

THE SOURCES

Below is a brief description of archival and printed sources of proceedings in the parliament of 1614. The materials described are not all included or referred to in the present volume, which is comprised of materials primarily pertaining to activities in the Lower House. The list of sources for proceedings in the House of Lords is provided for those readers interested in studying the parliament as a whole or the Upper House in particular.

THE HOUSE OF LORDS

The manuscript Journal of the House of Lords for 1614, H.L.R.O., Volume 8, comprises pages 273-339 of the same volume that includes the account of the fourth session of James's first parliament, 7 & 8 James I. The text of proceedings in 1614 begins on p. 281, preceded by lists of writs (ff. 273, 275) and proxies (f. 277) separated by blank leaves.

Unlike that for the Commons, the Lords Journal is very scant, containing essentially the business of the day—attendance lists, bill readings and committee appointments, reports, messages, memoranda, privilege cases, and an occasional motion, but virtually no speeches.

Robert Bowyer, Clerk of the Parliaments, kept the Journal, assisted by his nephew, Henry Elsynge, who was later to assume the office of Clerk at the time of his uncle's illness in 1621. A note in Bowyer's hand on Elsynge's report of the King's opening speech (Osborn MS. fb 159), records that "My nephew Elsynge did set this day as my clerk and took these notes."¹ Bowyer also kept a "scribbled book," most of which, except for a few entries that found their way into the collection of Petyt manuscripts, is now lost.²

¹ Osborn MS. fb 159, f. 83, Osborn Collection, Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Yale University. See also, Elizabeth Read Foster, *The Painful Labour of Mr. Elsynge*, (Philadelphia, 1972), 6, 7. With regard to Bowyer's notes, see Foster, *Proceedings in Parliament 1610*, 1: xxi-xxxi.

² For a description of the manuscript collection of William Petyt, Keeper of the Records in the Tower, 1636-1707, see Conway J. Davies, *Catalogue of Manuscripts in the Library of the Honourable Society of the Inner Temple*, 3 vols. (Oxford, 1972); for a calendar of Petyt 537/8, see *ibid.*, 2: 623-29. Another example of Bowyer's cursive and italic hands is in the list of Lords who took the oath of allegiance 7 and 12 Jac. I, H.L.R.O., Main Papers, H.L., 11 April 1614. The note of passage on the bill for Frederick, Count Palatine, is also in Bowyer's hand. H.L.R.O., Main Papers, H.L., 8 April 1614. For Bowyer's notes copied in Petyt 538/2, see *ibid.*, 683-86; the transcription in Davies is not altogether accurate. See also, "An Unpublished Manuscript of the Lords Journal for April and May 1559," *The English Historical Review*, 3 (July, 1913); 532 and Maurice F. Bond, *Guide to the Records of Parliament* (London, 1971), 280-82.

Petyt 537/8, ff. 278-91, comprises Robert Bowyer's "personal transcript" of the Lords Journal for 1614, annotated by him. Besides comments on the proceedings it includes several notes by Bowyer referring to his "rough or scribbled book" (ff. 284, 285) and an apology on 23 May (f. 286) for the "broken" quality of the notes taken at the time "from the mouths of the Lords," and now, "being long after, set down imperfectly." Some of the notes in Petyt 537/8 are included in various other manuscripts in the same collection.

Petyt 538/2, ff. 248-49, contains brief entries apparently fair copied from Bowyer's scribbled book described above or from one of the other manuscripts incorporating that material: a message from the Lower House regarding impositions, notes of the Bishop of Lincoln's speech on the *noli me tangere*, and a summary account of Lord Sheffield's speech, 21 May. On ff. 249-56 of the same manuscript are copies of Bowyer's notes of the speeches and debate of 23 May; additional Journal extracts follow on ff. 256-72. Petyt 538/3, ff. 4-11, contains extracts from the Lords Journal for 23 May only.

There are several other contemporary manuscript copies of extracts from the Lords Journal. Petyt 537/38 is an incomplete compilation copied from a larger folio volume (the folio numbers of the original appear in the margin), that contains (ff. 178-90v) entries for 5, 8, 9, 11, 14, and 15 April; 14, 19, 21, 23, 24, 26, 28, 30, and 31 May; and 4, 6, and 7 June. A copy of Bowyer's notes for 21 and 23 May is included in Petyt 537/21 (ff. 1-14), as are Journal extracts for 27-28 May (ff. 20-21), and 6-7 June (ff. 20-23).

Rawlinson D 723 includes copies of passages from the Journal; Stowe 354 contains copies of several of the messages sent to the Lower House on 28, 30, and 31 May; the Stowe/Temple MS. L9/B7, (ff. 41-42), in the Huntington Library, San Marino, is a collection of brief entries copied from the Journal, 21-23 May, regarding the conference on impositions. Entitled, "Proceedings in Parliament anno 12 *Jac.* I touching the point of Impositions by the Absolute Power of the King," Lansdowne 513, ff. 144-45, includes copies of the message and speeches on impositions, 21 and 23 May (including copies of Bowyer's notes from the scribbled book), that are in Petyt MSS. 537/8 and 538/2; and Lansdowne MS. 826, ff. 92-99, contains a fragment of proceedings in the Lords on 6 and 7 June, entitled, "Some further proceedings in the parliament held anno XII *Jacobi* I, together with the King's writ for dissolving the same, very remarkable upon several accounts." Carte 263, f. 251, contains an extract from 4 June 1614 regarding the privilege case of Stephan Clive, servant to Lord Eure.

Contemporary first-hand accounts of the parliament are rare. The most complete such account of proceedings in either House in 1614 is the diary of proceedings in the Upper House kept by Henry Hastings, Earl of Huntingdon, now in the Hastings Collection at the Huntington Library, and printed in H.M.C., *Hastings*, IV, 230-86.³ The diary includes the pro forma speeches at the opening of the session, 5 and 7 April; the Archbishop's lengthy address following the second reading of the bill for Frederick, Count Palatine, 8 April; and the King's speech, 9 May, followed by daily accounts of proceedings in the House. For the early days of the session, aside from the long set speeches enumerated above, Hastings records little more than the routine business included in the Journal. The impression he gives the reader is not one of frantic activity in the House of Lords in April and early May. Were they engaged in any business other than the bills of the moment? Were there lengthy committee debates relating to pending legislation? Or did they meet on other matters? Until there is further study of the activities in the Lords House in this session many questions remain unanswered.⁴ On 12 May Sir Warwick Hele moved in the Lower House that the Commons set aside the entire following day for reading bills a second time in order "to find the Lords something to do." Was he being facetious? It is only with the first serious discussion of impositions on 21 May that the Hastings account grows full; there are ten speeches recorded that day. For 23 May, Hastings includes twenty-four speeches in addition to that of Sir Edward Coke, judge; for 24 May, eighteen speeches, and so forth to the end of the parliament. It may be that until the joint conferences on impositions got underway the Lords did not have a full agenda. Much time was taken up in the Lower House during those weeks with debates on election returns and undertaking—matters not relevant in the Upper House. Furthermore, the bills of grace had been presented to the Commons first, not to be debated by the Lords until after they passed the Lower House. For the Upper House, the brevity of the first half of the Hastings diary may reveal as much about the business of the early part of the session as does the fullness of the second half of the diary for the latter part of the session.

³ See *Guide to British Historical Manuscripts in the Huntington Library* (San Marino, 1982), 137. With regard to Henry Hastings's record of other parliaments, see Foster, *Proceedings in Parliament 1610*, I: xxx-xxxiv.

⁴ The recovery of Bowyer's notes might enhance the record. Attendance was slightly higher at the end of the session, but not radically so. During the first nine days of the parliament (5-19 April) average daily attendance was 57 out of a House membership of 106 (26 bishops, 80 earls, viscounts, and barons); for the last nine days it averaged 68 per day.

For a list of peers and their connections in the House of Commons, see Moir, *Addled Parliament*, 175-83, 195-97.

The debates on impositions at the end of May and early June were compiled and printed in at least three collections of parliamentary proceedings: William Cobbett, *Parliamentary History* (London, 1806), 1: 1149-68; T.B. Howell, *State Trials* (London, 1816), 2: 866-70; William Petyt, *Jus Parliamentum* (London, 1739), 340-48.

THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

Manuscript Journal of the House of Commons, H.L.R.O.

The 1614 manuscript Journal of the House of Commons is in the House of Lords Record Office, MS. 9. Unlike the Journals for the later parliaments in the reign of Charles I, it includes the speeches of members. Pages 1-157 of the manuscript Journal contain proceedings for all but three days of the session. There is no account of the proceedings on 3 May, although a blank leaf was left in the book for entering it, nor is there much more than a dated heading for 6 June, followed by a blank leaf and a heading for 7 June on what would be p. 160 if the pagination continued to the end of the volume. Eleven blank leaves follow the 7 June entry; on what would be p. 185 is the following note in the Clerk's hand: "A copy of the order for going to the King for Sir Thomas Wentworth and another for Sir John [*illegible*] and of the King's breve for both." There are eighteen blank leaves between that entry and the end of the volume. Preceding the first numbered page of the manuscript are three unnumbered leaves, one of which contains memoranda jotted down by John Wright, the Clerk of the House of Commons. The memoranda are included in the present volume in the Appendix, below, pp. 471-72.

Petyt 502/7 (pp. 1-543), is a copy of the Commons Journal also lacking entries for 3 May, 6 and 7 June. Pages 547-53 contain an index to the manuscript.

This was John Wright's first parliament. The office of "sub-clerk of the House of Commons" having been granted to him in 1612,⁵ he came to the House in 1614 with little note-taking experience. His handwriting in 1614 is smaller and neater than in his later parliament journals; it is the rapidly written nature of the man-

⁵ 17 November 1612. *Cal. S.P. Dom.*, 1611-1618, 156, 159. Concerning the Clerk's role in keeping the record, see Maurice F. Bond, *Guide to the Records of Parliament* (London, 1971), 205-206.

uscript with its faulty syntax and poor spacing on the page rather than the handwriting itself that makes reading the notes difficult. The debates were obviously hastily taken down while the Clerk hurried to keep pace with the speakers, and often words as well as punctuation are omitted. Frequently false starts and full lines are crossed out.

I decided to include a new transcription of the manuscript Commons Journal in this edition for several reasons, the primary one being that the Journal has been long out of print and inaccessible in many college and university libraries in this country. Scholars and students studying the politics of the period must examine the "official" account of the session as well as the other sources, and therefore to include it with the collected accounts is a convenience to readers. Committee members, for example, are only listed in the Journal and rarely included, for any parliament, in a private diary. Consequently for research on bills, public or private, where committee membership is important a scholar is utterly dependent on the Journal. A second and perhaps equally important reason, however, hinted at above, for including it here is that with the discovery of the Kansas diary many of the ambiguities in the Journal record that are a result of poor syntax and lack of punctuation can now be clarified. The grammatical accounts of the speeches in the Kansas diary are so clear that the intent of the speaker, in most cases, cannot be mistaken.⁶ I have used the Kansas speeches as a guide in modernizing the punctuation in the speeches in the Journal in order to make them more comprehensible to the reader. Furthermore, although there are few errors of transcription in the published Journal there are some that are significant that I have corrected in the reprinted text. For example, "contraversing" was incorrectly read as "contracting" (12 April, n. 34); "packing" was erroneously read as "backing" in a speech on rigged elections (12 April, n. 49).

Unfortunately neither the Journal nor the diary accounts tell us very much about what went on in committees of the whole or in select committees. With the absence of these records the historian is still missing an important part of the story of the parliament.

MS E237, Kenneth Spencer Research Library

Manuscript MS E237, purchased by the Kenneth Spencer Research Library, University of Kansas, in 1977, is a compilation of records of parliamentary proceedings. A paper book, ff.1-147, cov-

⁶ Assuming of course that the copyist is accurate.

ered in unmarked limp vellum, it contains accounts of varying lengths of four parliaments: 1614, 1621, 1624, and 1625. Although the volume lacks contemporary foliation the present archivist has numbered every tenth leaf. Using those numbers as a guide, I have designated, in square brackets, in the text below, folio numbers for the interim pages. The entire volume is in the same fair hand,⁷ indicating that the accounts were copied by the same person either from a single or from multiple sources. There are virtually none of the deletions and emendations that mark notes written during the course of a session, although occasional copyist's errors are apparent.

The leaves were bound before the proceedings were transcribed. Each page has been folded vertically in half and then in half again, creasing a marginal line about two inches from the inside binding. The watermark is a crowned pot and there is a pattern of nine vertical watermarked chain lines in the paper.

The account of the 1614 assembly, which is the first in the manuscript (preceded by several quotations from St. Augustine on the nature of goodness and charity), is by far the longest. It extends for about sixty folios (ff. 3-62), covering all but the first two weeks of the session (18 April-7 June) and providing a record of activities for those days of 3 May, 6 and 7 June missing from the Commons Journal. It is followed, ff. 64-75v, by a diary of the parliament of 1621 and copies of various materials relating to it, including the protestation of the House of Commons, ff. 79-89.⁸ The short 1624 diary (about ten folios) and various separate speeches follow on ff. 93-114v,⁹ after which, ff. 116-117, are very brief entries for the first

⁷ Three items originally laid into MS E237 have been removed and are presently cataloged as MS P508, 1, 2, 3. They are the King's speech and the Lord Keeper's speech, 19 February 1624 and the Prince's speech of 11 March. The Lord Keeper's speech is in a different hand from MS E237 and the other two items of MS P508.

⁸ The 1621 diary includes accounts of proceedings for 5-10, 12, 14-17, 19, 20, 23, 26 Feb., 2, 3, 5, 10, 26 March, and a copy of "A demonstration sent by 12 of the nether House to his Majesty to New Market," followed by "The copy of the King's letter before the House had sent the answer to the precedent petition" and "The petition sent to the King's majesty with the former demonstration," followed by "His Majesty's answer to the apologetic petition of the House of Commons presented to his Majesty by a dozen of the members of that House by their direction." Copies of two other separates are included before the 1624 material: a message of 26 December 1621 from the King to Sir George Calvert and the protestation of the Commons, 18 December 1621.

⁹ The 1624 diary includes accounts of proceedings for 12, 16, 19, 21, 23-27 Feb., 1-5, 11-14 March, 1 April, 12 May, and 29 May, and the following separates: "The speech of both Houses to his Majesty the 5 March 1623 delivered by my Lord of Canterbury," "His Majesty's speech the 8 of March 1623," "Reasons conceived by the House of Commons to fortify their resolution to advise his Majesty to proceed no further in the treaties . . .," "My Lord of Canterbury's speech from both Houses . . . 12 of March 1623," "His Majesty's answer . . . 13th of March 1623," "My Lord of Canterbury's speech for the 3 subsidies," "His Majesty's speech the 23 of March 1623," "The petition of the Lords and Commons against popish recusants the 23 of April 1624," "His Majesty's answer to the petition the 23 of April 1624."

five days of the London session of 1625. Folios 118 through 147, the last leaf of the manuscript, are blank.

Next to entries of bills in the text of the 1614 diary are marginalia giving the number of the reading and in some instances a one or two word note of the content of the bill. Because that information is repeated in the text I have not included the marginalia in the present volume.

As discussed below, Kansas manuscript MS E237 was copied either from several discrete original diaries each written during the course of the session (1614-1625), or from another similar compilation put together after the fact. We do not know whether or not the account of proceedings in 1614 included in the Kansas manuscript is a copy of a copy or of an original and we do not know how that original or copy was put together. Did, for example, the author of the ur-version of the 1614 proceedings aside from his own notes (and possibly someone else's) have access to the Commons Journal? There are significant differences between the Kansas copy of the diary and the Journal that may be routine or, on the other hand, may be intentional and shed light on the political affiliation of the diarist. On 19 May, for example, when Leonard Bawtreay was to argue for the crown's position on the question of impositions the compiler of the Kansas diary omitted the speech (as did the Clerk of the Lower House in the C.J.) and included the note that Bawtreay "was so tedious and spoke so little to the purpose as the House rose before he concluded." Sir Anthony Cope's speech of 12 May was also given scant attention by the Kansas diarist who claimed that "he made a long and good speech but out of season, that made the House not have patience to hear him." In that case, however, the Clerk included a good account of the speech in the Journal. Attorney General Bacon's speech of 2 May (see below, p. 122), of some length in the Journal, in which he hoped to smooth the way over the problem of undertaking in order to move on to other business, namely the bills of grace, is reduced to one brief sentence in the MS E237 (see below, p. 125). Does this brevity indicate a lack of conviction on the diarist's part about the crown's position?

The Kansas diary provides the best account we have of the speeches which resulted in the imprisonment of their authors. Thomas Wentworth's speech of 21 May is condensed to a biblical citation in the C.J. (see below, p. 313), while the Kansas account devotes eight lines to his remarks (see below, p. 316). The account of Sir Walter Chute's speech in the C.J. is a sentence, in MS E237 it is almost a page (see below, pp. 403, 408). Christopher Neville's speech of 3 June wherein he called the bills of grace "mere titles

and nothing else,” is cut off in the middle of a sentence in the C.J., but once again there is a good account in the Kansas manuscript (see below, pp. 415, 419-20). Finally, the Journal’s version of John Hoskins’s famous speech of 3 June does not even mention the “Sicilian Vespers” in its four brief sentences (see below, p. 417). The Kansas version, although most likely not itself complete, is certainly the best extant version of the speech (see below, pp. 422-23).

The lively style of MS E237 is most vividly demonstrated by a comparison of the account of Sir Roger Owen’s brief speech of 20 April (see below, p. 117) with the version in the C.J. (see below, p. 112).

I have generally called attention in footnotes to the places where discrepancies occur between the Commons Journal and the Kansas diary.

The most intriguing question about the diary is where it came from. Whose were the notes from which it was copied? Are they the notes of one person who sat in all four parliaments or are they notes copied from discrete diaries kept by different people for each session? As far as I can detect, there is no internal evidence in any of the diaries that gives a clue to the identity of either the copyist or the author, except for the fact that the author of the original 1614 diary arrived in London two weeks after the opening of the 1614 session. His notes are of things “moved and preferred since my coming thither which was on the 18 of April 1614 but [the parliament] was begun the 5 of April.” According to Nicholas Fuller’s reckoning on 18 April, by that date returns for eighteen members had not yet been received and out of the whole number of knights and burgesses sixty-three had not taken the communion the day before; presumably those sixty-three were not all absent on grounds of religious conscience, some no doubt were not present at the communion because they had not yet arrived in Westminster. One can safely assume though that the diarist cannot be anyone who is recorded as speaking in the early days of the session before 18 April; that eliminates but fifty-four persons from the list of possible authors.

It might shed some light on the problem to know the provenance of the manuscript—in whose possession it was before it was sold to a bookseller and subsequently to an auctioneer to be sold to another dealer from whom it was finally purchased by the Kenneth Spencer Library. The volume was auctioned by Phillips, Son and Neale on Tuesday, 20 January 1976, at Blenstock House. I wrote to (and subsequently visited) Phillips’s London office inquiring

from whom they had obtained the volume, but they were reluctant to discuss the matter with me. All they revealed was that "The owner in this case was a Midland bookseller, then deceased." I thought if I found the name of the dealer there might be an outside chance that hidden somewhere was a list of his inventory drawn up for probate court, but I was unable to discover the identity of the bookseller, thus precluding the possibility of finding out from whom he had purchased the manuscript, or when—it may have sat on his shelves (or in a cardboard box in the basement) for a long time before he died and his stock was auctioned.

Add. 48, 101, British Library

B.L. Add. 48, 101 is a large, 12" x 8", unbound manuscript of ff. 1-397. Written in the inside front leaf in a hand not contemporary with the rest of the manuscript is the notation "Yelverton 110." At the time Professor Wallace Notestein transcribed the manuscript (see below) it was part of the Yelverton collection in the possession of Mr. Fitzroy-Calthorpe. That collection was subsequently sold to the British Library by Brigadier R.H. Anstruther-Gough-Calthorpe in 1953. The volume is a compilation of various manuscripts written separately and bound together at a later date: ff. 2-19 constitute a Discourse on the Court of Parliament; ff. 20-95, a True Relation, 1629; ff. 96-118v, a diary of proceedings in parliament in 1614. The pages of the latter, 7 by 6 inches, are smaller than those preceding it, confirming its original separateness.

The notes begin on 13 April; the diarist recorded the proceedings on that day and on 16 April and then stopped. He did not resume his record keeping again until 3 May, the day after the House reconvened following the spring recess.

The identity of the author of the notes remains anonymous. B.L. Add. 48, 101 is not original but a fair copy in a single hand, with few corrections. Internal evidence confirms that it was probably copied and revised here and there after the fact. Folio 97, for example, contains an entry for 16 April for the first reading of Pelham's bill, followed by a note in the same hand that it was "Cast out at 2 reading."¹⁰ In fact, that bill was not read the second time until 17 May and not dashed until after the third reading on 23 May. Obviously the copyist, who knew the outcome of the Pelham bill, was compiling his account after 23 May.

¹⁰ The ink is slightly lighter on the notation indicating the copyist may have gone back and inserted it after copying the entry on 23 May, which seems to point to the fact that Add. 48, 101 was taken from the original rather than from a copy that had already incorporated the entry into the text. See also below, 1 June, n. 26.

B.L. Add. 48, 101 was printed in 1935, essentially unedited, as part of the appendix to *Commons Debates 1621* (VII, 628-55). My decision to reprint it here was primarily to have it accessible in the same volume as the Kansas diary and the Commons Journal and edited in conjunction with those accounts. The diary contains fuller notes on the glass patents (3 May) and the committee on recusants (9 May) than the other accounts. The diarist recorded the King's speech of 4 May which neither the Kansas diary nor the Commons Journal includes. The account of the committee touching undertakers, 5 May, is also unique. Furthermore, B.L. Add. 48, 101 provides another record for the activities on 6 and 7 June which are missing from the C.J.

MS. 0.2.7., Trinity College, Cambridge

MS. 0.2.7. is a small paperbook, 9 1/2" x 7", originally bound in parchment which is now reinforced with cardboard attached to the remaining parchment on the spine. The pages are uniform and do not appear at any time to have had a separate existence outside of the bound volume. Folios 1 through 80 comprise the content of the volume, the last ten leaves, ff. 80v-92, are blank. Folios 1-58v contain notes of legal material, much of it in Law French, written in a single hand: *Consuetudines London* (ff. 16-24v), a French commentary on the law (ff. 25v-28v), a brief of law touching London and the customs there (ff. 29-33v), and notes on devise and mortmain (ff. 34-58v). All of the entries included after the legal material are in a second hand. Folios 59-60v are blank; ff. 61-61v constitute a tract on "The Most High and Most Honorable Court of Parliament." Folios 63 through 77v (f. 62 is blank) comprise descriptions of various courts: King's Bench, Common Pleas, Requests, etc. The notes of "The Parliament Helden A[nno] 1614" are the last section in the book. They are a fair copy, without alterations, of brief notes and comments on what was occurring in the Lower House on 15, 16, 18, and 19 April; 2, 3, 6, 9, 11, 13, 17, and 18 May, at which point they abruptly stop. The dates are consistently incorrect in the MS. (see below, 15 April, n. 20). The use of the word "we" on 13 May indicates that the author of the diary from which MS. 0.2.7. was copied was a member of the House in 1614.

Notes of Sir Nathaniel Rich (Notestein Transcript)

The notes of Sir Nathaniel Rich for 25, 26, and 27 May were part of the collection of manuscripts from Kimbolton Castle that burned with other of the Duke of Manchester's papers in a fiery truck crash in East Africa. There is no extant description of the original manuscript. The transcript printed in the present volume

was made sometime before 1935 by the editors of *Commons Debates 1621* and currently belongs to Professor Elizabeth Read Foster. It is filled with blanks and illegibles.¹¹ In the absence of the original, using the other accounts as a guide, I was able in some cases to correct the legal citations and spellings of proper names.

Holles Account, University of Nottingham

Among the Portland MSS., originally at Welbeck Abbey and now in the manuscripts and archives collection at the University of Nottingham (MS. A, ff. 176v-80), is a brief account of the session entitled, "A Summary of what was done in the Parliament begun 5 of April 1614, gathered by Sir John Holles who and Sir Jervoise Clifton, Baneret [*sic*], were the two knights for Nottinghamshire."¹² The account is correctly titled a "summary," being not a detailed daily record but a seven and one-half page condensation of the business of the Commons during the 1614 session, compiled after the fact.

The Holles summary is printed in H.M.C., *Portland*, 9: 132-39.

Anonymous Notes, Petyt 537/18

Notes for 7 June 1614 included in Petyt 537/18, ff. 37-40, are printed in Foster, *Proceedings in Parliament 1610*, 2: 414-22, as well as below.

Miscellaneous Collections of Separates

In the relevant footnotes I have referred to the extant separates of speeches and reports that I found. Several others, however, deserve particular mention.

S.P. 15/40:60, calendared as "Speeches on impositions, May (?) 1614," is actually a collection of notes from the 1610 session readily identifiable by the 28 June speech of Thomas Hedley who did not sit in 1614.

A compilation of speeches on "the case of impositions" is part of a collection of parliamentary papers (some of them once belonging to Henry Elsynge) in the National Library of Wales, MS. 17000D, 44 ff.

There is one petition from the merchants of London trading in Spain, France, and other foreign posts addressed to the "Most

¹¹ The editors of *C.D. 1621* looked at the notes and transcribed "what was easily legible." *C.D. 1621*, 7: 628.

¹² For an account of the political career of Sir John Holles, see *Letters of John Holles 1587-1637*, ed. P.R. Seddon, Thoroton Society Record Series, vol. 31 (Nottingham, 1975), 1: xxii-lxxiv. The Holles diary is calendared, *ibid.*, p. 50. See also A. Thompson, "John Holles," *Journal of Modern History*, 8.2 (1936): 145-57.

Honorable and High Court of Commons in Parliament” in the collection of Cranfield papers in the Kent Archives Office [EN/7824/M402], and also a second petition of complaint against the officers of his Majesty’s Custom House in general and against Sir Lionel Cranfield in particular [EN/7824/M359]. A third petition in the same collection of papers is a complaint against the “conceived wrong that merchants do endure at the hands of the farms” [EN/7824/M362]. EN/7824/M379 is a single page of notes addressed to “This honorable committee” and relates to one or all of the petitions described above. I have not included them with the texts below because it is not clear on precisely what date these notes and petitions belong in the chronology of the parliament, no doubt they relate to the complaint against Cranfield’s patent (see below, 6 and 7 May). John Chamberlain remarked in a letter of May 12 to Sir Dudley Carleton that “some beagles have Sir Lionel Cranfield in chase” (Chamberlain, *Letters*, 1: 528).

SCHOLARLY AIDS

Editorial Aids for Scholars

In the Appendix, below, pp. 447-70, are alphabetical lists of members of parliament in 1614. The first list is by surname, followed by Christian name and preferred constituency; the second list is organized by constituency. The spelling of the names in the lists (and in the texts) follows the spelling in a hierarchy of sources. In the cases where an M.P. is included in the *Dictionary of National Biography* I have given priority to that spelling. After the *D.N.B.* the source preference, in decreasing order is: *Proceedings in Parliament 1628*, *Proceedings in Parliament 1625*, *The Parliament of 1624*, the *Official Return*, and lastly the *Cal. S.P. Dom.* and *A.P.C.*

A list of bills originating in both Houses is also included in the Appendix, below, pp. 483-508. The list gives the full title of the bill (wherever possible); its House of origin; the name of the person preferring it (when known); and the dates of subsequent readings in both Houses. For information regarding the number of bills introduced and read, passed and dashed, etc., in the course of the session, see the “Introduction to Bills in Parliament,” below, p. 483.

For the names of those parliamentarians who held office in 1614, see Moir, *Addled Parliament*, 187-97.

EDITORIAL CONVENTIONS

In editing *Proceedings in Parliament 1614* I have followed wher-

ever possible the general guidelines devised by the editors on the staff of the Yale Center for Parliamentary History. The aim of the volume is to make available to scholars an accurately edited version of what went on in the House of Commons between 5 April and 7 June 1614. Following Professor Geoffrey Elton's dictum that a definitive text should "make all recourse to the originals superfluous" I have excised nothing from the manuscript texts printed below.

Specific editorial policy in the present volume also follows those conventions delineated in the volumes published by the Yale Center for Parliamentary History. In deciding at the outset to follow the YCPH practice of modernizing the text and other quoted manuscript materials, certain arbitrary decisions on rules about spelling, punctuation, and capitalization became necessary.

Spelling

In modernizing the seventeenth-century spelling wherever possible I have followed established American usage relying on Webster's *New International Dictionary* as a guide. For words not included in Webster I have followed the *Oxford English Dictionary*. For place names I have relied on the *Oxford Dictionary of Place Names*. See above, "Editorial Aids for Scholars" regarding the spelling of the names of M.P.s; for names other than M.P.s I followed the same order of preferences.

Capitalization

The modern convention of capitalizing only proper nouns has been adhered to. In keeping with the accepted practice in editing parliamentary texts established by Professor Wallace Notestein, the names of members speaking in the House are set in small capitals. In the cases of speeches made in committee meetings (or speeches by non-members, as in the case of the Lords present for the discussion of the Virginia Company business) the names are set in lower case letters.

Punctuation

I have modernized punctuation to conform to modern standards. The reasons for this decision are apparent to anyone looking at the original text of the Commons Journal and other contemporary manuscript materials. In Professor J.H. Hexter's words, "The idiosyncratic seventeenth-century punctuation of the manuscript sources is as likely to obscure the meaning of the text as to clarify it." The Kansas diary, which is somewhat of an exception to the above rule, was helpful as a guide in punctuating the manuscript Journal. The nineteenth-century printed edition of the *C.J.* in

some places further confused the speeches by over-punctuating them. Simplify, minimize, and clarify were the operative words in punctuating the texts. I trust speeches make good sense as they stand but readers should feel free to consider alternative punctuation in those cases that seem to them unclear.

Abbreviations

Abbreviations of the names of monarchs in legal citations are standardized but not extended, e.g., 3 *Eliz.* I, 4 *Jac.* I, 5 *Car.* I. Single letter abbreviations in names are not extended, e.g., Sir D. Digges. All other abbreviations and contractions are extended, as gentleman for gent., Edward for Edw., etc.

Numbers

Numbers given in the text generally are in the same form in which they appear in the manuscripts, with one exception: roman numerals used for other than keeping lists are changed to arabic, e.g., xiid impost on hats is altered to 12d impost on hats. Without exception all dates in running heads and those inserted in the text by the editor in square brackets, or used in footnotes, are new style. Dates recorded by the Clerk and diarists remain in the old style in which they were written. In citing letters sent from the continent to England I have kept the continental, or new style dates.

Italicization, Quotation Marks, and Brackets

Foreign language words are italicized in the text and footnotes, as are book titles.

Quotation marks are used in the text only when the speaker is quoting verbatim from a source. In keeping with the convention of using English style punctuation in editing parliamentary texts the punctuation within speeches appears outside of the quotation marks. In the introduction and annotation the American style is adhered to.

Folio and Page Numbers

The page and folio numbers given in the manuscripts are included in the texts printed below in square brackets. In the case of the Commons Journal, the page numbers of the printed Journal are also supplied to the reader in order that references in secondary works to those page numbers might easily be found in the text reprinted here.

Footnotes

Footnotes generally occur at the first instance a given subject is mentioned, with a cross reference at the second mention back to

the first. Where bills are debated in the House the substantive notes on the content of those bills very often occur on the day of the second reading and debate rather than at the time when the bill is first read.

In the many notes on procedural points I have endeavored to use the clearest contemporary tracts.¹³

Where Chamberlain's *Letters* are cited I have also given the State Paper references for those readers who may wish to examine the originals.

For proclamations I have cited to *Bibliotheca Lindesiana* rather than to Larkin's *Stuart Proclamations* which was not completely in print when I began this work.

Latin phrases in the text proper are translated in footnotes.

¹³ For a bibliography on parliamentary procedure, arranged chronologically by dates of compilation, see Maurice F. Bond, *Guide to the Records of Parliament*, 63-64.

