If art in modern Singapore began with the founding of the Nanyang Academy of Fine Arts (NAFA) in 1938, then how are the 19th-century genres of natural history drawings, landscape sketching and painting, photography and portraiture related and relevant to the beginnings of modern art in Singapore? Edward W. Said has argued in his ruminations of the beginnings of the novel in Western literary culture, that it was somewhere in the 18th and 19th centuries that the novel was acknowledged as an authorised, institutional and distinct experience in Western culture. It is in Said’s understanding of “beginning” as the “first step in the intentional production of meaning and the production of difference from pre-existing traditions. It authorizes subsequent texts—it both enables them and limits what is acceptable” that the establishment of the NAFA was the beginning of art in Singapore.1

Were these 19th-century practices of art an earlier “beginning” of modern art in Singapore? If they were, then where was the agency that institutionalised and authorised these practices of art? Or were they perhaps more the “origins,” as Said has defined it, of modern art in Singapore? Said juxtaposes this notion of beginning to that of origin, “the latter divine, mythical and privileged, the former secular, humanly produced, and ceaselessly re-examined.” In making this distinction between origins and beginnings, Said is pointing to the restructuring and animation of knowledge, not as something already achieved, but as a continual self-examination of methodology and practice. This essay is an attempt to probe possible 19th-century origins of art in Singapore, and how these possible origins may have informed the beginnings of art in Singapore in 1938, its subsequent practices and its effects on our understanding of Singapore’s history.

---

3 A facsimile reproduction of 138 of the 477 paintings are published in John Bastin, Ivan Polunin & Kwa Chong Guan, The William Farquhar Collection of Natural History Drawings (Singapore: Goh Geok Khim, 1999). Dr Polunin provided the annotations to these 138 selected drawings and identification for the rest of the collection. The entire collection of 477 drawings in reduced size is reproduced in John Bastin & Kwa Chong Guan, Natural History Drawings; The Complete William Farquhar Collection, Malay Peninsula 1803–1818 (Singapore: Editions Didier Millet & National Museum of Singapore, 2010) with annotations by Morten Strange and Hassan Ibrahim.
William Farquhar’s Legacy of Drawing Nature

William Farquhar (1774–1839) is remembered as the first Resident and Commandant who nurtured the East India Company settlement of Singapore that Sir Stamford Raffles is credited with establishing and was the absent father of. But Farquhar is today, with Raffles, acknowledged for having established the practice of drawing nature. Like others of his generation, Farquhar had a deep interest in the flora and fauna of Melaka where he served from 1795 to 1819. For Farquhar and other men of the East India Company posted to Sumatra and the Straits of Melaka from the late 18th century, it was not only the physical landscapes, but also the human and natural landscapes that were unfamiliar and fascinating. Like their peers in India, they set about documenting in drawings the flora and fauna of the world they found themselves in.

Raffles, through his various assignments in the region, beginning in Pinang in 1805 to his final departure for home in 1824, also maintained a strong interest in the region’s natural history, amassing a huge collection of specimens and commissioned drawings of plants and animals. To a lesser extent, he also collected historical and ethnographic artefacts. Unfortunately these collections were lost when the ship, the Fame, transporting them back to London, caught fire shortly after departing Bengkulu and sank in 1824. Today we have several drawings and one bound volume of 129 watercolours of birds from Sumatra in the India Office Library.

Farquhar, like Raffles, also commissioned drawings of the flora and fauna of Melaka during the years he was posted there. He evidently brought this collection of 477 natural history drawings to Singapore in 1819, and then back home to Scotland. He did not commission any further drawings while he was in Singapore. In 1827 he donated this collection to the Royal Asiatic Society, where they remained until 1937, when six of the eight volumes of drawings were loaned to the Natural History Department of the British Museum. In 1991 the Society recalled the loan for valuation and sale, as it needed funds to purchase new premises. The drawings were auctioned by Sotheby’s in London in their 20 October 1993 auction, where Goh Geok Khim successfully bid for them, and donated them to the National Heritage Board in 1996, where they are now on rotating display at the National Museum of Singapore.

Curatorial examination of Farquhar’s collection reveal that the drawings were—like those commissioned by Raffles, and their predecessor, by William Marsden for his book The History of Sumatra published in 1783—done by Chinese artists. These artists were probably recruited from Guangzhou, where there were studios producing artworks for European traders. It must have been a struggle for these Chinese artists, who were trained in Chinese techniques of drawing “flowers and birds” (huaniao) to adapt their artistic practice to the norms and techniques of European natural history drawings. Their training had not prepared them to conform to the rigours of taxonomic detail demanded in European botanical drawings or to render their subjects within the linear perspective of Western art. As a result, the trees they drew often appeared flat, like a fan, as evident in the drawing of a sea almond or ketapang tree (fig. 2.1). This “flatness” and “stiffness” which Raffles and others complained about is today seen as charming and perspicacious.

Today, Farquhar’s collection of natural history drawings can be perceived as the origins of the practice of late 19th-century natural history drawing practised by the Botanic Gardens of Singapore (established in 1888). The standards and detail of drawing demanded by Farquhar and Raffles of their Chinese artists and, more importantly, the East India Company of their Indian draughtsmen producing natural history
The Singapore Botanic Gardens have been exhibiting some of their collections of drawings by James and Charles de Alwis painted between 1890 and 1908 in their annual calendar for 2007 and 2014.

Eng's paintings of flowers were the theme of the National Parks Board calendar for 2003.

Mildred Archer discussed the circumstances surrounding the development of these company drawings and paintings and catalogued the Library's collection in *Company Drawings in the India Office drawings*, is now known as the “Company style.” This style remained in use long after the Company’s dissolution. This continuity of Western natural history drawings in India ensured that Henry Nicholas Ridley, the first Director of the Singapore Botanic Gardens, could engage a Ceylonese artist named James de Alwis in 1890 to illustrate his five-volume *Flora of the Malay Peninsula*. James and his brother, Charles, who succeeded him in 1900, came from a family of eminent natural history painters form the Botanic Gardens in Ceylon (fig. 2.2). Today this tradition of natural history drawing continues more as an aesthetic practice than the scientific documentation of nature. Eng Siak Loy is probably the last artist engaged by the Botanic Gardens in Singapore.

More critical is that the origins of looking scientifically at our natural environment is embedded in these natural history drawings. The aesthetics of *huangiao* painting were transformed to conform to the Western norms of clinical drawings of nature for scientific documentation. This documentation extended to appropriation of the local knowledge of the flora and fauna inscribed in the margins of each painting. This is evident in the pencilled notes correcting and commenting on the Jawi name of the plant or animal inscribed on each drawing. The common English and Latin names of the plant or animal according to the Linnaean system of classification, where they were known, were also pencilled in the margins. These marginal notes, which Ivan Polunin has collated, is testimony to the imperative of Western science in understanding and appropriating Malay knowledge of their world.

**The Rhetoric of Painting Landscapes**

Singapore’s rapid and unexpected development as a colonial port city in the first half of the 19th century is documented in not only its trade statistics, but also visually represented in drawings and paintings of its evolving landscape. Singapore in this respect, was no different from other colonial port cities in being visually documented by its residents and visitors and officials as part of their duties in an expanding British empire. The East India Company engaged a variety of Indian artists during the 18th and 19th centuries to visually document the territories they were slowly taking over. These artists produced thousands of works. Some 3,000 examples of these “Company Drawings/Paintings,” including a collection of prints of Southeast Asia, are today deposited in the India Office Library.

For Singapore, there are a larger number of sketches and paintings by its visitors and
residents than drawings by Company officials. Notable among the former are the paintings of the surveyor John Turnbull Thomson and Charles Dyce. A major focus of their visual documentation of Singapore’s development is understandably its maritime economy. Views of the shoreline with a variety of European and Asian ships anchored offshore, and an emerging townscape and Government Hill in the background, are found in a large number of paintings. The bustling mouth of the Singapore River is another focus of this visual documentation of Singapore’s growth (fig. 2.3). From the 1850s, there is a new series of drawings and paintings of the “New Harbour,” which was developed to replace the overcrowded Singapore River.

Another popular vantage point from which to paint Singapore’s development was Government Hill, before it became an artillery fort in 1857. From here the preferred view was down to the Singapore River to view the lighters anchored there, and then outwards towards the sea to capture the forest of sails offshore. Occasionally the view turns west, looking towards an emerging Chinatown. Other vantage points from which to view the port city were Princeps Hill (or Mount Sophia as it is known today) and Mount Wallich. The 1856 panorama in oil by Percy Carpenter of the View of Singapore from Mount Wallich, showing the town from Pearl’s Hill on the left to Tanjong Rhu and beyond, is probably the best known of this category of landscape paintings of Singapore. From these vantage points, the artists descended to record streetscapes and followed the extension of the settlement to its suburbs, rural towns and surrounding jungles. Sketches of Singapore are also found in collections of paintings of the other two Straits Settlements. The National Museum of Singapore published a selection of 52 of its collection in Nineteenth Century Prints of Singapore on the occasion of its centenary in 1987. Two decades later, on the opening of a new History Gallery, the National Museum published a new edition of its collection of these 19th-century prints of Singapore.

What is the significance of these 19th-century paintings and prints to the origins of modern art in Singapore? Did these 19th-century paintings and sketches prefigure what later artists would focus on when portraying the landscape? For example, the Singapore River captured the attention of a distinguished series of artists from the 1950s and continues to preoccupy us. Could these 19th-century drawings have established the Singapore River as a site of Singapore’s social memories?

Can we also see in these 19th-century paintings a precursor of our desire to provide


10 See in particular, Oral History Department, Singapore Lifeline: The River and its People (Singapore: Times Books International & Oral History Department, 1986), which draws on an exhibition curated by the Oral History Department based on its recordings focusing on the Singapore River.
a visual component to the textual record of Singapore’s historical development? In curating these 19th-century prints and paintings, we match them with texts that authenticate them as accurate and reliable representations of Singapore’s past—a fundamental function of art history. The hope is that these 19th-century images could then be archival records for a more visual understanding of our past.11 This appears to be the intent of the National Museum’s 1987 Nineteenth Century Prints of Singapore.

However, as with any other archival record, these prints can be read on a number of levels. At the most basic level, they can be read for what they show—most prints show grass or shrubs and pebbles in the foreground, which form the platform for human activity or construction in the middle ground, which then merges into a background of virgin jungle. But at another level, this picturesque framing of a landscape suggests the imposition of order and progress on the land under the East India Company; this is evident in J.T. Thomson’s best-known painting, The Esplanade from Scandal Point, completed in 1851 (fig. 2.4).12 As with other archival records, a close and critical reading of these paintings and sketches reveals gaps, absences and silences in what is depicted.13 The figures and activity represented in the middle ground of these paintings are invariably of Europeans taking in and enjoying the landscape. The landscape is a background to highlight the Europeans. The Asians servicing the landscape in these pictures are subservient to the Europeans. More critically, the location of these landscapes were centres of European activity and power: Government Hill or the Padang or the seafront dominated by European vessels. Absent is the Kallang River estuary which was clearly marked by Sir Stamford Raffles’ hydrographers on their sketch of the waterfront of Singapore as a “Ryat [sic] Village.” A “ra’yat village” in the 19th century referred to an aboriginal settlement, which in the context of the Kallang River estuary, meant the sea nomad communities who inhabited the estuary.14 Sultan Hussein’s decision to establish his Istana at Kampong Glam was part of a wider plan to re-claim the allegiance of these sea-nomad communities. This could help him develop the Kallang River estuary into an alternative harbour to the Singapore River and its waterfront, which were controlled by the British. The absence of any 19th-century painting of the Kallang River estuary is therefore notable, but perhaps not surprising. Also notable is the absence of any painting of Telok Blangar, where Temenggong ‘Abdu’r-Rahman parked himself, until it became the site of the “New Harbour.”

---

11 Peter Burke, Eyewitnessing: The Uses of Images as Historical Evidence (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2001) and earlier, the major study, Francis Haskell, History and its Images: Art and the Interpretation of the Past (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993), for the ways historians have turned to images to visualise and understand the past.

12 For comments on this oil by Thomson, see Hall-Jones, op. cit., 38; also Wong, op. cit., 112. All the buildings visible in the background of this painting were designed by G.D. Coleman, the first trained architect in Singapore. For details on Coleman and the identification of the buildings in the painting, see T.H.H. Hancock, Coleman’s Singapore (Kuala Lumpur: Malaysian Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society in association with Pelanduk Publications, 1986), 30–1.

13 See especially the monograph by Sophia McAlpin,
We have in these painting what Charles Harrison, in a striking phrase, says is the “picturing of power.”\(^\text{15}\) Wong Hong Suen recognises this “picturing of power” in the paintings she is curating when she writes:

> The predominance of certain depictions reflects how Europeans made sense of the Singapore landscape from a position of power. Views of the bustling harbour […] and a lively Singapore River, reflect how the raison d’être for the establishment and development [of Singapore] as a British settlement was founded upon trade and commerce […]. Views of the town rendered from high vantage points presented a panoramic view of the topography but, more importantly, convinced stakeholders that Singapore was a profitable colony; while scenes of the jungles reflected their ambivalent views of nature as being endearingly wild and underdeveloped but also economically valuable.\(^\text{16}\)

Irene Lim similarly points out that the Charles Dyce collection is significant for two reasons. Firstly, it provides information on the historical landscapes of Singapore, Malacca, Penang and Jakarta in the mid-nineteenth century. […] Secondly, the works yield invaluable insights into the mind of the European traveller-artist and more broadly, the British colonial empire in Asia.\(^\text{17}\)

We can see in these early 19\(^{\text{th}}\)-century sketches and paintings constructions of British colonialism and domination of the Singapore landscape. Sophia McAlpin has commented:

> Unlike India, the Malayan landscape was, to the European mind, relatively devoid of signs of a pre-existing civilisation, at least in the areas of British settlement to which these depictions were confined. Thus, the freedom to “imagine” the land according to their own needs. The type of images they produced were of a reassuringly familiar landscape, one that appeared to comfortably accommodate the cultural values and aesthetic tastes of their aristocratic patrons. They reflect a bond (however real or imagined) between these early British colonialists and the Malayan landscape evidenced not only in the obvious European presence but also in their civilising influence over the land and the manner in which it was transformed.\(^\text{18}\)
One reading of this power of picturing the landscape as background for European actions is that it shaped perceptions of what 19th-century Singapore was about: a creation of British colonialism. The native was marginalised and written out of the painting. He appears to have lost any power to resist colonial domination, and the silences and absences of these paintings do not conceal any subaltern resistance to power. The legacy of this power of picturing Singapore is British colonialism that moulded Singapore’s historical development into the 20th century.

The Vistas of the Photograph

The arrival of photography in Singapore—when Gason Dutronquoy established his studio at Coleman Street in 1843—would have provided residents of and visitors to Singapore with new vistas to view and shape the landscape. People no longer needed to commission an artist to sketch a view of the landscape for them. Anyone could engage the growing number of photographers establishing themselves in the High Street and Coleman Street core of European activity to make a mechanically objective and photographically true image of the Singapore they were seeing. These early European photographers initially offered their services as portrait photographers and painters, but soon realised there was a greater demand for topographical prints of Singapore and the region from an increasing number of tourists. Photographers started travelling around the region to develop a collection of photographs of not only landscape views, but also streetscapes with a focus on its “native” inhabitants. The studios of G.R. Lambert & Co. began in 1867 by undertaking commissioned portraits, but in the next 35 years grew to become the largest purveyor of topographic prints, not only of the Straits Settlement and Thailand, but also of China and Borneo.

These topographical prints with the imprint of G.R. Lambert and others continue to be in demand today as they are perceived to provide an objective perspective of the landscape. As with the earlier sketches and paintings, the photographic landscape also looks at Singapore’s coastline from the deck of the ship before moving inland to survey the landscape from its vantage points and then descending to capture the streetscape. As with paintings, the Singapore River also attracted much attention as the photographs of G.R. Lambert suggest (fig. 2.5). The mechanical ease of making a photographic image compared to producing a drawing enabled a much more detailed and

---

21 Jason Toh, Singapore through 19th Century Photographs (Singapore: Editions Didier Millet, 2009) for a selection of some 130 photographs presenting a “picturesque medley” of 19th-century Singapore.
extensive visualisation of the late 19th-century landscape of Singapore than in the paintings and drawings of the early 19th century. What has been the effect of these photographic images on our visualisation and understanding of Singapore’s past, captured in pictorial histories of not only Singapore, but also Malaya?22

Compared to the painter mentally visualising a streetscape for a drawing, the camera provides the photographer a more intrusive and intimidating gaze of the streetscape and its people. Despite its mechanical objectivity, the photographic image of any Lambert or Thomson photograph is about as authentic as a painting or sketch in its careful composition of subjects portrayed to convey narratives that speak of the uniqueness of the history, culture and performative practices of the subject. For Lambert or Thomson, their photographs had to capture what John Urry has termed the “tourist gaze,” catering to the emerging tourism market.23 These photographs capture the tourist expectations of Singapore and their gaze of its residents and exotic performative practices, as in Lambert’s photographs of Chinese barbers cleaning the ears of their clients. The step from the tourist gaze to the voyeuristic gaze, that say looks upon the nude Asian female form, is a small one (fig. 2.6). Can Lambert and his colleagues claim to be ethnographers visually documenting the peoples they were observing? Or, were they more view-makers and entrepreneurs?

In reproducing, displaying and exhibiting these 19th-century photographs, we are identifying ourselves with a landscape we have lost and are today nostalgic about. But in appropriating these images, have we also adopted and unconsciously internalised the tourist gaze embedded in these 19th-century photographs? It raises perplexing issues of what then is the real and authentic in these photographs.

**The Status of Portraits**

Photography also opened up new vistas for the making of portraits in not only painting but sculpture as well. Lady Raffles’ presentation of a copy of Sir Francis Legatt Chantrey’s (1781–1841) plaster bust of Sir Stamford Raffles to the Singapore Institution (later the Raffles Institution) in the 1830s is probably the beginning of a tradition of monumentalising significant personalities in civic portraits. Dutronquoy first established himself as a portrait painter and miniaturist when he arrived in Singapore in 1839, four years before he established the first photography studio in Singapore. Many, if not most, of the other photographic studios offered portraiture as a service, thus liberalising the production of portraits for clients wanting to commemorate others, especially ancestors, or celebrate themselves.

The visual representation of persons in painting, drawing or sculpture has a venerable genealogy in both Asian and European art history. But portraiture as a distinct genre of modern art, with the conventions, meanings and values we recognise in a portrait today, emerged in the 15th century and bloomed in the 18th century when it became part of the academy system for training, accrediting and exhibiting works of aspiring artists. 19th-century Singapore society followed this European tradition of portrait painting as an honorific process to commemorate and celebrate powerful, wealthy or symbolically significant persons. When Hoo Ah Kay (Whampoa) was awarded the Companion of the Order of St Michael and St George, he commissioned a portrait by John Edmund Taylor. Earlier, Whampoa had his portrait painted by the Prussian artist known by his surname Beyerhaus when he visited Singapore in 1845. Beyerhaus also executed the portrait of John Turnbull Thomson.

The portraits of Tan Kim Seng (1805–1864) and his circle tell of the evolution of portraiture in Singapore. Peter Lee’s close examination of these portraits suggests that the oldest work is a watercolour done by possibly a European artist working with European wa-
The later portraits of Tan are copies by Chinese painters trained in export painting techniques in Guangzhou and Shanghai. Daphne Ang sees influences of the aesthetic traditions of the Shanghai Jesuit painting school in two of the later portraits of Tan. Lee has also documented the contribution of these Chinese artists and their studios to the development of portraiture in Singapore, especially portraits for the veneration of ancestors. For this purpose, the photograph presented a new medium for capturing an exact likeness of the ancestor and re-presenting the dead. The one hundred-plus photographs and paintings that prominent Chinese Song Ong Siang collated for his One Hundred Years' History of the Chinese in Singapore is a venerable gallery of portraiture.

The National University of Singapore’s Baba House collects these portraits of Straits Chinese as part of its visual documentation of Singapore’s past. Pioneered by Lee, who serves as its honorary curator, this is a very recent museum venture. Lee donated his collection of early 19th-century oil and photographic portraits of Straits Chinese to the Baba House, which has been the subject of two exhibitions. The Asian Civilisations Museum’s Peranakan Museum in Singapore has also been collecting portraits of Straits Chinese as part of their collection policy. These portraits formed a significant component of the artefacts for their exhibition, Great Peranakans: Fifty Remarkable Lives (May 2015–April 2016).

These portraits are, as Baba House curator Foo Su Ling points out, “social markers” of those portrayed. They are more than mirror images or candid photos of the sitters. The postures and gestures of the sitters, their costumes and the accessories or objects surrounding them are not of the moment the camera shutter is opened. The artist or photographer has colluded with the sitter to produce an image which is a “presentation of the self” of the sitter. Both Whampoa and Tan Beng Wan chose to portray themselves with their foreign awards and titles, one conferred by the British and the other by the Qing court, to claim a measure of status in their respective communities. More significant is that the format of these portraits is European. The sitter is expected to be formally dressed and standing or sitting stiffly on a heavy chair, with a side table on which carefully selected objects projecting the sitter’s persona are displayed. The choice of costume and dress is, as Foo points out, especially significant. Much can be read into the fact that female sitters are always portrayed in formal Asian dress, while male sitters’ costumes have evolved from the long Chinese gown, such as the one Tan Kim Seng chose to be portrayed in, to formal European black-tie evening suit, as worn by Song Ong Siang in his 1936 portrait. This 1936 Julius Wentscher portrait of Song, wearing his medals and awards, seated on a solid and heavy Straits Chinese-style blackwood chair next to a side table on which are displayed Song’s One Hundred Years’ History of the Chinese in Singapore, and a row of leather-bound books, including a copy of the Bible, projects Song’s persona as a “King’s Chinese” and, more significantly, how completely this genre of portraiture has appropriated European conventions, techniques and styles of visually representing persons.

Should this portrait of Song have been given a place in Victoria Memorial Hall, along with portraits of former Governors and other notables who had contributed to Singapore? A number of these portraits of former Governors were commissioned by local community elites and leaders as a form of civic patronage. The earliest of these civic portraits was of Governor William Butterworth, commissioned in 1855 by a group of prominent residents led by Tan Kim Seng, Seah Eu Chin, Tan Kim Ching, Abraham Solomon and Syed Ali bin Mohamed Aljunied among others. Others followed in the remainder of the 19th century. These include a portrait of Governor Harry Ord which
Whampoa led the commissioning of in 1875. In all, 22 life-size portraits hung on the walls of the Victoria Memorial Hall, leaving no space for Song’s portrait in 1936 (a space was eventually made for it). As Ang notes, the space of the Victoria Memorial Hall “can be regarded as the first national gallery of Singapore.”

Conclusion

The 19th-century drawing of nature, landscapes and persons in portraits prefigures in a way 20th-century artistic concerns of picturing a perpetually changing landscape. In contrast to the early 19th-century paintings and drawings of the landscape in which the native is absent, the later 19th-century photographs and paintings focus on the natives as the exotic other and an underlying narrative of the civilising influence of colonialism.

Today these images shape our social memories of imagined spaces and nostalgia of a bygone world as captured in a new generation of paintings of the Singapore River (fig. 2.8) and rural scenes. Also embedded in these 19th-century practices is a tension between Eastern and Western artistic practices, of Asian mimicking of European artistic practice and conventions to produce hybrid forms of art which we live with today.
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