

200 Years of Spanish Shipping in Canton and Macao (1640–1840)

PAUL A. VAN DYKE*

ABSTRACT: Spanish shipping in Canton and Macao from 1640 to 1840 has recently received more attention from scholars but the history still remains somewhat ambiguous. The Spanish trade in opium in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries has been given wide coverage in recent years, but the number of vessels involved and many other aspects of the trade are still incomplete, vague, and obscure. This outcome has been especially true for the years from 1700 to 1785, which has received little scholarly attention.

With new information that has now emerged it is possible to fill in some of these gaps in our understanding. We can now construct a more reliable list of Spanish ships in the Delta, and show some of the problems with the historical data. The Spanish trade in the Delta was very important for several reasons: the ships brought huge amounts of silver to China, which helped to finance trade; their small ships exported large quantities of expensive silk, which meant that their cargos might be worth more than a ship much larger; and they imported large amounts of opium and rice. While the outcome of the trade would have certainly been much better off without the opium, many Chinese would have suffered significantly if the Spanish rice had failed to arrive. Spaniards played an intricate role in the development of Macao and the Delta, and deserve a place in the history of the trade.

KEYWORDS: Macao; Manila; Canton; Spanish Shipping; Silk; Rice.

* Paul A. Van Dyke, Ph.D. in History, retired professor from the Sun Yat-sen University in Guangzhou, China, is the author of a series of works on the theme of the Canton trade.

Paul A. Van Dyke, doutorado em História, professor jubilado da Universidade de Sun Yat-sen em Cantão, China. É autor de várias obras sobre o comércio em Cantão.



HISTORIOGRAPHY

INTRODUCTION

The Spaniards in Manila had a longstanding relationship with Macao dating back to the sixteenth century. From 1580 to 1640, the two Iberian nations were united under one crown. After they separated in the latter year, the Spanish trade at Macao declined significantly. There were many years when no Spanish ships went to Macao and no Portuguese ships went to Manila.¹

An enormous amount of research has been done on the early years of Spanish interactions in the Philippines, Japan, Macao, and China. There are endless numbers of books and articles in multiple languages covering this early period. The studies on trade naturally include missionary activities because at that time those men were actively involved in commerce.

For the period after 1640, and especially the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, we have fewer studies. On the Macao side, the best source on shipping is the two books by Benjamim Videira Pires. He went through the Portuguese records in Macao and extracted whatever he could find about ships and trade. Pires's book *A Viagem de Comércio Macau–Manila nos Séculos XVI a XIX* (1987) is full of details about the relationship between Macao and Manila. His books are the first place scholars go whenever they have a question about shipping in Macao.² Although not specifically focussed on Manila, George Bryan Souza, Ângela Guimarães, A. M. Martins do Vale, and Zhang Tingmao have also provided us with extensive data about Macao's trade in general.³

On the Manila side of the exchange, Pierre Chaunu's book *Les Philippines et le Pacifique des Ibériques (XVI^e, XVII^e, XVIII^e siècles)* (1960) has been the main source for ships and shipping. He reproduced figures from the Manila customs house (*Almojarifazgo*) and listed all the vessels recorded in those documents. Pires made use of Chaunu's book as well, so much of the data concerning the

ships sailing between Macao and Manila can be found in both sources.⁴

In recent years, considerable advancements have been made in the research of the Manila trade from 1640 to 1840. Some of this new research is based on, and generated from, newly found records in Spanish archives. Ander Permanyer-Ugarteandia discovered the Manuel de Agote collection in the Untzi Museoa — Museo Naval, San Sebastián, Spain. With the use of those and other records, he put together several detailed studies of the Spanish trade with China covering the years from 1787 to 1843.⁵

Other authors have written about the relationship between Macao and Manila. The authors include Birgit Tremml-Werner, Antoni Picazo Muntaner, María Dolores Elizalde, Lucille Chia, and Leonor Diaz de Seabra.⁶ Chenchen Fang and Shuru Fang made use of some very detailed Spanish records they found in the Archivo General de Indias in Seville. Their books are more narrowly focussed on the years from 1657 to 1687.⁷ Fang's book *Huaren yu Lūsōng maoyi* (2012) is especially rich in details about shipping in Manila and some of which duplicates Chaunu's data.

By comparing the tables in Fang's and Chaunu's books, we find that there are sometimes discrepancies in the figures. There are years when Fang shows ships arriving at Manila from Macao and Canton (Guangzhou), and Chaunu does not. Chaunu also shows ships in years when Fang does not. Examples below will show that some of the ships that Chaunu shows coming from Canton, were actually coming from Macao. Some ships he shows coming from Macao were coming from Canton (or more correctly, Whampoa).

Recently, I published some information about the Spanish trade at Canton covering the years from about 1757 to 1784.⁸ Since then, more bits and pieces of information have emerged and which led to the writing of this article. The sources

HISTORIOGRAFIA

I used include the records of the French, English, Dutch, and Swedish East India companies; Dutch records from Malacca, Batavia, Canton, and Macao; the Danish Asiatic Company's documents, American China trade records, and a variety of other sources. I also went through the Jardine Matheson collection at the Cambridge University Library.

George Bryan Souza had made use of some of the Dutch records when doing research on the Portuguese trade. Permanyer-Ugartemendia also made use of the Jardine Matheson archive. I have added more information from those sources. The other language sources have not been used previously in the study of shipping between Manila, China, and Macao. While many of the references below are incomplete and fragmented, they nonetheless help to fill in gaps in our understanding of the Sino-Spanish exchanges.

There were not many commercial interactions between Manila and Macao in the years from 1640 to 1697. I provide a brief summary below of that period, and some of the discrepancies that appear in the sources. For a more detailed study of those years, I refer the reader to Pires's *A Viagem de Comércio Macau–Manila* (1987).

In the following pages, there are many examples of Spanish and non-Iberian ships trading at Macao. Scholars familiar with Chinese regulations will correctly point out that the only vessels allowed to trade there were the 25 quota ships registered with the Qing government.⁹ They were the only vessels allowed in Macao's Inner Harbour. The exceptions to this policy were Spanish ships carrying rice, and ships that were damaged and needing repairs. The latter vessels needed to get special permission from the Portuguese and Chinese authorities before they could enter. Usually, they had to show clearly that the ship was in serious trouble and would not survive unless it could be repaired in Macao.

Many examples below show Spanish ships regularly trading at Macao, which were obviously not owned by Portuguese residents. We know that Luzon (呂宋) ships (ships from the Philippines) were often substituted for one of the 25 quota ships.¹⁰ There are many examples of this happening and it was generally allowed by the Qing administration.

I had originally wanted to focus only on the Spanish trade at Macao. However, after discovering the errors and omissions in Chaunu's sources, it became clear that I needed to include Canton. Before beginning, I need to make one clarification. Chaunu's sources show Spanish ships arriving at Manila from Canton. Foreign vessels were not permitted in the latter city, but were required to anchor 20 kilometres downriver at Whampoa. The captains and supercargoes then went upriver in their service boats to purchase their cargos. Only Chinese vessels were allowed at Canton. Thus, in all references below that mention foreign ships arriving at Manila from Canton, they were actually coming from Whampoa.

MANILA, MACAO AND CANTON (1640–1697)

The Spanish ships that visited Macao after 1640 were usually small in comparison to other European ships in Asia. The overwhelming majority of the Spanish vessels that arrived in the Pearl River Delta were from 70 tons to usually no more than 350 tons. In the Portuguese and Spanish records, they are often referred to as sampans (single mast), *balandras* or *chaloupe* (sloop, single mast), *pataches* (*pataje*, two-masted pinnacle), or *barque* and *barco* (bark, three masts).¹¹ Small vessels dominated the Spanish trade between the Delta and Manila up to at least 1840.

The best data we have about shipping between Macao and Manila after 1640 comes from Chaunu and Fang. In Tables 1 and 2, I compare their numbers for the years from 1657 to 1687.

HISTORIOGRAPHY

Chaunu's and Fang's figures in Table 1 are in agreement for the years from 1657 to 1682, with only one vessel making the trip between the two cities in 1672. The figures match again in 1685, but differ in other years. After the separation of the two countries in 1640, the two Iberian nations remained very suspicious of each other. In 1644, all of the Spaniards residing in Macao — including ecclesiastics — were exiled to Manila.¹²

There were several unsuccessful attempts to restore relations between the two cities. Sometimes Portuguese were imprisoned in Manila, and sometimes Spaniards were arrested in Macao when they arrived.¹³ The Portuguese also captured Spanish ships when the opportunity arose.¹⁴ In the meantime, the Qing government was attempting to take control of southern China from the Ming, in the years from 1644 to 1681. Thus, between the ill feelings generated by the Iberians, and the fighting that was going on between the two Chinese regimes, trade was in a very precarious state.

An exception was made in Iberian relations in 1672, when the ship mentioned above was allowed to make the voyage.¹⁵ Except for that vessel, commercial relations between Macao and

Manila were more or less non-existent during the years from 1643 to 1682. In 1681, Spanish officials and ecclesiastics landed in Macao again in hope of restoring relations and opening the door for 'the entrance of Spanish missionaries into China'.¹⁶ Mainland China was now united, which raised the possibility of sending in missionaries.

The 1681 mission to Macao managed to restore relations between the Iberians to the point that from 1683 onwards ships began making the trip again (Table 1). In 1684, the Governor of Manila sent General Antonio Nieto to Macao 'to settle some disputes relative to commerce'. That trip was deemed successful, so, for the time being, trade was back on track.¹⁷

The trade between Manila and Canton was also very limited in the years when the Qing administration was gaining control of southern China. Table 2 shows the vessels in Chaunu's and Fang's sources that arrived at Manila from Canton. Chaunu's records often only state that vessels came from China, without mentioning their port of origin. Thus, the figures in Table 2 are not necessarily complete or conclusive. There may have been other vessels arriving from Canton, which were not stated clearly in the sources.

Table 1
Vessels arriving at Manila from Macao
(1657–1687)

Years	Chaunu	Fang	Years	Chaunu	Fang
1657–1671	0	0	1684	3	0
1672	1	1	1685	1	1
1673–1682	0	0	1686	0	5
1683	2	3	1687	2	0

Sources: Fang, *Huaren yu Lüsòng maoyi*, 420–435; Chaunu, *Les Philippines*, Tables 5–7, 164–175.

Table 2
Vessels arriving at Manila from Canton
(1657–1685)

Year	Chaunu	Fang	Year	Chaunu	Fang
1657	1	1	1679	1	0
1673	1	1	1680	2	1
1674	0	1	1682	0	2
1676	1	0	1685	1	1
1677	2	1	Totals	9	8

Sources: Fang, *Huaren yu Lüsòng maoyi*, 420–435; Chaunu, *Les Philippines*, Table 5, 164–167, note 8, Table 6, 168–171, notes 12, 23, 26, 35, 38, 64.

HISTORIOGRAFIA

I assembled Table 2 to show that even in the years when Chaunu has specific port data, it does not always agree with Fang's data. In some years Fang shows ships arriving in Manila from Canton that do not appear in Chaunu's sources, and *vice versa*. In Table 2, I omitted the years that show no vessels arriving. The discrepancies in the figures in Tables 1 and 2 are not the authors' mistakes, but are rather problems that originate from the sources. This means that we have no way of knowing which figures are accurate.

Fang also has a table in her book showing the differences between her figures and Chaunu's, with respect to ships arriving at Manila from China. Some years match perfectly, but other years have wide differences. In 1685, 1686, and 1687, for example, Chaunu shows 17, 27, and 15 vessels arriving from China, respectively. In the same years, Fang shows 43, 59, and 33 vessels arriving, respectively. Clearly, there are problems with the sources.¹⁸

It is important to point out these discrepancies, because scholars have been depending on Chaunu's figures for six decades, with the assumption that the numbers were complete and reliable. However, as we see from Tables 1 and 2, there are other sources that contradict some of his figures. Other examples are presented below.

From 1683 to 1685, a number of vessels made the trip between Macao and Manila signifying the re-establishment of relations between the two cities. At the same time, Qing officials were busy coming up with new customs regulations, customs offices, and appointing officers to man them. Of course, these were transitional years for Macao's trade as well, as the Portuguese administration adjusted to the new regulations given to them by the Qing regime.

Table 1 shows two *pataches* sailing between the two cities in 1683 and three sampans in 1684. It is unknown whether these were Portuguese,

Spanish, or Chinese vessels. The term 'saman' was often loosely applied to smaller vessels such as a sloop, but more often, it referred to a small Chinese built vessel with a single mast.¹⁹

In 1685, a ship arrived at Macao from Manila with Spanish missionaries aboard. They were welcomed, but the Macao Senate was reluctant to give them free passage into China, without first having approval from Goa. However, it is a sign that friendly relations had finally been restored. According to Chaunu and Fang, no vessels arrived at Manila from Canton in 1686 and 1687.

According to Chaunu, there were a few vessels arriving at Manila from Canton in the years from 1688 to 1695, but no vessels from Macao. As Pires points out, there were some conflicts with the Chinese officials in those years in establishing new customs procedures and regulations.²⁰ Pires shows a *patache* arriving at Macao from Manila on 25 November 1695. The ship was allowed to pay the same 2% duties on imported silver as Portuguese ships, which is a sign that the Macao Senate was eager to receive them. That ship returned to Manila in 1696, and then it shows up in Chaunu's sources. From this year to 1700, nine vessels were involved in the trade between the two cities. Chaunu does not mention the nationalities of the ships, but most of them were probably Spanish. Pires points out that a Macao merchant received a licence to sail to Manila in 1696, so at least one of the ships was Portuguese.²¹

MANILA, MACAO AND CANTON (1698–1759)

Historian Montalto de Jesus mentioned that 'at the close of the seventeenth century [...] three ships from Manila brought a million dollars for the purchase of silk'.²² The Swedish historian in Macao, Anders Ljungstedt, also found in his study that 'Spanish vessels came in 1698 and 1700'.²³ The authors did not provide references, but as we will see from examples below, Montalto de Jesus's

HISTORIOGRAPHY

description is consistent with other evidence, and we know that Ljungstedt's statement is also correct.

Beginning around this time, other European sources emerge, which provide us with more information about the Spanish trade at Macao and Canton. From 1698 to 1700 there were several English and one French ship trading at Canton. During the months those traders were in the Delta, they recorded what they heard and saw in Macao. From this time forward, there are many other European records that discuss shipping activities in Macao, which can help clarify some of the ambiguities in Chaunu's sources.

On 17 February 1700, the French mentioned that 'a small Spanish vessel, of about eighty tons, ascended the river and anchored near the English ship. She had a hundred thousand crowns, in silver, on board'. Pires shows this vessel to be the *Sm. Juan*, commanded by the Armenian Ignácio Marcos.²⁴ On 26 April, 'the Spaniard went down the river and sailed for Manilla. She saluted us with five swivels [cannons on a swivel mount], which we returned with three guns, and she gave us back one'.²⁵

European and Indian ship owners sometimes hired Armenians to command their ships. The reason for doing this was simple. During times of European wars, an Armenian captain could raise a different flag, and claim the ship and cargo to belong to other persons. Armenians had no nation of their own at this time, so they could claim to be citizens of wherever they lived.²⁶ Europeans were at war with each other during the War of the Spanish Succession (1701–1714), and having an Armenian captain could provide some level of protection from enemies.

Armenians were allowed to trade in both Protestant and Catholic controlled ports in Asia, because they were considered to be members of both religious persuasions. These attempts to disguise the ownership of ships and cargos,

however, were not always successful. Sometimes the ships were captured anyway. Nevertheless, the practice provided some protection and it probably gave the owners some level of comfort that the voyage would be completed successfully.²⁷

The examples above show Spanish ships carrying large amounts of silver to China, and exporting large quantities of silk. They often paid cash for the goods they purchased, which gave them a distinct advantage in the trade. Other Europeans often paid for their exports in two-thirds to 80% in silver coins, and the rest in goods.²⁸ Moreover, they would usually not send a ship of 80 tons to China, as it was not cost-effective.²⁹

From these examples, we see two distinctions between the Spanish and other European trade in China. The former usually sent small ships with an import cargo made up almost entirely of silver. Other European ships trading at Canton were two, three, or four times as large as the Spanish vessels. They carried a mixed cargo of imports and silver coin.

Examples below will show a third distinction between the Spaniards and other Europeans. The majority of the Spanish export cargos consisted of raw silk and silk fabrics, with some porcelain and sometimes Nankeens but usually little or no tea. The majority of other European exports consisted mostly of tea, with a smaller proportion consisting of silk, porcelain, and a variety of other goods.

Silk was one of the most expensive items of the China trade, so a fourth distinction, was that, despite the smallness of their ships, the Spanish cargos were sometimes worth as much as, if not more than, the cargos of larger ships. Eventually, Spanish ships would carry large amounts of opium and rice to China as well. However, they would continue to send vessels loaded mostly with silver, which they used to purchase silk. This trend continued up to at least the First Opium War (1839–1842).

HISTORIOGRAFIA

In 1796, the Frenchman Chrétien-Louis-Joseph de Guignes visited Manila and gave an account of their trade with China. He also stated that Spanish exports from China consisted mostly of 'silk stuffs, silk stockings, nankeens, gold and silver plate, porcelain',³⁰ all of which were purchased with silver coins. I have also shown this to be the case with the Spaniards in the second half of the eighteenth century.³¹

With 100,000 crowns aboard in 1700, the Spaniards would have been very welcome guests in Canton. The Chinese merchants there would have been eager to accommodate them in any way possible. From 1700 to 1719, Chaunu shows no Spanish ships arriving at Manila from Canton but there were eight ships that arrived from Macao.³² Other European records provide additional details about the Spanish trade in those years.

The English East India Company's (EIC) records show several Manila ships trading at Canton from late 1699 to early 1700. They mentioned that three or four Manila ships were expected to arrive at Macao or Whampoa. In May 1700, the English confirmed that Manila ships had indeed arrived at Macao.³³ One of them would have been the *Sm. Juan* mentioned above. Another vessel was the Portuguese ship *St Maria e St Ana*, under the captaincy of the Armenian Estêvão.³⁴

In November 1699, the English feared that the arrival of the Manila ship 'would raise the price of Raw and Wrought Silks, and all other Goods' which would 'put an end to the hope that Silk [prices] would fall'.³⁵ Prices rose whenever Spanish ships arrived, because they demanded such large quantities of silk, and paid for everything with cash. In comparison, the Portuguese ships that sailed to Manila did not give rise to such fears, because they were not usually loaded with large quantities of silver and did not trade in large quantities of silk. In later years, Spaniards hired Portuguese ships to carry silver for them.

In 1704, another ship arrived at Macao from Manila, and returned in early 1705. Those men again purchased large quantities of silk, which suggests it was a Spanish cargo. Their arrival made it difficult for other Europeans to get the fabrics they wanted.³⁶ Chaunu shows a *balandra* arriving from Macao in 1705. However, there were actually two ships that made the voyage that year, the one above and the *Sm. Juan*.³⁷ The latter vessel arrived in April, and was again commanded by the Armenian Ignácio Marcos.³⁸ There is now a gap in the Spanish arrivals.

Chaunu shows two sampans at Manila from Canton in 1709, 1710, 1711, and one sampan in 1713. In 1711, he also shows a *patache* from Macao.³⁹ I have no references to these vessels in the Canton records. They were probably Chinese owned. In 1713, the Macao Senate licensed the Portuguese ship *St Maria e St Ana*, Captain Estêvão, to sail to Manila again. This vessel does not appear in Chaunu's list, but he does show a sampan arriving from Canton.⁴⁰ The next reference to a Spanish ship does not appear until several years later.

In 1720, Chaunu shows two Spanish *pataches* arriving from Canton. They were the *Nuestra Señora de Guia* and the *Sacra Familia du Reyno de Canton*.⁴¹ There was only one Spanish ship at Whampoa in 1719, which was probably the latter vessel.⁴² There was a ship in Macao that year named *Senhora de Guia Penha e Almas Benditas*. It sailed to Manila and Batavia in early 1720, which may have been the same ship that Chaunu recorded.⁴³ However, it was Portuguese, not Spanish, so the connection is unclear.

In 1721, Chaunu shows the *Nuestra Señora de la Concepción* arriving at Manila from Macao, and mentions that the captain was Armenian.⁴⁴ There was a Portuguese ship in Macao with the name *Nossa Senhora da Conceição*, which sailed to Batavia each year. It could have stopped in Manila

HISTORIOGRAPHY

on its way to or from Batavia. The Dutch in Batavia recorded two different captains for this ship, Pedro Rodrigos and Francisco Xavier de Laxa.⁴⁵

From 1720 to 1815, we know the number of foreign vessels at Whampoa each year. We also know their nationalities and most of their names, which makes it easier to compare them with Chaunu's figures.⁴⁶ In 1721, British sources mention that a 'small ship from Manilla [*sic*]' arrived at Whampoa on 23 October.⁴⁷ Another Spanish vessel arrived on 23 November. The officers of this latter ship sailed upriver in a sampan with the Spanish flag displayed on the stern.⁴⁸ Both of these vessels would have arrived in Manila in early 1722. Chaunu shows only one Spanish ship arriving from Canton that year, the *Nuestra Señora del Buen Viaje y San Francisco Xavier*, Captain Don Luís Sanchez de Figueroa.⁴⁹ Thus, there seems to be one ship missing from his figures.

In July 1722, the Manila ship *Nossa Senhora dos Milagres e Almas Santas*, Captain Rafael del Barco, arrived at Whampoa.⁵⁰ This ship was recorded by the English in Canton as a 'Manila ship'.⁵¹ The Canton authorities learnt that they were making guns in their factory, with the intention of selling them. After learning that the officials were onto them, the Manila men threw the guns into the river, which were later recovered by Chinese authorities. All persons involved with the guns were arrested. The Chinese landlord of their residence (factory) was also arrested, and the two Chinese merchants with whom they were trading were put in chains. The Manila ship was detained in China for an entire year until the matter was finally resolved. Presumably they spent considerable time in prison.⁵²

As Pires has shown, one of the men accused of selling guns in Canton was a Portuguese merchant named Cosme Serrão. He had received permission from the Viceroy in Goa to make a voyage directly to Manila and Canton, without the

need to stop at Macao. Serrão sent a letter from Canton to the Senate in Macao, dated 9 January 1723. He pleaded with the Macao Senate to help him get released and allow his ship to leave.⁵³ The matter was eventually resolved and Serrão and his colleagues were allowed to leave.

In 1723, Chaunu shows four 'Christian' vessels arriving at Manila from China, three of which came from Canton.⁵⁴ The *Nossa Senhora dos Milagres e Almas Santas* was the only Spanish or Portuguese ship at Whampoa in 1722 or 1723.⁵⁵ The other vessels mentioned by Chaunu may have been Portuguese ships from Macao, or perhaps Chinese Christians. It is unclear.

Chaunu shows the ship *Jesus, Maria, José* arriving at Manila from Canton in 1725. Arriving from Macao, he shows the *Madre de Dios* in 1728, the *Nuestra Señora de la Piedad* in 1730, and the *Nuestra Señora de la Peña* in 1733. Despite the spellings of the names, all of these vessels were Portuguese, and they did indeed come from Canton and Macao as stated.⁵⁶ The Spanish and Portuguese often used their own spellings, despite the ships not being from their nation. The *Corsário* applied for permission from the Macao Senate to make a voyage to Manila and Batavia in 1727.⁵⁷ Chaunu does not mention this ship, and I did not find it in the Batavia records.

We learn more about the Spanish trade in the early 1730s from British sources. On 2 March 1731, the English officers in Canton mentioned that 'the gentlemen lately arrived from Manila have brought four hundred thousand Dollars [*sic*] to be invested in silk manufactures'. These men were undoubtedly either Spaniards, or men commissioned to trade on their behalf. On 6 May 1731, the English supercargoes wrote that 'The gentlemen bound to Manila left this place in order to proceed to Macao and there embark upon a Portuguese ship bound to the said Port'.⁵⁸ They apparently hired a Portuguese ship to carry their silk to Manila.

HISTORIOGRAFIA

On 7 November 1731, two of the British captains who were anchored at Whampoa recorded a Spanish ship arriving from Manila. The Danes in Canton recorded the ship to be Portuguese, but then when it departed in late December they referred to it as a Manila ship.⁵⁹ Chaunu shows no ships coming from Macao in 1731 or 1732, but he shows a bark (*barco*) and a sloop (*chalupa*) coming from Canton in the latter year.⁶⁰ The sloop is correct, but the bark would probably have come from Macao, because there were no other Spanish or Portuguese ships at Whampoa in 1731.

On 30 November 1732, a 200-ton Spanish ship named *Nuestra Señora del Rosario*, Captain Balthasar de Arenetta, arrived at Whampoa from Manila.⁶¹ The Chinese merchants then told the English supercargoes that the price of silk would rise daily as the Spaniards concluded their contracts.⁶² This ship returned to Manila in early 1733. Chaunu shows a sampan arriving from Canton.⁶³ It is unlikely that the *Nuestra Señora del Rosario* would have been called a sampan by the customs officers in Manila, so this ship seems to be missing from his data.

Chaunu shows a *patache* named *Nuestra Señora de la Peña* arriving in 1733 from Macao. There was a Portuguese ship with this name in Macao in 1732, which might be the same vessel.⁶⁴ There was often more than one Portuguese or Spanish ship with the same name in Macao, so it is not always easy identifying them. There is now a gap in the arrivals.

Chaunu shows no ships arriving from Macao in 1736, and he has no data for 1737.⁶⁵ English officers recorded two Manila ships arriving at Macao in September 1736, and a third was expected to arrive later.⁶⁶ On 19 February 1737, the Dutch mentioned that the supercargoes from two Manila ships at Macao had arrived in Canton.⁶⁷ These entries suggest that there were two Spanish ships at Macao in 1736 and another two ships in the early months of 1737.

Chaunu shows a sloop (*chaloupe*) arriving from Canton in 1736, commanded by Captain Miguel Sanchez. This is probably a reference to one of the Spanish ships at Macao. Thus, there appears to be possibly three ships missing from Chaunu's data for 1736 and 1737.

At some point in 1737, the Spanish supercargoes from Manila advanced 10,000 taels to the Hong merchant Tan Honqua. This money was probably given to him to pre-order silk for their next ship to arrive. Unfortunately, Tan Honqua died in September 1738, and there is no mention of how the transaction was settled. A Spanish ship did arrive at Macao from Manila in early October 1738.⁶⁸ And a few days later another Spanish ship arrived. The latter vessel was bound for Amoy but owing to contrary winds the captain decided to put into Macao instead. The Dutch mentioned that the supercargoes of these two ships arrived in Canton on 14 October.⁶⁹

In the late 1730s and early 1740s, we see more problems connected to Chaunu's sources. In 1738, 1739, 1741, and 1743, Chaunu shows a Portuguese or Spanish ship arriving in Manila from Canton.⁷⁰ None of those vessels were at Whampoa in the years from 1737 to 1743.⁷¹ In 1741, Chaunu shows the ship *Santa Anna* arriving at Manila from Macao. The British and Dutch sources confirm that it was in Macao in 1740, and that it was a Portuguese ship. It left Macao in early 1741, and sailed to Manila and Batavia.⁷² In 1743, the *Santa Anna* appears again in Manila, but this time Chaunu shows it coming from Canton. That is a mistake. It did not go upriver in 1742, but stayed in Macao. It left Macao in early 1743, and sailed to Manila and Madras, with a brief stopover at Malacca. This route is confirmed by Dutch and British sources.⁷³

Chaunu shows the ship *Jésus de Nazareth* arriving at Manila in 1741 from Canton. This ship was in Macao in 1740, but it had actually

HISTORIOGRAPHY

arrived in 1739 (see below). It did not go upriver to Whampoa, but left Macao for Manila in the first half of 1741.⁷⁴ Another ship, the *Admirante*, was also in Macao in 1740 and returned to Manila in 1741. Chaunu does not mention the latter ship.⁷⁵

What seems to be happening with Chaunu's sources is that the contemporary writers did not always distinguish the ports of origin clearly or correctly. They probably jotted down whatever they heard or thought, with no effort made to ensure the information was correct. Each vessel would have paid port fees and duties at Manila, which, presumably, would mean that the total number of vessels mentioned in Chaunu's sources should be correct. However, we have already seen that this assumption is also not necessarily true, because his figures also differ with Fang's sources in the 1680s. All of these discrepancies raise the question of whether customs officers in Manila were manipulating the figures for personal gain. Of course, there is no way to prove that either.

While it is impossible to know exactly what is happening with the numbers, there are clearly problems with some of Chaunu's figures. Some ships seem to have arrived in Manila and were not recorded. Other ships were recorded incorrectly as coming from ports that they did not visit. Some of the figures in Chaunu's sources seem also to have been placed into the wrong years. Of course, it is possible that some of the ships that left Canton and Macao were wrecked along the way and therefore were not recorded in the customs books.

The *Admirante* and the *Jésus de Nazareth* arrived at Macao sometime in October or November 1739. The Danes recorded more information about the trade of those two ships. The *Admirante* had 200,000 pieces of eight (Spanish dollars) aboard to purchase a return cargo. An Armenian named Surrat was the captain of the *Jésus de Nazareth*, but he appears to have been commissioned by the Spaniards. He brought 300,000 pieces of eight to

purchase his cargo. Their export cargos consisted entirely of silk and gold.⁷⁶

The *Admirante* was a vessel of 150 tons and the *Jésus de Nazareth* was 250 tons. The value of their combined cargos, however, was worth more than what an 800-ton East India Company ship would normally carry. Significant lead time was needed to purchase such a large amount of silk and gold. First, the money needed to be forwarded to the suppliers in the interior to place the order. Then the silk needed to be spun and manufactured, and the gold mined. The goods were then shipped to Canton. Both silk and gold were often ordered and paid for a year in advance. Gold was actually illegal to export, but large quantities were indeed purchased by foreigners almost every year.⁷⁷ After arriving from the interior, the raw silk took many months more in Canton to be weaved, dyed, painted, and embroidered to order.⁷⁸

These purchases were so large that it took 18 months before the ships were finally loaded and ready to sail. They remained at anchor in Macao the entire time. The Dutch mentioned that some of the Spaniards left Canton on 6 January 1741.⁷⁹ Those men were probably from the *Admirante*. That ship left Macao shortly thereafter. The Danes mentioned that the rest of the Spaniards arrived at Macao from Canton on 1 May.⁸⁰

On 3 May, Captain Surrat of the ship *Jésus de Nazareth* organised a party at his residence in Macao. He invited the Governor and all European officers who were in port at the time. They gathered at midday and enjoyed an afternoon together. The French chief Duvelaër de La Barre did not arrive from Canton until later that day, so Surrat organised a separate luncheon for him on 7 May. The Spaniards were known for their lavish spending in Macao. Surrat's ship then left Macao on 10 May 1741.⁸¹

Spain was at odds with Britain during the War of the Austrian Succession (1740–1748).

HISTORIOGRAFIA

British warships were patrolling Asian waters at this time, so it is understandable that there would be few Spanish ships sent to Macao in those years. The British attacked and captured several Spanish and French vessels in Asia.⁸²

In early 1742, the French ship *Le Faliet* from Manila put into Macao for repairs. It had a load of rice, sugar, and other foodstuffs on board, which were in demand in Macao. The Dutch mentioned that the captain was given a 'Portuguese pass' to undergo repairs, and they were allowed to carry on some trade. They were apparently granted permission to enter Macao in exchange for their cargo of provisions. The Portuguese sources mention that the ship had indeed brought food from Manila.⁸³

These Frenchmen from Manila ordered some raw silk from the Hong merchant Tan Suqua (Chen Shouguan 陳壽觀). In March 1742, Suqua mentioned to the Dutch that he sent a shipment of raw silk downriver to Macao, which was to be loaded on the Manila ship anchored there. The well-known Manila trader, Francisco Manriquez, was aboard this vessel. He was a Frenchman and brother of Chevalier Faillet, who had been in Batavia the previous year. Thus, the Dutch were very familiar with this man. The ship was bound to Batavia and was on consignment to an Englishmen. I did not find that vessel in the Batavia records and it also does not show up in Chaunu's sources, so it is unclear where it went after leaving Macao.⁸⁴

In 1745, Chaunu shows two sloops (*chaloupes*) arriving at Manila from Macao, with Spanish captains.⁸⁵ If this information is correct, then the vessels should have been in Macao in either 1744 or 1745. The Portuguese, Dutch, Danes, and English all mention Spanish warships patrolling the waters around Macao in July and August 1744, but nothing about Spanish merchant ships arriving.⁸⁶ All of these Europeans trading in China were paying close attention to the movement of Spanish vessels in the

region, owing to the war. They made no mention to those merchant ships from Manila.

One of Chaunu's ships could be the Portuguese sloop *St António*. Pires mentions that the Spaniards captured this vessel in September 1744 and took it to Manila. Portugal was not involved in the war at this time, so this was an act of aggression against Macao. If that ship arrived in Manila with a Spanish captain, then it might have been recorded as such in the customs records. I found no other ships that could account for his second sloop in 1745.⁸⁷

By 1746, the two cities were back on friendly terms again. In that year, the Macao Senate lowered the tariffs on Spanish vessels to 1.5% on imported silver, in an obvious attempt to encourage more of those vessels to make the trip. This tariff was even less than what the local Portuguese paid (2%). Under the new regulations, the Spanish ships would pay the same in port fees as the Portuguese ships, and also pay no export duties. These new incentives were thought to be unfair by some traders because the Portuguese paid twice as much on silver in Manila (2%) than the Spaniards (1%).⁸⁸ Nevertheless, the new regulations remained in effect until 1773, when the duties on Spanish ships were raised again (see below).

A *balandra* arrived in Manila from Macao in 1747 and the ship *St Domingo* made the trip in 1748, with a Spanish captain.⁸⁹ The Macao records confirm that a Spanish captain did indeed apply for a licence to return to Manila in April and May 1748.⁹⁰ In 1749, Chaunu shows the *Nuestra Señora de la Concepción*, Captain Hieronimo de Illa, arriving at Manila from Canton. There were no Spanish or Portuguese ships at Whampoa at this time, so this ship must have come from Macao.⁹¹

In October 1750, some passengers arrived in Macao from Manila and brought a large amount of money with them to purchase raw and wrought silk. They were expecting a ship to arrive soon.⁹² It arrived in mid-November.⁹³ By April 1751, they

HISTORIOGRAPHY

had received their cargo and presumably sailed back to Manila.⁹⁴

As the examples show, from the late seventeenth century to the mid-eighteenth century, the Spanish trade consisted primarily of large amounts of silver being used to purchase large amounts of silk, and sometimes, gold. Tea is not mentioned. This scenario continued up to the 1780s, and then rice and opium became prominent items of import for most Spanish ships. Nevertheless, silver-laden vessels continued to arrive as well, which was used to purchase silk.⁹⁵

Maria Lourdes Diaz-Trechuelo mentions that the Spaniards in the Philippines ‘imported horses from China’, and they also purchased Chinese cattle. I have no references to cattle or horses, but she shows that the horse herds in the Philippines had grown so large by the 1750s that they began exporting ‘horse meat to China, where it was greatly appreciated’.⁹⁶ This is another aspect that made the Spanish trade very different from other European trade in China.

Chaunu shows the Spanish ship *Santissima Trinidad* arriving in Manila from Canton in 1756. There were no Spanish or Portuguese ships at Whampoa in 1755 or 1756.⁹⁷ Pires mentions that a Spanish ship with that name was captured by the English in 1762, but makes no mention of it having been in Macao in earlier years. If it had not come from Canton, then it probably came from Macao.⁹⁸

By 1757, the Hong merchant Poankeequa was supplying the Spaniards with most of their silk. His Chinese name was Pan Qiguan (潘啓官), and he originated from Fujian Province. The Pan merchants were involved in the junk trade to the Philippines and Southeast Asia. Poankeequa spent many years in Manila when he was young, and learnt to speak, read, and write Spanish.⁹⁹ In 1780, he mentioned that he had been a merchant in Canton for 40 years so he probably established himself there sometime around 1740.¹⁰⁰

When the Spaniards were in Canton, they stayed in Poankeequa’s factory. He kept an agent in Macao, who received their cargos and oversaw the offloading and on-loading of the shipments.¹⁰¹ Poankeequa’s agents and relatives in Amoy took care of the Spanish trade there as well. In 1781, for example, three Spanish ships went to that port and Poankeequa made the arrangements for their export cargos.¹⁰² He was probably doing this all along, because there were a number of Spanish ships that went to Amoy in earlier years as well. I have already discussed the relationship between Poankeequa and the Spaniards in other studies, so I will not repeat it here.¹⁰³

Pires shows a list of ten ships involved in the Macao–Manila trade from 1747 to 1758.¹⁰⁴ His source was the Manila customs (*Almojarifazgo*) records, which was Chaunu’s book. Pires supplemented Chaunu’s data with information from Portuguese sources. There appears to be a mistake in his 1753 entry. According to Chaunu, the ‘2 *barcos*’ shown in Pires’ list should be one bark, which means there were nine ships trading between Macao and Manila in those years.¹⁰⁵

Pires had no way of knowing, but some of the vessels that Chaunu shows coming from Canton were actually coming from Macao. There were no Portuguese or Spanish ships trading at Whampoa in those years.¹⁰⁶ Thus, after subtracting the extra ship in 1753, and adding the *Nuestra Señora de la Concepción* and the *Santissima Trinidad*, we end up with 11 ships from 1747 to 1758. Most of those vessels had Spanish captains.¹⁰⁷

The vessels in 1758 were the *El Espiritu Santo*, *El Santo Niño y Nuestra Señora de la Soledad* and *Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe*, both with Spanish captains.¹⁰⁸ One of these ships would have been the vessel that the Dutch mentioned was at Macao in October 1757.¹⁰⁹ In a later reference, the Dutch tell us why the Portuguese stopped sending ships to Manila:

HISTORIOGRAFIA

*1763, Oct 18: Several years ago, the Portuguese often sent ships to Manila, but after having lost several on that route, they abandoned it. Thus, they now leave all of the trade between Manila and Macao to the Spaniards, the more so because the inhabitants of Macao prosper from the great consumption of these Spaniards.*¹¹⁰

Pires pointed out that from 1735 to 1745 more than 11 Portuguese ships were lost at sea. The losses were so great that it was said there were no rich men in Macao, which is presumably a reference to the late 1740s.¹¹¹ Because the Portuguese pulled out of the trade, the Spanish arrivals became more consistent from the mid-1740s onwards.

With more arrivals from Manila, the Portuguese could enjoy the benefits of the 'great consumption of these Spaniards'. The Spanish tendency to pay for everything with cash made them very welcome guests in Macao. The importance of this influx of Spanish silver should not be underestimated. It was one of the reasons Poankeequa was so successful, and why he made special efforts to cater to Spanish needs.¹¹² It is also one of the factors that enabled the Canton trade to grow, and the reason the Macao Senate was often so willing to lower their duties so those ships would keep coming every year.

There has been considerable new research done on the Manila trade in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, which I discuss briefly below. However, in order to avoid repetition, I will again restrict the discussion to new information, with a brief summary for context.

MANILA, MACAO AND CANTON (1760–1840)

The organisation called the Cohong (公行 Gonghang) was established in 1760 in Canton. It was run by ten Hong merchants (licensed Chinese merchants), but under the supervision

of government officials.¹¹³ In 1757, the Qianlong Emperor forbade foreigners from going to other ports in China. Spaniards continued to be allowed at Amoy and Macao, and the Portuguese obviously continued their trade as well. All other foreigners, however, were now required to trade only at Canton.

In the early 1760s, there were fears in China that the export of silk was causing a deficiency in the local market. This led to quotas being established, whereby each foreign ship was limited to 80 piculs. There is a lot of confusion in the historical records as to how these quotas were applied, and the amount that ships were actually allowed to export. It is clear that some customs superintendents (more commonly called Hoppo) allowed unused quotas to be transferred to ships that wanted more silk. As far as the Spanish ships are concerned, they continued to export large quantities of raw and wrought silk, so somehow they were able to get around the quotas.¹¹⁴

From 1756 to 1763, Spain and Britain were embroiled in the Seven Years' War. From October 1762 to April 1764, the British occupied the Philippines. Most of the Spanish trade with China stopped at that time. A small Spanish vessel, named *San Carlos*, Captain Jorge de San Clemente, made the trip from Macao to Manila in 1764. He arrived in Macao in 1763, in a different vessel, and then purchased the *San Carlos* from a Portuguese merchant. Clemente had considerable commercial interactions with Poankeequa and made a number of voyages to and from Macao.¹¹⁵

After Britain handed the Philippines back to Spain in 1764, concerted efforts were made to restart the economy. The war and occupation had greatly upset the Manila trade.¹¹⁶ It is at this time that we see the voyages to Macao becoming more consistent again. It is also at this time that other Europeans began establishing full-time residents in Canton and Macao.

HISTORIOGRAPHY

Table 3
Spanish Ship Arrivals in the Delta (1764–1833)
 (Most of these ships traded at Macao)

Year	Ships	Year	Ships	Year	Ships	Year	Ships
1764	2	1782	-	1800	1	1818	1
1765	4	1783	1	1801	1	1819	4
1766	2	1784	-	1802	1	1820	14
1767	4	1785	3	1803	1	1821	16
1768	1	1786	4	1804	2	1822	7
1769	3	1787	10	1805	-	1823	7
1770	6	1788	24	1806	1	1824	6
1771	3	1789	24	1807	-	1825	8
1772	2	1790	26	1808	-	1826	4
1773	-	1791	4	1809	-	1827	1
1774	3	1792	8	1810	2	1828	23
1775	1	1793	1	1811	1	1829	24
1776	4	1794	8	1812	2	1830	26
1777	5	1795	17	1813	4	1831	38
1778	2	1796	9	1814	6	1832	47
1779	8	1797	2	1815	6	1833	54
1780	1	1798	1	1816	9	Total	523
1781	1	1799	4	1817	8	Average	7

Sources: BL: IOR G/12/41, G/12/59–60, G/12/62, G/12/64–66, G/12/72, G/12/82, G/12/86, G/12/96, G/12/98, G/12/101, G/12/103, G/12/108, G/12/147, G/12/175–176, G/12/202, G/12/207, G/12/229, G/12/231, G/12/240, G/12/241 Ship List for 1828, G/12/243 Ship List for 1829, G/12/245 Ship List for 1830, G/12/247 Ship List for 1831, G/12/251 Ship List for 1832, G/12/254 Ship List for 1833; BL: IOR L/MAR/A/CXXIII, L/MAR/B/452A; CUL: JM A2–4, JM C10–17, JM C10–16; RAC: Ask 236 List of ships in Macao, Ask 1120, Ask 1183, Ask 1192, Ask 1200–1207, Ask 1212; NAH: OIC 195, *dagregister*, 1794.06.20, 56, 1793.12.09, 4, OIC 197; NAH: VOC 3211 and VOC 4399 Lyst van den generalen aanbreng op Macao in Ao 1766, VOC 3333 and VOC 4406 Lyst van den Generaalen Aanbreng te Macao, VOC 3334, Malacca ship list, 1770.05.09, 611, VOC 3495, Malacca ship list1, 1776.05.13, 51, VOC 4425, Lyst aantoonde . . . Bodems ter Rhee de Wampho in China, VOC 4386, *dagregister*, 1760.11.29, 125, VOC 4431, *dagregister*; NAH: Canton 23, doc. dated 1781.01.01, Canton 95, 1789.04.19, 12, 1789.05.08, 12, Canton 96, Canton 97, Canton 99, Canton 263, Canton 245, 105–108, Canton 256 Ship List for 1794, Canton 258 Ship List for 1795, Canton 260, 66–67, Canton 268 Ship List for 1811, Canton 290, Aanbreng op Macao, Canton 378 Ship Lists for 1822; NAH: HRB 104, 245, Ship List for 1796, HRB 111 & 113 Ship List for 1799, HRB 120 & 123 Ship List for 1803, HRB 128, HRB 130 and HRB 131 Ship List for 1806; NAH: MK 2310A Ship List for 1816–1821; AMN: Dobrée 8Z 399 Manila Ship List for 1819; ANOM: C.1.13, 140r, C.1.14, Liste des Vaisseaux ... Anno 1783 a 1784; Chaunu 1960; Van Dyke 2016, Index “Clemente”; JCB: Brown Papers B.737 F.1 and F.3 List of Ships for 1788; Pires, *A Viagem de Comércio Macau–Manila*; Pires, *A Vida Marítima de Macau*; Andrew David, *The Malaspina Expedition 1789–1794*, 2:338–349; UMMN: Fondo Manuel de Agote, R630–638 Manuel de Agote Diarios 1787–1796; *Arquivos de Macau* 3–04–03, 161–2, 3–25–05, 267, 3–26–02, 114, 3–26–03, 169, 3–26–04, 3–26–05, 273, 194, 3–27–03, 170, 3–27–04, 188, 3–28–01, 45; *Canton Register*; *Chinese Courier*.

HISTORIOGRAFIA

From 1760 to 1771, the Cohong managed the trade and made the environment much more stable than it had been in previous years. This led to Europeans investing more into the China trade. They also began outfitting their residences in Canton with European façades and comforts. The men who remained in China went to Macao after their ships departed, and then returned to Canton when the next ships arrived.¹¹⁷

The British, French, Dutch, and Swedes were now maintaining year-round residents in China, and they began recording information about all ships coming and going. Within a few years, the Danes also had year-round residents in the Delta.¹¹⁸ Their records make it possible to put together a much more complete list of Spanish ships.

Table 3 shows a total of 523 Spanish ships arriving in the Delta from 1764 to 1833. Many of the ships made several voyages per year, so the figures do not represent different ships, but rather the number of arrivals. Most of the vessels traded at Macao. In a later publication, I will show the names and approximate dates of arrival as well as the sources for each year. That data, of course, is too voluminous to include here so I have just entered the number of arrivals for each year in Table 3.

In addition to the numbers in Table 3, other Spanish ships went upriver. From 1783 to 1815, there were 35 Spanish ships trading at Whampoa.¹¹⁹ From 1816 to 1833, the records from Whampoa are fragmented and incomplete but I did find another 9 Spanish ships trading there in those years. If we add 44 to 523, we get a total of 567 Spanish arrivals from 1764 to 1833. These figures do not include the Spanish ships that went to Amoy.

There is likely some duplication in the numbers in Table 3, because it is impossible to cross-reference every entry. One source might record a Spanish ship arriving at Macao or in the Delta,

and then a few days or weeks later, another entry mentions that same ship arriving at Whampoa. Many entries simply mention that a Spanish vessel arrived at Macao or the Delta, without providing its name, which makes it impossible to follow their movements. However, we know the names of all of the ships that went upriver to Whampoa in those years. I have eliminated the obvious duplications, but there are likely others that I was unable to detect.

Spanish ships were now a common site in Macao, which is reflected in art as well. With more foreigners, staying in China there developed a strong demand for paintings of the Delta. From the 1760s to the 1840s, hundreds of paintings of Canton, Macao, Whampoa, and views along the Pearl River were created. They were a type of memorabilia that traders could hang on their walls when they returned to their homelands. Those paintings are also a type of visual historical record, which correctly show Spanish ships anchored in various locations.¹²⁰

Plate 2, for example, is one of the rare paintings of Macao that actually has the name of the Chinese artist, Sunqua, and the date, 1824, inscribed in the upper left hand corner. Lying at anchor in the Inner Harbour on the left are four Portuguese ships, one Spanish ship, and one Chinese junk. Another ship appears to have both a white Portuguese flag at the stern and a Spanish flag on the main mast. It is unclear whether this is a mistake by the artist, or whether it actually had two flags. The Spanish and Portuguese ships did not all arrive or leave at the same time so this could indeed be an accurate depiction of 1824. Obviously, Sunqua considered it to be representative of the time by signing his name to it.

With the Spanish ships now arriving regularly each year from 1764 to 1772, the Portuguese government decided it was time to equalise the duties again, so that Spanish ships were treated similarly to Portuguese ships in Manila. In 1773,

HISTORIOGRAPHY



Plate 2: Macau: A Bird's-eye View. Oil on canvas, 23 ½ × 41 ¼ in. Signed and inscribed in upper left 'Macao/1824/Sunqua'. Courtesy of Martyn Gregory Gallery, London.

the duties were raised on Spanish ships. Note that none of those vessels showed up that year (Table 3).

In 1778, the Spaniards decided that they did not want to pay those high duties any longer so when the ships arrived, they told Macao officials that unless they lowered their duties to the level they had been before 1773, their ships would go upriver to Whampoa instead. In order not to lose that trade, the Macao Senate temporarily agreed. The matter, however, was referred to the Court in Europe, where the final decision would be made.¹²¹

The Spaniards were now becoming much more confident in Canton as well. In 1778, some of the Spaniards decided that they no longer wanted to live in Poankeequa's factory and rented their own accommodations. The British recorded that 'Part of them [the Spaniards] have taken a factory for themselves as thinking that in the House of Puan Khequa they had neither so much freedom to trade nor so good accomodations [*sic*] as they wished'.¹²²

Some Spaniards continued to live with Poankeequa, but others were now anxious to become independent from him and to be treated like other Europeans in Canton. Because Poankeequa could speak Spanish and helped them with their trade at Amoy, they always maintained good relations with him and his sons. This is evident from the continual trade they carried on with his family into the nineteenth century. However, the Spaniards were now gaining more control over their living arrangements, which would eventually lead to them establishing their own factory in Canton.

During the Anglo-Spanish War (1779–1783), Spain was at odds with Britain again over the former nation's support for American independence. This resulted in the Spanish trade being inconsistent in those years. Table 3 shows one ship arriving from Manila in 1780, but there were actually two. The Spanish ship *Hércules* arrived in Macao in May 1780 from Acapulco, via Manila. Because of the

HISTORIOGRAFIA

ongoing war, the owner of the vessel, Martin de Yrisarri, was afraid to sail from Macao. There were several English ships cruising around the entrance to the Delta looking for Spanish or French ships to capture. In order to avoid this outcome, Yrisarri came up with a plan to disguise the *Hércules* as a Portuguese ship.

The Danes mentioned that Yrisarri hired a Portuguese captain so that the ship could sail under a Portuguese flag. The cargo was freighted by some local Armenians in Macao so technically the goods aboard the vessel were not Spanish.¹²³ However, we know that Yrisarri spent several months in Canton that year, which suggests that he probably had a hand in ordering the cargo. He arrived there on 22 December 1780, and returned to Macao on 22 April 1781, so he was there for four months.¹²⁴ Moreover, there were three other Spanish supercargoes attached to this ship, Domingo Acebedo, José Muguerza, and Dionisio Bautista de Ollabarieta, all of which suggests that the ‘Armenian’ label was just a disguise.¹²⁵

Yrisarri commissioned the Portuguese supercargo Domingos Francisco do Azevedo to apply for permission from the Macao Senate to sail the *Hércules* as a Portuguese vessel to Manila, under the name *S. Francisco de Paula*, which was approved.¹²⁶ After sitting in the Inner Harbour for an entire year, the *Hércules* finally left Macao on 10 May 1781.¹²⁷ The ship was bound for Europe, via Manila and Acapulco.

The Danes mentioned that even though the *Hércules* sailed under a Portuguese flag, it still belonged to Yrisarri, which is confirmed by the Portuguese records and is the reason I included it in Table 3.¹²⁸ On the day the ship departed, the English officers at Macao recorded the following: ‘sailed the *Hercules* [*sic*] a large Spanish ship’. Thus, it seems to have been common knowledge that the ship was Spanish, despite the Portuguese flag. It managed to depart without incident.¹²⁹

The other Spanish ship that arrived in 1780, and that is not included in Table 3, is the *Santa Rita*. It arrived in the Delta from Manila in September but was then captured by the English privateer, Captain Tasker.¹³⁰ Even though it sailed under a Spanish flag, it was not actually a Spanish ship, so I did not include it in Table 3. I explain the situation surrounding this ship in another study so I will not repeat that information here.¹³¹

In 1785, the Royal Philippine Company was established and immediately began sending ships and money to Canton and Macao. Ander Permanyer-Ugartemendia and others have already discussed this company, so I will just show a few additional references below that add to the story.¹³² By the 1780s, the Portuguese were again engaging in the trade with Manila.

On 24 August 1788, the Spaniards officially established their own factory in Canton. On that day, they held a celebration in their factory for everyone to witness the raising of their national flag on the quay.¹³³ This was the first time the Spanish flag appeared in front of the factories at Canton. It was undoubtedly a very special occasion for them as their flag now — visually and symbolically — put them on the same level as all other Europeans trading at Canton.

Prior to raising the flag, they had rebuilt the factory and outfitted it with a European façade. In the following year (1789), the French, who lived next door, rebuilt their factory with a façade almost identical to that of the Spaniards.¹³⁴ Plate 3 shows the Spanish and French factories as they appeared in circa 1790. The Spaniards lived in this building every year from 1788 to 1822, when all the buildings burnt down. The factories were rebuilt and the Spaniards continued to fly their flag out front into the 1830s.¹³⁵

Poankeequa’s factory was next door, between the Danish and Spanish factories. Although it is not visible in Plate 3, Poankeequa kept large lanterns

HISTORIOGRAPHY



Plate 3: The Canton Factories, c. 1790. Chinese artist. Gouache. Courtesy of Martyn Gregory Gallery, London.

hanging outside his front door, with the name of his firm Tongwen Hang (同文行).¹³⁶ Before the Spaniards and French rebuilt their factories, those buildings looked very much like Poankeequa's in Plate 3.

The Spaniards maintained two different residences in Macao. In the late eighteenth century, they had a house on Rua de Santo António in Macao. It was just downhill from St. Paul's Church, and close to the Dutch residence.¹³⁷ In later decades, they also had a residence on the Praia Grande, which came to be called the 'Spanish House'. Plate 4 is a drawing of Macao from 1824. I have added a detail above and a label showing the location of the Spanish House. We know this to be correct, because other sources from the period clearly indicate which buildings foreigners were living in at the time.¹³⁸

The Dutch and Spaniards in Canton and Macao had many social interactions. They shared dinners together, and often greeted each other

when returning from Macao to Canton, and *vice versa*. Consequently, there are many references to Spaniards in the Dutch sources, to the point that we know almost precisely when they arrived in Canton each year, and when they returned to Macao.

A favourite pastime in Macao was to put on fireworks displays, and invite everyone to watch. On 5 April 1809, the English put on a fireworks display at Macao. This was usually done at their residence in the Casa Gardens, which was down the street from the Spanish and Dutch houses.¹³⁹ The Spaniards then followed suit, and put on fireworks display on 11, 12, and 13 April. On the latter two days, they also had the Dutch over for dinner.¹⁴⁰

These gatherings of foreigners in Macao are too numerous to reproduce here, but there were a number of more notable meetings that involved the Spaniards. On the evening of 12 June 1795, the Spanish supercargo Agote invited all of the English



Plate 4: View of the Praya Grande from the South, Macao (1824), by Captain Robert R. N. Elliot (?–1849). Pencil on paper, 40.5 × 88.5 cm. Donated to the Hong Kong Museum of Art by Sir Paul Chater. Hong Kong Museum of Art Collection: AH1964.0123. Detail view and label was added by the author.

and Dutch officers to dinner, which included the Dutch ambassador to China, Isaac Titsingh.¹⁴¹ Later that year, on 4 November, the Spanish and Dutch supercargoes enjoyed an evening in Poankeequa's garden and estate on the other side of the river in Canton. The Dutch described it as a very pleasant evening.¹⁴²

There are many entries in the European records showing the huge amount of silver imported to China by the Spaniards. They also hired other foreign ships to carry bullion to China. In order to get an idea of the scope and scale of these imports, I provide a few examples below.

On 24 April 1789, the Portuguese ship *Bemvindo* returned to Macao from Manila. The Dutch mentioned that the ship brought 200,000 *reales* of eight on the account of the Spanish company.¹⁴³ On 29 November of the same year, the Danes mentioned that a Portuguese ship arrived from Manila with 600,000 pillar dollars for the Spanish company.¹⁴⁴ This ship was probably the

Nossa Senhora do Carmo St António o Madrugada. Macao ships were now regularly visiting Manila every year, and freighting bullion and goods for the Spaniards.

On 9 May 1792, a Spanish ship arrived at Macao from Manila with \$280,000.¹⁴⁵ On 10 February 1796, the Spanish ship *St Clive*, Captain Ventura Martinez, arrived at Macao from Manila with \$600,000 aboard.¹⁴⁶ On 21 March 1798, the American ship *Mercury*, Captain Peleg Remington, arrived at Macao from Manila with \$40,000 aboard, on Spanish account.¹⁴⁷ On 19 July 1803, the Spanish ship *Lusitania* arrived at Macao from Manila. It had \$200,000 on board on private accounts and \$150,000 belonging to the Philippine Company.¹⁴⁸ On 3 September 1806, the Spanish frigate *Principe Fernando*, Captain Rodrigues de Aries, arrived at Macao from Manila, with \$400,000.¹⁴⁹ On 21 November 1809, the English frigate *Fox*, Captain Hart, arrived with \$200,000.¹⁵⁰ Most of this silver was imported on the account of the Spanish company.

HISTORIOGRAPHY

There were many years when Spaniards had money left over, after purchasing the cargos for their ships. Those funds were then loaned out to Hong merchants and others in Canton and Macao at 1.5% to 2% interest per month, which produced more revenues for the Spanish company. The influx of Spanish money helped to finance the growth of the China trade.¹⁵¹

As Table 3 shows, from 1787 to 1790, there was a dramatic increase in the number of Spanish arrivals at Macao, ranging from 10 to 26 ships. The numbers declined to just a few ships in the early 1790s. Then the arrivals increased to 17 ships in 1795. From 1796 to 1819, there were zero to nine Spanish ships arriving each year. Then in 1820 and 1821, the numbers increased to 14 and 16 ships, respectively. Table 3 shows six to eight Spanish ships at Macao from 1822 to 1825, and then dropping to four in 1826 and one in 1827. From 1828 to 1833 there was a huge increase in the numbers again. In those years, there were often more Spanish arrivals than there were Portuguese.

The dramatic fluctuations in the numbers demand some explanation. Firstly, I would like to point out again that many vessels made two, three, or four voyages within the same year so the numbers represent arrivals and not different ships. Secondly, the reason for the sharp rise in the numbers from 1787 to 1790, 1795, 1820 to 1821, and 1828 to 1833, has to do with crop failures occurring in China, and the need to import rice. The Philippines produced a huge amount of rice. Whenever China was in need of that grain, shippers in Manila responded within a couple of weeks. They immediately began sending ships to the Delta with cargos of rice. Most of those vessels unloaded their grain at Macao. There are many references to the Spanish ships being fully laden with rice.¹⁵²

An example from March 1795 shows how this happened. In that month, it had become clear that there was going to be another crop failure so

officials sent word out to the Hong merchants to encourage their customers to bring more rice to China. In response, Poankeequa and Monqua (Cai Wenguan 蔡文官) pleaded with the Spanish chief Agote, who was in Canton at the time, to send more ships with rice. They told Agote that the vessels would be allowed to enter free of charge, which was the normal policy in China for rice ships during famine years.¹⁵³

As can be seen in Table 3, the Spaniards responded very quickly to this request. From 8 arrivals in 1794, they increased the numbers to 17 in 1795. Because Manila was so close to China, the Spaniards could provide relief to famine sufferers within a couple of weeks.

In 1796, Guignes also mentioned that the Spaniards dispatched ‘small vessels laden with rice to Macao, which they exchange for various merchandise of China’.¹⁵⁴ After Lintin emerged as a major smuggling depot in 1820, the demand for rice cargos increased dramatically.¹⁵⁵ Besides the Spanish ships that Guignes referred to, there were now many other private vessels that were purchasing rice cargos in Manila and carrying it to China. The rice imports from Manila to Lintin and Macao continued into the 1820s.

In 1830, the Spanish government placed a ban on foreign ships exporting rice from Manila.¹⁵⁶ There was considerable opposition in the Philippines to the exportation of rice, because it was thought that foreign demand for the grain pushed up local prices. Of course, foreign exportation of rice could also lead to fewer opportunities for Spanish shippers. These opposing voices put pressure on the Manila government to restrict its exportation to Spanish ships only.¹⁵⁷ Consequently, we see the number of Spanish ships at Macao jumping from 26 ships in 1830 to 38 in 1831. In 1832, 47 Spanish ships visited Macao, and in 1833, 54 ships. Most of those vessels were carrying rice.

HISTORIOGRAFIA

It is difficult to tell from these numbers exactly how many Spanish ships were actually involved in the trade at Macao. Some of those vessels were now making upwards of five voyages per year.¹⁵⁸ Other ships, however, continued to make just one or two voyages each year. In 1838, Arenas mentioned that 25 to 30 Spanish ships were involved in the trade at Macao, which is a very substantial number, compared to earlier years. Most of the vessels were from 150 to 250 tons, but Arenas mentioned that some of them were upwards of 520 tons.¹⁵⁹ All vessels needed to have a shallow draught of no more than about 18 feet otherwise they could not enter Macao's Inner Harbour.

After these policies changed in Manila in 1830, foreign captains had no choice but to source their rice in Java, Sourabaya, India, or somewhere else, which required more travel time.¹⁶⁰ Nevertheless, there was an advantage to buying rice in Java. Opium could be exchanged for rice there.¹⁶¹ A captain could load his ship with opium in Bengal, exchange part of the cargo for a load of rice at Java, and then proceed to China. The rest of the opium in his ship (which would have been placed on top of the rice) was then unloaded at Lintin Island, and the ship could then proceed upriver to Whampoa as a rice ship, and receive a discount on the port fees.¹⁶² The captain could then load the vessel with a legitimate cargo from Canton, return to India, and exchange the Chinese goods for more opium. Thus, the ban on rice exports in Manila was not necessarily a detriment to those captains as rice was abundant in several ports in Asia.

The connection between rice and opium is important to point out because that is what was encouraging Spaniards to bring that grain to Macao. They could also sell their opium there or at Lintin, and engage in trade without having to pay the customary port fees. They could then purchase a return cargo of Chinese wares at Lintin, and sail

back home. In these ways, opium smuggling was closely connected to rice imports, all of which the Spaniards were much involved in.¹⁶³

In 1831 and the first half of 1832, Spanish captains more or less had a monopoly on the rice trade from Manila to China, which is reflected in the numbers in Table 3. But in those years, there was much confusion about the rice situation in Manila. In August 1832, for example, Jardine and Matheson in Canton declared that their ship *Austen* was 'now engaged in the Rice trade from Manila to China'.¹⁶⁴ The two partners had taken out insurance on the *Austen*, and one of the stipulations in all marine policies was to declare where the ship was going and what it would be carrying. Kierulf & Co. was Jardine and Matheson's agent in Manila, and had informed the men that he expected the ban on rice exports to be removed soon.

Prior to 1830, most of the rice that arrived at Lintin and Macao came from Manila. Thus, the ban on rice exports in the latter port effectively put Java rice exports on a similar level as Manila exports, which increased competition for that grain in Asia. Because foreign vessels brought import cargos to Manila, which generated duties for the government, it was probably not advantageous for the rice trade to be restricted only to Spanish ships. The ban on rice exports was probably more advantageous to Spanish shippers than it was for government revenues.

In October 1832, Kierulf & Co. informed Jardine and Matheson that the Manila government had indeed removed the ban on rice exports.¹⁶⁵ The latter men's ship *Carron* was in the Delta in December 1832. The captain of that vessel did not want to sail back to India without a cargo, so after unloading his opium at Lintin, Jardine and Matheson suggested that he go to Manila to get a load of rice.¹⁶⁶ By early 1833, several foreign captains were again purchasing and exporting rice from the Philippines.¹⁶⁷

HISTORIOGRAPHY

The ship numbers in Table 3 suggest that Spanish captains continued to dominate the rice trade between Manila and China, despite this opening. The Spaniards still had advantages in paying lower duties in the Philippines and in the purchasing of rice. Nevertheless, the Spanish government realised that an entirely open and unrestricted market for rice would inevitably disadvantage local shippers. Consequently, officials introduced a new policy stipulating that foreign captains would only be able to purchase a cargo of rice if they underwent at least \$2,000 worth of repairs to their ship at Manila.¹⁶⁸

Around this same time, the import duties on foreign ships at Manila were increased from 10% to 14%. Strangely, this increase in duties was also applied to Portuguese ships, despite the fact that Spanish ships enjoyed lower duties in Macao. At this time, Arenas reported that Portuguese ships ‘hardly ever come to the Philippines’, and that the trade to Macao was now done almost exclusively with Spanish ships again.¹⁶⁹ The Macao Government eventually reciprocated and raised the duties on Spanish vessels (see below).¹⁷⁰

This new stipulation in Manila led some captains no longer to consider the Philippines as an option, because they did not need repairs. In the 28 January 1834 issue of the *Canton Register*, an article was published confirming that all foreign vessels were now required by the Spanish government to undergo at least \$2,000 worth of repairs in Manila, before permission would be granted to purchase a cargo of rice. It essentially ensured that Spanish ships would continue to dominate the rice trade there.¹⁷¹

Spanish ships carried other cargo to China and Macao as well, and they did not all arrive from Manila. In March 1833, the Spanish ship *Correo de Manila* arrived at Macao from Singapore. It had a load of betel nut aboard. The cargo was actually owned by Charles Thomas & Co. of Singapore, but was being imported under the guise of a Spanish flag.

Being a Spanish ship, the Macao Senate would allow the betel nut to land there but Captain Marcaida was required to pay a heavy import tax, which he deemed entirely unreasonable. Instead of Macao, Marcaida contemplated selling the betel nut at Lintin, or, if that failed, then to sell it in Manila.¹⁷²

The *Correo de Manila*’s betel nut was eventually sold at Lintin, and the proceeds were credited to Charles Thomas & Company’s account.¹⁷³ In order to avoid problems with the Macao Senate, the ship remained at Lintin for an extended period of time until the government had lost sight of the cargo and could not connect it to the same goods that Marcaida had attempted to land at Macao. Because Marcaida had attempted to do all of this trade at Macao, there were concerns that the government would try to tax the trade despite the fact that the transactions had taken place at Lintin. There were no export duties at Macao, but any goods that were transferred to the *Correo de Manila* from another ship were required to pay a ‘transit duty’.

Marcaida was supplied with an export cargo at Lintin by Jardine and Matheson. In the end, Marcaida managed to make all of these exchanges without creating problems with the Macao Government.¹⁷⁴ His example shows that some Spanish ships purposely avoided going to Macao, so it was not always their first choice. There is no way of knowing how many ships in Table 3 went to Lintin rather than Macao. But it is clear from the many references to Spanish ships arriving at Macao that the overwhelming majority of them traded there and not in other locations.

In April 1834, Jardine and Matheson estimated that 100,000 piculs of rice would arrive that year at Lintin from Manila, and 60,000 to 100,000 piculs of rice from Java.¹⁷⁵ At a minimum of 4,000 piculs of rice being needed for a ship to avoid paying the port fees, the 160,000 to 200,000 piculs of rice meant that there were upwards of 40 to 50 ships now carrying that grain to China. When

HISTORIOGRAFIA

we add those figures to the amount of rice that was being imported at Macao, we can see that China was now consuming a huge amount of foreign rice.

By 1834, there was so much rice arriving in the Delta that one firm began advertising rice for sale. In the *Canton Register*, issues dated from October 1834 to January 1835, the following advertisement appears: 'Rice, in quantities for ships to enter the Port free of the Cumsha and measurement dues, may be had at Lintin. Apply to A. S. Keating'. The 'Port' is Whampoa, 'Cumsha' is a reference to the fees that were normally charged, and 'measurement dues', are the port fees. All ships that did not have a load of rice had to pay those charges.

The large amount of rice that was now arriving is representative of the enormous amount of smuggling that was going on, all of which the Spaniards were helping to grow. In 1832, there were 38 foreign ships involved in smuggling in the Delta. Seven of the ships made two or more voyages to China in the same year.¹⁷⁶ Most, if not all, of those vessels were involved in the opium trade, and would not want to leave China without an export cargo. Consequently, there was indeed a demand at Lintin for enough rice to load 40 or more ships.

By this time, the Portuguese government was allowing other foreign ships to land imports at Macao. In August 1834, the English ship *Stakely* unloaded its cargo of rice there. The rice was imported under the name of the Portuguese firm Almeida & Son of Singapore.¹⁷⁷ In October 1834, the English ship *Coventry* also landed its cargo of betel nut at Macao.¹⁷⁸ These vessels were now competing directly with the Spanish ships.

The Portuguese administration closely monitored the trade of the Spanish ships in Macao and the Portuguese ships in Manila to ensure they were being treated equitably.¹⁷⁹ After the import duties were raised on Portuguese ships in Manila, Macao responded in kind. On 15 July 1834, the

Macao Government 'issued an edict raising the duties on goods imported in Spanish vessels from Manila from 6% to 14%'. The object of this rise in duties was 'to place the Portuguese vessels trading to Manila under the same privileges which protect at present the Spanish vessels trading to Macao'.¹⁸⁰

We do not have accurate numbers of Spanish arrivals at Macao after 1833, so it is unclear to what extent this new policy affected Spanish shipping. It is probably safe to assume that such a huge increase in duties would have had a corresponding influence on the number of Spanish arrivals. The EIC's monopoly on trade between Great Britain and China ended in 1833, which means the diaries that they kept each year of the trade also ceased. By that time, all other East India companies had stopped their operations in China. The *Canton Register* and the *Canton Press* are wonderful sources for ship arrivals at Whampoa and the Delta, but they did not include in their lists the vessels that entered Macao. Consequently, for the years after 1833, I only have a few references to the Spanish trade.

Arenas has shown that the ban on foreigners exporting rice from the Philippines continued into the late 1830s.¹⁸¹ Some foreign ships, however, managed to get a cargo of rice there. In the summer of 1835, the English ships *Runnymede* and *Abel Gower* arrived in the Delta with a load of rice from Manila. The Danish ship *Syden* also made three voyages to Manila that year, and brought back a load of rice each time, which was unloaded at Macao.¹⁸² There is no mention of how they managed to do this. Presumably, the *Syden* would not have undergone \$2,000 worth of repairs each time.

There was a bumper crop in the Philippines in 1835 so the Spanish government may have made an exception in their rice policy.¹⁸³ It is not always clear how or why these exchanges were permitted.¹⁸⁴ Nevertheless, the Spanish shippers still had an advantage in the rice market. The Spanish ship *Colon*, for example, made three trips

HISTORIOGRAPHY

to China with rice in 1835. It earned 40 to 50 cents more per picul on the rice than the *Syden*, which was attributed to the advantages the *Colon* enjoyed in Manila.¹⁸⁵

In 1836, Hoppo Wenxiang (文祥) in Canton heard that some non-Iberian ships were landing their rice cargos at Macao. Consequently, he issued a new proclamation dated 25 June 1836 ordering all non-Iberian vessels to bring their rice upriver to Whampoa, and not to unload it at Macao or other places in the Delta. Persons who defied his order were to be arrested and brought to the Hoppo's office for questioning.¹⁸⁶

This move effectively stopped rice going to Macao on those vessels, which again ensured the Spaniards would have a monopoly on that commerce.¹⁸⁷ In July 1836, William Jardine mentioned that it was now impossible to ship rice to Macao on English ships, owing to the Hoppo's order.¹⁸⁸ In other ports, however, the Qing government had no effective means of stopping the rice exchanges. Rice and other goods continued to be offloaded and on-loaded illegally in the lower Delta.

Strangely, the Hoppo's proclamation did not stop other merchandise from going to Macao on non-Iberian ships. In December 1836, the English ships *Highland Chief*, *Lady Hayes*, *Soobrow*, and *Corsair* unloaded their cargos of betel nut at Macao, which was sold for \$4.10 to \$4.50 per picul.¹⁸⁹ The *Lady Hayes* also landed a quantity of ebony wood at Macao.¹⁹⁰ And the English ship *Edward* landed its cargo of cotton at Macao a few months earlier.¹⁹¹ All of these ships were required to go upriver to Whampoa, but now they had no problem unloading their cargos at Macao.

In this study, I have only briefly mentioned the Spanish opium trade, but it was frequent and widespread. That topic is extensively covered by Permanyer-Ugarteandia in his recent publications, so I refer the reader to those studies for a more complete picture of Sino-Spanish exchanges.¹⁹²

CONCLUSION

The Spanish trade in the Delta had many up and down periods. A ship might arrive one year, and then several years went by before the next one showed up. In some years, one, two, or three ships might show up unexpectedly at Macao with a huge demand for silk and gold. Regardless of how many ships arrived or their size, many Spanish vessels imported large quantities of silver coins, which made them very welcome guests in both Macao and Canton.

It is unfortunate that we have so few details of the Spaniards' day-to-day activities in the Delta. We only get brief glimpses of their trade from entries in other European records. We know that many Spaniards went to Canton after they arrived in Macao and we know about their attempts to make guns in Canton in 1722. We know that they gave loans to Hong merchants and other foreigners, and we know that they were among the largest purchasers of silk in Canton.

Wars caused much disruption in the trade and the relationship between Manila and Macao. Ships were captured or prevented from sailing. And when Spain and Portugal were at odds with each other, it obviously affected the situation in Asia. However, if we look at the two cities over a longer period from 1640 to 1840, some general observations emerge.

Macao usually responded quickly when the relationship with Manila was restored. The Portuguese initiated new incentives to woo the Spaniards back. This happened several times over the period. Spanish silver imports were very important to the city.

When we look at Manila's response in comparison, we see that the Spaniards were not nearly as generous in their treatment of Portuguese ships. Those vessels were not as important to Manila as the Spanish ships were to Macao. The Philippines had a steady flow of merchandise

HISTORIOGRAFIA

arriving from China on Chinese vessels, so the Portuguese had little to offer that could not be obtained elsewhere. Silver was vital for Macao's economy, and there was no better place to get it than from Spanish ships.

The Spaniards were also one of the major suppliers of silver to China, which helped to finance growth. Merchants and officials in Canton did whatever they had to do in order to attract those vessels back again. If stretching the rules on silk quotas was what was needed to woo them to Canton, then so be it.

The Spaniards were also much involved with the smuggling of opium, which led to the gradual deterioration and collapse of the China trade. But if overlooking the smuggling is what was needed to encourage more rice imports from Manila, then so be it too. Officials in Canton could gain a good reputation with the emperor if they were successful at bringing rice into the country when it was needed most. Of course, rampant trade in

opium would scar officials' reputations, so it was a delicate balance to maintain: no opium, no rice; no rice, people die. There is no question that many Chinese would have suffered greatly had the Spanish rice not arrived. Thus, like other foreign trading in China, there were positive and negative aspects to the Sino-Spanish exchanges.

With all of the new studies that have now been done, we can no longer ignore the Spanish contribution. For better or for worse, they were at the centre of the development of the trade in both Macao and Canton from the beginning. Whatever happened to Spanish trade in Macao and Manila, affected what happened to other foreign commerce in the Delta; whatever happened to non-Iberians in Macao, the Delta, and Manila, affected the outcome of the Spanish and Portuguese trade in China. The Spaniards were part of all the same processes that were at work in the region, and as such, should be given their due space in the histories of Macao and the China trade. **RC**

This article is from the research paper for the project 'Catalogue of Macao Shipping 1700–1833', funded by the Academic Research Grant 2020 of the Macao SAR Government.

NOTES

- 1 Pierre Chaunu, *Les Philippines et le Pacifique des Ibériques (XVI^e, XVII^e, XVIII^e siècles)* (Paris: S.E.V.P.E.N., 1960), Tables 4–7, 160–175.
- 2 Benjamim Videira Pires, *A Viagem de Comércio Macau–Manila nos Séculos XVI a XIX* (Macao: Centro de Estudos Marítimos de Macau, 1987); Benjamim Videira Pires, *A Vida Marítima de Macau no Século XVIII* (Macao: Instituto Cultural; Museu Marítimo de Macau, 1993).
- 3 George Bryan Souza, “Merchants and Commerce in Asia and the Portuguese Empire Over the Long 18th Century,” *Review of Culture (International Edition)*, no. 34 (2010): 7–19; George Bryan Souza, *The Survival of Empire: Portuguese Trade and Society in China and the South China Sea, 1630–1754* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986); A. M. Martins do Vale, *Os Portugueses em Macau (1750–1800)* (Macao: Instituto Português do Oriente, 1997); Ângela Guimarães, *Uma Relação Especial: Macau e as Relações Luso-Chinesas 1780–1844* (Lisbon: Edição CIES, 1996); Tingmao Zhang, *Ming Qing shiqi Aomen haishang maoyi shi* (Macao: MASTV — Publicação de Revistas, 2004).
- 4 Chaunu, *Les Philippines*.
- 5 Ander Permanyer-Ugarteandia, “Espanoles en Cantón: los Diarios de Manuel de Agote, primer factor de la Real Compañía de Filipinas en China (1787–1796),” *Itsas Memoria. Revista de Estudios Marítimos del País Vasco*, no. 7 (2012): 523–546; Ander Permanyer-Ugarteandia, “Opium after the Manila Galleon: The Spanish involvement in the opium economy in East Asia (1815–1830),” *Investigaciones de Historia Económica*, 10, no. 3 (Oct. 2014): 155–164; Ander Permanyer-Ugarteandia, “Una Presencia no tan Singular: Españoles en la Economía del Opio en Asia Oriental (1815–1843),” *Millars: Espai i Història* 39 (2015): 63–87; Ander Permanyer-Ugarteandia, “The Spanish Link in the Canton Trade, 1787–1830: Silver, Opium and the Royal Philippine Company,” in *China’s Development from a Global Perspective*, eds. María Dolores Elizalde and Jianlang Wan (Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2017), 1–17; Ander Permanyer-Ugarteandia, “Yrisarri & Co.: A Hispanic-Anglo Firm in the Opium Trade in East Asia (1815–30),” in *The Hispanic-Anglosphere from the Eighteenth to the Twentieth Century*, ed. Graciela Iglesias-Rogers (New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group, 2021), 67–82.
- 6 Birgit Tremml-Werner, “Marginal Players and Intra-network Connections: New Perspectives on the Manila Trade, c. 1640–1780,” *Journal of Social Sciences and Philosophy* 29, no. 4 (2017): 599–626; Antoni Picazo Muntaner, “El comercio de Filipinas en el tránsito al siglo XVIII: la política comercial china,” *Vegueta: Anuario de la Facultad de Geografía e Historia*, no. 20 (2020): 253–272; María Dolores Elizalde, “El viraje de Filipinas hacia Asia en el filo de los siglos XVIII y XIX,” *Vegueta: Anuario de la Facultad de Geografía e Historia*, no. 20 (2020): 163–187; Lucille Chia, “The Butcher, the Baker, and the Carpenter: Chinese Sojourners in the Spanish Philippines and Their Impact on Southern Fujian (Sixteenth–Eighteenth Centuries),” *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 49, no. 4 (2006): 509–534; Leonor Diaz de Seabra, “Power, Society and Trade. The Historical Relationship between Macao and the Philippines from the 16th to 18th Centuries,” *Review of Culture (International Edition)*, no. 7 (2003): 47–58.
- 7 Chenchen Fang, *Huaren yu Lüsòng maoyi (1657–1687): shiliao fenxi yu fanzhu* (Hsinchu: NTSU Press, 2012); Chenchen Fang, *Mingmo Qingchu Taiwan yu Manila de fanchuan maoyi* (Taipei: Daw Shiang Publishing Co., 2006); Chenchen Fang and Shuru Fang, *Taiwan Xibanya maoyi shiliao (1664–1684)* (Taipei: Daw Shiang Publishing Co., 2006).
- 8 Paul A. Van Dyke, *Merchants of Canton and Macao: Success and Failure in Eighteenth-Century Chinese Trade*, Vol. 2 (Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 2016) (hereafter MCM 2), Chapter 3, see especially 75–83.
- 9 The names of the 25 quota ships can be seen in Tingnan Liang, *Yue haiguan zhi* (Guangzhou: Guangdong People’s Publishing House; reprint, 2002), 533–534.
- 10 For examples of quota ships being substituted by other ships, see Fong Lau, ed., *Chapas Sínicas* (Macao: Instituto Cultural, 2018): 120, 239; Fong Lau and Wenqin Zhang, eds., *Qingdai Aomen zhongwen dang’an huibian*, 2 vols. (Macao: Macao Foundation, 1999): no. 393, 216; no. 448, 449, and 450, 244–245.
- 11 Chaunu, *Les Philippines*, Tables 4–7, 160–175.
- 12 Emma Helen Blair and James Alexander Robertson, eds., *The Philippine Islands 1493–1898*, vols. 1–55 (Cleveland, Ohio: The Arthur H. Clark Co., 1905), vol. 27, 311.
- 13 Blair and Robertson, *The Philippine Islands*, 35:15, 19; 37:192; 44:99; C. A. Montalto de Jesus, *Historic Macao* (Hong Kong: Kelly & Walsh Limited, 1902), 92–110.
- 14 Blair and Robertson, *The Philippine Islands*, 47:69.
- 15 Blair and Robertson, *The Philippine Islands*, 42:150–151. This reference does not have a specific date as to when relations were restored. In the index (53:307 and 54:271), Blair and Robertson suggest that this might be referring to ‘(ca. 1672?)’.
- 16 Blair and Robertson, *The Philippine Islands*, 42:17.
- 17 Blair and Robertson, *The Philippine Islands*, 42:195; Pires, *A Viagem de Comércio Macau–Manila*, 36–37.
- 18 Fang, *Huaren yu Lüsòng maoyi*, 93, Table 5.1.
- 19 Chaunu, *Les Philippines*, Tables 7, 168–171, notes 49 and 55.
- 20 Chaunu, *Les Philippines*, Table 6, 168–171, note 65; Pires, *A Viagem de Comércio Macau–Manila*, 37–39. For more discussion of this transitional period in Manila–Macao

HISTORIOGRAFIA

- relations, see Muntaner, “El comercio de Filipinas,” 254–255, 267; Charles Ralph Boxer, *Fidalgos in the Far East* (London: Oxford University Press; reprint, Hong Kong: Oxford University Press, 1968), 150–155. And more specifically, for the transformation of the Manila trade in this period, see Tremml-Werner, “Marginal Players and Intra-network Connections,” 9–15.
- 21 Pires, *A Viagem de Comércio Macau–Manila*, 37–40; Chaunu, *Les Philippines*, Table 7, 172–175, notes 50, 55, 61, 72, 77.
 - 22 Jesus, *Historic Macao*, 113.
 - 23 Anders Ljungstedt, *An Historical Sketch of the Portuguese Settlements in China; and the Roman Catholic Church and Mission in China* (Boston: James Munroe and Co., 1836; reprint, Hong Kong: Viking Hong Kong Publications, 1992), 70.
 - 24 Pires, *A Viagem de Comércio Macau–Manila*, 42.
 - 25 Saxe Bannister, trans., *A Journal of the First French Embassy to China, 1698–1700* (London: Thomas Cautley Newby, 1859), 137–139; Chaunu, *Les Philippines*, Table 7, 172–175.
 - 26 Carl T. Smith and Paul A. Van Dyke, “Armenian Footprints in Macao,” *Review of Culture (International Edition)*, no. 8 (Oct. 2003): 20–39.
 - 27 Smith and Van Dyke, “Armenian Footprints in Macao,” 28; Paul A. Van Dyke, “Ambiguous Faces of the Canton Trade: Moors, Greeks, Armenians, Parsees, Jews and Southeast Asians,” in *The Private Side of the Canton Trade, 1700–1840: Beyond the Companies*, eds. Paul A. Van Dyke and Susan E. Schopp (Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 2018), 21–42; Maria Lourdes Diaz-Trechuelo, “The Economic Development of the Philippines in the Second Half of the Eighteenth Century,” *Philippine Studies* 11, no. 2 (1963): 195–231, see 222.
 - 28 MCM 2: 192. In 1771, for example, the Dutch had to pay 80% in money for the silk they ordered. National Archives, The Hague (NAH): Canton 80, 1771.08.08. For other goods, they paid two-thirds in silver. NAH: Canton 81, 1772.08.09.
 - 29 Paul A. Van Dyke, *The Canton Trade: Life and Enterprise on the China Coast, 1700–1845* (Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 2005; reprint, 2007), 107.
 - 30 Chrétien-Louis-Joseph de Guignes, “Observations on the Philippine Islands and the Isle of France,” in *A Collection of the Best and Most Interesting Voyages and Travels in Various Parts of America; Many of Which are Now First Translated into English*, comp. John Pinkerton, Vol. 11 (London: Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme, and Brown, Paternoster-Row; Cadell and Davies, in the Strand, 1819), 68–95. The quote is on 87. This treatise was first published in French in Paris, by Imprimerie Impériale, in 1808.
 - 31 MCM 2: 75–83.
 - 32 Chaunu, *Les Philippines*, Table 7, 172–175, notes 76–77, Table 8, 176–179, notes 2, 6, 12, 15, 20, 25, 30, 34, 40, 48, 56, 62, 68, Table 9, 180–183, notes 2, 8, 13, 18.
 - 33 British Library (BL): India Office Records (IOR) G/12/5, 743, L/MAR/A/CXXIII, 17–103; Chaunu, *Les Philippines*, Table 7, 172–175.
 - 34 Pires, *A Viagem de Comércio Macau–Manila*, 43.
 - 35 BL: IOR G/12/5, 1699.11.02, 681.
 - 36 BL: IOR G/12/7, 1704.12.13, 1047.
 - 37 Chaunu, *Les Philippines*, Table 8, 176–179, note 16.
 - 38 Pires, *A Viagem de Comércio Macau–Manila*, 43.
 - 39 Chaunu, *Les Philippines*, Table 8, 176–179.
 - 40 Pires, *A Viagem de Comércio Macau–Manila*, 44; Seabra, “Power, Society and Trade,” 57; Chaunu, *Les Philippines*, Table 8, 176–179.
 - 41 Chaunu, *Les Philippines*, Table 9, 180–183, note 23.
 - 42 Chaunu, *Les Philippines*, Table 9, 180–183, note 23.
 - 43 Jakarta, Arsip Nasional Republik Indonesia (ANRI): 2547, 1719.04.29, f. 267; ANRI: 2548, 1719.07.26, f. 482; ANRI: 2550, 1720.04.03, f. 226; Chaunu, *Les Philippines*, Table 9, 180–183, note 23.
 - 44 Chaunu, *Les Philippines*, Table 9, 180–183, note 31.
 - 45 ANRI: 2550, 1720.03.01, f. 149, 1720.07.27, f. 440; ANRI: 2553, 1721.07.25, f. 469; ANRI: 2554, 1722.01.16, f. 22; Chaunu, *Les Philippines*, Table 9, 180–183; Pires, *A Viagem de Comércio Macau–Manila*, 48; Pires, *A Vida Marítima de Macau*, 34; W. Ph. Coolhaas, *Generale Missiven van Gouverneurs-Generaal en Raden aan Heren XVII der Verenigde Oostindische Compagnie, Deel VII: 1713–1725* (The Hague: Verkrijgbaar Bij Martinus Nijhoff, 1979) (hereafter GM 7), 1722.03.31, 597.
 - 46 Paul A. Van Dyke, *Whampoa and the Canton Trade: Life and Death in a Chinese Port, 1700–1842* (Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 2020), Appendix 1.2a.
 - 47 BL: IOR L/MAR/B/682B, 1721.10.24; BL: IOR G/12/22, 1721.10.24.
 - 48 BL: IOR L/MAR/B/402C, 1722.11.23.
 - 49 Chaunu, *Les Philippines*, Table 9, 180–183.
 - 50 BL: IOR G/12/24, 1723.07.15; Pires, *A Viagem de Comércio Macau–Manila*, 48–50.
 - 51 BL: IOR G/12/24, 1723.07.15.
 - 52 Paul A. Van Dyke, “Amoy Anqua (1696–1723) and the China Trade before the Rise of the Canton System,” *Review of Culture (International Edition)*, no. 66 (2021): 96–111, see 103 and note 42. Paul A. Van Dyke and Maria Kar-wing Mok, *Images of the Canton Factories 1760–1822: Reading History in Art* (Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 2015), 37; BL: IOR G/12/8, 1723.05.21, 1415, 1723.05.28, 1417, 1723.06.08, 1419, G/12/21, 1723.05.28, 23, G/12/24, 1723.07.15, 16.
 - 53 BL: IOR G/12/24, 1723.07.15; Pires, *A Viagem de Comércio Macau–Manila*, 48–50.
 - 54 Chaunu, *Les Philippines*, Table 9, 180–183, note 41.
 - 55 Van Dyke, *Whampoa and the Canton Trade*, Appendix 1.2a.
 - 56 Chaunu, *Les Philippines*, Table 9, 180–183, notes 54, 71, and 81, Table 10, 184–187, note 12; Van Dyke, *Whampoa and the Canton Trade*, Appendix 1.2a.
 - 57 Pires, *A Viagem de Comércio Macau–Manila*, 52.

HISTORIOGRAPHY

- 58 BL: IOR G/12/32, 1731.03.02, 6, 1731.05.06, 13.
- 59 BL: IOR L/MAR/B/644B and L/MAR/B/656E, entries dated 1731.11.07; “En Dagbog ført paa en Kinafarer 1730–1732 af Kadet Tobias Wigandt,” in G. L. Grove, *Tidsskrift for Søvesen*, ed. Kaptajn J. H. Schultz (Copenhagen: Hovedkommissionær Vilhelm Tryde, Thieles Bogtrykkeri, 1900), 183–211. See 203, 206; Van Dyke, *Whampoa and the Canton Trade*, Appendix 1.2a.
- 60 Chaunu, *Les Philippines*, Table 10, 184–187, see note 6.
- 61 BL: IOR G/12/33 p, 154, L/MAR/B/230B, 1732.11.30; Archives Nationales, Paris (ANP): 4JJ/129B/12 1732.12.01; Van Dyke, *Whampoa and the Canton Trade*, Appendix 1.2a.
- 62 BL: IOR G/12/33, 1732.11.25, 142.
- 63 Chaunu, *Les Philippines*, Table 10, 184–187, note 11.
- 64 *Records of Fort St George. Diary and Consultation Book* (Madras: Government Press, 1930) (hereafter FSG: DCB), 1732.07.15, 62; NAH: VOC 2240, Malacca dagregister, 1732.07.08, 175, 1732.07.15, 176; Chaunu, *Les Philippines*, Table 10, 184–187.
- 65 Chaunu, *Les Philippines*, Table 10, 184–187.
- 66 BL: IOR G/12/41, 1736.09.08, 23.
- 67 NAH: VOC 2410, dagregister, 1737.02.19, 210, *resolutie* dated 1737.03.04, 116.
- 68 NAH: VOC 2438, dagregister, 1738.09.13, 198, 1738.10.07, 207. The English shows two ships arriving from Manila in late September, but without stating their nationality. BL: IOR G/12/44, 1738.09.26, 73.
- 69 NAH: VOC 2438, dagregister, 1738.10.14, 210, report dated 1738.06.09, 59–60.
- 70 Chaunu, *Les Philippines*, Table 10, 184–187, notes 33, 39 and 61.
- 71 Van Dyke, *Whampoa and the Canton Trade*, Appendix 1.2a.
- 72 BL: IOR G/12/48, ‘List of Ships at Macao Anno 1740’, 55; ANRI: 2572, 1741.03.15, f. 129; Chaunu, *Les Philippines*, Table 10, 184–187.
- 73 FSG: DCB, 1743.03.30, 72; NAH: VOC 2570, dagregister, 1742.07.11, 393, 540–541, 1742.07.18, 394, 561; Chaunu, *Les Philippines*, Table 10, 184–187.
- 74 Chaunu, *Les Philippines*, Table 10, 184–187; BL: IOR G/12/48, 54–55.
- 75 Chaunu, *Les Philippines*, Table 10, 184–187.
- 76 Rigsarkivet, Copenhagen (RAC): Ask 1120, 1741.05.02, 123v.
- 77 For examples of foreigners purchasing gold in China, see the ‘gold’ entries in the indexes of Paul A. Van Dyke, *Merchants of Canton and Macao: Politics and Strategies in Eighteenth-Century Chinese Trade*. Vol. 1 (Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 2011) (hereafter MCM 1); and MCM 2.
- 78 For a discussion of the silk trade in Canton, and the silk weavers, painters, and embroiderers, see MCM 2: chapters 9 and 10.
- 79 NAH: VOC 8718, dagregister, 1741.01.06, 251.
- 80 RAC: Ask 1120, 1741.05.02, 123v.
- 81 RAC: Ask 1120, 1741.05.03–10, 123v.
- 82 Pires, *A Viagem de Comércio Macau–Manila*, 59–61; Pires, *A Vida Marítima de Macau*, 102–103.
- 83 NAH: VOC 2535, report dated 1742.03.14, 100, 105; Pires, *A Viagem de Comércio Macau–Manila*, 58; Pires, *A Vida Marítima de Macau*, 103.
- 84 NAH: VOC 2535, report dated 1742.03.14, 100, 105; Pires, *A Viagem de Comércio Macau–Manila*, 58; Chaunu, *Les Philippines*, Table 10, 184–187.
- 85 Chaunu, *Les Philippines*, Table 10, 184–187, note 69.
- 86 Pires, *A Vida Marítima de Macau*, 103; NAH: Canton 3, resolution dated 1744.08.29, Canton 70, 1744.07.19, 1744.08.07, 1744.08.27; RAC: Ask 1005, 1744.08.19; BL: IOR R/10/3, 1744.08.01–15, 58, 62, 124.
- 87 Pires, *A Vida Marítima de Macau*, 103.
- 88 Pires, *A Viagem de Comércio Macau–Manila*, 60–61.
- 89 Chaunu, *Les Philippines*, Table 11, 188–191, note 8.
- 90 *Arquivos de Macau*, series 1–3 (Macao: Imprensa Nacional, 1929–1977): 3–22–04, 239–241 (hereafter AM).
- 91 Van Dyke, *Whampoa and the Canton Trade*, Appendix 1.2a.
- 92 MCM 2: 76; BL: IOR G/12/54, 1750.10.14, 28.
- 93 BL: IOR G/12/53, 1750.11.19, 38, G/12/54, 1750.11.19, 81.
- 94 MCM 2: 76; BL: IOR G/12/54, 1750.10.14, 28.
- 95 MCM 2: 75–83.
- 96 Diaz-Trechuelo, “The Economic Development of the Philippines,” 203–204.
- 97 Chaunu, *Les Philippines*, Table 11, 188–191, note 48.
- 98 Pires, *A Viagem de Comércio Macau–Manila*, (?)117n115.
- 99 For Poankeequa’s story, see MCM 2: Chapter 3.
- 100 BL: IOR G/12/68, 1780.09.21, 186, and G/12/70, 1780.09.21, 165.
- 101 BL: IOR R/10/9, 1772.07.20, 25–26.
- 102 BL: IOR G/12/19, 1781.12.20, 211–12, G/12/72, 1781.10.24, 148, G/12/73, 1781.12.20, 92.
- 103 For Poankeequa’s role in the Spanish trade from 1757 to 1784, see MCM 2: Chapter 3, especially 75–83. Van Dyke and Mok, *Images of the Canton Factories*, see index entry for ‘Spanish’. There is some discussion in this book, and in the following article, about the Spanish trade and factory in Canton. Paul A. Van Dyke, “The Hume Scroll of 1772 and the Faces behind the Canton Factories,” *Review of Culture (International Edition)*, no. 54 (2017): 64–102.
- 104 Pires, *A Viagem de Comércio Macau–Manila*, 62.
- 105 See Chaunu, *Les Philippines*, Table 11, 188–191, note 34, and Pires, *A Viagem de Comércio Macau–Manila*, 62.
- 106 Van Dyke, *Whampoa and the Canton Trade*, Appendix 1.2a–b.
- 107 Chaunu, *Les Philippines*, Table 11, 188–191.
- 108 Chaunu, *Les Philippines*, Table 11, 188–191, note 56.
- 109 NAH: VOC 4381, dagregister, 1757.10.16, 188v.
- 110 Paul A. Van Dyke and Cynthia Viallé, *The Canton–Macao Dagregisters, 1763* (Macao: Instituto Cultural, 2008), 137. (hereafter CMD 1763).
- 111 Pires, *A Viagem de Comércio Macau–Manila*, 60.
- 112 MCM 2: Chapter 3.
- 113 For the establishment of the Cohong, its operation, and removal in 1771, see MCM 1: Chapter 3, and MCM 2: 83–84.

HISTORIOGRAFIA

- 114 MCM 2:75–83, 181–184.
- 115 Chaunu, *Les Philippines*, Table 12, 192–195, note 3; MCM 2: See Index for ‘Clemente’ references.
- 116 Diaz-Trechuelo, “The Economic Development of the Philippines,” 221–222.
- 117 Van Dyke and Mok, *Images of the Canton Factories*, Chapter 1.
- 118 Van Dyke and Mok, *Images of the Canton Factories*, Chapter 1.
- 119 Van Dyke, *Whampoa and the Canton Trade*, Appendix 1.2b.
- 120 Van Dyke and Mok, *Images of the Canton Factories*, Chapter 1.
- 121 AM: ser. 1, vol. 2, no. 2, 104; ser. 3, vol. 16, no. 4, 229–234; ser. 3, vol. 20, no. 4, 224; Pires, *A Viagem de Comércio Macau–Manila*, 60–61; Seabra, “Power, Society and Trade,” 47–58, see 57. The British also learnt of this decision to defer the final decision to Europe. BL: IOR R/10/8, doc. No. 63, letter to Court of Directors, dated 1779.01.21, 115–116.
- 122 BL: IOR R/10/8, doc. No. 63, letter to Court of Directors, dated 1779.01.21, 116.
- 123 For the story of the Armenians in Macao, see Carl T. Smith, “An Eighteenth-Century Macao Armenian Merchant Prince,” *Review of Culture (International Edition)*, no. 6 (April 2003): 120–129; Smith and Van Dyke, “Armenian Footprints in Macao,” 20–39; Carl T. Smith and Paul A. Van Dyke, “Four Armenian Families,” *Review of Culture (International Edition)*, no. 8 (October 2003): 40–50.
- 124 RAC: Ask 1183, 1780.12.22, 139r–v; NAH: VOC 4423, *dagregister*, 1781.04.22.
- 125 NAH: VOC 4421, *dagregister*, 1780.05.18.
- 126 AM: ser. 3, vol. 4, no. 3, 161–162.
- 127 NAH: VOC 4423, *dagregister*, 1781.05.10.
- 128 RAC: Ask 1185, 1781.05.02, 37r–v; AM: ser. 3, vol. 4, no. 3, 161–162.
- 129 BL: IOR G/12/72, 1781.05.10, 83.
- 130 Pires, *A Viagem de Comércio Macau–Manila*, 71–72; Van Dyke, *Whampoa and the Canton Trade*, 59.
- 131 For the identity and fate of the *Santa Rita*, see Van Dyke, “Ambiguous Faces of the Canton Trade,” 38–39.
- 132 Permanyer-Ugartemendia, “Españoles en Cantón,” 523–546; Permanyer-Ugartemendia, “Opium after the Manila Galleon,” 155–164; Permanyer-Ugartemendia, “Una Presencia no tan Singular,” 63–87; Permanyer-Ugartemendia, “The Spanish Link in the Canton Trade,” 1–17; Permanyer-Ugartemendia, “Yrisarri & Co.,” 67–82.
- 133 NAH: Canton 94, 1788.08.24.
- 134 Van Dyke and Mok, *Images of the Canton Factories*, 36, 39.
- 135 For a discussion of the factories, and the establishment of the Spanish factory in Canton, see Van Dyke and Mok, *Images of the Canton Factories*, Chapter 4.
- 136 Van Dyke and Mok, *Images of the Canton Factories*, 36. The lanterns can be seen hanging outside Poankeequa’s front door in Plate P20.
- 137 The locations of the Spanish and Dutch residences are indicated on a French map of Macao from 1792, entitled ‘Plan de la Ville Macau’, by Chrétien-Louis-Joseph de Guignes.
- 138 For one example, see Vai Meng Ung, co-ord., *Masterworks by George Chinnery* (Macao: Macao Museum, Instituto Cultural, 2010), no. 87, 138.
- 139 NAH: Canton 100, 1809.04.05. In the eighteenth century, a fireworks display was called an ‘illuminatie’.
- 140 NAH: Canton 100, 1809.04.11, 12, 13.
- 141 NAH: Canton 96, 1795.06.12, 22.
- 142 NAH: Canton 96, 1795.11.04, 41. Poankeequa senior died in 1788, so this was his son who entertained them. He was also called Poankeequa, with various spellings.
- 143 NAH: Canton 95, 1789.04.24, 12.
- 144 RAC: Ask 1205, 1789.11.29, 58r.
- 145 NAH: VOC 4447, *dagregister*, 1792.05.09, 29.
- 146 NAH: Canton 96, 1796.02.10, 66.
- 147 NAH: Canton 97, 1798.03.21, 1798.03.25.
- 148 BL: IOR G/12/144, 1803.07.19, 98–99.
- 149 NAH: Canton 99, 1806.09.03, 1806.09.21.
- 150 NAH: Canton 100, 1809.11.21.
- 151 NAH: Canton 96, 1796.03.31, 82, 1796.04.29, 95–96.
- 152 For a discussion of the rice trade in the Delta, see Van Dyke, *Whampoa and the Canton Trade*, 15–17; Van Dyke, *The Canton Trade*, 135–137. See also the indexes in MCM 1 and MCM 2, entries under ‘rice’.
- 153 Untzi Museoa — Museo Naval, San Sebastián, Spain (hereafter UMMN): R637, Agote Diario, entry in the March section entitled ‘Noticias Mercantiles’.
- 154 Guignes, “Observations on the Philippine Islands and the Isle of France,” 87.
- 155 Paul A. Van Dyke, “Smuggling Networks of the Pearl River Delta before 1842: Implications for Macao and the American China Trade,” in *Americans and Macao: Trade, Smuggling, and Diplomacy on the South China Coast*, ed. Paul A. Van Dyke (Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 2012), 49–72, see 50–55.
- 156 Cambridge University Library (CUL): Jardine Matheson Collection (JM) C10–11, letter to Remington & Co. at Bombay, from Jardine and Matheson in Canton, dated 1830.11.27, 403–404, JM C10–14, letter to John Shillaber at Batavia, from Jardine and Matheson in Canton, dated 1832.05.12, 665.
- 157 Rafael Díaz Arenas, *Report on the Commerce and Shipping of the Philippine Islands*, trans. Encarnacion Alzona (Manila: National Historical Institute, 1979; reprint, 1998), 20, 72.
- 158 Arenas, *Report on the Commerce*, 16.
- 159 Arenas, *Report on the Commerce*, 16.
- 160 CUL: JM C10–13, letter to Thompson Roberts & Co. in Batavia, from Jardine and Matheson in Canton, dated February 1832, 479–481.
- 161 CUL: JM C10–13, letter to John Shillaber in Canton, from Jardine and Matheson in Canton, dated 1831.12.28, 397–398.
- 162 CUL: JM C10–13, letter to Charles Thomas & Co. at Singapore, from Jardine and Matheson in Canton, dated 1832.02.14, 573–574.

HISTORIOGRAPHY

- 163 Van Dyke, *The Canton Trade*, 135–137.
- 164 CUL: JM C10–15, letter to Fergusson & Co. of Calcutta, from Jardine and Matheson in Canton, dated 1832.08.21, 148–149.
- 165 CUL: JM C10–15, letter to Kierulf & Co. in Manila, from Jardine and Matheson in Canton, dated 1832.11.12, 312.
- 166 CUL: JM C10–15, letter to Remington & Co. in Bombay, from Jardine and Matheson in Canton, dated 1832.12.10, 359–360.
- 167 CUL: JM C10–17, letter to Adam Skinner & Co. in Bombay, from Jardine and Matheson in Canton, dated 1833.12.29, 72–73, see the paragraph addressed to Roger de Faria & Co. on 74. For an example of a foreign ship being able to purchase rice again in Manila in early 1834, see CUL: JM C10–17, letter to Kierulf & Co. at Manila, from Jardine and Matheson in Canton, dated 1834.03.08, 238.
- 168 “Export of Rice from Manila,” *Canton Register*, January 28, 1834, 16.
- 169 Arenas, *Report on the Commerce*, 18.
- 170 Arenas, *Report on the Commerce*, 18.
- 171 “Export of Rice from Manila,” *Canton Register*, January 28, 1834, 16.
- 172 CUL: JM C10–16, letter to Charles Thomas & Co. in Singapore, from Jardine and Matheson in Canton, dated 1833.04.04, 43–44.
- 173 CUL: JM C10–16, letter to Charles Thomas & Co. in Singapore, from Jardine and Matheson in Canton, dated 1833.08.11, 206.
- 174 CUL: JM C10–16, letter to Charles Thomas & Co. in Singapore, from Jardine and Matheson in Canton, dated 1833.10.29, 395.
- 175 CUL: JM C10–17, letter to John Shillaber in Canton, from Jardine and Matheson in Canton, dated 1834.04.30, 325.
- 176 “List of Ships coming to China but not coming to Whampoa, taken for the year 1832,” *Canton Register*, February 11, 1834, 23.
- 177 CUL: JM C10–18, letter to Almeida & Son at Singapore, from Jardine and Matheson in Canton, dated 1734.08.11, 86.
- 178 CUL: JM C10–18, letter to Cursetjee Jamsetjee in Bombay, from Jardine and Matheson in Canton, dated 1834.10.21, 190.
- 179 See, for example, AM: ser. 3, vol. 21, no. 2, 73, 83, 120.
- 180 *Canton Register*, June 17, 1834, 93, 96.
- 181 Arenas, *Report on the Commerce*, 20, 72.
- 182 CUL: JM C4–4, letter to James Matheson in London, from William Jardine in Canton, dated 1835.05.10, 52–53.
- 183 CUL: JM C10–20, letter to George P. King at Ampanan, from Jardine and Matheson in Canton, dated 1835.12.22, 289.
- 184 CUL: JM C10–20, letter to E. Otadui & Co. in Manila, from Jardine and Matheson in Canton, dated 1835.07.10, 9.
- 185 CUL: JM C4–40, letter to James Matheson in London, from William Jardine in Canton, dated 1835.09.13, 124.
- 186 *Canton Register*, July 5, 1836, front page; *Canton Press*, August 6, 1836, 380.
- 187 CUL: JM C4–5, letter to George Armstrong in Liverpool, from William Jardine in Canton, dated 1837.01.20, 160–161.
- 188 CUL: JM C4–5, letter to John Shillaber in Manila, from William Jardine in Canton, dated 1836.07.12, 71–72.
- 189 CUL: JM C10–21, letter to Revely & Co. of Penang, from Jardine and Matheson in Canton, dated 1836.12.01, 236–237, letter to Anderson Wardrop & Co., from Jardine and Matheson in Canton, dated 1836.12.01, 237, letter to Bonstead Schwabe & Co. of Singapore, from Jardine and Matheson in Canton, dated 1837.01.02, 295, and letter to Anderson Wardrop & Co. at Penang, from Jardine and Matheson in Canton, dated 1836.01.02 (this letter is misdated, it should be 1837.01.02), 297.
- 190 CUL: JM C10–21, letter to Revely & Co. at Penang, from Jardine and Matheson in Canton, dated 1836.01.02 (this letter is misdated, it should be 1837.01.02), 296.
- 191 CUL: JM C10–21, letter to José d’Almeida at Singapore, from Jardine and Matheson in Canton, dated 1837.01.02, 296.
- 192 Permanyer-Ugartemendia, “Españoles en Cantón,” 523–546; Permanyer-Ugartemendia, “Opium after the Manila Galleon,” 155–164; Permanyer-Ugartemendia, “Una Presencia no tan Singular,” 63–87; Permanyer-Ugartemendia, “The Spanish Link in the Canton Trade,” 1–17; Permanyer-Ugartemendia, “Yrisarri & Co.,” 67–82. See also MCM 2: 75–83.

HISTORIOGRAFIA

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ARCHIVAL SOURCES

- Archives Municipales, Nantes (AMN): Dobrée 8Z 399
 Archives Nationales, Paris (ANP): 4JJ/129B/12
 Archives Nationales d'Outre-mer (ANOM): C.1.13–14
 Arquivos de Macau (AM): 3–04–03, 161–2, 3–25–05, 267, 3–26–02, 114, 3–26–03, 169, 3–26–04, 3–26–05, 273, 194, 3–27–03, 170, 3–27–04, 188, 3–28–01, 45, 3–22–04, 239–241
 Arsip Nasional Republik Indonesia, Jakarta (ANRI): 2547–2548, 2550, 2553–2554, 2572
 British Library (BL), India Office Records (IOR):
 G/12/5–254 and R/10/3–9 Diaries and Consultations of the Canton Factory
 L/MAR/A/CXXIII, 17–103, L/MAR/B/230B, 402C, 452A, 644B, 656E, 682B
 Cambridge University Library (CUL), Jardine Matheson Collection (JM): A2–4, C4–40
 John Carter Brown Library (JCB), Providence, Rhode Island: Brown Papers, B737 Ship *General Washington* Logbook 1788–1790
 National Archives, The Hague (NAH):
 Canton 3, 23, 70, 80–81, 94–97, 99–100, 245, 256, 258, 260, 263, 268, 290, 378
 HRB 104, 111, 113, 120, 123, 128, 130–131
 Ministerie van Kolonien (MK) 2310A
 OIC 195, 197
 VOC 2240, 2410, 2438, 2535, 2570, 3211, 3333–3334, 3495, 4381, 4386, 4399, 4406, 4421, 4423, 4425, 4431, 4447, 8718
Records of Fort St George (FSG), *Diary and Consultation Book* (DCB). Madras: Government Press, 1930.
 Rigsarkivet, Copenhagen (RAC), Ask 1005, 1120, 1183, 1185, 1205 Danish Asiatic Company's China trade records 1733–1806, 1820–1833.
 Untzi Museoa — Museo Naval, San Sebastián, Spain (UMMN): Fondo Manuel de Agote, R630–638 Manuel de Agote Diarios

PRINTED SOURCES

- Arenas, Rafael Díaz. *Report on the Commerce and Shipping of the Philippine Islands*. Translated by Encarnacion Alzona. Manila: National Historical Institute, 1979; reprint, 1998.
 Bannister, Saxe, trans. *A Journal of the First French Embassy to China, 1698–1700*. London: Thomas Cautley Newby, 1859.
 Blair, Emma Helen, and James Alexander Robertson, eds. *The Philippine Islands 1493–1898*. Vols. 1–55. Cleveland: Arthur H. Clark Co., 1905.
 Boxer, Charles Ralph. *Fidalgos in the Far East*. London: Oxford University Press; reprint, Hong Kong: Oxford University Press, 1968.
Canton Press, August 6, 1836, 380.
Canton Register, June 17, 1834, 93 and 96; July 5, 1836, front page.
 Chaunu, Pierre. *Les Philippines et le Pacifique des Ibériques (XVI^e, XVII^e, XVIII^e siècles)*. Paris: S.E.V.P.E.N., 1960.
 Chia, Lucille. “The Butcher, the Baker, and the Carpenter: Chinese Sojourners in the Spanish Philippines and Their Impact on Southern Fujian (Sixteenth–Eighteenth Centuries).” *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 49, no. 4 (2006): 509–534.
Chinese Courier.
 Coolhaas, W. Ph. *Generale Missiven van Gouverneurs-Generaal en Raden aan Heren XVII der Verenigde Oostindische Compagnie, Deel VII: 1713–1725*. The Hague: Verkrijgbaar Bij Martinus Nijhoff, 1979.
 “En Dagbog ført paa en Kinafarer 1730–1732 af Kadet Tobias Wigandt.” In G. L. Grove, *Tidsskrift for Søvesen*, edited by Kaptajn J. H. Schultz, 183–211. Copenhagen: Hovedkommissionær Vilhelm Tryde, Thieles Bogtrykkeri, 1900.
 David, Andrew, Felipe Fernandez-Armesto, Carlos Novi, and Glyndwr Williams, eds. *The Malaspina Expedition 1789–1794: Journal of the Voyage by Alejandro Malaspina*. 3 vols. London: Hakluyt Society, 2001.
 Diaz-Trechuelo, Maria Lourdes. “The Economic Development of the Philippines in the Second Half of the Eighteenth Century.” *Philippine Studies* 11, no. 2 (April 1963): 195–231.
 Elizalde, María Dolores. “El viraje de Filipinas hacia Asia en el filo de los siglos XVIII y XIX.” *Vegueta: Anuario de la Facultad de Geografía e Historia*, no. 20 (2020): 163–187.
 “Export of Rice from Manila.” *Canton Register*, January 28, 1834, 16.
 Fang, Chenchen 方真真. *Huaren yu Lüsòng maoyi* (1657–1687): *shiliao fenxi yu fanzhu* 華人與呂宋貿易 (1657–1687): 史料分析與翻註 (The trade between the Sangleys and Luzon (1657–1687): analysis, translation and annotation of the sources). Hsinchu: NTSU Press, 2012.
 ———. *Mingmo Qingchu Taiwan yu Manila de fanchuan maoyi* 明末清初台灣與馬尼拉的帆船貿易 (The galleon trade between Taiwan and Manila during the late Ming and the early Qing period). Taipei: Daw Shiang Publishing, 2006.
 Fang, Chenchen 方真真, and Shuru Fang 方淑如. *Taiwan Xibanya maoyi shiliao* (1664–1684) 台灣西班牙貿易史料 (1664–1684) (History sources of trading between Taiwan and Spain). Taipei: Daw Shiang Publishing, 2006.
 Guignes, Chrétien-Louis-Joseph de. “Observations on the Philippine Islands and the Isle of France.” In *A Collection of the Best and Most Interesting Voyages and Travels in Various Parts of America; Many of Which are Now First Translated into English*, compiled by John Pinkerton. Vol. 11, 68–95. London: Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme, and Brown, Paternoster-Row; Cadell and Davies, in the Strand, 1819.
 Guimarães, Ângela. *Uma Relação Especial: Macau e as Relações Luso-Chinesas, 1780–1844*. Lisbon: Edição CIES, 1996.
 Jesus, C. A. Montalto de. *Historic Macao*. Hong Kong: Kelly & Walsh Limited, 1902.

HISTORIOGRAPHY

- Lau, Fong, ed. *Chapas Sínicas — Stories of Macao in Torre do Tombo*. Macao: Instituto Cultural, 2018.
- Lau, Fong 劉芳, and Wenqin Zhang 章文欽, eds. *Qingdai Aomen zhongwen dang'an huibian* 清代澳門中文檔案匯編 (A Collection of Chinese Documents Relating to Macao during the Qing Dynasty), 2 vols. Macao: Macao Foundation, 1999.
- Liang, Tingnan 梁廷枏. *Yue haiguan zhi* 粵海關志 (Gazetteer of Guangdong Maritime Customs). Guangzhou: Guangdong People's Publishing House; reprint, 2002.
- "List of Ships coming to China but not coming to Whampoa, taken for the year 1832." *Canton Register*, February 11, 1834, 23.
- Ljungstedt, Anders. *An Historical Sketch of the Portuguese Settlements in China; and the Roman Catholic Church and Mission in China*. Boston: James Munroe and Co., 1836; reprint, Hong Kong: Viking Hong Kong Publications, 1992.
- Permanyer-Ugartemendia, Ander. "Espanoles en Cantón: los Diarios de Manuel de Agote, primer factor de la Real Compañía de Filipinas en China (1787–1796)." *Isas Memoria. Revista de Estudios Marítimos del País Vasco*, no. 7 (2012): 523–546.
- . "Opium after the Manila Galleon: The Spanish involvement in the opium economy in East Asia (1815–1830)." *Investigaciones de Historia Económica* 10, no. 3 (Oct. 2014): 155–164.
- . "Una Presencia no tan Singular: Españoles en la Economía del Opio en Asia Oriental (1815–1843)." *Millars: Espai i Història* 39 (2015): 63–87.
- . "The Spanish Link in the Canton Trade, 1787–1830: Silver, Opium and the Royal Philippine Company." In *China's Development from a Global Perspective*, edited by María Dolores Elizalde and Jianlang Wan, 1–17. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2017.
- . "Yrisarri & Co.: A Hispanic-Anglo Firm in the Opium Trade in East Asia (1815–30)." In *The Hispanic-Anglosphere from the Eighteenth to the Twentieth Century*, edited by Graciela Iglesias-Rogers, 67–82. New York: Routledge; Taylor & Francis Group, 2021.
- Picazo Muntaner, Antoni. "El comercio de Filipinas en el tránsito al siglo XVIII: la política comercial china." *Vegueta: Anuario de la Facultad de Geografía e Historia*, no. 20 (2020): 253–272.
- Pires, Benjamim Videira. *A Viagem de Comércio Macau–Manila nos Séculos XVI a XIX*. Macau: Centro de Estudos Marítimos de Macau, 1987.
- . *A Vida Marítima de Macau no Século XVIII*. Macao: Instituto Cultural; Museu Marítimo de Macau, 1993.
- Seabra, Leonor Diaz de. "Power, Society and Trade. The Historical Relationship between Macao and the Philippines from the 16th to 18th Centuries." *Review of Culture (International Edition)*, no. 7 (2003): 47–58.
- Smith, Carl T. "An Eighteenth-Century Macao Armenian Merchant Prince." *Review of Culture (International Edition)*, no. 6 (April 2003): 120–129.
- Smith, Carl T., and Paul A. Van Dyke. "Armenian Footprints in Macao." *Review of Culture (International Edition)*, no. 8 (October 2003): 20–39.
- . "Four Armenian Families." *Review of Culture (International Edition)*, no. 8 (October 2003): 40–50.
- Souza, George Bryan. "Merchants and Commerce in Asia and the Portuguese Empire over the Long 18th Century." *Review of Culture (International Edition)*, no. 34 (2010): 7–19.
- . *The Survival of Empire: Portuguese Trade and Society in China and the South China Sea, 1630–1754*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.
- Tremml-Werner, Birgit. "Marginal Players and Intra-network Connections: New Perspectives on the Manila Trade, c. 1640–1780." *Journal of Social Sciences and Philosophy* 29, no. 4 (2017): 599–626.
- Ung, Vai Meng, co-ord. *Masterworks by George Chinnery*. Macao: Macao Museum, Instituto Cultural, 2010.
- Vale, António M. Martins do. *Os Portugueses em Macau (1750–1800)*. Macao: Instituto Português do Oriente, 1997.
- Van Dyke, Paul A. "Ambiguous Faces of the Canton Trade: Moors, Greeks, Armenians, Parsees, Jews and Southeast Asians." In *The Private Side of the Canton Trade, 1700–1840: Beyond the Companies*, edited by Paul A. Van Dyke and Susan E. Schopp, 21–42. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 2018.
- . "Amoy Anqua (1696–1723) and the China Trade before the Rise of the Canton System." *Review of Culture (International Edition)*, no. 66 (2021): 96–111.
- . *The Canton Trade: Life and Enterprise on the China Coast, 1700–1845*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 2005; reprint, 2007.
- . "The Hume Scroll of 1772 and the Faces behind the Canton Factories." *Review of Culture (International Edition)*, no. 54 (2017): 64–102.
- . *Merchants of Canton and Macao: Politics and Strategies in Eighteenth-Century Chinese Trade*. Vol. 1. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 2011.
- . *Merchants of Canton and Macao: Success and Failure in Eighteenth-Century Chinese Trade*, Vol. 2. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 2016.
- . "Smuggling Networks of the Pearl River Delta before 1842: Implications for Macao and the American China Trade." In *Americans and Macao: Trade, Smuggling, and Diplomacy on the South China Coast*, edited by Paul A. Van Dyke, 49–72. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 2012.
- . *Whampoa and the Canton Trade: Life and Death in a Chinese Port, 1700–1842*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 2020.
- Van Dyke, Paul A., and Cynthia Viallé. *The Canton–Macao Dagregisters, 1763*. Macao: Instituto Cultural, 2008.
- Van Dyke, Paul A., and Maria Kar-wing Mok. *Images of the Canton Factories 1760–1822: Reading History in Art*, 37. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 2015.
- Zhang, Tingmao 張廷茂. *Ming Qing shiqi Aomen haishang maoyi shi* 明清時期澳門海上貿易史 (History of Macao's Maritime Trade during the Ming and Qing Dynasties). Macao: MASTV — Publicação de Revistas, 2004.