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Abstract
The reciprocal relations of the Ottoman Empire with Venice thanks to the visits of artists, merchants, ambassadors, travellers and pilgrims brought about the cultural interaction between two as a consequence of their strong diplomatic and economic relations in the 16th century. Decorative motifs and patterns on daily-used objects reflect the cross-cultural exchange among these civilizations with the synthesis of not only the Islamic style of art in the Italian culture, but also the Venetian artistic style in Ottoman art. Carpets and ceramics are among the most significant art objects, reflecting this synthesis, since a large amount of carpet and ceramic trade was made between the Ottomans and the Venetians. Therefore, this paper will specialize on carpets and ceramics as the icons of the 16th century cross-cultural exchange of the Ottoman Empire with Venice by making comparative analysis in their decorative arts.

I. Artworks in Ottoman Art Historiography

I am not interested in the notion of works of art “reflecting” ideologies, social relations or history. Equally, I do not want to talk about history as “background” to the work of art. I also want to reject the idea that the artist’s point of reference as a social being is the artistic community. Lastly, I do not want the social history of art to depend on intuitive analogies between form and ideological content.

Timothy James Clark¹

In this quote Clark, as an art historian, separates an artwork from its historical, social, political, and economic context. This means that art is for its own sake, rather than an instrument to prove the ideological content of the time. Although Clark initially considered removing art from its ideological content as the quotation implies, he later emphasized that he could not avoid interpreting an artwork without its content. Hence, he became aware of the fact that art and politics cannot remain separated from each other, which undoubtedly brings the study of art together with other social disciplines. This is also the method recently applied in Ottoman art historiography to advance more interdisciplinary studies. A typical example for “the politicization of art” is the iconographic role of artworks as the representatives of cross-cultural exchange among different cultures. Panofsky states that “what I see from a formal point of view is nothing, but the change of certain details within a configuration forming part of the general pattern of colour, lines, and volumes which constitutes my world of vision”.2 It leads me to think that one of the reasons leading to configuration in artworks through history is the cultural interactions originating from socio-political and economic factors. The changes in the artistic style of artworks, particularly, motifs and patterns appropriated from one culture to another through history as a consequence of mutual interaction, are significant in order to understand cultural transfer. Filiz Yenişehirlioğlu emphasizes that a floral or geometrical design does not explain a certain historical event, but are icons of civilizations defining a particular design and creativity of the civilization.3 Even though floral and geometrical motifs have been simply considered as patterns ornamenting artworks, architectural structures and paintings, they have made significant contributions to Ottoman art historiography. They were not only motifs decorating palaces, mosques, pavilions and a variety of artworks, but also intermediaries providing intense cultural exchange of the Ottoman Empire with other civilizations.

II. Venice and the Ottoman Empire in the Sixteenth Century

The expansion of the Ottoman Empire in the sixteenth century, especially during the forty-six year reign of Süleyman the Magnificent, led to changes in the balance of power in Europe. The interest of the Europeans towards Ottoman culture, including both the Byzantine and the

---

Islamic heritage in its origin, increased, which consecutively brought a cultural exchange due to political and commercial relations.

The Venetian culture was the one that the Ottoman Empire had intensive reciprocal relations in the sixteenth century. The broad diplomatic, economic and cultural relations conducted by the artists, merchants, ambassadors, dragomans, travellers, and pilgrims produced an exchange of motifs and patterns ornamenting portable objects. This exchange led to the introduction of not only the Islamic artistic style into the Italian culture, but also the Venetian style into Ottoman territories. Therefore, this paper will focus on the artworks as icons of cross-cultural relations of the Ottoman Empire with Venice, by making a comparative analysis among two different cultures. I will first start with examining their relation in the historical context and then concentrate on the economic base with regard to their strong trade relations with each other. Lastly, I will examine the exchange of portable objects, particularly carpets and ceramics, between Venice and the Ottoman Empire in the sixteenth century.

III. Trade of “Material Culture” between the Ottoman Empire and Venice in the Sixteenth Century

After the conquest of Constantinople by Mehmed II in 1453, the Ottomans strengthened their sea power and hegemony in the Sea of Marmara, the Aegean, and the Black Sea. The increasing naval power of the Ottomans combined with the capture of the Golden Horn which was a strategic port area jeopardized the predominance of the Venetians over sea.\(^4\) The continual ambition and attempts of the Ottomans to enlarge their territories led to a series of naval wars as such between the Ottoman Empire and Venice in 1463 concluded with the capture of the Negroponte Island as a key base in the Aegean in 1470 and with the fall of the Venetian colony of Scutari on the Adriatic in 1479.\(^5\) Even though the Ottomans signed a peace treaty with the Venetians in 1479, the Ottoman ambition to expand its territories did not stop. It captured Cyprus by coercing its Queens, a member of a Venetian noble family in 1489.\(^6\)


\(^5\) Thubron, “Challenge from the Terrible Turks,” 101.

\(^6\) Thubron, “Challenge from the Terrible Turks,” 102.
What was interesting in the relation of Venice and the Ottoman Empire in the sixteenth century is that although the Ottomans had clashes and wars with the Venetians through many years, Ottoman trade with Europe between 1450 and 1550 was dominated by Italian merchants. The Ottomans did not grant trading capitulations to the French, English and Dutch until 1569, 1580, and 1612, respectively, whereas, the Genoese received theirs as early as 1352 and the Venetians in the first decade of the fifteenth century. While the Ottomans purchased weapons and armaments from the Venetians, the Ottoman carpets, fabrics, ceramics, marbled paper and leather bindings found consumers in Venice. This distinctive relationship is interpreted by Fernand Braudel as “complementary enemies,” because there was the complementation of different practices in terms of diplomacy, economy, finance and law in spite of naval conflict of the Ottomans with the Venetians. Because of the economic dependence on sea trade, the Ottomans were the unique trade partner for the Venetians in order to sustain their commercial existence in the Levant.

IV. Cultural Transfer between Venice and the Ottoman Empire

Deborah Howard, an expert in cultural transfer between the Ottoman Empire and Venice, claims that the roots of the cultural transfer by circulating material goods were based on three main channels: diplomacy, trade, and pilgrimage. As an important component of diplomacy, gift-exchange and reception ceremony rituals played a significant role in the exchange of material goods. For instance, the Venetian ambassadors presented rich textiles and clothes and even quantities of Parmesan cheese to the Ottomans. Secondly, even though Venice and the Ottoman Empire had a series of wars and conflicts as a result of their ambition to acquire the sea power in the Adriatic and the Mediterranean, it did not prevent them to establish a trade relation with each other as mutual advantage. For instance, when one of the most successful “Turkey merchants” trading from Venice, Carlo Helman, died, the inventory of his
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possessions listed a profusion of Turkish artefacts as well as an impressive collection of Venetian paintings.\(^\text{11}\) Lastly, the pilgrimage as an inseparable part of trade and diplomacy was another channel for the acquisition of knowledge about the Islamic world with the passage of religious items across the barriers of faith in Venice. For example, a Venetian merchant, Stefano di Bossina, possessed many pilgrims’ souvenirs which included rosaries from the Holy Land and images of Jesus inlaid with gold from Jerusalem.\(^\text{12}\)

In addition to Howard’s three main channels, I think that another reason contributing to the development of cultural transfer is the demand of the Ottoman Sultans to represent themselves as a supreme power. For instance, the aim of the Sultan Süleyman the Magnificent was to represent himself as a world power and proclaim his supremacy over the European rulers, therefore the artworks representing his supremacy were produced as a result of the sultan’s imperial patronage. Gülru Necipoğlu states that the universal iconography that focused on the world domination was articulated in diverse media and objects such as the Süleyman’s Venetian-helmet crown, modelled on the papal tiara (Fig. 1).\(^\text{13}\) She adds that since there was a fierce competition between Süleyman the Magnificent and the Hapsburg Emperor Charles V, the Venetian-made helmet, featuring the four superimposed crowns, iconographically advertised his universal sovereignty over the “four quarters” of the world.\(^\text{14}\) This rivalry between the Sultan and the Hapsburg Emperor implicitly brought about the recognition of the Venetian-style helmet by the Ottomans.

V. Icons of Cultural Exchange between Venice and the Ottoman Empire: Ceramics and Carpets

According to Cemal Kafadar, the noticeable upswing of the Ottoman mercantile activity in Venice started after the peace of 1573, and trade grew well into the 1600s with the visit of real ambassadors charged with delivering messages and buying commodities for the court and high officials.\(^\text{15}\) As a consequence of increasing Ottoman-Venetian trade relation in the sixteenth century, portable objects, such as carpets, ceramics, textiles, glasses, and book

\(^{11}\) Howard, “Cultural Transfer between Venice and the Ottomans in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries,” 154.

\(^{12}\) Howard, “Cultural Transfer between Venice and the Ottomans in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries,” 170.


bindings were the most outstanding icons illustrating the cultural transfer among them. The commercial network between the Ottomans and the Venetians was influential not only in the introduction of portable objects from one to the other, but also the appropriation of new motifs and patterns ornamenting artworks. What is discovered in these portable objects is that traditional motifs ornamenting Ottoman artworks were introduced to the Italian objects which subsequently caused the intermingling of Ottoman motifs with patterns peculiar to the Italian culture. The term “appropriation,” used by Robert Nelson, is appropriate to describe the influence of Ottoman decorative elements on the Venetian artworks; the Ottoman patterns, adapted to the existing Italian decorative elements, paved the way for the new artistic style in Italian artworks. This influence can be explicitly observed with the ceramics and carpets as some of the most frequently traded commodities between the Venetians and the Ottomans in the sixteenth century.

In the “classical” era of the Ottoman Empire, particularly in the second half of the sixteenth century, the grand vizier Rüstem Pasha under the rule of Süleyman the Magnificent opened craft workshops to produce their own artefacts. This was an important breakthrough for the Ottomans to find their own artistic identity, and therefore Rüstem Pasha’s period can be thought of as “revolutionary” due to the creation of a new aesthetic canon after the establishment of court workshops. According to archival documents, the court workshops included 36 communities of ehl-i hıref (people of talent) who included craftsmen from the Timurid and Turkmen courts, from the Anatolian and Balkan provinces and from Austrian and “Frenk” territories. This heterogeneous group of artisans from different cultures also brought the intermingling of different motifs for the ornamentation of artworks.

---


### i. Ceramics

One of the most produced artworks in the sixteenth-century Ottoman craft workshops are ceramics. Ceramics, as a part of the material culture, are not only functional objects, but also a work of art due to their aesthetic value. Ceramics ornamented with the Ottoman floral design in *arabesque* style were mostly produced in the court workshops in Iznik which in later decades were to be inspired by the Italians for the use of style in Italian ceramics known as *maiolica*. The typical Italian *maiolica*, different from the Ottoman decorative art, are elaborated with human figures, portraits, landscapes and terms symbolizing mostly high-ranking people and historical events of Italy. For instance, in a Venetian deep dish named “An Abduction” a significant scene particular to the Italian culture is depicted (Fig. 2). However, Italian *maiolicas* were influenced from the Ottoman artworks produced in Iznik workshops, and the typical Ottoman motifs - such as *saz yolu*, *golden horn*, *carnation*, *tulip*, *rumi*, *hatai* and *leaf motifs* developed under the Huns, Göktürks, Ilhanids, Timurids and Ottomans - were introduced to the Italian *maiolica* as decorative elements. For instance, the appropriation of the Ottoman decorative element of the *golden horn* to the Italian *maiolica* can be observed with the similarity between the sixteenth century Italian vessels (Fig. 3) and a plate of the same century produced in Iznik (Fig. 4). Even though Ottoman motifs were appropriated to the Italian vessels as in the previous example, what draws my attention is that Italian craftsmen did not give up the use of their own traditional decorative motifs. Thus, apart from the use of Ottoman designs, they also followed the tradition of Italian Renaissance painting, including figural compositions as a decorative theme. For instance, the decoration of this jar, as an example to the appropriation of the Ottoman motif for Italian *maiolica*, illustrates the figure of King David at the center, his name behind his image in the medallion.

---

19 “*Maiolica*” is a term used for a fine earthenware with coloured decoration on an opaque white tin glaze, originating in Italy during the mid-sixteenth century. See *Oxford Dictionary*: [http://oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/maiolica](http://oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/maiolica).

20 “On the right, a woman kneels before a statue of Caesar or a God on a high pedestal. Behind her, a soldier restrains a standing woman and, further to the left, another seizes a second woman. Further back are two men, one of whom has a quiver on his back and looks into the distance. In the foreground to the left are a tree and grass beside a stream and in the background, a tree, the sea and a shoreline with distant mountains. Round the edge are two narrow blue bands with groups of short oblique strokes at intervals and a yellow band on the rim.” [http://webapps.fitzmuseum.cam.ac.uk/explorer/index.php?qu=abduction&oid=73392](http://webapps.fitzmuseum.cam.ac.uk/explorer/index.php?qu=abduction&oid=73392). This Italian *maiolica* is originally painted in typical Italian *maiolica* colours, yellow and blue. See Julia E. Poole, *Italian Maiolica and Incised Slipware in the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 419.

21 Cahide Keskiner, *Turkish Motifs* (Istanbul: Turkish Touring and Automobile Association, 2007).

and the rest of the jar are covered with lotus as one of the favorite Ottoman motifs, together with other Ottoman arabesque patterns. This exemplifies the harmonization of figural representations with the arabesque motifs of the Ottomans. Additionally, I consider that this figural representation by Italian craftsmen also implicitly contributed to the appearance of the Ottoman figures in Italian maiolicas. Since Italian craftsmen ornamented maiolicas with human figures, the Ottoman figures including sultans and ordinary people were also depicted in Italian maiolicas which was ultimately evidence that the Europeans were aware of the Ottoman society (Fig. 5-6). According to Filiz Yenişehrlioğlu, the representations of Ottoman subjects are more commonly found on the Italian maiolica plates than on tiles.\(^{23}\) For instance, the unique tile panel conserved in Musée de Nevers, France, illustrates Ottoman figures in the frame of Europeanized figures (Fig. 7). She asserts that these subjects are not imaginary, but they have been taken from the illustrations of a printed book and also copied from engravings of the French geographer Nicolas de Nicolay (Fig. 8).\(^{24}\) It is also important to emphasize that the appropriation of motifs and patterns were not only limited to the influence of the Ottoman decorative elements on the Italian maiolicas. Since the Ottomans had an interest in ceramic production, they also followed different ceramic styles produced in Europe and East Asia. Particularly, Italian ceramic tondini\(^{25}\) (Fig. 9) drew their attention, and the Ottomans started to introduce this shape into the repertoire of the Iznik workshops. Although the form of tondini is in Italian style, they are entirely ornamented with motifs characterizing Ottoman decoration (Fig. 10). However, there are also tondino ceramics illustrating the intermingling of the Ottoman motifs with Italian patterns, as in the examples of Italian maiolicas (Fig. 11). Since the Ottomans had strong trade relations with Europeans, especially with the Venetians, the cultural interaction between the Ottomans and the Europeans are commonly examined in the light of artworks. However, the Ottoman ceramics, beyond the Italian maiolica and tondino, were also affected by the Chinese and Japanese decorative elements, such as dragos, simurg, cloud, and chintamanis, which were used together with Ottoman motifs in the decoration of artworks. This implies that Ottoman craft workshops were influenced not only by Europe, but also by East Asia as a result of increasing political, social, and commercial activities of the Ottomans throughout the sixteenth century.


\(^{24}\) Yenişehrlioğlu, “Ottoman Ceramics in European Context,” 380.

\(^{25}\) Tondino is a maiolica plate with a wide flat rim and deep centre; the shape was often used by sixteenth-century istoriato (narrative) painters. See Oxford Reference: http://www.oxfordreference.com/.
ii. Carpets

In addition to ceramics, other famous decorative artwork frequently used in the Ottoman decoration is carpets. Since carpets have carried meanings of wealth, power, identity, learning, taste, and sanctity, its use in Ottoman culture was very common. The best example to illustrate the frequent use of carpets in Ottoman culture is to be found in miniatures depicted by painters (nakkaş) of the time. For instance, the Süleymanname by Arifi in 1558, as a manuscript illustrating events, settings, and personages of Süleyman’s reign is an effective visual documentary record to observe the use of the carpet as a decorative element in Ottoman culture. Specifically, Süleyman Receiving the Crown of Hungary (Fig. 12) and The Performance of Archers (Fig. 13) are two miniatures representing the historical and social events of the empire. However, even though the primary aim of the painter was to depict the event, he also painted the carpet on the background. This leads me to think that the carpet in these manuscripts represents the splendour of the Ottoman Empire apart from its function to ornament the manuscript itself. Similarly, the Hünername, a manuscript giving an account of accessions, deaths, characters, interests and hunting-parties of the Ottoman sultans from Osman Gazi to Selim I with historical events and wars of their times, illustrates many carpets as a decorative element. Their size is drawn bigger than the original and every motif characterizing the traditional Ottoman carpet is depicted in depth. Once again, this proves the significance of carpets in the Ottoman tradition; if the Ottomans attempted to depict carpets in Ottoman miniature paintings, carpets were used to a large extent in Ottoman daily life, and their extensive use undoubtedly caused the carpets to be easily recognized and appreciated by foreigners.

The prominence of Ottoman carpets is easily understood from the increasing demand of the Europeans towards carpets. Carpets, like ceramics, became a prestigious trade item between the Ottoman Empire and Europe, particularly with the commercial network of the

Ottomans with the Venetians. According to Rosamond E. Mack, there are two reasons that encouraged the Venetians to conduct carpet trade during the Italian Renaissance. The first is that only the most prosperous Europeans were able to purchase these carpets, because carpets as luxury goods symbolized wealth and power. Secondly, the provision of carpets was limited, which was most probably because the manufacturing of these hand-made carpets took a long time, and this increased the attractiveness of the Venetians towards the carpets.²⁹

Increasing interest among the Venetians in carpets, like their interest in ceramics, led to the reputation of carpets as an icon of cultural exchange between the Ottomans and the Venetians. However, the distinguishing feature of carpets from ceramics is that, while ceramics was an artwork produced both in the Ottoman Empire and in Italy at their own pleasure, carpet production remained unique to Ottoman culture. This means that ceramics became artworks causing reciprocal interaction between the Ottomans and the Venetians, but the spread of carpet from the Ottomans to the Venetians led to the emergence of one-sided relation among them. That is, carpets produced in the Ottoman territories attracted the attention of the Italians and were introduced to the Italian culture, which consequently provided an opportunity to the Ottomans to present their own artistic production to the different parts of the world. The adoption of Ottoman carpets into Venetian lifestyle can be exemplified with the paintings depicted by Italian Renaissance artist. According to Günsel Renda, it is sufficient to look at the paintings of sixteenth-century artists such as Hans Holbein, Lorenzo Lotto, Bernardino Pinturicchio and Sebastiano del Piombo to observe to what extent the Ottoman carpets became widespread.³⁰ In the literature, Ottoman carpets from the sixteenth century are referred as Holbeins, Mellings, Lottos, Bellinis and Crivellis because particular patterns of their individual groups appeared in paintings by those European artists.³¹ For instance, the carpet in the painting of Lorenzo Lotto, The Alms of St. Anthony, is classified as Lotto carpets whereas in the painting of Hans Holbein, The Ambassadors, the carpet is named Holbein carpet (Fig. 14). The depiction of Turkish carpets is not limited to the Italian paintings. In Dutch, Spanish, and English paintings carpets as decorative element are also depicted in the following centuries. The value given to carpets by Europeans increased

³¹ *Turkish Carpets from the 13th to 18th centuries, exhibition catalogue* (Istanbul: Ahmet Ertuğ, 1996), xi.
and, after the second half of the fifteenth century, this led to the presentation of carpets on tables rather than on the ground (Fig.15-16).\textsuperscript{32}

The representation of carpets in Italian paintings led to the appreciation of Ottoman decorative motifs by the Europeans, so that they were intermingled with the artistic style of European painters as in Holbein, Mellings and Lotto carpets. Remarkable is that geometrical motifs were the most widespread decorative type in Ottoman carpets, compared with other artworks, especially with ceramics ornamented with floral design. However, this discrepancy was blurred after the appearance of Ushak carpets.\textsuperscript{33} According to Kurt Erdmann, Ushak carpet led to a revolution in terms of motifs, compositions, colours, dimensions and techniques in the sixteenth century, because the geometrical patterns were now replaced by abstract floral motifs as well as the East Asian motifs such as the triple-spot, tiger-stripe, chintamani, lotus-blossom and Chinese cloud-bands.\textsuperscript{34} Particularly, medallion, star and chintamani were some of the commonly used motifs not only in Ushak carpets,\textsuperscript{35} but also in calligraphy, book-bindings, textiles and ceramics (Fig. 17-18).

VI. Conclusion

Although in this paper ceramics and carpets are attributed as icons of cultural exchange between the Venetians and the Ottomans in the sixteenth century, cultural interaction is not merely limited to them. As mentioned, motifs and patterns are fundamental indicators of the cultural exchange among them. This indicates that this cultural exchange is not only the exchange of the Venetians with the Ottomans, but also the exchange of the Ottomans with China, Japan and other European countries, apart from Italy. Therefore, in my opinion, in addition to diplomacy and trade, as main reasons for the appearance of cultural interaction among them, European interest in the East, stimulated by trade in the sixteenth century, is another significant motive in the emergence of a variety of artworks with patterns belonging to different cultures. That is, the curiosity in the West towards the East encouraged the

\textsuperscript{32} Rosamond E. Mack, \textit{Bazaar to Piazza: Islamic Trade and Italian Art, 1300-1600} (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2002), 130.
\textsuperscript{33} More recent research has pushed the beginnings of the Ushak group back to the fifteenth century, while analyses of designs have established a link with the Akkoyunlu Turcomans. See \textit{Turkish Carpets from the 13th to 18th centuries, exhibition catalogue}, xii.
\textsuperscript{34} \textit{Turkish Carpets from the 13th to 18th centuries, exhibition catalogue}, xii.
\textsuperscript{35} For the image, see Walter Denny, \textit{The Classical Tradition in Anatolian Carpets} (Washington, DC: The Textile Museum, 2002).
appreciation of Ottoman culture by Europeans and symbolically led to the engagement of Western patterns with Eastern motifs on artwork.
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