

Margaret M. Condon and Evan T. Jones (eds.), ‘Bristol 1470-71: Particulars of Account of Daniel Sheldon, controller, 4 November 1470 to 29 March 1471: Introduction’ (University of Bristol, Research Data Repository, 2019)¹

Text and Comment

This newly discovered account was found in a large bundle of fragmentary and undated customs accounts dating from the thirteenth to the seventeenth centuries. Generally in good condition, the document has some minor points of damage.² It consists of a single membrane of parchment displaced from a larger document, the start of which is no longer extant. The missing portion would have covered the period from November 1470 to late January 1471. The surviving membrane of the account begins mid-way through a ship entry for late January 1471 and continues to 29 March of the same year.³ Two additional entries for 30 March and 17 April post-date the formal period of account. Their inclusion is likely to be a consequence of the unstable political situation discussed below.

Perhaps the most interesting aspect of the account is that it details Bristol’s overseas trade for an eleven-week period during a particularly active phase of the ‘Wars of the Roses’. In September/October 1470, the Earl of Warwick, known as ‘The Kingmaker’ restored the Lancastrian Henry VI to the throne of England and forced the Yorkist monarch, Edward IV, to flee to Holland, which was part of the lands of Edward’s brother-in-law, the Duke of Burgundy. On 14 March 1471 Edward IV returned, landing at Ravenspur, in the East Riding of Yorkshire. He proceeded west to York, and then marched south towards London where he took Henry VI prisoner on 11 April. Edward defeated Warwick’s forces at the Battle of Barnet on 14 April; the Kingmaker was killed as he fled the field. Another contingent of Lancastrian forces, led by Margaret of Anjou, Henry VI’s wife, and young son, Prince Edward, landed in Weymouth on the same day and marched up through the West Country, hoping to join-up with the forces of Jasper Tudor (the half-brother of Henry VI) in Wales. Margaret halted at Bristol around the end of April/beginning of May, where, according to the Yorkist narrative known as ‘The Arrivall’ she received aid from ‘such as were the Kyngs rebels in that towne’ in the form of money, men, and artillery. Her army then proceeded up the Severn valley before being defeated decisively at the Battle of Tewkesbury on 4 May. Resistance was not yet over, and Edward IV remained in the field. Rebel activity included attacks on shipping in the Thames, and an assault on London on 12-14 May, where Henry VI had been interned in the Tower. Edward IV made his triumphant entry into London on 21 May. Henry VI was then murdered on Edward’s orders on the night of 21-22 May 1471, in the hope of extinguishing Lancastrian opposition.⁴

¹ The National Archives, UK [TNA], E122/174/3 (part). This transcription is an output of the ‘Cabot Project’ (University of Bristol, 2009-2016), funded by Gretchen Bauta, a private Canadian benefactor. We are indebted to Professor Wendy Childs for assistance with personal and place names. The transcription was originally completed in 2014.

² In consequence, quantity detail has been lost for some of the wine shipped on the first vessel entering.

³ Since the first dated entry is for 1 February, the preceding three ship entries, two specified as ‘eodem die’ (the same day) must be earlier, and therefore made in January.

⁴ Michael Hicks, *Warwick the Kingmaker* (Oxford, 1998), pp. 286-310; Bertram Wolffe, *Henry VI* (London, 1981), pp. 314-8; C. D. Ross, *Edward IV* (1974), pp. 145-77; Lucy Toulmin Smith, ed., *The Maire of Bristowe is Kalendar* (Camden Soc, New Ser. vol V, 1872), p. 45; John Bruce, ed. *Historie of the Arrivall of Edward IV... 1471* (Camden Soc., 1838), reprinted Keith Dockwray, *Three Chronicles of the Reign of Edward IV* (Gloucester, 1988), pp. 171-2; Peter Fleming and Kieran Costello, *Discovering Cabot’s Bristol: Life in the Medieval and Tudor Town* (Tiverton, 1998), pp. 27-9. It would be logical to suppose that Margaret was also supported with victuals once she had been admitted to the city. Fleming and Costello suggest that the resources of Bristol’s mint were used to manufacture coin to pay Margaret’s troops. Although no redemption accounts for the Bristol mint survive, John Langstrother, Henry VI’s treasurer, and John Delves, his treasurer of the household, were jointly appointed wardens of the Mint (including the regional mints) in February 1471. Langstrother accompanied Queen Margaret

Bristol's willingness to assist Queen Margaret cost the town dear. On 13 July 1471, John Shipward senior paid a *donum*, a free gift, into the Exchequer, of five hundred marks (£333 6s 8d). In May 1471 Edward IV had ordered his arrest; and he was not brought into the king's grace until September 1471.⁵ His son, John Shipward the younger, had been sheriff at the time of Margaret's entry, having assumed the shrievalty mid-term, in February 1471, on the death in office of the incumbent, Henry Chester.⁶ Six other citizens, including William Spencer and Robert Strange, both of whom figure as significant shippers in the 1470-71 customs account, were excluded by name from the proffered pardon for which the duke of Clarence, now restored to grace, had interceded. Clarence, previously allied with Warwick, had again switched sides, deserting the Lancastrian cause at the beginning of April 1471, a full month before the Battle of Tewkesbury, and had been reconciled with his brother. The city clearly saw the duke as an ideal mediator with the king, gifting him 5 tuns of wine. That this was paid for by, or was the property and gift of, William Spencer was clearly insufficient to save him from the king's condemnation.⁷ Edward IV did not mince words. While he chided the city in general for failings in 'duetie and ligeuance' he offered clemency, other than to 'the principall sturrers of rebellion'. He did not intend to punish the town in general, but it was 'notably knowen' that certain persons had 'largely offended', and action was to be taken against them.⁸ While details of the merchants' activities are unknown, they may well have assisted Margaret with funds; perhaps argued for her admission to the city or aided in the muster of troops. The town's recorder, Nicholas Hervy, had fallen fighting for Henry VI at Tewkesbury, so that his goods too were forfeit to the Crown.⁹ On 25 January 1472 the town – mayor, sheriff, burgesses and community of Bristol – obtained a collective pardon from Edward IV.¹⁰ The support given by Spencer and Strange to the Lancastrian cause cast a long shadow. Spencer, Strange, and John Cogan, another of those named by Edward, continued to prosper in both their mercantile and civic careers. But later in the same decade both Spencer and Strange were maliciously accused of further treason, and both briefly imprisoned.¹¹

on her return from France; and a goldsmith, John Sutton, was among those excluded in May 1471 from the king's pardon. Immediately prior to the redeption, the Bristol mint regularly consumed over 80 lbs Tower weight of silver per month, and variable amounts of gold. Langstrother fought at Tewkesbury, and was executed two days later: R. A. Griffiths, 'John Langstrother (d. 1471)', *ODNB* (2008); Francis Bickley, ed., *The Little Red Book of Bristol*, vol. II (Bristol, 1900), p. 131; TNA, E101/294/20.

⁵ TNA, E401/902; *Cal. Patent Rolls, Edward IV, 1467-77*, p. 274; Francis Bickley, ed., *The Little Red Book of Bristol*, vol. II (Bristol, 1900), pp. 130-2. Shipward had been mayor of Bristol 1469-70; his successor was Thomas Kempson, who held the office at the time of Margaret's admission to the city. Sir John Arundell, who is known to have joined Margaret's forces, made a *donum* of 1,000 marks, E401/902; Dockwray, *Arrivall*, p. 169.

⁶ E159/248, *Adventus Vicecomitum Eas, Mich, 12 Edw. IV, dorse* (cf. entry on the Pipe Roll, E372/316, muddled as Henry Shipward junior, sheriff); PROB11/6, fo. 4v. Nicholas Warynges was one of the witnesses to Chester's brief will.

⁷ Bickley, *Little Red Book*, II, pp. 130-1; E. W. W. Veale, ed., *The Great Red Book of Bristol, Part III*, (Bristol Record Society, xvi, 1951), p. 95; Fleming and Costello, *Discovering Cabot's Bristol*, pp. 24-5, 27-9. For Clarence, see also Ross, *Edward IV*, pp. 156-167; M. A. Hicks, *False, Fleeting, Perjur'd Clarence* (Gloucester, 1980), pp. 83-4, 96-100, 104-6.

⁸ Bickley, *Little Red Book*, II, pp. 130-1.

⁹ Bickley, *Little Red Book*, II, pp. 130-1; John Baker, *The Men of Court 1440-1550*, vol. I (Selden Soc. Supplementary Ser. 18(1), 2012), p. 829.

¹⁰ C67/48, m. 19. Merchants suing individually for pardons between November 1471 and February 1472 included not only Robert Strange, William Spencer, and John Cogan, but also William Canynges, Edmund Westcote, John Esterfield, Philip Mede, John Hawkes (mayor 1471-2), John Pynke, John Swancote, George Roche, Thomas Cokkes 'yeoman'; and Matthew Jubbe 'of Cardiff' and Richard ap Meryk 'of Taunton': C67/48, *passim*. Apart from Strange, Spencer, and Cogan, too much should perhaps not be read into individual pardons. Edward IV had offered clemency upon individual suit, and the ready availability of a general pardon was a useful insurance policy.

¹¹ E. W. W. Veale, ed., *The Great Red Book of Bristol, Part IV*, (Bristol Record Society, xviii, 1953), pp. 57-93; Samuel Seyer, *Memoirs Historical and Topographical of Bristol* (2 vols, Bristol, 1823), ii, p. 201. Seyer's source was the short version of Adam's Chronicle; the stories are also in the longer version of c. 1625, Bristol Record

Evidence for port and date

There is neither heading nor memorandum of delivery into the Exchequer to identify or date the document. The particulars can, however, be identified as a Bristol account produced by Daniel Sheldon, the port's controller. It was recognised as a Bristol customs account from the merchants named and the format of the entries, which include the name of the vessels and descriptions of them according to three types or sizes: *Navis* (great ship), *Navicula* (little ship), *Batella* (boat).¹² The roll format, and the absence of numeric values for customs (paid on cloth of assize), tunnage (paid on wine) or subsidy (an *ad valorem* duty paid on most other goods) indicate that the document is a Bristol controlment rather than a customers' ledger.

The document can be precisely dated. The final two entries, for 30 March and 17 April, are an addition, probably in the same hand, but using a finer pen. These two ship entries are crucial. They match the first two entries of the customers' particulars of account covering the period 29 March to Michaelmas 1471.¹³ Moreover, in the margin of the controlment for the 30 March entry, an Exchequer auditor has noted in a minute script that the second book of the customers begins at this point. Confirmatory indication of date emerges by comparing the manuscript with the enrolled account for Bristol customs of 4 November 1470 to 29 March 1471. That account cites an import by Fernando Gomes, alien, of goods valued at £10. The present document shows Gomes importing goods to this value – a pipe of the dye-stuff kermes carried from an unknown port towards the end of January 1471.¹⁴

The Accountant

Identification of Daniel Sheldon as the controller and accountant follows on directly from the document's date. Sheldon had previously served in the port as collector of tonnage and poundage on behalf of the earl of Warwick 1460-1. During Warwick's brief ascendancy, towards the close of Edward IV's first decade, Sheldon was appointed as one of the two customers of Bristol, serving from 26 August to 14 November 1469. He was then replaced.¹⁵ He was made controller in the port by the readeption government of Henry VI on 24 October 1470.¹⁶ Although his authority as controller should have ceased with Edward IV's restoration, the two additional entries on his roll for 30 March and 17 April 1471, and a near-illegible

Office [BRO], MS 13748/4, and a Bristol annals of about a century later, BRO 09594/1. The accusations are not mentioned by the town's official chronicler, Robert Ricart, whose annals 1476-9 comprise only the succession of the town's officers - even though the record of the accusations against Spencer is preserved at length in the Great Red Book of the city.

¹² For a discussion of what the terms indicate about the vessels involved, Evan T. Jones, 'The Shipping Industry of the Severn Sea' in Evan T. Jones and Richard Stone, eds., *The World of the Newport Medieval Ship: Trade, Politics and Shipping in the Mid-Fifteenth Century* (Cardiff, 2018), pp. 149-50.

¹³ TNA, E122/19/8. Sheldon's *Kateryne* of Drogheda is, however, recorded as the *Valentyne* in the customers' ledger.

¹⁴ TNA, E356/22, rot. 8d. Since Gomes' fellow merchants were all denizen, and the goods shipped typical of trade from southern Iberia, the probability is that this was a return voyage from Lisbon. The merchant list is incomplete, but of the merchants named William Wodington, Robert Strange and Robert Jakes had shipped outwards on the *Trinity* of Bristol, and William Spencer on the *Trinity* of Northam, both vessels sailing from Bristol to Lisbon in September 1470, TNA, E122/19/7.

¹⁵ *Cal. Fine Rolls 1452-61*, p. 258; *Cal. Fine Rolls 1461-71*, pp. 248-50; particulars of account (with Richard Walwyn), TNA, E122/19/6.

¹⁶ *Cal. Patent Rolls 1467-77*, p. 230.

marginal note in the succeeding customers' ledger, suggest that he may have continued to act until 4 July 1471, despite the absence of a new mandate.¹⁷

The parallel customers' ledger for the period does not survive. Unlike Sheldon, the two customers of the readeption period were reappointed by Edward IV, and continued in post together until November 1472. But whereas Richard Walwyn had served continuously since April 1468, and had thus been an earlier appointee of the Yorkist regime, Nicholas Warynges was appointed as customer by the government of the restored Henry VI. He received a new patent only on 29 May 1471, and was replaced 14 December 1472.¹⁸ Warynges had, however, served briefly as controller from August to November 1469, during the short ascendancy of the earl of Warwick. That means he had been controller in the same period that Sheldon served as customer.¹⁹

The enrolled account, which is a summary of the audit of the customers' account, ignores the restoration of Henry VI and registers their account for 1470 to 1471 as 4 November 10 Edward IV to March 29 March 11 Edward IV rather than recording the regnal year as 49 Henry VI. Moreover, it cites Walwyn's patent of 17 February 1468 as his authorisation for his exercise of office, ignoring his reappointment by Henry VI in October 1470, but states that Warynges acted without warrant. The unwritten sub-text here is that Henry VI, from whom Warynges derived his authority, was not merely being categorised as a usurper but was being written out of recent history. The effect was that Warynges' patent of office was treated as invalid.

The survival of this single membrane of the 1470-71 particulars of account is a useful reminder of ways in which the formal record of Exchequer process can, if read literally, be misleading concerning the archival trail. In the context of Exchequer customs accounts, the word 'controlment' is commonly taken to mean the manuscript particulars of account kept by each port's controller of customs and his clerks as a check on the work of that port's customers. It has already been shown that the present document is a controlment, datable on internal evidence to 1471. Yet the audit of the customers' account for 4 November 1470 to 29 March 1471 states that the customers accounted 'without controlment'. Similarly, their account from 29 March to 29 September 1471 was said be without controlment until 18 June 1471, and then by the controlment of Richard Alberton from that date until Michaelmas.²⁰

Strictly speaking, the absence of controlment, that is, of a counter-check against the customers' particulars, was true, at least at the point at which audit opened. The usual statement that the customers accounted by the 'view and testimony' of the controller is also lacking. Daniel Sheldon was not present in the Exchequer for the audit of the customers' accounts for both 4 November 1470 to 29 March 1471, and their later account from 29 March to 29 September 1471. That audit commenced in Trinity term (c.31 May – mid-July) 1472.²¹

¹⁷ TNA, E122/19/8, fo. 3v. The marginalium's casual reference to 'Danyell' perhaps suggests that Sheldon was related to the Exchequer clerk and future auditor of the same surname.

¹⁸ Walwyn was first appointed 17 February 1468 at the nomination of John, earl of Worcester, but seems not to have become active until April of the same year: *Cal. Fine Rolls 1461-71*, pp. 198-200; TNA, E356/21, rot. 33d; appointment of Walwyn and Warynges 26 October 1470, *Cal. Fine Rolls 1461-71*, pp. 269-74; re-appointment of Warynges by government of Edward IV, 29 May 1471, *Cal. Fine Rolls 1471-85*, pp. 5-9; patent cited as 29 March in enrolled account 29 March to Michaelmas 1471, and as 29 May for that of November to December 1471, TNA, E356/22, rot. 8d. Account for Michaelmas 1471-November 1471 not enrolled.

¹⁹ Warynges had replaced John Don, who in turn was reappointed 9 November 1469: *Cal. Patent Rolls 1467-77*, p. 167; TNA, C81/1634, no. 14.

²⁰ TNA, E356/22, rot. 8d; E368/245, States and Views Trin 12 Edw IV, rot. 2r.

²¹ TNA, E159/249, Recorda Eas 12 Edw. IV, rot. 6: Image at <http://aalt.law.uh.edu/> (IMG 191) under reference and date; E368/245, States and Views Trin 12 Edw IV, rot. 2r: (AALT, IMG 528 under reference and date). Trinity term could begin as early as the Monday after Trinity Sunday (which was a variable feast, falling on 24 May in 1472) to an indeterminate date in July, the latter depending on the level of business. For a discussion updating the summary in the *Handbook of Dates* see Stuart Jenks, ed., *The London Customs Accounts 24 Henry*

However, the following term, the prior of St James, Bristol, was deputed by the Exchequer to take Sheldon's oath, and to collect his rolls and deliver them into the Exchequer.²² The survival of part of Sheldon's controlment roll for November 1470 to March 1471 proves that this delivery of records was indeed done according to the Exchequer's order, while the customers' ledger for March to Michaelmas 1471 shows careful comparison against the records of both Alberton and Sheldon.

Richard Walwyn was allowed his fee *pro rata* as customer for November 1470 to March 1471; Warynges may not have been accorded the same privilege. Since almost all of their receipts were accounted for by tallies raised in the Receipt of the Exchequer, leaving insufficient even to cover the whole of Walwyn's fee, it seems possible that neither Sheldon nor Warynges were officially remunerated, although the latter had received his formal appointment to continue as customer shortly before audit commenced.²³ Sheldon, in particular, appears to have been Warwick's man: and the death of Henry VI had invalidated his patent.²⁴ All three customs officers would, however, have profited during their period of office from payments made locally, such as the fees for sealing cockets.

Text

The first entries on the surviving rotulet of the controlment continue from a preceding but now lost membrane, and thus do not name the ship concerned.²⁵

The roll records one Spaniard shipping on the *Mary Magdalen* as 'of Spain, denizen' suggesting that the commercial privileges accorded to merchants of Castile by Edward IV continued to be honoured in the port despite a change of regime. Apart from Fernando Gomes, recorded as an alien and paying customs and well as poundage on his import, other notes of status as applied to foreigners are unreliable.²⁶ It seems unlikely from his name that John le Favour, master of the *Mary* of the Île d'Oléron (entering from Brittany and exiting to Spain) was a Spaniard. Similarly, while the masters of two Norman ships, the *Margaret* of Dieppe and the *Christopher* of Caudebec-en-Caux, both exiting to Brittany, were described as denizen, this seems implausible.²⁷ Breton vessels, from the then-independent duchy, were not uncommon in Bristol. But it was unusual to find ships of northern France entering the port. The presence of the vessels in 1471 may have a result of the peculiar political circumstances of the times. The previous year the king of France had brokered an alliance between Queen Margaret and the earl of Warwick to facilitate the restoration of Henry VI. In February 1471 agreement was reached to negotiate a full peace treaty to replace the truce. The truce agreed on 16 February was intended, among other things, to encourage trade and the free movement of merchants and

VI (1445/46) (Quellen und Darstellungen zur hansischen Geshichte, N.S. 74, Hansischer Geschichtsverein, Cologne, 2018), pp. xxx-xxxi, 326-9.

²² TNA, E159/249, Recorda Mich 12 Edw IV, rot. 11d (AALT, IMG 838 under reference and date). The dates given in the memoranda roll are inconsistent, since they imply delivery of the rolls before the date of the writ; but suggest that audit continued into Michaelmas term 1472.

²³ TNA, E356/22, rot. 8d. Three tallies raised 26 January 1471 (for the king in his Chamber, and for the earl of Warwick) of themselves exceeded the customers receipts but are unlikely to have been paid in full; other tallies arising in 1471 out of the Bristol customs do not name the accountants: E401/901, 902.

²⁴ Hicks, *Warwick the Kingmaker*, p. 251; *Cal. Fine Rolls 1452-61*, p. 258; *Cal. Fine Rolls 1461-71*, pp. 248-50; *Cal. Patent Rolls 1467-77*, p. 513. He was again appointed controller in the port February 1484; but, as in 1471-2, audit of the customers' accounts proceeded without him, *Cal. Patent Rolls 1477-85*, pp. 404, 421; TNA, E356/22, rot. 11d.

²⁵ See above, n. 13, suggesting the *Trinity* of Bristol as a possibility.

²⁶ For Gomes, TNA, E356/22, rot. 8d.

²⁷ If any of the masters were Breton, they may have claimed the privileges granted in 1468, for which See H. S. Cobb (ed.), *the Overseas Trade of London Exchequer Customs Accounts* (London Record Society, xxvii, 1990), p. 124; Wendy R. Childs, *Anglo-Castilian Trade in the Later Middle Ages* (Manchester, 1978), pp. 53-5.

goods. Existing statutes and regulations were, however, to remain in force and there is no hint at this stage of special customs privileges.²⁸ So, while it seems from the customs account that the masters of the two Norman ships were being granted the privileges of ‘denizens’, thereby reducing the duties they had to pay on their merchandise, the reason for this is unclear.

In addition to the ambiguities of merchant status, there is at least one apparent scribal error. The navis, the *Anthony* of Bristol, carrying goods belonging to her owner, John Foster, was recorded as exiting to Ireland on 14 February. It seems likely that the destination is incorrect, or at least that it was not the ultimate destination. Foster was heavily involved in the Iceland trade and typically used the *Anthony* for an autumn/early winter voyage to Bordeaux followed by a late winter/spring voyage to Iceland. Moreover, the goods dispatched in February 1471, included butter, flour, perry cider, horseshoes and Osmond iron. These were all typical exports to Iceland, but not to Ireland. While the shipmaster is listed as ‘John Bewffytztes’ this too may be an error. The shipmaster Julian Beaufitz is listed elsewhere as the master of the *Anthony*. On the other hand, ‘John Beaufitz’ is not otherwise recorded in the late fifteenth century customs accounts as a master or merchant of this ship, or any other. The *Anthony* returned from Iceland on 9 July 1471 under Julian Power.²⁹

Notice of several merchants as ‘of London’ is a particular feature of the accounts of 1471-2, and possibly symptomatic of disturbed shipping conditions in the Channel – as well as a reminder of trading links between Bristol and London. Although the trading patterns recorded in the accounts are not particularly unusual, it may also be significant that while four ships entered Bristol during the key crisis period, no departures were recorded in the five weeks following Edward IV’s landing in Yorkshire on 14 March. Indeed, apart from one Irish owned and one Basque vessel, there were no recorded departures from Bristol until the second week of May, two days after the destruction of Margaret’s forces at Tewkesbury.³⁰

Comparison of the entries on the rotulet with the enrolled account indicates that this one membrane preserves the entries of over half (57%) of the trade by value for the period covered by the original account when complete. This is summarised in the table below. The entries for 30 March and 17 April have been excluded from the calculations, since they fall within the next accounting period.

Goods	Value /quantity Controlment E122/174/3	Value/quantity Enrolled account E356/22	% survival for Controlment
Cloth of Assize	140.5 piece	220 piece	63.86%
Wine	384.25 tuns ³¹	642.5 tuns	59.8%
Misc. Merchandise	£689.71	£1386.75	49.74%

Editorial Practice

All entries in italics, including extensions of abbreviations, have been supplied by the editors. The presence of editorial comments is marked by a red triangle in the upper corner of any cell, and appears on mouse hover.

²⁸ Thomas Rymer, ed., *Foedera, Conventiones et ...Acta Publica* Vol. XI (London, 1710), pp. 683-9, esp. p. 686.

²⁹ TNA, E122/19/8, fo. 3v. It seems possible Julian Beaufitz and Julian Power are aliases of the same man. Julian ‘Beaufitz’ brought the *Anthony* in from Iceland 10 September 1470; Julian ‘Power’ took her to Bordeaux a month later, E122/19/7, fos. 3r, 4r.

³⁰ TNA, E122/174/3 (part); E122/19/8, fos 1r-2v.

³¹ An under-valuation because of damage to the document.

The transcription into Microsoft Excel follows the pattern set by Evan Jones for his ESRC-funded project on Ireland-Bristol trade in the sixteenth century.³² These conventions are explained in the introduction to the account for 1461. In particular, surnames and ships' names follow the manuscript; quantities of any particular commodity have, as far as practicable, been standardised to a single unit, calculated if necessary to two decimal places. Wine and cloth of assize have been notionally valued at £4 and £2 respectively, unless specifically valued in the manuscript. Since this is a controlment rather than a ledger, the tonnage paid on wine is not entered. It is thus not possible to reconstruct tunnage of wine shipped from the duties paid if the quantity details are damaged or illegible in the document.³³

³² Databases at <http://www.bris.ac.uk/Depts/History/Ireland/datasets.htm> (accessed 29 January 2014); these were reformatted and published with indexes and abbreviated glossaries as Susan Flavin and Evan Jones, *Bristol's Trade with Ireland and the Continent 1503-1601* (Bristol Record Society, vol. 61, 2009). Editorial conventions are repeated at pp. xxii-xxv.

³³ In these instances the quantity has been entered (in italics) as 'zero' to enable manipulation and analysis of the spreadsheet data.