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Figure 1. Anonymous, The Kangxi Emperor, 1667. Engraving. From Athanasius Kircher, China Illustrata. Photo: Getty Research Institute.

Figure 2. Athanasius Kircher, China Illustrata, 1667, title page. Photo: New York Public Library Digital Collections.
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These words, penned by Father Johannes Grueber (1623–1680) a few days before Christmas in 1670, were directed to his fellow Jesuit Athanasius Kircher (1602–1680) and concluded a small but important disagreement between the two. A few months earlier, in March, Grueber commented on the portrait of the Kangxi Emperor of China | fig. 1 | included in Kircher’s last book, published in Amsterdam in 1667: China, Illustrated with Monuments Both Sacred and Profane, and Various Spectacles of Nature and Art, and Proofs of Other Memorable Matters.² | fig. 2 | Grueber pointed out that the iconography was inappropriate and planned to publish an amended and more faithful image of the emperor in his own book on China.³ However, his plan never came to fruition, and eventually Kircher’s image of the Emperor proved to be successful and influential. A copy of this print, for example, was included in Alain Manesson Mallet’s Description of the Universe, | fig. 3 | published in 1683, where several other non-European rulers were represented according to Westernizing principles in terms of bodily posture and insignia.⁴ Furthermore, in 1688, Eberhard Werner Hap pel included a simplified and slightly modified version of Kircher’s print as an illustration in his Thesaurus Exoticorum, with a clear acknowledgment in the text mentioning the prototype coming from the Jesuit Order in Rome.⁵

The problem with Kangxi’s portrait, Grueber argued, consisted in how the ruler was represented. He explained that this image would have been an insult for the Chinese viewers, and probably a portrait of the ruler sitting at a desk with mathematical books would have been more appropriate.⁶ Grueber had a specific traditional Chinese iconography in mind, as a hanging scroll portraying the young Kangxi Emperor at a desk, | fig. 4 | with a brush and several books, shows. This prototype could have provided a faithful and meaningful portrait of the Emperor,⁷ because such attributes were quite customary in Chinese portraiture, as a Portrait of an Unidentified Nobleman | fig. 5 | demonstrates: in this painting, a member of the highest ranks of society is sitting in front of an elaborate desk populated by writing instruments and books, as well as by other luxury objects.⁸ From Grueber’s observations, as well as from these Chinese scrolls, we understand that the spatial, architectural, and material contexts were crucial to define the ruler, in addition to the attributes and body posture. The problem in a transcultural reading of such images was the correct interpretation of each element in a portrait: what was appropriate
for a European viewer was not necessarily adequate in Qing China, and vice versa. More importantly, this controversy between the two Jesuits, followed by Kircher’s clear unwillingness to align himself with Grüber, shows that the “errors” in China Illustrata were probably intentional—a strategy to translate alterity into something easier to understand in Europe.

As this essay argues, Kircher understood this portrait as an image articulating the agency of architectural interiors in defining a European ruler’s public persona. Kircher, a Jesuit living in seventeenth-century Rome, had great familiarity with rulers inhabiting a peculiar and highly ritualized typology of domestic interiors: palaces, where the boundaries between private and public lives were blurred, and where everything—architectural plan, decoration, and furnishings—contributed to define status and regulate hierarchies and social relations. As much as the ruler’s body pertained to the public sphere and encapsulated his or her status, the architecture inhabited by the ruler had a public and symbolic dimension. Interiors represented in portraits mirrored such functions and had a quintessentially symbolic role in terms of defining the sitter’s status. The early modern palace’s interior was therefore a representational space, where domesticity existed only in relation to, and as function of, the public performance of those who inhabited such spaces. The interior’s materiality and the objects on display activated the symbolic dimension and function of such space: for this reason it was important, in Kircher’s book, that the Kangxi Emperor inhabited a space that the reader of China Illustrata could decode, to the detriment of architectural and material verisimilitude.

Focusing on the portraits of the Kangxi Emperor (fig. 1) and the Mughal Emperor Jahangir | fig. 6 | published in Kircher’s China Illustrata, this article explores how images reinvented these unfamiliar, distant, exotic rulers according to parameters, devices, and materiality that configured their personas and the interiors they inhabited as royal palaces according to European standards. As much as the ruler’s bodies or likenesses, the interiors became semantically charged and functioned as spaces where the figures could perform according to a series of conventions that could be understood primarily by Kircher’s intended audience: his European readers. By addressing how and why Kircher manipulated his sources to represent Jahangir and Kangxi, this essay argues that the two portraits should be considered as acts of translation that entail a negotiation of meanings and visual vocabularies to meet the expectations of Kircher’s Western audience.

Members of the Jesuit Order had been welcomed at the court of the Mughal Emperors, as well as by the Kangxi Emperor. It is therefore not surprising that Athanasius Kircher, a Jesuit, included illustrations of these two rulers in his book. Although recent historiography has challenged the traditional “from the top down” interpretation of Jesuit conversions primarily directed to the elites of Asian societies for a more nuanced view that takes into account how evangelization included all social groups, both Kangxi and Jahangir’s portraits—displayed in full folio prints—reminded the readers of the privileged status that the Jesuits enjoyed at the Mughal and Qing courts. At the same
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time, by being visual agents of transcultural connections through their function as visual translations for the European readers, these portraits positioned the Jesuit Order as a key “actant” in negotiating the incommensurability of cultures with different visual strategies to define the status of a ruler.  

Before delving into the analysis of the portraits, an overview of the publication of Kircher’s *China Illustrata* helps us understand the context for the production of these prints. In 1668 the *Journal des Scavants* introduced Father Kircher’s book with a statement stressing the author’s serious intention to verify his sources.  

Kircher’s credibility. The German Jesuit and Polymath Athanasius Kircher was a celebrity in seventeenth-century Europe for his encyclopedic knowledge and capacity to produce publications on virtually every field of knowledge. However, being “the most famous, or infamous, of scholars” as Paula Findlen has defined him, Kircher was often criticized for experiments and statements that could not be verified, and for publications that made bold claims based on fabricated evidence. 

Already in 1643 René Descartes had defined him a “charlatan” and, despite Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz’s initial enthusiasm for the Jesuit’s work on China, his reputation was so controversial that in 1677 Kircher’s pupil Gioseffo Petrucci published a book to defend the work of his mentor. The book, printed the same year of the *China Illustrata* and by the same publisher, Joannes Jansson van Waesberge, was part of a campaign to promote and advertise his work on China, and respond to the growing criticism against Kircher.

*China Illustrata*, written towards the end of a prolific career, represented the culmination of long-standing interests and aspirations for Athanasius Kircher. Articulated into six sections, the book covered a breathtaking gamut of topics including religious history, geography, ethnography, and linguistics (with a final chapter devoted to Chinese writing). However, no first-hand knowledge or research informed the writing of the book: even though he asked twice to be sent to China as a missionary, Kircher never left Europe and, after some peregrinations in Germany and France during the first years of his career, he spent most of his life in Rome. He was first appointed Professor of Mathematics at the Jesuit *Collegio Romano*, and later in his career abandoned the teaching activity to devote his entire time to his research and fervent publication activity.

Working from Rome, Kircher drew on previously published texts such as Martino Martini’s *Novus Atlas Sinensis*, published in 1655, Nicolas Trigault’s edition of Matteo Ricci’s journals (1615), and Alvaro Semedo’s *Imperio de la China* (1642). Furthermore, he relied on information provided to him by missionaries that had travelled through Asia and had provided him with manuscript information, objects, and drawings. In the text he acknowledged his debts to fellow Jesuits, such as the Austrian Johannes Grueber, with whom he exchanged many letters throughout the years. However, as Grueber’s letters
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Figure 7. Abu ‘l-Hasan or Dawlat (?), *Portrait of Jahangir*, first half of the seventeenth century. Private Collection. Courtesy of Bonhams.
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mentioned above show, his use of the information provided by those who had first-hand knowledge was often inaccurate, if not intentionally altered.

Notwithstanding the controversial reputation of its author, China Illustrata became a bestseller across the continent, shaping the perception of Asia in late seventeenth- and early eighteenth-century Europe. After the first Latin edition by Joannes Jansson van Waesberge, who had signed a contract with Kircher to have the exclusive publishing rights for all his books, an identical Latin edition was published by Jacob van Meurs in the same year, and soon translated into Dutch and French (1668 and 1670, respectively). Furthermore, parts of the volume were included in John Ogilby’s An Embassy from the East-India Company of the United Provinces, to the Grand Tartar Cham, emperour of China, published in London in 1669.

Illustrations in Kircher’s books were never just decorative elements, nor were they simply subordinate to the text. As Paola von Wyss-Giacosa has observed, Kircher had a remarkable “understanding of the role of the image as an integral part of the cognitive process.” Kircher was therefore thinking along the lines of the naturalist John Ray (1627–1705), who maintained that an illustration has an “advantage of a verbal description that it conveys speedily to the mind with ease & pleasure a clearer & truer Idea of the thing delineated, then the understanding can with much labour & in a long time form to itself in a description, be it never so exact.” Prints, in Kircher’s books, had an epistemological function: rather than simply visually demonstrating a verbal statement, they added extra information, as we will see with the two portraits of Jahangir and Kangxi. Images in Kircher’s books were therefore as important as the material evidence of the museum he assembled at the Collegio Romano, where objects on display articulated narratives of wonder, exoticism, antiquarianism, and science. This was even more evident and true for this specific book, entitled China Monumentis … Illustrata (China Illustrated … with Monuments) (fig. 2), because the sophisticated use of Latin syntax in the title established a hierarchy of words in which the monuments—embodiments of visual and material evidence—occupied a prominent place in the sentence, right after the word “China.”

Furthermore, even if the prints used as illustrations in his books were made by anonymous artists, we can postulate that Kircher himself had a firm control over them. Grueber’s letter, criticizing Kangxi’s portrait, clearly implied that Kircher had orchestrated the iconography of that illustration, and could have changed it—if only he wanted to do so. Kircher’s authority on (and role in) defining the print’s iconography is particularly important for the portraits of Kangxi and Jahangir, especially if we engage in a close reading of these prints representing emperors dwelling in interiors that did not belong to their traditions. How did these images, and the interiors represented in these images, construct visual discourses about royalty?

Both portraits reveal a similar strategy in the reconfiguration of the architectural space and its materiality, and the portrait of Jahangir in particular enables us to reflect on this issue because we know its prototype. A comparison with the original work reveals omissions, additions, and changes that were obviously intentional. Kircher himself explained in China Illustrata that Jahangir’s portrait was based on a painting that had been sent to Rome by
The cartouches with Kircher’s literary portrait of the emperor was clearly inspired by the painting showing Jahangir on a European-style throne and showcasing the cartouches probably occurred because they were considered as a frame by the viewers at the Collegio Romano, and this is particularly important for our argument: once deprived of its frame, this painting was ready to be included into a completely new and implausible larger interior—almost like a quotation in a new context.

The exclusion of the cartouches was not simply an iconographical or formal change; it generated a conceptual shift, situating the protagonist within new narrative threads and adding new elements. Jahangir’s role within the composition—and the narrative that such framework generated—changed: originally occupying almost the entire painting’s surface, in the print he is reduced to time by his servants with an expensive liquid. Near him was a precious vase containing liquid for him to drink in warm weather, or whenever he wanted.”

The chair covered in gold leaf and decorated with floral motifs, the sophisticated garments, the vessels on the floor, as well as the globe held by Jahangir are all equally present in the painting, the print, and the text. At first sight it seems that Kircher had been extremely faithful to his source. After all, this painting showing Jahangir on a European-style throne and showcasing the painter’s command of the three-dimensional space in the positioning of all objects, was visually intelligible for the European viewer. Despite the exotic robes, even some attributes such as the globe seem potentially quite familiar to European observers, who could establish a connection with the imperial orb. This painting was, in other words, a clear attempt to adopt an Occidentalizing visual culture. We might even speculate that this painting’s format and iconography were specifically intended for a European consumption. We know that major global centers such as Amsterdam were significant hubs for the import of art from the Indian subcontinent during the seventeenth century. Furthermore, the rooted and long-standing presence of the Jesuits at the Mughal court had fostered initiatives of artistic exchange, and it is therefore not surprising that this portrait was in Jesuit hands when Kircher was writing China Illustrata.

Heike Franke, in her analysis of the portrait, has noted only one missing element in Kircher’s ekphrastic words and in the print—the cartouches with verses composed by Jahangir on the four edges of the painting—and has highlighted the addition of a dog as well as several attendants. The omission of the cartouches probably occurred because they were considered as a frame by the viewers at the Collegio Romano, and this is particularly important for our argument: once deprived of its frame, this painting was ready to be included into a completely new and implausible larger interior—almost like a quotation in a new context.

The exclusion of the cartouches was not simply an iconographical or formal change; it generated a conceptual shift, situating the protagonist within new narrative threads and adding new elements. Jahangir’s role within the composition—and the narrative that such framework generated—changed: originally occupying almost the entire painting’s surface, in the print he is reduced...
Figure 9. Hyacinthe Rigaud, Portrait of Louis XIV, 1701. Oil on Canvas. Paris, Louvre. Photo: Photo 12/Alamy Stock Photo.

Figure 10. Agostino Tassi, Appointment of Taddeo Barberini as Prefetto of Rome, 1631–1633. Oil on Canvas. Rome, Museo di Roma, MR 5700. © Roma – Sovrintendenza Capitolina ai Beni Culturali, Museo di Roma.

in scale and pushed back to the middle ground, making space for a new interior that evoked a royal palace populated by attendants interacting with Jahangir and among themselves. What was previously an iconic image of the ruler, devoid of specific spatial coordinates, had become a portrait embedded in the narrative space of a courtly palace, where the throne and the baldachin suggested an audience chamber, at least to European viewers.

In such space, and in its materiality, lies a major difference with traditional Mughal painting. Mughal paintings representing Jahangir’s public audience (darbar), such as the one attributed to Manohar and Abu’l Hasan, [fig. 8] show a completely different narrative strategy, a very different articulation of the space, as well as a different materiality of the architecture and the objects populating it. In this painting Jahangir does not sit on a throne, but is positioned in the jharokha (a window framing the emperor during his public appearances), overseeing a courtyard and physically isolated from the attendants. As Ebba Koch has observed in relation to such painted records of the darbar, in these Mughal paintings “architecture is not represented for its own sake, but to provide a frame for the court event.” The architectural framework, systematized by Jahangir’s successors, Shah Jahan, with monumental audience halls covered and decorated with wood, and later with marble, was very different from the one presented in Kircher’s illustrations.

The print made for China Illustrata shows the Emperor sitting on the throne, elevated but still occupying the same room as the attendants. More importantly, instead of being in the jharokha, the Mughal ruler is sitting under a baldachin, the quintessential device defining the ruler in the European tradition. This canopy-like textile structure was ubiquitous in seventeenth-century state apartments, and marked especially important spaces for representational purposes: rulers appeared under a baldachin during official audiences. These textile structures were physically present in the domestic interior and were also often included in state portraits, as Hyacinthe Rigaud’s canonical Portrait of Louis XIV demonstrates. In China Illustrata Jahangir acts in the architectural interior much like Louis xiv, under a baldachin and on an elevated platform covered with a carpet that functions as a floor counterpart to the hanging canopy, generating a space that can only be occupied by the King’s sacred body. Climbing that step and crossing the threshold marked by the carpet and baldachin was simply inconceivable, unless instructed by the ruler to do so. The materiality of the interior, both in the real and in the represented spaces, produced spatial relations and regulated bodily distances that, to the European eye, instantiated social hierarchies.

Similar strategies based on proxemics (the relations between social hierarchies and bodily distances) were also used at the Mughal court to mark the sacred status of the Emperor and establish hierarchies at court. However, they took place in spaces very different from the interior depicted in Kircher’s China Illustrata. For example, a letter in the Jesuit Archive in Toledo shows that a “captain” who used to stand close to Jahangir’s jharokha was humiliated by the Emperor by making him stand below the jharokha for many audiences, and then called closer only during a rainy day, when the ruler received other people below the captain’s rank. This document is extremely important for our argument: it describes how the jharokha functioned in a courtly space.
that was liminal between interior and exterior (with courtiers exposed to the elements, while the ruler and his attendants were sheltered), and shows how the ruler’s space in Kircher’s print was apparently oblivious of it, by transporting Jahangir within the rooms of a palatial interior, sitting on an elaborate chair elevated by a platform, and under a baldachin.

More importantly, this letter proves the intentionality of such misrepresentation of Jahangir’s space. The missive, sent by a Jesuit Father to his superior, was part the Order’s network of knowledge and exchange of information and, along with many other texts, proves that the Jesuits were well aware of Mughal courtly rituals, and had a thorough knowledge of Mughal architecture. The Jesuits had established a regular presence at the Mughal court, and Manohar and Abu’l Hasan’s painting of Jahangir’s Darbar (fig. 8) included the Jesuit missionary Francesco Corsi. By being at the center of such network of information, Athanasius Kircher was certainly well aware of the darbar and its rituals, and yet the Mughal Emperor’s body was transported into a European interior. The choice of avoiding a truthful representation of Jahangir’s court life was, in other words, deliberate.

The baldachin and the platform elevating Jahangir’s chair were not the only elements of interior materiality in the print aimed at configuring the palace’s interior as a familiar architectural space for Kircher’s western audience. The walls are also covered with textiles decorated with floral patterns, repeated in a pattern of vertical bands, and a drawn curtain marks the door on the left, offering a glimpse to another room. Furthermore, the floor and the platform for the chair are also covered by carpets with similar decorative motifs. Such a presence of textiles seems a clear reference to the quintessential tradition that Kircher experienced daily in seventeenth-century Rome: the domestic interior had to be dressed, covered with textiles in order to be viewed in public.\(^\text{44}\) No portion of bare walls is visible in the print, and the entire interior is wrapped by wall hangings that cover the architectural structure and enshrine the space in an extremely expensive—and therefore socially distinctive—textile medium that marked the material experience of seventeenth-century European interiors.\(^\text{50}\) More importantly, this letter proves the intentionality of such misrepresentation of Jahangir’s space. The missive, sent by a Jesuit Father to his superior, was part the Order’s network of knowledge and exchange of information and, along with many other texts, proves that the Jesuits were well aware of Mughal courtly rituals, and had a thorough knowledge of Mughal architecture. The Jesuits had established a regular presence at the Mughal court, and Manohar and Abu’l Hasan’s painting of Jahangir’s Darbar (fig. 8) included the Jesuit missionary Francesco Corsi. By being at the center of such network of information, Athanasius Kircher was certainly well aware of the darbar and its rituals, and yet the Mughal Emperor’s body was transported into a European interior. The choice of avoiding a truthful representation of Jahangir’s court life was, in other words, deliberate.

The interior of the illustration in China Illustrata is quite complex, since a drawn curtain on the left shows a second room, also covered with wall hangings, where two attendants observe the central scene from a distance—separated from the protagonists, in a different space, just like us. The separation is marked by a balustrade, another device that establishes tangible boundaries between spaces that could be crossed according to the social rank.

This manifold interior space, where physical obstacles become indexes of social status and devices to socially activate the space, is very different from the interior-exterior space of the darbar described above. It rather functions along the lines of the courtly space illustrated in the Gobelin tapestry showing Louis xiv’s Audience with Cardinal Chigi.\(^\text{52}\) Made in 1665–1672, this tapestry is almost contemporary to Kircher’s print. It shows the king in profile, sitting on a throne and...
in front of his baldachin bed, on a carpet slightly elevated on a platform, where
the ambassador has been admitted because he represents the Pope. Moreover, a
balustrade provides a physical obstacle separating the King and the Ambassador
from the crowd of attendants. Even if mixed in slightly different order, these are
the elements of interior materiality that appear in Kircher’s print.

Now that we have considered the complexity
of the print’s spatial representation, we can also
further reflect on how both space and perspec
tive—added by the artist working for Athanasius
Kircher—did not simply epitomize a stylistic trans
lation into Western visual culture; rather, they
produced a semantic variance. In other words, the
perspectival representation of space in the print
became a means to make space, to generate the inter-
ior where Jahangir and his attendants perform. And
although their garments were still a mark of alter-
ty, the architectural interior and the way the figures
interact with the things populating the space were,
ultimately, a reflection of a seventeenth-century
European palace.

A similar narrative emerges from the portrait of
the Kangxi Emperor, a print where the interior and
its materiality convey ideas of wealth, as well as of
courty rituals regulating the life of the palace. We
can assume that Kircher did not have an original
image to use as inspiration for this print, other-
wise Johannes Grueber would have referred to it in the correspondence (if not
Kircher himself in China Illustrata). Indeed, if Kircher’s paragraph on Jahangir
quoted above showcased a close relation to the image, no similar description
of the print was included in China Illustrata. Without an image to describe, the
Jesuit simply referred vaguely to courtly rituals such as those of the attendants
in front of the throne: “Those admitted to the king’s presence stand before the
throne with their arms at their sides, since the Tartars think it is wrong to look
at His Majesty or to move the hands or feet, which would be an insult.”

This passage doesn’t bear any real relation to the print, except, as we will see, the
reference to avoiding any eye contact with the emperor. It even contradicts the
image, where attendants are shown sitting on cushions in front of the Emperor,
in the background of the print, instead of standing as Kircher explained. This
discrepancy further confirms that Kircher penned the text without an image
in mind, and probably only at a later stage decided to commission a portrait of
Kangxi to be included in his book.

Kangxi performs like a European ruler in the illustration for China Illustrata
that Grueber criticized so overtly. Engaging the viewer with a kind gaze and
a smile, arm akimbo and walking stick in his right hand, the young Chinese
emperor seems to mirror Charles I at the Hunt in the famous portrait by Anthony
van Dyck. This seemingly informal and approachable ruler, identi-
fied by the inscription in the cartouche as the “supreme monarch of the
Figure 13. Anonymous Qing Dynasty Court Painter, Portrait of the Kangxi Emperor in Court Dress, late Kangxi period. Hanging scroll, colour on silk. Beijing, The Palace Museum. Photo: Album/Alamy Stock Photo.

Figure 14. Athanasius Kircher, China Illustrata, 1667, frontispiece. Photo: New York Public Library Digital Collections.
Sino-Tartar empire” and accompanied by the same dog that was included in Jahangir’s portrait, is nonetheless wearing robes that convey his status, especially by showing the dragon on the chest of the emperor. Even if the garments are not accurate, as comparisons with Chinese paintings demonstrate, \[ \text{fig. 13} \] Kircher described at length and in various parts of the book the dragon as a symbol of both secular and religious power in China.\[55\]

The spatial organization of the composition functions as a narrative strategy in this print, since Kangxi appears twice in a sequence of two rooms: the complex architectural interior becomes a device for a *mise-en-abyme* of the emperor that multiplies and complicates his iconographical presence. He is standing in the foreground, and in the background we find a much more formal and ritualized iconography, with Kangxi sitting under a baldachin with drawn curtains, elevated by three steps and surrounded by five attendants that seem to have their gazes directed towards the floor—the only element in common with the text cited above.

Once again, the agency of the interior’s materiality is crucial to define Kangxi as an emperor for Kircher’s European readership. In the foreground, the emperor is standing by a column, an obvious reference to power, and his presence is revealed by a drawn curtain—a quintessentially baroque compositional strategy that was ubiquitous in state portraits and is epitomized by the above-mentioned portrait of Louis XIV (fig. 9).\[56\] Textiles are, as in Jahangir’s portrait, omnipresent, with a curtain decorated with floral motifs that forms a backdrop for Kangxi and a cushion partially visible on the left, behind the emperor. The balustrade—almost identical to the one in Jahangir’s portrait, demonstrating how the artist used the same elements in both prints—separates the scene in the foreground from the one in the background, where textiles cover all architectural surfaces.

As it happened with Jahangir’s portrait, the baldachin does not correspond to any Chinese traditional object. It is, indeed, a purely European baldachin with all the typical elements: the elevation above the floor, the use of textiles, and even the presence of a stylized sun in its ceiling. This iconographical detail duplicates the sun in the room’s ceiling, thus configuring the baldachin as a micro-architecture within the room’s architecture, and at the same time isolating the ruler in his own sacred and ritual space, just like any European king. Moreover, the presence of the sun would have looked familiar to any viewer in seventeenth-century Rome—the place where Kircher wrote his *China Illustrata*—since the ceiling of the baldachin was often called “cielo” (sky) in archival documents describing such objects.\[57\]

Johannes Grueber’s comment on this print—a potential insult for an emperor who would not have recognized himself in this image—was probably not surprising for Athanasius Kircher, who certainly knew that the iconography and narrative were not faithful to any contemporary Chinese representation of Kangxi. Even if obtaining an image of Kangxi in late seventeenth-century Europe was not easy, as Marco Musillo has recently demonstrated,\[58\] descriptions of the emperor’s court and its rituals were well known in Europe, and especially among Jesuit networks. Kangxi had welcomed Jesuit priests at his court, and the missionary and astronomer Johann Adam Shall von Bell (1551–1666) had, notably, achieved a high social status and became

---


Kircher was well aware of this, and extensively celebrated Shall von Bell in *China Illustrata*, with images and words: he included two portraits of the fellow Jesuits, in the frontispiece of the book [fig. 14] and as a full-page illustration. If the Jesuits knew so much about the Chinese imperial court, what was the reason for Kircher’s inaccuracies? I argue that these were not mere mistakes, or naïve misrepresentations of exotic rulers. As with the portrait of Jahangir, Athanasius Kircher made an attempt to translate potentially illegible or misleading iconographies, rituals, and garments that articulated rulers’ sacrality in terms that could have been difficult to grasp for a European audience.

The concept of translation can be extremely relevant for images that aimed to articulate knowledge about foreign cultures, such as these ones included in Kircher’s *China Illustrata*. By reflecting on how these images reinterpreted foreign cultural frameworks, conventions, and knowledge, we can better address their epistemological intention and validity. Much work has been done in terms of exploring translations of texts in the early modern global world, and especially studies conducted by Peter Burke and R. Po Cha Hsia have cast fresh light on how European cultures translated (and therefore construed, or manipulated) foreign cultures on a global scale. Umberto Eco argued that translations always entail varying degrees of “negotiation” that inevitably have an impact on the meaning of the message, and reminded us that a successful translator must, in some circumstances, be “literally unfaithful” to the original text. Reflecting on Eco’s arguments and on the potentially controversial issue of faithfulness, Peter Burke highlighted how translators “learn to live with a dilemma: should they be faithful to the original text from which they are translating, or intelligible to the readers of the text they are writing?” Transcultural exchanges, in other words, always entail a shift in vocabulary and a semantic negotiation.

If we consider these two images as acts of translation, then we can better frame the disagreement between Grueber and Kircher discussed at the beginning of this essay as a divergence of opinion on the translator’s dilemma posed by Peter Burke. Spectatorship lay at the core of this dispute between the two Jesuits: while Grueber understood the print in relation to Qing canons of portraiture, Kircher conceived it as an illustration within a book intended for a European public. Therefore, the motives and the strategies that led Kircher to instruct the printmaker to situate Jahangir and Kangxi within European interiors were connected to the objectives of translating the social performance of rulership in European terms.

If we consider Kircher’s readership—a European public reading in Latin, French, Dutch, and English—these images were sophisticated ways to represent rulers to convey their status as Emperors. Images completely faithful to the actual rituals, costumes, and architectural interiors would have conveyed notions of alterity and exoticism, but would have probably been less effective in articulating a visual and material vocabulary of power and social status. What would the European viewers think of Jahangir’s bare feet, without Kircher’s explanation in the text discussed above, and without a context reassuring them of the emperor’s status as powerful and—no less important—well-mannered ruler? Kircher’s text played a crucial role in clarifying this
Figure 15. Anonymous, Johann Adam Schall von Bell, 1667. Engraving. From Athanasius Kircher, China Illustrata. Photo: New York Public Library Digital Collections.

Figure 16. Anonymous, Abbas II of Persia, 1634. Engraving, from Thomas Herbert, A relation of some yeares travaile, begunne anno 1626. Photo: Wellcome Library.
specific detail, but prints were often observed independently from the text and it was imperative, for their legibility, to function without the exegetical support of verbal statements.

The two prints explored in this essay are certainly not isolated episodes. On the contrary, they belong to a widespread tradition of representations of non-European rulers and dignitaries that early modern Western artists re-invented according to Western iconographical parameters. The portrait of Abbas I of Persia (1571–1629), included in Thomas Herbert’s A Relation of Some Years Travaile, Begunne Anno 1626, is a case in point, | fig. 16 | with the ruler represented in profile, arm akimbo, riding a rampant horse and wielding a sword.67 The print, rather than providing a credible image of Safavid Persia, was clearly reminiscent of the long-standing western tradition of equestrian monuments and—more precisely—provided Thomas Herbert’s readers with an eloquent allusion to the many painted and sculptural equestrian monuments that became so popular in early seventeenth-century Europe, from the Gibbolognesque tradition in Italy, France and Spain, to Rubens’s and Van Dyck’s equestrian portraits in Spain and England.68

The European tradition of state portraiture provided parameters of interpretation, highly developed theoretical frameworks, and a widely accepted system of iconographical conventions for the representation of rulers—in other words, a visual vocabulary shared by most of the European courts, where monarchs, state officials, and ambassadors acted according to a choreography of rhetorical gestures, wore semantically charged garments, and followed a rigorously ritualized etiquette.69

In the two portraits of Jahangir and Kangxi, the interiors and their materiality played a crucial role in instantiating the palace’s magnificence and in regulating social rituals. Textiles dressed the walls, baldachins provided micro-architectures for the sacred body of the ruler, balustrades organized space, decoration articulated a wide gamut of narratives. The palace was a space where the interaction between people and things defined hierarchies and produced a framework for social distinction. The portraits of Jahangir and Kangxi show how Kircher attempted to transport these two rulers into such framework.

Such interiors responded to (and even anticipated) viewers’ expectations, and enabled Kircher’s readers to imagine these rulers, to construe them as powerful emperors. The things that populated such interiors—baldachins, wall hangings, thrones, balustrades, carpets—became primary agents of translations and, therefore “acts that produced commensurability” across cultures.70 Moreover, the tension between the material culture of Westernizing interiors and the Asian rulers inhabiting them became a key agent regulating the oscillations between inventing exoticism and imagining familiarity. ¶
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