APPENDIX 2

Reconstructing the Merchant Fleet: A Methodology

The methodology that has been used to calculate the individual ships in Table 4.2 was achieved by matching three 'identifiers' that the sources consistently provide. Thus, if a particular ship name from a certain port appears with the same master in the records of more than one expedition it is counted once. As such Table 4.2 takes account of those ships and masters that we know served on more than one occasion. This method can still give rise to both overestimates and underestimates of vessel numbers, due to double counting and unidentified linkages. To compensate for this we can analyse the repetition of ship names from certain ports. Those ships sailing in the same fleet with the same name would provide a minimum number of ships with that name sailing from that port. Finally, we can also assess the repetition of service amongst shipmasters. A large number of masters serving repeatedly would suggest that the merchant marine was small, whereas a small number of repeat servers would argue for a large pool of shipmasters, and thus a larger merchant marine. This methodology in its simplest form would be as follows: Robert Tynwit, a shipmaster from Great Yarmouth, operated the same ship, the *Nicholas*, on three separate occasions. This, of course, could be three individual ships, all with the same name, which would mean the individual ship totals in Table 4.2 would be underestimates. But Tynwhit also commanded a ship called the *Bartholomew* in 1347, and thus following the methodology applied in this book although he made four separate voyages he did so in two ships.[1] Alternatively, John Shipman of Hythe commanded the *Nicholas* in 1336 and 1337, and in 1335 the *Cog Johan*, so although he served three times he did so in only two vessels.[2] Ship size can also play a part in the methodology. For example, in 1355 John Bethe commanded the *Margrete* out of Sandwich and it is possible that this could be the same *Margrete* that sailed in 1362 commanded by John Frensh. Fortunately, the sources tell us that the *Margrete* of 1355 was 60 tuns burden, while the *Margrete* of 1362 was 116 tuns burden.[3] It can also be the case that the same ship operated out of different ports with different masters. In 1338 Robert Goderich took command of the *Mariot* in the port of Colchester

[1] Robert Tynwhit served as master of the *Nicholas* for the first time in the 1338 transport fleet, he fought at the battle of Sluys in 1340 as master of the *Nicholas*, and he captained the *Nicholas* in 1342 when he transported the king to Brittany. He was master of the *Bartholomew* during the siege of Calais. See E101/21/10, m. 5; E101/22/25, m. 1; E36/204, p. 235; E101/25/24, no. 23.

[2] E101/19/22, m. 3v; E101/19/38, m. 7; E101/19/39, m. 3.

[3] E101/26/37, m. 2; E101/28/24, m. 1.

and sailed this vessel from 17 June until 20 July. On 21 July, however, a different master, Ralph Goderich, took command of this same ship but in the port of Blackeney and continued to operate it until 2 August.[4] Considering these issues and examining ship names, the service records of thousands of shipmasters over more than 150 ports along with ship tunngaes means the methodology has more complex dimensions to it. Broadly, this means examining each individual port's ships and masters and comparing these with each other before moving on to an examination of the ships and masters from neighbouring ports. At the same time different ports' vessels must be compared with each other in order to see if the same ship was arrested in a different port from one year to the next.

Although this method is liable to a margin of error it does nonetheless seem to offer the most accurate means of assessing the contribution of England's maritime resources to the king's wars between 1320 and 1360. Linking the ship name to a master's name and the port of origin also lessens the chance of over calculation when each port is individually assessed. Of the 4,065 individual ships in operation throughout 1320–60, it is possible to know the names of 2,793. Some 1,266 ships do not appear with their name in the sources or they are absent from the records.[5] With regard to ship names there are six that appear with the greatest frequency. Out of the 2,793 vessels with known names 248 were called *Nicholas*, 180 were called *Seintemariecog*, 125 were named *Blithe*, 131 *James*, sixty-one were called *Rodecog* and forty-seven were named *Margarete*.[6]

[4] E36/203, p. 382; E101/21/12, m. 3. The *Mariot* was recorded as 160 tuns burden and was operated by fifty-eight seafarers with Robert and fifty-six with Ralph.

[5] The 747 Crécy ships cannot be named and nor can 117 from the Brittany campaign; some ships serving in 1333 cannot be named. There are forty-nine vessels from the Black Prince's fleet of 1355 that have no known names due to the damage of one of the documents. There are other ships that served in various campaigns in Scotland and in the French war that are also not named in the sources, including the eighty ships that transported Balliol's army of 1332, the Cinque Port ships that possibly served in 1322, 1327 and 1333, the thirteen ships that transported Ralph Stafford to Gascony, and some of the vessels employed to transport Oliver Ingham in 1342. See E101/15/9; E101/16/6, m. 6; E101/18/36, m. 9;E101/21/33; E101/26/36/; E101/26/38; E101/27/22, m. 1; E101/27/23, m. 1; BL, Stowe MS 553, fols 76r, 76v; BL, Cotton MS, Nero C.VIII, fols 246v, 265v C47/2/25, nos, 12, 13; E372/179, mm. 43, 44; E372/187, mm. 43, 44; E36/204, p. 240; *CCR, 1318–23*, p. 660; *CCR, 1333–37*, pp. 367; *CCR, 1337–39*, p. 46; *CCR, 1343–46*, pp. 128–32; *CPR, 1327–30*, p. 104; *CPR, 1334–38*, p. 98; *CPR, 1338–40*, pp. 85, 366. *Rot. Scot.* I, pp. 226, 232, 233, 234, 248–9, 255. The chance that a ship would have its named changed at some point during its life should also be considered. However, it is unlikely that this occurred on a large-scale and therefore would not alter the margin of error greatly. Note also that fifty-nine ships out of the 2,793 were foreign.

[6] BL, Add MS 7967, fols 94v, 95r, 95v, 97v, 98v, 99r, 99v; BL, Cotton MS, Nero C.VIII, fols 264r, 265r, 266r; BL, Stowe MS 553, fols 76v, 77r; E101/15/36; E101/16/6, m. 2; E101/16/34; E101/16/40; E101/17/3, mm.1b, 6b, 7, 8; E101/17/4, m. 2; E101/17/10, mm. 1, 2; E101/17/24, mm. 4, 4d; E101/17/25, m. 4d; E101/17/35; E101/18/3; E101/18/9; E101/18/28, m. 2; E101/18/31, m. 1; E101/18/36, m. 2; E101/19/2, m. 4; E101/19/3, m. 8; E101/19/6, mm. 2, 3, 4; E101/19/11; E101/19/14; E101/19/16, mm. 2, 2d, 3, 4; E101/19/22, mm. 1, 2v, 3v, 6d; E101/19/28, mm. 3, 4, 7; E101/19/32; E101/19/38, mm. 3, 4, 7; E101/19/39, E101/20/1 mm. 2, 3; E101/20/4, m. 7, 8;

Yet if we take this down to the level of individual campaigns we can see that repetition of particular names does not appear to be significant. To take the name *Nicholas* as an example: sixty-nine ports supplied all the 248 ships called the *Nicholas* over the forty years covered by this study. The port contributing the largest number of vessels with this name was Great Yarmouth (34); indeed, this town supplied a ship called the *Nicholas* to every campaign in the period from 1322 to 1359. When the vessels from this port called the *Nicholas* are examined more closely we can see that only two masters served on board a ship with this name more than once over the forty years.[7] If we take this example further and examine the frequency that the name *Nicholas* occurs within individual transport fleets, it is possible to say that between 1338 and 1340, and out of two fleets numbering 450 individual ships, only twenty-eight vessels were named the *Nicholas*.[8] Neither are the results from the name *Nicholas* any different in this regard and when we analyse other ship names we encounter similar findings. For example, if we examine the frequency which the name *Seintemariecog* appeared in the 1338 and 1340 Flanders transport fleets we find only twelve ships called the *Seintemariecog*. This pattern is repeated throughout different armadas. For instance, in 1342 within the fleet that transported Edward III's army to Brittany we find only thirty-three vessels out of 675 ships were named the *Seintemariecog*, and these were supplied by as many as twenty-five ports. When we investigate the repetition of ship names within individual ports, we also find similar low numbers of vessels with the same name. Out of all the 347 ships supplied by Great Yarmouth from 1320 to 1360 only two were called *Seintemariecog*, thirty-four were called *Nicholas* and twenty-three were named *James*.[9] Great Yarmouth was not unusual in this and London, for example, supplied eighty ships to the

E101/20/6; E101/20/16; E101/20/34, m. 1; E101/21/4, m. 7;E101/21/7, mm. 2, 3; E101/21/10, mm. 3, 4, 5; E101/21/13, m. 3; E101/27/15; E101/21/33; E101/22/25, mm. 1, 2, 3, 4; E101/23/22; E101/25/9; E101/25/20, nos, 6, 13, 15, 30, 31, 35; E101/25/24, nos, 2, 17, 21, 24, 25, 26, 29, 31, 34, 43, 47, 49; E101/26/36; E101/26/38, m. 2; E101/27/19; E101/27/24, mm. 1, 2; E101/27/25, m. 2; E101/389/8, m. 16; E101/556/37; *Norwell*, pp. 363–86; E36/204, pp. 221–40; C47/2/25, nos, 9, 10, 15; C47/2/30, mm. 1, 1d, 2, 2d; *CCR, 1318–23*, pp. 453, 591; *CCR, 1333–37*, pp. 290, 348; *CCR, 1339–41*, pp. 143, 207; *CCR, 1343–46*, pp. 128–32; *CPR, 1321–24*, pp. 14, 77, 288; *CPR, 1327–30*, pp. 27, 104; *CPR, 1334–38*, p. 536; *CPR, 1338–40*, pp. 491–92; *Rot. Scot.* I, p. 530; SC1/40, no. 10.

7 The first was Robert Tynwit who served in the 1338 Flanders fleet, the battle of Sluys and the 1342 Brittany fleet. Tnywit also served during the siege of Calais in 1347, but on that occasion he commanded the *Berthelmeu* of 180 tuns from Great Yarmouth. The other master was John Norman who served in 1338 and 1342. For Tynwit's service, see E101/21/10, m. 5; E101/22/25, m. 1; E101/25/24, n. 23. For Norman's service, see E101/21/10, m. 5; E101/21/13, m. 3; E36/204, p. 234.

8 Twenty-four ships from the 1338 fleet went on to serve at the battle of Sluys.

9 E101/16/40, m. 1; E101/20/4 m. 8; E101/20/16; E101/21/10, m. 5; E101/22/25, mm. 1–4; E101/25/9; E101/25/22; E101/25/24; E101/26/38; E101/27/22, m. 3; E101/27/25, m. 2; E36/204, pp. 234, 235; *Norwell*, pp. 379–382; C47/2/25 no. 15; *CPR, 1327–30*, p. 104; *CPR, 1338–40*, p. 492

campaigns of the period and only five of these were called the *Seintemariecog*.[10] In short because of the pattern of ships names the prospects for double counting to affect the overall total of individual ships is small.

Nevertheless, it is still probable that the same ship from a particular port had different masters from one campaign to the next. What we can examine, however, is how many ships with the same name served at the same time; this would provide us with the minimum number of vessels with that name, from that chosen port. Such an analysis of several ports from both admiralties shows that anywhere between a 20 and 30 per cent margin of error could be applied to the individual ships numbers in Table 4.2. For example, the port of Newcastle contributed 117 ships to campaigns in Scotland and in France between 1322 and 1360. If we analyse in detail the individual ship names we can determine how many appear with regularity throughout the period, and this will provide some indication of the possible extent of the double counting problem. In all there are fifty different ship names for the port of Newcastle with the most popular names being; *Trinite*, *Seintemaribot*, *Blithe*, *Nicholas* and *Godyer*. There were seven vessels called *Seintemaribot,* and these sailed in naval operations in 1334, 1335, 1336, 1337 and 1339. However, only one master, Robert Trym, served on board a ship with this name more than once (he served in three victual operations between 1334 and 1339 in Scotland).[11] Moreover, different masters commanded all five ships called *Nicholas* that served between 1337 and 1359,[12] and the same applies to the ten ships called *Trinite*, which served in five campaigns between 1337 and 1359. Following the three-identifier methodology all the vessels named *Trinite* would be counted as individuals because they were commanded by different masters. However, by examining how many ships with the same name sailed at the same time, we could potentially reduce the ten vessels called the *Trinite* to three individual ships. For example, three ships called the *Trinite* sailed in the Scottish campaign of 1335 and a further three more served in the Brittany fleet of 1342. These potential six ships could, however, be the same three vessels used on different occasions by different shipmasters.[13] Indeed, if we were to say that only those ships that served at the same time, with the same name were individual vessels Newcastle's maritime contribution could be reduced by 32 per cent.[14]

[10] BL, Cotton MS, Nero C.VIII, fols 265r, 266v; BL, Add MS 7967, fol. 99r; E101/16/40, main roll; E101/18/35 p. 5d; E101/19/3, m. 8; E101/20/39 nos, 37, 38, 46; *Norwell*, pp. 363–365; E36/204, pp. 221–222;; E101/25/9; *CCR, 1318–23* pp. 660–1; *Rot. Scot.* I, p. 523.

[11] BL, Cotton MS, Nero C.VIII, fols 265r, 266r; E101/19/6, mm.. 2, 2d; E101/21/4, m. 7; C47/2/30, m. 1d.

[12] C47/2/30, mm. 1, 1d; E101/26/38; E101/27/22, m. 1.

[13] BL, Cotton MS, Nero C.VIII fol. 264v; E101/20/34, m. 1; C47/2/30, m. 1, 1d; E101/26/38; E101/27/22, m. 1.

[14] The six most popular ship names from each port were analysed first. The popularity of ship names varied between ports. However, the 'sample' was extended further to include all the names of ships from a particular port that served more than once. The findings show that the percentage of error that could be applied by using the six most popular names is between

When we apply the same methodology to other ports we find similar results. For example, between 1333 and 1355 eight ships called the *Nicholas* sailed from the port of Hull (Hull's total ship provision was 158); but only a maximum of two vessels with this name sailed in the same fleet, therefore, these eight ships could actually be the same two vessels repeatedly arrested but with different masters. Similarly, in Hull there were eleven ships called *Godyer* that served between 1324 and 1345, but only a maximum of two served concurrently in any one expedition of the period. There were four ships called *Blithe* and these served in four separate campaigns all with different masters. And of the seven ships from Hull called *Leonard* a maximum of two served in any one campaign.[15] Taking all the names of the vessels that served more than once, and if we assume that only those ships with the same name that served at the same time were individual vessels, Hull's overall shipping contribution to the maritime dimension of the war could be reduced by 27 percent.[16]

An examination of three ports from the southern admiralty provides similar results. Winchelsea's overall ship provision of 136 individual vessels could be reduced by 14 per cent over the six most popular names and by 22 per cent if we were to extend the methodology to all the ships name variants within this port. Sandwich's overall contribution of 104 ships would be decreased by 20 per cent and London's eighty ships by 18 per cent.[17] As these percentages suggest it is possible that up to a third of the vessels recorded in Table 4.2 could be double counted. However, it is worth noting that repeat service between transport fleets

14 to 19, while the inclusion of all the ships that sailed more than once raises this to 25 to 30 per cent.

[15] BL, Add MS 7967, fol. 99v; BL, Cotton MS, Nero C.VIII, fol. 266v; *Foedera*, II, ii, p. 912; E101/16/40, roll 1; E101/18/28, m. 2; E101/18/31, m. 1; E101/19/3, m. 8; E101/19/6, m. 1; E101/21/4, m. 7; C47/2/30, m. 1; C47/2/35; *CCR, 1343–46* pp. 126–32; E101/25/9; E101/25/20 no. 13; E101/25/24, nos, 41, 42.; E101/26/38, m. 2.

[16] Further, Boston's contribution could be reduced by 47 per cent; King's Lynn would be decreased by 26 per cent; Great Yarmouth's contribution would be reduced by 19 per cent using the six most popular names and 32 per cent if we included all the ships that served more than once at the same time and with the same name; Ipswich's overall shipping contribution could be reduced by 27 per cent, and Colchester's by 21 per cent. See *CPR, 1321–24* p. 205; *CCR*, 1333–37 p. 348; *CCR, 1343–46*, p. 132; C47/2/30; E101/16/40; E101/18/3; E101/18/31; E101/19/16, mm. 1, 2, 2d, 3; E101/19/32; E101/20/1; E101/20/34, m. 1; E101/21/7, m. 2; E101/21/10, m. 3; E101/21/12, m. 2; E101/25/9; E101/25/24, no. 35; E101/25/24, nos, 1, 6–10; E101/26/38, m. 2; E101/27/22, mm, 3, 4; E101/27/23; E101/27/24; E101/27/25, m. 2; BL, Stowe MS 553, fol. 77r; BL, Add MS 7967, fols 98v, 99r; *Norwell*, pp. 378, 382–83; E36/204, pp. 232–33; E372/179, m. 44; C47/2/30, mm.1, 1d, 2, 2d.

[17] BL, Add MS 7967, fols 97v, 98v 99r, 99v; E101/16/40, main roll; BL, Cotton MS, Nero C.VIII, fols 264r, 265r; *CPR, 1327–30*, pp. 10, 104; *CCR, 1339–41*, p. 143; E101/17/10, mm. 1, 2; *CCR, 1343–46*, pp. 128–32; E101/17/24, m. 4d; E101/18/3; E101/19/2, m. 4; E101/19/28; E101/19/32; E101/19/38, m. 2; E101/19/39, m. 3; E101/20/4, m. 8; E101/20/7; E101/20/16; E101/20/34, m. 1; E101/21/10, mm. 2, 4, 5; E101/21/33; E101/21/36; E101/22/25, mm. 1, 2, 3, 4; E101/25/9; E101/25/20, nos, 15, 16; E101/26/18; E101/26/38; E101/27/22, m. 3; E101/27/25, m. 2; E101/27/37; E101/389/8, m. 16; C47/2/25, no. 15; E101/27/24 m. 3.

was infrequent, which provides another compelling reason to be confident that double counting is not a significant problem. For example, by applying the three identifier methodology to the 1,320 ships that sailed as transport vessels in 1338, 1340, 1342 and 1345 only ninety-two ships, or 7 per cent, of these vessels served in more than one of these armadas. Furthermore, there is also the fact that we are missing the evidence from the major royal fleets of 1340, 1345, 1355 and 1359, which means that there are possibly as many as 1,000 ships unaccounted for in this evidence.[18]

A further methodological complication, related to the problems of double counting, arises from the difficulty of estimating the lifespan of medieval ships. The king's vessels, however, provide the perfect case study to investigate this because they usually served in every expedition and we have a rich seam of source material relating to them. By examining the evidence it can be seen that the *Cog Thomas*, *Cog Edward* and *Rodecog* served for over twenty years.[19] The *Rodecog* began its service in 1335 during the Scottish campaign of that year and continued to sail in 1336 and 1338 (Flanders and Gascony). This vessel was still in operation in 1354 before sailing for the last time in the Reims campaign of 1359. Apart from its last outing, the ship was commanded by Hugh Reppes on every occasion.[20] The *Cog Edward* began its service in 1336 and was still operational in 1354 after participating in four expeditions commanded by Thomas Springet.[21] The *Cog Thomas* also served over a twenty-year period. It began operations in 1338 and was in continual use between 1339 and 1340. In 1342 it formed part of the armada that transported the king to Brittany, after which a gap appears in its service record before it sailed to St Vaast-la-Hougue in the fleet of 1346. This ship was also present at the battle Les Espagnols sur Mer in 1350, but disappears after 1359. Throughout its long career it had three masters, Robert Salmon, Richard Fille and John Willie.[22] That medieval ships could have a lifespan of twenty years or more is also evidenced in the mid-Tudor period. For example,

[18] In addition, the fleet that engaged with the Spanish vessels off Winchelsea is absent from the sources as is the fleet that transported Edward to Calais in 1350. Furthermore, there are several documents that have not been used by this book as they are outside the parameters of the research topic (for example, E101/27/5 that lists fifty-one ships that have not been included). Moreover, there are numerous payrolls, such as E101/26/5, mm. 1–4, which records the wages paid to thirteen ships' crews for the freighting of wool in royal ships.

[19] The king on occasions possessed two ships with the same name. However, the three ships used as examples here do seem to be the only royal vessels with those names, see G. R. Cushway, 'The lord of the sea', p. 97.

[20] BL, Cotton MS, Nero C.VIII, fol. 246r; *CPR, 1333–37*, p. 692; *Norwell*, p. 364; E101/20/39, nos, 2, 4, 25, 26, 29; H. J. Hewitt, *The organisation of war*, p. 79; E101/27/15, m. 2. Reppes appears as the master of the same ship on E101/27/5, which has been dated to 1356.

[21] *Norwell*, p. 363; *CCR, 1333–37*, p. 692; *CPR, 1334–38*, p. 387; E101/19/3, m. 8; E101/20/39, no.3; H. J. Hewitt, *The organisation of war*, p. 79.

[22] Norwell, p. 363; E101/389/8, m. 16; E101/20/39, nos, 4, 9, 10; D. Hannay, *A short history of the royal navy*, p. 24; E101/27/15, m. 2.

the *Mary Walsingham* of Dunwich was in service from 1524 to 1548, while the *Sabin* of Ipswich was at sea for thirty years.[23] What this short discussion of the king's ships illuminates is that medieval vessels could remain on active service for decades.[24] Indeed, given the nature of the service that the king's ships were engaged in, which included two fiercely fought battles, it is possible that vessels operating in a much safer environment could provide a longer life of service for their owners.

It could be argued, however, that the king's ships are not a good indicator of potential lifespan owing to the fact that they would have been regularly maintained. This being said it was by no means certain that royal ships were sufficiently repaired at all times. In July 1346 the king's ship *George* was delivered to Stephen Padiham and Henry Finch of Winchelsea by Thomas de Snetesham and Robert Salmon. Finch and Padiham were expected to 'keep it safely at their peril' and they had seemingly formed an indenture with Snetesham and Salmon to care for and repair the ship. However, only days after this vessel had been in their care it began 'to be broken up by misfortune in the port of the town, when it might have been saved if Henry and Stephen had shown diligence'.[25] This shows that in some cases the king in effect 'farmed' out the repair of his ships to other shipowners who did not always provide suitable or sufficient service. As such we should perhaps not assume that royal vessels were better maintained than other merchant ships.

Although the king's ships may not provide the perfect examples to estimate lifespan, because of the richness of the source material generated by the clerk of the king's ships they do nevertheless offer the best way of tracing the same vessels over periods of time. Can we, however, extend this methodology to ships from the general merchant fleet and find examples of vessels that had continuous and repeated service over more than ten years? This is difficult owing to that fact that we are missing payroll evidence from the 1340, 1345/46, 1350, 1355 and 1359 expeditions. Nevertheless, it is still possible to see evidence of the same ship, commanded by the same man, serving over a long period of time. Adam Permay from Boston commanded the *George* in 1342, 1355 and 1359.[26] Similarly, Ralph Gardiner sailed the same ship, the *Sefray*, from Gosforth, in 1338, 1340, 1342, and 1345, and John Frese commanded the *Margrete* from Dunwich in 1327 and

[23] G.V. Scammell, 'Shipowning in England', p. 109.

[24] R. Malcomson, 'The longevity of wooden warships: the Great Lakes example', *MM* 89 (2003), pp. 425–36, pp. 426, 472, 433 notes that even wooden ships that were laid up throughout harsh winters in areas where there were no dry docks, no sufficient dockyards, no store houses or work shops and in which warfare was commonplace could survive for thirty-one years, with the majority of vessels between 1750 and 1830 serving between ten and twenty years.

[25] *CCR, 1346–49*, p. 95.

[26] C47/2/35; E101/26/38, m. 2; E101/27/31, m. 1.

again in 1342, showing that this ship was operational for nearly twenty years.[27] Another shipmaster with regular service in command of the same vessel was John de Wyndesore of Poole. Wyndesore commanded the *Blithe* on no fewer than five occasions between 1325 and 1338. He first took charge of the ship in 1325 when *Blithe* participated in the earl of Surrey's transport flotilla to Gascony. In the following year Wyndesore along with the *Blithe* was called upon to form part of a defensive fleet that was designed to halt the landing of Queen Isabella and Roger Mortimer. Wyndesore's final appearance as master of the *Blithe* came in 1338 when both he and the ship formed part of the transport armada that freighted Edward III to the Low Countries.[28] This evidence shows that Wyndesore and the *Blithe* had a record of service together stretching over thirteen years. Indeed, the findings here are supported by other studies which show that some vessels have 'traceable' trading lives of thirteen or more years.[29] This short analysis clearly suggests that vessels could provide a life of service for twenty or more years. Consequently, although the method used throughout this book is in danger of both overestimating and underestimating the numbers of individual ships that sailed in the wars, the use of the three identifiers coupled with the fact that there is not much repetition of ship names in separate campaigns, should lessen its impact on the accuracy of the tabulated information. Indeed, it is argued here that conflation and double counting will probably account for no more than 30 per cent of the totals.[30]

[27] C47/2/35; E101/18/3; E101/389/8, m. 16; *CPR, 1343–46*, pp. 128–32.

[28] E101/17/3, m. 7; E1012/17/24, m. 4; E10119/38, m. 3; E101/19/39, m. 3; E101/21/7, m. 3.

[29] See, for example, W. R. Childs, 'Irish merchants and seamen', pp. 31–32.

[30] It is also worth noting that to some extent, conflation and double counting will cancel each other out. This is especially so when the numbers involved are large.