

University of Richmond

## UR Scholarship Repository

---

Honors Theses

Student Research

---

1-1970

### Henry Parker's doctrine of the consent of the governed /

Barbara Cahoon  
*University of Richmond*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarship.richmond.edu/honors-theses>



Part of the [European History Commons](#)

---

#### Recommended Citation

Cahoon, Barbara, "Henry Parker's doctrine of the consent of the governed /" (1970). *Honors Theses*. 337.  
<https://scholarship.richmond.edu/honors-theses/337>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Research at UR Scholarship Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Honors Theses by an authorized administrator of UR Scholarship Repository. For more information, please contact [scholarshipprepository@richmond.edu](mailto:scholarshipprepository@richmond.edu).

UNIVERSITY OF RICHMOND LIBRARIES



3 3082 01028 5004

History

Cahoon

HENRY PARKER'S DOCTRINE  
OF THE CONSENT OF THE GOVERNED

by

Barbara Cahoon

*Dr. Lyall Rosen  
clearly presents*

A

History Honors Thesis  
Westhampton College  
January, 1970

## PREFACE

The role of Parliament in England's history has been one of interest to historians for centuries. The background and origin of a rule based on the people's consent has been attributed to many people in England's past. I hope to show that one of the first men who developed this theory of government which was later taken up by Locke and other philosophers was Henry Parker. The people choosing their types of government and laws was a new idea that few had voiced. Parker writing in the 1640's saw the tendency of government evolving to Parliamentary sovereignty, not monarchy.

I am indebted to Houghton Library at Harvard University for their assistance in obtaining Parker's pamphlets from which the bulk of my research was taken. In the paper I retain the seventeenth century spelling in order to capture some of the flavor and spirit of the age in which Parker audaciously penned his theories.

## CHAPTER I

Parliament's rise to power in the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries was made possible by brave action and the power of the pen wielded by men well ahead of their time. Such men have been described as "men with a vision of a nobler world."<sup>1</sup> Indeed they were, and their world consisted of one in which the reins of government were in the people's hands, not tied up in an autocratic King and incompetent ministers. Although the battle for Parliamentary sovereignty was not resolved until 1688, pamphleteers such as Henry Parker of Sussex kept the issue before the nation.

Stuart England was a century for innovation and turmoil in government. A conflict between the King and Parliament was taking shape, yet in the early part of the century the King was looked upon by many as God's annointed one.<sup>2</sup> Furthermore, in 1628 the position of the King was strengthened when Phelips spoke in favor of liberty but was quick to remind Commons that subjection was also necessary.<sup>3</sup> This view was held by many Englishmen. James and Charles both ruled on the divine right principle and regarded Parliament as a mere court. Only when the abuses toward Parliament got out of hand was any concrete action taken. Gradually the English

people began to disavow divine right and <sup>to</sup> question the right of monarchs to rule. Parliament in 1641 after the issuance of the Grand Remonstrance began to see the law as supreme, not the divine right principle.<sup>4</sup> "The constitutional doctrine that Parliament was the interpretor of fundamental laws of the land contained the germ of the doctrine of Parliamentary sovereignty. Development of this doctrine divided the old constitutional party of the Long Parliament into the two parties that fought the Civil War."<sup>5</sup>

The struggle for power began in the Civil War when Charles raised his standard. Parliament in the first part of the seventeenth century felt the balance between the royal prerogative, and the privileges of the King to be very good government.<sup>6</sup> But by 1628 the Parliamentary party's views had changed because the King, royalist ministers, judges, and clergy had tipped the scales too much in favor of the prerogative.<sup>7</sup> The restoration of a proper balance between the two factors and the insurance of the subject's rightful place in government became the task to which they bent all their energies.<sup>8</sup>

The war was fought on paper as well as on the battlefield. Such royalist writers as Dudley Digges sought to justify the King's position, just as Parliament had its writers procaliming its cause. The greatest of Parliamentary writers was Henry Parker, the first Englishman to recognize that a transfer of sovereignty must come about without completely destroying

all form of government.<sup>9</sup> Parker was the "clearest and most realistic thinker during the Civil War period,"<sup>10</sup> and "perhaps first of Parliamentary writers to disavow the King and attack policy which could scarcely admit of any constitutional compromise."<sup>11</sup> Thus Stuart England was on her way to a new form of government--a type of government which Parker, in his secular approach, saw as the only alternative. He was unique for his age and even considered radical when the Long Parliament of 1640 assembled.<sup>12</sup> He approached central problems of political theory in a secular manner contemptuous of and varying from both the traditional and medieval views.<sup>13</sup> Power must rest with the people in Parliament for a responsible government in England to become a reality.

In exalting Parliament's power and in order to justify it, writers had to turn to the people as the final authority.<sup>14</sup> From this, the doctrine of the consent of the governed began to grow. When Parker sounded his bold appeal in 1642 that government was based on the consent of the governed, it was the most radical democratic note which had yet been uttered by a speaker or writer supporting Parliament's cause.<sup>15</sup> For centuries the King and Parliament had been the seat of power. According to Parliament's theory of government, when the King waged war against it, Parliament should be the rightful ruler for it was the representative of the people. Thus the gap between Parliament and monarchy widened. The struggle for

power was on. Henry Parker in his pamphlets not only gave form to Parliament's stand but also developed a political philosophy which "was in the end to become the doctrine of the English Constitution."<sup>16</sup>

## CHAPTER II

The main thrust of Parker's political theory was based on the doctrine of the consent of the governed. To base a government on this principle, a firm foundation had to be built. In order to develop his thesis, he went back to the origin of all government and utilized Adam and the fall of man to illustrate his tenet.

In 1642 Parker wrote in Observations Upon Some of His Majesties Late Answers and Expresses what he believed to be the situation from which the beginnings of government grew. He expressed it thus:

Man being depraved by the fall of Adam grew so untame and uncivill a creature, that the Law of God written in his brest was not sufficient to restrayne him from mischief, or to make him sociable, and therefore without some magistracy to provide new orders, and to judge of old, and to execute according to justice, no society could be upheld. Without society men could not live, and without lawes men could not be sociable, and without authority somewhere invested, to judge according to Law, and execute according to judgment, Law was a vaine and void thing. It was soon therefore provided that lawes agreeable to the dictates of reason should be ratified by common consent, and that the execution and interpretation of those Lawes should be intrusted to some magistrate, for the preventing of common injuries betwixt Subject and Subject . . .<sup>1</sup>

Man's state in the beginning was one of chaos, and he saw the need of laws to maintain order. He also saw the necessity of having some sort of force assure that these rules which society set up were carried out; but this enforcement body was to be chosen by the people who made up the laws for the



protection of all. The people upon their common consent chose their magistrate. They gave him the power to carry out the laws but by virtue of his selection the people retained the ultimate power. Government rose out of human need and necessity so "human consent was a vital factor in its origin and continuance."<sup>2</sup>

Parker's thesis supported a form of government based on man's consent and his ability to alter the form if it became unbearable. He expanded his theory that even in Judea God perhaps would command a person to rule, but the people would choose; but if He made the choice the people would give force and sanction.<sup>3</sup> From this he moved on to refute the Royalists' stand that the idea of a king came from the Conquest and William. Parker said that to him, "William had been a Robber not a Victor"<sup>4</sup> and that the nation "could not be engaged by any other means than the consent of the people. . . ." <sup>5</sup> The right of a king to rule was solely due to the people's consent and could be altered if they saw the need. Having seen the people forming government at its origin, "Parker held that the state was man's creation, it might be molded within the limits of historical destiny to his needs and aspirations."<sup>6</sup>

In developing his thought on the origin of government, Parker saw the government of England as a "mixture of Monarchy, Aristocracy, and Democracy."<sup>7</sup> All three forces determine the makeup of government and its functions. The King would rule only in Parliament and in conjunction with the Aristocracy,

but on equal footing with the Commons in order to secure the democratic process. Government was a mixture, not an autocratic state like the one the Stuarts had created. Parker had very definite views on this position.

The privileges which the King challenges to himself are to be yielded to, only so far forth as they are consistent with the acknowledged Privileges of the two Houses, because the monarchy being acknowledged to be a regulated Monarchy and the Government mixt of Aristocracy and Democracy, as well as Monarchy; it is the Privileges of the two Houses of Parliament that makes the mixture, and so they must regulate and interpret the privileges of the King and not the Privileges of the King regulate or interpret theirs, save only to the maintaining still the Regal Dignity and the succession according to Laws.<sup>8</sup>

Since government from its source has had a check-system, the forces of democracy, monarchy, and aristocracy should work in combination. From this Parker deduced that since "government is regulated then the King is not above law but subject to it."<sup>9</sup> Parker based his theory here on the old Germanic folk tradition that the law belonged to the folk and could only be changed by the folk.<sup>10</sup> Based on these ancient accounts, the people hold the reins of government. The King was placed in a very precarious position. Government was a mixture of the three elements, and by virtue of this fact the King has definite powers which would seem irrevocable. Parker inserted a catch clause stating that in extreme cases Parliament may interpret the powers of the King for the Kingdom's welfare which would sweep away all protection for the King's position.<sup>11</sup> He is thorough in his approach to the ori-

gin of government and integrates all elements well, in the end seeing that government was founded upon the consent of the people. Parker saw this as a truth that was established early and ran throughout history, not one developed in his day.

Kings grew up out of the chaos after Adam's fall, but only by the consent of those they governed. Parker uses English history as well as Biblical references to illustrate the point that the people chose their rulers even in the first days. By going back to the origin of government, Parker firmly laid the groundwork for Parliament's supremacy in later history.

### CHAPTER III

As the concept of a civil society emerged, man's consent became more intrinsically woven into the framework. Parker stated in 1642 that,

Power is originally inherent in the people, and there is nothing else but that might and vigour which such or such a societie of men containes in itselfe and when by such or such a Law of common soncent and agreement it is derived into such and such hands, God confirmes that Law: and so man is the free and voluntary author, the Law is the Instrument, and God is the establisher of both.<sup>1</sup>

The growth of society and its regulators was an evolutionary process. In the beginning Parker saw society as one household with the reins of government loosely held by man.<sup>2</sup> Later states became larger, increasing their size because of the growth of towns and cities; and as danger of foreign invasion increased, monarchical power was established for protection as in the Jewish Kingdom.<sup>3</sup> But this circumstance did not prescribe a justification for absolute monarchy because the Jewish Kingdom was directly administered by God.<sup>4</sup> Parker developed society and placed monarchy in it, but only in a limited sense. Monarchy or some form of rule was necessary to keep order. Parker was quick to reply that "when the consent of societie~~s~~ convayes rule into such and such hands, it

may ordaine what conditions and prefix what bounds it pleases, and that no dissolution ought to be thereof, but by the same power by which it had its constitution."<sup>5</sup> Parker ascribed to the theory that the power to create is the power to destroy. Government was created by the people and was responsible to them, if monarchy did not operate in the best interests of the people then they had the power to abolish it.

The princes who functioned as rulers in this government were created by the people for the people's sake, and these rulers were limited by laws, so that they could not violate the people's liberty.<sup>6</sup> Consequently, princes created for the benefit of the subject should act as servants of the people because the princes' power came from the people and was always conditioned by their needs.<sup>7</sup> As Henry Parker visualized it, society ruled government in every way.

A natural outgrowth of this theory was that the "welfare of the people should be the primary concern of the government"<sup>8</sup> and furthermore that "the proper end of government was the good of the governed."<sup>9</sup> Society should have been oriented toward the needs of the governed. Man was the free and voluntary author of government and it should function for his benefit. Parker saw the welfare of the people as the paramount law which provided a model for all human laws in existence.<sup>10</sup> "Parker's emphasis upon popular consent as the basis of government and upon the welfare of the people as the guide for

governmental policies, provided him with ample justification for Parliament's stand in 1642 and in succeeding years."<sup>11</sup>

Charles had ceased to rule for the good of the nation, for eleven years he carried out policies without consulting Parliament. Therefore, Parliament, representative of the people, took over. Parker held that this spelled his ruin. "Wee thereby maintain that in all cases whatsoever the generality is touched, the generality must be consulted."<sup>12</sup> England under Charles was in bondage, for "no nation can be free without; framing and passing of laws, declaring and interpreting laws, executing and preserving laws in force."<sup>13</sup> Tyranny was more the reality under Charles, and Parker saw the tyranny of monarchy as the evil of the day. The only just remedy would be the restoration of the people's consent in the formation of government. Society was a creation of the people and should be geared to their welfare.

Parliamentary sovereignty, the people ruling themselves, was Parker's answer. Since Parliament was "indeed the State it selfe, it should and does possess the final authority."<sup>14</sup> Parker's theory had begun to take shape in that he saw the people as the source of political authority in the state and made their welfare the goal of government, but his democratic tendencies ended there.<sup>15</sup> Parker was conservative in his "fear of mob rule,"<sup>16</sup> and his near "passion for the necessity of order in human affairs led him to attribute the sovereignty

essential for order, not to the people themselves, but only to Parliament by whom it could be safely wielded in an orderly way."<sup>17</sup> Thus, Parker's idea of society where the governed would rule was exemplified in Parliament, which represented the people and would promote their welfare and safety.

## CHAPTER IV.

In Parker's form of government for England, he could not justify the role of the monarchy. Any government based on the power of the people had no place for an autocratic ruler. It was to this sort of rule that Parker reacted and caused quite a furor. In his pamphlets, he wrote about the inconsistencies of monarchical rule and its evils, setting out to shatter what had been established in England for centuries: the idea of the Kingdom and the King.

In his attack upon monarchy, Parker stated that "Princes were created by the people, for the people's sake, and so limited by expresse Laws as that they might not violate the people's liberty."<sup>1</sup> In other words, Kings were created by the people and are ultimately responsible to them. Parker concluded that princes should act as servants, keeping the subjects' welfare in mind. Not only would this benefit the people, but also the King; the power and greatness of a nation lies in its people, and if they are happy and content then the King will be too.<sup>3</sup> In other words, Parker believed that as the people prospered or regressed so did the monarchy, and that the ultimate power never left the hands of the people.<sup>4</sup>



Parker asserted that the result of absolute monarchy could only end in tyranny.<sup>5</sup> The King's power had to be restrained to insure the safety of the Kingdom,, and he saw Parliament as the proper instrument in promoting this safety. Parker saw the need for some force to be brought in because Charles was ruling without any regard for the welfare of the people. The facts were well known by Englishmen but were not condemned until Parker in his bold assertions against the King spoke up. Being well ahead of his time, he saw no need for monarchy, especially when it wasn't performing its duties. The King was to support the safety and well being of the Kingdom and should never challenge anything from the sanctity of his office which would derogate from the people.<sup>6</sup> Parker came to the conclusion that since the King's power "came from the people and was always conditioned by their needs, there could be no sound justification for absolute monarchy."<sup>7</sup>

After establishing that there was no basis for absolute monarchy, Parker began dispelling such myths as the divine right theory, the autocratic power of princes, and hereditary successors. Parker saw these traditions as unjust impositions upon the very ones in whom the power to govern was originally vested. In opposition, many men believed that only the King should safely rule and based their argument on two principles. First, according to divine right, they felt that the King was

the closest of all human beings to God, who possessed perfect justice; thus, only the King could know what was best for the Kingdom.<sup>8</sup> Secondly, they argued that by virtue of his high office, the King would have greater concerns for the public welfare than the public itself.<sup>9</sup> Parker answered this statement saying that,

Those men therefore that maintain, That all Kings are in all things and commands(as well where personall resistance accompanies, as not) to be obeyed, as being like Gods, unlimitable, as well in evill, as in good unquestionable, are sordid flatterers. And those which allow no limits but directive only, And those no other but divine and naturall; And so make all Princes as vast in power as the Turk, (for He is subject to the directive force of God, and natures Laws;) and so allow subjects a dry right without all remedy, are almost as stupid as the former.<sup>10</sup>

Parker, as has been demonstrated, saw the people as molders of this government and believed that the King got his power from them, not through divine right. Being secular in his approach to such questions, Parker became angered when he saw some people's view that "the Kings and Princes, all their names and successions were let down from heaven in the same sheet that the beasts were in Peter's vision and had not their root in the earth as all other magistrates."<sup>11</sup> Such a king as this would have all knowledge and could do no wrong and to rebel against such a divine personage would be a great sin. Parker did not hold to this theory. He went on to issue his belief that God is no more the author of one form of gov-

ernment as He is of any other.<sup>12</sup> Even when the crown was established upon the House of David, Parker maintained the people still had a voice in their government; before every coronation they could assemble and vote for a person not necessarily from the House of David.<sup>13</sup> God did not impose a certain form of government, or a King even upon his chosen people. It was sheer folly for Englishmen to make such an assertion that the government of England should be based on God's choice of the King. The main thrust of Parker's philosophy was that the people have always given their consent and that God confirms only that form of government which is selected by common consent.<sup>14</sup> Nevertheless, this belief in the divine right of kings was firmly entrenched in Englishmen's minds in the 1640's. Parker felt as if he were waging an uphill battle. "We have much to beat off this notion in pen and sword," he said, "but have too strong a hold in most men's hearts, though to their own undoing."<sup>15</sup> The facts were plain to Parker, but his countrymen found them hard to grasp. Even the Parliamentary party didn't claim resistance until 1642, and still were not resisting the person of the King but his evil ministers.<sup>16</sup> This form of government would be hard to break.

Parker saw innumerable evils in a monarchy. He aired his disgust by stating,

It is almost a miracle, to see a great Monarch good: and if he be, it is more miaculous, to see him upon

the receipt of Appeals, and other Addresses (as often as occasion shall require) from remote parts, to distinguish truth and falsehood, or to sift the Bran from the Flour so neerly as it ought to be.<sup>17</sup>

Ruling families were more often than not some of the least capable people of the realm. Such families often got their position by such means as their personalities, good fortunes, or position in court.<sup>18</sup> This being the case, to show the sad state of government in England, Parker pointed out "that all an heir has to do is become of age. It being enough if he can know his own name, and be able to write himself Rex, though he knows little what belongs to the office, or relation of a King."<sup>19</sup> This was an evil and hindrance to good government. Monarchy held responsible government back because it was "the custom that people be content with what they can find, be he good or bad, reducing and giving up own wills and liberties to such a succession."<sup>20</sup> Parker had a keen insight into the inner workings of monarchy and the evils it inflicted upon society. Parliament was beginning to feel these results, but Parker was the first one to so boldly attack the King. He put in printed form the emerging feelings of the Parliamentary party and felt that monarchy should be seen for what it was, an evil to society.

And though all Monarchies are not subject to the same conditions, yet there scarce is any Monarchy but is subject to some conditions, and I thinke to the most absolute Empire in the world this condition is most naturall and necessary, That the safetie of

the people is to be valued above any right of his, as much as the end is to be preferred before the means; it is not just nor possible for any nation so to enslave itself, and to resign its own interest to the will of one Lord, as that Lord may destroy it without injury, and yet to have no right to preserve itself.<sup>21</sup>

Parker finding no justification for monarchy, saw the need for a transfer of power. Thus, the government moved toward the people obtaining more power and subsequently to the rise of Parliament.

## CHAPTER V.

Having developed the doctrine of the consent of the governed from the origin of government through the establishment of society, Parker saw the proper embodiment of this thesis in Parliament. He felt that the interests of England, as well as the hopes and fears of reasonable men, would be better served by a representative body, chosen by the people, rather than by a monarchy which had ceased to function as an effective part of the English government.<sup>1</sup>

"The end of all government is the preservation of human society"<sup>2</sup> Parker recounted, and Charles's failure to uphold this, made his stand in the war unjust. Furthermore, Parker stated that,

The Mosse impious and mischievous thing in us, either to forsake, or by arms to seek the destruction of that sacred Court for these reasons: First, in former ages this Kingdome relinquished the counselland had to repent and Repentence proved fatal both to King and Kingdom. Secondly, private counsell of the King obscures itself from the world and wages unjust war against Parliament.<sup>3</sup>

He saw Charles as the "architect of England's ruin"<sup>4</sup>. Parliamentary sovereignty was necessary because "Parliaments have also the same finall cause as Monarchies, if not greater, for indeed publike safety and liberty could not be so effectually provided for by Monarchs till Parliaments were constituted, for the supplying of all defects in that government."<sup>5</sup>

When the King waged war against Parliament, he relinquished the fact and legality of sovereignty.<sup>6</sup> "Under these circumstances, Parliament--the ultimate reservoir of sovereignty--simply gathers into its own hands the dispersed fragments of power and legality."<sup>7</sup>

The Civil War was a battle for sovereignty in which Parker visualized Parliament, as the people's choice of government, to emerge as the dominant force. He further stated that the political power of Parliament was derived from the agreements of men.<sup>8</sup> Parliament was the just rule because the nation had given its consent to those it wanted to rule, thus the people had a voice in government as long as Parliament sat. According to Parker, the Houses of Parliament were free to abrogate the ancestral compact with the King and abolish kingship whenever they felt such a step was necessary.<sup>9</sup> Parker saw Parliament's stand in the war as completely just for the government was of the people and the consent of the people had established it. The King was unfit to rule and had sought to destroy the people. Parliament, as the representative of the people, had to defend its power in government; "Shall Parliament be blamed for cutting off usurpers and tyrants and reducing affairs to their natural and right principle?"<sup>10</sup> The differences between the King and Parliament were thus reduced to a contest for power, where the two great elements of the constitution were brought into open conflict.<sup>11</sup> Each had spe-

cific principles for which they fought: Charles defending his ministers and Parliament claiming the right to judge these men. "If neither was completely in the right, the view taken by the Commons was far nearer to the truth than the view taken by Charles."<sup>12</sup> Thus, the transfer of power was complete, and Parliament, as representative of the people, stood alone, vested in robes of legality and supported by the requirements of policy.<sup>13</sup>

The people sovereign in Parliament was Parker's vision of the rightful government of England. Parliament, sanctioned by the people, should rule. Although Parker didn't live to witness a government in England based on the people's consent gain true power, he laid the framework from which this government was built in 1688.



## CONCLUSION

Parker in his writings during the 1640's "offered the clearest assertion which had yet appeared in print of the dependence of government upon the consent of the governed."<sup>1</sup> Those who created government should have a voice in its administration. Parker saw Parliament as the only just means by which the people could give sanction to the form of government that they desired. "I think arbitrary rule was most safe for the world, but now since most countries have found out an Art and Peaceable Order for Publique Assemblies, whereby the people may assume its owne power to do itselife right without disturbance to it selfe, or injury to Princes, he is very unjust that will oppose this Art and order."<sup>2</sup> That is, Parliament, being the voice of the people and the supreme judicature of the realm, has binding force in its decisions from which there can be no appeal.<sup>3</sup>

Parker was among the first who said that Parliament should be sovereign, not the King. He foresaw in the 1640's the only alternative for effective government in England while others were still trying to rule with a king. Parker gave sovereignty to the Parliament but maintained that ". . . the power of Parliaments is but a derivative and depending upon publike consent."<sup>4</sup> Thus, he saw the consent of the people as an in-

trinsic doctrine woven into the government of England from its origin, to the sovereignty of Parliament.

Parker developed in the 1640's what became an actuality in the 1680's. His theory of the consent of the governed was placed before the nation forty years before it came to be integrated in the governmental framework. Parker was advanced for his age and had a keen perception of what responsible government should be.

In the Revolution of 1688, Parker's ideas were finally realized. The people did control and gave consent to their government. At last as a result of Parker's development of a political theory based on the consent of the people, the English who counted politically in the affairs of the nation triumphed, and never in the future was their power successfully overthrown by kings.<sup>5</sup>

## Primary Source Commentary

Since little research has been done on Henry Parker and his political thought, the bulk of my research was done by reading a large portion of his pamphlets. In order to ascertain trends and premises in his political thought, I read all the pamphlets that I could obtain. Fortunately Harvard University had a large collection, and I was able to use them and began to view Henry Parker's thoughts that caused such turbulence in England during the 1640's.

Several pamphlets were most beneficial to me while others became repetitious. Observations upon some of His Majesties late Answers and Expresses clearly stated Parker's view that the King is dependent upon the subjects' will and he also developed the consent of the governed principle from which he based the doctrine of Parliamentary sovereignty. This work helped me to gain a deeper understanding of his view of monarchy. The Contra-replicant also showed Parker's belief that the only just rule in England could be the people sovereign in Parliament. In Jus Populi. Or, a Discourse Parker attacked Divine Right and developed his theory of Civil Society. This pamphlet helped me gather all his views of monarchy and then assimilate Parker's basis for the people controlling government. A political catechism was actually written as a catechism in which Parker would ask questions and then make his reply. He covered the whole scope of his

FOOTNOTES

Chapter I

- <sup>1</sup>W. K. Jordan, Men of Substance (New York, 1967), 1.
- <sup>2</sup>Margaret Judson, Crisis of the Constitution (New York; 1964), 17.
- <sup>3</sup>Ibid., 19.
- <sup>4</sup>T. C. Pease, The Leveller Movement (Washington, D.C., 1916), 10.
- <sup>5</sup>Ibid., 16.
- <sup>6</sup>Margaret Judson, 64.
- <sup>7</sup>Ibid.
- <sup>8</sup>Ibid.
- <sup>9</sup>W. K. Jordan, 6.
- <sup>10</sup>Margaret Judson, 46.
- <sup>11</sup>W. K. Jordan, 144.
- <sup>12</sup>Ibid., 31.
- <sup>13</sup>Ibid., 148.
- <sup>14</sup>Ibid., 415
- <sup>15</sup>Ibid., 416.
- <sup>16</sup>T. C. Pease, 27.

## CHAPTER II

- <sup>1</sup> Henry Parker, Observations Upon His Majesties Late Answers and Expresses (London, 1642), 13.
- <sup>2</sup> Margaret Judson, Crisis of the Constitution (New York; 1964), 417.
- <sup>3</sup> Henry Parker, Jus Populi (London, 1644), 7.
- <sup>4</sup> Ibid., 14.
- <sup>5</sup> Clayton Roberts, The Growth of Responsible Government in Stuart England (Cambridge, 1966), 14.
- <sup>6</sup> W. K. Jordan, Men of Substance (New York, 1967), 173.
- <sup>7</sup> Henry Parker, Political Catechism (London, 1643), 2.
- <sup>8</sup> Ibid., 6.
- <sup>9</sup> Ibid., 2.
- <sup>10</sup> Margaret Judson, 275.
- <sup>11</sup> T. C. Pease, The Leveller Movement (Washington, D.C., 1916), 28.

CHAPTER III

<sup>1</sup>Henry Parker, Some Few Observations Upon His Majesties Late Answers(London, 1642), 1.

<sup>2</sup>Henry Parker, Jus Populi(London, 1644), 43.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid.

<sup>5</sup>Henry Parker, Observations Upon His Majesties Late Answers and Expresses, 2.

<sup>6</sup>Margaret Judson, Crisis of the Constitution (New York, 1964), 417.

<sup>7</sup>Ibid., 418.

<sup>8</sup>Ibid., 419.

<sup>9</sup>Clayton Roberts, The Growth of Responsible Government in Stuart England(Cambridge, 1966), 19.

<sup>10</sup>Margaret Judson, 419.

<sup>11</sup>Ibid., 418.

<sup>12</sup>Henry Parker, Observations Upon His Majesties Late Answers and Expresses, 8.

<sup>13</sup>Henry Parker, The Contra-replicant(London, 1643), 8.

<sup>14</sup>Margaret Judson, 428.

<sup>15</sup>Ibid., 426

<sup>16</sup>Ibid.

<sup>17</sup>Ibid.

CHAPTER IV

<sup>1</sup> Margaret Judson, Crisis of the Constitution (New York, 1964), 417.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid., 418.

<sup>3</sup> Clayton Roberts, The Growth of Responsible Government in Stuart England (Cambridge, 1966), 16.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid., 17.

<sup>5</sup> Henry Parker, The Contra-replicant (London, 1643), 4.

<sup>6</sup> Henry Parker, Jus Populi (London, 1644), 5.

<sup>7</sup> Margaret Judson, 418.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid., 30.

<sup>9</sup> Ibid.

<sup>10</sup> Henry Parker, Observations upon His Majesties Late Answers And Expresses (London, 1642), 44.

<sup>11</sup> Henry Parker, The Trve portraitvre of the Kings of England (London, 1650), 4.

<sup>12</sup> G. P. Gooch, English Democratic Ideas in the Seventeenth Century, 92.

<sup>13</sup> Henry Parker, Jus Populi, 46.

<sup>14</sup> G. P. Gooch, 92.

<sup>15</sup> Henry Parker, The Trve portraitvre of the Kings of England, 4.

<sup>16</sup> Margaret Judson, 19.

<sup>17</sup> Henry Parker, Jus Populi, 52.

<sup>18</sup>Henry Parker, The Trve portraitvre of the Kings of England, 4.

<sup>19</sup>Ibid., 7.

<sup>20</sup>Ibid., 5.

<sup>21</sup>Henry Parker, Observations upon His Majesties late Answers and Expresses, 8.



CHAPTER V

<sup>1</sup>W. K. Jordan, Men of Substance(New York, 1967), 173.

<sup>2</sup>Henry Parker, Jus Regum or a Vindication of the Regall Power(London, 1645), 17.

<sup>3</sup>Henry Parker, A petition or declaration humbly desired to be presented to the view of His most excellent Majesty (London, 1642), 2.

<sup>4</sup>Jordan, 157.

<sup>5</sup>Henry Parker, Observations upon His Majesties late Answers and Expresses(London, 1642), 5.

<sup>6</sup>Jordan, 164.

<sup>7</sup>Ibid.

<sup>8</sup>Perez Zagorin, A History of Political Thought in the English Revolution(London, 1954), 5.

<sup>9</sup>T. C. Pease, The Leveller Movement(Washington, D. C., 1916), 31.

<sup>10</sup>Henry Parker, Jus Regum or a Vindication of the Regall Power, (London, 1645), 15.

<sup>11</sup>S. R. Gardiner, History of England, V(London, 1884), 434.

<sup>12</sup>Ibid.

<sup>13</sup>Jordan, 165.

## CONCLUSION

<sup>1</sup> William Haller, Liberty and Reformation in the Puritan Revolution(New York, 1967)), 73.

<sup>2</sup> Henry Parker, Observations upon His Majesties late Answers and Expresses(London, 1642), 14.

<sup>3</sup> William Haller, 74.

<sup>4</sup> Henry Parker, 1.

<sup>5</sup> Margaret Judson, Crisis of the Constitution(New York, 1964), 433.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Primary Sources

- Parker, Henry. Animadversions animadverted. London: 1642.
- \_\_\_\_\_ . An answer to the poysonous sedicious paper. London: For Robert Bostock, 1647.
- \_\_\_\_\_ . The Contra-replicant. London: 1643.
- \_\_\_\_\_ . The Danger to England Observed. London: 1642.
- \_\_\_\_\_ . Of Free Trade. London: By F. Neile for Robert Bostock, 1648.
- \_\_\_\_\_ . Jus Populi. Or, a Discourse. London: 1644.
- \_\_\_\_\_ . Jus Regum or a Vindication of the Regall Power. London: 1645.
- \_\_\_\_\_ . The Manifold Miseries of Civill War. London: For George Lindsey, 1642.
- \_\_\_\_\_ . The Oath of Pacification. London: For Robert Bostock, 1643.
- \_\_\_\_\_ . Observations upon some of His Majesties late Answers and Expresses. London: 1642.
- \_\_\_\_\_ . A petition or declaration humbly desired to be presented to the view of His most excellent Majesty. London: 1642.
- \_\_\_\_\_ . A political catechism. London: For Samuel Gellibrand, 1643.
- \_\_\_\_\_ . The Question Concerning the Divine Right of Episcopacie. London: For Robert Bostock, 1641.
- \_\_\_\_\_ . Severall poysonous and sedicious papers of Mr. David Jenkins answered. London: For Robert Bostock, 1647.

\_\_\_\_\_ . Some few Observations upon His Majesties late Answer. London: 1642.

\_\_\_\_\_ . The True portraiture of the Kings of England. London: By R. W. for Frances Tyton, 1650.

\_\_\_\_\_ . The Trojan Horse, 2nd ed. London: 1646.

\_\_\_\_\_ . The vinters answer to some scandalous pamphlets. London: 1642.

## Secondary Sources

Davis, Godfrey. Bibliography of British History-Stuart Period. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1928.

Gardiner, S. R. History of England, Vol. V, VI, IX: London: Longman, Green, and Co, 1884.

These Particular volumes of Gardiner give a good survey of England from Charles I through the outbreak of the Civil War. I found them particularly helpful in understanding the political events that were transpiring in England during the period in which Parker was writing.

Gooch, George P. English Democratic Ideas of the Seventeenth Century. Cambridge, England: University Press, 1927.

This book shows the men and their roles in the developing democratic thought in England. Gooch discusses men such as Milton and Harrington, and in his references to Henry Parker, I was able to see how far his democratic tendencies went and where they stopped.

Guizot, F. P. G. History of Charles the First and the English Revolution 1625-49, Vol. I. Translated by A. R. Scoble. London: 1854.

This book was a survey of Charles' reign and the English Revolution. It didn't help me a great deal since Gardiner is a much better source for this period.

Haller, William. Liberty and Reformation in the Puritan Revolution. New York: Columbia University Press, 1967.

Haller's book gives good background into the role of the Puritan Revolution in English liberty and history. His summary on Parker's contribution offered material for a deeper understanding of Parker's conception of Parliament.

. Tracts on Liberty in the Puritan Revolution, Vol. I. New York: Octagon Books, Inc., 1965.

In this book was a copy of one of Parker's pamphlets, Observations upon His Majesties's

Primary Source

late answers and Expresses, which I used.

Hill, Sir Christopher. Intellectual Origins of the English Revolution. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965.

In Hill's book which deals with the thinkers behind the Revolution, he emphasized Parker's secular approach to problems. By reading this book I got an idea of the deeper reasons behind the English Revolution and a broader perspective of Parker's political thought.

Jordan, W. K. The Development of Religious Toleration in England. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1940.

*not used*  
W. K. Jordan examines the development of religious toleration in England with little or no emphasis on political occurrences. Since I was mainly interested in the political aspects, I used it mainly for background.

\_\_\_\_\_ . Men of Substance. New York: Octagon Press, 1967.

This book was one of my main research materials. Jordan presents the life, religious and political views of Henry Robinson and Henry Parker. By reading this general picture of Parker, I was able to view him as a whole person and understand his political writings and what prompted them. Jordan gives a good study of both men.

Judson, Margaret. Crisis of the Constitution. New York: Octagon Books, Inc., 1964.

Miss Judson's book deals with the changing view of the rule of England from the divine right of kings in the beginning of the seventeenth century until the doctrine of Parliamentary sovereignty. She covers all areas of the controversy and her views on Parker's contributions to the doctrine of Parliamentary sovereignty and the role of the people in government gave me a basis from which to work. The book covers very well the many views that went to make up the English Constitution.

Pease, T. C. The Leveller Movement. Washington, D. C. 1916.

In Pease's discussion of the Leveller Movement, he shows the influence that Parker had on the movement. Pease gives a good summary of Parliament's actions during its struggle and the various justifications for them. Pease mainly deals with Parl-

liament's rise to its place of sovereignty and with the Leveller advancement.

Pocock, J. G. A. The Ancient Constitution and Feudal Law. New York: W. W. Norton and Co, 1967.

Roberts, Clayton. The Growth of Responsible Government in Stuart England. Cambridge: University Press, 1966.

Roberts views the growth of responsible government from Theobalds in 1616 and develops it from there. He had several sections on the germination of the idea of Parliamentary sovereignty and on Henry Parker which I found of great value. Unfortunately I had a faulty copy of the book and cannot evaluate it to a greater extent.

Stephen, Sir Leslie and Sir Sidney Lee, eds. The Dictionary of National Biography, Vol. 2. Oxford: University Press, 1950.

Wedgwood, C. V. The King's Peace, 1637-1641. Vol I. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1956.

A general survey that I read to get a feeling of the period. Miss Wedgwood seems to present a royalist point of view in which I was interested so that I might have a balanced view of the era.

\_\_\_\_\_. The King's War, 1641-1642. Vol II. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1959.

Wing, Donald Goddard. Short Title Catalogue, Vol. III. New York: Columbia University Press, 1951.

Zagorin, Perez. A History of Political Thought in the English Revolution. London: Routledge and Paul, 1954.