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The Cross-Cultural Chase in Eighteenth-Century Denmark

Josefine Baark

The eighteenth-century Indian trade textile known as the Tranquebar Palampore is strikingly flamboyant (plate 1). Brightly coloured people and animals radiate out from its centre, organised across the oblong fabric into four distinct and dramatic scenes. On one of the longer sides, a female rider trains her shotgun at a fleeing deer that has jumped from behind a tree populated by monkeys. On the opposite side, from atop a horse, a man pushes a long spear into a squealing boar. On one of the shorter sides, a rampaging elephant is trampling two figures and lifting a third upside down with its trunk. Just above this scene, a man observes the commotion from inside a richly decorated seat on the back of a tame elephant. Opposite, a troop of soldiers accompanied by musicians parade under a Danish flag, while two other soldiers fire a cannon at a target. Again, this is overseen by a man from atop an elephant. The centre of the textile is dominated by the large monograms of a royal couple, the Oldenburg King Christian VI of Denmark-Norway (r. 1730-1746) and his wife Sophie Magdalene of Brandenburg-Kulmbach. Each corner is occupied by a heart, framing monograms of other members of the royal family and each heart
is held by a pair of winged wildmen, presumably meant to be the wild men or woodwose of the Oldenburg coat of arms.

The Tranquebar Palampore comes with a number of historical challenges. Its materials and style confirm that it was made in India in the eighteenth century, most likely in the region of Tamil Nadu near the court of Thanjavur.\(^1\) However, almost nothing is known about its artists, iconography or patronage.\(^2\) Similarly, there are visual clues, including the centrally placed royal monograms, to show that the textile was meant for the court of Christian VI, but while it was probably sent there from India during the 1740s, it is difficult to tell whether it ever reached that court. Although, in all likelihood, it did. Given that both Christian VI and his son and successor, Frederik V, feature prominently in the design, it seems unlikely that the textile passed out of royal hands until after the latter died in 1766. However, the only known details about the Palampore’s provenance is that it was purchased by the Danish Design Museum from Baron Bent Holstein-Holsteinborg in 1925 at the auction of the Holsteinborg Castle collection.\(^3\)

The Palampore is also challenging in terms of its typology. The design has been painted on two large sheets of fabric, sewn together in the middle. The back is lined with three further conjoined sheets of cotton fabric and, altogether, it measures an unwieldy 221 x 261 cm. It is exceptionally well preserved, indicating that it was only used occasionally, yet its exact usage
remains unknown; perhaps it never had one specific purpose. Serving as a tablecloth is one possible function; in early modern European court culture, large textiles were often displayed on tables. If the textile were spread on a table so that the four figural scenes became the overhang, the space covered by the cloth would still be substantial, around 210 x 180 cm, given that each border scene is approximately 25 cm high. The size of such a table suggests that it would have been a central piece of furniture, such as a dining table and thus, would have been much in use. Alternatively, such textiles could serve as canopies above royal *lits de parade* or beds from which the royals could receive visitors. However, the average eighteenth-century bed was between 170 and 180 cm long, and the canopy above would have been heavily draped. The textiles above a royal *lit de parade* were especially expansive so the Tranquebar Palampore would have been rather small for this purpose.

To complicate matters further, the Palampore does not comfortably accommodate a single viewing position. It cannot be displayed vertically, since this would turn one scene upside down. Even if displayed lying flat, for example on the ground or suspended above a bed, it is still difficult to take in the whole. If used as a tablecloth, each scene is at least the right way up, but one would still have to walk around it to see everything. At the same time, the figural scenes do not join up concentrically to perform a coherent narrative. Instead, they connect thematically,
most explicitly across the central field with the royal monograms.

Within these material and historical constraints, how might we get a sense of where meaning lies when the Tranquebar Palampore is considered within early modern Danish court culture? In other words, how might we attempt a history of the Palampore after its arrival in the Kingdom of Denmark-Norway? In recent years, interesting new categories have appeared on the academic stage: the mobile object, the translated object, the mundane object, the luxury object, even the clever object. While these have expanded our understanding of material culture, all these approaches, to risk a generalisation, rely on one or both of the two things missing from the Palampore: a clearly documented history or biography and a comfortable fit within a typology, with objects that it resembles in appearance and usage. But this is why objects like the Palampore are important. As art historians increasingly attend to world art, we need to reassess how we handle things that have neither the format nor the necessary documentation to fit comfortably within any of the categories enumerated above. Are there imaginative ways – within the bounds of reason – that a particular historical style can be used to tell us more about an object? How might we develop an alternative purchase on the problems pertaining to early modern objects-in-motion.
To explore this, I shall frame the Tranquebar Palampore with an account of the associative values generated by the larger visual and material world it could have inhabited. Placing the Palampore in the chinoiserie interiors of politically important Danish royal palaces, I shall suggest that it most likely joined a type of display meant to erase geographic specificity and even to specifically disassociate the textile from other Indian objects; that its meaning was not yoked to its Indian origins but to the global perspective of wall decorations to be found in royal and noble reception rooms in Denmark. Moreover, in these reception rooms, chinoiserie was used to visualise an awareness of the elite as a global phenomenon by means of fanciful hunting practices that served to connect them across cultural and political borders; the iconography of hunting allowed the imagining of what it meant to be royal or aristocratic across the early modern world. Again, this is an environment where something like the Palampore could represent not cultural division but shared cross-cultural status.

Considering the Palampore within three different rooms, each from a different moment in the development of Danish chinoiserie, reveals three distinctive forms or uses of exoticism that depended on shifting political and economic circumstances for their meaning. First, the Palampore’s design will be considered in relation to the two oldest and most detailed chinoiserie interiors found in Denmark. The two rooms at
Rosenborg Castle pre-date both the textile and direct trade with China. Yet, like the Palampore, these rooms were the result of an Asian trade that was mediated by India. Moreover, they were still in use during the 1740s. Placing the Palampore within this context exposes fantasies that continued to underpin Danish trade and foreign policy in the subsequent century.

Second, relocating the textile to the chinoiserie reception room in Prinsens Palais, where the wall design was based on the novel, but nonetheless real life Danish experience of a multinational trading network, shifts the framework for interpretation from the ideation of a trade empire to the solid experience of one, while revealing the continuing power that fantasy could wield in the economic and political spheres.

Finally, the iconographic use of exoticism as a primary indication of kingship and power in Eremitagen Hunting Lodge connects the Palampore to King Christian VI’s personal stake in expanding the trade with India to accommodate a direct trade with China. Finally, the argument is not that the Palampore definitely was displayed in these places; rather, that this associative world, which is cultural, political and economic, yields rich possibilities for understanding how the object and its mobility were understood.

Frames of Reference
The various activities depicted on the Palampore were quite closely related to actual Indo-Danish encounters. These began with the arrival of the first Danish trade envoys on the Coromandel Coast, who were financially supported by King Christian IV (r. 1588-1648) and led by Ove Gjedde. In 1620, the Danish envoys managed to negotiate a trade agreement with the ruler of southern India, Ragunatha Nayak. The encounter was steeped in pomp and circumstance. For instance, Ove Gjedde’s report to the King states that: ‘When the Type-Naike [sic] led me through the garden, I found it to be well ordered. We walked together to a tall building, where we met with the Naike [sic] and from whence we observed his elephants fight two buffalos.’

Violence, in the form of hunting and baiting of animals, and other such displays of power were clearly intrinsic to early modern international diplomacy, and thus to forging bonds between the courtly elites of India and Denmark-Norway. Its first use, as a parade textile, on the initial leg of its journey from the Thanjavur court to the Danish trade station on the Coromandel Coast, meant to make public in India the role of Denmark-Norway as a tributary polity.

Once it arrived in Denmark, however, its awkward dimensions would have resisted the standard usages and forms of display associated with Indian textiles in early modern Europe. Very few Indian artefacts were on display in the royal court of Denmark-Norway, and, unlike most other gifts from...
India, the Palampore never entered the royal Kunstkammer. Hence, although it might have conformed to the broader and vaguer Danish sense of exoticism that characterized the ‘Indian Chamber’ of that institution, it was housed within the domestic and public royal spaces that looked explicitly to Chinese artefacts and European descriptions of China for inspiration.

For in all three locations to be discussed, the style of ornament under scrutiny is ‘chinoiserie.’ Chinoiserie is a well-established French term referring to the exotic influence of Chinese goods on European fashions. Famously characterized by figures in loose clothes and pointed hats inhabiting a fanciful countryside dotted with pagodas sporting exaggerated sweeping roofs, European-made chinoiserie was a particular imaginative and sometimes humorous aspect of an immersive ornamental style that spread to any and all available surfaces. European artists and designers used Chinese artwork, artefacts and books in conjunction with European travel illustrations as a source of inspiration. The results can often be found in architectural decorations, fabrics and furniture, but are not limited to these and may appear in the most surprising places. This style began to spread across Europe in the later seventeenth century, but it really took off in the early 1700s. Direct trade with China through an array of European East India Companies ensured that more Chinese objects and European travel illustrations became available.
Chinoiserie was as fashionable in Scandinavia as elsewhere in Europe. In Denmark, the desire for interiors covered from floor to ceiling in Asian-inspired ornament can be identified as early as the 1670s and, by the early eighteenth century, a number of Danish palaces had rooms covered with panels or painted wallpaper featuring a lively world of pavilions, animals and hunters. Of course, the development of chinoiserie at the Danish-Norwegian court predates the Palampore; as will be shown, Danish chinoiserie draws on and combines genuine Chinese sources, French rococo and contemporary political and economic events.

The lightness with which chinoiserie treats its subject caused much twentieth-century scholarship to dismiss its frivolity as incapable of engaging seriously with politics, philosophy or identity. Nonetheless, a new transdisciplinary approach that sees chinoiserie as a means ‘to reflect—but also to shape—taste, identity, and political opinion’ has come to the fore. For the purposes of the argument presented here, Greg Thomas has provided an excellent framework for understanding chinoiserie as a style, in a similar vein to Neoclassism. Rather than approaching the fascination with China within the problematic binaries produced by an orientalist approach and then reproduced by an East-West framework, it is far more rewarding to see chinoiserie as ‘a logical aesthetic system with
its own particular stylistic unity and the capacity to carry various ideological meanings.\textsuperscript{15}

This is certainly true of Danish chinoiserie, which was a peculiarly capacious phenomenon, encompassing motifs and imaginary scenes that were less about a European fantasy of China and more about international trade and, crucially, a means of articulating the global resonances of hunting as an early modern elite activity.

This returns us to the pictorial contents of the Palampore, with its scenes of violence, hunting, military display and its royal insignia. I shall argue that, because of an already established Danish chinoiserie tradition, these motifs would have come to the fore in any Danish attempts to integrate the textile into existing courtly spaces. The process of meaning making surrounding artefacts like the Palampore was thus predicated on chinoiserie and its Danish royal context, and any meaning generated from this reciprocal relationship would have been accrued by the textile.

**Rosenborg Castle**

The earliest extant Danish examples of chinoiserie interiors are two rooms at Rosenborg, a small royal summer palace on the outskirts of Copenhagen. François de Bray, who had been summoned to Copenhagen from Haarlem by King Frederik III (r. 1648-1670), designed both rooms.\textsuperscript{16} The earlier of the two,
‘Kongens Gemak’ (the King’s room, a reference to King Christian IV), was re-panelled for Queen Sophie Amalie between 1663 and 1665 (plate 2). This means that they predate direct trade between Denmark and China by more than half a century; before 1729 Chinese goods were only available indirectly, mediated by ports such as the Danish trading post in India.

The room at Rosenborg is covered from floor to ceiling with 75 panels of japanning inlaid with delicate gold outlines and framed by oak frames painted to imitate tortoise shell. The wooden panels are in a moody dark green, which stands in an intense contrast with the gold contours. The bottom tier depicts detailed ships of both Asian and European origin, a clear indication of how already at this date chinoiserie was an encompassing, even a global idiom. Then, at eye level, the glowing thin outlines delineate Orientalising scenes set in pastoral landscapes. Directly below the ceiling are larger figural compositions with little other detail. The doors to the room are doubled and the inner doors are japanned to match the rest of the room; when they are closed, the effect is unusually coherent.

Located on the ground floor, this bedroom and the private, marble reception room next door passed from King Christian VI to his daughter-in-law Queen Sophie Amalie. In addition to commissioning the panels, she decorated it with beautiful Chinese blanc de chine porcelain sculptures from the Kangxi
Emperor’s reign (1661-1722), which had been taken from the royal Kunstkammer. The pieces are hollow altar statues representing the goddess Guanyin and her handmaids.\(^{18}\) Thus, the space contained exotic artefacts that would deepen the immersive experience, including ‘a large black cabinet inlaid with ivory, tortoise shell and gilded Zink’\(^{19}\) and several other japanned pieces of furniture. To boot, in this room the Queen did not merely sleep in silk, she slept in the choicest bed ‘in an East Asian manner.’\(^{20}\)

The Asian artefacts in ‘Kongens gemak’ provided inspiration for the images on the walls and thus functioned as a means of legitimizing them, of making the immersive experience seem authentic as well as globalising. For example, the figures at the top and the boats in the bottom row were explicitly copied from porcelain pieces, travel illustrations and imported books.\(^{21}\) Landscapes, however, were only really found on porcelain pieces, as is confirmed by the figures inside the Rosenborg landscapes, who are mostly reminiscent of porcelain painting.

The second chinoiserie room at Rosenborg, ‘Prinsessens Tårnkammer’ (the Princess’s tower chamber), is located one floor up and on the other side of the building to ‘Kongens Gemak’ (\textit{plate 3}). Its decorative scheme dates from 1668 at the latest, when it was described by Johannes (Hans) Hansen Schmidt (1650-1707, later ennobled as Lilienskiold), a
Norwegian student at Copenhagen University, in his travel diary
of his trip from Bergen to Italy.\textsuperscript{22} The chamber was restored in
1716 by Christian van Bracht, and thereafter used as a study by
Sophie Hedevig (1677 – 1735), King Frederik IV’s sister –
hence its official name. Much smaller – too small to have been a
bedchamber – it has a far more intimate atmosphere. The walls
and ceiling are covered in large panels that shimmer with layers
of colour and gold, where the raised contours of mythical beasts
curl seductively around mother-of-pearl and turquoise stones.
The wall panels are arranged in three tiers, as in the lower
chamber, but each level is of a different size. The upper tier has
large figures, similar to those arranged below the ceiling in
‘Kongens Gemak’. Gudmund Boesen has demonstrated that
these figures were directly copied from Martinus Martinius’
“Novus Atlas Sinensis” published in 1655.\textsuperscript{23} However, here each
scene is more elaborate and colourful and with additional details
of trees and flowers.

The middle panels, the largest and most elaborate, are
particularly interesting (\textit{plate 4}). Each depicts a central tree or
piece of foliage, gnarled and twisted to resemble those favoured
in scholarly scenes in Chinese paintings; and various beasts are
arranged around these verdant forms.\textsuperscript{24} At the entrance to the
room, the panels to the right of the door show mythical
monsters, including a leonine tiger, a dragon, and a \textit{Fo} dog.
Following the panels around the room, one sees more foliate
imagery around the central windows, and the panels to the left of the entrance depict a series of birds.

Although they are very early, these pieces of chinoiserie already come with a strangely floating sense of landscape, which serves as a set of stages where foliage and animals make imaginative interventions. Though the Rosenborg interiors pre-date the Tranquebar Palampore by half a century, they nevertheless constitute a key monument and moment for understanding how that textile might have worked once it reached Denmark. If anything, the focus on nature and wildness that is only nascent in these rooms would gradually take on increased importance in the imaginative interpretation of chinoiserie and exoticism that unfolded at the Danish court.

In both the Palampore and the rooms where it may have been on display, nature is consistently presented as uncontrolled, monstrous and wild. This wilderness is then put to use connecting its human inhabitants to each other through their attempts to skilfully dominate it. Instead of presenting the relationship between the Danish royals and their Indian counterparts in the very real light of their mercantile connections, a different and far more aristocratic kind of sociability is sought by both the Indian and the Danish/Dutch artists. In the Palampore, the wilderness is observed by Indian royalty and inhabited by foreigners, monkeys, boars and deer, while imagined trees sprout an endless supply of dissimilar
flowers. Although the landscape contains imagined foliage and exotic occupants, it is not in and of itself exotic.\textsuperscript{25} The untamed wildness of the elephant has dire consequences, but the wild animal will certainly be brought back under control. In addition, the wildness of the woodwose guarding the monograms has been severely toned down. As will become apparent, this attitude to nature and man’s place in it is mirrored and elaborated in the Danish depictions of hunting, where the landscape could accommodate both real and imagined scenes of social bonding, yet simultaneously house dangerous, fantastical encounters.

For both the Indian artists who made the Palampore and for the Danes who displayed it, the wildness of the rampant elephant and its various animal companions represented an exciting monstrosity that could nevertheless be momentarily captured, tamed and observed. The idea of royalty as grounded in a ‘wise’ harnessing of natural ‘animal’ inclinations, personified in the figure of the woodwose, was already central to established Oldenburg patterns of self-representation.\textsuperscript{26} Moreover, the heart that frames each monogram, but particularly the flaming heart carried by one of the wildmen was a common emblem in Europe of intense, even overpowering zeal and devotion.\textsuperscript{27} Through references to wildness (both animal and conceptual), the textile keys into the existing Danish perception

that royalty must be understood in terms of the prudent management of earthly desires in service of spiritual devotion.

Danish fascination with the exotic was by no means divorced from pan-European articulations of otherness in the early eighteenth century. This is evident simply from the fact that many chinoiserie images were sourced from early travel accounts. However, whereas wildness and monstrosity of a satirical chinoiserie became a key political tool for the British in the lead up to the Opium Wars, the political use of chinoiserie was less overt. As the interiors at Rosenborg show, European desires for wildness and an imaginatively exotic world were already being met by chinoiserie decoration in Denmark well before the style became widespread in the eighteenth century. Were the Tranquebar Palampore ever displayed at Rosenborg, it too would have become part of an immersive environment characterised by Asian luxury, while the textile’s explicit representations of enormous flowering trees, as well as the hunting and the taming of wild elephants would have resonated with existing imagery of prowling tigers, gnarled foliage and curled-up dragons. In a sense, this aligned with the global reality that China was mediated through India in the century preceding the arrival of the Palampore. Likewise, by the mid-eighteenth century, the Indian textile would have been mediated by the Chinese decorative scheme, as direct trade with China had taken
political precedence. In this decorative world, connections were constantly being made.

**Fabulous Encounters in Prinsens Palais**

The chinoiserie style of the panels at Rosenborg was succeeded by a courtly theatrical exoticism. It is best exemplified by the red and gold wall panels at Prinsens Palais in Copenhagen, dating to around 1725, when that building was transformed into a residence for the Crown Prince, the future Christian VI (*plate 5*). The panels were originally designed and produced for a small reception room by Carsten Tønder, who was involved in the early restoration of the chinoiserie panels at Rosenborg.²⁹

One panel depicts two men fighting off a dragon with spears. The dragon has already slain one of their fellows, who lies beneath its claws (*plate 6*). The scene is observed from above by two other dragons and a bird, while a goose and a turtle watch from below. Meanwhile, a fourth man hides behind the trunk of a nearby tree; the whole scene looks as if plucked straight from a fairy tale. Nonetheless, it is indicative of a new conception of chinoiserie landscape as a stage for exciting contests between humans and animals rather than a space for idyllic pastoral meanderings, as is the case for in ‘Kongens Gemak’ at Rosenborg. The rest of the panels show similar scenes, each one populated by loosely clothed figures and culminating in elaborate, twisted trees just below eye-level.
In one of these panels, two Chinese fishermen stand by the shore (plate 7). In this European fantasy of a floating world, water is indicated by a curved line snaking its way upwards, past the base of the tree. One of the fishermen has caught sight of a man in a kayak and is pointing the figure out to his companion. This man, evidently an Inuit hunter, is in full hunting gear with his spear raised, gracefully steering his craft through the water. Much like the astounded angler on the shore, one might reasonably ask what a man from Greenland could possibly be doing sailing through an ostensibly Chinese landscape. Like the Danish figures on the Tranquebar Palampore, he is out of place yet his activity grounds him firmly in the imaginative landscape because he, too, is hunting and is doing so with skill from the seemingly unstable base of his kayak.

In fact, this Inuit man may be related to an opportunistic Danish-Norwegian ploy to sell their Arctic trade to new investors. Eighteenth-century courtiers might even have been able to name the man, and therefore would have understood the underlying dynamics at play in his presence inside a princely audience chamber. On 9 November 1724 a procession sponsored by ‘Bergen Grønlandske Compagnie’ (the Bergen Greenland Company) sailed the canals of Copenhagen, including two Inuit hunters in kayaks accompanied by boats carrying Arctic goods. In addition, there were several larger boats, some of which contained musicians, with sails decorated with pictures of polar
bears (the insignia of Greenland), whales, salmon and cod and Danish royal symbols.\textsuperscript{32}

One of the two extant visual representations of this procession is a ‘kistelågsblad’ (a print to be pasted on the lid of a chest) accompanied by a short text (\textit{plate 8}). At the front two Inuit hunters, Poq and Kiperoq, are shown hunting ducks. Ostensibly, the two had come of their own free will, persuaded by the newly arrived missionary to Greenland, Hans Egede, to be ‘enlightened’.\textsuperscript{33} The promotional event had some success; word reached an enormous number of people and it generated a plethora of portraits, laudatory poems and attention from other courts in Europe, including that in Frankfurt, where a miniature portrait of the two Inuit is held.\textsuperscript{34} Other portraits were made, including some still in the royal Danish collection.

The two men stayed at the Danish court for several months until Kiperoq died, after which Poq returned to Greenland.\textsuperscript{35} Slightly later again, the Danish playwright and satirist Ludvig Holberg wrote a lively portrayal of the two Inuit visitors as a prelude to a defence of continued trade with the Arctic.

Some years ago, some of the savages […] were] sent to Copenhagen, where they publicly demonstrated their ability to canoe and hunt to the King and the entire town: They seemed very apt, particularly one, whose name was Pock.\textsuperscript{36}
Holberg then praised the Inuit skills of rowing and hunting:

Here see a man and a boat of inflated sealskin,
With whales’ fins and long ribs
He rows with (just) one oar
Half his body rests in the same skin-boat
It is dry and clean.  

Although turned slightly and deprived of his friend, the hunter in Prinsens Palais is clearly a replica of Kiperoq in the procession.

While Tove Clemmensen and Mogens Mackeprag, whose work has made groundbreaking contributions to the study of chinoiserie in Denmark, attribute the ‘lighter, more idyllic’ style of these later decorations to the ‘usual’ foreign [implicitly European] influence, the figure of Kiperoq is clear evidence of one distinct aspect of this new fantastic and theatrical Danish chinoiserie: it could encompass Arctic imagery.

The idea of the Northwest Passage was deeply entrenched in the public imagination, even if a suitable route to China via Greenland and northern America had never been found. One state-sponsored endeavour to do so, led by Jens Munk in 1619, had the catastrophic consequence of killing its whole crew but for three men. To this should be added that, from the sixteenth century onwards, there had been some trade with the Inuit, but it
was mainly limited to goods such as narwhal tusks and sealskins sold to Danish, British and French fishermen hunting for bowhead whales. Additionally, the closer integration between Denmark and Norway inaugurated in 1536 meant that all Norwegian land claims in the Arctic, including that to Greenland which dated back to the tenth century, now fell to the Oldenburg monarchy.

Illustrations of Inuit peoples had circulated previously, but their images are commonly bound to illustrated books or objects made of narwhal tusk. One such is the “unicorn tankard” from c. 1656 from the treasury collection in Rosenborg (plate 9). The body of the tankard is made from 17 staves of narwhal tusk and mounted on three reclining unicorns. The lid is attached by a silver thumbpiece in the shape of a Greenlandic hunter holding a narwhal tusk and sitting next to a dead seal, on which he rests his left hand. On the inside of the lid is a silver medallion, engraved with a copy of two Greenlandic figures from an illustration in Adam Olearius’ *Vermehrre Moscovitische und Persanische Reisebeschreibung*, published in 1656. The two figures, “Hiob” and “Grunelle”, hold their weapons, but do not use them. Although the dead seal attests their skill in hunting, the format, as well as the inspiration for the image does not allow for their active practice thereof.

The procession of boats displaying goods from Greenland and Inuit hunting methods through the canals of Copenhagen
almost two centuries later was just one of several attempts at
drumming up enthusiasm for Arctic trade. The chinoiserie
panels in Prinsens Palais may be understood as a more
permanent assertion of Oldenburg dynastic claims to the
Norwegian colonies and their trade.

How might all this fit with the Tranquebar Palampore? For
one thing, it shows the ways in which hunting could be put to
royal, dynastic and mercantile use. On the other hand, the
Palampore certainly has no Inuit, no dragons and even the
woodwose flanking the royal monograms are less ferocious than
those found elsewhere on Oldenburg heraldry, perhaps because
they were increasing associated with a restraint of nature and
wilderness. Yet the textile explicitly stages skilled contention
with the animal kingdom, something that occurred on a regular
basis whether in Tamil Nadu, in Denmark or in Greenland. In
Rosenborg, the connection to the animal kingdom articulated in
the Palampore would have keyed into the ways in which China
was mediated via India. In Prinsens Palais, the intended
perception of Danish economic reach and the extent of its trade
network, which could be reinforced by the Palampore’s
presence, was expanded to a wider global context and an
increasingly fierce political ambition.

In particular, the trope of the rampant elephant breaking
its bonds and menacing its carers is a recurring theme in early
modern Indian writings, whether by Maratha scholars or Danish
sailors and emissaries. In a broader sense, the visual representation of wild elephants could be put to use to illustrate the majestic skills of past rulers. In a late eighteenth century miniature of the Emperor Akbar (r. 1556–1605), his royal abilities are prominently on display as he controls and tames a wild elephant that has broken free of its bonds and like the elephant on the Palampore is about to toss a man in the air (plate 10). Clearly, the dangers of hunting, and the battle with natural forces involved in its practice, meant that – as a visual motif – it was an ideal place to find resonances with other cultures, whether through imagined encounters like that of Kiperoq and the Chinese fishermen or through real events, such as their staged hunt in Copenhagen’s canals or ostensibly tame elephants going on the rampage.

A Chinoiserie Stage for the Pleasures of the Hunt

It was not only the trade with and religious mission to Greenland that were at stake in the 1720s. Commerce with Asia was at a crucial juncture; after a century of Indian mediation, a political and financial coalition led by King Frederik IV (r. 1699–1730) and a slew of newly moneyed aristocratic merchants was formed to develop direct trade with China. Thus, in 1729, the first Danish ship bound directly for Canton bypassed the Indian trade station.
With the coming of direct trade with China, the 1740s ushered in a period of progressively panicked propaganda for the India trade. Poul Krisk Panck, the governor of Tranquebar, sent increasingly large hauls of gifts to Copenhagen. The Palampore may well have arrived in such a consignment. One gift of this kind is the large model of a Hindu temple sent from India, which entered the royal Kunstkammer in the 1740s. This is another reason for assuming that the Palampore is a product of the Thanjavur court, to which the Danes had to pay a yearly tribute for permission to maintain the trade fort at Tranquebar. Thus it is likely that it was meant to persuade Christian VI to re-invest in trade with India and, more broadly, to cement links between the two courts. If it arrived in Denmark in the 1740s, this would have coincided roughly with a renewed interest in the India trade at the Danish court, demonstrated by the new translation by Christoph Theodosius Walther (1699-1741) of the first diplomatic letter from the Nayaka ruler of Thanjavur to Christian IV. Despite being a diplomatic missive, the letter had been incorporated into the ‘Indian Chamber’ of the royal Kunstkammer under Frederik III. The new translation revealed that the gold leaf document was a personal letter from the Nayak of Thanjavur and not, as the Danes had believed, a copy of the trade treaty. Like most other Indian artefacts, excepting the Palampore, it was once more consigned to the Kunstkammer.
Here again it is necessary to consider the Palampore within the broader framework of the early modern Asian trade, especially as this trade became increasingly focused on China. This was a process at least in part fuelled by European desires for tea, spices and silk and even for armorial porcelain. Admittedly, it has not been possible to identify an armorial set produced for Christian VI and Sophie Magdalene. Yet having porcelain dinner sets covered in monograms, which were then used during banquets, had by then become a standard European display of status. The Tranquebar Palampore, structured as it is by royal monograms, taps into this trend explicitly. But, even if its purpose were to promote the India trade, it makes no explicit reference to mercantile transactions or to Indian goods. Instead, the Palampore functions through a subtle, culturally commensurable visual language of flattery and shared hobbies. Ultimately, the conspicuous consumption of leisure as depicted on the Palampore fitted with a new trend in Denmark, where hunting increasingly served to connect royally funded trade with a rising mercantile elite.

To grasp how this works, it is fundamental to consider both the newly direct trading connection to China and the already established Danish version of chinoiserie, in which hunting imagery had already been used to blur distinctions between the global and the local, for example in the depiction of the Inuit man and the Chinese fishermen inside Prinsens Palais.
Ultimately, the Palampore was meant to act as an intermediary between Denmark and India, but once it had arrived at the Danish court, it is likely that it also served to connect India and China, since both could be and were encompassed by the imaginary form of hunting seen in the chinoiserie style.

In any case, because of the hunting scenes on the Palampore, once it had arrived in Copenhagen it would have been a natural fit for Eremitagen (‘the Hermitage’), a newly renovated royal hunting lodge to the north of the city. The splendid, leisured lifestyle represented on the textile would have suited the royal couple’s idea of themselves as affluent and cosmopolitan. We cannot ascertain that the Palampore was ever on display inside Eremitagen but the central themes of the textile connect well with the decorative scheme of the hunting lodge, its layout and its relationship to the surrounding forest.

Christian VI and his wife were avid hunters. In 1733, they had commissioned a hunting lodge in Dyrehaven, part of an extensive royal hunting forest to the north of Copenhagen. Designed by Lauritz de Thurah, it was completed in 1736. The castle is situated on a slight hill, at the centre of straight paths radiating outwards from it. The building itself is small and was built for private dinners to be taken by the royal party after hunting. Hence the dining room is the most important space and there are no bedrooms at all (plate 11). Instead, there are four small and individualized rooms off each corner of the dining
room where the royal couple and the crown prince and princess could change their clothes in privacy. These four rooms were decorated with silk chinoiserie wallpaper, now unfortunately destroyed, while the staircase leading from the entrance to the dining room on the main floor is covered in Dutch blue and white ceramic tiles showcasing scenes of bucolic bliss, including men hunting.

The design, structure and decoration of Eremitagen all demonstrate that the hunting lodge was meant as a space for luxurious royal entertainment after a long day’s *par force* hunting. Accordingly, the King and Queen had their monograms emblazoned on the ceiling of the dining room. Additionally, the room features a large stucco sculpture of the classical goddess of the hunt, Diana. However, the lodge’s main attraction was that it was exceptionally private. For example, it had been fitted with a mechanical table, installed in 1736 by the carpenter Johan Jeremias Reusse. This table would emerge from a specially designed subterranean chamber, where it could be loaded with food directly from the kitchens; the royal hunting party could thus dine without having any servants nearby. The dimensions of the table indicate that it cannot have been very large; only fourteen ‘Chinese chairs’ were recorded in the inventory in the years 1731-1741. Once filled with a feast, the table would appear directly underneath the two royal monograms on the dining room ceiling.
Would the royal family and specially selected guests enter the dining room after their hunt and see a version of their recent feats, including deer hunting and pig sticking, draped on either side of the central table? Were their monograms emblazoned in red both across the table and in gold across the ceiling? Certainly, they would have changed out of their hunting gear in rooms covered in chinoiserie prints and then moved into the dining room, perhaps to see the table with the Palampore disappear into the ground and then return moments later, splendidly laden with a feast.

Unfortunately, the dimensions of the mechanical table were never recorded. However, if it were like the table in the Kina Slott (Chinese Pavilion) at the Swedish royal palace of Drottningholm in Stockholm, the Palampore would have fitted quite comfortably. Emphatically, this is not to suggest that the textile was used as a tablecloth during dinners; the wear on the fabric would have destroyed it and, as noted, it is exceptionally well preserved. Instead, the cloth might have been a decorative covering. The table was very unusual and would have drawn spectators even during times when the royals were not present.

To this, it should be added that extant early modern inventories for Eremitagen do not include fabrics. However, the inventory of the first hall on the second floor of Queen Sophie Magdalene’s dowager home, Sophienberg, mentions a ‘Dining Table covered in Chinese printed cloth’.

This, at least, shows that textiles like
the Tranquebar Palampore were eminently mobile and could easily be added to or subtracted from a room as and when deemed appropriate.

Something of a case can be made for the display of the Tranquebar Palampore at Eremitagen but the archival connections are tenuous. Indeed, the aim here is not to prove that this was ever so, even if the textile and the hunting lodge are linked via the royal couple. Instead, it reveals the personal, political and economic dynamics in chinoiserie spaces that could be mediated via objects like the Palampore. And, vice versa, it points to how the history of such objects can emerge from an understanding of how early modern courts understood global connections, when these were used to structure royal life and its decorative repertoire.

**A Domestic Rococo Ferocity**

In Denmark, many of the early eighteenth-century paintings representing hunting as an aristocratic display of sportsmanship were poised and playful. Rather than depicting the slaying of animals in violently explicit ways, the Danes tended to focus on the moment of social gathering before the hunt (anticipation) or the enjoyment of spoils thereafter (celebration), albeit that these moments were still punctuated by an awareness of the potential for violence inherent in the sport. While depictions of the hunt in rococo France demonstrated the moment of death with
gratuitous detail, the Danes delicately abstained from such visual drama.\textsuperscript{50} In an eighteenth century woodcut by Thomas Larsen Borup (1726 - 1770), ‘The Worship of Hunting and Its Uses’ (Jagtens Tilbedelse og dens Nytte, \textit{plate 12}), the accompanying verses proclaim:

\begin{quote}
Horses, Dogs, Hunting skill

Cannot be dispensed with in the Hunt

Without all effort becoming futile.

Animals are not easily caught.

Hunting is truly necessary,

It benefits us greatly:

Without it, even people

Lack protection from animals. \textsuperscript{51}
\end{quote}

Sitting a tree stump with her back to us and propping her rifle on the ground, a woman looks on as a man juggles two horses’ reigns and two dogs on leash, having thrown his rifle over his shoulder. Behind one of the horses’ rumps, a third man with a hunting horn has lifted it to signal the beginning of the hunt.\textsuperscript{52} Between two treetops, a small bird rises in fright at the sound of the horn, while a larger bird swoops down from above to grasp it in its claws. The scene is one of companionable, perhaps even marital, bliss, although the moment could well be a precursor to
the action packed killings by the European pair on the Palampore. Yet, the birds and the accompanying verses emphasize that the hunt is at heart a struggle for dominance over and safety from the dangers of the natural world. It is a place and a pursuit where human characters must band together with their domestic animals and exhibit their ‘skills’ in order to survive.

A significant change in hunting practices came about at the end of the seventeenth century and this is pertinent to the activities featured in chinoiserie decoration. The English envoy to the court of King Christian V (1646-1699), Robert Viscount Molesworth (1656-1725) described the hunt as follows:

At Fredericksburg the Court spends most of its time in Stag-hunting, for there are few Fallow-Deer in Denmark; during which Sport the King allows great freedom to his Domesticks, and Ministers, who commonly do all accompany him wherever he goes; insomuch that he seems to lay aside all Majesty, and the Formalities of it for that Season; they eat and drink together, the latter sometimes to Excess, after a hard days hunting; when as soon as Dinner is done, they adjourn to the Wine-Cellar.  

Molesworth had been stationed at the Danish court for three years, and had clearly noted the emphasis on sociability that
accompanied the practice. Christian V’s diary confirms the emphasis on hunting as an important social marker.54

On 24 August 1691, Christian uses the term *par force* for the first time to describe a stag hunt. In this sport, the king, as the main hunter, processed along visually spectacular straight paths toward an animal that had already been tired out by his retinue and lay ready for what was to all extents and purposes an act of ceremonial slaughter.55 The design of entire royal gardens and forests, like those surrounding Eremitagen, were structured to accommodate *par force* hunting. Christian V’s comment heralded a new format for hunting that required both greater theatrics on the part of the king, and greater control over the landscape. As seen in the park surrounding the Eremitagen Hunting Lodge, the rules for hunting required by the *par force* practices meant that nature could be structured and policed to make the royal hunt a performance of power. This need for a structured landscape and the ritual demands that accompanied them may have pushed the easy sociability into the comparatively wilder structures of the chinoiserie landscape during the reign of his successor.

I suggest that while the landscape in which Danes hunted became increasingly structured, chinoiserie provided an outlet for a different but connected set of sensibilities. In other words, the wild plants and animals that already inhabited the chinoiserie landscape, allowed for imaginative depictions of the hunt. In
turn, the exotic landscape took on the task of housing loosely defined social groups. By accommodating the tightly controlled spaces measured out by the monograms, as well as the violent deaths of animals and humans alike within its visual program, the Tranquebar Palampore could retain the sociable aspects of the hunt within the new hunting framework.

The practice of *par force* hunting had been imported by the Danes from the court of Louis XIV (r. 1643-1715). The connection between the two courts was maintained partly through their shared interest in the sport and, on the 3 November 1768, Louis XV presented a full riding habit to Christian VII of Denmark. The coat was silver and gold thread and chamois, while the whip was made of tortoiseshell and the hat was made of silk. That the Palampore could so easily align with this new theatrical way of hunting, while also accommodating the old sociable mores valued so highly by the Danes, indicates both the adaptability of the object to new political structures, as well as that of the globalizing decorative repertoire of which it became a part. The Tranquebar Palampore was able to tap into both the exotic landscape created by chinoiserie and the increasingly structured approach to nature provoked by the French influence at the Danish court. In this manner, it avoided becoming part of the royal Kunstkammer as merely another ‘curiosity’ and instead, became part of the fabric of the royal household. The iconography of the hunt, seen in the Palampore and the
chinoiserie interiors, was uniquely adaptable to changes in social, royal and economic organisation.

**An Associative Value Framework**

The Tranquebar Palampore comes with a number of visual and historical challenges, even considering the expanded analytic parameters provided by the renaissance of material culture theory. The textile lacks a clearly documented history or biography and, although it contains elements from a chinoiserie typology, whose ornamental style it resembles in fundamental ways, it is not a comfortable fit in terms of appearance and usage. Instead, chinoiserie can be employed as an analytic tool. The aim has been, by identifying and using the meshwork of associative values, to provide at least a partial answer to the question raised in the beginning of this article: Are there imaginative ways – within the bounds of reason – that the use of a particular historical style as a conceptual matrix can be used to compensate for the lack of empirical data about an object?

In the argument presented here, the relationship between man and animal framed by the Tranquebar Palampore and its resistance to categorization has sparked an array of associations to ritual, structure, dominance and community. Once it entered the Danish royal sphere, the textile added its unique voice to an existing conversation that loosely connected the ruling elite with its local and global trade partners. In turn, this conversation was
inflected by the spaces where indeterminate and shamelessly imaginative chinoiserie landscape had become a staple of royal ornamental style.

Using the global phenomenon of hunting and the associative values that this practice conjured to look at how early modern Danes put exotic objects and images to use in their interiors reveals that while the promise of violence was a way of navigating and controlling nature, it was also a means of forging bonds between the courtly elites of India and Denmark-Norway and of understanding those bonds globally, related to other cultural and economic connections. In a similar vein, imagined violence in a space like the chinoiserie floating landscape, where nature’s boundaries were malleable, could be put to use in fashioning oneself as a global power. It is in such a mobile global context that we must view objects like the Tranquebar Palampore; for the Palampore demonstrates how objects moved through the early modern world and, in the process, were thoroughly entangled in ideas and practices that can be very challenging to pinpoint, let alone categorise.57
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