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ABSTRACT
This working paper examines seven Ottoman silk velvets in the collection of the Doris Duke Foundation for Islamic Art. The first part of the essay investigates how the textiles were used in their primary contexts during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. It then moves on to consider their use in the twentieth century—namely by Doris Duke as she realized her vision for Shangri La. The second and longer portion of the paper considers how the textiles were produced. The seven objects are unified by some material and aesthetic features, but they also exemplify the range found in a single category of object. This section also provides comparanda and dating for the textiles, and places them in the larger continuum of Ottoman silk weaving.
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This paper provides an overview of ten Ottoman silk fabrics that Doris Duke (1912–93) purchased to furnish Shangri La, her property on Black Point in Honolulu. The fabrics—all made for use as upholstery—were destined for display in her house: photographs taken during Duke’s lifetime illustrate their respective places in the Damascus, Syrian, and Mihrab rooms (fig. 1). At Shangri La, then as now, the textiles were most often used as backdrops for other objects, and the recent reinstallation of the Damascus Room, as well as the current arrangements in the Syrian and Mihrab rooms, are very much in keeping with Duke’s own choices about the display of her textiles. At the same time, the textiles themselves manifest not only the collector’s preference, but also the state of the art market during the mid-twentieth century. Most of all, though, the textiles are objects of art and craft, and deserve careful consideration on their own merits.

Fig. 1: The Damascus Room as installed at Shangri La, no earlier than 1962; visible in the wall vitrine is cushion cover 83.6.1 or 83.6.2 (see figs. 7–8). Shangri La Historical Archives, Doris Duke Foundation for Islamic Art, Honolulu, Hawai‘i.

In discussing the Doris Duke Foundation for Islamic Art (DDFIA) collection of Ottoman textiles, which span the years between ca. 1600 and ca. 1900, this paper focuses on seven velvets from the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries and three matching cushion covers from the late eighteenth century, also made of voided and brocaded silk velvet; all are most probably from the city of Bursa.¹ The textiles are united

Author’s note: This paper builds upon the author’s residency at Shangri La during summer 2012. I thank Dr. Keelan Overton of Shangri La for all of her help during my residency, and for her able editorial assistance after the fact. Dawn Sueoka, the Shangri La archivist, was also very prompt and helpful with all the relevant documentation of Duke’s travels and acquisitions. Ann Svenson, consulting textile conservator, was also extraordinarily generous with her expertise and insights. Deborah Pope, Carol Khewhok, and Jamie Mejia are also thanked for their kind attention.

Note to reader: Unless preceded by a repository name, all accession numbers are in reference to objects in the collection of the Doris Duke Foundation for Islamic Art (DDFIA).

by their technical features and their silk and gold components, as well as by their place of production in the Ottoman Empire in the early modern period. As a group, even this relatively small number of silks presents an instructive selection from the wide range of luxury textiles made in the eastern Mediterranean; though they are all unmistakeably Ottoman, each or each group also suggests the diversity of tastes and fashion, as well as other changes across time and place.

This paper is most interested in the structural and material features of the textiles, which will be taken up in detail. But consumption drives production, at least in some cases, and for this reason, the paper starts by considering how Ottoman subjects used luxury textiles in their homes and speculating about the styles and formats that passed into and out of fashion in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The purchase and display of the same silks in the twentieth century—by Duke and other collectors—is another facet of a similar type of luxury consumption. The first section, therefore, places the textiles in the context of Shangri La, as well as in that of Ottoman subjects and their homes. The second, and longer, part of the paper groups the objects by date and place, providing comparanda and explaining how they partake of the complexities of weaving and the silk industry in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

THE TEXTILES AT HOME IN THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE, AND IN SHANGRI LA’S DAMASCUS AND SYRIAN ROOMS DURING THE 1950s, 1980s, AND IN 2012

Duke’s decision to display the textiles in a domestic setting brings the objects back to their primary contexts: they were almost certainly intended for use as upholstery from the moment of their production and subsequent sale. Cushions, bolsters, mattress- and quilt-covers—as well as wall hangings, door and window curtains, and hearth-screens—all featured in the residences of wealthy Ottoman subjects, and some of the most beautiful and most sumptuous were made of figured silk—that is, silk woven with motifs more complex than simple stripes or checks. Inheritance inventories made between the sixteenth and eighteenth centuries indicate the enduring appeal of decorative textiles, and velvets most especially. Although silks from France, Florence, and Venice are found in the records, those from the city of Bursa, a main weaving center, were equally popular, and became more so as the centuries progressed.

1 Several more Ottoman voided and brocaded velvet furnishing fabrics are found in the collection, namely six identical crimson textiles from the nineteenth century (83.32.1–6) and five panels of velvet probably also from the nineteenth century (83.1.1–5). Two panels of brocaded lampas, probably from late sixteenth-century Bursa (83.12, 83.30), and a somewhat different brocaded lampas, probably from Ottoman Chios (Sakız Adası) (83.37), are also in the collection, and are only briefly considered here. Duke’s Ottoman carpets, clothing, and embroideries—mostly from the nineteenth century—are left aside for the moment, in the expectation that they will be the subject of further research; these include a ca. seventeenth–eighteenth century boğça (85.50); two Ottoman women’s velvet dresses embroidered with metal thread, probably Bursa, late nineteenth–twentieth century, in the hundred branches style (bindalli) (86.100, 86.101); two satin panels embroidered with metal thread, one with inscriptions, late nineteenth century (85.31, 85.111); and four knotted wool pile carpets, late nineteenth century (81.10, 81.11, 81.15, 81.51).
3 As in most regions during this time, textiles were the main objects with which people filled their homes; wood or metal furniture was comparatively rare.
Ottoman Silks in the Ottoman Empire

Silks were by no means inexpensive, and even the plainest remained out of reach for a very large proportion of Ottoman subjects. However, at the same time, to answer a broad demand for luxury textiles, and for velvets especially, weavers were able to make economizations in some of their practices, and to offer textiles for those with shallower pockets. Equally important, the established appeal of the silks, which were crimson and gold with elegant and distinctive motifs, ensured a ready market; the weavers were guaranteed that their goods would sell. Inventory lists from the Ottoman cities of Istanbul and Edirne, made between 1600 and 1800, suggest that silk upholstery velvets were a principle feature of the Ottoman home. Manuscript paintings, too, show the readily recognizable Bursa velvets lining the back of the sedir, the long, low bench along the walls of the residences of the wealthy. The visibility of these cushions, in fact, plays a large role in their popularity, as we shall see.

The balance of supply and demand, disruptions to the silk trade with Iran, general economic pressure on all segments of the Ottoman population, and shifts in fashion and taste all played roles in the changing nature of silk weaving between about 1600 and 1800. As a group, the DDFIA silks illustrate some of the most significant changes. The first is the establishment of an iconic style often referred to as “classical Ottoman,” which is represented in three of the DDFIA çatma (voided and brocaded velvet—I will use the Ottoman term from here): two quilt faces or sitting cloths (sing. maq’ad, pl. maq’adlar) (83.3, 83.5) and a length (83.16) (figs. 2, 3, and 4). Their respective sun burst–like roundels, floral hexagons filled with tulips and carnations, and carnations arranged in an ogival lattice are unmistakeably Ottoman, as are their palettes and formats; the textiles exemplify what is sometimes termed the “canonical” style of the late sixteenth and first several decades of the seventeenth centuries. These three çatmas share much in common with the bold motifs found in contemporary architectural tilework, leatherwork, book illumination, metalwork, and other arts; the iconic elements were used most often in

---

4 The sedir served as the main furnishing; it was used for sitting during the day, and for sleeping at night, the change effected by a switch in pillows, mattresses, and coverings. The best representation of this is in a 1728 copy of the Hamse (Five Works) of Nevizade Ataî, now in the Topkapi Palace Library, H.2392. This author’s dissertation, about silk velvet upholstery, looks at the use of textiles in the home and how its consumption drove production: Amanda Phillips, Weaving as Livelihood, Style as Status: Ottoman Velvet in a Social and Economic Context, 1600–1750 (Oxford: University of Oxford, 2011).

5 Voided and brocaded velvet, the structure of which is discussed in detail below, could be used, of course, for other purposes: horse-trappings, for instance. Its relatively stiff and heavy nature made it less suitable for clothing, though examples of kaftans and over-kaftans exist (consider Topkapi Palace Musuem, 1). Quite a bit of çatma was put to use in the Russian court: to cover a saddle (State Historical Preserve, Moscow Kremlin, TK-213), to cover a book (State Historical Preserve, Moscow Kremlin, KN-33), as altar covers (State Historical Preserve, Moscow Kremlin, TK-2802; Sergiev-Posad Museum Preserve, Zagorsk, 405), and to make copes, dalmatics, or other ecclesiatical garments (Sergiev-Posad Museum Preserve, 2284, 2287, and 2404). All of these are illustrated in Atasoy et al., IPEK.

regular and geometric formats—rows and columns—or in mirror symmetry. Much has been made of the court-driven impetus for this style, and for its popularity all over the Empire, and indeed, the three DDFIA examples are related to the style of Istanbul and its rulers.

Fig. 2: Portion of a quilt facing, summer carpet, or mattress cover, Turkey, Bursa, first half of the seventeenth century, voided and brocaded silk velvet (çatma). Doris Duke Foundation for Islamic Art, Honolulu, Hawai‘i, 83.3, on view in the Syrian Room. (Photo: David Franzen, 2012.)
Fig. 3: Portion of a sitting cloth (maq’ad), Turkey, Bursa, first half of the seventeenth century, voided and brocaded silk velvet (çatma). Doris Duke Foundation for Islamic Art, Honolulu, Hawai’i, 83.5, on view in the Damascus Room. (Photo: David Franzen, 2005.)

Fig. 4: Length, Turkey, possibly Bursa, first half of the seventeenth century, voided and brocaded silk velvet (çatma). Doris Duke Foundation for Islamic Art, Honolulu, Hawai’i, 83.16, on view in the Mihrab Room. (Photo: David Franzen, 2010.)
But in the seventeenth century, the bold motifs found in 83.3, 83.5, and 83.16 gave way to centrally planned formats. DDFIA 83.2 and 83.17 (figs. 5 and 6), both cushion covers, share their palette and some motifs with the *maq’ads* (sitting cloths) or quilt faces and the length discussed above. Their overall style—the dimensions, palette, and the end finishes—is certainly Ottoman, but the elegant scalloped medallions are less assertively so than the all-over motifs found in 83.3 and 83.5. The trefoil finials, the sinuous spandrels, and the general style are part of a wider Mediterranean phenomenon that extended, even, to Iran. Bookbindings, carpets, and other media from the Mamluk Levant, Timurid and Safavid Iran, and even Italy also shared some of these features. In fact, from some point around the middle of the seventeenth century, the medallion style would almost entirely take over in the Ottoman cushion cover format, as seen in DDFIA 83.6.1 and 83.6.2 (figs. 7 and 8). Perhaps the style’s appeal to Ottoman subjects distant from Istanbul factored in its popularity, an idea further considered below.⁷ At the same time that the centrally planned format took over, the cushion covers themselves took over, as we shall also see below.

---

**Fig. 5:** Cushion cover, Turkey, Bursa, seventeenth century, voided and brocaded silk velvet (*çatma*). Doris Duke Foundation for Islamic Art, Honolulu, Hawai‘i, 83.2, on view in the Syrian Room. (*Photo: David Franzen, 2012.*)

---

⁷ Thanks to Dr. Overton of the DDFIA for this insight, which has broad implications for the conceptualization of Empire-wide taste.
Fig. 6: Cushion cover, Turkey, Bursa, ca. 1640, voided and brocaded silk velvet (çatma). Doris Duke Foundation for Islamic Art, Honolulu, Hawai‘i, 83.17, on view in the Mihrab Room. (Photo: David Franzen, 2012.)

Fig. 7: Cushion cover, Turkey, Bursa, ca. 1640, voided and brocaded silk velvet (çatma). Doris Duke Foundation for Islamic Art, Honolulu, Hawai‘i, 83.6.1, on view in the Damascus Room. (Photo: Ann Svenson, 2012.)
Fig. 8: Cushion cover, Turkey, Bursa, ca. 1640, voided and brocaded silk velvet (çatma). Doris Duke Foundation for Islamic Art, Honolulu, Hawai‘i, 83.6.2, on view in the Damascus Room. (Photo: Ann Svenson, 2012.)

Three more cushion covers—DDFIA 83.7.1–3—exemplify both the dominance of the centrally planned format and another shift in aesthetics (fig. 9). The most notable difference is in color: wine red and deep blue on a background of silver brocade. The motifs, too, have undergone a sea change; the end finishes and main borders are larger but less defined and encroach on the main field, and the subtle scallops and rosettes have given way to curving and arrow-straight rays emanating from a small and simple central oval. These three covers, which were almost certainly woven on the same loom and sold as a set, are probably from the decades after the turn of the nineteenth century. They reflect a new aesthetic, which is less formally symmetrical and less driven by discrete forms, and which has shed most of the canonical Ottoman motifs, such as the tulip, roundel, carnation, and rosebud. In their stead, the cushions employ petite palmettes, scrollwork, and lotus leaf-like shapes. While the weavers in Bursa were surely aware of these changes, and may have even initiated some of them, this type of çatma cushion is most often associated with the neighborhood of Üsküdar, on the Asian side of Istanbul, where a çatma cushion-making workshop was located in the foundations attached to the Ayazma Mosque. This provenance gave rise to the “Scutari” label for çatma cushions; in the European and North American markets, it would be attached to all velvets in this format, as we shall see below.

---

8 Sadi Bayram and Adnan Tüzün, "İstanbul Üsküdar Ayazma Camii ve Ayazma Camii İnşaat Defteri," Vakıflar Dergisi XXII (1991): 199–288. This type of textile is also attributed to Hereke, as discussed below.
During the eighteenth century, it was not only the style of Ottoman textiles that shifted, but also their formats and perhaps their function as well. As noted briefly above, the production of çatma in quilt, sitting cloth, and length formats seems to have declined or ceased entirely, while cushions remained popular among those who could afford them. A tragic testament to their far-reaching fame comes from Syria: a merchant travelling to Aleppo in 1782 was ambushed just outside the city; he lost his life, as well as a saddle bag full of Bursa-style cushion covers—likely made of çatma. The waning of the other çatma formats contrasted with the continued production and ownership of çatma cushion covers is more neatly summed up in an inventory list made for a man named el-Hac Ibrahim Ağa ibn Süleyman who died in the Eyüp neighborhood of Istanbul in 1790. He left three sets of leaning cushions (sing. yastık, pl. yastıklar), sitting pillows (sing. minder, pl. minderler), and sitting clothes—only the leaning cushions were çatma, while the other objects were wool broadcloth (çuha).³⁰

---

Extant cushion covers datable to the last years of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries also may reflect some of the economic hardships that impacted the weavers and silk industry, as well as the ability of consumers to afford luxury textiles. Severe disruptions in the trade of Iranian silk, an increasing sale of reeled silk (silk filaments unraveled from cocoons and reeled onto spindles) to the looms in Europe (which meant less silk available to Ottoman weavers), and general inflation and currency devaluations all took their toll. However, in 1841, Sultan Abdülmecid founded a manufactury for textiles and carpets in the small city of Hereke, on the Marmara Sea. It used new steam machines for reeling and for some weaving, and its primary goal was to re-interpret older Ottoman styles for the Dolmabahçe Palace, the new royal residence. The textiles were reserved for palace use, although they were exhibited at World’s Exhibitions and Fairs by the end of the century, as well as in Ottoman industrial expositions and fairs. Two velvet cushion covers made for Sultan Abdülhamid (r. 1876–1909) use a deep green field with scattered stars and a large crescent moon as a main motif. This heralds a new style, but an Ottoman style nonetheless. Similarly, although the three “Scutari” cushions at Shangri La were made in a new fashion to suit a different taste than that of the earlier çatma examples, they are still emphatically Ottoman, sharing features with architectural decoration of the period and using centrally planned arrangements with wide borders and the suggestion of end finishes.

The definition of any and all Ottoman styles necessitates an exclusion of objects, formats, styles, palettes, and technical features that do not fit the paradigm, however flexible. The last textile considered here, DDFIA 83.18, is a seventeenth-century velvet in a centrally planned format similar to that of the cushion covers (83.2, 83.17, 83.6.1–2) (fig. 10). However, several factors immediately cast doubt upon an Ottoman attribution. It is solid pile velvet, rather than voided, and uses three colors of velvet warps. These features are not entirely unknown to Ottoman velvets, but they are comparatively rare. The aubergine, yellow, and green palette is also somewhat outside the seventeenth-century Ottoman preference for crimsons, greens, and blues. Equally important are the motifs, which are at once more plump and graceful than those of the Ottoman velvets; the blossoms and the delicate forms within the medallion are also well outside the usual repertoire. For these reasons, this velvet should probably be attributed to either Safavid Persia or to Mughal India. The object was exhibited at the Persian Exhibition in Philadelphia in 1926, which might suggest a Persian attribution; however, several of the DDFIA Ottoman textiles were also displayed there. With the 1926 exhibition as a link, we now turn to the textiles’ twentieth-century history.

---

13 Two cushions are extant, one in the Topkapı Palace Museum (13-986) and the other at the Sadberk Hanım Museum in Istanbul (2540 D 81). They are illustrated, respectively, in Hülya Tezcan and Sumiyo Okumura, Textile Furnishings from the Topkapı Palace Museum (Istanbul: Vehbi Koç Vakfı, 2007); and Hülya Bilgi, Çatma and Kemha: Ottoman Silk Textiles (Istanbul: Sadberk Hanım Museum, 2007).
14 Atasoy et al., İPEK, 222, for three-color velvets. The production of figured solid pile velvets, which is small, endures until the late sixteenth or early seventeenth century but no longer.
The Textiles at Shangri La in the 1950s, 1990s, and in 2012

The history of Duke’s acquisition of the architectural elements that form the Damascus and Syrian rooms at Shangri La provides an example of the twentieth-century context for the consumption of Ottoman velvets in North America. Duke’s Honolulu home—the design, building, and decoration of which had a strong initial impetus from her travels in India and Iran, in particular—also used elements from the Mediterranean.15 In 1952–53, Duke purchased late-eighteenth-century wood panelling in the ‘ajami technique (a raised surface of gypsum and animal glue, embellished with metal leaf covered in translucent colored glazes, and further painted and gilded) originally from a Damascus house (or houses) from the firm of Asfar & Sarkis, based in Damascus and Beirut; this panelling would become the Damascus Room at Shangri La.16 Duke travelled to Syria in 1952 and 1953, almost certainly to view the panelling and perhaps to discuss its restoration and installation, as well as to make other purchases.17 In 1954 and 1955, news about the panelling’s restoration in Damascus and shipment to Honolulu occupied much of the

---

16 For further information on the Damascus Room’s provenance, retrofitting, furnishings, and conservation, please see the papers presented by Overton, McGinn, Severson, Svenson, and the author at the June 2012 colloquium held at Shangri La, “The Damascus Room in Context: Acquisition, Furnishings and Conservation.” Papers are available at http://www.shangrilahawaii.org/Cultural-Programs/Symposia/Damascus-Rm-Colloquium/.
17 The DDFIA and author are grateful to Mary Samouelian, Doris Duke Collection Archivist at Duke University, for recently providing access to archives that confirm Duke’s travels to Syria in both 1952 and 1953, among other important details about the Damascus Room.
correspondence between Duke and the firm of Asfar & Sarkis. At the same time, Hagop Kevorkian, an archaeologist, scholar, and collector of a wide variety of art and artifacts from the Middle East, sent Duke a photo of the Nur al-Din room (now the Damascus Room at the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York) in situ in Damascus. Although Duke did not purchase Kevorkian’s panels in 1954, she must have continued thinking about the furnishings for her own newly acquired Damascus Room. In the summer of the same year, a letter from George Owayshek, who was in charge of carpets and textiles at Asfar & Sarkis, mentions the delivery of a brocade, as well as “the four enameled lamps, the little square table and the ten stands for trays” that Duke probably intended to use in the Damascus Room.

The Ottoman textiles that Duke selected for the Damascus Room, however, came from no further than New York, though they were also almost certainly purchased with the Damascus Room in mind. In October of 1953, presumably just as Duke left for Syria, the Parke-Bernet Galleries on Madison Avenue auctioned part of the Kelekian Collection of Antiquities in a three-day-long sale. Duke purchased a quantity of textiles there, as well as numerous other objects (fig. 11). The invoice of her purchases lists fourteen lots

---

18 Hagop Kevorkian (d. 1962) excavated in Turkey and Iran from the beginning of the twentieth century until around the 1930s. He purchased, and sold, a great deal of art during the 1920s. He is responsible for the Metropolitan’s acquisition of the “Nur al-Din Room in 1970 via the eponymous Hagop Kevorkian Fund. Although Duke’s interest in Damascene interiors was further piqued by the photo that Kevorkian sent her in 1954 of the Nur al-Din Room, she did not purchase the interior’s pair of vertical fruit/floral panels (64.17.1–2) until the late 1970s. From New York, they travelled to Rough Point—Duke’s residence in Newport, Rhode Island—where they were restored. They were then shipped to Honolulu in February 1979 and subsequently installed in the “Turkish Room” (now known as the Syrian Room), where they remain on view today. This provenance is based on the ongoing collaborative research efforts of Mecka Baumeister and Beth Edelstein (Metropolitan Museum of Art), Anke Scharrahs (conservator in private practice, Dresden), Keelan Overton, and Dawn Sueoka; a publication is forthcoming.

19 See footnote above.

20 Letter from George Owayshek to Doris Duke, August 8, 1954, Doris Duke Papers on the Shangri La Residence, Doris Duke Charitable Foundation Historical Archives, David M. Rubenstein Rare Book & Manuscript Library, Duke University (hereafter DDCFHA). Owayshek was the assistant in charge of carpets—and manager and right-hand man—in Damascus and then in Beirut, to which he also emigrated with the Asfar and Sarkis families. He remained with the firm until it closed. Correspondence from Naji Asfar, Beirut, to Keelan Overton, May 2012 (the DDFIA is grateful to Naji Asfar for this information). The four hanging lamps (44.3.1–4), as well as some of the tray stands (likely 65.6.1–5), were indeed used by Duke in her Damascus Room, as confirmed by photographs dating to the late 1950s and 1960s.

21 Invoice from Parke-Bernet, October 23, 1953, DDFIA. Dikran Kelekian (d. 1951) was an art dealer and a major collector of decorative and fine art from the Middle East and Southern Europe. He was also a major advocate for contemporary Iranian art and craft, participating in several world expositions. He lent objects from his own collection to several world’s fairs and to the 1926 Persian Exhibition in Philadelphia, which was curated by Arthur Upham Pope (d. 1969). Pope would go on to advise Duke about the furnishing and design of Shangri La, both old and new; see Overton, “From Pahlavi Isfahan.” Returning to Kelekian’s collection, its sale would have been a major event and attracted collectors, connoisseurs, and scholars from all over the world.

22 At the sale, Duke also purchased a glass rosewater sprinkler (probably 47.91, Iran, twelfth century) and many ceramic vessels, including three late sixteenth-century Iznik dishes (48.25, 48.31, 48.35), three Safavid-period monochrome-glazed dishes (48.27, 48.29, 48.30), and two Safavid blue and white dishes (48.60, 48.61). She also purchased an important Syrian tile panel (48.70) and ten Persian and Arabic manuscripts (a notable flurry of acquisition given that her collection includes just eighteen manuscripts). Several of the portable Persian and Turkish glass and ceramic objects appear in photographs of the
of textiles comprising twenty-six items with various European and Middle Eastern origins. All but one were intended for Honolulu, indicated by pencil marks on the invoice itself. Of the Ottoman and other Islamic textiles at Shangri La, several may be matched to the goods listed on the invoice, thanks to a set of handwritten notecards describing several of the lots. At the October sale, Duke purchased all of the Ottoman çatmas: the cushion covers (83.2, 83.17, 83.6.1 and 83.6.2, 83.7.1–3), the two quilt faces or sitting clothes (83.5, 83.3), and the length (83.16). She also bought two pieces of an Ottoman figured crimson silk in lampas-weave, both probably from the later sixteenth century and from Bursa or Istanbul (83.12 and 83.30), and another lampas, probably made on the island of Chios during the seventeenth or eighteenth century (83.37). Five lengths of gold and white voided velvet (83.1.1–5), most likely Ottoman and probably datable to the nineteenth century, seem to be the latest of the objects she acquired at the 1953 sale. Duke also bought two “table covers” described as “French for the Eastern Market” and European silks, including velvets from Italy and Portugal, a length of Italian brocatelle, and several other pieces.

Fig. 11: Historic vitrine of the Damascus Room, no earlier than 1962; on display are several Iznik ceramics purchased at Parke-Bernet in October 1953, as well as 83.7.1–3 (see fig. 9). Shangri La Historical Archives, Doris Duke Foundation for Islamic Art, Honolulu, Hawai‘i.
Of the Ottoman velvets, the most expensive was the one with the roundels (83.3; see fig. 2), which was possibly part of a maq’ad, as noted above. This was an undeniably handsome object, and its condition is also very good; the roundel motifs, while a familiar part of the Ottoman repertoire, are rarer than floral sprays or other arrangements. Like several other objects Duke bought at the sale, this textile was also featured in the Philadelphia Persian Exhibition of 1926, organized by Arthur Upham Pope. It alone, though, was published in Gaston Migeon’s catalogue of the Kelekian Collection textiles, a limited edition volume from the first decade of the twentieth century. The other velvets also displayed in the exhibition were the two pieces of crimson silk lampas from the sixteenth century (83.12 and 83.30), the large cushion cover (83.2), the other maq’ad (83.5), and the Persian or Indian velvet (83.18). Considered together, these are arguably the finest silk textiles at Shangri La.

As well as providing a glimpse into the priorities and fixations of the mid-twentieth-century art market, the notes accompanying the 1953 invoice describe the pair of cushion covers (83.6.1–2), the single cushions (83.17, 83.2), and the more floral of the two maq’ads (83.5) as “Scutari.” The term “Scutari” derives from the cushion-making workshop in Üsküdar, mentioned above, and is more appropriately applied to the DDFIA’s three later cushion covers (83.7.1–3). The term was current from the beginning of the twentieth century; it remains in use today, mostly in auction catalogues, to refer to the cushion covers. A full discussion may be found elsewhere, and it is enough to note that while “Scutari” may have been a very convenient way to summarize a specific format of Ottoman çatma, it was not especially accurate. All but the later cushion covers are additionally described as “jardiniere velvet,” a term usually reserved for European velvets and silks from the seventeenth century, and which describes the motifs and format rather than the weave or geographic origin. Curiously, the handsome voided velvet maq’ad with the roundels (83.3) is not described this way, but as “drap d’argent,” another slightly ambiguous term.

In furnishing the Damascus (1952–55) and Syrian rooms (late 1970s/early 1980s), Duke chose to use the velvets as backdrops for shelves displaying ceramics, glass, and other portable vessels. Her decision was in keeping with twentieth-century practice, in both museums and private collections. Of all the silks Duke purchased in 1956, the Chios lampas (83.37), perhaps because it is almost figural, stands on its own. It is now on view in the Mihrab Room.

---


27 The Persian or Indian velvet (83.18), however, was not purchased by Duke in the 1953 sale. It is not easily identified with any of the items on the invoice.


29 Of all the silks Duke purchased in 1956, the Chios lampas (83.37), perhaps because it is almost figural, stands on its own. It is now on view in the Mihrab Room.
auction at the Paris-based Tajan, a brass candlestick reposes on a çatma cushion cover, which lies half flat, the upper half attached to the wall to form a backdrop. Duke’s choices, and then the display itself, were also a departure, because the textiles were placed in a period interior rather than in a gallery space. Later, the Metropolitan Museum of Art would also include Ottoman çatmas in its Damascus Room, basting the cushion covers onto cushions that were placed along the sedir. The velvets were protected, however, because the public could look into, but not enter, the space. On the other hand, Duke’s Damascus Room seems to have been used for entertainment purposes during the first decades of its history. Starting in the 1950s, her sedir was covered with a multicolored silk and cotton fabric called kutni or kütnü, which is almost certainly from southeast Turkey and may have been purchased by Duke as early as the late 1930s (fig. 12).

Fig. 12: The Damascus Room’s sedir (low-lying bench) upholstered in Turkish kütnü fabric, no earlier than 1962. Shangri La Historical Archives, Doris Duke Foundation for Islamic Art, Honolulu, Hawai‘i.

Although Duke purchased the Ottoman textiles with the Damascus Room in mind, she eventually used several of them in other parts of Shangri La—one of the cushion covers (83.17), for example, graced a hallway outside the Damascus Room for some years. In the Damascus Room during the later 1950s, the pair of cushion covers (83.6.1–2), the two all-over patterned maq’ads (83.3 and 83.5), and the group of three cushion covers (83.7.1–3)—sewn together as one object—served as backdrops for vessels from Iznik (see fig. 11). With the installation of the Syrian Room in the late 1970s, some of the textiles from the Kelekian collection were displayed in that interior as well.

31 Other collectors, and decorators, used the cushion covers as furnishings, incorporating them into benches, chairs, screens and other furniture. See Phillips, “The Historiography”, 13.
32 Before its incarnation as the Damascus Room, this second-story space located off of the foyer served as a guest bedroom and was decorated in a Spanish-Mediterranean style. Photographs of the Damascus Room from the late 1950s and 1960s show the kütnü divans around its perimeter, thereby suggesting that it was used for social gatherings, albeit intimate ones, during this time. Only later did it again serve as a guest bedroom, in the strictest sense of the term, for a family member.
33 Photograph, ca. 1960s–70s, DDCFHA.
The Damascus Room as it stands today (July 2012 onward) honors Duke’s vision. The çatma maq’ad (83.5) now serves as a backdrop for an array of glass, metalwork, and ceramics, while the pair of cushion covers (83.6.1–2) hang behind vitrines of facsimile archives (photographs, letters, receipts) attesting to Duke’s travels in Lebanon and Syria and the acquisition of associated collections (figs. 13 and 14). The other textiles remain on view in the Syrian and Mihrab rooms, where they are also used as backdrops for pottery and glass (fig. 15).

Fig. 13: The Damascus Room as reinstalled in July 2012, looking southwest. Doris Duke Foundation for Islamic Art, Honolulu, Hawai‘i. (Photo: David Franzen, 2012.)

Fig. 14: The Damascus Room as reinstalled in July 2012, looking northeast. Doris Duke Foundation for Islamic Art, Honolulu, Hawai‘i. (Photo: David Franzen, 2012.)

---

34 The room was conserved in four phases (2004–2008) by graduate interns training to become conservators from the Winterthur/University of Delaware Program in Art Conservation (WUDPAC). In July 2012, it was opened to the public for the first time. The current installation retains some of Duke’s original furnishings and display choices; others were modified to accommodate and enhance the visitor experience.
Duke’s decision to place the velvets in the niches of the Damascus and Syrian rooms was less anachronistic than one might guess. The function of luxury textiles in the Ottoman Empire was as much display as it was insulation or cushioning or any other more tangible purpose. The cushion covers were propped along the back of the sedir, easily recognized by their proportions, palette, and motifs, and appreciated, admired, and coveted. The maq’ads were similarly visible. Quilts were folded or rolled up during the day, most likely with their elegant and colorful faces on the outside; they were stowed in niches or open cupboards in the wall and also served as decoration and a display of taste and refinement. The situation at Shangri La is, in fact, similar.

**TEXTILES AND TEXTS: THE OBJECTS AND THEIR PRODUCTION**

*Brocaded Velvets, 1600–1750: Two Covers, One Piece of Upholstery, and Four Cushion Covers*

This section starts with a description of the steps involved in weaving a figured velvet; because these çatmas share some features in common, it is useful to outline them first and to give several notes on their shared characteristics and modes of production. It then places the DDFIA textiles in chronological order, considering each in terms of technical structure before moving on to a more general discussion about weaving in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Bursa, one of the Ottoman Empire’s most renowned silk centers.
In the period during which these textiles were made, çatma was woven not only in the city of Bursa, near the Sea of Marmara in western Asia Minor, but also in two nearby towns, Bilecik and Göynük. Bursa had been a silk-trading center from the Byzantine period, and by the mid-seventeenth century, a good proportion of men and women there and in surrounding areas were involved in some aspect of silk production. The city was famous for its velvet, and specifically for crimson çatma cushions. The court in Istanbul certainly purchased silks from Bursa, but the looms there also supplied textiles to wealthy members of the general populace, near and far.

Like all velvets, the ten at Shangri La use a compound structure, meaning that they have more than one set of warps and one set of wefts. The çatmas are also figured, meaning that they use motifs more complex than the stripes or checks allowed by a treadle-operated six-shaft drawloom—in these cases, the roundels, carnations, or medallions so critical to the çatma’s identity. These motifs required the use of a loom equipped with a pattern harness. The contrast between the ground and motif was achieved by leaving some areas of the velvet bare of pile (or voided). The pattern harness was programmed ahead of time by an expert designer of motifs, called a nakşbend. The nakşbend, working from a drawing on squared paper, understood which warps and wefts needed to interact to produce the medallions, flowers, or other motifs on the finished textile. Most of the Ottoman textiles feature designs that repeat in straight or mirror symmetry, and the nakşbend would program only the smallest area necessary to make the repeat. For instance, in the DDFIA cushion covers, a quarter of a medallion and its surrounding field and border were programmed, and the pattern harness, attached to the loom and operated in a certain set sequence, allowed it to be repeated four times. Despite the immense time commitment and expertise required from the nakşbend, and the relatively lengthy task of mounting the pattern harness to the loom, the pattern harness resulted in a savings of labor because it spared the weaver from having to select the warps by hand—a time-consuming and inaccurate process; instead, it allowed him to pass the foundation weft through the warps selected by the pattern harness in one motion. It also allowed for exact repetition of the motifs, as well as for perfect symmetry. The use of the pattern harness demanded a second worker, a drawboy, who worked with the weaver and at his command. The drawboy hauled the patterning warps—the bright colored silk that made the velvet pile—while the weaver operated treadles to raise and lower the foundation warp.

Occasionally, the system broke down; a famous example in the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York shows the results of miscommunication or other confusion between the weaver and the drawboy. The hiccup, which might have become obvious only after the mistake was irretrievable, was then copied in another length in order to

35 Other Ottoman centers may have produced çatma, including Istanbul and Aleppo.
38 An image of this çatma (MMA, 09.99) is available online at http://www.metmuseum.org/Collections/search-the-collections/140003146. It is also discussed in Atasoy et al., IPEK, 201.
create the identical pair required of a complete cover.\textsuperscript{39} Errors aside, once the pattern harness was attached to the loom, it could then be used to make multiple identical versions of the same velvet, which allowed for great efficiency. As we shall see below—most obviously in the case of the pair of cushion covers in the Damascus Room and in the three “Scutari” cushions—this practice was probably standard.

The structure of the çatmas most typically has two sets of warps and three sets of wefts. The foundation is a five-shaft satin weave, in which relatively densely packed silk warp threads hide thick cotton weft threads inside. A supplementary warp, which forms the velvet pile, is brightly dyed, glossy, twisted silk. The supplementary weft, used to brocade the sections of the textile left void of pile, was always a thread called kilaptan in Ottoman Turkish, which was a silk core around which silver or gold-gilded silver was wrapped (fig. 16). A third weft is visible only on the reverse of the textiles, and it helped keep in place any of the velvet warp thread that was not being used on the front and that therefore floated across the back. It is sometimes called a binding weft, and in the DDFIA çatmas, it is a very thin, untwisted silk thread, almost a filament (fig. 17).

\textbf{Fig. 16:} Warp-weft structure of 83.3 (see fig. 2) under 50X magnification; visible are the kilaptan supplementary wefts (comprised of silver or gold-gilded silver wrapped around a silk core). Doris Duke Foundation for Islamic Art, Honolulu, Hawai‘i. (Photo: Ann Svenson, 2012.)

\textbf{Fig. 17:} Reverse of 83.3 (see fig. 2) under 50X magnification; visible is the third weft, or binding weft. Doris Duke Foundation for Islamic Art, Honolulu, Hawai‘i. (Photo: Ann Svenson, 2012.)

\textsuperscript{39} There is another possibility that would explain why two lengths of çatma have the exact same mistake in sequencing: two weavers and their two drawboys were working in a single atelier at the spoken command of the more experienced or lead weaver.
Just as production of the textiles themselves required multiple kinds of specialized labor, several more types of craftsmen made the five types of thread required. Several different sets of workers grew and reeled the silk, twisted and dyed it, and cut it into standard lengths.\(^{40}\) A special workshop under state supervision was responsible for making the metal foil used in the kilaptan, and specialists wound it around the silk filament.\(^{41}\) Cotton was grown and processed at a more local and less professionalized level, most likely in the river valleys near Bursa. Skilled workers of all types organized themselves into associations, somewhat akin to guilds, and made, sold, and bought materials as collectives—at least sometimes.\(^{42}\) They also set standards for the goods they produced, though whether or not these regulations were adhered to with any consistency is unclear.

Çatma Furnishings: 83.5 and 83.3

For both 83.5 and 83.3 (see figs. 3 and 2), the crimson ground is typical of this date and type; hundreds of closely and less closely related examples exist in private collections and museums around the world.\(^{43}\) The date for both of these objects may be established using similar textiles that are in turn datable because of their presence in royal or institutional collections.\(^{44}\) 83.5 is very close to a çatma used in a cope now found in Zagorsk, which is dated to before 1652.\(^{45}\) 83.3 is less easy to pin down, but its scale, colors, fineness of materials, and format also link it to the first half of the seventeenth century.

83.5 was certainly designed to be half of a larger whole, which would have been created by sewing it together with its mirror image—the border would have framed the field, and the shape would be more or less square. Similar to others in the group, its width from selvedge to selvedge is that of the loom’s width, about 65 cm, and it is 120.7 cm long (warp direction). It was probably meant to be a furnishing of some sort, and possibly—as mentioned earlier—was what Ottoman inventory lists refer to as a maq’ad (sitting cloth), which was placed on the sedir.\(^{46}\)

The motifs in the main field comprise rows of eight-lobed medallions with alternating rosebuds and single hyacinth stems; this motif has no exact equivalent known

---

\(^{40}\) Documents about silk workers in Bursa are assembled in Fahri Dalsar, *Bursa’da Ipeçcilik: Türk Sanayi ve Ticaret Tarihinde* (Istanbul: Istanbul University Press, 1960). Silk from northwest Iran was highly prized, of outstanding quality, and very expensive. Locally grown silk became increasingly available in the mid-seventeenth century.


\(^{43}\) Atasoy et al., *İPEK*, assembles the best catalogue of datable objects, 240–52.

\(^{44}\) See footnote above.

\(^{45}\) Atasoy et al., *İPEK*, 248, no. 48.

to this author, though similar examples abound. The arrangement is also somewhat unusual in that the medallions are stacked one atop another, instead of staggered on diagonals. The medallions in the border, which use rosebuds and carnations, are more common and find a greater variety of comparanda.

The *kilaptan* (metal foil–wrapped silk) is found only in certain key features of the motifs: in the centers of the medallions of the main field and in the small six-petaled blossoms in the interstices of the border. The relatively sparing use of this expensive material was practiced in some similar examples, such as a floor covering or summer carpet (*nihale*) now at the Detroit Institute of Arts, which also provides a comparison for the border motifs. The use of a strong blue in the details of the motifs is also typical, though the DDFIA one is especially handsome.

83.3 is also part of what was designed to be a larger textile. It, too, has a border which would have served to unite the pieces as well as defining the final size and perhaps function of the whole. Without a third border to indicate the intended length, it is difficult to guess what the total dimensions might have been. The length of any textile is more easily varied by the weavers because the warp could be as long as desired, and because new threads could even be knotted to those that might run out, in order to avoid rewarping the loom completely. Known examples of covers made from two loom widths range from 120.7 to 275 cm in length—from squares to long rectangles. For 83.5, discussed above, the complete cover would have been almost square. By contrast, 83.3, already 140 cm in length, was certainly longer than it was wide. Its intended use is more difficult to guess; it could be a quilt facing, though for a very large quilt face (*yorgan yüzü*), a summer carpet (*nihale*), or even a mattress cover (*döşek yüzü*).

The motifs in 83.3 comprise staggered circles with central roundels on a crimson field with sets of three small circles in the interstices. The three small circles, along with the flame-like details in the larger circles, may be taken together as a variant of the Ottoman *çintamani*, a visual combining three pearls perched in a triangle atop two wavy lines of flames, which had auspicious or apotropaic connotations.

---

47 For comparanda for the field medallions, see Topkapı Palace Museum (13/1462). Godfrey Kneller’s portrait of Piotr Potemkin (1681–2) (State Hermitage Museum, GE-10583) shows the statesman dressed in a fur-lined caftan that uses similar medallions, though the interstices between each element are different. The closest known comparanda for 83.5 is a piece of *çatma* at the Los Angeles County Museum of Art (M.73.5.686); an image is available online at http://collectionsonline.lacma.org/mwebcgi/mweb.exe?request=record;id=34850;type=101. There are numerous others that also use stacked eight-lobed medallions: Topkapı Palace Museum (13/1446), Musée des Arts Decoratifs (8356); State Hermitage Museum (T-346), State Historical Museum, Moscow Kremlin (GIM-20171), Topkapı Palace Museum (13/1462). Several more textiles use similar small medallions, but they are staggered across the main field, including LACMA 85.237.3.

48 For the medallions and the small blossoms in the interstices, see Sergiev-Posad Museum Preserve, Zagorsk (2287).

49 An image of the Detroit piece (48.137) is available online at http://www.dia.org/object-info/f9417291-71f3-4342-91d7-4805ed84d2e0.aspx?position=1. Other examples also limit their use of the *kilaptan*; see State Historical Museum, Moscow Kremlin (GIM-20163) and Musée des Arts Decoratifs (8356).

50 One of the longest known lengths is more than five and a half meters long (Ethnographic Museum, Ankara, 4304); see Atasoy et al., *İPEK*, 305.

51 A single known three-loom-width cover is 144 x 183.5 (see Venice, Palazzo Mocenigo, 823).

52 The word *çintamani*, meaning auspicious or wish-fulfilling jewel, is Sanskrit; the use of the motif and the word both predate the Ottoman Empire by centuries. However, it is unclear whether the word *çintamani* was used in the Ottoman period to describe this motif, as it is not found in contemporary writing about the
elements of the çintamani, by the seventeenth century, were combined and re-combined to create multiple motifs, some of them at a remove from the complete conception, as in 83.3. The voided areas in the circles were once entirely covered in silver kilaptan, which now remains only in the innermost spaces. This probably attests to wear and tear; the pile of the inner roundels helped protect the kilaptan in the center, but that in the larger spaces was more vulnerable to abrasion. The contrast between the lustrous crimson silk and the larger areas of shiny silver would have given the piece the glittering, contrasting effect, one that so often provoked comment among Europeans visiting Ottoman cities.

83.3 is especially fine: the kilaptan brocading weft is tightly wrapped, using a good quantity of metal foil, now much tarnished. A comparison with the kilaptan in 83.5 is instructive (fig. 18). The kilaptan wefts of 83.5 are also tightly packed to a uniformly glittery surface, at least in the areas it was used. But for 83.3, the weaver used two types of kilaptan, on white and on gold silk cores, to provide contrasting areas of gold and silver, and furthermore used it in all the voided areas (see fig. 16). This provides a sumptuous but simple variation that is appropriate to the gestalt. The crimson and blue silk threads are good quality, richly hued, and densely packed. The pattern itself is well-proportioned, unfussy and undeniably Ottoman—a hallmark of this type of çatma. 83.3 exemplifies the excellence that the Ottoman weavers of Bursa could, and did, attain.

Fig. 18: Warp-weft structure of 83.5 (see fig. 3) under 50X magnification; visible are the kilaptan supplementary wefts (comprised of silver or gold-gilded silver wrapped around a silk core). Doris Duke Foundation for Islamic Art, Honolulu, Hawai‘i. (Photo: Ann Svenson, 2012.)
Further comparisons help situate 83.3 more precisely, and provide some insight into some Ottoman weaving practices.\textsuperscript{55} An almost identical iteration to 83.3 is found in the city of Konya, at the Mevlana Museum.\textsuperscript{56} The detail color in the Konya velvet is greenish gold, rather than the greenish blue found in the Honolulu example. One of three possibilities might account for this difference: a choice made by the weavers based on aesthetic preferences; a dearth of one color, which led to the substitution of another; or an uneven fading or discoloration of the silk in one or both pieces. Equally possible, the switch in color could have been achieved while the loom was warped and the pattern harness was attached by knotting new warp threads onto the old, which was more efficient than re-warping the loom and re-attaching the pattern harness.\textsuperscript{57}

Without technical analysis for the Konya piece, it is difficult to confirm whether the velvets are from the same loom and same pattern harness; several observations, however, argue for this conclusion.\textsuperscript{58} The motifs of the Konya and Honolulu examples are identical, and their placement on the main field also appears identical. The visual parallels between the two pieces further extend to the small dots or pearls; the stacks of three alternate between those with same-colored inner circles on one warp axis and those with color-contrasting inner circles along the width, or weft axis. More compelling evidence strengthens the argument for an attribution to the same loom. For both çatma, small irregularities are obvious in the inner ring of flame-like elements found in each roundel. In both çatma, in every other lengthwise row of roundels, the separate devices fuse together at the 90° and 270° marks; in the alternate rows, the fusing does not occur (fig. 20). This irregularity results from one of two circumstances: from a small mistake in the design of the thread model (the program that determines the pattern harness, and in turn the motifs), or from a hiccup during the setting up of the loom, in which the worker accidentally neglected to attach a small final part of the pattern harness’s cords to the velvet warp threads. It was indeed a very small and very final part—the irregularity occurs at the point where the motifs pivot to repeat in mirror symmetry.

\textsuperscript{55} What appears to be an identical velvet is now at the Calouste Gulbenkian Museum in Lisbon (inv. 512); unlike the Honolulu object, it is complete. An image is available online at http://www.museu.gulbenkian.pt/obra.asp?num=1512&nuc=a4&lang=en

\textsuperscript{56} The authors of İPEK mention a very similar piece in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston (77.265); for Mevlana Museum (614), see Atasoy et al., İPEK, plate 98.

\textsuperscript{57} Atasoy et al. have assembled five groups of silks that were woven from the same programmed repeat unit, though not necessarily on the same loom; see Atasoy et al., İPEK, 214–15.

\textsuperscript{58} I have not been able to see the entire Konya object, which comprises two pieces sewn together along the selvedge.
One salient difference between the Konya and Honolulu objects indicates the agility with which the weavers worked. 83.3 has a thin stripe that acts as a border, while the Konya velvet does not (see fig. 19). This type of border, in which two narrow lines of velvet pile frame a few centimeters of voided and brocaded foundation, does not need to be built into the pattern harness or subsequently into the warping of the loom. Instead, the weaver could isolate the velvet warps in the border, remove them from the leashes of the pattern harness, and place them in other leashes; this would be simple to program because they made a straight line, and the warps were easy to identify for that reason. Making the change required no great skill, and the weaver or his assistant could have done it himself before work commenced. The original cords of the pattern harness were kept intact and tucked out of the way, and could be re-engaged for use in the next length or piece. It was a quick change, and easily affected, but it allowed for the weavers to switch their format at will, without incurring the expense of hiring a nakşbend or losing time as the loom was re-harnessed.

DDFIA 83.5 presents an alternate case, using a wide border that includes another set of motifs entirely. Like those of the central field, they were programmed into the pattern harness ahead of time, and could not be adjusted or elided once the loom was warped. The borders suggest this çatma was designed as a maq’ad (sitting cloth), or for similar use, and was not conceived of as an undifferentiated length. Although the side borders were fixed, the weaver could, however, change some elements in the length (warp direction) of the cover at will. To do this, he would simply instruct the drawboy to maneuver the pattern harness to make another row of main field medallions, thereby extending the textile. The part of the pattern harness that would be engaged to make the border medallions could be then put into use after that row, or after any number of additional main field rows.

The descriptions given above illustrate some of the craft practices of the seventeenth century, and the conclusions that we can draw from them demonstrate the flexibility and awareness with which the weavers manipulated efficiencies, and responded to demand for a variety of specific objects, qualities, and styles. The notion of quality and style are especially significant for the next two sections of this paper, which look at one length of çatma and four çatma cushion covers.
The length of çatma on view in a wall vitrine in the Mihrab Room at Shangri La (83.16; see fig. 4) is most likely from the first half of the seventeenth century and most likely Ottoman, as it conforms to the broader repertoire in its format, motifs, and size (61 cm in width).\(^5^9\) The çatma has some parallels in a large general category of textiles that use individual motifs placed in ogival lattice work.\(^6^0\) In the case of 83.16, this is a carnation populated with five small sprays of three blossoms each, which is repeated in staggered rows. The ogives are filled with buds and flowers, and appear to be brocaded with kilaptan, unlike the carnations themselves. Neither carnations nor the ogives have exact comparanda, which makes it difficult to place the object in context, which in turn makes dating and even definite attribution difficult. The proportions of the motifs, which appear stretched length-wise, may result from clumsy draughtsmanship or, more likely, from the use of thicker than planned wefts; these wefts built length more quickly than predicted, thereby disrupting the proportions of the motifs. The most important observation here, and one to which we will return, is the çatma’s exclusive use of crimson, without an additional blue or green for the details. The efficiency—or economization—is clear.

Four Ottoman Çatma Cushion Covers, ca. 1600–1720 (83.2, 83.17, and 83.6.1–2)

Four cushion covers (pl. yastık yüzleri) are currently divided between the Syrian, Damascus, and Mihrab rooms at Shangri La. As a collective, the cushion covers represent several different modes of weaving in the city of Bursa; they provide tangible evidence for the material, economic, and other pressures interacting in the silk industry between 1600 and 1720. The quality and quantity of the silk and gold, the overall dimensions, the use of color, and the style and size of the motifs all vary, though for different reasons. Çatma cushion covers, as a category, form one of the largest cohesive groups of Ottoman silk weavings.\(^6^1\) Approximately 400 or more survive in collections worldwide, and documents attest to the scale of their production, trade, and consumption during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. In 1650, for example, a man in the town of Bilecik offered ten pairs of çatma cushion covers as a surety for a loan, and a merchant in Edirne left 28.5 pairs when he died in 1658.\(^6^2\) The format of the cushion covers—with the lappets at each end and fairly consistent dimensions—remains more or less immutable during about a century and a half. In sum, the features of çatma cushion covers are more persistent, and their form perseveres for more than eighty years. This contrasts sharply with other çatma formats, which slowly disappear from inventory lists during the second half of the seventeenth century, as discussed in Part One (see page 6).

\(^5^9\) I was not able to analyze this piece firsthand during my stay in 2012.

\(^6^0\) Including Italianate examples from the mid-sixteenth century with two intertwining ogives (Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, 97.467), later ones with larger floral motifs (Ethnographic Museum, Ankara, 4304), and those with floral medallions (State Historical Preserve, Moscow Kremlin, TK-2767). The ogival motif is one of few design formats found in both çatma and in Ottoman silk lampas (kemha).

\(^6^1\) Phillips, Weaving as Livelihood, treats the type extensively.

83.2 (Syrian Room; see fig. 5) is the largest of the four, and exemplifies some of the finest traits of seventeenth-century Ottoman weaving. The slightly oblong central medallion is elegantly scalloped, and each end bears a trefoil finial. Six-petaled blossoms with finely detailed outlines in crimson pile share interlaced stems with small leaf forms. The interlacing is carefully crafted to mediate between the small round sunburst in the center of the medallion and the oval wreath made by the blossoms. Spandrels, with rose blossoms and leaves, soften the surrounding square of the main field, which is an almost purple crimson. Similar rosebuds and small hyacinth blossoms, carried by more stems, fill the lappets. Despite its current poor condition, it is an exceptional example of drawing.

Given the large number of surviving çatma cushion covers—over 400—it is surprising that 83.2 has little direct comparanda. The lappets find a close match in several pieces incorporated into an ecclesiastical vestment now in Lyon. The spandrels and their blossoms may be compared to several other cushion covers, but although scalloped medallions abound, some with flowers, none are closely related to that of 83.2. This is a handsome object, not only in terms of motifs, but also in terms of craftsmanship. The velvet, though now much abraded, is densely packed and shiny, and each individual thread is well-twisted and thick. The object uses what was meant to be gold-tinted kilaptam; the metal foil is almost entirely gone, as is the silk core, but what remains is yellow—meant to be read as gold. Dating this example is difficult, but it is certainly 1600s, and might be placed in the middle third of that century.

83.17 (Mihrab Room; see fig. 6) provides an example of another type in the çatma cushion cover category, and an interesting contrast to the former. This object is significantly smaller, especially length-wise, at 105 by 62.5 cm. It too has a scalloped medallion inset with small carnations alternating with crude three-pronged shapes, which may be simplifications of the hyacinth motif. Instead of being elongated, this medallion is somewhat squat, which is also a result of the smaller and squarer main field. The finials are also trefoils, and the spandrels each contain a tulip on a sinuous stem. The main difference in format between 83.17 and 83.2 is the main border of the former; the border of 83.17 is strewn with leaves and stems, each with five three-part round forms that may be read as sprays of small pomegranates.

83.17 also has a wide variety of comparanda. The most striking example is one with almost identical main borders in the Museum of Applied Arts, Budapest. The scalloped medallion—one of the most oft repeated main field motif—is similar to many others of the general type, but has no exact equivalent. The lappets—with their carnations, two leaves, and three small upper blossoms—are part of a wide phenomenon, and many
similar examples exist. 83.17 uses a single color of velvet pile, another economization and a fact that we will return to in the discussion of the next two cushion covers.

83.6.1 and 83.6.2 are a matched pair now on view in the Damascus Room (see figs. 1, 6, 7). They bear some affinity to 83.17 in their use of a scalloped medallion with floral motifs, trefoil finials, crimson ground, and spandrels with rosebuds—similarities found, as noted above, in a variety of other cushion covers. They are equivalent in size, each measuring 63 by 108 cm. Çatma cushion covers were woven in multiples, as suggested by the Edirne shop inventory from the seventeenth century, cited above (see page 22). Even more compelling than the now separated 83.6.1 and 83.6.2 are pairs that remain attached to each other; in these cases, the weaver or whoever bought them did not cut the warps to separate the two pieces. In addition to being made in multiples, the cushion covers were also used in multiples. Inheritance inventories list some of the cushion covers in pairs, which are presumably matching.

Although the DDFIA pair employ motifs from the wider cushion cover group, neither their medallion nor their border have exact parallels. The borders are especially unusual. Instead of a single wide, main border, as in 83.17, the pair uses three narrower ones comprised of a flower and leaf rinceau—with disconnected motifs, however—between two diagonally striped elements that suggest architectural elements. A similar arrangement is found in a brocade-ground çatma cushion cover at the Victoria & Albert Museum, and in another at the Saberh Hanım Museum in Istanbul, which has a different middle element, but similar colorways. The borders of 83.6.1–2 find many similar examples, including several on textiles with a similar palette. Although the spandrels have no exact equivalents, they are part of a continuum in which rosebuds and other small blossoms or leaves curve inward on stems with three sets of two leaves.

The cushion cover that most resembles the DDFIA pair in general gestalt—in elements of the medallion, finials, borders, and lappets—is preserved in the Musée des Arts Decoratifs in Paris. Equally significant, the Paris çatma also uses red velvet pile through its center and green on each side. The pair in the Damascus Room, though perhaps less ambitious in drawing and general conception, display a further refinement.

---

66 The closest comparisons are Cooper Hewitt Museum (1978-169124); a fragment in the Metropolitan Museum of Art (2002 494 745); Grünberg Collection, Paris (inventory unknown); the Budapest example mentioned above (14434); Karlsruhe Badisches Landesmuseum (D.202); one sold at the Sotheby’s Turkish Sale in 1998, lot 179; and Riggisberg Abegg Foundation, Switzerland (2203).

67 Topkapi Palace Museum (13-1424), for example.

68 See footnote 61 for the pairs of cushions in Edirne and Bilecik. Other inventories suggest the same: a pair of cushions was listed as such, but if a person had two unmatched cushion covers, they were listed separately. For instance, a woman named Fahr Hatun ibnet-i Mustafa Beğ, who died in Istanbul in 1612, left eight çatma cushions: three pairs, one of which was purple, and two single cushions. Said Öztürk, Askeri Kassama ait Onyedinci Asır İstanbul Tereke Defterleri: Sosyo-Ekonomik Tahilî, (Istanbul, Osmanlı Araştırmaları Vakfı, 1995), 273–4.

69 Victoria & Albert Museum (476-1884), Sadberk Hanım Museum (17542 D 251); the attribution of the latter textile is uncertain.

70 Victoria & Albert Museum (88-1878).

71 The continuum seems to start with a stem of the rosebud, several other blossoms, and large leaves; see Musée des Arts Decoratifs (14490), a pair exhibited at the Colnaghi Gallery in 1980 (number 25), and Museum of Fine Arts, Boston (77-257). It then moves to only two blossoms on a similar stem; see an example sold at Piasa, Paris, 13 June 2003 and Victoria & Albert Museum (90-1878). It ends with a single blossom on a stem still made distinctive by the small leaves toward the base.

72 Musée des Arts Decoratifs (13917).
They use two different greens along the borders, separated from one another by a very thin guardstripe of crimson. This feature makes the two çatma cushion covers unique in their subset, which includes about twenty known objects. The use of one color of pile in the central portion of the textile and another in the borders also allows the weaver to save on the expensive dyed silk warp threads. To make this type of two-color çatma, in fact, requires the same proportion as a single-color velvet (such as 83.17 or 83.16), but only half the bright dyed silk of a çatma using two colors throughout (such as 83.3, 83.5, and 83.2). This is a ferocious—but savvy—economization indeed.

Despite the iconic nature of Ottoman silks, and velvets especially, it is difficult to find more than a pair, or perhaps four, that are absolutely identical. The weavers altered borders, lappets, small motifs, or colorways—as noted for 83.3—to introduce variation. While perhaps partly due to uneven survival, it is also probable that the weavers worked in small variations to please the merchants who bought the textiles, or perhaps commissioned them. Equally, they could be responding to men and women who demanded slightly different, and in their eyes no doubt improved, versions of the same thing displayed by their neighbors.

Production Changes and the Fashion for Çatma, 1600–1760

As a group, the DDFIA çatmas represent several facets of the Bursa silk-weaving tradition. The possible-maq’ad and maq’ad and (83.3 and 83.5; see figs. 2, 3) were made in the first half of the seventeenth century, as was 83.16 (see fig. 4). The all-over patterning in the three objects, as well as some of the individual motifs, positions them firmly in these fifty years. During this half century, weavers in Bursa also produced cushion covers with similar all-over patterns. An example now in a private collection is similar to 83.3, and the motifs in 83.5 have equivalents in multiple cushion covers. Just as the weavers of 83.3 were able, with minimal fuss, to add the thin stripe to create the border, weavers of cushion covers could add a pattern harness component that would make lappets. This allowed diversity, and also the production of perfectly matched cushion covers, maq’ads, mattress faces, and small carpets.

Çatma maq’ads are found in inheritance inventory lists in the late sixteenth and first part of the seventeenth century. Consider, for example, a dark blue one owned by a man named Ahmed, who died in 1638 in the city of Edirne, or the green one owned by a man named Süleyman, who died in the same city in 1640. A woman named Fatma, who died that same year, also in Edirne, owned çatma cushions, mattress covers, and quilts, in what were possibly two matching sets—four cushion covers (including a pair), two quilt covers, and two mattress covers. Other records provide slightly different evidence: a list of fixed prices issued by Ottoman authorities in 1640 included several different qualities of çatma available for purchase in Istanbul, each with a corresponding price. Indeed, all

73 There are ten of the type in the Victoria & Albert Museum, and more are scattered throughout collections in Turkey, Europe, and North America.
75 Kuru, 29 Numaralı, record 56.
76 Kuru, 29 Numaralı, record 22.
77 This list sets the values for goods sold in Istanbul, as well as services, and includes a multitude of items, ranging from brooms to rifles to silk fabrics. The lists were promulgated for different cities, on an irregular basis, as need or perceived need arose, and might include many or few goods. The 1640 list is unparalleled
sorts of çatmas, other silk fabrics, and cloth made of cotton, wool, and linen figure prominently in the 1640 list. In the early modern period, textiles formed the chief part of furnishings in the home and were also used in dress, headgear, and horse-trappings, and for household chores and routines—napkins, handkerchiefs, wrappers, and the like.

Although other textiles—especially wool, cotton, and linen ones—persisted in records from the later seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the çatma maq’ads and quilts began to disappear from inventory lists sometime after 1650. The çatma cushion covers, however, continued to feature significantly. This fact is confirmed by the DDFIA corpus—the çatmas with all-over patterns (83.3, 83.5, 83.16) are most firmly dated to the first half of the seventeenth century, while the cushion covers (83.6.1–2, 83.17, 83.2) should probably be dated to the late seventeenth century.

A brief aside here may prove useful: art historians often assume that objects that appear less beautiful or use production efficiencies—fewer colors, fewer threads or less gold, materials of lesser quality, with somewhat less skillful craftsmanship—are decayed versions of earlier objects. The assumption, often tacit, is that the people making the lesser objects were separated by years or miles from a center of production that had originated the first and finest type. The corollary supposition is that there is a decline in artistic merit as well as quality. The underlying paradigm is a powerful one, especially for the decorative arts, and it is difficult to resist. This model would demand that DDFIA cushion covers 83.6.1 and 83.6.2 be dated later than the other velvets, and suggests that they should be viewed as a step in the prolonged debasement of Ottoman and Islamic art of the post-1650 period.

There is, however, every reason to think that the weavers in Bursa, most likely responding to demand, produced objects in a range of qualities from the earliest period of large-scale production. As early as 1502, a sultanic investigation into silk-weaving in Bursa suggested that standards had slipped—or, at least, that some court official perceived a decline. In a later court case, several qualities of çatma were permitted, as long as their prices corresponded. An order for velvet and other Bursa silks made by the Topkapi Palace in 1575 also specified high-, medium-, and low-quality versions of a variety of goods. Finally, the aforementioned 1640 list of fixed prices specifies three grades of many goods—very high, high, and medium quality—including crimson çatma cushion covers from Bilecik, near Bursa. The evidence from objects and documents alike argues for a diversity of production that ensured textiles for customers of more modest means.

in its length and in the precision of some of its descriptions. Mubahat S. Kütükoğlu, Osmanlılarda Narh Müessesesi ve 1640 Tarihli Narh Defteri, (İstanbul: Enderun Kitabevi, 1983).

78 Especially strong in the practice of Ottoman art history, which in its early years absorbed some of the “decline” debate that then dominated Ottoman history itself. See Phillips, “The Historiography of Ottoman Velvets,” 7.

79 The 1502 investigation may have been driven by factors beyond the state of the silk industry. It was the Sultan’s obligation to ensure a “just marketplace” as a crucial factor in his right to rule. Beyazid II initiated this investigation, perhaps, to assert his legitimacy and to please his subjects with a nod toward consumer protection. Thanks to Dr. Rhoads Murphey for this insight. For a general discussion of the market, see Nikolai Todorov, The Balkan City, 1400–1900, Chapter Six (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1983).

80 Dalsar, Bursa’da İpekçilik, document 242.

81 Dalsar, Bursa’da İpekçilik, document 173.

82 Kütükoğlu, Osmanlılarda Narh, 175-6.
The practices of production, though, cannot explain what drove the ascendance of the cushion cover alone. Cushion covers were smaller, and less expensive, than the other formats; propped up along a sedir, they were highly visible to anyone in the home, including visitors. Their initial establishment as an object of fashion—and perhaps of conspicuous consumption and a signifier of refinement and status—may have preserved them from the fate of the maq’ad and quilt facing, which were inherently less visible, and less immediately identifiable, than the cushions. Even as the weavers made adjustments for the sake of economy and sought to broaden their markets by making less expensive and perhaps less absolutely elegant silks, the cushion covers’ ability to signify remained.

**The Cushion Cover Continues to Rise**

A final set of three cushion covers in the DDFIA collection (83.7.1–3; see figs. 9, 11) represents one of the later styles of çatma made in the Ottoman Empire. Fashions changed sometime around the 1750s, and this set illustrates the new gestalt, apparent also in other decorative arts. The palette is consistent with that of its predecessors, but the colored velvet pile now creates petite motifs, rather than comprising the main field, which is instead voided and brocaded—a reversal of the materials and their uses. The proportions are longer and especially narrower; each one is about 49 cm in width by 126 cm in length. The central motif, a spiky sunburst with alternating straight and shimmering rays in red and green, is similarly elongated. The main borders remain, but are less distinct from the field, into which the spandrels have encroached. Small crimson blossoms with green stems and leaves are densely packed; each of the four corners is filled by a large blossom—a sort of lotus blossom and oak leaf hybrid, which is also represented in Ottoman velvets from the later seventeenth and the eighteenth centuries. New elements, though, are introduced to the design: the scrollwork around the brocaded main ground and the finials on either end. Both motifs also pay homage to architectural elements, another feature of textiles—and other arts—of the period.

A smaller number of this type of cushion cover is found in collections that also preserve the earlier examples. The closest comparanda are in the Metropolitan Museum of Art and the Victoria & Albert, but both Lyon and Warsaw also hold several, and still more are found in sale rooms in London and New York. Whether made in Hereke or Üsküdar or even Bursa, the style is one of the later iterations of the cushion cover format. Later versions kept the brocade ground, but would change the reds and blues for greens and yellows, as well as adding architectural flourishes, and in one case, even motifs of kiosks and Ottoman caiques (small boats used exclusively on the Bosphorus).

---

83 There is a corresponding decrease in the production of the other type of silk fabric for which Bursa was famous, kemha, a kind of lampas. DDFIA 83.30, a length of kemha with large-scale palmettes between interlaced ogives, is an example of the type, and may be dated to the mid-sixteenth century. It is difficult to identify any kemhas, in fact, from Bursa made after about 1670. The island of Chios became a center for the weaving of this cloth.

84 Metropolitan Museum of Art (44 53 5); Victoria & Albert Museum (338-1892, 347-1892); Lyon, Musée des Tissus et Arts Decoratifs (35.751).

85 Warsaw, National Museum (10 52T 1441); Lyon, Musée des Tissus et Arts Decoratifs (35.747, 38.879); Metropolitan Museum of Art (44 52 3); Krefeld, Deutsches Textilmuseum (10733).
The Ottoman çatma upholstery fabrics at the DDFIA are part of the larger story of Shangri La, as Doris Duke conceived of her home and its collections in the 1950s and reimagined them in the 1980s. As a group, the textiles also bear witness to the slow but complex changes in production and consumption that marked the history of Ottoman silks in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The shift from the repeating designs on large-scale lengths, maq’ads, or quilt faces to centrally planned formats on smaller cushion covers neatly sums up, also, the significant but often overlooked change in fashion from one aesthetic to another. Though canonical, the Ottoman style might not be timeless, and the shifts of motif, format, and palette during the seventeenth century merit further examination. Çatmas, at the DDFIA and elsewhere, are a good place to start.