

Cai and Qiu Enterprises:

蔡邱

Merchants of Canton 1730-1784

PAUL A. VAN DYKE*

Relation	Trade Name	Popular Chinese Name	Chinese
1) Partner	<i>Semqua</i>	Qiu Kun	邱崑
2) Father	<i>Honqua</i>	Cai Hunqua	蔡 — —
3) Son no. 1	_____	Cai Tinghu	蔡廷瑚
Son no. 2	<i>Anqua</i>	Cai Anqua	蔡 — —
Son no. 3	<i>Tseonqua</i>	Cai Tseonqua	蔡 — —
Son no. 4	<i>Tayqua</i>	Cai Tayqua	蔡 — —
Son no. 5	<i>Sequa</i>	Cai Sequa	蔡 — —
4) Son no. 6	<i>Tsjonqua</i>	Cai Xiangguan	蔡相官

Appellations that appear in the records for the surname Cai

Tsja, Tsa, Tsia, Tja, Tjay, Tay, Ti, Tè, Chai, Choi, Chia, Si, Se, Cheo, Cha, Chua, Chwan, Sai, Sia, Chi, Zey, Zay, Say, Sey, Soy, Sy, Thaay, Thay, Tsaay, Tsay, Tjaay, Tshaa, Tzwaa, T'Swaa, Tsey, Tsoi, Tsy, Tzy, Chiu, Schy.

TRACKING CAI AND QIU THROUGH THE HISTORICAL RECORDS

There are references to Cais being involved in the trade in some capacity in the early eighteenth century, but no clear evidence has emerged showing their business activities. The first men to appear whom we can clearly connect to that family are Hunqua and Suiqua (Ruiguan 瑞官). Cheong has suggested that the two men were brothers and that they began their activities about the same time in 1728, but so far no evidence has emerged to confirm this relationship or this early date. It is plausible that the two men were relatives, as sometimes they conducted business together, and, of course, they shared the same surname.¹

This study is about Hunqua's branch of the family, and a partner by the name of Semqua (Qiu Kun 邱崑). It is not always an easy or straightforward task to follow either of these men through the records, especially Hunqua. From the 1720s to the 1750s there were no less than three Hong merchants who went by the name "Hunqua" (or something similar), and when their last names are not given, it is difficult to know which one is being referred to. The Hunquas whom we have been able to identify so far are Leunqua (or Le Hunqua), who was Ye Longguan 叶隆官, owner and operator of the Duanhe Hang 端和行; Tan Hunqua, who was Chen Xiongguan 陈雄官, owner of the Yuanlai Hang (远来行 or 源来行); and Tsja Hunqua (or Chai Hunqua), who was of the Cai 蔡 family and traded out of the Yifeng Hang 义丰行. There was a small shopkeeper who went by the name Hunqua as well. Each body of documents have their own peculiar problems in trying to identify these men, so we will first provide a short summary of the sources to show how we have dealt with these ambiguities (see the Schedules for a list of the sources mentioned in this section).²

BELGIAN RECORDS

There are numerous entries showing a Hunqua(s) in the Ostend General India Company (GIC) journals, but there is no way of knowing the family name(s).

This man (or men) traded extensively with the GIC in the 1720s, and because Tan Hunqua (from the Chen family) seems to have been the one who was most active at this time, they are perhaps references to him. But as far as age is concerned, Cai Hunqua could probably have been old enough in the 1720s to be trading.

We can roughly establish Cai Hunqua's age by looking at his sons. His eldest son Tinghu 廷瑚 married in 1756, and if we assume that he was possibly at least in his mid-twenties at the time, then his birth date would be sometime around 1730. We also know that another son, Tayqua (possibly son number four), started trading by at least 1752.³ If we assume that he would have been at least in his late teens or early twenties at that time, then his birth date would be sometime in the early-1730s. We do not know how many wives Hunqua had, but if we assume that he may have been around twenty-five years old when having his first son, and maybe at least thirty years old when having his fourth son (he also had at least one daughter), then his birth date would be sometime in the early 1700s. This would make him around sixty to seventy years old when he died in 1770, which also corresponds to the Dutch and Swedes calling him "old" in the 1760s. Thus, Hunqua should have been old enough to trade by at least the mid-1720s, but the ambiguities in the GIC records (and other records) do not allow us to establish this with certainty.⁴

DUTCH RECORDS

Cai Hunqua does not appear in the Dutch resolutions or ledgers in 1729 or 1730, but in 1731 two Hunqua's are mentioned, "Tanhonqua" and "Young Honqua". Even though Cai Hunqua was in his late twenties or early thirties at the time, he was indeed referred to as "young". The term is, of course, relative, because it could mean a young age, younger than the other Hunquas or the other merchants, young in experience, or simply that he looked young. Because the Dutch list these two men separately in their account books, we know that they were not the same person.

Young Hunqua appears again in the Dutch records in 1733, and beginning in 1738 these two Hunqua's become "Tanhonqua" (Chen Xiongguan) and "Tjayhonqua" (Cai Hunqua). We have thus chosen to accept the earlier "Young Honqua" references in the Dutch records as being Cai Hunqua. Once the spelling Tjayhonqua begins, it is easier to identify him in the

* Ph.D. in History from the University of Southern California.
Assistant Professor of History at the Macao Inter-University Institute.

Doutorado em História pela Universidade da Califórnia do Sul.
Professor Auxiliar no Instituto Inter-Universitário de Macau.

HISTÓRIA

records. Leunqua (or Ley Hunqua) appears in a couple of years in the Dutch records as well, but as is mentioned above, he was from the Ye family.

ENGLISH RECORDS

Cheong suggests that Cai Hunqua may have been the “Chua Teinqua” who shows up in the English records in the early 1730s working in the house of the well known Suqua (Chen Shouguan 陈捷官), which is plausible.⁵ In later years, those two families formed a close alliance in the trade that lasted for decades, and Cai Hunqua seems to have gone by the name Teinqua (with various spellings) in later years. In 1735 and 1737, a “Young Hungqua” shows up in the English records. In the latter year, there is also a reference to “Ton Hunqua”, which suggests that “Young Hungqua” was a different person and thus may have been of the Cai family. We have not found a reference to Ley Hunqua being referred to as “young” at this time, so it is not likely to be him.

It becomes more difficult to follow Cai Hunqua through the English records in later years because he begins to show up as “Teunqua” or “Seunqua” and various other spellings. This presents a huge problem because during these years there was another member of the Cai family operating in the Fengyuan Hang 逢源行, who was actively involved in the trade, and he also went by the name Teunqua (as did a member of the Chen family). Moreover, it is possible that some of the references to Seunqua are actually referring to Semqua (Qiu Kun), who appears in the Dutch and Swedish records and not to Cai Hunqua or his son as is often suggested in the secondary literature. This proposition seems more credible when we consider that previous authors who have used the English records have not acknowledged (except perhaps Cheong) that there were actually two persons running the Yifeng Hang all along, Hunqua and Semqua. This fact will be explained in detail below.

Because of all the problems inherent in the English records and because those are the documents that have been predominantly relied upon in the past to write the Hong merchant histories, it is not surprising to see that very little has been written about the early years of the Cai traders. It is not until the 1750s that clearer references to Cai Hunqua and family begin to appear in the English sources. In 1755 he shows up in an English translation of a Chinese document as “Chai Hunqua” and in 1757 as “Chihunqua.” From 1760

until his death in 1770, Hunqua shows up regularly in the English records as “Si Hunqua”, and then there are extensive references to a couple of his sons, Sy Anqua (son number two) and Seunqua (son number six).⁶

SWEDISH RECORDS

In 1732 a “Young Hunqua” appears in the Swedish East India Company's (SOIC) records (many of which are written in English), and he was clearly a different person from “Tan Hunqua”. Later references again suggest that this Young Hunqua was probably a reference to Cai Hunqua. In 1738 and again in the early 1740s Hunqua shows up in the Charles Irvine papers (a supercargo for the Swedish East India Company), with the last name “Say” or “Tzy”. In 1752 and 1753 Hunqua appears again with the last name “Zey” or “Zay” in the Christian Tham papers (another SOIC supercargo).

Cai Hunqua appears again in the 1760s in the private records of Johan Abraham Grill (another SOIC supercargo), as “Zey Hunqua”. This name continues to appear in the Grill papers until at least 1784, but Grill knew that Hunqua had died in 1770 and was only using the name in the years after that to refer to his trading house. Cai Hunqua seems to have done little business with the SOIC, but he carried on some private trade on the side with the Swedish supercargoes and borrowed money from them.⁷

DANISH RECORDS

The three Hunquas mentioned above show up in the Danish records as well. The Danes, however, were more diligent about recording them with their last names attached. There is a merchant with the name “Zey Tinqu” who appears in 1734, 1738 and 1742, which may refer to Hunqua because other records do not show a Cai Tinqu active in the trade at this time (there were several Chen Tinquas). The spelling of Tinqu is very close to the Teinqua that appears in the English records, and the Zey suggests he may be from the Cai family.

The first clear references to “Zey Hunqua” (Cai Hunqua) appear in the Danish Asiatic Company (DAC) journals beginning in 1739. In about 1751 the spelling of his name changes to “Sey Hunqua”. Cai Hunqua did a fair amount of business with the DAC, but it was not always consistent. There are many years where he is not mentioned in the DAC records, or where he is only mentioned in reference to his trade with other companies.⁸

HISTORY

FRENCH RECORDS

The French East India Company (CFI) records were not consulted for this study, but Cai Hunqua's romanized name appears in an extract from a French document that Dermigny printed in his *Le Commerce à Canton*. In 1760 the Hong merchants are listed in this document, and Hunqua appears as "Sioukoa." Cordier also gives us a brief history of the Hong merchants in Canton from French and English sources. He mentions a "Sayonqua", which is probably a reference to Cai Hunqua as well.⁹

CHINESE RECORDS

There are a couple of Chinese documents that specifically mention the Yifeng Hang, but not Cai Hunqua or any member of the Cai family, which raises the question of who actually owned the business. In 1754 the Macao magistrate received a memo from the Yuehaiguan concerning the Dutch officers who were going there in the off-season. In this document, the Hong merchant Qiu Kun 邱崑 of the Yifeng Hang is mentioned as the person responsible for the Dutch while they were in the delta. Many entries in the foreign records, however, clearly state that Hunqua of the Cai family was the person who was acting as security merchant for the VOC. Cai Hunqua appears in many of the foreign contracts as the proprietor of the Yifeng Hang. Those documents often have his business name and chop clearly displayed in Chinese characters with his romanized name so there is no question that this is Cai Hunqua. The Chinese and Western sources thus seem as though they contradict each other, but there is an explanation.

Another Chinese document from 1754 dated nine days earlier than the one mentioned above shows a merchant by the name of Cai Guohui 蔡国辉 of the Jufeng Hang 聚丰行. This is most likely a reference to Cai Ruiguan 蔡瑞官 and not Cai Hunqua, albeit there has been some confusion about this in the secondary literature. As far as we know, Cai Hunqua did not own the Jufeng Hang, but he did some business with it. In their studies of the Hong merchants, Liang, White and Cheong also found connections between Cai Guohui and the Jufeng Hang. All of these authors, however, have also confused Cai Hunqua (or Teunqua/Seunqua) of the Yifeng Hang with Cai Ruiguan (or Suyqua) of the Jufeng Hang, so the connections they are trying to make are unclear.¹⁰

Some of these references could in fact be referring to another Cai who was operating at the time—Teunqua of the Fengyuan Hang (mentioned above). Like Hunqua's partner Semqua, Teunqua has also received very little mention in the history books despite the fact that both of them were actively trading throughout the 1740s and 1750s. It is not until Teunqua's son Monqua (Cai Wenguan 蔡文官) emerges in the early 1760s that we learn much about this Cai branch, which suggests that his name has also been confused with others.¹¹

In a Chinese document that Cordier found dated 1765, there is a list of the ten merchant houses in Canton coupled with the owners' family names. Cai Ruiguan, who owned the Jufeng Hang, for example, is referred to as Cai Jufeng. Here again the Yifeng Hang is coupled with the family name K'ieou (Qiu Yifeng 邱义丰) and not with Cai. By cross-referencing this information with data in the foreign archives, we can establish the identity of this Qiu merchant.¹²

There were two persons who managed the Yifeng Hang: Hunqua and Semqua. Both of them worked hand in hand in the foreign trade and both of them were assigned positions in the Co-Hong in the 1760s. We know that Hunqua was of the Cai family, so he could not be Qiu Kun. Hunqua's sons who show up in the records and who were involved in the Yifeng Hang were of course also Cais. We also know that Semqua was not of the Cai family. In 1774 the Dutch tell us that the rights to the Yifeng Hang were transferred from Semqua to Hunqua's son Tayqua. The Swedish, Dutch and Danish records show that Hunqua and Semqua were the sole managers of the Yifeng Hang, and there is no other person mentioned in those records connected to that business except Hunqua's sons. Thus the only logical conclusion is that Semqua was the same person as Qiu Kun and that he was the real proprietor of the Yifeng Hang, and not Hunqua. Reasons for Hunqua showing up in the foreign records as the owner of that business will be given below.

SUMMARY

The sources above show that Cai Hunqua was active in the trade from the 1730s to his death in 1770. By starting with the positive mentions to him in the late 1730s and 1740s and then working backwards in time, it is logical to conclude that the "Young Hunquas"

HISTÓRIA

mentioned in the early 1730s are probably references to him. We have thus decided to begin Cai Hunqua's story in 1731.

HUNQUA, SEMQUA AND THE RISE OF THE YIFENG HANG

In 1731 and again in 1733 Hunqua shows up in the records trading porcelain and tea with the Dutch. In 1738 he traded some mercury with them, and by 1742 he was trading extensively in a wide range of products. It was common for merchants in their beginning years to dabble in just a few items, and then, after they gained experience and credibility with the foreigners, to expand into other commodities. In 1737 Hunqua shows up trading with the Dutch with a partner Semqua (called "Felix" at this time, see Schedule). By 1742 Hunqua and Semqua had established themselves firmly with the VOC. From that year to 1756 they were the major suppliers of the Dutch cargoes (unfortunately, figures are not available for those years).¹³

Hunqua also carried on some trade with the Danes. In 1739, he traded porcelain with them, but he did not establish a regular trade with the DAC until the late 1740s. As far as we can tell from the records, the merchandise Hunqua (and Semqua) supplied never exceeded more than about 22 percent of the cargo of a DAC ship, and it was often more like 10 or 15 percent (see Table A and Schedule). The Yans were the major suppliers of the DAC cargos from 1734 to the 1770s, supplying an average of about 40 percent of the cargoes, so it is logical to see Hunqua not being as active with them.¹⁴

In 1735 the English report that they contracted one fourth of their woven silks with "Young Hunqua". One of the reasons they decided to go with him was to establish competition with Suqua, who had gained a large share of the market. In 1736 Hunqua is also mentioned by the EIC officers as being one of the "merchants that we have chiefly dealt with". By this time, the Yan and Huang partners, who began their business in 1734, had made significant inroads into the market and were rapidly grabbing market share. Between them, Hunqua and Semqua, and several others, there was enough opposition to keep Suqua from controlling the trade.¹⁵

Sometime around 1743 Felix becomes more commonly known as Semqua, but still trading regularly with Hunqua out of the Yifeng Hang.¹⁶ The Dutch tell

us that Semqua could not speak a European language (meaning Pidgin English), so he communicated with the foreigners through his secretary, while his partner Hunqua spoke directly with them. The limited ability to communicate is probably another reason why the foreigners most often refer to Hunqua in their journals and not Semqua. Some of the Dutch supercargoes had a very low opinion of Semqua as a businessman and did not trust him, but if they wanted to deal with Hunqua, then they had to interact with Semqua because their business was one and the same.¹⁷

In June 1756 the Dutch mention that Hunqua was preoccupied with preparing for his eldest son's wedding, so nothing could be done. We also learn this year that Hunqua's mother passed away during the off-season, which kept him away from the trade for some time. In February 1764 Hunqua's eldest son passed the imperial examinations and was appointed a "War Mandarin" in Beijing. In the Panyu County Gazetteer, there is a Cai Tinghu 蔡廷瑚 recorded in 1765 as having obtained the *wuju* 武举 degree (this would be equivalent to a "War Mandarin"), which is very likely a reference to him. If his case was typical, then Hunqua was probably supporting Tinghu all of these years in preparation for the examinations.¹⁸

The Dutch tell us that Anqua was Hunqua's second son, and he shows up in the records under several names, making it difficult to track him (see Schedule). The other sons were Tseonqua, Tayqua, Sequa and the youngest, Tsjonqua (Cai Xiangguan 蔡相官). All of the sons except Tinghu appear in the foreign records from time to time helping with the trade. While Hunqua was still alive, Anqua and Tayqua were the most active with the foreigners. The others were possibly sent into the interior each year to order goods for the coming season. We know that other relatives were also involved with the trade, because the Dutch mention in 1756 that Tayqua's cousin (or possibly uncle) was sent to the tea lands in the off-season with an amount of money to place the tea orders.¹⁹

Both Anqua and Tayqua worked closely with Semqua, often going together with him to Macao to take care of the Portuguese trade. The two sons traded individually as well, under the authority of the Yifeng Hang. Anqua and Semqua regularly took out loans from the Swedes in the 1760s to finance the trade (see Table C). The sons were undoubtedly also closely involved in the family junk trade on some level.

HISTORY

In September 1762 Hunqua is mentioned as having a share in the cargo of a junk that was caught in Batavia smuggling pepper and had to pay a stiff fine. Hunqua regularly purchased junk cargoes when they arrived in Canton, and he was closely connected to the people handling that merchandise, which was possibly done through Semqua. In November 1763 the Dutch mention that Semqua had to abandon his quarters in his junk factory (presumably at the request of the Hoppo) in order to make room for some English private traders who could not find suitable accommodations.

This reference to a junk factory undoubtedly means that Semqua was outfitting junks in that place. In 1768 the Swedes tell us that Semqua had sponsored the Junk *Muntingchew* on a voyage to Passiak, and that it operated out of the Chapgi Hang (Jiyi Hang 集义行), which could be the junk factory that the Dutch refer to. Semqua's junk factory was located next to the Dutch factory, and we know from other references that junks were fitting out in this place up until at least the 1780s (and probably later).²⁰

Hunqua and Semqua's connections to the junk trade are very typical of the Hong merchants, as it was necessary to be competitive. The Yans for example had a relative by the name of Hongsia (Yan Xiangshe), who coordinated their junk trade, and another Yan was a captain of one of the junks sailing to Batavia. The Hong merchant Poankeequa (Pan Qiguan 潘启官) also ran a junk factory, which was managed by his partner Quiqua (similar to Semqua's case). Pan handled much of the trade between Canton, Macao and Manila, including both the foreign and junk cargoes. The Ye 叶 merchants also operated several junks in conjunction with their foreign export trade, which sailed to Vietnam and Cambodia. The Hong merchant Tan Tsjoouqua (Chen Zuguan 陈祖官) owned one of the junks that sailed to Batavia.²¹ It is thus not surprising to see in the Swedish records that Semqua and Anqua were both sponsoring Canton junks in the 1760s.²²

Aside from Semqua, Hunqua had several other partners at different times. From 1749 to 1751 he traded with the Dutch in partnership with Texia (Yan Deshe 颜德舍). Texia died in the latter year, and then Hunqua's son Tayqua begins to show up in the records. Texia had two sons, Swetia (Yan Ruishe 颜瑞舍) and Ingsia (Yan Yingshe 颜瑛舍), who later formed a partnership with Hunqua and Semqua that would last for many years (explained below). All of them seem to

have had some connection to the Hong merchant Beauquiqua (Li Kaiguan 黎开观) as well.²³

In 1752 and 1753 Hunqua carried on some trade with the SOIC (see Schedule). In the latter year, he is noted as having a partner "Tionqua", who may have been the man mentioned above, who was the head of one the other branches of the Cai family. In 1754 the Dutch mention that Hunqua, Semqua and Tayqua and Company were compelled to pay Tionqua and Suyqua's (Cai Ruiguan mentioned above) arrears. Tionqua had fallen behind on his payments to the inland merchants, and Suyqua was behind on his trade with the French. Because Hunqua and Semqua secured the ships with which those two men had traded, they were responsible to cover the customs duties. These were rather minor matters when we consider the enormous volume of merchandise that was being handled by the Yifeng Hang. Hunqua and Semqua were now central players in the commerce. In 1755 the Danes record the top six merchants in Canton, and Cai Hunqua is fourth on their list. In 1756 the Dutch also state that the two partners were in a "secure state".²⁴

In 1758 a crisis emerged in Canton that brought many changes to the trade. The Hong merchant Beauquiqua died this year leaving behind a substantial debt. Beau's brother and surviving son tried to continue the business, but the debt was more than they could handle, so it was eventually divided up and distributed to Beau's former partners, Chen Anguan 陈安官, Swetia and others. It is not clear how Hunqua and Semqua fared in this debt restructuring, but they were certain to have been affected in some way. The debt crisis undoubtedly played a major role in Hunqua and Semqua deciding this year to join forces with the Yan and Chen families so that together they could better control and protect their profits.

From 1758 until Hunqua's death in 1770 most of the Yifeng Hang's trade with the VOC was done in partnership with these two families (see Table B and Schedule). In the beginning the three members of this new consortium were Cai Hunqua (with Semqua), Swetia, and Chetqua (Chen Jieguan 陈捷官). The names of the latter two men's main businesses (merchants often had more than one firm) were the Taihe Hang 泰和行 and the Guangshun Hang 广顺行, respectively. Each one of the three partners was responsible for the other's share, which was a way for the Chinese merchants and the Dutch to gain more

1765
Sept: 6 Det skal blive, alt/aa maas jeg da og vilde Tidsen, og for
jeg tult med Toghængra 800, Sats og gaverne, men sandt sagde
jeg at være fornøjet med, som Angskia og Schäggra gjorde.
Endt Lingüis Tago Tiap for 109 Caffer med Porcelain som
i Morgen skal af Skibet.
Kun i angot vi samvælsom de andre for værende Nationer,
at Porcelainet vil komme fra Landet. — Vi saar nu på det alt
som vi forer Kibet, her Angen nogle forer Myg, som er
nu komne forværd ande, og Hje Myg, som er for og nogle
and komne, som vi nu forer mange nye, som er Porcelain
vil komme, vi fandt blive de første som fandt det af for
og Kibet, at vi fandt som det første og borte, lige som jeg
med fandt som fandt, vi fandt det som alle andre af Kibet,
og på det som fandt og gødt, at vi ingen Kibet borte, det
er end som Komfren skal finde den Kibet og Joga Diction
valde, som fandt, at det er Jibet og Attræen.
7 Af samte til Skibet Bronning Sophia Chagdalena
med 1 Jampan, indbyr og sigt af 2. Matrofer Skel, Israel,
og Jens Larsen, 92 Caffer med Porcelain, og 11 Dito med Por-
celain & Tago, i alt 109 Caffer, det med skibet er og
Specification som den Copie vogen folio 30.
M. Kauritzky C. E. Ernst, Jens Mellet M. Brandt,
Rigerup.
Kendelig som vi fandt at vider, og M. Schäggra, som forer
for at kunne og Marmir, som fandt den accorderede grønne
Thei skal kunne Kauritzky M. Angskia 100 Piccul Songlo, af
1. og borte fort a 2.4 Tail, og Piccul M. Schäggra 50 Piccul
1. og borte fort Songlo a 2.4 Tail, og 50 Piccul Tunkaj af b.
fort a 2.6 Tail, M. Toghængra 100 Piccul borte fort Tunkaj
Thei a 2.6 Tail, alle som er gaverne Om Tofningor fandt
alt Vefco, som Jibet Angning, til borte Thei vider.
Skibet Dr. Sophia Chagdalena indbyr, og nogle forer
p Piccul af Songlo Thei a 16 Tail, og p Piccul af Tunkaj
Thei 18 Tail, det omvige naar Lescransen er skibet
og mo Angen, vi fandt at vider skibet folgender.
Contract
Vi indbyr Toghængra, Schäggra, og Toghængra,

HISTORY

1765
Sept. 7

Röbmans og Interessenters, af det for i Canton og i den 98.
Conhaang, frændt og formid viderlig gior, at fann Accor-
decret, og Contrahieret, med Super Carguorne, sk. C. Schmitzen
C. Ernst og J. Holst, for det Kongelige Octroyerede Danst.
Asiatisk Compagnie skil Dronning Sophia Magdalena
og for forbannede Compagniets Røgning, at lønne til sig.
barnet Compagnie skil Dr. Sophia Magdalena 150 Piccul
figer Jindrade og salt træspindstygge Piccul Senglo Thee af
1^{te} og 6^{te} fort, for for batalit pr Piccul 2.4 Tail, figer Jind og
lyng Tail; Englembil til maas barnet skil ut lønne 150 Piccul
Tunkag Thee, figer Jindrade og salt træspindstygge Piccul af
6^{te} fort, for for batalit pr Piccul 2.6 Tail, figer Eng og lyng
Tail, og forarteris barnet grønn Thee imellom af saaled.
figer Ingkia, lønne 100^{te} figer Jindrade Piccul Senglo
Thee, af 1^{te} og 6^{te} fort. —
figer Schagva lønne 50^{te} figer salt træspindstygge Piccul
af 1^{te} og 6^{te} fort, Senglo Thee, samt 50^{te} figer salt træspindstygge
Piccul af 6^{te} fort Tunkag Thee. —
figer Joghlangva lønne 100 figer Jindrade Piccul Tunkag
Thee, af 6^{te} fort; — Jindrade og salt træspindstygge Piccul af 6^{te} fort
10^{te} figer pr Piccul Senglo 18 Tail for for debitorer i sin Røgning.
I lønne og til forlygter af for for lønne 80 Stagn for
dato at røgnen om forlangt, alt Joghna gavnne Dr. C. Schmitzen
og af 6^{te} fort, og alt an den for for samt samt af 6^{te} fort
af 6^{te} og 6^{te} fort, og alt an den vandfald, at røgnen for vorit Røgning
indtil barnet 150 figer Jindrade og salt træspindstygge Piccul
Senglo Thee, og 150 figer Jindrade og salt træspindstygge Piccul
Tunkag Thee, og salt forbannede skil Joghna Waipen, eller
Boeck & Tigre Røgnen er indlagne og modtagne. — Til Dr.
lønne af 6^{te} fort for Joghna Contracte fuldbyrdet i alle
lønne, samt vi Joghna Contracte tillige med Super Carguorne
engne fann sig indtægter, og vorit fannlige Dr. Maxilla
Joh. Ingelt; Canton den 7 September A. 1765.
C. Schmitzen C. Ernst Jens Holst —
C. Schmitzen P. Egerups

泰和號
廣順行
義豐行

Illustration 1:
Tea Contracts dated 7 September 1765 for the DAC Ship Dronning Sophia Magdalena, with Hunqua, Cherqua and Ingstia for the delivery of several different kinds of tea. (RAC: Ask 1154).

HISTÓRIA

security in their business dealings, and a way for the Yifeng Hang to gain more control over the market. Illustration 1 shows the three merchants contracting tea together with the DAC as well, so the partnership was not only for the VOC.²⁵

The alliance of these three major houses was certain to have had a significant impact on the outcome of the trade in Canton. As is mentioned above, the Yans had control of much of the Danish trade and a good portion of the junk trade to Southeast Asia. With respect to the foreign trade alone, that family controlled probably around 15 percent of total exports from Canton. The Yans also raised large sums of investment capital from Macao, from other foreigners, and from other Chinese to finance the junk voyages to Southeast Asia. Thus, they not only enjoyed a good share of the foreign exports and access to investment capital, but they also had some control and influence over the junk imports and exports.

Hunqua and Semqua continued to handle the majority of the Dutch trade, and they supplied an average of 10 percent of the Danish cargoes in some years. Chetqua's firm, being one of the oldest in Canton, was involved with almost everyone in some capacity. He regularly supplied about 20 percent of the cargos of many of the DAC ships, which means that he, Swetia and Hunqua had control of the majority of the Dutch and Danish cargos. From the records that have survived, we also know that the three partners were securing the majority of the English ships as well. Together, they probably supplied as much as 50 percent of the total English exports if not more.

As far as overall volume of trade in Canton is concerned, the Danish, Dutch and a good portion of the English trade represents perhaps about 40 percent of the total export market in the 1760s. The thirty or so junks that operated in Canton at the time carried another 30 percent of the total volume. As a group, the Yans, Chens and Cais were investing in more than half of those junks. Thus, in terms of determining the outcome of the trade in Canton, this consortium could now wield its influence over perhaps 40 to 50 percent or more of the total export market. Because Hunqua was the dominant voice of the new consortium, he was certain to have gained considerable power and prestige with its formation, which in turn gave him the wherewithal to meet his financial obligations. The other 50 percent of the market (including the junk cargos)

was largely in the hands of the six or so smaller merchant houses who were being controlled (or at least manipulated) by the other prominent Hong merchant Poankeequa and his younger brother Sequa (Pan Seguan 潘瑟官).²⁶

The collapse of Beauquiqua's firm and the subsequent formation of the three-family alliance were certain to have been two of the main reasons behind Poankeequa pushing for the establishment of the infamous "Co-hong" in 1760. It was also in the interests of the government to promote this society for two reasons: firstly, to prevent future failures by providing the merchants with more security through the regulation of prices and the limiting of access to markets; and secondly, to keep merchants from controlling the markets so that prices remained competitive and the trade continued to grow. The Co-hong was the body through which government officials could work hand in hand with the Hong merchants to come up with effective policies each year to accomplish these two objectives. The foreigners, however, saw it simply as a merchant monopoly that eliminated competition and did away with their right to "free and liberal trade", which is only partially true.²⁷

Hunqua had considerable influence, but he could not actually make decisions for the other two men. The partnership operated on a consensus basis, so they had to compromise to move the trade forward, but Hunqua nonetheless gained benefits for himself from this new association. In 1762 for example, he privately agreed with the Dutch to convince the other two partners to accept an interest rate of 2 percent per month for a loan of 150,000 taels. In 1760 the three men had borrowed the same amount at this interest (see Illustration 2), but in 1761 they had only paid 1.5 percent interest per month for money they had borrowed, so they were now reluctant to agree again to the higher rate. In return for arranging this loan, Hunqua received a private preferential loan of 30,000 taels at 1 percent per month. In 1763 he was granted another private loan of 20,000 taels at the same low rate in exchange for convincing the other two to accept 2 percent per month for a loan of 50,000 taels.²⁸

It was common for Chinese merchants to pay 1½ to 2 percent interest per month for short-term loans. The early 1760s were especially difficult years for the capital market in Canton because of the heavy costs of the Seven Years War (1756-1763), which left

HISTORY

the English and the French companies wanting for silver coin.²⁹ As a result, the Dutch were one of the few sources of money at the time, so even without Hunqua's prodding, Chetqua and Swetia may have eventually succumbed to their higher interest rates. Without Hunqua's encouragement, however, the loan would have undoubtedly been delayed for a few months in order to put pressure on the Dutch, which meant that the money would sit idle earning no interest. Hunqua simply sped up the transactions so that the Dutch could maximise their profits, and in so doing, was rewarded for his services.³⁰

These secret arrangements he made with the VOC officers earned him the reputation of being the most honest and upright among all the Chinese, which of course may have been true for the Dutch but not others. The English supercargo Samuel Blount had a different opinion of him as someone who wanted to dominate the trade, and as far as Chetqua and Ingsia were concerned, if they knew all the negotiating he was doing behind their backs, they would likely think differently of him as well.³¹

Some documents from the 1760s give us a glimpse of another means of acquiring working capital in Canton. It has been pointed out in recent studies that most of the Hong merchants in the mid-eighteenth century were very active in the gold trade, and Hunqua and Semqua were no exception. Because it was illegal to export gold out of China, we usually only hear of these activities from the foreign records or in Chinese documents when someone is caught with the contraband. Illustrations 3 and 4 show that the three partners were also participating in this trade.

Illustration 3 is a contract between the three merchants and the VOC for the purchase of Dutch tin in August 1760. All four merchants (including Semqua) are mentioned at the beginning of the contract, but then Semqua's name was later crossed out. The last paragraph of the contract explains that the reason for removing his name was not because Semqua was not involved in the transactions but rather because one name (in this case Hunqua) represented both of them as they traded together. This is another clear indication that everything we have learned about Hunqua's dealings from studies that have been done in the past should rightfully be attributed to Semqua as well. Aside from showing Semqua's anonymous involvement in all of this trade, this contract is also important because

some of the tin that was purchased from the Dutch was credited to a purchase of gold.

Illustration 4 shows a contract between the four men and the VOC, with Semqua's name included. This is a very unique document because it is a gold contract that was actually written in Chinese, that was signed and chopped by all three partners in Chinese, and that clearly shows all four merchants illegally trading gold. We would not expect to find a document like this in any archive, because illegal trade is something that Hong merchants usually never recorded in Chinese. The fact that the four of them actually submitted to having the terms of this gold written out in their own language is testimony in itself of the extremes they had to sometimes resort to in order to get the capital that they needed. This was risky business, because if this document had fallen into the hands of the Hoppo or governor-general, these men would have been in very serious trouble.³²

The Dutch ordered the 4,500 taels (weight) of gold in 1760 (450 shoes of 10 taels per shoe), to be delivered on the same day two years later (30 November 1762). Because gold purchases usually required the full amount of the value of the gold in advance, this illegal trade provided the merchants with another way to gain working capital. This commodity had the peculiar function of allowing the merchants to receive their profits in advance. Illustration 4 shows that in this particular case, the Dutch were able to get the merchants to accept partial payment in cotton and tin, which was not common because gold was usually only exchanged for silver. The merchants had two years to dispose of these imports, so that still gave them an opportunity to exchange the goods for cash money.

Aside from all of these dealings mentioned above, the alliance actually helped the trade move forward with more regularity. Cai Hunqua and his rival Poankeequa were arch enemies to the point that the former often did not want to be in the same room with the latter. Swetia was firmly on Hunqua's side, but Chetqua could play to both sides at the same time. Being a member of the small and exclusive Co-hong of which Poankeequa became the head, Hunqua had little choice but to work with him in the regulating of the trade each year. On one level, the conflict between the two camps actually worked in favour of the trade because it kept them competing with each

852 110.

Q78

Bij ondergeschreeven Tsjahungpa
 in Comp.: Tan Chetqua in Swetia,
 Chinese en albin woen achtig Hoopsleden, bekennen
 en verklaren bij deuren, van de Superfargas
 der genen aal, Soederlandsche Oost-Ind. Comp.
 O. Heeren Martin Wilhelm Hulle,
 Fredrick Megander, Christian
 Wilhelm Susters, & Johan Be-
 nedictus Scharfow te hebben ontfan-
 gen en dus aan gemelde Comp. degelijk
 schuldig te zijn, een Somme van Een Bon-
 derl. & vijftig duijzent Thailen in
 202.702 ²⁶/₃₇ nieuwe ronde Spaanse Realen in
 74 cent: condijgen tijder Realen gerekent.
 Beloven bij deuren in goetima forma voor ons
 en onse Erven, ged. Th. 150000: of 202.702 ²⁶/₃₇
 nieuwe ronde Sp. R. aan te zijn & te zullen re-
 situeren, voor te Vertisch van derzelven Laas-
 tige Schip dan wel binnen den Tijd van Een Bon-
 derl. & vijftien daagen na dato deuren, met Twee
 Percentos Interest voor zijder maand dat die gel-
 den onder ons zijn berustende geweest van heden
 zijnde den Dag der ontfangst af te rekenen

h-h

tot dien der Affekaling toe.

Verbinden der Naarhoming van 't geen voorrey
is in seker forme bij deeren elk voor zijn zelven
en den eenen voor de andern onse Perzoonen en
generalyk alle onse Goederen niet gaders die
van onse, Enen der elve, stellende, den bedwang
van alle Richteren en Presbys.

In kennis der waerheid en den heeten dat wij
voor d' affekaling der Saaffzorn en Antresten
naar homing van deure, verband schrift en alle opzied
den de eenen voor d' andern Borg blyven, en dus een
ijder an ons bij Insolventie van d' andern voor de
gebuul, som zig schuldig stelt, en wannem, die op
de bestemde Tye 't zullen voldoen, hebben wij
deure niet onse gewoone Hand-Teekeningen en
Hong-Regels bekrachtigt.

Canton in China den 2 September 1760.

泰和行

乾隆二十五年九月廿三日 義豐行接

廣順行



立借銀單義豐行廣順行泰和行今借到
河蘭大班米以許力公班牙花銀壹拾伍
萬兩言定花銀每員作柒分四算其
銀每兩每月加息文分算其銀約至尾船
將開行之日清還不悞此單一樣寫
文幣若銀兩本利還清收回一幣
其餘一幣視為政府此始

338.

876

Bij ondergeschreeven Tsa Hingpa
 en Semopai in Compz. Tan Phetqua's
 Swedia China en alhier woonachtige, Kopen-
 Lieden, bekennen en verklaren bij dezen, een-
 yder voor zig zekeren den eenen voor de andere,
 met de Luyverfugas der Generale Nederlandsche
 goetvrijde Oost-Indische Compagnie
 O Heeren Martin Wilhelm Hülle,
 Friedrich Megänder, Christian
 Wilhelm Hetsen en Johan Berge-
 dius Scharfow te zijn overeen gestroomt en van
 haan te hebben getoed: een quantiteit van
 225000 duizent of Achtthien duizent
 Tient Pils Thon; ten Tijde van Twalf
 Thailen en vijf maazen te den Pils van 6.
 122½ de Hollands gewicht.
 Beloven mits deuren in bester Torine het be-
 draagen van voorn: 16000 of 18000 Pils
 Thon te zullen voldoen in nieuwe ronde Spaanse
 Realen te 11 chineze pondlijnen de Real geueken;
 binnen den Tijde van Een sonderth Daagen na dato dezes.
 Verbinden her daer koming van geen voorrecht
 is in bester Torine, en yder voor zig zekeren den eenen
 voort

voor de aandrif, onze Perzoonen en generality
 alle onze Goederen, niet gaders die van onze Erven,
 dezelve stellen de ten Bedraving van alle
 Rechten en Rechten.

In kennis der Waarde zijn hiervan gemaakt
 twee eensluydende en niet onzer gewoone Hand-Te-
 keningen en Leegule beknopte Verband-
 schriften, mits den eene volgeen zijnde de
 andere van geender Waarde is.

Canton in China den 29^{en} August 1760.

De Naam van Semqua is doorgeaalt, niet daarom
 als of denzelven niet onzer Tjakt. Semqua in fomp-
 docht, neen, maar om dat die twee Leiden maaden Torzoo
 representeren, en met haar bijden niet anders aangemerkt
 worden als Chetqua en Pritia, jacht op zijn selvon.

立創車義豐行廣順行泰和行今買到
 河南大班未氏許力公班牙茶錫三船約共
 重萬陸千担至壹萬八千担每担價拾貳
 兩五錢實每壹百廿兩半作一担算花
 漆每員作貳分算其貨銀約一百日清
 楚此船此車一様寫立此布若交貨明白
 收回此其餘一布視為故布再始

乾隆廿五年七月廿二日義豐行創單

廣順行

泰和行



N^o 24.

813

Zij onbegescreven Tsja Hingwa
 en semqua in comp^e. Jan Chetqua &
 Loretia schinwa & alhier woonachtige kooplieden
 bekennen en verklaaren bij dezen een ieder voor zig
 zelve, en den een voor den ander; met de supercargos
 over den directen Handel der Generaale, Heeders
 Landsche geöctroyeerde Oost-Indische
 Compagnie voor dit loopende Jaar. O Heeren
 Martin Wilhelm Hall, Friedrich Megander
 Christian Willem Tüsfer & Johan Benedix
 Scharlow te zijn overeengekomen & met hun E^d
 te hebben gecontracteert: Om aan diegenen dewelke
 als hunne successoren van wegens de evengenoemde
 Heeders Landsche comp^e: alhier zullen komen te arriveren
 op ultimo Novembris van 't aanstaand² Jaar 1762
 te leveren: Vier duizent vijf hondert Thai-
 Lens oprecht de anking's Goud; van 't ordinair
 Gehalte van de eigentig Toekij. en wel konijnke
 van Een hondert zeventien Thailen zilver
 per de Paauw van Thien Thailen Goud; bedragende
 met het opgelte op het Spaans tegen 718 casjes de Spaans
 mact gerekent een somma van Vier & vijftig duizent
 Twee hondert drie & zestig Thailen, Twee ma-
 zen drie condrijnen & acht casjes. Welke
 evengenoemde somma van Th: 54263:2:3:8. aonions
 ondergescreven kon'volle Genoege door voornoemde

813 B

Heeren Superfargas in volgender voegen voldaan zijn
 Met 69 1/2 = 68 cattij Battoon Souratte in de ^{1ste} September
 Accourant gekocht in op de schaal ontfangen bedragende
 a. R. 9: 7: 5 G. den G. van 122 1/2 is een somma, van R. 6743: 8: 8
 Met 3576 G. 88 58/125 cattij Thien mede, in
 Accourant onder minder Tariff van hun R. 2
 gekocht in op de schaal ontfangen bedragende
 a. R. 12: 5: 5 G. G. van 122 1/2 is een somma van , 44711: - 5: 4
 Een obligatie de dato 31 Jan: Accourant ten
 laste van Tan Phetgia groot Rp: 3300: -
 Interest van 10/m tot heden = 1 1/2 % 495: -
 Deumende, wijf deze Obligatie met Interest = 3795:
 Spaans realen voor contante betalingen aan
 en renuntierend bij dezen op 't zieleltigste
 voorelt, de aanaing die wegens waaruyt die
 ook mochte grouyken; bedragende = 74 condr:
 G. te Spaans geuekent een somma van , 2808: 3: -
 & met het voorenstaande, samen het Montant van R. 52263: 2:
 Dus wij de hieromme genoemde 4500 Thailen sprucht
 de ankings Goud van 90 Toekij aan gehalten op bestem
 Tijde aan de, Toonder of, Thooners dezes vrijen,
 vranck. int. h. aanstaande, Handel saizoen, verplicht
 zijn en beloven afgeueven. Verbindende wijf het
 de aarhoming van deze, Contract in voor d' ontfange

81A

Tenn ingent een zijder zo wel voor zijn gedeelte, als voor h
 geheel onze, Verzoonen en generalijk alle, onze Goede-
 ren mits gaders die, van onze, Ewens, Heilend, durek-
 en ten bedwang van alle, Rechten en Rechten,
 en reunt teuren bij deuren op h solemniteit, en doen
 afstand van alle, vrijheden die, ons teegenswoordige, of
 hoekomende Lands wetten ten onslag of vernietiging
 van deze, Borgschaps den een voor den ander en
 Tijd en wijle, zonder kiennen komen, aan de, hand te
 geven. In Teeken der waarheid zijn hiervan
 gemaakt, vier eens ley dende, en mits onze, gewone, Land-
 Teekening, te zegels bekrachtigde, verbandschrieten,
 mits den een, voldaan zijnde, d'andre, drie, van geender
 waarde zullen zijn.

In de, Noord-er Landsche, Factorij, te Canton in China,
 den 30 de Novembers 1760.

荷蘭大班來氏聯叻公班牙來銀五萬四千貳
 百六拾三月零三分八厘花分每員作貳分四厘
 算折申每員貳分八厘實重銀五萬貳
 千六百五拾兩言明做誠色金價比自算該
 金肆千五百兩其金約至來年冬間荷蘭尾
 船開行日交清不悞此單一樣至立四帝
 若交金清楚日收回一帝其餘三帝視
 為故帝此照

乾隆廿五年十月廿四日義豐行

廣順行

泰和行



HISTORY

other for the best terms. After the three partners had agreed on what they wanted, then Chetqua provided the channel through which communication and negotiation could flow to Poankeequa. It was always a very cumbersome ordeal for the Co-hong to reach a consensus, but with the three men working together, they had the means to bring it about. It is not likely they could have accomplished anything if all four houses had been operating completely independent of each other.³³

The 1760s brought several changes and challenges to the alliance. In January 1763, Swetia fell ill and retired to his women's house in the city, where he stayed for the next couple of months. On March 7 of the same year, the Dutch report that nothing could be done at Hunqua's house because Semqua was burying his father who had died ten years before. There was a grand procession with many members of the family in attendance to carry the body to the new gravesite.³⁴ Then on March 16 Swetia passed away at the young age of 42.

Hunqua went to console the family in the city, while Chetqua continued to watch over the trade. Everything appeared to be in good order in the Yan house, albeit it was still carrying a sizeable debt from Beauquiqua. Swetia's brother Ingsia took over the management, and the partners soon regained the trust of the Dutch and everything continued as before.³⁵

In December 1763 Hunqua's daughter fell ill, which left him in much distress. He must have been somewhat relieved when news arrived the following February of Tinghu passing the imperial exams, but then Hunqua himself fell ill a few months later. He was laid up in his women's house in the city from April to July of 1764 and again the following year in November and December. By January 1766 Hunqua was back in his factory taking care of the Dutch orders for the coming year.³⁶

It is at this time that we see Semqua becoming more directly involved with the foreigners. In February and March 1766 Semqua made contracts directly with the Danes in his own name, but under the chop of the

Yifeng Hang. Illustration 5 shows one of these contracts, and Hunqua's name does not appear anywhere on the document. Semqua also carried on some direct trade with the DAC in 1767 and 1768 (see Schedule), and, as is mentioned above (and shown in Table C), he was taking out loans directly from the Swedes to finance the trade. Semqua's increased involvement is probably partially due to Hunqua's now fragile physical condition.³⁷

In 1767 and 1768 the Cai, Yan and Chen consortium contracted silk with the EIC, but most of the English trade was done on their individual accounts. The information is incomplete, but we know that Hunqua was security for one EIC ship in 1761, two in 1764, and three in 1768. Ingsia and Chetqua were also securing EIC ships, and Ingsia's family was supplying about 40 percent or more of the DAC cargoes. The Yans continued to finance the Canton junks as well, so the alliance held their market share fairly well in the 1760s.³⁸

In November 1768 both a son and a daughter of Hunqua's fell ill, and this time his daughter did not recover. After her death, Hunqua was said to have grown reticent about the trade. At this time the Swedes refer to him as "old" and "blind", which shows he was rather frail and advanced in years now. Then in March 1770 one of Hunqua's sons reported to the Dutch supercargoes that his father had fallen very ill. He was carried to his women's house in the city. On May 1, at six in the evening, Hunqua died.³⁹

The passing of Hunqua created many difficulties for the trade in general because he had been at the centre of the commerce for four decades. There was no other dominant figure like Hunqua among the members of the alliance that could fill his shoes, so it sent the partnership into confusion for a short time. Moreover, Hunqua did not name a successor because, as is pointed out above, the Yifeng Hang was actually in Semqua's name, albeit the sons clearly had a share in it as well.

Because Semqua was not a favourite of the Dutch, and because the VOC trade was the core of their business, he needed to find a way to keep them happy. The Dutch were willing to continue with Semqua if he would join into partnership with someone else such as Young Huyqua (Chen Anguan 陈安观). They trusted Huyqua and thought this arrangement might help the Yifeng Hang get through this transitional

Illustration 4:
Gold Contract dated 30 November 1760 for 4,500 taels (weight) of Nankin's gold (450 shoes of 10 taels each) of 90 percent fineness. The VOC paid the total amount of 54,263.238 taels (currency) to Hunqua, Semqua, Chetqua and Swetia in the form of tin, cotton, and silver coin. The gold is to be delivered to the VOC in Canton by 30 November 1762. (NAH: VOC 4387).

HISTORY

period, but Huyqua wanted nothing to do with the suggestion.⁴⁰

After Hunqua's passing, there were several months before the season began, so there was time to work out a solution. Moreover, Hunqua's eldest son Tinghu in Beijing had to be notified of his father's passing. He was expected to arrive at Guangzhou within a month or a month and a half. Then there would be forty days of mourning and funerary ceremonies for their father, so the Dutch did not anticipate anything happening with the trade for at least three months.⁴¹

SEMQUA-ANQUA AND COMPANY

The discussion over the successor of the Yifeng Hang began again in late July. By early August, it had been decided that Hunqua's second son Anqua would succeed him in the business in partnership with Semqua. They became known as Semqua-Anqua and Company (with Anqua's brothers making up the "Company"). For the time being, this arrangement satisfied the Dutch. The VOC continued with the Yifeng Hang as before, and, having the support of the Yans and Chens, helped to alleviate any doubts or misgivings. But Semqua was put to the test shortly after he took over.⁴²

The Dutch approached Semqua about 175 chests of Bohea that had been purchased from Hunqua in 1769 and that were found to be of poor quality when they arrived in Holland. The VOC supercargoes now demanded retribution. Hunqua had apparently made this sale on his own, as Semqua refused to stand security for the loss saying that it was none of his concern. Anqua, however, stepped in and agreed to replace the damaged tea for the sake of his father's reputation.⁴³

The EIC also continued with the Yifeng Hang, but under Anqua's management. For some unknown reason, Semqua is missing from the narratives about the English trade in almost all of the secondary literature (including Morse). These omissions are probably due to his name being confused with other persons rather than non-involvement. Cheong found some references to a person like Semqua in the EIC records, but there

is much confusion about who he was. Cheong shows Hunqua and Semqua trading out of the Jufeng Hang rather than the Yifeng Hang, and he suggests that this Semqua (spelled "Samqua") may have been another name for Hunqua's son Anqua (who of course is not connected to the Jufeng Hang, but rather the Yifeng Hang). Nevertheless, the fact that Cheong found a person like Semqua in the English records suggests that a fresh look at those sources may yield some new information about him.⁴⁴

The VOC contracted with Semqua and Anqua in 1770 as they had done before under the consortium, and the Dutch also did some direct business with the Yifeng Hang and Tayqua individually (see Table B). Tayqua had been trading on his own for many years, but now also the youngest son, Tsjonqua, begins to show up in the records. In 1772 Tsjonqua contracted with the DAC, and within a couple of years he was trading with the EIC and VOC as well (see Schedule).

In early February 1771 the Dutch accused Semqua and his writer Thomking of giving the good tea that they had contracted to the English. This was a very touchy matter because any loss in confidence such as this could quickly lead to losing a customer. Hunqua had been very careful in the past to make sure such reshuffling of stock was not done, as he knew the Dutch were likely to catch it. This matter probably also has a connection to the problems that Anqua was soon to have with the English.

Ch'en mentions that in early 1771 Anqua was offered one-eighth of the EIC woollens to be applied towards tea contracts in the coming season, but he turned them down. Later in the season, however, he changed his mind and made a contract with the company. He did the same in 1772 but then began to fall behind with the EIC. He could not settle his account by the time the English left for Macao in early 1773 so had to sign a bond for the debt. When they returned in September, Anqua could still not pay them, so they sent a letter to the governor-general and Hoppo complaining of a breach of contract. After several correspondences, Anqua was ordered by the Hoppo to pay his debt to the EIC, half on the first day and half on the last day of the eleventh moon, but when the time came, he was still more than 7,000 taels short.⁴⁵

Then on 13 March 1771 Chetqua died, which brought further questions to the already delicate relationship with the Dutch. Chetqua's brother Tinqua

Illustration 5:
Tea Contract dated 24 March 1766 with Semqua of the Yifeng Hang, to deliver 1,080 to 1,100 piculs of Bohea tea to the DAC, at 17.8 taels per picul. The tea is to be packed in 400 chests, and the DAC pays 10 taels per picul in advance and the remainder when the first Danish ship arrives. (RAC: Ask 1156b).

HISTÓRIA

had actually been running the Chen house for the past two or three years because Chetqua had been sick much of the time. The Dutch continued with the consortium in the 1771 and 1772 seasons but were not happy with the way things were going. There was much confusion in 1772 as to whether or not any trade should be done with the Yifeng Hang. The Dutch approached Anqua's younger brother Tayqua in August 1772 to find a solution to their problems.⁴⁶

TAYQUA AND BROTHERS

Tayqua was ill at the time, but he answered the Dutch that as much as he wanted to trade with the company, he could not do it without Ingsia and Tinquá as there would likely be no profit to be made, and it would also generate bad feelings amongst the Chinese. By the early 1770s the Dutch had already begun to refer to Tayqua as being "old", which is interesting because he was not very old. If he were born in the late 1720s or early 1730s as is suggested above, then he would have been at the most in his late-forties at this time. He is not distinguished from another younger Tayqua, so we must assume that he did indeed appear old to the Dutch. The debts that had now accumulated were certain to have weighed heavy on Tayqua's conscience, which may partially account for his old appearance.⁴⁷

In the meantime, other merchants were running into financial troubles as well. In 1771 Tjobqua (Cai Yuguan 蔡玉官) of the Jufeng Hang 聚丰行 began falling behind on his payments. In January 1772 he was followed by Wayqua (Ni Hongwen 倪宏文) of the Fengjin Hang 丰晋行. He could not pay the English the more than 11,000 taels that he owed them, and he undoubtedly had more debts owed to others.⁴⁸ Because Tiauqua (Ye Zhaoguan 叶朝官) of the Guangyuan Hang 广源行 was also connected to the Fengjin Hang, this put that house in worse shape as well. In 1773 Tiauqua could not satisfy his commitments, but he managed to make it through until the next year. About the same time, Ingsia started falling behind on his payments, and the repercussions from that began to weaken the solvency of Tinquá's firm (which would surface a couple of years later).⁴⁹

Since about 1767/1768, Hunqua and Semqua had been taking out loans from the Swedes to help finance the trade. By December 1772 the Swedes were

still carrying a loan for the Yifeng Hang of 5,000 taels at 20 percent interest per year. If the principle could not be settled, then at least the interest on the loan had to be paid each year. The Swedes continued to receive payment on this loan up until at least 1781, which reflects the hard times the firm was now experiencing.

The Dutch finished out the 1773 season with Anqua and Semqua, but then Tayqua and his other brothers took over the VOC part of the trade. On 11 August 1774 the Dutch report that Semqua had received permission from the Mandarins to transfer the Hong merchant rights of the Yifeng Hang to Tayqua. This clearly establishes that Semqua was indeed in charge of the Yifeng Hang all along, as the Chinese documents suggest. Semqua was an old man now, at least in his sixties or seventies. We can only assume that he probably departed the business penniless. He could certainly not divert any funds away from the Yifeng Hang because all of his family's property would have been subject to confiscation as well in order to pay the firm's debts. Unfortunately, Semqua disappears from the records thereafter, so we have no knowledge of what happened to him.⁵⁰

Tayqua and his brothers "Schonqua" (Tsjonqua) and Sequa took over the business, but the first thing that had to be done was to settle the debts. By this time, the arrears of the Yifeng Hang had grown to well over half a million taels. At the end of the 1774 season, the Hong could not pay the customs duties that were due, so the house was seized and all the effects were sold to pay the arrears.

In February 1775 the Mandarins ordered Tayqua to pay the remaining 500,000 taels to the foreigners (200,000 of which belonged to private English traders and their agents) in ten equal instalments over a ten-year period. As was usually the case, the foreigners were not allowed to charge interest on those arrears, so as long as no new debts were incurred the principle would not grow larger.

Much of Tayqua's debt seems to have accumulated under Semqua and Anqua's management. Servicing such a huge debt was a formidable task in the very competitive environment that had now emerged after the closing of the Co-hong. In order to alleviate his burden somewhat, Tayqua approached the Dutch to see if the company would consider passing a portion of his arrears to his eldest brother. It is not clear which brother he is referring to, but the eldest

HISTORY

would be the Mandarin Tinghu. Anqua died sometime in late 1774 or the first half of 1775, but if he was alive at the time, the eldest brother could perhaps refer to him as well (he was the oldest brother involved in the trade). The Dutch answered Tayqua by saying that such transferring of debt was not something they could do simply upon his requesting it, and thus rejected his suggestion.⁵¹

The debt dilemma was certain to have hung very heavily on the consciences of all the Hong merchants at the end of the 1774 season. It was very clear now that some person or persons were not going to survive the next season. By the summer of 1775 Anqua had already died in debt, and on 3 July Tiaqua passed away. His father had died ten years before, leaving a sizeable debt behind, and now Tiaqua suffered the same end. His Guangyuan Hang, which had been a mainstay of the trade for several decades, was declared insolvent and liquidated over the following months. In July 1775 the Swedes record the debts of Hunqua's house to be much larger—800,000 taels—which suggests that the figures above are lacking some numbers. Tayqua, however, was soon relieved of his burden, as the Dutch report on September 8 that he had also passed away (it is not clear when).

In the summer of 1775 Tsjonqua stepped into this very dismal environment. He was allowed to succeed Tayqua in the Yifeng Hang under the same promise of settling the debts within ten years. There was much talk going around at the time about establishing a new Co-hong, but it never happened. With the loss of two brothers, the collapse of a former partner, a couple of houses in ruins, and a huge debt now hanging over his head, Tsjonqua faced formidable odds when he took command of the business in September.⁵²

TSJONQUA AND THE COLLAPSE OF THE YIFENG HANG

Unlike some of the other members of the Yifeng Hang, such as Semqua and Tayqua, there is considerable information in the English records about Tsjonqua. As a result, we already know a good deal about him from previous studies. His proper name was Cai Zhaofu 蔡昭复, but he was more commonly known by the English as “Seunqua” (Xiangguan 相官, with many different spellings). Because this name is so often

confused with that of his father, with Semqua, and with his brother Anqua, we have chosen to use the Dutch spelling Tsjonqua instead.

Considering all that Tsjonqua was up against when he took over the business in 1775, it is amazing that he was able to finish out the year. He filled the contracts as agreed upon, but fell short of making all of the debt payments. Because of his young age and his recent misfortune of losing his father (and brothers), Governor-General Li Shiyao 总督李侍尧 showed him leniency and allowed him to delay the first payments. For these reasons, and because of his good reputation, the English agreed not to press the issue, but allowed their payments to slide to the next year.

Thus, the first season ended with the foreigners wary of Tsjonqua's precarious financial status, but more or less satisfied with his performance. He won more contracts in the off-season with the VOC and the DAC, which was not spectacular, but nonetheless helped to put the Yifeng Hang on the road to recovery. Tsjonqua was even able to make a payment to the EIC.

For other merchants the doom and gloom was not over yet. In 1776, Wayqua was beaten and imprisoned for the debts he had accumulated. He was later banished to Ili by order of the emperor but died in prison the next year before the sentence was carried out. Tjobqua also died sometime in 1776, leaving behind close to 120,000 taels in debts.⁵³ The two houses that were formerly Tayqua's partners were now under the management of Ingsia and Coqua, and both of them fell behind on their payments in 1777.

Surprisingly, Tsjonqua managed to make it through the 1777 season, despite losing the DAC contract. He continued through the next season as well, making some progress on his debt payments. At the end of 1778 Coqua's Guangshun Hang collapsed with 800,000 taels in arrears. Ingsia and Tsjonqua took over a portion of this debt, which weakened them even more.

Ingsia's Taihe Hang was now in very serious trouble, as was a partner of his—Kousia (Zhang Tianqiu 张天球). At the end of 1779 Ingsia's foreign debt amounted to about one million taels, Kousia's to about 288,000 taels, and Tsjonqua's to over 460,000 taels (and maybe much more according to the Swedes). Tsjonqua managed to hold out, but the former two were forced into bankruptcy. Their houses and effects were confiscated, and then in early 1780 they were both exiled to Ili as punishment for their debts.⁵⁴

HISTÓRIA

As precarious as things were, Tsjonqua somehow managed to make some progress with his payments. The collapse and removal of the other houses was actually a temporary boost to him, as he could rapidly step in to pick up market share. There was usually a delay in transferring debts from one merchant to another, so this time gave him a little reprieve. With an expanded volume, he gained wherewithal to service more debt. From 1777 to 1780 his share of the VOC cargos increased each year, more than doubling over the four-year period (see Table B). We do not have figures for the DAC trade in these years, but the journals that have survived show Tsjonqua making contracts for several years, with 1779 being rather substantial (see Schedule). Because he made some progress on his debt payments, the Hoppo continued to be lenient with him and did not force him into bankruptcy or press him for full compliance with the debt payment schedule.⁵⁵

This marginal success, however, turned to the worse in 1781. Tsjonqua landed a contract for Bohea tea with the English that year, but they were unhappy with the quality he delivered, and discontinued further dealings with him. Because of war, only one VOC ship showed up in China this year, which greatly reduced his business with the Dutch. He contracted some tea with the DAC, but it was also not on the scale as before.

The next year was much worse. No Dutch ships showed up in 1782 because they were all captured or destroyed in the war with the English. Tsjonqua's contracts were extended to the following year, but to no avail. The Dutch supercargoes remained in Macao throughout the war, so Tsjonqua could discuss affairs with them, but without any money or any ships, there was very little the Dutch could do. Tsjonqua also had no trade with the Danes or English this year, and without trade, he was finished.

In early 1783 the Hoppo ordered Tsjonqua to sell his last remaining property, the Dutch factory, so he could pay the emperor's duties that he owed. The next year his ten-year repayment schedule was about to come due, so the Hoppo wrote to the emperor informing him of the situation and recommended that the remaining foreign debts be distributed to the merchants who were guarantors for the Yifeng Hang. The emperor approved the suggestion, the debt was redistributed, and the business was closed for good.⁵⁶

Thus despite Tsjonqua's hard work and good intentions, the Yifeng Hang was just not meant to survive.

Tsjonqua owed the VOC over 30,500 taels, which was distributed equally to the merchants Tan Tsjoouqua (Chen Zuguan 陈祖官), Monqua, Pinqua (Yang Bingguan 杨丙官) and Kiouqua (Wu Qiaoguan 伍乔官). They agreed to pay the debt in four equal instalments over four years.⁵⁷ The name of the Yifeng Hang continues to show up in the records thereafter, but only in connection to the debt payments. Tsjonqua and his remaining brother(s) now also disappear from the records, and nothing more is known of what became of them.

THE CAI AND QIU TRADE IN SUMMARY

Histories of the Hong merchants provide us with an insight into China's unique form of capitalism and give us a better understanding of early modern global trade in general, but often at the expense of the merchants themselves. Because most of the historical material deals specifically with their business dealings, and because so many of those businesses ended in failure, the conclusion is to some degree already predetermined to be very negative. After decades of hard work and many contributions made to society and to China's economy, such an outcome does not seem fitting, proper or fair. Rather than allow the business to dictate the conclusion, we will instead summarize Cai and Qiu enterprises below and draw some parallels with the Yan family trade (recently published). These examples and information will enable us to comment on the wider environment so that we can better understand their situations.

There are many parallels between Cai and Qiu (Hunqua and Semqua) enterprises and those of Yan and Huang (Texia and Simon). Both of the firms began in the early 1730s, both were a closely knit two-person partnership working out of one firm, both had many sons and relatives working for them, both of them had about an equal share of the market, and both of them were ruined by the early 1780s. Semqua often operated as Hunqua's silent partner working behind the scenes and indirectly with the foreigners, much like Simon (Huang Ximan) did with Texia (Yan Deshe). Semqua and Simon probably took care of the Chinese side of

HISTORY

their businesses, which would account for their limited mention in the foreign records. Hunqua and Texia, on the other hand, were very active in dealing with the foreigners and thus show up in the foreign records frequently.

Both firms purchased their tea, porcelain and silk directly from inland producers (or perhaps their brokers there), which means they did not depend on the inland middlemen who came to Canton each year. Choosing their goods directly from the source gave them more control over quantities and qualities, which was essential for landing large contracts with the foreigners. But purchasing direct also meant that they had to come up with their own capital to forward to the interior, which means they were heavily dependent on foreign credit to keep the trade going. Unless a merchant was already independently wealthy, there was no other way to become a big player except with credit.

Credit, however, had many things attached to it. High interest of 20 percent per year or 2 percent per month was very common. Table C shows the loans that Hunqua, Semqua and Anqua took out from the Swedes in the 1760s, and it was no different from what the Yans were doing at the same time. In fact, almost all of the Hong merchants were borrowing money from private individuals, but as far as Cai-Qiu and the Yans were concerned (Simon disappears in 1744), these were periphery loans that helped but were not the heart of their support. They rather depended on one company for the bulk of their capital. Cai and Qiu enterprises catered to and favoured the Dutch, just like the Yan merchants depended on the Danes. Poankeequa was also depending heavily on the SOIC money each year, and Cai Suyqua on the French, and so on and so forth. Aligning oneself with one of the foreign firms was the only way to ensure continual and constant access to investment capital, which was vital for expansion. With the establishment of long-term friendships came a more stable environment, because everyone had a good idea of what to expect each year. With more stability came more predictability and security to profits, and with the latter came more investors to China to finance the expansion. Because all of the different factions were competing with each other, those relationships also kept downward pressure on the prices of export goods. Thus, the formation of these closely knit Chinese-foreign relationships was an essential component in the growth of the port.

But in order to maintain those close relationships over time, the Chinese merchants had to offer competitive prices and terms so as not to discourage their patrons. We see this in Hunqua regularly arranging loans for the Dutch and offering them favourable prices to assure that he received their cash advances each year. Many of these preferential agreements that the Cais made with the Dutch and that the Yans made with the Danes were done secretly and out of the purview of the other Chinese merchants, the other foreigners, and often outside of the knowledge of the Co-hong as well. Thus, despite the Co-hong's control over the trade in the 1760s, there was much competition going on that helped to minimise the negative effects of that monopoly. This is an important point to make because it is what kept the foreigners coming back each year.

Because of the many similarities between the Cai-Qiu and Yan (and Chen) operations, it made good sense for them to form an alliance in 1758. They needed to trade in large volumes in order to have the wherewithal to service debts such as those of the failed merchant Beauquiqua. Because they had to offer preferential terms and/or prices to the foreigners in order to get the capital they needed, it made sense for them to join together (with the Chens) to gain better control of and influence over the prices and the markets. In theory, this influence could help protect their profit margins, which in turn would give them more stability.

Shortly after the formation of the alliance, however, we also see the Co-hong being established, which was certainly not a coincidence. The alliance was the three partners' solution to their capital and debt problems, just as the Co-hong was Poankeequa's solution to keeping the three houses from running the trade. He had government backing because it was also in the interests of the government to maintain a competitive environment and at the same time help officials to manage the failures.

The Co-hong successfully prevented Hunqua and associates from dominating the trade. The fact that the Cai, Yan and Chen partnership was not forced to dismantle also indicates that officials understood the rationale behind the alliance. There were, of course, other factors connected to the creation of the Co-hong that are not necessary to bring up here, but the point is that better management was needed to control failures, while at the same time maintain competition. Either

HISTÓRIA

one of these factors could have a very negative impact on growth, which could not be tolerated.

The downside of this structure presented above is that as merchants gained market share and wealth, they also became more likely targets for the assumption of debts. It also meant that they would have to “donate” to local administrative budgets when there were insufficient funds to meet demands. We have not dealt with this latter issue in this study as we have no good examples in the sources to show Hunqua and Semqua making these “contributions”, but other studies clearly show that the government used this option regularly and none of the merchants were exempt from the extractions.⁵⁸

Another negative aspect to maintaining a close relationship with one specific foreign company is that the ups and downs of that firm also affected the merchants. With the coming of war and the temporary collapse of the Dutch trade in 1781 and 1782, Tsjonqua was completely ruined. With the huge debt that he was carrying, it does not seem likely that he would have survived very much longer anyway, but we should not minimize the fact that this dependency on one main source of capital was a precarious one. Even if Tsjonqua had been in a good financial state at the time, the non-appearance of the Dutch vessels would still have been catastrophic to him because this was his main source of income and credit. Many of the Canton merchants were put to extremes like Tsjonqua when their trading partners failed to appear, and this was a consistent characteristic of the trade throughout the Canton era (c. 1700-1842).

The foreign companies, on the other hand, did not want to be tied to the successes and failures of the Chinese merchants, so they often limited the proportion of the trade that each firm could handle. The EIC is probably the classic example of this as it regularly proportioned out the trade each year to a variety of merchants so that one could not dominate the cargos. Other companies followed this scheme to some degree, but there are examples of ships and companies sometimes relying primarily on one firm for the great majority of their cargos.⁵⁹

Another downside to maintaining these close relationships was the need to satisfy the foreigners' demands so they would loosen their purse strings. This meant taking more imports at a good price in exchange for exports. The Dutch pressured the three partners

constantly to accept more VOC imports such as tin, cloves or nutmeg before agreeing to export contracts and before giving any loans or money advances. The English and others, of course, were doing the same. This practice meant that any loss on the sales of the imports would affect the profits of the exports.

During the 1760s Co-hong regulations helped to minimise the effects of tying sales to purchases (a practice known as “truck”) by regulating prices, quantities, amounts to be advanced, and even interest rates. Thus with the end of that organization in 1771, Hong merchant profits became more exposed to risk. To add insult to injury, the partnership, which had maintained influence over 40 to 50 percent of the market, also fell apart. Each man was then left to his own devices. This was a major blow to all three of them, and it sent them on a downward path to destruction. Thus in some respects, the business histories of the three firms are inseparable and really need to be considered as a whole in order to understand their outcomes. We now have histories of the Yan and the Cai businesses, and when the Chen branch is completed, we will likely learn much more about the other two as well.

Now if we return to the objectives of the government administrators again, we see a much different outcome. The Yifeng Hang held out as long as it could, but in the end it was expendable. As far as the trade was concerned, that failure did not matter, because there were others who could step in to keep everything moving along. The growth was not interrupted, despite the many houses that went down, and the trade machine just continued to pump out more volume decade after decade. Thus, when all is said and done, the real service that the Yifeng Hang provided throughout the many years of its operation was fuel for growth (competition).

CONCLUSION

Studies of the Hong merchants have not brought out the importance of the Cai and Qiu trade in the past primarily because of the difficulty of piecing that history together. With the new information presented above, we hope to begin to fill this void. But until we learn of the other two branches of the Cai family, we will still have a very limited understanding of the extent of their many contributions to the commerce and the city.

HISTORY

Hunqua and Semqua helped to lay the foundation upon which the Canton trade would grow over time. They built up their business slowly but steadily until they became central to the commerce in the 1750s. In 1758 Hunqua became one of the most influential men in the port with the formation of the Cai, Yan and Chen alliance. One word from Hunqua could make or break a contract, and he used that power to bring benefits to himself.

Despite his great influence, however, he never gained complete control of the trade. His arch enemy Poankeequa made sure that the three-member consortium always had competition, as did the officials governing the Co-hong. With the many fights that Hunqua had with Poankeequa in the Co-hong when deciding the terms of the trade each year, he and Semqua must have wished many times that they could find a way to eliminate that opposition. In the 1760s they were the closest to being able to accomplish this, but for the reasons mentioned above, they never reached a point where they could dominate the trade.

As is so often the case in history, it is very difficult to maintain balances when a prominent personage like Hunqua leaves the scene, regardless of whether it is in a political, social or commercial setting. After his death, the Yifeng Hang declined very rapidly and was never able to reach a balance between all of the interests of the business as Hunqua had done in the past. The fact that debts began accumulating almost immediately also suggests that there was little or no money in the Yifeng Hang's treasury. So far no hard evidence has emerged to show that Hunqua was insolvent when he died, but given the fact that there seemed to be no funds in reserve after being in business for four decades is evidence enough to say that things were not going well for the Yifeng Hang in Hunqua's later years. Nevertheless, the VOC, DAC and EIC all remained confident in him up until his death, which shows his great skills at diplomacy.

Semqua and Anqua managed to continue the trade for a couple of years, but then in 1774 with a large debt now draining their resources, both of them bailed out, and Tayqua stepped in, albeit with much apprehension. He did not like the idea of splitting with the old allies of Yan and Chen but had no choice in the matter. The disappointing and rapid decline of their business was certain to have hung very heavy on Anqua and Tayqua's perceptions and probably contributed to their early deaths.

Considering the formidable odds, Tsjonqua is the real hero of this story. Despite (or perhaps because of) his young age, he walked boldly into a very dismal situation and faced the ominous obstacles head on. This gained him the respect of everyone in Canton, including the governor-generals and the Hoppo who showed him great leniency in enforcing his debt payments. Tsjonqua definitely had some of the negotiating skills of his father, and he certainly had all of his optimism. The things that he accomplished in the first five years of taking over the business are nothing short of amazing.

But a turnaround of the Yifeng Hang was not going to happen. The failure of Coqua in 1778 and the assumption of a portion of his debts added to the firm's already weakened state. Tsjonqua was able to gain market share for a few years, and with the fall of Ingsia and Kousia in 1779 he gained considerable ground with the VOC, but the great dependency on that company was also part of the problem.

In the early 1780s war between the Dutch and the English broke out, which cut off the majority of Tsjonqua's credit and income in one blow. Only one VOC ship showed up in 1781, when there had previously been four each year, and none showed up in 1782. As a result, all of Tsjonqua's contracts and orders had to be cancelled or delayed, giving him no means of fulfilling his obligations. Tsjonqua, however, stayed at the helm right to the end, selling his last property to pay the emperor's duties. The fact that he received no punishment like Ingsia and Kousia is perhaps testimony to the respect that he had gained for his dedication and performance. Most of that debt had not been accumulated by him, so there was also less reason or justification for him to be exiled to Ili.

With these final paragraphs, we complete another history of one of Canton's great merchant-houses. The fact that this story ends very similarly to that of the Yans and the Yes (and the Chens, when it is written) suggests that we really need to approach these merchants differently from the way that we look at businesses in more recent times. The Hong merchants had enormous odds stacked against them, making it impossible for many of them to survive in the long term. Rather than pointing out all of the reasons for their failures, which many of them had no way of preventing anyway, it seems more appropriate that we simply expect that to be the outcome and focus our attention on the things that they did to keep the businesses operating as long as they did.

HISTÓRIA

In this respect, Tsjonqua provides us with a strong and positive ending. Even though there was little hope of surviving, he was not afraid to do whatever he could to help the firm recover. The loss of his father and brothers was certain to have weighed heavy on his thoughts at the time, but perhaps that was the source of his energy and ambition as well. He probably had many schemes in motion at the same time in the event that things turned this way or that way, as it is not likely he would have survived as long as he did without much tough negotiating and bending of the terms. He could not have predicted the sudden absence of the Dutch ships even if he had known that war was about to break out. Out of four VOC ships each year surely a couple of them would get through, but not so. And because he had few other alternatives, it probably would not have mattered even if he had known.

Tsjonqua knew (or at least learned) better than anyone that sometimes one has to be willing to risk failure in order to succeed. Considering all that had happened since his father's death in 1770 to the collapse of the firm in 1775, he was sure to have had many opportunities to back out of the business. After all, he had at least one older brother, Sequa (and maybe Tseonqua), who was still involved in the trade

and managed to avoid the responsibility, but if Tsjonqua had chosen to exit the scene without trying, then he would have failed before he had even started. Failure was not one of the options on Tsjonqua's optimistic agenda. If he had done the impossible and had turned the firm around as he had hoped, then we would now be writing about him as one of the great merchants of the eighteenth century, just like his father.

A NOTE ABOUT THE CITATIONS

References that have a signature in Chinese characters of the name of the merchants are noted with the bracketed superscript ^{“(s)”} such as RAC: Ask 2190^(s). References that have the name of the business in Chinese characters are listed with a ^{“(b)”}. References that have the superscript ^{“(s/b)”} have either a signature or business name or possibly both (unfortunately, these were not clearly referenced). References that have only a chop and nothing else are noted with the superscript ^{“(c)”}. **RC**

Author's note: Research conducted under the auspices of the Cultural Affairs Bureau of the Macao S.A.R. Government.

ABBREVIATIONS FOR SOURCES AND ARCHIVES

Ask	Danish Asiatic Company Archive in the National Archives, Copenhagen.		
Can	Canton Archive in the National Archives, The Hague. 1.04.20		
Ch'en	Ch'en Kuo-tung Anthony. <i>The Insolvency of the Chinese Hong Merchants, 1760-1843</i> . 2 vols. Taipei: Academia Sinica, 1990.	Liang	Qing Dynasty Concerning Macau), 2 vols. Macau 澳门 : Aomen Jijin Hui 澳门基金会, 1999. (The numbers listed are the document numbers rather than page numbers.)
Cheong	Cheong, Weng Eang. <i>Hong Merchants of Canton</i> . Copenhagen: NIAS-Curzon Press, 1997.		
GL	Göteborg, Landsarkivet (Provincial Archive). ÖIJ A406.	Morse	Morse, Hosea Ballou. <i>The Chronicles of the East India Company Trading to China, 1635-1834</i> , 5 vols., Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1926. Reprint, Taipei: Ch'eng-wen Publishing Co., 1966. (Numbers listed as 1:266 refer to vol. 1, page 266).
Irvine	Charles Irvine Archive at the James Ford Bell Library, University of Minnesota.	NAH	National Archives, The Hague.
JF	James Ford Bell Library, University of Minnesota. The B 1758 fNe collection contains Dutch records from Canton, 1758.	NM	Nordic Museum Archive, Stockholm. Godegårdsarkivet F17.
Lau	Lau Fong 刘芳 and Zhang Wenqin 章文钦, eds. <i>Qingdai Aomen Zhongwen Dang'an Huibian</i> 清代澳门中文档案汇编 (A Collection of Chinese Documents from the	RAC	Rigsarkivet (National Archives), Copenhagen
		VOC	Dutch East India Company Archive in the National Archives, The Hague. 1.04.02.

HISTORY

OTHER ABBREVIATIONS

A	Amber	pj	putchuk
Ak	Arrack	pm	polemiten (fabric)
Al	Alum	pp	pepper
An	Ankay tea	pq	Pekins (fabric)
Arm	Armenians	ps	powder sugar
B	Bohea tea	psy	Pordesoy (fabric)
Bg	Bing tea	pt	Perpetts (fabric)
By	Bottomry bond	Q	Quicksilver (mercury)
C	Congo tea	R	Rhubarb
Can	short for "Canton"	Rg	Radix galingale
CFI	French East India Company (Compagnie Française des Indes)	rm	ras de Maroque (Marocco)
ci	cinnabar	Rx	Radix China
cl	caneel (cinnamum)	S	Soulong tea
ct	cotton	sa	sago
cu	curcuma	sat	satin
D	Damask	Sc	Souchon tea
DAC	Danish Asiatic Company (Danske Asiatisk Compagnie)	Sl	Songlo tea
EIC	English East India Company	SOIC	Swedish East India Company (Svenske Ostindische Compagnie)
<i>fiador</i>	security merchant	sp	spelter
FR	Factory Rent	spw	sappanwood
G	Gold	SR	Snor Rottinger (rattan cord)
ga	galingale	sta	Star Anise
GIC	Ostend General India Company	su	sugar
gn	gorgoran (fabric)	sw	sandalwood
Go	Gobie tea	tea	tea
Gt	Green tea	tin	tin
H	Heysen/Hyson tea	tu	tuttenage (zinc)
HS	Hyson/Heysen Skin tea	tx	textiles
J	Joosjes tea	Ty	Tunkay tea
la	lakenen (worsted fabric)	VOC	Dutch East India Company (Verenige Oostindische Compagnie)
ld	lead	w	woollens
mp	mother of pearl	z	silk
ms	muscus (musk)	zg	silk-geschilderde (painted silk)
Nk	Nankins	zr	silk-raw (unprocessed)
Nl	Nanking linen	zt	silk textiles
P	Porcelain	ZZ	Ziou Zioun tea
Pc	Peco tea		
PcZZ	Peco-Ziou Zioun tea		

HISTÓRIA

NOTES

- 1 One of the Cais is reported to have owned the I-ho factory in the early eighteenth century. Ch'en Kuo-tung Anthony, *The Insolvency of the Chinese Hong Merchants, 1760-1843* (Taipei: Academia Sinica, 1990), 307; Cheong Weng Eang, *Hong Merchants of Canton* (Copenhagen: NIAS-Curzon Press, 1997), 86; and National Archives, The Hague (NAH): Canton 19.
- 2 In one reference, Cheong appears to have understood that Ton Hunqua and Chai Hunqua were two different persons, but then in another reference he refers to them as if they are the same person. Cheong, *Hong Merchants*, 39, 70 n. 58 and n. 62.
- 3 NAH: Canton 7, 17, 79.
- 4 Cheong claims to have followed Cai Hunqua back to "around 1728" under the name "Young Hunqua", but no reference is given. He sometimes confuses Ton Hunqua with Chai Hunqua, so it is not clear that the "Young Hunqua" he mentions is actually a reference to Cai, but it is possible. Cheong, *Hong Merchants*, pp. 70 n. 58 and 62, pp. 71 n. 70, pp. 86.
- 5 Cheong refers to a "Chua Teinqu", "Cha Tenqua" and "Chwan Tinqu", which are possibly references to Cai Hunqua. Ch'en mainly deals with a later period, so he did not consult many of the earlier documents in his study. Ch'en mentions that Cai Hunqua was already active in the trade as early as 1741, but we know from other sources that he started much earlier. Cheong, *Hong Merchants*, 71 n. 70; and Ch'en, *Insolvency*, 261.
- 6 For a few examples of the problems in identifying Seunqua, see Liang Jiabin 梁嘉彬. *Guangzhou Shisan Hang Kao* 广州十三行考 (Study of the Thirteen Hong of Canton) (1937; reprint, Taipei: 1960; reprint, Guangdong: Renmin Chubanshe, 1999), 270-272; Cheong, *Hong Merchants*, 82, 94-98; Ann Bolbach White, "The Hong Merchants of Canton" (Ph.D. diss., University of Pennsylvania, 1967), 55-56; Ch'en, *Insolvency*, 261-268; and Hosea Ballou Morse, *The Chronicles of the East India Company Trading to China, 1635-1834*, 5 vols. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1926; reprint, Taipei: Ch'eng-wen Publishing Co., 1966), 5:13.
- 7 James Ford Bell Library, University of Minnesota (JF): Charles Irvine Papers; Gothenburg, Landsarkivet (Provincial Archive) (GL): ÖIJ A406; and Nordic Museum Archive, Stockholm. Godegårdsarkivet Archive (NM): F17.
- 8 See references above and Cheong, *Hong Merchants*, 71 nn. 70 and 74.
- 9 Louis Dermigny, *La Chine et l'Occident. Le Commerce a Canton au XVIII^e Siècle 1719-1833*. 3 vols. (Paris: S.E.V.P.E.N., 1964), 834; and Henri Cordier, "Les Marchands Hanistes de Canton," *Toung Pao* 3 (1902): 281-315.
- 10 Lau Fong 刘芳 and Zhang Wenqin 章文钦, eds., *Qingdai Aomen Zhongwen Dangan Huibian* 清代澳门中文档案汇编 (A Collection of Qing Chinese Documents Concerning Macau) 2 vols. (Macau: Aomen Jijinhui Chubanshe 澳门基金会, 1999), nos. 1367-8; Liang, *Shisan Hang Kao*, 270-272; Cheong, *Hong Merchants*, 82; and White, "The Hong Merchants of Canton", 55-56.
- 11 Ch'en states that this Teunqua was active by 1739, and he shows up in the Dutch and Swedish records as well. There is much confusion in Cheong's book about who this man is. Cheong seems to be identifying him as either "Teunqua I" or "Teunqua II" and traces his branch of the family back to 1734, but this part of the story is very confusing, and there seems to be some cross-referencing to other Cais (Hunqua or Suyqua). Ch'en, *Insolvency*, 307; and Cheong, *Hong Merchants*, 170-171.
- 12 Cordier, "Les Marchands Hanistes de Canton", 306; Liang, *Shisan Hang Kao*, 221.
- 13 In 1737, Semqua appears as "Felix Hongvua" in the Danish records selling Bohea tea, and in 1742, there are many references connecting him (with various spellings: Phalix, Pfelix, etc.) with Honqua. He is shown to be very active in the trade, but Hunqua's name is the one that appears more often in the foreign records. In 1743 the Danes listed the Canton Hong merchants with whom they were trading, and Semqua does not appear, but we know from other records that he was involved with them. In 1755 the Danes again list the nine prominent merchants with whom they did business, and again no Semqua (or Felix), but in both of those lists Cai Hunqua is mentioned. In 1754 the Dutch supercargoes mention in a report that Hunqua had been master of his own business since 1749, but the examples above show that he had already established himself firmly with the Dutch as early as 1742 and was trading on his own since the early 1730s. Moreover, as has been shown, Semqua was the owner of their house—not Hunqua. NAH: Canton 19; Rigsarkivet, Copenhagen (RAC): Ask 1117, 1121; Cheong, *Hong Merchants*, 72 n. 81; NAH: VOC 2410, 4375; Ch'en, *Insolvency*, 261; and Morse, *Chronicles*, 1:234, 258.
- 14 Paul A. Van Dyke, "The Yan Family: Merchants of Canton 1734-1780s" *Review of Culture*, International Edition 9 (January 2004), 30-85.
- 15 Van Dyke, "The Yan Family," 30-85.
- 16 RAC: Ask 1117, 1121.
- 17 NAH: Canton 22, 26, 27, 34, 72-73, 79-80.
- 18 NAH: Canton 22, 73; and *Panyu Xian Zhi* 番禺县志. I am indebted to Dong Shaoxin 董少新 at Zhongshan University for finding this reference to Cai Tinghu.
- 19 NAH: Canton 22, 73; and *Panyu Xian Zhi*.
- 20 We know the managers of five of the junk factories in the 1760s, and Semqua is not among them. The manager of the Chapgi Hang is not known. NAH: Canton 25, 72; Paul A. Van Dyke, "Port Canton and the Pearl River Delta, 1690-1845," (Ph.D. diss., University of Southern California, 2002), Appendixes O, P and Q; and Paul A. Van Dyke, *The Canton Trade* (Hong Kong University Press, forthcoming). We know that this junk factory next to the Dutch factory was outfitting junks for many years as the Dutch mention in 1785 that it had caught fire and was full of merchandise, but the fire was extinguished in time. NAH: Canton 91. The Chapgi Hang is also mentioned in the *Yuehaiguan Zhi*. Liang Tingnan 梁廷楠, *Yuehaiguan Zhi* 粤海关志 (Gazetteer of Guangdong Maritime Customs) 5 vols. (1839; reprint in 1 vol., Guangzhou: Guangzhou Renmin Chubanshe 广州人民出版社, 2001), 496.
- 21 Van Dyke, "Port Canton," Chapter Five and Appendixes O, P and Q; and Van Dyke, "The Yan Family."
- 22 Paul A. Van Dyke and Cynthia Viallé, *The Canton-Macao Dagregisters*, 1762 (Macao: Cultural Institute, forthcoming), entry on September 29 and note 62; Van Dyke, "Port Canton," Chapter Five; and Van Dyke, "The Yan Family", 30-85.
- 23 NAH: Canton 25, 71, VOC 4394.
- 24 NAH: Canton 19-22; RAC: Ask 1135.
- 25 RAC: Ask 1143, 1145.
- 26 Van Dyke, "The Yan Family," 30-85; NAH: Canton 23-24, 73; and JF: B 1758 fNe. For a breakdown of the distributions of the overall trade in Canton in 1763, see Paul A. Van Dyke, "A Reassessment of the China Trade: The Canton Junk Trade as Revealed in Dutch and Swedish Records of the 1750s to the 1770s," in *Maritime China in Transition*, eds., Wang Gungwu and Ng Chin-keong (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2004), 151-167.
- 27 For a discussion of the limits of the Co-hong's administration in the 1760s, see Van Dyke, *The Canton Trade*, forthcoming.
- 28 NAH: Canton 25-26, 71-72.
- 29 Because of the cash shortage, the English had to borrow money from the Portuguese in Macao from 1763 to 1765 at 12 to 13 percent interest per year. NAH: Canton 29.
- 30 NAH: Canton 74. For a more thorough analysis of interest rates in Canton, see Van Dyke, "Port Canton," Chapter Five.

HISTORY

- 31 NAH: Canton 73.
- 32 For other examples of merchants trading in gold and its connection to the Nanjing silk trade, see Van Dyke, "The Yan Family," 40; and Van Dyke, *The Canton Trade*, forthcoming.
- 33 NAH: Canton 71.
- 34 NAH: Canton 72.
- 35 Van Dyke, "The Yan Family," 30-85.
- 36 NAH: Canton 73, 74; and *Panyu Xian Zhi*.
- 37 NAH: Canton 75; and RAC: Ask 1156b.
- 38 Morse, *Chronicles*, 5:137, 202-203; and Van Dyke, "The Yan Family," 30-85.
- 39 NAH: Canton 77; NM: F17; and Ch'en, *Insolvency*, 262, 269.
- 40 NAH: Canton 79.
- 41 NAH: Canton 79.
- 42 The new partnership was also called Anqua-Semqua and Company as the foreigners generally dealt with Anqua, not Semqua. NAH: Canton 79.
- 43 NAH: Canton 34.
- 44 Cheong and Ch'en mention that "Seunqua II" (Sy Anqua) succeeded Hunqua. Cheong, *Hong Merchants*, 82, 94-98, 124 n 64; and Ch'en, *Insolvency*, 262.
- 45 Cheong states that Hunqua was in debt "\$113,213 in 1763 and \$266,692 in 1775." This information and figures do not agree with other sources. Cheong has the wrong death date for Hunqua (he says 1775), and he seems to have much of Hunqua, Semqua and the Yifeng Hang's story mixed up with Tan Hunqua, Cai Suyqua or Cai Teunqua, so we have not used this reference. Cheong, *Hong Merchants*, 260-261.
- 46 Ch'en, *Insolvency*, 261-264; NAH: Canton 34.
- 47 NAH: Canton 81.
- 48 Cheong, *Hong Merchants*, 84-85; Dermigny, *Le Commerce à Canton*, 2:894-900; and Ch'en, *Insolvency*, 185-190, 259-260.
- 49 Van Dyke, "The Ye Merchants," forthcoming.
- 50 NAH: Canton 83.
- 51 Van Dyke, "The Ye Merchants," forthcoming; Ch'en, *Insolvency*, 264; and NAH: Canton 84.
- 52 As was mentioned at the beginning of this article, there is some confusion with all of these deaths. In Morse, who is quoting from the English sources, it is mentioned in 1780 that "Seunqua's" (Tsionqua) father died in 1774, but other sources clearly show that he was the youngest son and that his father Hunqua had died in 1770. The 1774 reference is perhaps a confusion with Anqua, who died either in 1774 or early 1775. Morse, *Chronicles*, 2:55. Ch'en, *Insolvency*, 264; NAH: Canton 84; NM: F17; and Van Dyke, "The Ye Merchants," forthcoming.
- 53 Cheong, *Hong Merchants*, 84-85; Dermigny, *Le Commerce à Canton*, 2:894-900; and Ch'en, *Insolvency*, 185-190, 259-260.
- 54 Van Dyke, "The Yan Family," 50; NM: F17; and Morse, *Chronicles*, 2:46, 54. Cheong mentions that Tsionqua ("Chao-fu") was in debt "\$603,061 in 1779." This may be true, but for the reasons stated in note 45, we have not used this reference. Cheong, *Hong Merchants*, 261.
- 55 Morse, *Chronicles*, 2:46, 55-56.
- 56 Ch'en, *Insolvency*, 267-268.
- 57 NAH: Canton 47.
- 58 Many examples of these type of extractions can be found in the records, and they came from both local and central administrations. Morse, *Chronicles*, vols. 1-5; Ch'en, *Insolvency*; Cheong, *Hong Merchants*; Liang, *Shisan Hang Kao*; Zhuang Guotu, *Tea, Silver, Opium and War: The International Tea Trade and Western Commercial Expansion into China in 1740-1840* (Xiamen: Xiamen University Press, 1994), 41-42; and Van Dyke, "The Ye Merchants," forthcoming.
- 59 See for example, Cudgin who handled more than 70 percent of the Ostend General India Company's cargos in 1725 and 1726 in Van Dyke, "The Ye Merchants," forthcoming.

HISTÓRIA

1) Semqua

Proper Names: Qiu Kun 邱崑 or 邱坤

TRADE NAMES: *Felix, Felix Samqua, Felix Honqua, Phyllis Hunqua, Fellis, Felis, Phalix Honqua, Felix Hounqua, Pfelix, Phelix Honqua, Fa Samqua, Sanqua, Sunqua, Ko Samqua, Macao Samqua, Jau Samqua, Gau Samqua, Gausamqua, Canton Samqua, Samqua, Semqua.*

BIOGRAPHICAL DATA	SOURCE
Date first mentioned in the records 1729	see sources below
Years trading in Canton 1729-1774	see sources below

SCHEDULE OF TRADING ACTIVITIES IN CANTON AND SOURCES					
YEAR	PARTNERS LISTED IN RECORDS	HONG	Co.	PRODUCTS OFFERED FOR SALE	NAME IN THESE SOURCES
1729	VOC	P	VOC 4375
1730	VOC	P	VOC 4375
1736	EIC	tea	Morse 1
1737	Hunqua	VOC	P	VOC 2410
1737	EIC		Cheong 72 n.90
1737	DAC	B	Ask 1117
1742	DAC	P,B	Ask 1121
1743	Tjaay Hunqua	VOC	D,sat,pq,gn,pw,B,P,Ty,pp, Sc,Sl,Bg,Q	Can 2, 69
1744	Tjahunqua	VOC	D,pq,ps,pp,P,tea,gn,tx	Can 3, 70
1745	VOC	z	Can 5, 70
1746	Tja Hunqua	VOC	mp,ct,B,D,pq	Can 5
1748	DAC	P,sa,ga	Ask 1126, 2200, 2201
1751	VOC	G	Can 13
1752	Hongqua, Taayqua	VOC	G,pp,rc,B,z,tx,Sl,H,Sc,C, Pc,ct,I	Can 7, 10, 14-17
1753	Hongqua, Taayqua	VOC	pt,rm,pm,mp,pw,pp,B,tin,P	Can 17, 19
1754	Honqua, Thayqua	Yifeng	VOC	cl,cv,ng,G,Ty,C,Pc,Sl,H,tin,ld, R,Rx,ga,cu,sta,Al,Nl,Rg,D,psy, ms,pp,zt,z,P,pj,Ak,ct	Can 17-20; Lau 1368
1755	Honqua, Thayqua	VOC	B,pp,pm,rm,pt,P,An,spw	Can 20-21
1756	Honqua, Thayqua	VOC	tin,ld,G,zr,zt,Rx,ga,cu,R, Sl,H,Pc,sta,Al,ms,cn,P,C, B,Sc,Nl,Ak	Can 21-22
1757	Honqua, Thayqua	VOC	see Cai Tables	Morse 5:64; VOC 4381
1758	Honqua, Thayqua	VOC	see Cai Tables	Can 23-24; VOC 4382 ^(bc) ; JF:B1758 fNe

HISTORY

YEAR	PARTNERS LISTED IN RECORDS	HONG	Co.	PRODUCTS OFFERED FOR SALE	NAME IN THESE SOURCES
1760	Hunqua & Co. (for Batavia)	VOC	see Cai Tables	VOC 4386, 4387 ^(b)
1762	Hunqua, Swetsia, Chetqua	VOC	see Cai Tables	Can 25, 71; VOC 4390, 4394, 4395
1763	SOIC	By	NM:F17
1763	Hunqua, Swetia, Ingsia, Chetqua	VOC	see Cai Tables	Can 26, 72; VOC 4392, 4394
1764	Chetqua	VOC	la	Can 27, 73; VOC 4396
1764	Zey Hauqua (Anqua)	SOIC	NM:F17
1765	Yifeng	DAC	see Cai Tables	Ask 1154 ^(bc) -1155
1765	Zey (Macao) Hauqua	SOIC	NM:F17
1766	Zey (Macao) Hauqua	SOIC	NM:F17
1766	VOC?	Can 75
1766	DAC	see Table	Ask 1156ab, 2231
1767	Zey Hauqua	SOIC	By	NM:F17
1767	Yifeng	DAC	see Table	Ask 1160 ^(bc)
1768	Zey Hauqua/Houqua/Hocqua	SOIC	By	NM:F17
1768	DAC	see Table	Ask 1162, 2234
1769	Zeyhonqua	SOIC	By	NM:F17
1770	Anqua, Chetqua, Inksja	VOC	see Cai Tables	Can 33, 79; VOC 4406
1770	Zey Hauqua	SOIC	By	NM:F17
1771	Anqua, Chetqua, Inksja, Taayqua	VOC	see Cai Tables	Can 34, 80; VOC 4408
1771	SOIC?	NM:F17
1772	Anqua, Chetqua, Ingsia, Tinqu	VOC	see Cai Tables	Can 35; VOC 4410
1772	SOIC?	NM:F17
1773	Anqua, Tayqua, Tinqu	VOC	see Cai Tables	Can 36, 82; VOC 4411
1774	Anqua, Tinqu	VOC?	Can 37; VOC 4412
1777	Anqua	VOC?	Can 40, 86

2) Cai *Hunqua*

TRADE NAMES: *Hunqua*, *Teinqu*, *Honqua*, *Honequa*, *Hungqua*, *Hongqua*, *Hingqua*, *Chua Teinqu*, *Chiu Teinqu*, *Sai Chio*, *Cha Tenqua*, *Chwan Tinqu*, *Chihunqua*, *Jong(e)* [Young] *Hon(e)qua* (1731-1733), *Honqua d' Jonge* (1731), *Junqua*, *Oude* [Old] *Hunqua* (1763-1764), *Zey Tinqu*.

BIOGRAPHICAL DATA	SOURCES
Date first mentioned in the records	1731 VOC 4376
Died	1770, May 1 (hr 18:00) Can 79
Years trading in Canton	1731-1770 see sources below

HISTÓRIA

SCHEDULE OF TRADING ACTIVITIES AND SOURCES					
YEAR	PARTNERS LISTED IN RECORDS	HONG	Co.	PRODUCTS OFFERED FOR SALE	NAME IN THESE SOURCES
1731	VOC	tea,P	VOC 4376
1732	SOIC	Campbell
1732	VOC	P	VOC 4377
1733	VOC	tea,P	VOC 4378
1734	“Zey Tinqa” not Hunqua	DAC	B,Pc	Ask 2190
1734	“Chua Tenqua” not Hunqua	EIC	Cheong 72 n.90
1735	EIC	w,ld	Morse 1:234
1736	Tucksia?	EIC	Morse 1:258
1737	Felix	VOC	P	VOC 2410
1737	EIC	Cheong 72 n.90
1738	VOC	Q	VOC 2438
1738	SOIC	cpr	JF:Irvine
1738	“Zey Tinqa” not “Hunqua”	DAC	Ask 1118
1739	DAC	see chart	Ask 2193
1741	SOIC?	P	JF:Irvine
1742	VOC	ct,P,pp,la,ld,C,Sl,H,Ak, tin,B,Q,G	Can 1
1742	“Zey Tinqa/Honcqua”	B	Ask 1121
1743	Semqua	VOC	D,sat,pq,gn,tu,B,P,Ty, pp,Sc,Sl,Bg,Q	Can 2, 69
1744	Semqua	VOC	D,pq,pp,P,tea,gn,tx	Can 3, 70
1744	SOIC	Sl,zt	JF:Irvine
1745	VOC	Can 5, 70
1745	SOIC?	JF:Irvine
1746	Semqua	VOC	mp,ct,B,D,pq	Can 5
1746	DAC	ld,see chart	Ask 1124, 2197-2198
1746	SOIC?	zt	JF:Irvine
1747	VOC	P,tu,Q,Nk	Can 6
1748	VOC	Ak,zt,Sc,H,pj,tu,su	Can 7, 9, 10
1748	DAC	see chart	Ask 1126, 2200-2201
1749	Texia	VOC	pp,G,FR,tea	Can 12
1750	Texia	VOC	pp,G,tin,zt,tx,zr,sat,FR,Nl	Can 11, 13
1750	DAC	see chart	Ask 2203, 2204
1751	VOC	sat,la,pm,rm,G,H,B,zt,An,pj,ct,zt	Can 7, 13-16
1751	Texia	VOC	G	Can 13
1751	Tan Hongqua	VOC	G	Can 14
1751	B	Ask 1129
1752	VOC	G,pp,B,zt,tx,Sl,H,Sc,C,Pc,ct	Can 7, 10, 14-17

HISTORY

YEAR	PARTNERS LISTED IN RECORDS	HONG	CO.	PRODUCTS OFFERED FOR SALE	NAME IN THESE SOURCES
1752	Semqua, Taayqua	VOC	G	Can 7, 17
1752	SOIC	B,z,ct,Sc,P,pp	GL:ÖIJ A406
1753	Tionqua	Yifeng	SOIC	B.....	GL:ÖIJ A406 ^(b)
1753	Yifeng	VOC	zt,G	Can 17; ÖIJ A406 ^(b)
1753	Yifeng	CFI	tea	GL:ÖIJ A406 ^(b)
1753	Semqua, Taayqua	VOC	pt,rm,pm,mp,tu,pp,B,tin,P	Can 17, 19
1753	DAC	B,tx	Ask 1132
1754	Semqua, Thayqua	Yifeng	VOC	cl,G,Ty,C,Pc,Sl,H,tin,ld,R,Rx,ga, cu,sta,Al,Nl,Rg,D,psy,ms,pp,zt,z, P,pj,Ak,ct	Can 17-20; Lau 1368
1755	Semqua, Thayqua	VOC	B,pp,pm,pt,P,An,spw	Can 20-21
1755	EIC	Morse 5:41-42
1755	Ask 1135
1756	Semqua, Thayqua	VOC	tin,ld,G,zr,zt,Rx,ga,cu,R,Nl,Ak, Sl,H,Pc,sta,Al,ms,cn,P,C,B,Sc,	Can 21-22
1757	Semqua, Thaayqua	VOC	see chart.....	Morse 5:64; VOC 4381
1758	Semqua, Thayqua	Yifeng	VOC	see chart.....	Can 23-24; VOC 4382 ^(bc) JF:B1758 fNe;
1758	Swietsia, Chetqua	VOC	tin,G	Can 23-24
1759	Swetia, Chetqua	Yifeng	VOC	see chart.....	VOC 4384 ^(bc)
1759	DAC	see chart.....	Ask 2214, 2215
1760	Swetia, Chetqua	Yifeng	VOC	see chart.....	VOC 4386; 4387 ^(b)
1760	Semqua & Co.	Yifeng	VOC	see chart.....	VOC 4386, 4387 ^(b)
1760	Schequa, Swissia, Giqua	DAC	see chart.....	Ask 1143 ^(c) , 1145 ^(c) , 2216, 2217
1760	EIC	tea.....	Morse 5:86, 91
1761	Sweetsia, Setqua (Chetqua)	Yifeng	VOC	see chart.....	VOC 4388 ^(b) , 4389
1761	EIC	<i>fiador</i>	Morse 5:202-203
1762	Semqua, Swetsia, Chetqua	VOC	see chart.....	Can 25, 71; VOC 4390, 4394, 4395
1763	Semqua, Swetia, Ingsia, Chetqua	VOC	see chart.....	Can 26, 72; VOC 4392, 4394
1763	DAC	see chart.....	Ask 2223-2226
1764	Ingsia, Chetqua	VOC	see chart.....	Can 27, 73; VOC 4395, 4396
1764	DAC	see chart.....	Ask 2227-2228
1764	EIC	<i>fiador</i>	Morse 5:202-203
1765	Ingsia, Chetqua	VOC	see chart.....	Morse 5:125; Can 28, 74; VOC 4397, 4398

HISTÓRIA

YEAR	PARTNERS LISTED IN RECORDS	HONG	Co.	PRODUCTS OFFERED FOR SALE	NAME IN THESE SOURCES
1765	Samqua, Chetqua, Tinquá, Ingsia	Yifeng	DAC	see chart.....	Ask 1154 ^(bc) -1155, 2229, 2230
1766	Ingsia, Chetqua	VOC	see chart.....	Can 29, 75; VOC 4399
1767	Ingsia, Chetqua	Yifeng	VOC	see chart.....	Can 30, 76, 229 ^(bc)
1767	SOIC?	NM:F17
1768	Ingsia, Chetqua	VOC	see chart.....	Can 31, 77; VOC 4402, 4403
1768	SOIC	sa.....	NM:F17
1768	Yngshaw (Ingsia), Chetqua	EIC	zr,w,Sl.....	Morse 5:135
1769	Ingsia, Chetqua	VOC	see chart.....	Can 32, 78; VOC 4405
1769	SOIC?	sa.....	NM:F17
1770	Ingsia, Chetqua	VOC	see chart.....	Can 33, 79; VOC 4406, 4556
1770	SOIC	sa.....	NM:F17

FAMILY MEMBERS				
RELATION	ALIASES	NAME	CHINESE	SOURCES
Son no. 1		Cai Tinghu	蔡廷瑚	Can 73; <i>Panyu Xianzhi</i>
Son no. 2	<i>Anqua</i>	Cai	蔡__	Can 36, 79
Son no. 3	<i>Tseonqua</i>	Cai	蔡__	Can 36; VOC 4411
Son no. 4	<i>Thayqua</i>	Cai	蔡__	Can 36, 39, 83; VOC 4411
Son no. 5	<i>Sequa</i>	Cai	蔡__	Can 36, 83; VOC 4411
Son no. 6	<i>Tjonqua</i>	Cai Xiangguan	蔡相官	Can 36, 39, 83, 85; VOC 4411
alias	<i>Seunqua</i>	Cai Zhaofu	蔡昭复	Ch'en 21
Relative?	<i>Monqua</i>	Cai Wenguan	蔡文官	<i>Caishi Jiapu</i>
Relative?	<i>Suiqua</i>	Cai Ruiguan	蔡瑞官	Cheong 86

ASSOCIATES AND BUSINESSES				
ASSOCIATES	YEARS	NAME	CHINESE	SOURCES
<i>Felix/Semqua</i>	1737-1770	Qiu Kun	邱崑	see sources above
<i>Texia</i>	1749-1751	Yan Deshe	颜德舍	see sources above
<i>Tan Hongqua</i>	1751	Chen Xiongguan	陈雄官	see sources above
<i>Tionqua</i>	1753	Cai Yongjie?	蔡永接?	see sources above
<i>Swetia</i>	1758-1770	Yan Ruishe	颜瑞舍	see sources above
<i>Chetqua</i>	1758-1770	Chen Jieguan	陈捷官	see sources above
<i>Tinquá</i>	1765	Ye Zhaoguan	叶朝官	see sources above
BUSINESS				
I-phong		Yifeng Hang	义丰行	see sources above

HISTORY

3) Cai Hunqua's sons numbers 2-5: *Anqua, Tseonqua, Tayqua, Sequa*

(Son No. 1 was a mandarin and thus not involved in the trade)

TRADE NAMES	
2) Anqua:	<i>Teunqua I, Hanqua, Hauqua, Hocqua, Hoqua, Houqua, Macao Hauqua, Sai Chiong, Sy Anqua, Zey Hauqua.</i>
3) Tseonqua:	<i>Tseonqua</i>
4) Tayqua:	<i>Thayqua, Thaayqua, Teyqua, Tacqua, Macao Tayqua, Taiqua.</i>
5) Sequa:	<i>Seequa</i>

SCHEDULE OF TRADING ACTIVITIES IN CANTON AND SOURCES					
YEAR	TRADE NAME & PARTNERS	HONG	CO.	PRODUCTS TRADED	SOURCE
1752	Taayqua, Honqua, Semqua	VOC	see Honqua's Schedule	
1753	Teyqua, Honqua, Semqua	VOC	see Honqua's Schedule	
1754	Thayqua, Honqua, Semqua	VOC	see Honqua's Schedule	
1755	Thayqua, Honqua, Semqua	VOC	see Honqua's Schedule	
1756	Thayqua, Honqua, Semqua	VOC	see Honqua's Schedule	
1757	Thayqua, Honqua, Semqua	VOC	see Honqua's Schedule and Table	
1758	Thaayqua, Honqua, Semqua	VOC	see Honqua's Schedule and Table	
1759	Taiqua	DAC	P,mp,Pc,ZZ	Ask 1139-1144, 2214-2215
1762	Tayqua	SOIC		NM:F17
1763	Thayqua (Macao)	VOC	see Table	Can 26, 72; VOC 4394
1764	Tayqua (Macao)	SOIC		NM:F17
1764	Zey Hauqua, Samqua (Macao)	SOIC		NM:F17
1765	Tayqua	VOC	see Table	Can 28, 74; VOC 4397
1765	Zey Hauqua (Macao), Samqua	SOIC		NM:F17
1766	Zey Hauqua (Macao), Samqua	SOIC		NM:F17
1767	Taayqua (Macao)	VOC	B	Can 30, 76
1767	Tayqua	SOIC		NM:F17
1767	Zey Hauqua & Samqua	SOIC		NM:F17
1768	Taayqua	VOC	tu	Can 77
1768	Old Tayqua (Macao)	SOIC		NM:F17
1768	Zey Hauqua/Hocqua & Samqua	SOIC		NM:F17
1769	Tayqua & Quiqua	VOC	see Table	Can 32, 78; VOC 4405
1769	Tayqua/Tacqua (Macao)	SOIC		NM:F17
1770	Tsey Anqua/Hanqua, Semqua	VOC	see Table	Can 33, 79; VOC 4406
1770	Old Taayqua, Anqua, Semqua	VOC	see Table	Can 34, 80; VOC 4408
1770	Zey Hauqua/Anqua & Samqua	SOIC		NM:F17
1771	Zey Hunqua's house	SOIC?		NM:F17
1772	Old Thayqua, Tinqu, Ingsia	VOC	B,C,tu,Sc,Pc,H,HS,R,Rx,Rg,Bg	Can 35
1772	Anqua, Semqua, Chetqua, Ingsia	VOC	see Table	Can 35; VOC 4410

HISTÓRIA

YEAR	PARTNERS LISTED IN RECORDS	HONG	Co.	PRODUCTS OFFERED FOR SALE	NAME IN THESE SOURCES
1772	Zey Hunqua's sons/house	SOIC?		NM:F17
1772	Sy Anqua	EIC	B,Sl,Ty	Morse 5; Ch'en 262
1773	Tayqua, Semqua	VOC	their house burns up	Can 82
1773	Tseonqua, Thayqua, Sequa, Tsjonqua	VOC	see Table	Can 36; VOC 4411
1773	Anqua, Semqua, Tinqu	VOC	B,C,Sc,sta,Nl	Can 36; VOC 4411
1774	Old Tayqua, Schonqua, Sequa, Tsjonqua, Tinqu, Ingsia	Hifon	VOC	see Table	Can 37, 83; VOC 4412
1774	Anqua, Semqua, Tinqu	VOC	B,C,Sc,sta,Nl	Can 37; VOC 4412
1774	Zey Hunqua's house	SOIC?		NM:F17
1775	Tayqua, Tsjonqua, Tinqu, & Bros.	I-phong	VOC	B,Ty,Pc,zr,Sl,C	Can 38, 84; VOC 4413
1775	Tayquas house	SOIC?		NM:F17

BUSINESS	YEARS	NAME	CHINESE	SOURCES
I-phong		Yifeng Hang	义丰行	see sources above

4) Cai Xiangguan 蔡相官

Proper Name: Cai Zhaofu 蔡昭复

Son no. 6	<i>Tsjonqua</i>	Cai Xiangguan	蔡相官	Can 36, 39
TRADE NAMES: <i>Tsionqua, Tsjonqua, Seunqua, Se Unqua, Schonqua, Teunqua, Ziunqua, Ziounqua, Ziungqua, Tschunqua.</i>				

BIOGRAPHICAL DATA			SOURCE
Date first mentioned in the records	1772	see sources below
Date last reported trading in Canton	1784	see sources below
Years trading in Canton	1772-1784	see sources below

SCHEDULE OF TRADING ACTIVITIES AND SOURCES					
YEAR	PARTNERS	HONG	Co.	PRODUCTS TRADED	SOURCE
1772	DAC	Nk,C,R	Ask 1168-1169, 2238-2239
1772	EIC	Ch'en 265
1773	EIC	Ch'en 265
1773	Brothers	VOC	see Table	Can 36, 82; VOC 4411
1774	VOC	see Table	Can 37; VOC 4412
1775	I-phong	VOC	see Table	Can 38, 84
1776	Iphong	VOC	see Table	Can 39; VOC 4414

HISTORY

YEAR	PARTNERS	HONG	CO.	PRODUCTS TRADED	SOURCE
1776	DAC	C	Ask 1175
1776	EIC	Ch'en 266
1777	Gi-fong	VOC	see Table	Can 40, 86; VOC 4415; NM:F17
1777	EIC	Ch'en 266
1778	Yifeng	VOC	see Table	Can 41 ^(sb) , 87, 89; VOC 4418, 4556
1778	Y-fung	DAC	Ask 1179
1778	EIC	Ch'en 266
1779	VOC	see Table	Can 42; VOC 4419
1779	Y-Fung	DAC	ZZ,H,Sl,ld,C,Ty,SR,pp,HS	Ask 1180
1779	EIC?	Morse 2
1780	VOC	see Table	Can 43, 88-89, 243; VOC 4421
1780	Y-Fung	DAC	H,Ty	Ask 1183
1780	EIC	Morse 2; Ch'en 266
1781	VOC	see Table	Can 44; VOC 4423
1781	DAC	P,C	Ask 1185
1781	EIC	B	Ch'en 266
1781	Jefong	SOIC	NM:F17
1782	VOC	zt,Rx,Rg,Al,pm	Can 44; VOC 4430
1783	Iphong	VOC	see Table	Morse 2:92; Can 44-45; VOC 4430
1784	Iphong	VOC	see Table	Can 46, 90; VOC 4426

BUSINESS	YEARS	NAME	CHINESE	SOURCES
I-phong/Y-Fung		Yifeng Hang	义丰行	see sources above

HISTÓRIA

TABLE A: CAI-QIU AND COMPANY TRADE WITH THE DAC 1739-1772 (ALL FIGURES IN CHINESE TELS)

YEAR	DAC SHIPS	TOTAL CARGO	CAI TRADE	% OF TOTAL	PRODUCTS	NAME
1739	Sleswig	99,056.964	638.490	0.006	P	Zey Hunqua
1746	Fyen	114,544.890	7,680.896	0.067	ps,B	Zey Hunqua
1746	Christiansb. Slott	91,179.677	7,323.746	0.080	ps,B	Zey Hunqua
1748	Christiansb. Slott	125,866.099	15,791.238	0.125	B,Sl	Zey Hunqua
1748	Fyen	147,983.404	17,317.449	0.117	B	Zey Hunqua
1750	Fyen	156,159.997	8,455.824	0.054	B	Hunqua
1759	Kong af Dan	139,580.744	176.518	0.001	P	Hunqua
1760	Graeve Mottkes	115,782.238	25,547.708	0.221	B,C	Sey Hunqua
1760	D Juliana Maria	155,966.306	33,212.676	0.213	B,C	Sey Hunqua
1763	Kong af Dan	158,367.887	22,046.215	0.139	B	Sey Hunqua
1764	Pr Fred af Dan	263,800.278	9,051.405	0.034	B	Sey Hunqua
1765	Cron Pr af Dan	195,377.025	32,461.065	0.166	B,C	Sey Hunqua
1765	D Juliana Maria	157,100.742	15,893.865	0.101	B	Sey Hunqua
1766	Fred'borg Slott	203,819.535	28,167.356	0.138	B	Samqua
1767	D Sophia Magd	174,170.662	11,762.253	0.068	B	Samqua
1767	Pr Fred af Dan	240,874.719	21,612.192	0.090	B	Samqua
1768	Fred'borg Slott	212,081.658	7,961.234	0.038	B	Samqua
1772	Fred'borg Slott	153,585.472	23,557.620	0.153	C	Sey Hunqua*
1772	Kong af Dan	166,886.184	11,349.725	0.068	Nk,C,R	Ziounqua
Total:	19 Ships	3,072,184.481	300,007.475	0.098		
	Average per ship	161,693.920	15,789.867	0.098		

* Sey Hunqua died in 1770 so this is a reference to his trading house rather than to him.

HISTORY

TABLE B: CAI-QIU AND COMPANY TRADE WITH THE VOC 1757-1784 (ALL FIGURES IN CHINESE TAELES)

CAI-QIU AND COMPANY TRADE WITH THE VOC 1757-1772					
YEAR	SHIPS	INDIVIDUAL	JOINT	PRODUCTS HANDLED	NAMES OF MERCHANTS
1757	1		98,417.814	zr,R,G,z,Nl,H,S,sp,Rx,Sc,P,Rg,C,T	Honqua, Semqua, Tayqua
1758	3		74,745.681	z,Sl,Rg,Sc,B,C	Honqua, Chetqua, Swetia
1760	3		582,900.563	sp,B	Honqua, Chetqua, Swetia
1760		42,244.049		Rg,Ty,Sc,S,C	Honqua
1761	2		291,962.750	Sc,Bg,Sl,Ty,Pc,B,HS,H,C,mp	Honqua, Chetqua, Swetia
1762	3		611,607.960	B,Sl,zr,Sc,Bg,B,C,Ty,H	Honqua, Chetqua, Swetia
1763	3		864,659.712	zr,Nl,sp,C,B,Rx,ms,P,ci,Gt,z,D,Sc	Honqua, Chetqua, Inksia
1763		3,059.200		Pc	Tayqua
1764	4		930,495.638	Sc,Bg,HS,Sl,Pc,H,C,sta,zr,Nl,R,z	Honqua, Chetqua, Inksia
1764		2,499.385		An,C	Honqua
1765	4		906,807.375	sp,sta,z,Rx,Nl,B,Gt	Honqua, Chetqua, Inksia
1765		3,262.350		Pc	Tayqua
1766	4		734,658.507	R,sta,sa,z,sp,B,Nl,C,zg	Honqua, Chetqua, Inksia
1768	4		599,011.031	sta,Nl,zg,z,R,Gt,P,B,zr,C	Honqua, Chetqua, Inksia
1769	4		379,897.260	Rx,Ty,zr,sp,z,zg,ms,B,sta	Honqua, Chetqua, Inksia
1769		282,234.128		B,D	Honqua
1769		834.250		Pc	Tayqua
1770	5		487,542.276	sp,Nl,zr	Semqua, Anqua, Chet., Inksia
1770		103,048.475		g,B	Honqua
1770		132,864.972		An,B,C,H,Sc	Semqua Anqua & Co.
1770		8,961.590		Ty,C	Tayqua
1771	4		610,072.966	R,Gt,z,zr,C,sp,Nl	Semqua, Anqua, Chet., Inksia
1771		23,155.933		D,ci,Rx,Sc	Semqua Anqua & Co.
1772	4		172,052.954	H,Sl	Semqua, Anqua, Chet., Inksia
1772		201,433.917		Rx,Rg,D,ln,B,C,sp,R,Gt,S,HS,Sc	Semqua, Anqua & Co.
Total	48	803,598.249	7,344,832.487	Total individual and joint trade	8,148,430.736
Ave per ship		16,741.630	153,017.343		169,758.974
1/3 of joint trade			2,448,277.496	Total individual and 1/3 of joint trade	3,251,875.745
Average per ship			51,005.781	Est. average per ship for Cai-Qiu	67,747.411
The Cai-Qiu portion of this trade was arrived at by taking one third of the joint-trade figures. The remaining two-thirds belong to the Yan and Chen partners.					

HISTÓRIA

CAI-QIU AND COMPANY TRADE WITH THE VOC 1773-1784					
YEAR	SHIPS	INDIVIDUAL	JOINT	PRODUCTS HANDLED	NAMES OF MERCHANTS
1773	4	10,105.590		sc,B,C	Tsjonqua
1773		1,951.050		S	Tayqua
1773		153,988.290		sta,Rx,B,Rg,sa,g,C,sc,hs,ln,rb	Tayqua & Brothers
1774	4	1,548.820		C	Tsjonqua
1774		3,853.920		C	Tayqua
1774		164,554.593		Rx,rb,Rg,B,Ty,S,sa,ln,rz,g	Tayqua & Brothers
1775	5	3,278.100		C	Tsjonqua
1775		4,053.095		S	Tayqua & Brothers
1776	4	70,840.299		Rg,sta,C,B,Rx	Tsjonqua
1777	4	104,123.612		sta,sp,Rg,Rx,S,B,C,sc,Pc,A	Tsjonqua
1778	4	161,247.929		sp,Rx,sc,Rg,B,C,S,g	Tsjonqua
1779	4	191,979.956		Pc,sp,Rx,Rg,B,C,sta,z,rb,S,J,H	Tsjonqua
1780	4	237,423.076		S,sc,ln,rz,Pc,Rg,Rx,sta,J,B,C,rb	Tsjonqua
1781	1	92,759.678		Pc,sc,D,B,Ty	Tsjonqua
1783	2	143,326.358		sc,C,B,T	Tsjonqua
1784	4	41,433.521		H,sta	Tsjonqua
Total:	40	1,386,467.887			Cai Trade
Ave per ship		34,661.697			
ESTIMATE OF CAI-QIU AND FAMILY TRADE WITH THE VOC 1757-1784 (EXCLUDING CHEN AND YAN)					
	48	3,251,875.745		Years 1757-1772	Cai-Qiu Trade
	40	1,386,467.887		Years 1773-1786	Cai Trade
Total	88	4,638,343.632		Years 1757-1786	Cai-Qiu Total
Ave per ship		52,708.450		Years 1757-1786	Cai-Qiu Average
After Hunqua died in 1770, it is not possible to tell with any degree of accuracy if Semqua or the sons are trading on their own or as a group. They are listed here as they appear in the Dutch records.					

HISTORY

TABLE C: CAI AND QIU LOAN TRANSACTIONS RECORDED IN SWEDISH RECORDS FROM 1765 TO 1772
(ALL FIGURES IN CHINESE TAEIS)

Zey Hunqua	Interest Rates Tabulated by the Year			
	Rate	Debit	Credit	Balance
₪ 1767.01.18	1.20	3,330.000		3,996.000
₪ 1767.12.12	1.20	1,665.000		1,998.000
1768.12.19	1.20	3,996.000		4,795.200
1768.12.08	1.20	2,220.000		2,664.000
1768.12.12	1.20		333.000	1,665.000
1769.12.08	1.20	1,776.000		2,131.200
1769.12.08	1.20		2,664.000	-
1769.12.08	1.20	2,664.000		3,196.800
1769.12.31	1.20	2,131.200		2,557.440
1770.10.22	1.20	2,131.200		2,557.440
1771.12.28	1.20	3,108.000		3,729.600
1772.12.31	na	3,700.000	(for junk trade)	
Gau Samqua	Interest Rates Tabulated by the Year			
	Rate	Debit	Credit	Balance
1768.03.13	1.20	3,700.000		4,440.000
1768.12.12	1.20		740.000	3,700.000
1768.12.18	1.20	1,480.000		1,776.000
1769.01.10	1.20	740.000		888.000
1769.12.18	1.20		1,776.000	
1769.12.31	1.20	740.000		888.000
1770.10.22	1.20	740.000		888.000
1770.12.18	1.20	740.000		888.000
Samqua & Zey Hauqua	Interest Rates Tabulated by the Month			
	Rate	Mo.	Debit	Credit
1765.01.10	0.02	11.00	174.375	
1765.01.10	0.02	15.50	825.625	
1765.01.31	0.02	12.00	222.000	
₪ 1765.04.30	0.02	12.00	526.123	
1765.09.18	0.02	8.00	1,000.000	
1765.12.10	0.02	11.00		38.362
1766.04.30	0.02	12.00		126.269
1766.05.01	0.02	15.50		255.943
1766.05.04	0.02	8.00		200.000
1768.14.14				172.050
1768.14.14				63.640
1768.14.14			49.950	
1768.14.14			588.752	

Key: Rate 0.02 = 2%, Rate 1.20 = 20%

Note. The way in which the transactions were recorded vary over time so it is not possible to reconstruct an exact representation of all transactions. Source: NM F17.