

Section 1. Study of art

<https://doi.org/10.29013/EJHSS-23-1-3-14>

Lin Zhiyu,
Deerfield Academy
High School Independent Researcher

18th CENTURY CHINOISERIE: THE ORIENTALIST RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CHINA AND THE WEST SHAPED THROUGH ART

Abstract. This paper explores the early history surrounding chinoiserie artworks in the 18th century and earlier to argue that an Orientalist relationship exists between the East and West. I will first analyze how the reliability of chinoiserie artists' sources affected how China is stereotyped. Then, the focus will turn to the role of patronage in chinoiserie and europeanerie and how the West and East developed a complicated power relationship through their artistic treatment of foreign culture. Throughout the paper, Said's theory of Orientalism and Spivak's theory of the subaltern will apply to visual art produced by Chinese and European artists. As part of the conclusion, I will discuss early chinoiserie's legacies in the modern and contemporary world.

Keywords: sino-European relations, chinoiserie, Orientalism, history of art.

Introduction

A blonde-haired girl with rose cheeks, a man with an old European string instrument called hurdy-gurdy, a sky of pastel-colored rococo clouds... Such details constitute the scene in French painter Antoine Watteau's "Chinese Musician", though one should be highly skeptical of this work's "Chinese" part [1]. This "somewhat Chinese" art style circulated in 18th and 19th century Europe, centering in elite societies of France and Britain and was named *chinoiserie*. According to the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie Française*, the word *chinoiserie* was first described as an "object of art, furniture, or curiosity, that comes from China or the Chinese taste (Objet d'art, d'ameublement ou de curiosité, venant de Chine ou dans le goût chinois)" [2]. The "Chinese taste" is constructed partly by various European artists including Antoine Watteau and François Boucher through stereotyping

China, and partly by patrons that relied on possessing chinoiserie to distinguish their status. Although the word chinoiserie only entered the French dictionary at the height of European interest in East Asia in the 19th century, the term also retroactively applies to earlier works that founded the style [2].

Around the same time in China, chinoiserie's counterpart, europeanerie, also emerged from within Emperor Qianlong's Yuanmingyuan palace. Kangxi, the Qing emperor in 1709, began the palace's construction, and his heir, Qianlong, embellished the palace according to his European tastes. He erected a series of delicate stone buildings in the Italian Baroque style, where the emperor collected elaborate artifacts brought by travelers and missionaries from the West. Qianlong's project of europeanerie and China's take on exoticism contribute to the Orientalist paradigms.

In exploring the power relationship between the East and West, post-colonialist scholar Edward Said offers valuable insight applicable to chinoiserie. His titular term, Orientalism, depends on a distinction between the constructed categories of “the Orient” (the East) and “the Occident” (the West). In his book *Orientalism*, Said defines the word in three ways. Still, his main interest is the third: Orientalism is a Western style for dominating, restructuring, and having authority over the Orient [3]. For the West to achieve this domination, Said writes, “Orientalism depends for its strategy on this flexible positional superiority, which puts the Westerner into a whole series of possible relationships with the Orient without ever losing him the relative upper hand” [3, 7]. One of those possible relationships is the West’s wanton portrayal of China through art.

The philosophy around Orientalism has reverberated among contemporary scholars and found voice in Gayatri Spivak’s essay, “Can The Subaltern Speak?” [4]. Spivak builds on Said’s idea of the West keeping the Occident separate from the Orient so that Europe maintains its position as the subject while constructing the East as the object. Her essay defines the subaltern as a group with comparatively less power and argues that colonizers often homogenize the subaltern’s heterogeneity while representing it to the world. Spivak says, “For the ‘true’ subaltern group, whose identity is its difference, there is no unrepresentable subaltern subject that can know and speak itself” [4, 27]. In the context of this paper, Spivak’s subaltern is China, whose subjectivity is deferred to Western artists and missionaries representing them to Europe through chinoiserie. It is also worth exploring the asymmetries when Spivak’s theory is applied to europeanerie in Chinese palaces, a similar practice to chinoiserie where artists construct a version of Europe for elite Chinese consumption ship all docked at Canton [5, 44].

Canton’s availability to all ships rendered the region a space of contact and transmission. Adding to the long history of foreign contact in China, trade

companies established embassies and numerous travelers explored China. Portugal was one of the first European countries to gain trading rights with China when they sent an embassy in 1557 [5, 34]. Portuguese Jesuit Matteo Ricci won respect among the Chinese and established the precedent for future Jesuits of all nationalities joining the royal courts [5, 36–37]. In 1655–1657, a Dutch East India Company employee documented China with detailed illustrations that later European artists studied [6]. More than a century later, the British draftsman William Alexander drew over a thousand illustrations of China during the 1793 Macartney Mission [7]. All these moments of contact and transmission contributed to the development of chinoiserie in Europe and its pendant europeanerie in China.

This paper explores the early history surrounding chinoiserie artworks in the 18th century and earlier to argue that an Orientalist relationship exists between the East and West. I will first analyze how the reliability of chinoiserie artists’ sources affected how China is stereotyped. Then, the focus will turn to the role of patronage in chinoiserie and europeanerie and how the West and East developed a complicated power relationship through their artistic treatment of foreign culture. Throughout the paper, Said’s theory of Orientalism and Spivak’s theory of the subaltern will apply to visual art produced by Chinese and European artists. As part of the conclusion, I will discuss early chinoiserie’s legacies in the modern and contemporary world ship all docked at Canton [7]. Canton’s availability to all ships rendered the region a space of contact and transmission. Adding to the long history of foreign contact in China, trade companies established embassies and numerous travelers explored China. Portugal was one of the first European countries to gain trading rights with China when they sent an embassy in 1557 [5, 34]. Portuguese Jesuit Matteo Ricci won respect among the Chinese and established the precedent for future Jesuits of all nationalities to join the royal courts [5, 36–37]. In 1655–1657, a Dutch East India Company employee documented China with de-

tailed illustrations that later European artists studied [6]. More than a century later, the British draftsman William Alexander drew over a thousand illustrations of China during the 1793 Macartney Mission [7]. All these moments of contact and transmission contributed to the development of chinoiserie in Europe and its pendant europeanerie in China.

Reliability of Chinoiserie

Art produced by Europeans traveling through China constructed a homogenous picture by extrapolating from experiences of individual regions to the whole country, diminishing China's regional specificity. The Dutch East-India Company sailed to China with its secretary Johannes Nieuhof in 1655, seeking to establish trading relations with the country [6, 536]. The party docked and stayed in Canton for seven months waiting for the emperor's approval before heading to Beijing [6, 553]. During this extended stay in the southern tip of China, Nieuhof absorbed Canton's tropical geography, creating many drawings of the region. Nieuhof generalized the whole of China from his experiences with a specific region, spreading a narrow view of the country in a way that resembles colonizers [8].

Quangsi primarily and even mixed in foreign from India and the Maluccan Islands [8, 221–229]. This would have confused readers to believe that China was a tropical country. Specifically, Nieuhof was misleading in his text when he wrote, "Here grow also in many Places abundance of Coco- Nuts" [8, 219]. In reality, 90% of the coconut coverage in China is concentrated in Hainan, a little southern island, and not abundant "in many Places" like Nieuhof assumed [9]. He also illustrated an elephant in the book. He exaggeratedly wrote that the animal was found "[i]n several parts of China" when they are only located in the extreme south of the Yunnan province [8, 234; 10]. Nieuhof's trees and elephants exemplify how the expression of a foreign representative's unilateral views can eliminate a country's heterogeneity.

Despite the sources' unreliability, European artists often chose to blindly trust Western records in-

stead of sincerely investigating the culture, thus perpetuating an inaccurate version of China. Nieuhof's *An embassy* was a popular source of reference for chinoiserie artists, as multiple tapestries in the Beauvais tapestry series "The Story of the Emperor of China" included variations of the sitting emperor figure on the book's cover page [11]. Nieuhof's imprecise records could have deluded chinoiserie artists such as Francois Boucher into believing that elephants are a signature fauna of China. For example, in Boucher's 1742 Beauvais tapestry called "The Chinese Fair," he placed two carriages hauled by elephants among the long line of fancily dressed participants when the animal usually resides in Southeast Asia, not China [12, 32] (Elephants have been correctly placed before in a 16th-century Brussels tapestry depicting the deeds of the Portuguese governor of Goa, which includes two, grand elephants that carry dozens of soldiers). Boucher would have made this mistake if he referenced Nieuhof's generalized claim about elephants found throughout China in *An embassy*. In addition, the tapestry series that "The Chinese Fair" belongs in almost all featured grand coconut trees, which are not typical in mainland China [11, 107; 110; 112; 113]. That's why tapestries like Boucher's "The Feast of the Emperor of China" produce such dissonance: in it, the emperor, who traditionally never leaves his palace in Beijing, sits under a canopy of coconut trees and appears to be feasting on a tropical vacation [13]! This ridiculous situation was made possible by Boucher's indiscriminate trust in Western sources that perpetuated a false idea about coconut trees in China.

Even Nieuhof himself was a victim of unreliable sources. In *An embassy*, Nieuhof included an exaggeratedly armor-plated rhinoceros with fantastical details [8, 235]. Surprisingly, this was not his observational drawing from China but a direct copy from the 1515 woodcut by Albrecht Dürer, who had also never seen the animal and only learned of it through other artists' depictions [5, 34]. Nieuhof's rhinoceros is another example of imposing a western

iconographic source onto the Chinese setting. This insertion presumes a haughty authority for western art sources regardless of their accuracy rather than observing directly from the land itself. Ultimately, chains of unreliable sources, including Nieuhof's rhinoceros, produced the classic chinoiserie art in the 19th century that barely spoke of China.

In addition to diminishing China's regional differences, European travelers also homogenized the Orient by mixing cultural items from different Asian countries. Besides referencing Nieuhof's inaccurate sources, another explanation for Boucher's misplaced elephants may be that the artist confused the mammal's origins. Since the 16th century, European ships have cruised around the East Indies collecting exotic items [14] (This practice that could have stemmed from the Renaissance interest in building "cabinets of curiosities", which displayed collections of fantastic natural and artificial items). For example, a catalog of goods from English privateers in 1592 shows off artifacts from as many as nine different East Asian countries and thus created confusion over their origins and nomenclature by the time the items reached Europe [5, 37]. Like the travelers who lost track of each country's local products, perhaps Boucher also confused the elephants' natural habitats in "the Chinese Fair" while attempting to capture so many exotic elements. In an Orientalist context, Boucher's confusion generalized Asian countries and advanced a West-constructed Asia.

Despite bridges and deep eye sockets [8]. This could be due to shifting powers in China during Nieuhof's stay. The new multinational Qing court was constituted by the ruling Manchus, a group of nomadic tribes from the Northern prairies of China that reorganized under eight banners; Mongols, who governed the previous Ming court; and Hans, who were auxiliary to the Mongols [15, 343]. Since the Manchus, Mongols, and Hans all came from diverse geographies in China, Nieuhof likely saw and documented a courtroom full of people with different facial features. Only by recognizing the heterogeneity

of Chinese ethnicities under Qing dynastic power can one understand Nieuhof's depictions as potentially accurate.

Except for the Dutch artist's recognition of Qing heterogeneity, the accumulation of inaccuracies in chinoiserie serves as testimony to Spivak's theory of the subaltern. When Western travelers reported oriental "facts" back to Europe, misunderstandings were bound to be reverberating from source to source. In the case of chinoiserie, this results in an inaccurate and, at times, reductive depiction of China. In her essay "Can the Subaltern Speak?," Spivak accuses the West of deliberate "epistemic violence" to "constitute the colonial subject as Other" and "(obliterate) (the) trace of that Other in (the West's) precarious Subjectivity" [4, 24–25]. To constitute China as the "Other" is to confiscate its voice so that the power to define it remains in the hands of the Occident. Then, European painters could generalize the existence of elephants, coconuts, and anything else they wished without opposition.

Chinoiserie

The strange mix of European and Chinese elements in chinoiserie, a feature that is the signature of the style, concerns the question of power and patronage. Watteau's strange-looking "Chinese Musician" exemplifies the effects of French patronage on chinoiserie. The painting's owner Joseph-Jean-Baptiste Fleuriau d'Armenonville was intendant of finances during the reign of Louis XIII and Louis XIV. His family reached across the French court circles [16, 292–293]. An artwork in an aristocrat's room must serve according to its owner's *honnêtes* tastes. Phoebe Scott, a contemporary scholar investigating 18th – century chinoiserie, defines the *honnête homme* as "an ideal aristocrat whose very person had been transformed into a work of art by cultivating pleasing modes of speech, dress, manners, and adornment" [17]. Whereas the journalistic works of travelers such as Nieuhof aim to record a truthful China whose faults only fall on his ignorance and inaccurate sources, Watteau's work indulges and ennobles his

aristocratic patrons' tastes. The appearance of the hurdy-gurdy in "Chinese Musician" is an example of Watteau's attempt to cater to noble interests. While high societies in the Renaissance abandoned the ancient instrument, the peasantry passionately continued it. During the Rococo period, the hurdy-gurdy became popular among the nobilities again as a symbol of romantic rustic life [18; 19]. Watteau's patron d'Armenonville, an aristocrat himself, could have had similar taste. Thus, including the hurdy-gurdy in the hands of a Chinese peasant not only satisfies d'Armenonville's curiosity for the exotic but also enhances the idyllic feeling of the room, making the patron seem respectable among his other aristocratic guests.

Watteau's teacher Boucher also confronts the pressure of patronage by adjusting his chinoiserie paintings to fit European standards. One could argue that the elephants in "The Chinese Fair" were intentionally placed to support the exotic nature of the theme. Still, it is painfully hard to ignore a whole tapestry filled with European-looking fair go-ers. In the bottom-left corner, a group of attendees looking at exotic birds are dressed in elegant Chinese textiles but have Western features—high nose bridges and deep eye sockets—and blond hair [12]. This was not Boucher's doing but that of Jean-Joseph Dumons, a designer from the Beauvais Manufactory who adapted Boucher's initial painting into a tapestry. "The Chinese Fair" was only one of the tapestries that Dumons transformed from Boucher's series of eight Chinese-themed paintings exhibited at the 1742 Louvre Salon [20]. Although most details were faithfully transferred, Dumons altered Eastern features into Western ones. Boucher's painting version of "The Chinese Fair" more closely represents the Chinese figure with black hair and slender, unprotruding features, which Dumons reworked into a stereotypical Western face adorned by golden hair [13]. These adjustments were potentially made to suit royal patrons. The Beauvais Manufactory satisfied the demands of 17th to 18th-century French aristocrats

and kings who made tapestry collection a fashion: Louis XV personally owned five Beauvais tapestries produced between 1743 and 1745 [21]. Keeping Beauvais's patrons in mind, a Chinese-themed series to satisfy the *honnête homme's* exotic tastes while keeping some elements still familiar, such as blonde or brown hair, promised a successful commission.

As a secretary-artist, Nieuhof's mercantile patronage distinguished his chinoiserie from Boucher and Watteau's. Nieuhof created the illustrations in *An embassy* for the powerful Dutch East India Company, which wanted to establish trade ties with China [6, 536]. The trading company possibly wanted to use Nieuhof's records to understand China better to expand the Dutch economic power to the Eastern seas more successfully. Therefore, instead of the languishing and wanton rococo painting, Nieuhof drew prints in a more documentary than an artistic manner to educate the Dutch merchants. However, he may have had to guess some details due to the swift voyage. Nieuhof's work differs from the later French chinoiserie as it is not yet a European interpretation of a Chinese style but a subjective collection of China-related information that later artists would interpret into a distinct, Oriental style. On the one hand, the trader patrons influenced Nieuhof's work; on the other hand, his art also became a detailed but inexact source that shaped western patrons' ideas about China.

Europeanerie

The blend of different cultures in artworks was not unique to the West; this phenomenon reappeared in China with *Europeanerie*. Emperor Qianlong, who directed the completion of his summer palace Yuanming Yuan, had a widespread interest in *Europeanerie* and commissioned Jesuit artists to construct Baroque-style palaces in his residence, though they were insufficient imitations. American scholar Carroll Brown Malone characterized these counterfeits in 1930: "Ch'ien Lung (Qianlong)'s European palaces contained numerous false windows and doors, excessive ornamentation in carved stone, glazed tiles

in startling color combinations, imitation shells and rock-work, meaningless pyramids, scrolls and foliage, and conspicuous outside staircases...” [22].

According to Malone, the decor of the European palaces was “false,” “excessive,” an “imitation” and “meaningless,” implying that the architecture fell short of Occidental rococo standards despite Qianlong’s interest, just like how chinoiserie art commissioned by Orient-loving French patrons didn’t look authentically Chinese. The inside of palaces was stuffed with foreign trinkets, as French missionary Jean-Durant Attiret described in his 1743 letter, “(The interior) is furnish’d and adorn’d with all the most beautiful and valuable Things that could be got in *China*, the *Indies*, and even from *Europe*” [23]. This description suggests that Qianlong had an exotic collecting passion similar to the European ships that browsed Asia. The emperor owned ornate European clocks and toys and an assortment of music boxes, but his most significant possessions were two Beauvais tapestries made from Boucher’s chinoiserie designs [24, 133]. These tapestries were bought by the French king and given to Henri Bertin, France’s India Company’s foreign minister, who in turn sent them with missionaries returning to Beijing as a gift for Qianlong on behalf of the French government; the emperor loved them so much that he even created an observatory just for the tapestries! [24, 136]. The observatory demonstrates that Qianlong was fascinated by how Europe viewed his country and echoed Louis XIV’s interest in foreign artifacts. In fact, the two similar rulers interacted through the French Jesuit Joachim Bouvet: the missionary brought engravings of Versailles and Louvre to Qianlong, then told Louis XIV of his resemblance to the Chinese emperor [22]. The French and Chinese rulers shared a superficial fervor over exotic items, suggesting that similar modes of patronage (both imperial, in this case) bear similar artistic results.

Like the French patrons who preserved aspects of Western life in chinoiserie paintings, Qianlong Emperor also ensured Chinese traditions remained in

his court paintings. Giuseppe Castiglione was among the wave of Jesuit missionaries that entered China in the 18th century. He arrived in 1715 and was favored by Emperor Kangxi and Qianlong as an influential painter in court commissions. Upon admission to the Chinese court, Castiglione received training to “correct” his painting to the local style until the Italian painter mastered Chinese inking skills and Taoist composition [25]. In Castiglione’s 1739 painting “The Qianlong Emperor in Ceremonial Armour on Horseback,” rocky mountains and scarce trees fade behind Emperor Qianlong in a classic Chinese landscape fashion [26]. There are also no shadows of the horse on the ground where one might expect to see one, another tradition in Chinese painting [27]. In terms of texture, clear and solid outlines emphasize the armor’s hardness, while soft contours enhance the emperor’s downy hair and shadowless face. This extreme attention to detail achieved through thin lines and light glazing evokes the delicacy of the Chinese Gongbi style. Apart from the techniques, Castiglione also captured Chinese culture and values in this piece. From as early as the Zhou dynasty (1050–221 B.C.E.), skill in the shooting was valued as one of the noble arts and a great virtue for the emperor [28]. By adorning the emperor with bows and arrows, Castiglione recognized the ancient virtue the Chinese had ascribed to archery. Moreover, an archery-themed portrait would especially be dear to Qing emperors since they were Manchu and the nomadic Manchus were very proud of their horseback shooting skills [29]. The Jesuit also preserved traditional Chinese patterns by painting colorfully decorated gold armor and the two dragons on the front plates that symbolize the emperor. These European paintings should have satisfied the Qing standards at last since Qianlong, a painter himself would sometimes watch as Castiglione painted and point out displeasing details until the emperor was happy [25, 48].

However, Chinese and European paintings differed from each other when it came to borrowing

inspiration and techniques from foreign spheres. Unlike chinoiserie, which maintained the traditional Western style but manipulated Chinese elements, the Qing court incorporated Renaissance painting techniques into traditional flat Chinese ink art while keeping China as the subject. From Europe, Castiglione brought China a new framework of painting, including linear perspective, oil paints, and western portraiture. While European artists dismissed Chinese painting and favored their traditions, the Qing emperors welcomed foreign art forms, evidenced by the large quantity of Qing paintings made in oil. Castiglione drew on his earlier Italian training and contemporary Chinese painting techniques to produce a hybrid style that grew so distinguishable that it was named “Langshining (Castiglione’s Chinese name) new form” [30]. This style is reflected in the same 1739 europeanerie portrait, which paints the emperor in classic equestrian portraiture traditionally reserved for European kings or nobles [26, 31]. By posing himself in a Western setting, the Chinese emperor demonstrates his willingness to accept and experiment with the art practices of other cultures. Even his face no longer resembles the generalized and enhanced features of portraiture from previous dynasties; instead, Qianlong boldly allows his painter to capture every crease and detail of his face in a naturalistic, Renaissance manner [32]. The Qing Emperor loved Castiglione’s style, as the Jesuit was required to teach oil painting to at least ten inner-court clerks; they were the first round of Chinese painters to learn Western techniques [30, 3]. By the end of Castiglione’s career, the Western painting techniques had infiltrated the courts so deeply that even when he fell sick, the emperor could subpoena other court artists to paint in his absence, and they worked in a similar style [30, 10].

Orientalism in Chinoiserie and Europeanerie

The Western and Eastern attitudes toward exotic painting demonstrate that imperial governments treat foreign culture similarly—taking its artifacts as a trophy of status since both chinoiserie and europeanerie

are collected among the upper class. Louis XV possessed tapestries depicting China, while the Chinese emperor prized his collection of exotic toys in his European palaces. However, because the patrons were more interested in the appendages of exoticism and less about the true culture it represents, they made sure to limit foreign influences by imposing local cultural forms on the art. The French maintained a rococo style in chinoiserie and the Chinese by making the subject of europeanerie Chinese.

The West and East endorsed the Orientalist scheme through their separate ways of treating foreign culture in art. Europe’s fervor over chinoiserie reflects its desire to maintain power over the East. Simply by dictating what composes chinoiserie paintings, western patrons assume the power to redefine an eastern country. Their accumulated artistic substitutions simultaneously silence Asia and construct their version of the Orient, reinforcing Spivak’s philosophy of the subaltern being unable to speak. Behind seemingly innocent alterations like hair color change, more harmful versions of chinoiserie continue to promote racism. In *La Grande Singerie* (The Great Monkey Room), Chinese people are depicted as monkeys (due to their foreign appearance) doing silly anthropomorphic activities [17]. Owing to the power of patronage, these images were painted on the walls of Le Chateau de Chantilly and preserved as precious artifacts of the tastes of its aristocratic owners. As a result, *La Grande Singerie* still attracts countless visitors today, a testimony to the great power of Orientalism as the art continues to propagate mocking stereotypes of Chinese people indefinitely [33].

In the East, China’s unreciprocated attitude in welcoming foreign cultures covertly supports Orientalism too. While Europeans scorned Chinese art as feminine, the Chinese were eager to learn new painting technology [34, 215]. Borrowing Said’s idea in *Orientalism*, no matter how genuinely Castiglione devoted himself to the Qing court, he was European first, then an emperor’s employee [3, 11].

He inherited the Occident's view of the world and presented their advanced techniques as a gift for China. By accepting this "gift" while its own culture was not received the same way in Europe, China unknowingly helped Europe colonize Chinese art and spread its power to the East. Another reason chinoiserie became so erroneous is that China had almost no direct representation in Europe. In the 18th century, only a few rare travelers, including Loum Kiqua and Chitqua, briefly visited Britain [35]. According to the Chinese Embassy in the UK, China's first diplomatic mission wasn't until 1877, when they established their embassy in London [36]. The West took advantage of China's lack of direct representation and made it into Spivak's silent subaltern.

Conclusion: Legacies of Chinoiserie

While chinoiserie could not be a reliable source to learn about China, the development of this style reveals plenty about the power dynamics between the Eastern and Western spheres. The Occident's desire to control and silence the heterogeneous Orient manifests through foreign representatives' attempt at narrating China in their shallow understanding of the country and patron-serving artistic choices. This is evidenced by the misleading illustrations and descriptions found in Nieuhof's *An embassy* and Rococo artists Watteau and Boucher's works. Europeanerie complicates the picture by providing a counterpart to chinoiserie shaped by Chinese patronage. Castiglione and his successful promotion of Western painting techniques in the Qing court is testimony to China's warm embrace of foreign art practices, which is unreciprocated by Europe. The Chinese court unintentionally played into the Orientalist scheme through this asymmetric interest. Due to chinoiserie and Rococo's decline and infamy, scholars in the 18th and 19th centuries had rarely treated chinoiserie as a legitimate subject of its own, dismissing the subject merely as a side branch of Rococo; only recently have art historians attempted to dig out more profound interpretations in chinoiserie [37]. However, it is crucial to investigate the dawn of this style in the 18th

century because Europe's early Orientalist regimes left a long-lasting and deformed image of China to the world.

In the later 18th and 19th century Europe, chinoiserie matured into a popular French decorative style that diverged further and further from the true China. Chinoiserie became closely embedded into the rococo taste and developed defining motifs, which include palm trees, monkeys, pagoda roofs, and Chinese characters. When extracting elements, Europeans took inspiration from Chinese porcelain and paintings and Japanese lacquer, and Indian cotton, directing chinoiserie to a general Oriental style that no longer represents China exclusively [38]. In addition to hybridizing chinoiserie, European manufacturers also began to produce local porcelain emulating Chinese porcelain that was expensive to import and too fragile for western dining. Manufacturers in Delft, Holland; Frankfurt, Germany; and Rouen, France, produced inexpensive tin-glazed faïence copies of Chinese porcelain [39]. Chinoiserie designs popularized in wallpaper, too, since the Chinese style of the painting looked flat and thus was an excellent decorative element for walls [38, 112]. As chinoiserie appeared in more frequent daily life through walls and ceramics, the art's skewed views towards China could more readily influence the French people. Through the circulation of jumbled chinoiserie elements and local manufacturing of faïence porcelains and wallpapers, the matured Oriental style propagated generalized and Eurocentric views on China worldwide.

As Rococo became increasingly criticized in the 19th century for its lavishness, chinoiserie subsided too; but the impact of its existence lingered wide and deep. Chinoiserie crossed the ocean and reached the colonized America's newspapers via Jesuit reports as early as 1710, providing Americans with information, accurate or not, on Chinese religion, politics, and commodities [40, 19]. In Salem, Social Library members had access to elaborate maps that often included Chinese figures with signature long mustaches

and braided queues [40, 19–22]. This consumption of chinoiserie could have impacted Americans' later stereotypes toward Chinese immigrants. A simple comparison between the Chinese figures in anti-Chinese cartoons in the American *Puck* magazine in 1912 and the drawing of Chinese temple visitors by William Alexander, draftsman of the 1792–1794 British Macartney mission to China, is enough to see chinoiserie's influence: Chinese figures in both works had a sliver for eyes, a signature queue behind the head, and exaggerated movements [41; 42]. Therefore, investigating chinoiserie in the 18th century is valuable for understanding how the lasting bigotry came to be.

In addition, as mentioned earlier, *La Grande Singerie* and *La Petite Singerie* continue to preserve deprecating 18th – century Sino-monkey wallpapers for visitors today, sustaining a profoundly detrimental image of China in the Western world. The reverberations of chinoiserie throughout the 18th and 19th centuries and contemporary consumption of its harmful legacies in museums and other contexts demonstrate the endurance of the stereotypes produced in the style's earliest phases. One must correctly recognize the historical context of this “beautiful” style in order to develop a fair vision of China and stop the conservation of Orientalist attitudes toward the East.

References:

1. Watteau J.-A. “Viosseu” or Chinese Musician, 1708–16, oil on canvas, Private Collection. URL: https://www.wga.hu/html_m/w/watteau/antoine/1/00chine2.html
2. “Chinoiserie,” in Tome Premier: A-H, 7th ed., – Vol. 1. Dictionnaire de L'Académie Française, Paris, France: Institute de France, 1878. URL: <https://www.dictionnaire-academie.fr/article/A9E0429>
3. Said E. W. Orientalism, – New York: Pantheon Books, 1978.
4. Spivak G. ‘Can the Subaltern Speak?’ in Nelson C. and Grossberg L., eds., Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture, – London: Macmillan, 1988.
5. Impey O. R. Chinoiserie: The Impact of Oriental Styles on Eastern Art and Decoration, – London: Oxford University Press, 1977.
6. Kops H. R. “Not Such an ‘Unpromising Beginning’: The First Dutch Trade Embassy to China, 1655–1657”. Modern Asian Studies – 36. – No. 3. 2002. – P. 535–78. URL: <http://doi.org/10.1017/S0026749X02003025>
7. Zheng L. “The George Macartney Mission to China, 1792–1794”. Gale (blog), entry posted June – 28, 2018. Accessed: June 24, 2022. URL: <https://blog.gale.com/the-george-macartney-mission-to-china-1792-1794/#:~:text=On%20September%2026%2C%201792%2C%20a,occasion%20of%20his%2080th%20birthday>
8. Nieuhof J. An embassy from the East-India Company of the United Provinces, to the Grand Tartar Cham, emperor of China: delivered by their excellencies Peter de Goyer and Jacob de Keyzer, at his imperial city of Peking wherein the cities, towns, villages, ports, rivers, &c in their passages from Canton to Peking are ingeniously described by John Nieuhoff: also an epistle of Father John Adams, their antagonist, concerning the whole negotiation: with an appendix of several remarks taken out of Father Athanasius Kircher: Englished and set forth with their several sculptures by John Ogilby, trans. John Ogilby, n.p.: London, England: Printed for the Author (i.e. Ogilby), 1673. URL: <https://digital.library.wisc.edu/1711.dl/CLN46BDSQAN5H8B>.
9. “Development Faces Many Difficulties: Chinese Coconut Industry Has Great Potential”. Fresh Plaza. Accessed: June 23, 2022. URL: <https://www.freshplaza.com/article/2199917/chinese-coconut-industry-has-great-potential/#:~:text=The%20current%20surface%20area%20devoted,coconut%20production%20area%20in%20China>

10. "Elephants in China". Ele Aid, last modified 2022. Accessed: July 31, 2022. URL: <http://www.eleaid.com/country-profiles/elephants-china/#:~:text=China's%20elephants%20are%20only%20found,and%20the%20Nangunhe%20Nature%20Reserves>
11. Standen E. A. "The Story of the Emperor of China: A Beauvais Tapestry Series". *Metropolitan Museum Journal* 11, (January 1976). URL: <https://doi.org/10.2307/1512687>
12. Boucher F. and Dumons J.-J. *The Chinese Fair, 1742, wool, silk; tapestry weave*, Minneapolis Institute of Art home, Minneapolis, MN. URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/community.15642396>
13. Boucher F. *Feast of the Chinese Emperor, study for a tapestry cartoon, 1742, oil on canvas*, Musée des Beaux-Arts et d'Archéologie, Beasancón, France.
14. Francken Jr. F. *Chamber of Art and Curiosities, 1636*. Accessed: July 7, 2022. URL: <https://sothebysinstitute.com/news-and-events/news/cabinets-of-curiosities-and-the-origin-of-collecting/?mode=list>
15. Corradini P. "On the Multinationality of the Qing Empire". *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* – 51. – No. 3. 1998. – 343 p.
16. Scott K. "Playing Games with Otherness: Watteau's Chinese Cabinet at the Château de La Muette". *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* – 66. 2003. – P. 192–193. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40026316>
17. Scott P. "Mimesis to Mockery: Chinoiserie Ornament in the Social Space of Eighteenth-Century France". *Philament* – 5. 2005. Accessed: July 2, 2022. URL: <https://web.archive.org/web/20201127174030/http://www.philamentjournal.com/articles/mimesis-to-mockery-chinoiserie-ornament-in-the-social-space-of-eighteenth-century-france>
18. Nowotnik P. "Hurdy-gurdy: Contemporary Destinations" (master's thesis, University of Melbourne, 2012). – P. 14–15. Accessed: July 7, 2022. URL: <https://academia.edu/resource/work/8383525>
19. Hunt W. M. *The Hurdy-Gurdy Boy, 1851*, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston. USA. URL: <https://collections.mfa.org/objects/31114>
20. Smentek K. "Chinoiseries for Beijing: An Eighteenth-Century French Gift to the Emperor of China". lecture presented at The Frick Collection, – New York, NY, October 21, 2015. Video, Accessed: July 12, 2022. URL: https://www.frick.org/interact/kristel_smentek_chinoiseries_for_beijing_eighteenth-century_french_gift_emperor_china
21. Doridou-Heim A. "La 'Seconde Tenture Chinoise' de François Boucher" (the "Second Chinese Series" by François Boucher], *La Gazette Drouot*. Accessed: June 23, 2022. URL: <https://www.gazette-drouot.com/en/article/la-22seconde-tenture-chinoise-22-de-francois-boucher/13029>
22. Li L. M. "The Garden of Perfect Brightness II: The European Palaces and Pavilions of the Yuanmingyuan". MIT Visualizing Cultures, accessed June 28, 2022. URL: https://visualizingcultures.mit.edu/garden_perfect_brightness_02/ymy2_essay03.html
23. Jean-Denis Attiret J.-D. A Particular Account of the Emperor of China's Gardens near Pekin: In A Letter from F. Attiret, a French Missionary, Now Employ'd by that Emperor to Paint the Apartments in Those Gardens, to His Friend at Paris, November 1, 1743. Accessed: July 3, 2022.
24. Thomas G. M. "Yuanming Yuan/Versailles: Intercultural Interactions between Chinese and European Palace Cultures". *Art History* 32. – No. 1. February, 2009. – 133 p. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8365.2008.00652.x>
25. Mc Caffery E. "Giuseppe Castiglione: A Personal View". *The Month*, February 1998. – 46.

26. Castiglione G. The Qianlong Emperor in Ceremonial Armour on Horseback, 1739, color on silk, The Palace Museum, Beijing. Accessed: June 28, 2022. URL: <https://www.dpm.org.cn/collection/paint/228806.html>
27. Yang Y. Tao Gu Presenting a Lyric, 1470–1524, ink and color on silk, National Palace Museum, Taipei, Taiwan, accessed July 12, 2022. URL: <https://www.comuseum.com/painting/masters/tang-yin/tao-gu-presenting-a-lyric>
28. World Traditional Archery Organization. “China Archery Culture”. World Traditional Archery Organization, accessed July 2, 2022. URL: <http://www.wtao.org/China#:~:text=During%20Chinese%20history%2C%20archery%20was,Arts%20of%20the%20Zhou%20dynasty>
29. Schottenhammer A. “Horses in Late Imperial China and Maritime East Asia: An Introduction into Trade, Distribution, and Other Aspects (Sixteenth to Eighteenth Centuries)”. In *Horses in Late Imperial China and Maritime East Asia: Pferde in Asien: Geschichte, Handel Und Kultur* (n.p.: Verlag der österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2009). – 3 p. URL: <https://doi.org/10.2307/J.CTVMD83W6.26>
30. Yang B. “郎世宁在清内廷的创作活动及其艺术成就”. (Giuseppe Castiglione’s Artistic Activities and Achievements in the Qing Court). *故宫博物院院刊* – 2. 1988. – 10 p. URL: <https://doi.org/10.16319/j.cnki.0452-7402.1988.02.001>
31. David J.-L. Napoleon crossing the Alps, 1800. Musée national de Malmaison et Bois-Préau, Rueil-Malmaison, France. Accessed: June 8, 2022. URL: <https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:David-Napoleon-crossing-the-Alps-Malmaison1.jpg>
32. Zhou F. Court Ladies Adorning Their Hair with Flowers, late 8th-early 9th century A.D., colors on silk, Liaoning Provincial Museum, Liaoning, China. Accessed: July 10, 2022. URL: <https://artsandculture.google.com/asset/%E7%B0%AA%E8%8A%B1%E4%BB%95%E5%A5%B3%E5%9C%96/sgEnDl0cAnX9GQ?hl>
33. France Today Editors. “La Grande Singerie”. France Today, last modified May 14, 2012. Accessed: June 28, 2022. URL: https://francetoday.com/culture/art_and_design/la-grande-singerie
34. Emery E. “The Musée d’Ennery and the Reception of French Chinoiseries”. In *Beyond Chinoiserie: Artistic Exchange between China and the West during the Late Qing Dynasty (1796–1911)*, ed. P. T.-D. Chu and J.D. Milam (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2019).
35. Clark D. “Chinese Visitors to 18th Century Britain and Their Contribution to Its Cultural and Intellectual Life”. *Curtis’s Botanical Magazine*, December, 2017. – 498 p. URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/48505845>
36. “The First Diplomatic Mission Abroad in the History of China”. Embassy of the People’s Republic of China in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. Accessed: July 12, 2022. URL: <https://www.mfa.gov.cn/ce/ceuk/eng/sgxx/zjsg/t693274.htm#:~:text=Established%20in%201877%2C%20The%20Chinese,in%20the%20history%20of%20China>
37. Justice M. “Searching for the Chine in François Boucher’s Chinoiserie”. (PhD diss., University of Florida, 2013). – P. 16, 23. Accessed: June 20, 2022. URL: https://ufdcimages.uflib.ufl.edu/uf/e0/04/56/28/00001/justice_m.pdf
38. Mayor A. H. “Chinoiserie”. *The Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin* – 36. – No. 5. 1941. – 112 p. URL: <https://doi.org/10.2307/3256573>

39. Chen E. "China through the Eyes of Chinoiserie". Taiwan Panorama, September 1990. Accessed: June 28, 2022. URL: <http://www.taiwanpanorama.com.tw/Articles/Details? Guid=5208784f-f5f2-43a9-a307-7deb0c005c10/> Impey, Chinoiserie, 102–103.
40. Johnson P. "The China Trade and the Classical Tradition in Federal America," in *Beyond Chinoiserie: Artistic Exchange between China and the West during the Late Qing Dynasty (1796–1911)*, ed. P. Ten-Doesschate Chu and J. D. Milam (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2019).– 19 p.
41. Erhart S. D. "Lo, the poor chink! 'Heads we win, pigtails you lose!'" cartoon, Puck, January – 3. 1912.– 9. URL: <https://www.loc.gov/item/2002720340>
42. Alexander W. A temple visitor kneeling before the sacred urn, in which perfumed sticks are burning during sacrifice, 1793, illustration. Accessed: July 31, 2022.