

Mandarin Quiqua

陳魁官

and Family:

Merchants of Canton

1724-1794

<u>Relation</u>	<u>Trade Name</u>	<u>Popular Chinese Name</u>	<u>Chinese</u>
1) Father	<i>Mandarin Quiqua</i>	Chen Kuiguan	陳魁官
2) Son-in-law?	<i>Inqua</i>	Ni Yongguan	倪永官
3) Son	<i>Chowqua</i>	Chen Zuguan	陳祖官
4) Grandson	<i>Lokqua</i>	Chen Junhua	陳鈞華

Problems in Identifying Mandarin Quiqua and Family.

There is much confusion in the primary and secondary literature of the identity of Mandarin Quiqua. In the 1720s and 1730s, there were several merchants who used the name Quiqua, with prefixes or suffixes. They include Cudgin Quiqua, Emmanuel Quiqua, Old/Senior Quiqua, Young/Junior Quiqua, Hawkesbill Quiqua, and Mandarin Quiqua. All of these names are sometimes shortened to Quiqua making it impossible to know which person is being referred to. There were also several merchants who were called Mandarin such as Cudgen, Suqua and Quiqua, and they were sometimes shortened to 'Mandarin', making the identity unclear. Moreover, Emmanuel Quiqua was commonly known as Manuel Quiqua, which was sometimes abbreviated Man. or M. Quiqua, which could also refer to Mandarin Quiqua.

To make matters more confusing, sometimes merchants were given several names. Suqua, for example, was known by all of these names: *Ton Suqua, Tansoequa, Tansouqua, Sjouqua, Shoukoa, Shouqua, Sjonqua, Siouqua, Suqua, Seuqua, Schoqua, Souqua, Siuqua, Souqua alias: Comcha, Comcia, Cumshaw, Comshew, Cumsha, Kimco, Chouqua, Oude (Old) Tan Soequa (1751-),* and prefixes: *Manterin-Manderin-Mandarin-Mandaryn-Mandrin-Mand.* with suffixes: *Ziuqva-Ziuqua-Ziuqvoa-Zuqua-Zuicqua-ZioyQua-Ziouqua-Soucqua-Ziuqua-Ziecqua-Ziequa-Zuiqua-Siuqua-Sionqvoa-Sioyqvoa-Siouqua-Suqva-Suiquoa.* He could be called Cumshaw in one sentence, Tan Sioyqvoa in another, or Mandarin Zuqua, Old Soucqua and Ziecqua in other citations. We know these refer to the same person, because he is frequently listed under all names as being the father of Chetqua trading out of the Guangshun Hang.

Mandarin Quiqua was also known by several names, but because of the many Quiquas in the records, it has been more difficult to identify them. New information, however, shows that the names Old Quiqua, Senior Quiqua, Old Khequa, Qouy Cong and the like are all referring to Mandarin Quiqua, and that Young or Junior Quiqua are references to his son. This is different from Cheong's findings where Old Quiqua and Mandarin Quiqua are listed as two separate persons, and he was unable to identify Young Quiqua. Cheong states that Old Quiqua did business with his son Enqua (also spelled Inqua, Hienqua, etc), until they went bankrupt in the early 1740s (same time that Mandarin Quiqua died).¹

The Danish Asiatic Company (DAC) and Dutch East India Company's (VOC) records provide the clues that enable us to identify these men. In 1730, the Dutch records show Mandarin Quiqua's Chinese name to be Chen Kuiguan 陳魁官, which are the same Chinese characters used for Old Quiqua in a 1738 Danish reference so we know they are the same person (see Schedule and Illustration 1 for references). Aside from these companies, Old Quiqua is also mentioned in the Swedish East India Company's (SOIC) records in the 1730s so he was clearly one of the prominent merchants in Canton. When Mandarin Quiqua died in 1742, his son Chowqua (Zuguan 祖官, also spelled Tsjoouqua) took over the business, which at that time was called the Zhengfeng Hang 正豐行. Chowqua would later establish the Yuanquan Hang 源泉行, out of which he would conduct most of his trade.

Both the father and son did business with a partner Inqua, whose Chinese name is Ni Yongguan 倪永官. Inqua is thus not Mandarin Quiqua's son as Cheong found in the English East India Company (EIC) records, but he could perhaps be a son-in-law (a common error in the records). When Chowqua died in 1789, he was succeeded by his son Lokqua (Junhua 鈞華), who only lasted a couple of years before going broke. With this new information, we can show

¹ Cheong, *Hong Merchants*, 33, 72 n. 90. Cheong has recorded some conflicting information about these men. He usually shows correctly that Mandarin Quiqua was Chowqua's father and that he died in 1742, but on page 114, he mistakenly records 'Cudgin' as his father. And on pages 250-251, he suggests that Mandarin Quiqua retired in the 1730s.

who these men are, but Chowqua's early years are still a mystery because he did not go by that name until the late 1750s. The DAC, VOC and Ostend General India Company (GIC) records can help us solve this problem.

The DAC records show that before his father's death, Chowqua had been conducting trade (sometimes in partnership with Inqua) under the name 'Jong [Young] Quiqua'. The names Old/Senior Quiqua and Young/Junior Quiqua go back to as early as 1724 and show up continually until 1742. We have seen that Old/Senior Quiqua was the same person as Mandarin Quiqua, but before 1734, Cudgin Quiqua was sometimes called old as well. In those early years, we have only included information that we can show to be referring to Mandarin Quiqua. In 1734, Cudgin left Canton and retired from the trade, and there is no longer mention of him in the records so the more recent references to Old Quiqua are not a problem. But we still need to show that the names Young or Junior Quiqua in the early years are also references to Chowqua.

The Dutch tell us that Chowqua was 83 years old when he died in 1789. If this age is correct, then he would have been about eighteen years old in 1724, when we begin to see the first references to 'Quayqua Junior' appearing in the Belgian records (Table A). It was normal for male Chinese to begin learning their trade in their teenage years, and there is no information in the records that suggests there were two Young Quiquas. The DAC records show Chowqua going by this name in the 1730s and 1740s so we assume that references in the 1720s are also referring to him.

Unfortunately, after his father died there was no longer a need to call Chowqua 'young' to distinguish him from his father so he begins to show up with a single name, which include: *Quayqua, Qveiqvoa, Quayqua, Coqua, Kaiqua, Khoiqua, Khiqua, Ziuqua, Ziouqua, Ziunqua, Siuqua, Ziuqua, Ziauqua, Siouqua, Siauqua, Sjoqua, Suyqua, Soyqua*. There were several merchants who had names like these in the 1740s and 1750s which makes it impossible to track him. This is why Table B shows a gap in years between 1727 (the GIC trade) and the 1760s (the VOC and DAC trade) and no references appear in Chowqua's schedule of activities from 1742 to 1757. Beginning in the 1760s, the entries are clearer, making positive identification possible.²

Now that we have established these men's identities, their connections (or non-connections) to each other, and the limitations of the sources, we can begin to restructure their lives.

INTRODUCTION

Mandarin Quiqua and family's trade spans 70 years in Canton, but their activities in the years prior to their appearance in the port are not well documented. Cheong suggests that Mandarin Quiqua may have been the Quanzhou merchant who had established a business in Manila called *Qouycong*. According to Cheong, Mandarin Quiqua moved at some point in the early 1720s and set up operation in Amoy, and by 1726, he had established a *Qouycong* branch in Canton. Other information suggests that this scenario is possible.³

From 1724 to 1730, the following names appear in the GIC records attached to Mandarin Quiqua: *Quecong, Queyquon, Quicong, Quaycon, Guycon*. They are often followed with the words *alias Mandarin*. In 1729, he appears in the VOC records as *Quey Cong named Mandaryn*. Unfortunately, when the characters for Mandarin Quiqua's business appear in the Danish records

² Other reasons for the gap are that the Belgian's sent no more ships to China after 1733, and the Dutch account books (*grootboeken*) from 1734 to 1756 have not survived. Many of the Danish records have survived from these years and there are figures from the Swedish company in 1753, but the names are not distinguishable. The English and French records list the data differently making it difficult or impossible to distinguish what each Chinese merchant did.

³ Cheong, *Hong Merchants*, 159-160.

in 1738, they are not accompanied with a romanized name. Normally, Cantonese pronunciations were used for *Hong* merchants' businesses, and in that language, Zhengfeng 正豐 would be spelled something like *Cheongfong*. If Mandarin Quiqua retained his Fujianese pronunciation, however, as Cheong has suggested, then Zhengfeng might appear as *Quicong*. This explanation seems more likely than a change in his business name.⁴

From the time Mandarin Quiqua and Chowqua first appear in the records in 1724, they trade in fairly large quantities of Bohea tea and numerous other products. This means they must have had a good supply of capital, or at least good credit, and were already well connected to the inland tea supplies. In 1724, Chowqua traded one third the volume of his father with the GIC. Together they supplied probably about 25 percent of the two ships' cargos (the exact totals are not available). Cudgin was the security merchant for the GIC ships so he supplied the largest share.⁵

In 1727, Mandarin Quiqua contracted tea and silk with the EIC, and he and Chowqua continued to supply part of the GIC cargos until 1732. As the schedules and tables show, by the early 1730s, the family was supplying cargos to most of the companies in Canton. Their shares of the DAC and VOC trade continued to be small, but they had clearly established themselves by this time as one of the pillars of the trade. By 1737, Inqua also begins to appear as Mandarin Quiqua's partner, and together they managed to wrest more of the VOC trade away from competitors Texia and Simon (Yan Deshe 顏德舍 and Huang Ximan 黃錫滿).⁶

Cheong suggests that Mandarin Quiqua's family were the Chens who employed the famous Poankeequa before he emerged on his own in the 1750s. This idea comes from a brief mention in the Pan family genealogy that records Poankeequa working for a wealthy Chen family. The coincidences of Mandarin Quiqua being a Chen, successful in business, and from Manila and Amoy, makes him a logical candidate for the Chen in the Pan genealogy. There are several references to 'Young Khequas' working in Mandarin Quiqua's house in the 1730s and 1740s, but unfortunately, there is no way of knowing if these are Poankeequa. Chowqua was also called Young Khequa (Khequa is a variation of Quiqua) so they could be references to him.

Other information suggests that Poankeequa was connected to a different branch of the Chen family. From the 1750s to the 1770s, Poankeequa and his brother Sequa (Seguan 瑟官) show up in the records trading out of the Dafeng Hang 達豐行. In the 1750s, this firm was run by Chen Zheng 陳正, and in the 1760s, by Tan Quiqua (Chen Guiguan 陳貴官). Tan Quiqua also served as one of Poankeequa's writers. These were the Chens whom Poankeequa was associated with, and so far, no information has emerged to show any connections to Mandarin Quiqua's family or firms.⁷

Chowqua traded in partnership with Inqua, in some years, but after his father died, the two appear to have parted ways. Inqua then shows up trading with new partners. In 1758, Chowqua shows up in the English records with his new appellation. From this year forward, we can find him again in the records. In 1760, he appears trading out of a new firm, the Yuanquan

⁴ Morse also mentions that Mandarin Quiqua came from Amoy. Thanks to Yee Tuan Wong at the Australian National University for the Cantonese and Fujianese pronunciations. Morse, *Chronicles*, vol. 1. See schedule for GIC and VOC sources.

⁵ Van Dyke, 'The Ye Merchants', forthcoming.

⁶ The GIC sent no more ships to China after 1732. OIO: G/12/26; and VOC 2410.

⁷ Cheong, *Hong Merchants*, 44, 81, 159-160. Establishing relationships between the Chens are difficult because there were four or more branches of the family operating in Canton at the same time. The Chinese names recorded in the foreign records are popular names or nicknames and are usually different from the formal names recorded in Chinese genealogies making matching them impossible. Chowqua's name (and all its variations), for example, was derived from the Cantonese pronunciation of Zuguan 祖官, which is what everyone knew him by. But his formal name was Wenkuo 文擴, and the latter is the form of the name that usually appears in the genealogies.

Hang. Because we are unable to track Chowqua through the records from 1743 to 1757 and because the firm names Zhengfeng and Yuanquan do not appear in those years, we do not know what Chowqua was doing at this time. He appears to have traded with the Danes after his father's death, but under his father's name. 'Mandarin Quiqua' appears in those records until 1752, and we assume that these are references to Chowqua (see Schedule).

A Chinese document from 1759 complicates the mystery behind Chowqua's absence in the records. This source lists all of the *Hong* merchants and their businesses operating in Canton at the time and surprisingly Chowqua, Zhengfeng Hang and Yuanquan Hang are not mentioned. We know that Chowqua was elected into the Co-hong in 1760, but he does not appear to have been one of the privileged merchants before that year. His absence in this list raises the question of whether he was possibly operating out of another firm, or perhaps retired temporarily to his home in Fujian.

When he reappears in the records in 1760, however, Chowqua carries on his trade as if he had been doing it all along. And surprisingly, even though he was not one of the official merchants at the time, he was elected into the Co-hong. At the same time, another well-established house, the Longshun Hang run by Tan Tinqu (Chen Zhenguan 陳鎮官), was expelled from the trade. Like Chowqua, Tinqu had been trading in Canton since the 1720s, but he was not well liked among other *Hong* merchants. He is mentioned in the 1759 list.

This coincidence raises a couple of questions. Tinqu had risen to prominence shortly after Mandarin Quiqua's death so was he connected in some way to Chowqua's disappearance? Was Chowqua part of a political reshuffling of the trade by persons who had favored his father and used the opportunity of the creation of the Co-hong to push Tinqu out? Did Chowqua voluntarily leave the trade in Canton to carry on business in Fujian, as other merchants had done?

A possible scenario is that Inqua continued the Zhengfeng Hang until 1746, when he disappears from the records⁸, and Chowqua established the Yuanquan Hang when they separated. Houses that were run by a partnership between two or more families were difficult to pass to descendants because it was not always clear who owned and was responsible for what part.⁹

When Chowqua's name reappears in a recognizable form in the late 1750s, he is operating one of the smaller trading houses in Canton. In 1760, he was elected into the Co-hong making him one of the ten merchants, who had rights to trade with foreigners. Four large houses ran the society, and dictated the terms and prices each year to the smaller houses. This arrangement was much resented by the smaller men like Chowqua, but despite their protests, they were powerless to end the society.¹⁰

⁸ In 1755, an 'Inqua' appears in the Swedish records and in 1758, an 'Iqva' is mentioned in the Danish records. Both entries show the man trading in porcelain. Because of the eight-year gap between 1747 and 1755 when no name like Inquas appears, and because these later references show the man trading in porcelain, we are inclined to believe this is a different person. This latter Inqua also disappears from the records. GUB: H22.4A; and Ask 2211-2213.

⁹ The Yifeng Hang went through a similar problem in 1770, when Cai Hunqua (of the Cai 蔡 family) died and confusion erupted over which of his sons would continue with his partner Semqua (Qiu Kun 邱崑). The business struggled for a couple of years with much fighting among Hunqua's sons about who was to control what. Finally, in 1774, Semqua transferred his share of the business to Hunqua's son Taiqua, which ended the squabbles but not before the business had fallen deep into debt. Van Dyke, 'Cai-Qiu Enterprises', forthcoming.

¹⁰ In July 1763, the Dutch inform us that Chowqua and the five other small merchants had gathered at a local temple to discuss ending the Co-hong. They drank a concoction of sacrificial blood from two pigs and two goats mixed with wine and vowed to force the trade open or quit altogether. They were unsuccessful, and *Hong* merchants were not to leave the trade without permission so the bond was of little effect. But the men were certain to have contributed to the eventual collapse of the Co-hong in 1771. Van Dyke, 'The Ye Merchants', forthcoming. Referring to 1755, Cheong describes Chowqua as 'young', but that is because his age was not known. He would have been about fifty years old that year. Cheong, *Hong Merchants*, 93.

The small merchants did not have a vote in the Co-hong, but they did have some protection. When the society was established, each of the ten houses had to stand security for each other. If one of the failed, then the designated houses that stood security had to assume his debts. In 1765, for example, the small merchant Giqua (Ye Yiguan 葉義官) died insolvent. Giqua's son Tiauqua (Zhaoguan 朝官) was allowed to continue the business, but the debt was more than he could handle. The arrears were divided among those who stood security, which included the large Yan family house. Thus, the small merchants may not have had a voice in the administration of the trade, but it was not in the interests of the large houses for them to be ruined, as then they would have to assume their debts.

One of Chowqua's strategic advantages in the trade was his ability to supply top quality Bohea tea. The Dutch had a high regard for his tea, and in 1763, they found his product to be even better than the large houses in Canton. The strong demand for the best teas and the limited supplies meant it was difficult to get enough good tea at prices foreigners were willing to pay. Even the large houses with their extensive resources came up short, from time to time, making customers turn to others. By the early 1760s, Chowqua had gained control over an area in the tea lands that consistently produced the best Souchon tea (a type of Bohea) which gave him an edge over the others. He was the only one of the six small merchants who was able to get this tea, which enabled him to compete with the large houses.¹¹

Besides the foreign export trade, Chowqua was also involved in the junk trade to Southeast Asia. In 1762, his small Batavia junk had drifted to the west of Macao, and had to hire ten sampans at 60 Spanish reals each to pull it into Macao. There was a very strong westerly current along the coast so a strong easterly wind was needed to sail against it. Weather was not always cooperative so in order to reduce the risks of running aground, sampans needed to be hired to keep the vessel in deep water, and if possible, to tow it to Macao.

It is unfortunate we do not have more information about Chowqua's junk trade. He does not appear to have been as active in this business as some of the other *Hong* merchants. But with his father's past experience and connections in Manila and Fujian we would expect Chowqua to be regularly involved with this trade. His junk was one of four that regularly sailed from Canton to Batavia in the 1760s. They were all managed by members of the Chen family, and if we knew which one Chowqua owned, we could possibly retrace some of its movements. It is not until 1782 that another reference appears to him owning a Batavia junk (see below) so we can only assume that he was sending the junk out each year.¹²

In the competitive environment that emerged at the end of the Co-hong in 1772, merchants struggled to form new alliances in order to gain and protect market share. Chowqua joined forces with one of the other small houses run by Monqua (Cai Monquan 蔡文官). The two houses continued their relationship over the next twenty years, which gave them more security but also united their fates to some extent. The trade went through considerable restructuring in the 1770s, and the partnership seems to have helped both of them survive.

¹¹ CMD 1762 and 1763; and NAH: Canton 32, 73-78.

¹² The names of the four junks that frequented Batavia in the 1760s were *Samkonghing* 三廣興, *Sihing* 瑞興, *Ektay* 益泰 and *Wansun* 源順. A complete record of their movements each year is not available, but we know that the first one went to Batavia in 1762. Their names show up in Dutch and Swedish records for several years so if we knew the name of Chowqua's junk and/or its captain we could possibly retrace some of its movements. Van Dyke, "Port Canton", Appendixes O and P; Paul A. Van Dyke, "A Reassessment of the China Trade: The Canton Junk Trade as Revealed in Dutch and Swedish Records of the 1750s to the 1770s", in *Maritime China in Transition*, eds., Wang Gungwu and Ng Chin-keong (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2004), 151-167; and CMD 1762. Ch'en also found in the English records that Chowqua was sending 'a junk or two to trade with South-East Asia'. Ch'en, *Insolvency*, 294.

From 1771 to 1775, the small merchants Tjobqua (Cai Yuguan 蔡玉官), Wayqua (Ni Hongwen 倪宏文) and Tiauqua failed. Even the large house of Cai Hunqua, which had been a pillar of the trade for several decades, was deep in debt by 1774. Absorbing those debts put much burden on the others, but failures were not all bad news. Someone had to pick up those shares of the market, which gave Chowqua and Monqua a boost to their business.

By 1775, Monqua had risen to become the fourth largest merchant in Canton.¹³ In 1765 he had been listed as seventh and Chowqua sixth. In the 1770s, both of them were securing EIC ships. In 1778, Coqua (Chen Keguan 陳科官) failed, and the Hoppo declared that Chowqua and Monqua, along with Ingsia (Yan Yingshe 顏瑛舍) and Tsjonqua (Cai Xiangguan 蔡相官), had to stand security for Coqua's debts (Illustration). These failures were followed the next year by Ingsia and Kousia (Zhang Tianqiu 張天球). A portion of their arrears was handed to Chowqua and Monqua.¹⁴

In 1779, the English supercargoes reported that Chowqua was 'clear of debts' but that he was 'old and does but little business'. Chowqua was now in his seventies, but still running his business as he had for more than fifty years. His son and writers, however, were probably taking care of much of his business. This is the time when his partner Monqua began falling behind on his payments. The English supercargoes stated that Monqua now owed 'a great deal, but is not supposed to be in any immediate distress'.¹⁵

In 1781, the Danes tell us that some private Chinese merchants in Canton were supplying tea to the EIC and SOIC under the name of Chowqua. Chowqua had been backing some of these smaller men for years. In 1763, for example, he stood security for a loan of 3,000 taels that the Dutch loaned to the porcelain dealer Lisjoncon (Li Xianggong 李相公). In 1784, Chowqua and Geowqua also stood security for Weaver Lochop. These outside men were required to channel their trade through one of the *Hong* merchant, who were held responsible for the duties. There were risks involved if the merchant absconded or failed, but that was the nature of trade.¹⁶

The small traders also had risks. Geowqua (Wu Qiaoguan 伍喬官) was Ingsia's writer, but conducted trade with the Dutch and Danish companies under Chowqua's authority since at least 1772. When Ingsia failed, and was exiled to Ili in 1780, Geowqua became Chowqua's writer. He continued to carry on his private trade with several of the foreign companies under his employer's authority. Then in 1782, Geowqua was appointed a *Hong* merchant and began trading out of his own firm, the Yuanshun Hang 源順行. His earlier association with Chowqua's house, however, meant that he had to take over the debts of that firm when it failed. Thus, these associations tied one to the other in other ways as well.¹⁷

By 1782, Chowqua and Monqua were listed among the top merchants in Canton so they continued to hold their own. In this year, another entry appears of Chowqua's Batavia junk. The English and Dutch were at war now and an English privateer used this opportunity to plunder Chowqua's Batavia junk near Banca under pretence that the cargo belonged to the VOC. Chowqua claimed the cargo to be worth 38,398 taels, and demanded retribution. But despite his protests, the EIC Committee in Canton refused to intervene in the matter.¹⁸

The war between the English and Dutch brought an end to Cai Hunqua's firm when the VOC ships failed to show up in Canton in 1782. The war also depleted the EIC's silver reserves, and before long, the English company was owing large amounts to some of the *Hong* merchants.

¹³ RAC: Ask 1173.

¹⁴ Morse, *Chronicles*, 2:33-34; RAC: Ask 1179; and NAH: Canton 41, 46, 89.

¹⁵ Morse, *Chronicles*, 2:45. Cheong mentions that Chowqua was now senile. Cheong, *Hong Merchants*, 88.

¹⁶ CMD 1763; and NAH: Canton 46.

¹⁷ Cheong, *Hong Merchants*, 88-89.

¹⁸ Morse, *Chronicles*, 2:79-80.

In 1786, the company owed Chowqua about 190,000 taels. Within a few years, however, their roles would be reversed.¹⁹

Chowqua continued to contract an eighth share of the EIC trade, and his share of the Dutch trade grew steadily from 1780 to 1789. Cai Hunqua's firm had been supplying the bulk of the VOC cargoes since the 1740s so when that business closed, Chowqua took over some of this business. The exact VOC figures are not available, but Chowqua's share probably consisted of 20 to 50 percent of the cargoes. His DAC trade, however, continued to be small from 2 to 8 percent of a ship's cargo (see Table B).²⁰

Besides Monqua and Geowqua, Chowqua also formed partnerships with Tsjonqua and Pinqua (Yang Bingguan 楊 丙 觀). Together they took care of most of the VOC trade, and each of them were securing EIC ships each year and trading with the other foreigners as well. As a consortium, they were probably in control of about 50 percent of the Canton trade, which is not unlike the partnership of the 1760s when the Cai, Yan and Chen families were united. As a group, merchants had more control over stocks and prices as well as each others trade. They would have to absorb debts of others who failed regardless of whether they were in partnership with them so it made sense to combine forces and in so doing, gain some influence in their transactions. In this way, they could at least try to direct the outcome to better advantage.

The partnership, however, was not meant to last. After a couple years of illness, Chowqua died on 27 May 1789. He was survived by his son Locqua (Junhua 鈞 華), who was allowed to continue the business. Ponqua (Ni Bangguan 倪 榜 官) was now the chief writer in the Zhengfeng Hang and assisted Locqua in the transition. In order to ensure no problems arose, the Dutch insisted that their four merchants Locqua, Monqua, Geowqua (spelled Kiouqua) and Pinqua stand security for each other.²¹

The English supercargoes wrote in their diaries that Locqua was afflicted with a mental disorder shortly after taking over the firm. If this was true, it would have certainly contributed to the financial problems. The Dutch records, however, show Locqua trading competently throughout the 1791 season so if he was unstable, it did not last long (or came later). There was a serious of bankruptcies at this time, which piled additional debt onto the *Hong* collective. Howqua (Lin Shimao 林 時 懋) failed in 1788, Iqua (Wu Zhaoping 吳 昭 平) and Chetai (Li 李 family) in 1791, and Pinqua the next year. Their debts were distributed to the remaining *Hong* merchants for repayment so there was probably ample reason for Locqua to experience mental anguish.²²

As we saw with Chowqua, Hong merchants were able to survive these additional burdens if they expanded their trade in unison with the increased debt load. We see from Table B that Locqua lost a significant share of the Dutch trade beginning in 1790. He does not seem to have made up for this loss with gains in other companies' trade (the records are incomplete). The Zhengfeng Hang's strategic advantage in the trade had come partially from its connections to China's inland markets and the ability to procure the best quality products.

Locqua also handled superior products. In October 1791, he offered top quality raw silk to the English, French and Dutch, and asked the exorbitant price of 500 taels per picul. The Dutch whittled him down to 353 taels per picul. They had paid 340 taels per picul the previous

¹⁹ Van Dyke, 'Cai-Qiu Enterprises', forthcoming; and Cheong, *Hong Merchants*, 114.

²⁰ The VOC trade figures often include factory expenses, wages, advances, interest payments, etc., so it is difficult to know the exact amount of the cargos. Ch'en mentions that Chowqua had 'been ailing for a couple of years' prior to his death in 1789, and that he usually had one eighth of the EIC trade. Ch'en, *Insolvency*, 294; and Morse, *Chronicles*, 2:97.

²¹ NAH: Canton 51-52; and Ch'en, *Insolvency*, 294. Ponqua had the same last name as Inqua so he may have been a relative.

²² Ch'en, *Insolvency*, 291. Iqua was exiled to Ili on 2 September 1791 as punishment for his debts. UBG: Ms 1985.

year, but were willing to pay a higher price this year because the quality was excellent. Locqua also had high grade Congo and Hysan tea in 1791, which shows that the Zhengfeng Hang continued to maintain its high quality of standard right up to its end. Locqua's family clearly had good inland connections, which is one reason why the firm was able to survive for so long when other houses collapsed.²³

There is some indication, however, that the Zhengfeng Hang was now facing new competition. In 1791, the Dutch discovered that Gregorio's (a partner of Poankeequa's) Pecco tea was better than Locqua's, and his Kampoy tea was also a superior grade. Gregorio had good connections to the Nanking linens, and offered the Dutch thousands of pieces of that fabric. The Dutch found the quality to be uneven, but it was not full of black spots like Locqua's linen.²⁴

Ponqua (Locqua's writer) and Wyqua (Geowqua's writer) also had excellent quality Soulong and Souchon tea this year, which they offered to the Dutch. Ponqua began trading more on his own account after Chowqua's death, which suggests he may have had ambitions of leaving the Zhengfeng Hang. The Hoppo appears to have noticed this as well and appointed Ponqua to *Hong* merchant status in 1792. Three other new *Hong* merchants and together they would replace those who had failed.

Ponqua's appointment proved to be disastrous for Locqua, because it turned him into a direct competitor rather than an accomplice. With Ponqua's knowledge of and connections to Locqua's clientele, he could move in and grab market share quickly. Ponqua began immediately to win shares of the Dutch and Danish cargos. But the English remained wary of him due to his connections to merchants who had failed or were about to fail.²⁵

As a result of these changes and new competition, Locqua was not able to regain trade he had lost, and with the increased debt load he was now carrying, the Zhengfeng Hang declined rapidly.²⁶ Without sufficient revenues, debts began to build, which forced Locqua into bankruptcy. At some point in 1793, the Zhengfeng Hang was closed and the debts were distributed to the other merchants. It is not clear what became of Locqua, because his name disappears from the records thereafter.

From Manila, to Amoy to Canton, the Zhengfeng Hang had been part of the trade for seven decades. Considering the odds stacked against the accumulation of capital in Canton, it is amazing the business lasted as long as it did. Other houses that had begun in the 1720s and 1730s and that had grown in unison with the Zhengfeng Hang had gone broke long before this time. Their numbers are many, and a few of the founding merchants such as Beauquiqua, Chen Shouguan, Cai Hunqua, Semqua and Texia built extensive commercial enterprises that dwarfed the Zhengfeng Hang in volume.

Thus, rather than ask why the Zhengfeng Hang failed, it seems more relevant to ask why the firm was able to survive for so long? Locqua's family was never considered among the prominent merchants in Canton, but they were among the most stable. Their good connections to inland suppliers and their focus on top-end products and good service, combined with their ability to expand trade in unison with the increase in debt load, kept the business competitive and dependable. The Dutch preferred to deal with Chowqua's family, because they could depend on them for the best products.

But with Chowqua's death and the increase in debt load thereafter, combined with new competition that challenged Locqua's position, and Ponqua's leaving the firm, the Zhengfeng Hang was forced to an end. Locqua was unable to regain trade he had lost, and without sufficient income, there were insufficient funds to service debts. His grandfather had been one of the

²³ UBG: Ms 1985.

²⁴ UBG: Ms 1985.

²⁵ Ch'en, *Insolvency*, 322-327.

²⁶ Ch'en, *Insolvency*, 295.

founding fathers of the trade, and his father had carried on a solid business for an amazing 65 years, but the continuation of the Zhengfeng Hang was not meant to be. We can only hope that Locqua suffered a less disgraceful departure from the commerce than those who had been exiled to Ili.

[all info is now collected for these four merchants. Now I need to start assembling the data to write the history.]

1) Chen Kuiguan 陳魁官

[GIC, DAC, EIC, SOIC, VOC records are all checked for Kuiguan so he is done. Names are loaded.]

Trade Names:
<u>Prefix 1:</u> (referring to "Mandarin") <i>Mandarin, Man, Mandareen, Mandryn, Mandoor, Manderin</i>
<u>Prefix 2:</u> (referring to "Old" beginning in 1724) <i>Oudt, Aud, Ouwe, Gamle, Gl., Oude, Oue, Old.</i>
<u>Names:</u> <i>Quiqua, Qvaiqva, Quequa, Quey Cong, Queque, Quyqua, Quecong, Qverqva, Qveiqua, Queyquon, Quycon, Qveiqua, Qweiqva, Quoyqua, Quayqua, Quicong, Guycon, Koiqua, Keicqua, Keyqua, Khequa, Quinquua.</i>
<u>Other Names:</u> <i>Quaiqua Mandoor, Quayqua Theo, Quayqua Senior, Quayqua de oude,</i>

Biographical Data:		<u>Source</u>
Date first mentioned in the records:	1724	
Date last reported trading in Canton:		see sources below
Death:	1742	Cheong 44
Years trading in Canton:	1724-1742	see sources below

Schedule of Trading Activities in Canton and Sources					
Year	Partners	Hong	Co.	Products Traded	Sources
1724	GIC	see Table	IC 5684, 5740; PMA 479
1725	GIC	see Table	IC 5690, 5692
1726	GIC	see Table	IC 5695, 5740, 5757
1727	GIC	see Table	IC 5698-5700, 5753
1727	EIC	w,tea,zt	Morse 1; G/12/26
1729	VOC	see Table	VOC 4374 ^(s) -4375 ^(s)
1730	GIC	see Table	IC 5710, 5741
1730	VOC	see Table	VOC 4375 ^(s)
1731	VOC	see Table	VOC 4376
1732	GIC	see Table	IC 5707
1732	EIC		Morse 1
1732	VOC	see Table	VOC 4377
1733	VOC	see Table	VOC 4378
1734	EIC		Morse 1; Cheong 72 n. 90
1734	DAC	see Table	Ask 2190
1736	EIC	sk,tea	Morse 1
1736	SOIC		JFB: Irvine
1736	DAC	see Table	Ask 1116
1737	EIC		Cheong 72 n. 90
1737	Inqua.....	VOC	see Table	VOC 2410
1737	DAC	B	Ask 1117
1738	EIC		G/12/45
1738	Hinqua.....	Zhengfeng	DAC	see Table	Ask 1118 ^(sbc) ; 2192
1739	EIC	I,E,SI	Morse 1
1740	DAC	P,D,pq,psy,Nk,la,ZZ	Lin 5893
1742	(Kuiguan dies this year).....	DAC	Pc,H,SI,B	Ask 1121
1746	(probably Zuguan).....	DAC	see Table	Ask 1124, 2197-2198
1747	(probably Zuguan).....	DAC	see Table	Ask 2199
1751	(probably Zuguan).....	DAC	FR	Ask 1129
1752	(probably Zuguan).....	DAC	B	Ask 1131

Associates and Businesses

<u>Associates</u>		<u>Sources</u>
<i>Ton Hunqua</i>	Chen Xiongguan	see sources above
<i>Inqua/Hinqua</i>	Ni Yongguan	see sources above
<u>Businesses</u>		
<i>Qouycong</i>	Zhengfeng Hang	Cheong 40; Ask 1120 ^(sbc)

2) Ni Yongguan 倪永官

[checked all name files for Inqua. 12/03/05. Names are recorded in data base. 25/03/05]

Trade Names: *Inqua, Enqua, Hienqua, Hinqua, Incqua, Ynqua*

Biographical Data:

Source

Date first mentioned in the records:

Date last reported trading in Canton:

Death:

Years trading in Canton:

Schedule of Trading Activities in Canton and Sources

Year	Partners	Hong	Co.	Products Traded	Sources
1734	DAC	Rx	Ask 2190
1736	DAC		Ask 1116
1737	Old Quayqua.....	VOC	B	VOC 2410
1738	Oue Quaiqua.....	Zhengfeng	DAC	P,Rx,ga	Ask 1118 ^(sbc) , 2192
1740	Jon Qviqua.....	Zhengfeng	DAC	B,Sl	Ask 1120 ^(sbc)
1741	Jon Quaiqvoa.....	Zhengfeng	DAC	B	Lin 5893; Ask 1120 ^(sbc)
[Mandarin Quiqua dies and Inqua begins trading on his own]					
1742	Tjetqua.....	VOC	pp,tin,B,C,R,rm	Can 1
1742	Jacqua.....	DAC	B,C,Sl	Ask 1121
1745	VOC	z	Can 5, 70
1746	Oemjamqua, Zinqu.....	VOC	Nkr,pw,B,C,Pc,Sc,Bg,Sl,H	Can 5

Family Members

Relation:	Aliases	Name	Chinese	Sources

Associates and Businesses

Associates	Years	Name	Chinese	Sources
<u>Businesses</u>				

3) Chen Zuguan 陳祖官

[VOC, EIC, SOIC, GIC, USA and DAC records are done for Zuguan and Junhua. Names are recorded in Chinese merchant data base.]

Trade Names: (The following prefixes and/or suffixes are found in the records attached to Zuqua's names. They refer to "Young" or "Junior" to distinguish him from his father, who died in 1742. They were in use from 1724 to 1741): *Jong, Jonck, Jonghe, Jeun, Jeune, Juun, Junior, Jon, Young.* (The

following names appear in the records for Zuguan, sometimes alone and other times with his surname Tan/Ton attached): *Qviqua, Quiqua, Quaiqvoa, Quaiqua, Quayqua, Qveiqvoa, Quyuqua, Coqua, Kaiqua, Khoiqua, Khiqua, Tan Ziuqua, Ziouqua, Ziunqua, Siuqua, Ziuqua, Ziauqua, Siouqua, Siauqua, Sjoqua, Suyqua, Soyqua, Tsiooqua, Tsjooqua, Tjooqua, Tjoqua, Tjauqua, Tiauqua, Tsioqua, Tsjoqua, Tioqua, Tjouqua, Tsouqua, Tsoqua, Ta Tjoqua, Chowqua, Chouqua, Cowqua.*

Biographical Data:		<u>Source</u>
Born:	1705/1706	Can 95
Date first mentioned in the records:		
Date last reported trading in Canton:		see sources below
Death: 83 years old	1789, Mar 27	Can 95; M2:181; Cheong 161
Years trading in Canton:	1724-1789	see sources below

Schedule of Trading Activities in Canton and Sources					
Year	Partners	Hong	Co.	Products Traded	Sources
1724	GIC	see Table	IC 5682, 5684, 5698bis, 5740; PMA 479
1726	GIC	see Table	IC 5695
1727	GIC	see Table	IC 5698-5700, 5753
1734	EIC		Cheong 72 n. 90
1736	EIC	tea,P,Nk	Morse 1
1737	VOC	B	VOC 2410
1737	EIC		Cheong 72 n. 90
1740	Inqua.....	Zhengfeng	DAC	B,Sl	Ask 1120 ^(sbc)
1741	Inqua.....	Zhengfeng	DAC	B	Ask 1120 ^(sbc) ; Lin 5893
1742-1757	[Zuguan's name changes making it impossible to distinguish his from other names]				
1758	EIC		Morse 5
1759	EIC		Morse 5
1760	Yuanquan	VOC	see Table	VOC 4386-4387 ^(sbc)
1760	EIC		Morse 5:91
1762	DAC	see Table	Ask 2220-2222
1762	VOC	see Table	Can 25, 71; VOC 4394
1762	SOIC		NM: F17
1763	VOC	see Table	Can 26, 72; VOC 4394
1764	DAC	see Table	Ask 2227-2228
1764	VOC	see Table	Can 27, 73; VOC 4396
1765	VOC	see Table	VOC 4397
1766	DAC	see Table	Ask 1156a, 2231
1766	VOC	B	Can 75
1767	DAC	see Table	Ask 2232-2233
1767	VOC	B	Can 30, 76
1768	DAC	see Table	Ask 1162, 2234
1768	VOC	see Table	Can 31, 77; VOC 4402
1768	EIC		Morse 5
1768	SOIC		NM: F17
1769	DAC	Nk	Ask 1165
1769	VOC	see Table	Can 32; VOC 4405
1770	DAC	see Table	Ask 1166, 2236-2237
1770	VOC	see Table	Can 33, 79; VOC 4406
1771	Monqua.....	VOC	see Table	Can 34, 80; VOC 4408
1772	Monqua, Poankequa.....	VOC	see Table	Can 35; VOC 4410
1772	EIC	B,Sl,Ty	Morse 5
1773	DAC	C,Sl	Ask 1170
1773	VOC	see Table	Can 36, 82; VOC 4411
1773	EIC	B,HS,Ty,Sl,H	Morse 5

1774	VOC	see Table	Can 37, 83; VOC 4412
1774	EIC	tea	Morse 5
1775	DAC	Sl,C,PcZZ	Ask 1173
1775	Monqua.....	VOC	see Table	Can 38, 84; VOC 4413, 4556
1776	DAC	Pc,C,Sl	Ask 1175-1176
1776	Monqua.....	VOC	see Table	Can 39, 85; VOC 4414
1776	EIC	w,ld	Morse 2
1777	DAC	C,PZZ,z	Ask 1177
1777	Monqua.....	VOC	see Table	Can 40, 86; VOC 4415
1777	EIC		Morse 2
1778	Syqua.....	Yuen-csiuen	DAC	Pc,Nk	Ask 1179
1778	Monqua.....	Yuanquan	VOC	see Table	Can 41 ^(sb) , 89; VOC 4418, 4556
1778	EIC	B,Ty,Sl,rz,w	Morse 2
1779	DAC	ZZ,H,Sl,ld,C,Ty,SR,pp,HS	Ask 1180
1779	Monqua, Tsjonqua, Inksia	VOC	see Table	Can 42, 87-88; VOC 4419
1779	EIC	is old and does little business	Morse 2
1780	DAC	PZZ,K,S,C	Ask 1183
1780	Monqua, Tsjonqua, Inksia	VOC	see Table	Can 43, 89, 243; VOC 4421
1780	EIC	Db	Morse 2
1781	Kiauqua.....	DAC	zt,tea,K,tu,H,Sl,Ty,Pc,ZZ,HS	Ask 1185
1781	Monqua, Tsjonqua	VOC	see Table	Can 44; VOC 4423
1781	EIC		Morse 2
1782	Kiauqua.....	DAC	see Table	Ask 1190, 2240
1782	Monqua, Tsjonqua	VOC	see Table	Can 44; VOC 4430
1782	EIC	owns a junk captured by the English	Morse 2
1783	DAC	see Table	Ask 2241
1783	Monqua, Tsjonqua	VOC	see Table	Can 45; VOC 4430
1783	EIC	pp,Ty,Sl,B	Morse 2
1784	DAC	see Table	Ask 2242
1784	Kiauqua, Monqua, Tsjonqua, Pinqua, Kiauqua	VOC	see Table	Can 46, 90; VOC 4426
1784	EIC	B,Sl	Morse 2
1784	USA	gardens	Shaw 179
1785	DAC	see Table	Ask 2243
1785	Monqua, Pinqua, Kiauqua	VOC	see Table	Can 47; VOC 4431
1785	EIC		Morse 2
1786	DAC	see Table	Ask 2244
1786	Monqua, Pinqua, Kiauqua	VOC	see Table	Can 48, 92; VOC 4432-4433 ^(bc)
1786	EIC		Morse 2
1787	DAC	see Table	Ask 2245
1787	Monqua, Pinqua, Kiauqua	VOC	see Table	Can 49, 92; VOC 4436
1787	EIC		Morse 2
1788	Monqua, Pinqua, Kiauqua	VOC	see Table	Can 50; VOC 4440
1788	EIC		Morse 2
1789	DAC	see Table	Ask 2247
1789	(Zuguan died this year)	Juun Luun	VOC	see Table	Can 51, 95; VOC 4444
1789	EIC		Morse 2

Family Members

Relation:	Sources
Father <i>Mandarin Quiqua</i> Chen Kuiguan 陳魁官	Cheong 44; Ask 1120 ^(sbc)
Eldest son <i>Locqua/Chowqua II</i> Chen Junhua 陳鈞華	Morse 2:181; Can 51, 95; VOC 4444
Relative? <i>Anqua</i> Chen Anqua 陳安官	Cheong 44, 71-72 nn. 79-80; VOC 4381 ^(sb) ; Ask 1144 ^(bc)

Associates and Businesses

Associates	Sources
------------	---------

<i>Inqua</i>	Ni Yongguan	See sources above
<i>Monqua</i>	Cai Wenguan	See sources above
<i>Poankequa</i>	Pan Qiguan	See sources above
<i>Syqua</i>	Cai?	See sources above
<i>Tsjonqua</i>	Cai Xiangguan	See sources above
<i>Inksia</i>	Yan Yingshe	See sources above
<i>Kiauqua</i>	Wu Qiaoguan 伍喬官	Ask 1185
<i>Pinqua</i>	Yang Bingguan	See sources above
<i>Kinqua</i>	Shi Zhonghe	See sources above
<u>Businesses</u>		
<i>Qouycong</i>	Zhengfeng Hang	Cheong 40; Ask 1120 ^(sbc)
<i>Yuen-csiuen/Juun Luun</i>	Yuanquan Hang 源泉行	VOC 4386-4387 ^(sbc) ; Ask 1179

4) Chen Junhua 陳鈞華

[All records checked for Junhua and names are recorded, so he is done.]

Trade Names: *Lockqua, Loc-qua, Locqua, Lopqua, Chowqua, Chowqua II*

Biographical Data:		<u>Source</u>
Date first mentioned in the records:		
Date last reported trading in Canton:		see sources below
Death:	1794/1795	Aanw 298
Years trading in Canton:	1789-1793	see sources below

Schedule of Trading Activities in Canton and Sources					
Year	Partners	Hong	Co.	Products Traded	Sources
1789	Juun Luun	VOC	see Table	Can 51, 95; VOC 4444
1790	VOC	see Table	Can 52; VOC 4445
1790	EIC		Morse 2
1791	Ponqua (writer).....	Yuanquan	VOC	see Table	Can 53 ^(b) ; VOC 4446 ^(b) ; GUL Ms 1985
1792	VOC	see Table	Can 54; VOC 4576
1792	DAC	see Table	Ask 2249
1792	EIC		Morse 2
1793	(failed this year).....	VOC	C	Can 55; VOC 4447
1794	VOC	C,Sc,Pc	Can 56

Family Members				
Relation:	Aliases	Name	Chinese	Sources

Associates and Businesses				
Associates	Years	Name	Chinese	Sources
Ponqua (writer in 1791)				GUL Ms 1985
<u>Businesses</u>				