



The Chinese Taste in Eighteenth-Century England

DAVID PORTER

The Chinese Taste in Eighteenth-Century England

DAVID PORTER



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town,
Singapore, São Paulo, Delhi, Tokyo, Mexico City

Cambridge University Press

The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 8RU, UK

Published in the United States of America by

Cambridge University Press, New York

www.cambridge.org

Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9780521192996

© David Porter 2010

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception
and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements,
no reproduction of any part may take place without the written
permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2010

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library

Library of Congress cataloguing in publication data

Porter, David, 1965–

The Chinese taste in eighteenth-century England / David Porter.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-0-521-19299-6 (hardback)

1. England – Relations – China. 2. China – Relations – England. 3. China – Foreign public
opinion, English. 4. Aesthetics, Chinese – England – History – 18th century. 5. Popular
culture – England – History – 18th century. 6. Consumption (Economics) – Social aspects –
England – History – 18th century. 7. Intercultural communication – England – History – 18th
century. 8. Ambivalence – Social aspects – England – History – 18th century. 9. England –
Social life and customs – 18th century. 10. England – Intellectual life – 18th century. I. Title.

DA485.P674 2010

303.48'24205109033 – dc22 2010033028

ISBN 978-0-521-19299-6 Hardback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or
accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in
this publication, and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is,
or will remain, accurate or appropriate. Information regarding prices, travel
timetables, and other factual information given in this work is correct at
the time of first printing but Cambridge University Press does not guarantee
the accuracy of such information thereafter.

Acknowledgments

Every writer of cultural history aspires to tell a good story, and like most storytellers, I am beholden to many a muse. A fair number are listed in the bibliography; to others to whom my debt exceeds what a footnote can acknowledge, I express my gratitude here.

I should like first to thank my friends and colleagues in the Departments of English and Comparative Literature and the Center for Chinese Studies at the University of Michigan for their advice, encouragement, and companionship over the many years this book has been in the making. Gregg Crane, Lincoln Faller, Marjorie Levinson, Yopie Prins, Tobin Siebers, and Valerie Traub offered close, careful readings of individual chapter drafts. Michael Schoenfeldt and George Bornstein provided professional guidance and support at many a critical juncture, keeping me on track as best they could. Vanessa Agnew, Jim Cogswell, Steve Darwall, Dena Goodman, Mark Koch, Tina Lupton, Scotti Parrish, Adela Pinch, Sean Silver, and Viv Soni, in wide-ranging conversations, gave me new perspectives from which to consider problems in eighteenth-century cultural history, while Miranda Brown, Ellen Laing, Erik Mueggler, Christian de Pee, Marty Powers, and David Rolston contributed invaluable sinological expertise. To members of the Eighteenth-Century Studies Group, the First Draft Club, and my graduate seminars I am grateful for rich and provocative discussions that have consistently demonstrated the best of what intellectual exchange can be.

Email and the proximity of the Detroit airport have made it easier than perhaps it should be to impose on colleagues further afield as well. I especially appreciate the inspiration and guidance I have received at various stages from John Bender, Theresa Braunschneider, Timothy Brook, Rod Campbell, Terry Castle, Craig Clunas, Joseph Dennis, Benjamin Elman, Chris Gabbard, Robert Gordon, George Haggerty, Jing Jiang, Suvir Kaul, Michael Keevak, Dorothy Ko, Susan Lanser, Edward Larkin, Lydia Liu, Tina Lupton, Robert Markley, Paula McDowell, Felicity Nussbaum, Kenneth Pomeranz, John Richetti, Erik Ringmar, Haun Saussy, Patricia Spacks, Bin Wong, and Zhang Longxi. For special thanks, I would like to single out James Cahill, who has been a wonderfully generous correspondent on matters of Chinese art history.

I have been fortunate to receive generous funding support for this project from the Institute for Advanced Study, the National Humanities Center, and the American Council for Learned Societies, and I remain deeply grateful for their endorsements of this project and for the opportunities for sustained research and writing their grants made possible. The faculty of the School of Historical Studies at the Institute for Advanced Study were especially generous with their time and counsel; I would like particularly to thank Heinrich von Staden, Irving Lavin, and Giles Constable for their mentorship and encouragement. Among my colleagues at the National Humanities Center, I benefited from particularly helpful conversations with Sherman Cochran, Paul Griffiths, and James Knowlson.

Travel grants from the University of Michigan made possible a number of productive research trips, and the extraordinary expertise of the museum curators and research staff I met on several of these expeditions has proven invaluable in coming to terms with the richly evocative material worlds of Chinese and Chinese-styled objects in their collections. In particular, I would like to thank William Sargent and Karina Corrigan of the Peabody Essex Museum, Hao Sheng of the Boston Museum of Fine Arts, Jan Stuart of the Smithsonian's Freer/Sackler Gallery, Sarah Fayen and Jonathan Prown of the Chipstone Foundation, Hilary Young, Helen Clifford, and Clare Browne of the Victoria and Albert Museum, Katie Scott of the Courtauld Institute of Art, Linda Eaton at the Winterthur, and Oliver Impey of the Ashmolean Museum. Knowledgeable librarians have, as always, been indispensable; I am especially grateful for the assistance I received navigating various collections at Michigan, Princeton, Yale, Duke, the University of North Carolina, Beijing University, and the British Library.

The manuscript was improved considerably thanks to the thoughtful comments of two anonymous readers at Cambridge University Press. Karen McConnell, Jeremy Carnes, and Angela Heetderks provided invaluable assistance with citations, references, illustrations, proofreading, and indexing. They and many of those named above have helped me catch errors and infelicities; those that no doubt remain are my own. Earlier versions of several chapters appeared in the journals *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, *Studies in Eighteenth-Century Culture*, *Eighteenth-Century Life*, and *Mosaic*, and in Jennie Batchelor and Cora Kaplan, eds., *Women and Material Culture: 1660–1830* (Palgrave, 2007). I am grateful to the publishers for permission to use this material.

Finally, I must thank my family for having been so wonderfully supportive of this all-too protracted enterprise. My parents showed me the way to my calling, and their own impassioned liveliness of mind has remained a model

for me ever since. My wife Lani showed me the way to China, and has always encouraged my subsequent research pursuits with wisdom and good humor. Our boys Nathaniel and Nicholas, with their buoyant spirits and contagious *joie de vivre*, have provided constant reminders that curiosity and playfulness are among the most reliable paths to learning. I dedicate this book to the memory of my grandfather, the late Thomas E. Hill, whose gusto for good storytelling will remain an inspiration always.

Illustrations

- 1 William Hogarth (British, 1697–1764). *Marriage à la Mode*, Plate II, 1745. Etching and engraving, 38.0 × 46.4 cm. The Cleveland Museum of Art. Gift of Mr. and Mrs. Milton Curtiss Rose 1959.311.2. [page 32]
- 2 William Marlow (1740–1813). *View of the Wilderness at Kew*, pagoda designed in 1757 by William Chambers, 1763. Watercolor, sheet: 11¹/₁₅ × 17¹³/₁₆ in. (28.1 × 45.2 cm). Harris Brisbane Dick Fund, 1925 (25.19.43). [42]
- 3 Vase. China, Qing dynasty, Kangxi period (1662–1722). Porcelain painted in overglaze famille verte enamels and gilding. H. 16 15/16 in. (43 cm). Bequest of John D. Rockefeller Jr., 1960 (61.200.67). [61]
- 4 Qiu Ying, *Spring Morning in the Han Palace* (detail). Scroll painting, late Ming dynasty. National Palace Museum, Taipei, Taiwan, Republic of China. [63]
- 5 Kwong Sang Hong advertising poster, c. 1920. [64]
- 6 Qiu Ying, *Early Spring in a Palace Garden* (detail). Scroll painting, late Ming dynasty. [69]
- 7 William Hogarth, *Analysis of Beauty*, Plate I, 1753. © Trustees of the British Museum. [82]
- 8 William Hogarth, scene from the *Rape of the Lock*, engraving for the lid of a snuffbox, date unknown. © Trustees of the British Museum. [83]
- 9 William Hogarth, *Royalty, Episcopacy and the Law*, 1724. Engraving. Photograph reproduced with the kind permission of the Royal Pavilion and Museums, Brighton & Hove. [87]
- 10 Frontispiece and title page from *A Chinese Tale*, London, 1740. The Kinsey Institute for Research in Sex, Gender, and Reproduction. [89]
- 11 *The Tea Table*, 1710. © Trustees of the British Museum. [90]
- 12 Scholar's stone in a Suzhou garden. Photograph by the author. [99]
- 13 Wu Wei, *Celebration at the Fishing Village*, 1507–8. H. 27.3 cm. Private collection. [106]
- 14 Louis-Philippe Boitard (active in England c. 1735–60), *A Very Lively Tea Party*. The Ashmolean Museum of Art and Archaeology. [107]
- 15 Fragment of a bed curtain. English or Scottish, late 17th or early 18th century. Linen and cotton twill embroidered with wool. 140 × 66 cm

- (55 $\frac{1}{8}$ × 26 in.); Legacy dimension: 27 × 56 $\frac{1}{2}$ in. Photograph
 © 2010 Museum of Fine Arts, Boston. The Elizabeth Day McCormick
 Collection 53.172. [109]
- 16 William and John Halfpenny, "Plans for a Design to a House and
 Offices," in *Chinese and Gothic Architecture Properly Ornamented*,
 London, 1752. [118]
- 17 Thomas Chippendale, "China Case," in the *Gentleman and Cabinet
 Maker's Director*, London, 1754. [119]
- 18 Covered jar of inverted ballaster shape, Qing dynasty, Kangxi reign.
 © The Frick Collection, New York. [140]
- 19 Late Stuart phallic drinking cup, London, 17th century. The Museum
 of London. [140]
- 20 Hubert Gravelot (1699–1773), *Matrimonial Fisticuffs, with a Portrait of
 the Pugilist John Broughton, in the background*. Formerly attributed to
 Paul Sandby (1725–1809). Early 18th century. Greywash with pen and
 grey ink and watercolor over graphite on laid paper, version prepared
 with red chalk for transfer. 2 $\frac{3}{4}$ × 4 $\frac{5}{8}$ in. (7 × 11 cm). Yale Center for
 British Art, Paul Mellon Collection, B1981.25.2631. [142]
- 21 William Hogarth, *Harlot's Progress*, Plate II, 1732. © Trustees of the
 British Museum. [143]
- 22 *The Hen Pecks Husband*, 1768. © Trustees of the British Museum.
 [144]
- 23 Red pottery tripod vessel (*Li*). Neolithic (c. 4500–2000 BCE). Pottery.
 © Compton Verney. [146]
- 24 *Kendi*, Wanli period, c. 1610–20. The Reeves Center, Washington and
 Lee University, Gift of Euchlin and Louise Herreshoff Reeves. [147]
- 25 Francis Hayman, *Jonathan Tyers and his Family*, 1740. © National
 Portrait Gallery, London. [149]
- 26 Alphonse Mucha (1860–1939), *Chocolat Idéal*, 1897. Lithograph, 117
 × 78 cm. © 2010 Mucha Trust/AGAP, Paris/ARS, New York. [151]

Contents

List of illustrations [page vi]

Acknowledgments [viii]

Introduction: monstrous beauty [1]

PART I CHINA AND THE AESTHETICS OF EXOTICISM [15]

1 Eighteenth-century fashion and the aesthetics of the Chinese taste [17]

2 Cross-cultural aesthetics in William Chambers' Chinese garden [37]

PART II WHAT DO WOMEN WANT? [55]

3 Gendered utopias in transcultural context [57]

4 William Hogarth and the gendering of Chinese exoticism [78]

PART III OF ROCKS, GARDENS, AND GOLDFISH [93]

5 The socio-aesthetics of the Chinese scholar's stone [95]

6 Horace Walpole and the Gothic repudiation of chinoiserie [115]

PART IV CHINA AND THE INVENTION OF ENGLISHNESS [131]

7 Chinaware and the evolution of a modern domestic ideal [133]

8 Thomas Percy's sinology and the origins of English romanticism [154]

Notes [184]

Bibliography [207]

Index [221]

Introduction: monstrous beauty

Take a stroll in any modern Chinese city with even a modest tourist trade and you will soon stumble upon street-side stalls offering for sale a cornucopia of antiquarian bric-a-brac. Corroded old coins, dusty ceramics, multi-limbed Buddhist figurines, and tattered scroll paintings jostle for space among vintage Mao Zedong alarm clocks, jade bracelets, sepia post-cards, and foot-long opium pipes. Linger for more than a moment over this motley assortment and you will likely be offered a shoe. Not a leather shoe with which to prolong your stroll, but a delicately embroidered silk slipper to stroke, to admire, to cup in the palm of your hand as you struggle to imagine how it could ever have encompassed the foot of a full-grown woman. For you will, by now, have been assured, with a somber nod and a sigh, that this dazzling green or yellow or red piece of handiwork had once belonged to an elegant lady of the late Qing dynasty.

The price is negotiable, and once you have walked off with your prize, the quantity of equally ancient and equally immaculate silk slippers you will find offered for sale at markets, temples, and historical sites throughout the city will remind you that the supply of venerable “antiques” for the tourist trade is, in fact, inexhaustible, and that there are handsome profits to be made in the manufacture of historical relics. But their questionable pedigree notwithstanding, the ubiquitous silk slippers stand out among the jades, porcelains, coppers, and lacquerwares of the antique-dealer’s stall. They are, by far, the most colorful and visually engaging objects in what is often otherwise a rather drab collection. They appeal to the touch as well, offering in their smooth surfaces and sensuous softness an alluring contrast to the cold metallic clamor of the copper coins in the neighboring bin. And inevitably, they conjure up a dim memory of a curiously cathected eroticism, dating from those dark pre-revolutionary days when the delights offered by her lotus-blossom feet topped every blazon of a beauty’s charms.

Such a memory will prove an ambivalent one at best. With any scrutiny, after all, the scene of sensual pleasure quickly unravels into unspeakable childhood torments, aching legacies of blistered flesh and deformed bone. The gentlemanly relish of podial beauty appears, in retrospect, a perverse aesthetic irrevocably compromised by the inhumanity of the sacrifice it

required. The shudder of disgust it evokes in the modern viewer opens a chasm across which identification is impossible. At the same time, it transposes the physical monstrosity of the individual misshapen foot onto the spectacle of footbinding as cultural practice, so that the entire social system in which it was embedded is tainted with the stench of barbarism. It is precisely this stench, I would suggest, this perversely poignant evocation of cultural monstrosity, that ultimately accounts for why the antique merchants of Beijing and Shanghai sell so many delicately embroidered slippers. Every shudder of disgust, after all, is accompanied by the thrill of self-righteousness. To recognize the barbarism of Qing patriarchal norms is simultaneously to revel in the humanity and progressivism of our own values and practices. Both the modern Chinese and the Western tourist require the commonly received history of footbinding as a crucial point of orientation for affirming and demarcating their own enlightened modernity.¹ Just as the erotic beauty of a bound foot at once veiled and derived much of its power from the signs of physical suffering that lay beneath the wraps, so the market-tested appeal of mass-produced four-inch slippers at once conceals and re-appropriates the monstrosity of an underlying historical reality.

As far as we know, embroidered silk slippers did not appear among the luxuriously extravagant displays of Chinese wares that filled the hundreds of china shops in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century London. The exotic imported goods these shops did offer, however, proved every bit as captivating to contemporary consumers. Chinese silks made up a large part of the trade, as did dozens of varieties of tea. The rapid emergence of tea drinking as a new national pastime required teawares, and these in turn demanded, in the well-appointed home, a fashionable complement of painted porcelain jars and vases and molded figurines. Fire screens, wallpapers, and lacquerware chests rounded out the inventory of better-stocked shops, offering the enchanting and often realized possibility of fitting out an entire room in the Chinese taste, especially once skilled European craftsmen began imitating and adapting Chinese motifs in the ceramics and furnishings that marked the advent of the chinoiserie style.

Chinese and Chinese-styled goods were so familiar, so thoroughly naturalized within the eighteenth-century English interior, that an aging Charles Lamb, speaking through his narrator Elia as he reflected dreamily in 1823 on the origins of a lifelong passion for old china, could not recall a time when porcelains had not been daily before his eye. Though the London shops where Elia would have acquired it surely provided a more luxurious setting than their modern Beijing counterparts, his infatuation with musty Chinese bric-a-brac suggests more than a glancing resemblance to that of

the modern tourist. At once quaint and exotic, redolent of a storied history and unfailingly fashionable, Chinese objects then as now captivated the imagination with their novel forms and surface splendor. But a peculiar note of ambivalence that intrudes upon Elia's porcelain-induced reveries offers a more compelling parallel. "I had no repugnance then – why should I now have? – to those little, lawless, azure-tinctured grotesques, that under the notion of men and women, float about, uncircumscribed by any element, in that world before perspective – a china tea-cup."² While old china clearly owes much of its charm for Elia to such departures from familiar visual conventions, its grotesque figures and absurd deformations of the perspectival frame are also sufficiently unsettling to require a defensive denial of their repugnance.

The structure of this ambivalence in the aesthetic monstrosity underpinning the allure of Chinese wares functions for Elia, moreover, in much the same way as it does for his globe-trotting twenty-first-century successor. If Elia has difficulty in conjuring up an interior space before the appearance of old china, he has no trouble imagining a visual space prior to the invention of single-point perspective, for this is the lawless, uncircumscribed, visual world that old china makes available. This pre-perspectival lawlessness leads to absurdity: figures floating up in the air, a courtly mandarin handing tea to a lady who appears to be two miles away, another lady stepping into a boat "moored on the hither side of this calm garden river, with a dainty mincing foot, which in a right angle of incidence (as angles go in our world) must infallibly land her in the midst of a flowery mead – a furlong off on the other side of the same strange stream."

These "*speciosa miracula*" are delightful in themselves, in a playful, fairytale way, and Elia expresses his gratitude that the prosperity he and his cousin have recently enjoyed has made it possible for them "to please the eye sometimes with trifles of this sort."³ But such goods are, finally, merely trifles, and the speaker surely finds pleasure also in the condescension that they invite. That the art of the Chinese reflects a world before perspective allows him to ask (if only rhetorically) "if far or near can be predicated of their world," and to posit for that world a non-Euclidean geometry in which angles shape space according to strange and unfamiliar rules, if they follow any rules at all. Accompanying such reflections, as lighthearted as they may be, is the comforting assurance that our own thoroughly rationalized, post-Renaissance visual world has advanced to the next level, and that we can recognize ourselves in this difference. The fantasies of monstrous beauty embodied by Elia's teacup and the modern tourist's embroidered slipper are cut of the same cloth. Quaint and charmingly lawless porcelain grotesques

conjure for Elia a comfortably pre-perspectival China in much the same way that equally quaint and enticingly barbaric silken artifacts evoke for his successors a reassuringly feudal Chinese past that both delimits and guarantees the privileged space of European modernity.

This book explores the role of the Chinese taste in the making of this modernity. Eighteenth-century consumers in England were, as Lamb suggests, infatuated with Chinese and Chinese-styled goods, even as they were amused, perplexed, or troubled by the alien aesthetic sensibility these goods embodied. This ambivalence, I will argue, figures centrally in the period's experience of Chinese exoticism and foregrounds the importance of the two questions, or sets of questions, I will set out to address in seeking to understand this experience. The first, quite simply, is how a foreign aesthetic that was so often depicted in negative terms – strange, monstrous, grotesque, repugnant, trifling – came to be so thoroughly and successfully assimilated within its host culture. What were the sources of an appeal that transformed curious emblems of otherness, in the space of little more than a century, into paradigmatic emblems of Englishness, and how did this transformation take place? The second set of questions concerns the significance of this appeal for the art, literature, and collective imagination of eighteenth-century England. How did the popularity of the Chinese taste inflect other important stylistic trends, such as classicism, Gothicism, and romanticism? What new meanings and values did Chinese objects make available to English consumers? What specific functions did these objects take on within the material and visual culture of the time? My working hypothesis here is that the thorough-going domestication of the alien Chinese aesthetic involved not merely a superficial shift in British taste or a passing fad, but rather a profound transformation of underlying constructs of gender, nation, and desire. It is well known that eighteenth-century consumers admired, collected, displayed, satirized, and roundly condemned Chinese wares; my purpose here is to ask how these seemingly trivial goods in turn acted upon the culture in which they were consumed.

In asking these questions, I hope to push back against three interpretive paradigms that habitually condition, in often unhelpful ways, our understandings of intercultural exchange in the early modern period. The most pervasive of these is the model of European diffusionism, which takes “modernity” in all of its guises to be a distinctly European phenomenon, and conceives the global history of the past several centuries as one in which major developments – capitalism, liberal democracy, the public sphere, Enlightenment rationality, industrialization, the novel, the modern subject – emerge initially in Western Europe and spread gradually outward across the

globe. According to J. M. Blaut, diffusionism first emerged as a historical paradigm in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, became a fully formed scientific theory in the nineteenth, and experienced a resurgence in the work of post-World War II scholars and policy makers concerned with problems of modernization in the Third World.⁴ While it has been subjected to increasing scrutiny in the past two decades, diffusionism underpins the implicit Eurocentrism that continues to condition much historical scholarship. As Dipesh Chakrabarty writes in *Provincializing Europe*, “Europe remains the sovereign theoretical subject of all histories” and the “silent referent in historical knowledge.”⁵

Within the field of Chinese studies, the theory of diffusionism has guaranteed the dominance of a historical model that tends to regard developments in China from the seventeenth century onward, but most especially in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, as mere responses to the Western impact in the realms of painting, politics, economics, mathematics, technology, education, literature, and the like. According to Paul Cohen, modern Western understandings of recent Chinese history have been based on the problematic assumptions that “the confrontation with the West was the most significant influence on events in China” and that “it was the West that played the truly *active* role in this period of Chinese history.” One consequence of the persistence of such assumptions, I would suggest, is an anachronistic tendency to project this image of Western dominance back onto earlier periods. We are left to imagine, in the absence of compelling narratives to the contrary, that Western cultures were always already uniquely and self-sufficiently proto-modern, while China waited in a state of perpetual dormancy (Marx compared China to a “mummy carefully preserved in a hermetically sealed coffin”) for the Western spark that would ignite the traumatic transformations of the past hundred years, leading to “the making over of Chinese culture in the Western image” that many a naïve China watcher still awaits, expectantly, today.⁶

While the present book has very little to say about Chinese history *per se*, part of my purpose in framing its central questions as I have is to complicate received narratives of early modernity in England by calling attention to the extraordinarily far-reaching cultural impact in the eighteenth century of the rising imperial power at the other end of the Eurasian land mass. If cultural diffusion was taking place between England and China, or more broadly between East Asia and Western Europe during this period, its dominant flows were clearly not in the direction we are accustomed to imagining. As Kenneth Pomeranz, Bin Wong, Andre Gunder Frank, and other revisionist historians have recently argued, England, when viewed from within a

global macroeconomic perspective, occupied a rather peripheral position in what, until 1800 or so, was a largely Sinocentric world trade system.⁷ To take seriously the question of the impact that Chinese aesthetics had on eighteenth-century England is then to extend this revisionist critique into the cultural sphere, and to open the door to exploring the material and imaginative ramifications of a less rigidly Eurocentric model of modernity.

A second barrier to fresh interpretations of the phenomenon of the Chinese taste in England is the tendency, especially pronounced within eighteenth-century studies, to read references to exotic luxuries in literary and artistic works as tropes reflecting and often celebrating Britain's rising imperial power. Students of the period take their cue from Addison, Lillo, Hogarth, and other contemporaries whose manifest pride in the expanding reach of Britain's trade networks is unmistakable, and there is no doubt that a consciousness of their nation's rising place in the world inflects their perception of the spoils of overseas trade that increasingly crowded London warehouses and fashionable shops. There is some danger, though, of reading too much of the Victorian era's imperial triumphalism back into the Stuart or early Georgian periods. As Gerald MacLean argues in his study of early modern English writing about the Ottoman empire, the emergence of British imperial pride was preceded by a considerably less swashbuckling era of imperial envy, a structure of feeling with respect to the material products and cultural achievements of an advanced and powerful Eastern civilization that was characterized by awe, admiration, and desire. While these responses were coupled with predictable anxiety and resentment, there was no question of the proto-colonialist condescension more familiar in later periods: "During the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, English writers never forgot that they were dealing with an empire that controlled a great deal of Eastern Europe and a third of the known world, not a backward, vulnerable and somehow 'orientalized' space waiting to be conquered and controlled."⁸

Robert Markley finds a similar dynamic at work in English writing about China in the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. The frustrating awareness of the economic supremacy of the 'Far East and of Europe's marginalization in a Sinocentric global economy led to the emergence, according to Markley, of compensatory strategies for managing and concealing in narrative the profound anxieties generated by all-too-regular reminders of England's national abjection in the arenas of world trade. China's function as "the locus for dreams of attaining a golden age of prosperity and abundance," Markley suggests, posed for contemporary readers

“a crucial set of challenges to Eurocentric conceptions of culture, personal and national identity” that we continue to grapple with even today.⁹

Prevailing attitudes in England towards China began to shift noticeably in the eighteenth century, as the generally admiring accounts of Jesuit missionaries and their followers gave way before considerably more hostile discourses of trade and diplomacy. Chinese imports and the imitations they spawned may have helped to catalyze this shift, by providing a material and visual context through which the vast, even overwhelming power and history of the Chinese empire could be re-imagined as fragile, superficial, and faintly absurd.¹⁰ But at the same time, these objects and the storied civilization they evoked continued to remind their viewers, often uncomfortably, of England’s cultural backwardness, material dependency, and relatively late arrival on the world stage. As in previous centuries, then, the East and its cherished luxuries evoked a complex range of responses best characterized, perhaps, as profound ambivalence. Only an awareness of this ambivalence, of the potential status of Chinese objects as a site of both imperial envy and imperial pride, can enable us to recognize the semiotic fluidity and transformative potency of these seemingly ephemeral objects in the English imagination.

This brings us to the third paradigm I hope to contest in the following pages. An air of ephemerality attaches itself all too readily to a Chinese teacup. Porcelain is a fragile material, and one whose decorative conventions in our period favor lightness and delicacy. Cobalt-blue figures float about in a shimmering glow of ethereal white, apparently beholden, as Lamb’s Elia gleefully notes, to laws of neither gravity nor perspective. Regardless of the quality of its craftsmanship and artistry, the porcelain vessel (and its near cousins in lacquerware, textiles, printed wallpapers, and furniture) was consigned in the eighteenth century and remains consigned today to the domain of the merely decorative. Art was an evolving category in the eighteenth century, but however it was understood, Chinese imports did not qualify. Grand history paintings commanded the greatest respect in the art world, followed by portraiture, landscape painting, and still life; the decorative arts groveled down near the bottom of the ladder along with painted shop signs and rough woodblock prints.

While a lively culture of collecting and connoisseurship has sustained scholarship on decorative wares, modern museum curators and art historians readily confirm that we have inherited from the eighteenth century scales of artistic value that make it difficult to regard decorative objects seriously as agents and instruments of culture, if we can be troubled to regard them at all. As a result, few scholars ask the questions of, say, an imported

Chinese jar that they might ask of the painted portrait or volume of Dryden's poetry that once shared a room with it in an English country house. The decorative arts, like female-authored fiction for an earlier generation, serve as merely ornamental accoutrements to the true work of culture manifest in the heroic couplet or neoclassical pile. To consider such objects seriously as cultural artifacts requires not only an acknowledgment that, in the lingo of material culture studies, "things matter," but that merely decorative things may command special attention by virtue of that very "mereness," that potent combination of ubiquity, transparency, and utter irrelevance that enables them to perform the work of culture under the leisured, luxurious pretence that there is no work to be done.

So how, in particular, do Chinese things matter? Lamb's essay opens up a number of rich veins through which the question might be usefully explored and promising alternatives to outmoded paradigms pursued. The memorable confession that begins the essay – "I have an almost feminine partiality for old china" – reminds us that the meaning and appeal of Chinese-styled porcelains had long been understood in gendered terms.¹¹ How did this slightly embarrassing "partiality" first come to be coded as distinctly "feminine," and how did its meanings function and evolve over the course of a century noted for its obsessive concern with reshaping the unsettling contours of female desire? As static and clichéd as the association between eighteenth-century women and their tea-wares may seem to us today, I will argue that for the contemporary imagination it proved an endlessly dynamic, versatile, and productive one that not only reflected changes in the representation of gender positions but also contributed to shaping them. The "feminine" and the "Chinese," I hope to show, were reciprocally constituting categories throughout much of the century, collectively evoking otherness and extravagance while dialectically combining the tantalizing allure of superficial beauty with the troubling specter of transgressive monstrosity.

A partiality for old china on the part of a man requires an apology not only for the inversion of gender norms that it implies, but also for its defiance of established hierarchies among the arts. "When I go to see any great house," Lamb continues, "I inquire for the china-closet, and next for the picture gallery."¹² The narrator defends his indefensible preference on the grounds of idiosyncratic personal taste. But as the remainder of his narration amply demonstrates, he might have defended it more convincingly on the grounds that the insignificance of the ephemeral "trifles" he finds in the china-closet is itself a merely ephemeral signification, reproducing a scale of aesthetic value that serves particular purposes within a culture. Among