; John Burke and John Bernard Burke, *A Genealogical and Heraldic History of the Extinct and Dormant Baronetcies of England, Ireland, and Scotland* (London, 1864; repr. Baltimore, 1964), p. 400; *The Records of the Honorable Society of Lincoln's Inn*, 5 vols. (London, various dates), I (Admissions, 1420–1799), p. 210. Fifth son: H. R. Mosse, *The Monumental Effigies of Sussex* (Hove, [1931]), p. 161. Jordan, *Men of Substance*, pp. 25, 29, hedges his bet. I take Sir Nicholas Parker's word, following H. R. Mosse, who describes Sir Nicholas' own alabaster monument, showing his wives and listing his children. Henry is fifth and last among the sons, who are otherwise known to be in birth order. The confusion probably was caused by the death, in 1618 or 1619, of the third son, Robert, whose name is the one omitted in the shorter lists; see Mrs. C. E. D. Davidson-Houston, "Sussex Monumental Brasses, Part V," *Sussex Archaeological Collections*, 80 (1939), p. 140.

[8] Mark Anthony Lewis, "Notes on Jack Cade and his Adherents," *Sussex Archaeological Collections*, 18, pp. 37–41.

I.[9] In religion, Sir Nicholas Parker appears to have drifted from a mere conformity accompanied by Catholic connections to a politically reliable Protestantism. While Henry's childhood culture was solidly gentle and Protestant, it is hard to call it puritan according to any definition.[10] The family was ideologically relaxed, dappled with complaisance, lukewarm adherence to the powers that be, and, later, with royalism.[11]

The Parker heritage was a handsome one, and had it been his, Henry would have been able to share the substance as well as the prejudices and manners of the ranking gentry. Matters did not fall out that way. In 1619, shortly before his death, Sir Nicholas made over the bulk of his estates to Sir Thomas, who also was overseer of his father's will. This made Henry, a much younger son, standard-grade fuel for the engine of downward social mobility required by the hierarchical but partly open society of the first half of the seventeenth century. We have no knowledge of Henry's relationship with his oldest brother. Perhaps it is an eloquent silence, perhaps only another marker of ignorance. But it is notable that Parker's most theoretical work, *Jus Populi*, contemptuously dismissed the role of primogeniture in the origin of political power. It was "supposed by some" that after the death of the "Father" the eldest son inherited "dominion" or "at least some superioritie over his younger brethren." Parker disposed of that purported outcome as a "fond dreame." According to "philosophie" the fraternal tie was "no sure preparation for superioritie."[12]

Probably Sir Thomas Parker never much wondered what philosophy told of his inheritance. For his part, Henry had to live by his wits, making the most of the education and entrée his birth did afford him. He proceeded BA (St. Edmund Hall) in 1625, MA in 1628. In 1630 he was admitted to Lincoln's Inn, and called to its bar in 1638. Probably Parker received communion within the Church of England in connection with his call, being in the first

[9] The hefty account of Sir Nicholas Parker in Jordan, *Men of Substance*, pp. 13–25, is corrected by P. W. Hasler, ed., *The House of Commons, 1558–1603*, 3 vols. (London, 1981), III, pp. 172–3. For Sir Thomas Parker, see Mary Keeler, *The Long Parliament 1640–41* (Philadelphia, 1954), pp. 295–6, and Anthony Fletcher, *A County Community in Peace and War: Sussex 1600–1660* (London, 1975), *passim*.

[10] The monument that Sir Nicholas installed in Willingdon church (see n. 7) was the sort that puritans did not favor.

[11] On Sir Thomas Parker's trimming career, Fletcher, *A County Community*, p. 295. The Parker circle included several lukewarm parliamentarians: the Temples of Stowe, Sir Alexander Denton, and Lord Dacres, Sir Thomas's father-in-law. Sir Thomas' daughter Grace married a royalist officer, Sir William Campion. For Sir Thomas' son George, a royalist, see Fletcher, *A County Community*, p. 291, and anon., "A Willingdon Petition to Parliament, 1648," *Sussex Notes and Queries*, 1 (1927), pp. 191–2.

[12] [Henry Parker,] *Jus Populi* (London, 1644), p. 35. On the culture of the younger son, Joan Thirsk, "Younger Sons in the Seventeenth Century," in Thirsk, *The Rural Economy of England* (London, 1984), pp. 335–57.

class of barristers to be called under a recent reiteration of the old rule.[13] This should help dispose of the canard, based upon a misidentification and belied by all Parker had to say on the subject in later years, that at this time Parker was a separatist, supposedly in a circle that included the Chidleys and John Lilburne.[14]

Parker's other activities in the 1630s are a mystery. There is a prima facie case that he must have been up to something: Parker's first known pamphlets, which are dated 1640 and 1641, appear to have been composed for or in the interest of William Fiennes, Viscount Say and Seale, Parker's uncle and his one indubitably puritan connection.[15] It strains belief that Parker was deputed these important tasks without earlier development and recognition of his character and talents; Parker's lack of independent means, his marriage (in 1634),[16] and his age also point to an earlier career.

But the evidence of earlier activity is scanty, conjectural, and, of course, tantalizing. The Folger Shakespeare Library possesses a manuscript text of an epistolary poem by one "Henerie" Parker to Philip Massinger, consoling the dramatist on a recent stage failure.[17] It is likely but not certain that the Henry Parker who wrote this poem is the subject of this book. The Folger text is not in Parker's hand and "Henerie" is not a form that Parker used.[18] The possibility remains, however, that the text is a true copy; and the Folger catalogue and several Massinger scholars conclude, without explanation, that "Henerie" Parker is the political writer.[19] On at least one other occasion

[13] *The Records of the Honorable Society of Lincoln's Inn*, II (Black Books, 1558–1660), pp. 344–5.

[14] Ian Gentles, "London Levellers in the English Revolution: The Chidleys and their Circle," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 29 (1978), p. 283. Gentles mistakes a Henry Parker (n. 15) and his wife mentioned in Champlin Burrage, *The Early English Dissenters in the Light of Recent Research*, 2 vols. (Cambridge, 1912), I, pp. 322, 326; II, pp. 299, 302, 318, for Parker the political writer. But our Parker was almost certainly not married in 1633, as was the one noted in Burrage's sources. For Parker's marriage in 1634 (I follow Jordan's spadework in *Men of Substance*, p. 30), *A Calendar of the Marriage Licence Allegations in the Registry of the Bishop of London, 1597–1700* (London, 1937), I (1597–1648), p. 116. A marriage allegation was preparatory to a dispensation by the bishop from the usual requirement of the banns; it was frequently used when the marriage was to be celebrated in a church other than the parish church of either of the parties. So it appears that Henry Parker and Jane Cannon married in a setting unconnected to either family.

[15] Sir Nicholas Parker and Lord Say both married daughters of Sir John Temple of Stowe; Katherine Temple was Henry's mother.

[16] See n. 14.

[17] In a possibly cruel comment, the poem also notes the "censure" of "hee w^{ch} hath a Clearer iudgm^{t}."

[18] Folger Shakespeare Library MS X d.245 (b). The verses were printed in G. Thorn-Drury, ed., *A Little Ark Containing Sundry Pieces of Seventeenth-Century Verse* (London, 1921), pp. 2–3. The poem is found amongst some Ben Jonson ephemera, which makes it less significant that the piece is not in Parker's hand.

[19] Donald S. Lawless, *Philip Massinger and his Associates* (Muncie, Ind., 1967), p. 35 and n. 103; Philip Edwards and Colin Gibson, eds., *The Plays and Poems of Philip Massinger*, 5 vols. (Oxford, 1976), I, p. xl.

Parker succumbed to the verse bug that bit so many of his contemporaries.[20] Both texts were graced by only a fleeting appearance of the muse, both used classical allusions in an academic way and proceeded by contrasts and paradoxes – but this is true of much verse of the day. To say the least, a friendship with Massinger cannot be excluded from Parker's *curriculum vitae*; and membership in or dalliance with literary London was fairly common amongst political writers in the 1640s. The future earnest defender of Protestants and the crypto-Catholic Massinger made for an odd friendship, perhaps; but Massinger also protested illegal taxation, as would Parker (by his lights) in *The Case of Shipmony*.[21]

Another prospect totters between the plausible and the fantastic. In August 1638 the privy council wrote to Sir William Uvedale commending Mr. Henry Parker's "ffitnes & abilitye" to execute the place of deputy clerk of the Star Chamber.[22] Given Parker's ideological commitments in the 1640s, given also the possibility that he was active in the anti-Laudian movement of the later 1630s (of which more momentarily), the supposition must be that the privy council's favor was bestowed upon another Henry Parker, perhaps the one who in 1625 showed interest in collecting fines for the Star Chamber.[23] However, this was precisely the sort of job Parker held in the 1640s; the equivocations and ambivalences attending very disparate roles would in fact correspond to features of Parker's later political thought.

Of Parker the writer there is no direct evidence before 1640. But the magnitude and range of Parker's pamphleteering enterprise in 1640 and 1641 strongly suggest prior development or experience. And, indeed, a tract of 1638 is suspiciously close in themes, manners, and style to the later Parker – and sufficiently unlike other productions of writers known to have been active in the 1630s – to merit a closer consideration. This is *Divine and*

[20] An elegy upon the death of Parker's current patron, the earl of Essex, is found in manuscript in the Thomason collection, BL E. 358 (1). It is discussed below, p. 23.

[21] Lawless, *Philip Massinger*, p. 34, notes Massinger's comments against illegal taxation in a lost play, "The King and the Subject." See also Douglas Howard, "Massinger's Political Tragedies," in Douglas Howard, ed., *Philip Massinger: A Critical Reassessment* (Cambridge, 1985), pp. 117–38. Given the paucity of information, it is impossible to say when Parker developed his characteristic political attitudes. Unsurprisingly, the poem sheds little light on the political attitudes of its author. Poor Massinger should not allow himself to be dragged down by the "hissing crowde" or the dislike of the "Gallantes." The mature Parker had little use for either group; but most likely the figure merely refers to the dislike of the play throughout the house.

[22] *Privy Council Registers Preserved in the Public Record Office Reproduced in Facsimile*, 12 vols. (London, 1967–8), IV, p. 394 (19 August 1638).

[23] PRO SP 16/13/38, 16/13/39. The hand in these documents is not that of our Parker.

Politike Observations, a review of Archbishop Laud's apologia at the sentencing of Prynne, Bastwick, and Burton in the Star Chamber.[24]

Divine and Politike Observations issued from the so-called Richt Right Press, the English separatist press in Amsterdam operated by John Canne.[25] Of late the press had pursued the tactics of the common front, partly for political reasons, partly to pay the bills, joining to its separatist fare works of general puritan divinity, news of presbyterian triumphs in Scotland, works of Prynne and Burton (who were not yet outright root-and-branchers),[26] and this emphatically national-church critique of Laud. Even with the press's attempt at puritan latitudinarianism, *Divine and Politike Observations* may have given Canne some trouble, which might account for the tract's clumsy attempt at self-misrepresentation. The title page and two prefaces by a supposed translator played a small charade of presenting the tract as the work of a Dutch divine. No one was long fooled. By the second page of the tract itself, detailed knowledge of English affairs dropped the corner of the veil; in quick steps the English king was "his Majesty," the Bible was in the translation of "K. Iames," and the concern was for the purity of the Book of Common Prayer. Moments later the veil fell unceremoniously to the floor, with the appearance of the phrase "here in England." A contemporary hand somewhere close to the source amended some copies of "The Translators [*sic*] Dedicatory Epistle" to read "the Authors Dedicatory Epistle." Had these giveaways been missing, the English ethos and uncompromisingly laic and political orientation of the tract still would have given the lie to the authorship of a Dutch divine.[27]

In texture and tone, *Divine and Politike Observations* was unlike the other English smuggled books of the decade. Set amongst Canne's other English offerings and the general effusion of pro-martyr writings, *Divine and Politike Observations* was a debutante in a doss house – urbane, controlled even in anger, unmoved by the apocalyptic fervor of the puritan *enragés*. In fine, it followed the rhetorical conventions of country-house politics rather than those of an extremist fringe never more happy than when in misery. Unfailingly, Laud was "his Grace" or "your Grace"; Parker followed this style as

[24] *Divine and Politike Observations* ([Amsterdam,] 1638); William Laud, *A Speech Concerning Innovations in the Church* (London, 1637).

[25] John F. Wilson, "Another Look at John Canne," *Church History*, 33 (1964), pp. 40–1. C. E. Sayle, *Early English Printed Books in the University Library, Cambridge (1475 to 1640)*, 4 vols. (Cambridge, 1900–7), III, pp. 1433–5. For the ancestry of the press, A. F. Johnson, "The Exiled English Church at Amsterdam," *The Library*, 5th series, 5 (1951), pp. 219–42.

[26] William Lamont, *Marginal Prynne 1600–1669* (London, 1963).

[27] *Divine and Politike Observations*, "The Translators Dedicatory Epistle," pp. 2, 3, 4, 10. The copy in the British Library (found in the STC films), the Folger copy, and the copy described by Sayle, *Early English Printed Books*, III, p. 1434, have the author/translator emendation.

late as 1644 and 1645.[28] *Politesse* was no accident; "good manners" was a political category, a precondition of acceptable utterance.[29] It gave authority to the writer (an odd ploy considering this was a smuggled book), putting a little distance between the fiery puritan martyrs and this cool opponent of their tormentor. "Good manners" was also a weapon, capable of highlighting the archbishop's own descent into vulgarity.[30]

Figures and themes in *Divine and Politike Observations* match those of Parker in 1640–1. *Divine and Politike Observations* defended those "nicknamed" puritans from calumny, but also was reluctant, in a way common among the so-called puritan gentry, to use the term in self-description – a theme and manner of *A Discourse Concerning Puritans*.[31] There was a sense that parliament was the real target of the puritans' calumniators, and that parliament was the best means to combat the vague plot hatched by the anti-puritans, a perspective shared by *A Discourse Concerning Puritans* and *The Case of Shipmony*.[32] Conversely, there was great sensitivity to Laud's charge that the opponents of the bishops sought to "strike through" the bishops' "sides" at the king; the same figure is found in Parker's 1641 pamphlets.[33] In common with writings undoubtedly Parker's, *Divine and Politike Observations* was intensely interested in, even fascinated by, Constantine and Theodosius. As in Parker's Long Parliament pamphlets, the conventional image of Constantine the heroic imperialist caesar-pope gave

[28] *Divine and Politike Observations*, "The Translator to the Reader," pp. 25, 32, 55. Cf. H[enry] P[arker,] *The Altar Dispute* (London, 1641[/2]), p. 2. Parker dedicated H[enry] P[arker,] *The Question Concerning the Divine Right of Episcopacie Truly Stated* (London, 1641), sig. A_2 recto, to Archbishop Ussher, "the most Reverend and Gracious Father in God, my Lord Primate of Ireland." In *Jus Populi*, p. 65, Ussher is styled "his Grace." In [Henry Parker,] *Jus Regum* (London, 1645), pp. 1, 8, 37, Laud is "my lord of Canterbury."

[29] "Good manners" are invoked three times: "The Translator to the Reader," pp. 25, 32; later (p. 55) Laud's "passionate expressions" were held to lead to a "diminution of the Respect due" to the archbishop's speech. In H[enry] P[arker,] *The Altar Dispute*, p. 2, Parker thought the "venomous raylings and distempers" of the clergy "when they are treating matters of Religion" disgraced the age, the country, and the religion; in [Henry Parker,] *A Discourse Concerning Puritans* ([London,] 1641), p. 8, Parker defended Henry Burton's loyalty, but did not contest the court's view that Burton's "style" was seditious.

[30] Laud complained that it was considered superstitious to come into church with greater reverence than a "Tinker & his Bitch come into an Ale-house": *A Speech Concerning Innovations in the Church*, p. 46; cf. the use made of this figure in *Divine and Politike Observations*, pp. 41, 42, 46, 47.

[31] *Divine and Politike Observations*, pp. 14, 51, 55; cf. p. 22. "Nicke-name" is also used in *A Discourse Concerning Puritans*, p. 56.

[32] *Divine and Politike Observations*, pp. 14, 15, 31, 34; *A Discourse Concerning Puritans*, pp. 41, 47; [Henry Parker,] *The Case of Shipmony* ([London,] 1640), pp. 31, 32, 34. Cf. *The Altar Dispute*, pp. 1, 2; *Jus Regum*, pp. 9, 26–7. See also Caroline Hibbard, *Charles I and the Popish Plot* (Chapel Hill, 1983).

[33] *Divine and Politike Observations*, pp. 2, 3, 25; *A Discourse Concerning Puritans*, p. 6; *The Altar Dispute*, p. 22.

way to a more sophisticated and timely image of the emperor as the dupe of his clergy.[34]

Such similarities are reinforced by more idiosyncratic parallels, and by further similarities of design and structure. Among Parker's deepest and most characteristic ideological commitments in the 1640s were a conception of parliament that emphasized its role as council (rather than its activity as a court and a legislature) and an unrelenting hostility to "churchmen" as a private interest group. Both attitudes were present in Parker's earliest pamphlets of the Long Parliament era and both attitudes are to be found in *Divine and Politike Observations*. Parker's anti-clericalism was so visceral and so highly developed in early 1641 that he stands quite alone amongst his publishing contemporaries; the similarity of *Divine and Politike Observations* with the later Parker is therefore quite striking. "Churchmen" tricked Constantine, another one tricked Henry V, and they are at it still, machinating not only against the prince but "the state."[35] And in seeing the role of parliament as that of a great council, the author of *Divine and Politike Observations* also adopted as his own another highly characteristic Parker trait. A phrasing such as "the honourable Court of Parliament that representative body of the Kingdome, his Majesties most faithfull and least corruptible counsell" could have appeared in any Parker pamphlet of the 1640s, and was never "boilerplate" but a straightforward emphasis upon the conciliar – rather than judicial or legislative – aspect of parliament; indeed *Jus Regum*, a reply to Laud's scaffold speech, had parliament "the Kings great Councell, and the representative body of his Kingdom."[36] *Divine and Politike Observations* is also in line with the title and form of a number of Parker pamphlets. The motif of "observations" is found, of course, in *Observations upon Some of His Majesties Late Answers and Expresses* and its predecessor *Some Few Observations*. It is present or implicit in the long titles of other Parker pamphlets, the apparent motive of others still, and a common formal

[34] *Divine and Politike Observations*, pp. 2, 24, 25. Constantine and the related history of Theodosius and Ambrose figure widely in Parker's 1641 pamphlets: *A Discourse Concerning Puritans*, pp. 6, 12, 16, 23–4, 32–3, 35, 43; *The Altar Dispute*, pp. 17–19, 29, 61–2; [Henry Parker,] *The True Grounds of Ecclesiasticall Regiment* (London, 1641), pp. 11, 16, 48–50, 56, 61, 65, 76, 83. The importance of Constantine is stressed by Lamont, *Marginal Prynne*, and *idem*, *Godly Rule: Politics and Religion, 1603–60* (London, 1969).

[35] *Divine and Politike Observations*, pp. 24–5 (Constantine), 45 (Henry V), 8, 10, 18–19, 21, 41, 60 (other usages, mostly contemporary). "State" (a favorite Parker term) is counterposed to churchman directly on p. 21, and implicitly through the congruence of state and parliament. "Minister" was reserved (pp. 32, 37) for the modest divine; that "churchman" was the generic term is clear from p. 13, where Laud is lumped with "others of your Coat." Parker used "churchman" in the same way; see, e.g., *A Discourse Concerning Puritans*, p. 35, and *Jus Regum*, p. 11.

[36] *Divine and Politike Observations*, p. 13; *Jus Regum*, p. 35, cf. p. 37.

element throughout the *œuvre*.[37] All of these are features common to many writings of the period, but their presence in this early pamphlet, which had fewer models to draw upon, as well as in Parker's earliest efforts in 1640–1 point to Parker as a likely author.

The question of authorship can be attacked from both ends. Nothing has ever been written by "Anonymous"; if not Parker, then who? The approach is not nearly as remote as it might appear; most thoughtful authors appeared more than once in the lists in the 1640s, and it is more than fair to ask which authors active in the 1630s and early 1640s fit the composite. The first crew to be excluded are the usual suspects of the day – Prynne, Bastwick, Burton, Lilburne, the separatist émigrés – whose manner was so very different. The rampant anti-clericalism and a laudatory mention of *The Holy Table* cast doubt upon John Williams, who otherwise might have matched the description,[38] as well as upon the rest of the learned pamphleteers active in 1640–2. But if Parker's authorship of *Divine and Politike Observations* must remain a conjecture, the attribution does fit in well with what is known about the attitudes and activities of some other Lincoln's Inn men in 1638. William Prynne, after all, was one of their own, and while his mien and manner were not universally admired, he had his local partisans. The court suspected another Lincoln's Inn barrister, Oliver St. John, of providing legal advice underhandedly to Dr. John Bastwick.[39] Another index of Lincoln's Inn opinion in 1638 is a private letter found there on the ground and transmitted to Secretary Windebank for its supposedly seditious content. Laud had "subdued the puritane faction" and in the process had intimidated even the "Nobility." The council "for the most parte are novi ho[m]ines," and the "auntient happie gouver[n]ment by p[ar]liam[t] is alltogether dispised."[40]

[37] [Henry Parker,] *Some Few Observations* ([London, 1642]). For use in extended titles, see *Jus Regum*. Parker noted a desire in *The Altar Dispute*, sig. A_2 verso, to make his "observations more publike." [Henry Parker,] *The Contra-Replicant* [London, 1642/3], in the title and initial remarks, and H[enry] Parker, *Scotlands Holy War* (London, 1651), p. 1, for example, announce themselves as responses to other pamphlets. The form underlies *A Discourse Concerning Puritans*, which is primarily a response to Henry Leslie, bishop of Down and Connor, *A Speech, Delivered at the Visitation of Downe and Conner, Held in Lisnegarvy the 26th of September 1638* (London, 1639), a vitriolic attack upon puritans from the days of Elizabeth to the present, as well as *The Case of Shipmony*, a response to royalist opinions in the ship money case.

[38] *Divine and Politike Observations*, p. 51.

[39] *Privy Council Registers*, I, pp. 37, 40. This corrects Rossingham's impression that Henry Burton was the beneficiary of St. John's advice: S. R. Gardiner, ed., *Documents Relating to the Proceeding against William Prynne in 1634 and 1637*, Camden Soc. Publ. 2nd ser., 18 (London, 1877), pp. 77, 78, reproducing PRO SP 16/363/31.

[40] PRO SP 16/401/19 and 19.1. Cottington, who transmitted the letter to Windebanke, demonstrated his isolation in presuming the letter to be Scottish in origin. For the politics of Lincoln's Inn, Wilfrid R. Prest, *The Inns of Court under Elizabeth I and the Early Stuarts 1590–1640* (Totowa, N.J., 1972), pp. 206–7, 213.

II

The trail is longer and sometimes clearer in the Long Parliament. Parker's writings provide one valuable source of information, largely because of George Thomason's for-personal-use attributions. From mid-1642, Parker's hand is occasionally to be found in the public records. Other sources flesh out the portrait of the pamphleteer-privado.

The admixture of roles is clear from the first. On the title page of *A Discourse Concerning Puritans* Thomason wrote "By Henry Parker a Cou[n]cellor."[41] By this Thomason might have made reference to Parker's legal standing, since counsellor could mean barrister; it could also carry a more general sense of adviser, as in "cabinet counsellor."[42] Probably Thomason had the latter sense in mind. Nothing suggests Parker ever developed a successful conventional practice in the common law. Parker made small display of his legal learning throughout his career, viewed the nuts and bolts of the law with contempt, dismissed its higher values, and strove for years to obtain a position in the prerogative office (the former Prerogative Court of Canterbury), for which a common law background was irrelevant.

Another word for Parker's trade was "privado." Buckingham's inner circle had been known by that strange term in the 1620s, and Parker himself so labeled his opposite numbers on the other side. While writing anonymously on behalf of some Vintners, Parker scornfully noted the "privadoes" of their enemy, William Abel.[43] In his first pamphlet of the Long Parliament era, Parker dubbed the courtier-advisers of Charles "an inconsiderable number of Privadoes" at odds with the whole kingdom.[44] On the eve of civil war, Parker laid out the grounds of war as a "Crisis of seducement" in which the king had been seduced by "Privadoes."[45] Later, using synonyms, Parker insisted that the king's promises meant little, because he merely swore for himself, "not his Favourites and Counsellors," who were more to be feared.[46] But more than once, royalist writers used the term to describe the anonymous author of *Observations*.[47]

In Spanish, "privado" is "favorite," as the favorite of a prince. But in the

[41] On his copy of *The Case of Shipmony*, Thomason wrote "By y^{e} same m^{r} Henry Parker."

[42] J. H. Baker, "Counsellors and Barristers: An Historical Study," *Cambridge Law Journal*, 27 (1969), pp. 205–29, esp. 205–9; D. S. Bland, *The Vocabulary of the Inns of Court* (Liverpool, 1964), pp. 5–6.

[43] Richard Cust, *The Forced Loan and English Politics 1626–1628* (Oxford, 1987), p. 24. [Henry Parker,] *The Vintners Answer to Some Scandalous Phamphlets* (London, 1642), pp. 10, 14, 16.

[44] *The Case of Shipmony*, p. 35. [45] *Observations*, p. 30.

[46] [Henry Parker,] *The Oath of Pacification* (London, 1643), p. 10; see also pp. 14–16, for history of favorites from Gaveston to Strafford.

[47] *A View of the Observations* (Oxford, 1642), p. 4. *An Answer or Necessary Animadversions* (London, 1642), t.p., sig. A1 verso, pp. 17, 23, 28.

seventeenth century, the word leaned as much to the political as the precious, and pointed to the agent as much as to the minion. Bacon described this raising of "Servants" to the rank of political friend: "Princes ... raise some Persons, to be as it were Companions, and almost Equals to themselves ... The Moderne Languages give unto such Persons, the Name of *Favorites*, or *Privadoes* ... But the Roman Name attaineth the true Use, and Cause thereof; Naming them *Participes Curarum*."[48] The privado of a prince might be a Buckingham; equally, he could be a Sir Julius Caesar or a Burghley; and such men had their own associates in care. In this way, a privado could be, or have been, a secretary, or agent, or ghost-writer, and might have others performing for him the services he performed for another. Such a figure could easily appear aulic and sinister, and Parker, who loved to manipulate exotic terms, usually used the word in that way, playing as well on the opposition of private and public that was the dominant polarity in his thought. However, as Parker put it on one occasion, parliaments were more "knowing then any other privadoes."[49] Parker's hostility to the role was to its privacy, or antipathy to the public good. But otherwise he performed the function and at times revered it. This tension would pull a train of conflicts, ambivalences, and contradictions that are in substantial measure the theme of this study. Parker would be the public's privado.

The privado had its apologists. The reigning expert – the author of an enchiridion on the subject and a proud exemplar of the role – was resident in England in 1640 as one of the three ambassadors of Philip IV.[50] This was Virgilio Malvezzi, a Bolognese marquis in the service of the king of Spain.[51] Henry Parker opened *A Discourse Concerning Puritans* with an extended quotation from one of Malvezzi's works, a circumstance, along with Parker's temporary fascination with the term, that serves to introduce the improbable tangle of connections known to exist in the early 1640s between Parker's uncle and patron, Lord Say, Malvezzi's English publisher, Richard Whitaker,

[48] Sir Francis Bacon, *The Essayes or Counsels, Civill and Morall*, ed. Michael Kiernan (Oxford, 1985), "Of Frendship," p. 82. For other usages, several of which serve to link closely the privado and the cultivated "servant," secretary, agent, or minister, see s.v. *OED*; C. A. M. Fennell, *The Stanford Dictionary of Anglicised Words and Phrases* (Cambridge, 1964); Robert Nares, *A Glossary* ..., "new" edn., with additions by J. O Halliwell and Thomas Wright, 2 vols. (London, 1859).

[49] *Some Few Observations*, p. 5.

[50] *Il Ritratto del Privato Politico Christiano* (Bologna, 1635). Like all of Malvezzi's works, it was translated throughout the principal European languages. The English edition did not appear until 1647: *The Pourtract of the Politicke Christian Favourite*, trans. Thomas Powell (London, 1647).

[51] On Malvezzi, see Rodolfo Brändli, *Virgilio Malvezzi, Politico e Moralista* (Basel, 1964), and Virgilio Malvezzi, *Historia de los Primeros Años del Reinado de Felipe IV*, ed. with introduction by D. L. Shaw (London, 1968), pp. ix-xxviii.