The Volume and African Origins of the British Slave Trade before 1714
Monsieur David Eltis

Abstract
This paper uses a new data set of 1,633 slaving voyages to produce new estimates of the volume of the English transatlantic slave trade from 1662 to 1714. The new estimates are compared with those of Joseph Inikori (in an earlier essay in this journal), and of other scholars. The paper presents breakdowns by decade and colony of arrival, and offers detailed information on African regions of embarkation. New estimates of voyage mortality are also presented.

Résumé
Importance et origine des Africains au sein de la traite britannique des esclaves au XVIIIe siècle: une évaluation comparative. — Cet article utilise un nouvel ensemble de données portant sur 1 633 expéditions négrières afin d'établir de nouvelles estimations de la traite britannique des esclaves entre 1662 et 1714. Ces nouvelles estimations sont comparées à celles qu'a données Joseph Inikori dans un article paru dans les Cahiers d'Études africaines (n° 128, 1992), et à celles d'autres chercheurs. L'auteur fournit des chiffres par décades et par colonies de destination, et offre une information détaillée sur les zones africaines d'embarquement. De nouvelles estimations de la mortalité au cours des voyages sont également présentées.
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In a recent issue of *Cahiers d'Études africaines*, Joseph Inikori offered a fresh look at the volume of the British slave trade between 1655 and 1807. For the period down to 1713, it is possible to improve on Inikori's figures on the basis of a voyage by voyage count of slave ships. In this paper I present my own estimates of the quantity of slaves carried in English ships before 1714, as well as estimates of the coastal origins of these slaves. This is followed by a comparison of my own estimates with those of other scholars, not all of whose work is evaluated in the recent Inikori essay.

The basis of the research discussed here is a data set of 1633 separate slave voyages, all of which sailed from English ports between 1662 and 1714. Any one voyage in this set draws from several sources, some of them published. The central source is the Colonial Office papers and the correspondence, accounts, and miscellaneous papers (organized into the T 70 series in the British Public Record Office) of the Company of the Royal Adventurers of Africa and its successor, the Royal African Company. Between them these companies maintained a network of agents that linked three continents. These sources make possible an annual series of slave arrivals in Jamaica, Barbados, the Leeward Islands, and less certainly, Virginia and Maryland from 1662 to 1713. The derivation of the series may be found elsewhere, but summaries for groupings of years are presented in Table I. Table I shows arrivals in the Amer-

---
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2. The sources for the data set so far are British Public Record Office, Series T 70, volumes 1-18, 20, 22, 23, 26, 43-45, 50-52, 57, 58, 61-63, 75-77, 134, 138, 164, 169, 175, 309, 599, 600, 635, 646, 869-70, 913-25, 933-60, 1205, 962-71, 1198, 1199, 1213, 1215, 1216, 1222, 1438, 1515, 1575; Series CO 1/9, 17; 5/1320, CO 33/13-15, CO 142/13-14, CO 157/1, CO 268/1, CO 308/1, CO 388/1, 10-15, CO 390/5-12; Bodleian Library, Rawlinson ms, C 745-7. Published sources incorporated include RICHARDSON (1986); MINCHINTON, KING & WAITE (1984); TATTERSFIELD (1990); DONNAN (1930-35, I). Among the sources not included here are the Port Books at the Chancery Lane Public Record Office, series E 190 (although T 70/175 appears to have copies from the London Port Books for slave ships in the 1698-1707 period).
ications, but it may also form the basis of estimates of departures from Africa. Two pieces of information allow us to convert a series of arrivals broken down by American regions into departures from major African embarkation zones. The first is the knowledge of which African coastal zone supplied each major American importing region. The second is the number or rather proportion of Africans that died during the voyage across the Atlantic.

### Table I.—Estimated Slave Arrivals in the Americas on English Ships, 1662-1713

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Barbados</th>
<th>Jamaica</th>
<th>Leewards</th>
<th>Virginia Maryland</th>
<th>Other Regions</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1662-1670</td>
<td>30 318</td>
<td>11 031</td>
<td>2 801</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>44 562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1671-1680</td>
<td>21 400</td>
<td>20 323</td>
<td>9 566</td>
<td>3 082</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>54 689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1681-1690</td>
<td>39 101</td>
<td>27 730</td>
<td>14 146</td>
<td>3 450</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>84 715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1691-1700</td>
<td>29 394</td>
<td>35 945</td>
<td>5 304</td>
<td>3 391</td>
<td>2 104</td>
<td>76 138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1701-1707</td>
<td>25 629</td>
<td>30 808</td>
<td>10 414</td>
<td>8 515</td>
<td>1 423</td>
<td>76 789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1708-1713</td>
<td>10 167</td>
<td>34 711</td>
<td>7 048</td>
<td>5 273</td>
<td>2 110</td>
<td>59 309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1662-1713</td>
<td>156 009</td>
<td>160 548</td>
<td>49 279</td>
<td>23 711</td>
<td>6 655</td>
<td>396 202</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Calculated from Eltis (ftheg).*

The data set contains information on the African place of trade for 865, or just over half the voyages recorded. The relative distribution of these voyages over the African coast for each major American region of arrival is shown in Table II. This table thus provides the first piece of information necessary to convert arrivals in the Americas into departures from Africa. The second piece of information comes from Table III. This table shows voyage mortality rates for slaves on board 287 slave ships leaving five different African regions during 1662-1713. Overall voyage mortality rates approached 20 percent, but there were clearly major variations between regions, despite the fairly high variances shown in column 2. No data survive for South-East Africa, and an average is assumed for the small numbers that began their transatlantic voyage from here. To complete the conversion, we need to multiply each cell in Table I by the relative distribution of African origins shown in each row of Table II. The resulting product is then divided by 1 minus the appropriate mortality rate in Table III. This procedure is repeated for each arrival zone in the Americas, and the sum of all the products, adjusted for loss of life on the voyage is shown in Table IV. In total, British ships landed just under 400,000 Africans in the Americas between 1662 and 1713, and carried just over 500,000 from the African continent. Before 1662, English slavers are not likely to have carried more than 2,000 slaves a year to the Americas.3

---

### Table II. — Relative African Origins of Slaves Arriving in the British Americas, 1662-1713 (all rows sum to 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Upper Guinea</th>
<th>Gold Coast</th>
<th>Bight of Benin</th>
<th>Bight of Biafra</th>
<th>West-Coast Africa</th>
<th>South-East Africa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1662-1670</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1671-1680</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1681-1690</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1691-1700</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1701-1707</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1708-1713</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbados</td>
<td>1662-1670</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1671-1680</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1681-1690</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1691-1700</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1701-1707</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1708-1713</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Leewards</td>
<td>1662-1700</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1701-1713</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virgin/Maryland</td>
<td>1662-1700</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1701-1713</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Regions*</td>
<td>1662-1713</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Data for “Other Regions” are inadequate. The ratios for this category are accordingly based on the distribution for Jamaica, 1662-1713.

Source: Computed from sources in fn 2.
### Table III. — Voyage Mortality Rates for Africans on Board English Slave Ships, 1662-1713

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Mortality Rate</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Number of Voyages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senegambia</td>
<td>.1673</td>
<td>.1604</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold Coast</td>
<td>.2023</td>
<td>.2211</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bight of Benin</td>
<td>.2244</td>
<td>.1744</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bight of Biafra</td>
<td>.3130</td>
<td>.1907</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West-Central Africa</td>
<td>.1247</td>
<td>.1287</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Regions combined</td>
<td>.2071</td>
<td>.1933</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Computed from sources in fn 2.*

### Table IV. — Estimated Slave Departures from Africa in English Ships by African Region of Departure, 1662-1713

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Upper Guinea</th>
<th>Gold Coast</th>
<th>Bight of Benin</th>
<th>Bight of Biafra</th>
<th>West-Coast Africa</th>
<th>South-East Africa</th>
<th>Total*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1662-1670</td>
<td>1 496</td>
<td>7 997</td>
<td>13 727</td>
<td>32 497</td>
<td>4 083</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>59 891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1671-1680</td>
<td>5 072</td>
<td>17 518</td>
<td>17 174</td>
<td>22 944</td>
<td>8 315</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>71 332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1681-1690</td>
<td>10 599</td>
<td>12 676</td>
<td>40 089</td>
<td>18 219</td>
<td>19 826</td>
<td>5 392</td>
<td>106 801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1691-1700</td>
<td>13 141</td>
<td>17 097</td>
<td>33 434</td>
<td>10 544</td>
<td>17 153</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>91 559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1701-1707</td>
<td>8 366</td>
<td>38 016</td>
<td>35 041</td>
<td>12 481</td>
<td>7 476</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>101 383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1708-1713</td>
<td>3 681</td>
<td>40 441</td>
<td>20 529</td>
<td>4 214</td>
<td>3 677</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>72 547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1662-1713</td>
<td>42 355</td>
<td>133 745</td>
<td>159 994</td>
<td>100 899</td>
<td>60 530</td>
<td>5 990</td>
<td>503 513</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Computed from sources in fn 2.*

We turn now to comparisons between the estimates presented here, and those of other scholars. There are no less than five scholarly estimates of the British slave trade for all or part of the period 1662-1713—those by Kenneth Davies, Philip Curtin and David Galenson focus on arrivals in the British Americas; the remaining two, by Joseph Inikori and David Richardson, focus on the size of the English slave trade.  

Both Curtin’s and Galenson’s figures derive

4. There are actually at least seven existing estimates, if we include Harlow’s figures (1926: 312, 316-317) for Barbados, 1663-64 and 1673-84 and Higham’s estimates (1921: 154) for the Leeward’s, 1674-86. However, Davies (1957: 361-363) incorporated the sources that Harlow and Higham used in his own esti-
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from population data. To convert these into estimates of the English slave trade requires adjustment for the net outflow of slaves to non-English regions as well as for the minor flow from Africa to non-English areas in English ships. The Davies, Inikori, and Richardson estimates derive from shipping rather than demographic records.

Davies's estimates are the oldest, among the most strongly rooted in the documentary sources, and, except for Richardson's post-1698 series, the only annual data hitherto available. Davies's chief aim was to summarize Company sales in the West Indies. He totalled the slaves sold by auction according to the Company books, presented these as a series, and then estimated separately the likely scale of Company deliveries under contract, i.e., the slaves that were not sold at auction. Davies made no attempt to include slaves smuggled ashore by the officers of Company ships, nor those landed by non-Company slavers called 'interlopers'. His annual auction-based series yielded 90,768 slaves between 1672 and 1711, to which he added 10,000 possible contract slaves. In contrast, the estimates presented here attempt to account for all arrivals in the English colonies (with certain exceptions), not just those under the control of the Royal African Company (RAC). Moreover, the current data set counts slaves arrived as well as slaves sold. Thus the figure of 101,000 slaves calculated by Davies is not directly comparable with the 322,000 arrivals for the same period that can be calculated from Table I. Nevertheless there are reasons for arguing that even under terms that Davies set for himself, his series underestimates the true figure. Not all auction sales seem to have been included in the invoice books on which Davies relied. Near the end of the Company's busiest decade the RAC calculated its own sales from auctions at 46,396 slaves, 6,000 (15 percent) greater than Davies's figure. Moreover, Davies made no systematic use of Naval Office or, more generally, Colonial Office documents, in his study. He thus bypassed sources that would have provided information on the 'contract' arrivals of slaves that were not put up for auction. These arrivals were more numerous than he assumed. It is not

mates and the Harlow and Higham data are not discussed further. The other estimates are Philip D. Curtin (1969: 52-72); David Richardson (1989: 157-158); David Galenson (1981: 212-218); Joseph Inikori (1992, fn 1). In addition both Patrick Manning (1979) and John Thornton (1992: 118), have estimated departures from Africa using mainly secondary sources.


6. A comparison of the two suggests that 95.7 percent of arrivals were actually sold at the time of the auction (N = 251).

7. Davies (1957: 362) computes 40,371 for 1680-88. The RAC clerks computed 46,396 (CO 388/10, H108). While the current data set incorporates the Invoice Books, data from this source were not entered separately. It is thus difficult to extract a separate Invoice Book (and non-Invoice Book) series for comparative purposes.

8. Davies (1957: 362) actually refers to the RAC summary of its own auction sales indirectly when he cites a document from the late eighteenth century to support his estimate of 'contract' arrivals (Report of the Privy Council on the Trade to Africa, Parliamentary Papers (1789), Part IV, No 5, Appendix B). This document drew on the RAC summary in CO 388/10 without giving the source, but
always possible to identify RAC ships once one moves away from the T 70
series, but a count of only those slaves carried in clearly identifiable RAC ships
yields a minimum estimate from the data set of 125,000 slaves from 1672 to 1711,
the years of Davies series. The actual figure is probably higher by several thou-
sand. The Davies count of RAC arrivals alone thus needs to be increased by at
least 30 percent.

Both Curtin and Galenson estimate slave arrivals as a ‘residual’ and concen-
trate on decadal or quarter-century data. In other words the estimate of slave
arrivals remains after subtracting the population at the end of the period from
the population at the beginning of the period and allowing for births and deaths
in the interval. Curtin also uses slave arrival data to supplement his residual
approach. From Curtin one can infer an estimate of 325,300 arrivals in the Brit-
ish Americas from 1662 to 1713—the period spanned by Table I.9 From Galen-
son, who uses a more sophisticated residual calculation than does Curtin, an esti-
mate of 394,300 can be similarly extracted.10 Table I by comparison presents
gross rather than net arrivals. It does not include all pre-1698 disembarkations
of slaves in Virginia and Maryland, nor does it take into account slaves sold out
of the British Americas, though it might be noted that the effect of these two
omissions are opposite and therefore to some extent counteractive. As already
noted, the most important ‘resale’ market was to the Spanish Americas, which
could have absorbed 25,000 slaves from this source—most of them within rather
than without the Asiento channel. Whether these sales were 15,000 or 35,000
their subtraction from the 396,200 aggregate figure for arrivals in the British
America between 1662 and 1713 shown in Table I compares favorably with the
work of Curtin and Galenson—given the 20 percent margin of error that the
former allowed. A net figure of say 375,000 is 15 percent greater than Curtin’s
figure, and within 5 percent of Galenson’s ‘residual’ series.

There are, however, some large differences in distribution in both time and
space between Table I and Galenson’ series. Galenson has 52 percent more
slaves landing in the Leewards, 30 percent more on the British mainland, 13 per-
cent fewer slaves in Barbados and 12 percent fewer in Jamaica than does
Table I. But these differences prove much less significant when it is understood
that some of the mainland and Leeward population increase is explained not by
arrivals from Africa, the concern of Table I, but by migration or sales from Bar-
bados. Likewise Jamaica was the main entrepot for the trade with Spanish
America. Galenson estimated net population change, whereas this paper esti-
mates total arrivals. Most of the adjustment for sales to Spanish America,
which helps convert the gross data of Table I to a net figure, has to be made to
the Jamaican estimate. There is also some difference in the distribution over

Davies assumed that the total of 46,396 it cited included ‘contract’ sales, and
compared this with his own auction sale count of 40,371. With some other
adjustments this was the basis of his small allowance for contract slaves. In
fact, as the original document makes clear, the total was for auction sales only,
and contract sales were much higher than Davies estimated.
10. Galenson (1981: 212-218). Both Curtin’s and Galenson’s estimates are for
black migration rather than the slave trade, though the difference between the
two would be small.
time. Table I suggests a greater inflow after 1700 than do the Galenson estimates. At the aggregate level there is nevertheless a reassuring similarity between the two series despite their radically different methods of calculation.

Richardson and Inikori provide shipping-based estimates for the British slave trade as a whole rather than just the RAC. Inikori includes slaves carried on ships leaving the British Americas and aims at a conservative or minimum figure; Richardson focuses on ships based in England only, and attempts a maximum estimate. Although Richardson provides annual estimates the discussion here focuses on the eleven years, 1699-1709, as a unit. For these years Richardson estimates 131,767 slaves delivered from 629 ships and 164,709 taken from Africa. Inikori estimates 152,071 arrivals and 190,089 departures in 631 ships from Britain, to which should be added 13,500 arrivals and 16,692 departures in 110 ships from the British Americas. Table I by comparison suggests 121,000 slaves arrived in the Americas from both British and the British American ships, and 151,000 left Africa. They left on approximately 600 vessels, although the present data set contains only about 580 of these. Clearly, the current estimates (as well as those of Galenson) are lower than those of the two scholars that have done the most archival work on this issue, and merit further comment.

The major reason for the difference is that both Inikori and Richardson build their estimates on consolidated listings of ships that cleared from English ports for Africa and Guinea. Such an approach does not allow evaluation of each separate voyage and makes insufficient adjustment for ships that did not complete actual slave voyages.11 This approach produces two possible sources of upward bias: first, ships involved in the bilateral produce trade that cleared for Africa without carrying slaves to the Americas and, second, ships that failed to complete the voyage to the Americas on account of shipwreck, pirates or war.12

One of the documents Richardson uses to derive ship clearances in the 1699-1709 decade lists 504 ships clearing from London.13 All these are counted as slave ships by both Inikori and Richardson, but neither author notes that the document’s author estimates that 85 of these ships returned to London from Africa with produce and without making a transatlantic slaving voyage. On the ‘failure ratio’ issue it would seem that during the war years 1703-1712, 14 percent of slave ships in the present data set did not disembark slaves in the Americas on account of the elements, enemy action, and piracy—the basis for insurance rates more than doubling during the period.14 In short, clearance lists are not as

---

11. Richardson specifically notes these sources of upward bias in presenting an upper-bound estimate of the trade. Ships that did not complete voyages are at the centre of a recent major downward revision of the volume of the later British slave trade (Behrendt 1993: chap. 1).

12. There is also one source of minor downward bias. Several ships returned direct to Africa for a second cargo of slaves before sailing back to England. Thus one clearance could mean two or more slave voyages. In the present data set eight ships out of 580 between 1699 and 1709 have been identified as following this route. These are counted as separate voyages in the current data set.

13. ‘Extracts of the Number of Ships dispatcht from London to Africa...’, in CO 388/11, I 8; see also CO 388/11, I 77-78.

14. Some of these failed voyages (four percentage points out of the fourteen) had an unknown outcome and a few of these could have landed slaves without any record surviving. Stephen Behrendt (1993) has found that a similar ratio of
effective a way of measuring the volume of the slave trade as multi-source data sets built up on a voyage-by-voyage basis. Indeed, much of Richardson’s work, some of it incorporated here, provides the basic groundwork for such an approach.\textsuperscript{15} It should also be clear that after 1713 different ratios of produce ships and uncompleted voyages might apply.

Inikori also provides estimates for the pre-1700 trade. For 1655-1700 he uses two approaches. One is based on a 1788 report of the Jamaican House of Assembly from which he computes slave imports into Jamaica, for 1655-1700, at 82,279. He then relies on Royal African Company figures to suggest that one quarter of British-carried slaves went to Jamaica and that 23.7 percent of Africans died on the middle passage. Using these ratios he estimates that the British carried 431,345 slaves from Africa between 1655 and 1700. The present data set suggests that this approach undercounts slave arrivals in Jamaica, which were 95,000 in the 1662-1700 period alone. Inikori thus understates the relative importance of Jamaica, which took 37, not 25 percent of the British slaves before 1700; and overstates the mortality rate, which was 20 rather than 23.7 percent. If we use Inikori’s approach with data and ratios drawn from the present data set, then it would appear that the British carried about 320,000 slaves from Africa between 1662 and 1700. Allowances for the missing pre-1700 Virginia data and a few thousand departures between 1655 and 1662 would still leave the present estimates, say 340,000, well below Inikori’s estimate of 431,000.

Inikori’s second approach is to increase Davies’s figures for RAC arrivals by 20 percent and then to assume that the interloper traffic was equal to its RAC counterpart before 1690, and double that of the RAC between 1690 and 1700. For 1662 to 1672 he infers slave departures from English commodity trade data for two years, 1662-63 and 1668-69.\textsuperscript{16} For the 1660s the present data set provides a firmer basis for an estimate of slaves carried than do the English trade figures that Inikori uses. For the period from 1672 the above discussion suggests more RAC and less interloper activity than Inikori argued for. But these differences cancel each other out to some extent. Thus Inikori’s second approach yields a total estimate for 1662 to 1700 of 369,494. This is only 9 per-

\textsuperscript{15} See Richardson (1986) and Richardson, Beedham & Schofield (1993). On ship characteristics and estimates of the Caribbean based traffic, there is agreement between the current data set and the Inikori estimates. Mean numbers of slaves arrived on ships sailing from London and Bristol between 1699 and 1709 (excluding those ships going on to other markets) was 236 (N = 218). Inikori uses a mean cargo of 241. The data set shows 119 slavers from Antigua, Jamaica and Barbados (although this may not be complete); Inikori assumes 111 such ships. The mean numbers of slaves disembarked on these Caribbean based ships was 152 (N = 81); Inikori assumes a mean of 131. Both Richardson and Inikori use a shipboard mortality rate of 20 percent to convert arrivals into departures and vice versa - a rate supported by the current data.

\textsuperscript{16} This CO document appears to exclude gold and African produce shipped from the Americas. A similar summary of English imports and exports to Africa, 1699-1715 in CO 390/5, shows a similar ratio of imports to exports, but as the document notes, excludes produce brought to England via the West Indies. Gold was never entered in the Customs Records.
cent higher than the one presented here, but rather different in its distribution over time and between RAC and non-RAC ships.

In summary, the present data provide a much firmer basis for estimating the English slave trade between 1662 and 1713 than has hitherto existed. They also provide a basis for estimating departures from different African regions for the first time. The new estimates presented here accord well with Galenson's decadal estimates and reasonably well with one of Inikori's pre-1700 estimates. After 1699, the data fit better with the Richardson than the Inikori series, though both are probably too high. The main advantage of the present approach is that it presents annual data for the full 1662-1713 period and holds out the possibility of easy subsequent revisions. If any scholar wishes to change these estimates it is a straightforward task to check for double-counting and to add or subtract slaves. Ship-clearance lists and opinions of contemporaries no longer suffice for these years.

Queen's University, Kingston, Canada.
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ABSTRACT

This paper uses a new data set of 1,633 slaving voyages to produce new estimates of the volume of the English transatlantic slave trade from 1662 to 1714. The new estimates are compared with those of Joseph Inikori (in an earlier essay in this journal), and of other scholars. The paper presents breakdowns by decade and colony of arrival, and offers detailed information on African regions of embarkation. New estimates of voyage mortality are also presented.
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