

THE DORIS DUKE JEWELRY COLLECTION

Until not too long ago, jewelry was associated with aristocracy and power. Only nobles needed gold and gemstones, and indeed they bedecked themselves with precious jewels in order to remind themselves and their vassals just how important they were. Jewelry, because it was inherently precious, was synonymous with wealth, and wealth was intimately associated with power.

Eventually, as ordinary people began to prosper, they desired the trappings of power and wealth. In colonial America, a small but steady demand for gold jewelry made by local craftsmen grew until, by the beginning of the 1800s, it warranted the start of a small jewelry “factory” by Epaphras Hinsdale in a modest New Jersey farm town called Newark.¹

By the middle of the nineteenth century, not only was there a well-established jewelry industry in this country—and not just in Newark but in every good-sized city in the nation—but there was also a vast middle-class market for the latest fashions of solid gold jewelry from Europe. Jewelry, once the province of the mighty, had become a desirable commodity for the rising *bourgeoisie*; once a luxury only for the very rich, it had become a necessity for the average American. Women had to have pearl necklaces and gold bracelets and diamond rings. Men had to have gold collar buttons and sleeve buttons and tie pins, as well as the requisite gold watch and chain with accoutrements such as seals and pocketknives. To cope with this growing demand, Newark factories employed hundreds of men, women, and children, working six days a week, to make solid gold jewelry.²

It was in this world of “jewelry as necessity” that Doris Duke’s maternal grandmother, Florine Russell Holt, was born and raised and married Thaddeus Holt, Jr., who came from a prosperous Macon, Georgia, family. The Holt family suffered financial ruin, probably in the panic of 1883, and Thaddeus later died at sea, leaving his widow and teenage daughter Nanaline to fend for themselves in genteel poverty. However, in the years before the hard times, Thaddeus had purchased for his wife the kind of elegant *haute bourgeoisie* jewelry that women of her class had come to expect. The carved coral jewelry that Doris Duke owned (*Figs. 8, 9*) most certainly came from her grandmother Holt and dated to the years shortly after the Civil War when the Holts were still prosperous.³ Such jewelry, invariably of a rich orange-pink coral mounted on yellow gold and naturalistically carved with leaves, roses, and other plant motifs, was standard fare for the genteel lady in the middle decades of the nineteenth century. The coral was carved in Italy and shipped to the United States where it was retailed throughout the country. Every aspect of the decorative arts of this period was influenced by French taste, from imported porcelains to the carved rosewood parlor furniture made famous in the American South by New York manufacturers such as John Henry Belter and Joseph W. Meeks. Florine Holt’s coral jewelry with its intricate carvings bears a lineage to these designs. Of special interest is the charming and beautifully crafted demi-parure of a brooch and earrings in the form of grape clusters (*Fig. 8*). The finely worked filigreed leaves and the coral grapes represent the plant motif of the typical mid-Victorian American home. The original presentation case for the set has survived, showing

that the brooch-and-earring demi-parure was the most common form for jewelry wearing in the period. This was not casual jewelry by any means. Florine Holt would have worn this group of coral jewelry with great pride and only on special occasions.

The word genteel seems strangely archaic today, but gentility was the yardstick by which all Americans measured themselves and their peers in nineteenth-century America. To be genteel, one did not need to be rich, although gentility implied a certain financial comfort and that comfort demanded jewelry as part of the necessary accoutrement. For more casual, daily wear, Florine Holt might have worn the carved cameo earrings and brooch encircled with half pearls (*Fig. 11*). Mimicking the carved cameos and intaglios of Roman antiquity, such jewelry was commonplace in Europe by the 1820s and spread throughout the American middle-class market in the 1860s, fueled by the popularity of the French *néo-grec* or “new Greek” style of Napoleon III and Empress Eugénie. A more glamorous and costly example of this fashion is the pair of gold woven-chain bracelets in the Etruscan style, both of which are engraved Holt (*Fig. 12*). Until the late-nineteenth century, bracelets were commonly worn in pairs, either as rigid bangles or as link bracelets. These bracelets are probably American and very likely were made in Newark, New Jersey, by the firm of W. C. Edge & Sons. William Edge was an English emigrant, who, by introducing machinery into what was formerly a hand-process, managed to lower the cost of woven gold, “foxtail” chains from one dollar to two cents per foot.⁴ These bracelets seem to take full advantage of the new chain-making technology of the 1880s and, thus, might date to the years after Thaddeus Holt’s impoverishment and death. In that case, perhaps they were a gift to Florine Holt from her daughter, Nanaline, who had regained prosperity through her marriage to William Inman.

Diamonds were very rare in American jewelry before they were discovered in South Africa in the late 1860s. From that time on, diamonds became—for the first time in human history—accessible to the middle class. The small diamond set in the center of Florine Holt’s gold watch from the 1890s (*Fig. 10*) is typical of the early use of such gems in more bourgeois jewels.⁵ This watch also exemplifies the “gendering” of jewelry in the nineteenth century. Women’s watches became smaller and more ornately decorated, while men’s watches remained larger and plainer.

To Nanaline Duke, and then to her daughter Doris, this small collection of heirloom jewels must have evoked poignant memories of a determined, strong-willed woman who clung to her genteel status through long years of hardship, to finally triumph in the meteoric rise of her only surviving child to the pinnacle of the Gilded Age society. However, another small group of modest jewels owned by Doris Duke tells another, even more poignant tale.

Among all the opulent jewels owned by Nanaline and Doris Duke, there is a small group of cuff links—set with simple cabochons of amethyst, moonstone, and turquoise. With them is a simple, gold pocketknife meant to be worn on a watch chain, engraved “J.B.D.” (*Fig. 4*). These are the only remaining examples of James Buchanan Duke’s own jewelry. To Doris Duke, these must have been talismans of the doting father who died when she was twelve years old. Aside from a gold watch chain, a pocket watch, and a signet ring,

he may not have owned much more jewelry than this.⁶ Men, even major industrialists of the Gilded Age, were not supposed to wear much jewelry. Even for the richest men, strict standards of good taste were imposed by social convention, at least for men who cared.⁷

James B. Duke bought jewelry at Tiffany & Co. in New York and Cartier in Paris, the same kind of elegant, yet simple, cuff links for daily wear that any other American businessman in any American city might have owned. Indeed, two of his sets of cuff links (*Figs. 5, 6*) were made by Carrington & Co., a Newark firm that produced elegant men's jewelry for high-end retailers all across the nation, including both Cartier and Tiffany. Although known for his flamboyant personality, he was never flashy in his personal dress, preferring, as we shall see, to dress his wife in glittering gems.

A single, diminutive gold bangle, inscribed "MM to DD" was given to Doris Duke as a toddler (*Fig. 3*). It is not known who made the presentation, perhaps a godmother. The dents on it suggest long wear by an active little girl. Such symbolic, simple jewels were given to babies during the nineteenth century. A gift of a gold bracelet symbolized in its material the preciousness of the recipient. In spite of high infant mortality in the nineteenth century, children were seen as new beginnings, and the tradition of baby gifts of silver or gold became deeply engrained by the early-twentieth century. It is in that light that we can see the delicate, little, pearl-encrusted gold locket, given to Doris Duke when she was eleven years old—possibly the last gift of jewelry her father gave her (*Fig. 2*). It is the kind of jewelry that any middle-class father might have bought his little girl as she entered adolescence. But more than that, it is the kind of jewelry that was seen as appropriate for an eleven-year-old girl. The fact that Doris Duke was worth many millions did not make any difference. Pearls symbolized purity, so they were what young girls wore—anything more would have been unseemly. Typically, this locket, plus a seed-pearl barrette and matching "handy pins" (*Fig. 1*) used for cuffs and collars, would comprise an entire ensemble of the kind that Doris Duke would have worn exclusively until she was in her teens.

Two final heirloom jewels symbolize the Gilded Age in a very literal way, one Doris Duke inherited from her mother, the other from her mother-in-law. Neither of these pieces were in fashion by the time she came of age, and so she probably kept them as symbols of powerful society women at the height of their social power. By the turn of the twentieth century, mesh bags, also known as chain purses or chatelaine purses, were popular at all economic levels. Base metal chain bags were favored fashion accessories through the 1920s, and silver-plated mesh bags sold for as little as ten dollars in most department stores. Sterling silver bags were more costly but still common enough for middle-class women. Solid gold bags, made in Europe as well as in America, were at the upper end of the market. A simple fourteen-karat gold, mesh bag, which sold for about five hundred dollars in the early 1900s, was considered appropriate for daytime use. Adding diamonds increased the dollar value.⁸ Nanaline Duke's mesh bag, its filigreed frame glittering with substantial diamonds (*Fig. 13*), and used as an evening accessory in the early years of her marriage, would have been a standard accoutrement for women of her class. By the late 1920s, she had acquired an even more glamorous, if more discreet, evening bag (*Fig. 23*).

Nanaline Duke's good friend and social peer, Philadelphia *grande dame* Eva Cromwell Stotesbury, owned a vanity case that functioned much like the above-mentioned purse. This vanity case of engraved green gold is set with sapphires and diamonds and dates from the years around World War I (*Fig. 14*). Like Nanaline's mesh bag, this opulent object was intended for evening use but was less bulky and was carried suspended from a chatelaine pin hooked to a belt or waistband. With its superb Louis XVI engraving, it evokes the lavish world of the *belle époque*, combining modern convenience with the trappings of aristocracy. Because it bears Doris Duke Cromwell's monogram as well as Eva Stotesbury's own name and address engraved on the frame, it was, most likely, given to Doris Duke around the time she married Eva Stotesbury's son, James Cromwell, in 1935.⁹

Two elegant pendant watches show a shift in Nanaline Duke's jewelry style from the late-nineteenth century to the early-twentieth century. The earlier watch (*Fig. 18*), made by Longines, retains its original fleur-de-lis chatelaine pin. A bright *bleu celeste* enamel contrasts with the rich rococo goldwork of the case, which is further ornamented with a central motif studded with small, rose-cut diamonds. Nanaline probably acquired this watch in the 1890s when she was still Mrs. William Inman. The later watch, by Tiffany & Co. (*Fig. 19*), demonstrates the altogether more subtle, but still very French, taste of Mrs. James B. Duke. The reticulated, knife-edge border of tiny diamonds contrasts with the brilliant green of the guilloché and transparent enamel border around the dial, which is further enriched with a blue swag-patterned guilloché and transparent enamel case centered with a cabochon emerald. As compared with the *haute bourgeoisie* quality of the Longines watch, the later Tiffany watch evokes self-consciously, upper-class refinement and subtlety; it represents Tiffany imitating Cartier imitating Fabergé. Compared with Florine Holt's gold pendant watch from a generation before (*Fig. 10*), it gives mute witness to how far Nanaline Holt's star had risen.

Doris Duke inherited all Nanaline's jewelry after her death in 1962. Although Doris Duke frequently modified her jewels over time (a habit she apparently learned from her mother), one of her mother's greatest jewels survived intact, probably because it was so strikingly beautiful and well made. Nothing better exemplifies Nanaline Holt Inman's new role as the wife of James B. Duke than the diamond festoon necklace Mr. Duke bought his bride at Cartier in Paris in 1908 (*Fig. 15*).¹⁰ Festoon necklaces were popular in the early-twentieth century, and nice examples in gold with pearls or amethysts could be purchased by middle-class women for as little as thirty dollars.¹¹ Nanaline Duke's festoon of diamonds and platinum was perhaps among the most opulent of its time in America. Cartier's Paris shop charged James B. Duke FR 18,500 for it, after he provided them with most of the large diamonds.¹² The icy-white color scheme of the necklace was the fashion for formal jewels in this period, when platinum had finally come to dominate diamond jewelry as the technology to work with this very hard metal was perfected. The classical symmetry and soft draping of the chains of diamonds embodied the luxurious style of the time, harking back to the designs of eighteenth-century European nobility. It epitomizes the *belle époque* period with its swags, decorated with four-petaled flowers, joined at the center by a vertical design ending with a pendant suspended from a natural pearl whose color softens the



Doris Duke with an unidentified gentleman. She is wearing the Verdura pink topaz and diamond ear clips (Fig. 49).

stark whiteness of the diamonds. The large pearl mounted just above the pear-shaped diamond pendant might seem odd but, at the time, pearls of large size were as valuable as diamonds.

Nanaline Duke would continue to combine pearls and diamonds throughout her jewelry-buying life. The next major example of this in the collection, showing a significant style shift, is an art deco diadem set with two large diamonds and a large oriental pearl, which either she or James B. Duke bought at Cartier in 1924 for \$23,000 (Fig. 16). Mikimoto's pearl farming process, first perfected in 1905, had not yet devalued natural Asian pearls, and it was logical for Nanaline to want to showcase this one. The geometric design of this bandeau-form tiara reflects Eastern European folk design and shows the continued influence of the Russian Imperial Court taste, over a decade after its demise. The more hard-edged look of this piece stands in strong contrast to the softer opulence of the earlier necklace.

A Cartier bracelet Nanaline Duke acquired a few years later (Fig. 17), set with magnificent diamonds, is a testament to superb design. Louis Cartier continually searched for new sources of inspiration for his jewelry designs. When the rectilinear style of the art deco period became popular, he turned to the design potential of ancient temples and pagodas, especially to such elements as

columns and arches on the Taj Mahal and the Pantheon, as well as abstract patterns formed by the stepped outlines found on ancient structures such as Babylonian ziggurats or Mayan temples. The architectonic possibilities of these shapes conformed to the emerging new style and offered a tableau for the new diamond cuts, including the baguette cut that Cartier introduced in 1912. This bracelet bears witness to their fine design. One marquise-cut and four pear-shaped diamonds counterbalance the angularity of the baguette-cut diamonds and serve the double function of softening the overall appearance while highlighting the striking effect of the columnlike central links. This design is dictated by the shape of the diamonds in much the same way that jewelry from the 1950s was conceived with no visible mounting, letting gemstones create the design.

A pair of bracelets purchased by Nanaline Duke, and later worn by her daughter, also presents a mixture of stylistic generations (*Fig. 22*). The soft graduated strands of fine pearls evoke the fashion for multistrand pearl dog collars and bracelets in the early-twentieth century. The drum-shaped clasps, set with baguette diamonds, however, are pure modernist design. Doris Duke considered them up-to-date enough to wear—together on one wrist, as was the 1930s fashion—when she was photographed by the celebrated Cecil Beaton (see page 46).

Nanaline Duke owned two important rings, both symbols of her new standing as Mrs. James B. Duke, which provide further proof of her love of large gemstones. The compressed globe of the large oriental pearl seen in one ring (*Fig. 21*) is recognizable in her 1926 portrait (see page 34). The pearl's large size (nine millimeters) and exotic, yet perfect, shape would have made it especially valuable in its day. By the same token, the monumental emerald-cut diamond from Tiffany's, nearly twenty carats in weight, speaks of a new, more hard-edged glamour (*Fig. 20*).

As the decades progressed, so did Nanaline Duke's taste in jewelry. Her Tiffany pendant watch and the diamond-mounted gold mesh purse represent styles from the turn of the century. But, styles changed and so did her preferences. Two pieces she added to her collection continued to document her shifting taste. James Buchanan Duke bought Nanaline a wristwatch with a pearl bracelet as a Christmas present in 1922 from Charlton & Co., in New York City, a prominent American jeweler. In 1935, Nanaline instructed Cartier to remake it with a diamond bracelet but to keep the original Charlton dial (*Fig. 27*).¹³ Wristwatches became popular after World War I, when men wore small watches strapped to their wrists in battle. The bracelet watch for women existed in the nineteenth century but did not gain broad favor until the late 1910s. For ladies of Nanaline Duke's age (she turned forty-eight in 1919), wristwatches did not really catch on until after World War I. Another piece in her collection, the ruby and diamond lapel watch (*Fig. 24*), is a rare example of a watch from the 1920s. In contrast, the *sautoir* watch, worn on a long chain around the neck, was offered by just about every retail jeweler.¹⁴

An elegant evening bag from Cartier exemplifies the monochromatic, geometric, art deco style of the early 1930s (*Fig. 23*). The design is based on Chinese motifs, an inspiration that is evident in Cartier's jewelry from this period. Contrasted with the solid gold mesh and large diamonds of Nanaline Duke's earlier purse, this one, while probably far more costly, is subtle and discreet.

Two more bracelets owned and worn by Nanaline Duke underline her generation's love of softer jewelry styles well into the 1920s. Like the pair of bracelets in Figure 22 with the drum-form clasps, the intricate, Middle Eastern latticework of pearls on a bracelet (*Fig. 29*) contrasts with the complex geometry of the diamond plaque at its center. Cartier's extensive work for the nobility of India might have influenced the design of this piece. Certainly Nanaline's love of large stones influenced the acquisition of the only large colored stone in her collection—a 35.54 carat Ceylon sapphire, set in a bracelet (*Fig. 30*) of pearl strands that James B. Duke bought for her from Cartier in 1925. Ceylon has produced fine sapphires for at least twenty-five hundred years, but this source, according to Benjamin Zucker in *Gems and Jewels*, "...is not as plentiful as before."¹⁵ Today, it is rare to find a

stone with the quality of the sapphire in this bracelet, precisely the type of stone that Louis Cartier would have sought for his jewelry designs. Cartier's fame for colored stones in the 1920s is evident only in this single piece in Nanaline's collection. Her daughter, on the other hand, would glory in colored stones throughout her own jewelry-collecting lifetime.

It is hard to imagine why Nanaline purchased the bracelet in Figure 28 from Cartier in 1939. It is an elegant and handsome piece, architectonic in its late art deco modernism, massive and tailored in its styling. It does not seem like the sort of jewel a woman nearing seventy would have purchased. And yet Nanaline owned it until her death in 1962. Perhaps its novelty intrigued her, or maybe it reminded her of the heavy, hinged gold bangles of her own mother's mid-Victorian youth in Macon, Georgia. Whatever her reasons for buying it, it seems oddly out of harmony with the rest of her jewelry.

Two pairs of clips—one of ear clips and one of dress clips—also offer a final insight into Nanaline Duke's evolving taste. The Egyptian lotus-form diamond ear clips from 1933, purchased at Cartier by Nanaline, hug the ear—the scroll fitting neatly over the lobe—in a most flattering fashion (*Fig. 26*). These ear clips are in keeping with the all-white look of jewelry at the end of the 1920s and the beginning of the 1930s. One of the last pieces of jewelry from Nanaline's collection—a pair of leaf-form diamond dress clips ornamented with rosettes of sapphires (*Fig. 25*)—evoke the romantic naturalism of the nineteenth century. Made by an unknown jeweler in New York in the early 1940s, these clips illustrate the rise of naturalism in jewelry in this decade. Doris Duke's own jewelry would also show this influence. To Nanaline, however, these clips would have reminded her of Victorian flower-form jewels, a familiar landmark in a world that had changed irrevocably from the one she entered as Mrs. James B. Duke in 1907.

When Doris Duke began to buy jewelry, her taste favored the more classical jewels from the 1930s. Unlike her mother, she did not go for the big gems. Even at the outset, her style was geared more towards design rather than the intrinsic value of the "big rocks." This early preference presaged her choice of jewelry for the rest of her life.

Perhaps being the richest woman in the world meant she did not have to impress others. For most of her life, she was hounded by the press, who were eager to take a photograph of her no matter what the occasion. She shunned publicity; even when her husband, James Cromwell, was seeking a political position, she avoided the press. As a child and young adult, since there had been many kidnapping threats, she never went out in public without a bodyguard. This emphasis on security caused her to travel incognito, to make airplane reservations under an assumed name, or to arrive at the airport at the last minute so no one would know beforehand that she was flying. This need for privacy influenced the way she lived and carried over to the jewelry she purchased.

Doris Duke patronized the foremost jewelry *maisons*, such as Cartier and Van Cleef & Arpels, as well as rising designers such as Paul Flato, Fulco di Verdura, Seaman Schepps, and David Webb, all of New York City. She often instructed them to make new jewels out of old ones, a custom she would have learned from her mother who was fond of having old jewels refashioned into updated styles, retaining the gemstones but getting rid of the mountings. Alas, the Duke women were not the only ones to do this, a major reason why



Doris Duke on her wedding day, September 1, 1947, when she married Porfirio Rubirosa. She is wearing the diamond and yellow gold choker (Fig. 68).

so many important gemstone jewels from past periods no longer exist.

In the early 1930s, when Doris Duke began buying her own jewelry, she was still under the influence of her mother, shopping at the same salons and choosing jewelry that followed the conservative taste of the period. The diamonds in her jewelry tended to be shaped in simple geometric cuts where the stones dictate the design but do not overwhelm. The pair of bracelets in Figure 35 feature two pavé-set diamond buckle motifs with circular, lozenge, marquise, and baguette-cut diamonds. The diamonds are set in such a way that the bracelets are flexible, feeling almost like a piece of fabric. These bracelets can be joined to form a choker necklace, a popular feature in the early 1930s, which would have accessorized the new fashions. In place of the flapper image of short skirts and plunging necklines of the mid-1920s, there was a shift to a more traditional silhouette through figure-slimming clothes in the 1930s. The stock market crash of 1929 and the ensuing Great Depression marked the end of an era and the temporary end of prosperity. Paradoxically, as day clothes became

more conservative in design, evening dresses were the most elegant of the century. This choker/necklace would have gracefully encircled the neck of the young Doris Duke at a chic evening engagement.

Although most of the jewelry Doris Duke bought in the 1930s is monochromatic, she did buy a few pieces with emeralds. Yet, even when she selected fine jewelry with important gem material, it was the color and not the size that mattered to her. The two emerald bead necklaces are such examples (Figs. 31, 32). The emeralds are fine specimens, strung simply like pearls; their monetary value resides in the quality of the stones. She would have worn them at the collar of a tailored suit, where they would have attracted the attention of both the discerning gem connoisseur and the untutored person who would not know their true worth. Besides valuing their superb color, Miss Duke also would have enjoyed them because emerald was the stone most associated with India.¹⁶

Cartier capitalized on the emerald's popularity in India, bringing back cabochon emeralds or emeralds engraved with floral designs that they set into imaginative jewels. The clip brooch and bracelet in Figures 33 and 34 (the former was remade in 1954 from an earlier design) that Cartier had created for Doris Duke are good examples. Cabochon emeralds are arranged within the central plaque; the Indian theme is evident in the lotus design of the clip brooch.

The Eastern theme is also seen on the vanity case in Figure 41. In the days of glamour, when the fashionable lady went out in the evening, she deemed herself undressed if she was without her requisite cosmetic articles, usually consolidated within an exquisitely designed vanity case. According to Sylvie Raulet, "...the most trivial item... offered a delightful pretext for combining the richest materials in the creation of a unique work of art—a work which could compete with the rarest pieces of the Renaissance and the eighteenth century."¹⁷ The vanity case, based on the oriental *inro*, was comprised of several compartments holding essential items such as a compact, lipstick, perfume flask, and comb. The Cartier vanity case (Fig. 41) in the Duke collection is decorated with lapis lazuli and colored gemstones with a central floral Indian motif reminiscent of an oriental carpet, a true work of art in miniature form.

Doris Duke married James Cromwell on February 13, 1935. They spent most of that year on their honeymoon, traveling to India, where she began her lifelong love affair with the arts of the East. The couple bought prodigiously: carpets, ivory carvings, tiles, jade, bronze statuary, clothing, and jewelry. On their return trip, they stopped in Hawaii where a year later Doris Duke bought a plot of land near Diamond Head for her home, Shangri La. While overseeing construction of the estate, she became friends with Sam Kahanamoku, a swimming champion who, at some point, gave her a bracelet with his swimming medals (Fig. 77).

Jewelry of the 1930s took on a softer look. Although straight geometric lines continued to dominate, curves were introduced and overall shapes became rounder. In response, Doris Duke had some of her outdated jewelry adapted into the new forms. From a clip brooch/hair barrette, she had Cartier create the pair of hair slides in Figure 40 in simple, half-moon shapes set with circular and baguette-cut diamonds. These hair slides are the type of jewelry she favored in the 1930s—nothing too ostentatious, nothing too bold. This also holds true for her earrings. In contrast to the long, dangling style from the art deco period, earrings now hugged the ear lobe. Another interesting piece of jewelry designed by Cartier is the pair of ear pendants in Figure 38. These elegant but understated jewels are beautifully conceived incorporating briolette diamonds. Most available reference material on diamonds agrees on one point about briolettes: they are a very rare form of cutting. A briolette is a pear or drop-shaped diamond whose surface is entirely covered with triangular facets. It is the oldest form of symmetrical diamond cutting, dating to the seventeenth century when advancements in optics opened the door to a way of faceting diamonds to allow greater light refraction. Over the ensuing centuries, this type of diamond cut has been the preferred choice for royal jewels.

Along with wide bracelets, double-clip brooches became a staple of the decade. They could be worn clipped to lapels or hats, or hooked together and worn as one brooch. The clip brooches in Figure 37 exemplify this flexibility of use. Convertible jewelry that could function in many ways was popular throughout the 1930s, perhaps in response to the Great Depression and the need to economize evident in all strata of society. By the 1940s, the economy was beginning to rebound. During the war, many women took over the jobs of men serving abroad; even Doris Duke served as a wartime International News Service correspondent. New challenges for women necessitated a new wardrobe. Large shoulder

pads lent an air of the military to jackets, coats, and dresses, and “separates,” ensembles of interchangeable skirts and blouses, were introduced. After the war, Christian Dior’s “New Look” brought a softer silhouette to the figure. Jewelry followed the new fashion trends with designs evolving into three-dimensional configurations with scrolls, volutes, domes, and rectangles. Curves were back, and nowhere is this more evident than in the double-clip brooch (*Fig. 36*) by Paul Flato. Streams of baguette-cut diamond, ribbon-like elements flow from the center. Drama had returned to jewelry design.

During the war years, it was American, rather than European, fashion designers who dictated what American women would wear. This was indeed true of jewelry designers. Up until the late 1930s, jewelry design in America had followed the dictates of European styles. Then, as a result of the Depression, many jewelers were forced to close their doors. Those who survived, or even flourished, were those who created innovative concepts and designs. Trabert & Hoeffler, Inc.—Mauboussin introduced the “Reflections” line whereby clients could design their own jewelry using parts made from castings. They, along with Paul Flato, catered to an emerging group of stage and screen stars avidly seeking the latest designs. Fashion magazines such as *Vogue* and *Harper’s Bazaar* were quick to illustrate the latest styles.

In the midst of the hard times, an invigorated style emerged reflecting developments in the fine and decorative arts, where machine-age concepts and a return to naturalism were occurring simultaneously. The latter was fostered by several new designers not connected with the main jewelry houses. One of the earliest and most innovative of these designers was Fulco di Verdura who, after working with Paul Flato, opened his own business in 1939. To him, design was always paramount. He took simple, universal images and turned them into playful, imaginative jewels. For the brooch in Figure 70, he borrowed the Indian head on the reverse of the five-cent piece, using a baroque pearl for the feathered headdress. This design is reminiscent of George Catlin’s paintings and drawings of American Indians from the nineteenth century.¹⁸ In the early 1940s, Verdura created a series of brooches made out of painted ivory chessmen from India (*Fig. 75*). He took these amusing figures and turned them into small works of art adorned with precious gemstones and pearls.¹⁹ These chessmen were not like anything that any other jeweler was making in the early 1940s. Instead, the chessmen were a refreshing look at jewelry design, based not on the value of the gem material but on creativity. Verdura was not afraid to stretch beyond traditional parameters to find a new, exciting vernacular, which was eagerly embraced by his clients. The chessmen must have appealed to Doris Duke, whose artistic eye had been honed by her collecting of Eastern artifacts and, in particular, by her strong love of India.

Doris Duke purchased a crossover necklace from Verdura (*Fig. 50*) that, although using traditional jewelry materials, was created in an innovative manner. Adorned with citrines attached to dangling wires, the necklace swoops around the neck in a manner similar to the diamond-set “Comet” necklace that Coco Chanel created in 1932 or the vine necklace by Paul Flato.²⁰ Verdura, who had worked for both Chanel and Flato, would have known this style. One can imagine Miss Duke carrying the gem-set vanity, also by Verdura (*Fig. 63*), that coordinates with this necklace.

In the 1960s, Doris Duke added a suite of pink topaz and diamonds by Verdura to her jewelry collection (*Fig. 49*). The necklace is formed as a circlet surrounding the neck from which pink topaz drops are suspended. Ear pendants and a coordinating bracelet complete the suite. She probably selected this jewelry as an appropriate complement to a dress or suit. Throughout her life, Doris Duke frequented Verdura's salon. Ward Landrigan, who purchased the company in 1985, remembers her buying cuff links for gifts. As he said, "She knew what she wanted and would study a piece intently. But, she was very specific...for example, she liked blue."²¹

Blue is the dominant color of the Seaman Schepps three-piece ensemble (*Figs. 60, 61, 62*) set with cabochon sapphires. Schepps, a talented jeweler who had opened for business in the 1920s, was a victim of the stock market crash in 1929 and was forced to close his shop on Sixth Avenue in New York City. Realizing that only new, innovative jewelry was saleable, he reinvented himself, opening a shop a few years later that offered only unique designs. He is credited as one of the designers to introduce whimsy back into jewelry design by incorporating man-made materials in combination with precious and semi-precious gemstones. The bracelet of this set (each piece was purchased at different times) is composed of five rows of cabochon sapphires, each stone a different size to give interest to the piece. The clasp is disguised in a buckle-type attachment decorated with engraved sapphires and set with diamonds and other gemstones that recalls the "fruit salad" bracelets created by Cartier in the late 1920s.²² The bunch-of-grapes clip brooch (*Fig. 60*) is large in scale but very wearable. In it Schepps made each cabochon sapphire grape a different shade of blue, just as on a real bunch of grapes—almost inviting one to pluck a grape to eat!

The 1950s was a time of affluence in America, similar to the late 1990s, in which this country sustained an extended period of growth when large segments of the population enjoyed the benefits of wealth. Fine jewelry was no longer the province of the rich. The middle class could now afford precious stone jewelry and desired to emulate such legendary screen stars as Grace Kelly, whose wedding to Prince Rainier III of Monaco on April 19, 1957, was an event that captivated the world. Jewelry of the 1950s evolved from the bold look of the previous decade into sumptuous gem-set creations. No longer would settings dominate a piece of jewelry; gemstones now became the focal point.

The jeweler who most epitomized this new direction was David Webb. Following in the footsteps of Flato, Verdura, and Schepps, he created bold, sculptural jewels that came to symbolize the essence of the modern woman in the second half of the twentieth century, when women began to assume a more dominant role in the work force and wanted jewels to reflect who and what they were.

Doris Duke was in her early fifties when she began buying jewelry from David Webb. Working closely with him, she was able to take advantage of his bold and colorful use of stones to achieve designs emphasizing the overall distinctiveness and elegance that suited her taste and lifestyle. When she bought from Webb, she wanted not just a necklace but also coordinating earrings. Ruby beads, accented with pearls, form a fringe necklace (*Fig. 52*), inspired by Eastern examples; another necklace is made of engraved fluted emerald beads, which could take months to make (*Fig. 47*). This necklace bears a relationship to the

multistrand necklaces favored by Indian maharajahs. Webb designed ear pendant drops (*Figs. 48, 51*) for both necklaces that could be suspended from a pair of diamond-set scroll earrings (*Fig. 56*). Opals with crystal spacers highlight another necklace formed of two strands and it, like the above mentioned necklaces, has a matching pair of ear pendants (*Figs. 53, 54*). The turquoise, sapphire, and diamond suite consists of a necklace and bracelet that Miss Duke purchased in 1965 (*Figs. 44, 46*). According to Stanley Silberstein at David Webb, Inc., “The necklace was a private commission for Miss Duke.”²³ Four years later, she returned to Webb to buy ear clips with the same stones, this time set in all platinum (*Fig. 45*). Perhaps the most spectacular David Webb jewel in Doris Duke’s collection is a diamond brooch, made with pear-shaped diamonds from a bracelet that her mother had given to her (*Fig. 55*). This floral spray bears similarities to the jewelry the Parisian jeweler, Massim, designed in the 1850s with mountings with waterfall, or *pampille*, settings in which diamonds are set on articulated wires that quiver when worn. It was designed with three stems that curl upwards, evolving into three leaves from which either pear- or marquise-cut diamonds are suspended. The theme of movement is provided both in the design of the gracefully arched stems and leaves that direct the eye to the dangling diamonds, as well as in the actual movement of the hanging diamonds themselves. Attention has been paid to details such as the leaves, where circular-cut diamonds decorate each leaf while baguette-cut diamonds delineate the center vein. It is truly a spectacular jewel, in keeping with the splendid diamond jewelry her mother owned.

Another spectacular jewel acquired by Doris Duke is a one-of-a-kind pair of diamond, pearl, and baroque pearl ear pendants measuring 3½ inches in length (*Fig. 69*). With the diamond-set rosettes and dangling elements, they are similar in design to Indian jewelry, like many other pieces in her collection. Miss Duke also owned a pair of costume jewelry ear pendants that are almost identical to this pair. In fact in photographs of her, it is hard to distinguish which pair she is wearing.

In contrast to the Webb ear pendants, Doris Duke owned two pairs by Van Cleef & Arpels that clip onto the ear lobe without any dangling elements. In one, diamonds are patterned in the guise of snowflakes (*Fig. 66*); the other features scrolls set with aquamarines and diamonds (*Fig. 67*). Both are easy to wear during the day or into the evening. They both recall her mother’s Cartier scroll ear clips from 1933 (*Fig. 26*). She also owned a suite of “Hawaii” flower jewelry by Van Cleef & Arpels (*Fig. 73*). It is made with clusters of flowers consisting of diamond centers and alternating sapphire and ruby petals, arranged in dome-like constructions.

The last piece of Western jewelry that we know Doris Duke bought for herself is the pair of Cartier emerald-bead ear clips (*Fig. 64*) she purchased at auction in 1991, just two years before her death. When one looks at these jewels, one can see why she would want them: set with emeralds, the stone she most associated with India, in the shape of leaves, a reference to nature, they are, like all Cartier jewelry, superbly crafted. These ear clips epitomize both her taste in jewelry and her lifelong love affair with the arts of the East.

Doris Duke's taste for jewels from India dates to 1935, the year she took her honeymoon trip around the world with Jimmy Cromwell. At that time, the Indian subcontinent was still the "jewel in the crown"—the crown being, of course, the British Empire. India was divided into some six hundred autonomous princely states and territories. The glory days of the Mogul empire in the north and west were long gone, but tattered remnants remained, with petty kings and nobles living out their days organizing tiger hunts and other amusements. In the capital city, Delhi, the newly married Cromwells were entertained by the viceroy, Lord Willingdon, and the field marshal, Philip Chetwode.²⁴ It is likely that they were treated to some glittering dinner parties in settings that would have seemed like a fantastic dream in comparison to the luxurious but staid environment they had come from. Even though all the warning signs of change were there, the British Empire in India was still keeping up appearances, maintained by thousands of servants, cooks, and gardeners. Members of the Indian elite would have mixed with the British upper echelon at parties but usually without their wives or other female members of their households.

A required stop on the itinerary of all tourists to India in 1935 was, as is now, the Taj Mahal in Agra. Built by the fifth Mogul emperor, Shah Jahan, as a tomb for his beloved wife, Mumtaz, it was supposed to be mirrored by an identical building in black marble on the opposite riverbank, but that never came to pass (this story may be a romantic myth). It is likely that, if the stories of Doris Duke declaring that she wanted a building like the Taj Mahal are true, she already had an eye for the kind of architecture and art that she later collected in such abundance, including jewelry. She hired an architect in Delhi to design doors and windows to be fabricated and inlaid with jade, agate, malachite, lapis lazuli, and mother of pearl by craftsmen in Agra, to be shipped later to America.²⁵ Local craftsmen, descendants of the same families that created the inlaid stonework on the Taj, had fallen on hard times as patronage from the old families was no longer there. The princely states in pre-independence India still supported artists and craftsmen to some degree, even into the 1930s, but industrialization had eaten into the livelihoods of many craft professions. Under these circumstances, a commission from a wealthy American must have been very well received.

To understand the jewelry from India that Doris Duke collected, it is important to have some knowledge of the history of the country and how jewelry was viewed within the culture of the land and to understand the forms and styles that had been popular for many centuries. In many cases, these styles are vastly different from Western designs and are, therefore, foreign to our Western sensibilities. The reign of Shah Jahan and the Taj Mahal in the seventeenth century came at the apex of the Mogul empire, when its vast accumulated wealth was spent on creating works of art in every medium. Even their lethal hunting daggers and swords for warfare were exquisitely crafted with jade handles inlaid with rubies and emeralds and with scabbards covered with silk and gold velvet. Nothing in daily use in the Mogul court was left unadorned, and the men were as jeweled and perfumed as the women.

Every year on his birthday, Emperor Aurangzeb, the son of Shah Jahan, was weighed against gold, silver, textiles, and other valuables from the Treasure, which were then given to charity. After the ceremony, the guests—including officials, family members, and nobles—gave the Emperor gifts, which were then recorded by scribes. In October 1665,

he received diamonds, rubies, emeralds, pearls, gold, silver, carpets, brocades, elephants, and horses, probably worth many times more than what he had given away to charity.²⁶ This custom persisted until at least 1937, two years after the Cromwells' honeymoon trip, when the Maharajah of Bikaner was weighed in gold ingots on the fiftieth anniversary of his rule, and the equivalent amount in cash was distributed to charity.²⁷

Work in metal, stone work, textiles and, above all, jewelry, was exquisite. Women of the Mogul courts in India, roughly from the sixteenth to the nineteenth centuries, were treated like exotic imprisoned birds, not allowed the freedom to do much besides compete with each other in the accumulation of jewelry and clothing purchased with the cash allotments they received. A pleasing appearance was rewarded with more gifts of jewels as a sign of approval (in a limited sense not unlike the milieu in which Doris Duke may have been raised).²⁸

Intrigue ruled in the women's quarters, or *zenana*, where competition was fierce. As a result, craftsmen tried to outdo each other in creating gilding for the already lovely ladies. Niccolao Manucci, a Venetian who spent many years in India in the last half of the seventeenth century and early part of the eighteenth, and was allowed access to the *zenana* to administer medical aid, wrote quite detailed descriptions of the women's jewelry.²⁹ A woman would have her nose pierced with a gold hoop strung with pearls, possibly a smaller ring studded with gems, or as a variation a gold stud. A pendant would be worn on the forehead, attached by bands of pearls or gold chains. There were many variations of earrings, some so long that they had to be attached to the hair or to a neckband to relieve the weight. Upper arms would have armlets, and lower arms and wrists could have multiple bracelets and bangles of various widths. As Manucci recounts, "On their fingers are rich rings, and on the right thumb there is always a ring, where, in place of a stone, there is mounted a little round mirror, having pearls around it. This mirror they use to look at themselves, an act of which they are very fond, at any and every moment."³⁰ In present-day India, such adornments are still seen during weddings, when borrowed finery or family jewels are brought out for the wedding party.

In India, Doris Duke was certainly exposed to abundant local history and folklore, but as she did in her own country, she exercised her own preferences for jewelry and frequently altered pieces to suit her looks and style. A good example is the centerpiece of her Indian jewel collection (*Fig. 80*), a bib necklace that she had had adapted from a necklace, a pendant clip, and earrings she bought at auction in 1971; the pieces had originally been made in India for the noted Polish soprano, Ganna Walska.³¹ The enormous diamonds boast their Indian heritage within a distinctly Western design.

For Western women, bracelets are probably the most easily wearable items of Indian jewelry, and Miss Duke acquired some wonderful examples. In a pair of delicate bracelets (*Fig. 84*), rubies are made to look like rose petals, each ruby pierced on the unseen, overlapped edge and threaded with a wire which is then embedded in lac, a natural resin of animal origin, to hold it in place.³² *Kara* (*Fig. 83*) is a typical enameled bangle bracelet from Jaipur with elephant head protome terminals. The bracelet opens by means of a tiny screw set to the side of the animal head. This style of bracelet, with animal heads guarding the opening, is believed to have originated in the Near East and spread to India in the third century A.D. The design,

still popular in India, became fashionable in the West during the art deco period after Cartier introduced it during the 1920s.³³ The animal heads can also take the form of parrots, tigers, snakes, dragons, and makaras, or creatures from Hindu mythology.³⁴

During the late 1960s and early 1970s, when flamboyant “ethnic chic” clothing spread from the so-called “hippie revolution” all the way to the far reaches of Newport society, Indian jewelry fit perfectly with the party clothes of the day. The lovely armlets, or *bazuband* (Fig. 85), which might have looked quite outrageous if worn with a 1950s gown, would have been worn with perfect aplomb in the early 1970s. These are examples of the most finely worked type of armlet, interlocking units set with diamonds and enameled on the reverse side with tiny flowers. The anklets (Fig. 104) of diamonds set with gold, along with these armlets, would only have been worn by women of great privilege, if not royalty. For a less ostentatious type of armlet, the charming pair with seed pearl bracelets (Fig. 98) bears a resemblance to granulated gold jewelry of a similar form.

Hands were another area of the body decorated in every possible manner in India. The pair of hand ornaments (Fig. 95), called *hathphul*, or “hand-flower,” were not just placed on bare hands but were complemented by floral *mehndi* (henna) designs covering the palms and fingers (as well as the soles of the feet).

In a favored technique peculiar to Indian jewelry,³⁵ used in many of the pieces in this collection, stones are set in a purified gold ground, called *kundan*, which requires heating beaten strips of gold foil and then pressing them around the stones. *Kundan* was used in the spectacular *arya* (necklace) made in Bikaner, in the western edge of the Great Indian Desert (Fig. 89). The *arya* is one of the most complex constructions in Indian traditional jewelry.³⁶ *Kundan* was also used in many of Doris Duke’s other pieces, such as an armlet from Jaipur set with multicolored stones (Fig. 93) and a pair of ruby and diamond bangles (Fig. 82).

A very easy piece for Doris Duke to wear would have been the complex and lovely diamond, pearl, and sapphire gold necklace with polychrome enamel on the reverse and edged with a fringe of tiny pearls (Fig. 88). This piece matched her coloring preference in a way that ruby and emerald pieces would not.

Belts, either rigid or in sections, were another part of the traditional north Indian court costume. The belt (*kamarband*, from which comes cummerbund) from Jaipur (Fig. 99) is made of white sapphires set into gold with polychrome enamel on the reverse.

Indian earrings were often so long that they covered the entire side of the head and neck, fastening onto the hair under a veil. Two examples of these (Figs. 91, 92) are made in a style still worn by Indian brides.

A few pieces from Doris Duke’s collection of Indian jewelry do not belong to the north Indian jewelry tradition. One of these is a magnificent necklace from Madras (Fig. 100), featuring a typically south Indian design with small cabochon-cut rubies probably from Burma, where they occur in gem-bearing gravel of alluvial deposits. Indian craftsmen try to preserve the maximum size of these gems, which are naturally rather small and reasonable in cost.³⁷

Another south Indian piece is the hair ornament in the form of a *nagaraja*, or snake-king (Fig. 101), meant to be fastened at the nape of the neck. A long, attached jeweled piece

ending in tassels—missing from this example—would conceal the wearer’s braid of hair. Typically, this ornament would be worn by brides or by *Bharata-natyam* dancers. For the latter, the long jeweled braid would sway as they danced.³⁸ Other ornaments depicting the sun and the moon would be fastened higher up on the back of the head. A five-headed *nagaraja* is sometimes depicted hovering over the head of Goddess Durga as a protector, so this tradition may derive from that source.³⁹

The Thai pieces from the Duke collection provide interesting contrasts to her Indian jewelry. Doris Duke loved Thai art and architecture, and indeed she wanted to build an entire Thai village in Hawaii. However, when appropriate land could not be obtained for it there, she had the village sent to Duke Farms, her Hillsborough, New Jersey, estate. The Thai belt buckle of gold and diamonds (*Figs. 105, 106*) seems more refined and delicate in comparison with the somewhat earthier Indian pieces. Comparing the Indian necklace of rubies and diamonds (*Fig. 87*) to the Thai necklace of synthetic rubies and silver gilt (*Fig. 109*) gives one a sense of the difference in approach between the two cultures.

The foregoing discussion attempts to present the Doris Duke jewelry collection within the context of her family background and her own development as an avid collector. Hopefully, this account has succeeded in showing that this collection is much more than an assemblage of beautiful, expensive pieces that a person of refined tastes and almost unlimited resources accumulated during her long life. Two important aspects make this collection unique and immensely valuable. Firstly, it includes jewelry purchased during almost every period critical to the development of the American jewelry industry, starting from the emergence of the mass market for jewelry in the nineteenth century and spanning through several critical phases of its subsequent evolution to a position of leadership in the twentieth century. At the same time, because of Doris Duke’s strong interest in the arts from the East, the collection provides an excellent perspective on aesthetic values and techniques predominant in India and other Eastern countries, as well as a firsthand view of possibilities for a successful marriage of Eastern and Western jewelry materials and designs. And, of course, guided by her unerring eye, viewing the collection is an undeniable aesthetic delight.

End Notes

1. Ulysses Grant Dietz, "The Glitter & The Gold: Fashioning America's Jewelry," in *The Glitter & The Gold: Fashioning America's Jewelry* (Newark: The Newark Museum, 1997), p. 11.
2. By 1869, there were 1,493 people working full time in the jewelry industry in Newark. See also Ulysses Dietz, "The Glitter & The Gold," p. 15.
3. It is unlikely that any of this early jewelry belonged to a Duke. Washington Duke, Doris Duke's paternal grandfather, was twice widowed by the end of the Civil War. Moreover, the Dukes were smalltime, rural farmers—respectable, but relatively poor. It was probably not until James B. Duke's generation that Duke women would own fine jewelry. For illustration of other examples of coral jewelry, see Martha Gandy Fales, *Jewelry in America 1600-1900*, (Woodbridge, Suffolk: Antique Collector's Club, 1995), pp. 244-45.
4. Janet Zapata, "The Names Behind the Jewelry," in *The Glitter & The Gold*, p. 169.
5. Ferdinand Herpers of Newark, New Jersey, patented the first pronged setting for diamonds in 1872, just one year after the Kimberly Pipe was discovered. See Ulysses Dietz, *The Glitter & The Gold*, p. 17.
6. There is a dress set of mother of pearl with small diamonds (Fig. 111) that was most likely Mr. Duke's and a plain gold pocket watch that belonged to Doris Duke's half-brother, Walker Inman (Fig. 120).
7. Jenna Weissman Joselit, "Jewelry: The Natural Gift," in *The Glitter & The Gold*, p. 22, fig. 13.
8. Dietz, "Producing What America Wanted: Jewelry from Newark's Workshops," in *The Glitter & The Gold*, p. 89.
9. According to Elizabeth Steinberg, archivist, Doris Duke Charitable Foundation, this piece was listed in Nanaline Duke's estate appraisal in 1962. This contradicts the evidence offered by the piece itself and suggests the possibility that Doris Duke gave it to her mother after her divorce from Cromwell in 1943.
10. The original invoice is in the Duke University Rare Book, Manuscript, and Special Collections Library.
11. Dietz, *The Glitter & The Gold*, p. 66.
12. James B. Duke bought another item which, also, is recorded on the same invoice as the diamond necklace. He purchased a tiara (probably dismantled at a later date) that could convert into a corsage ornament and shoulder brooch. Set with seven large pear-shaped diamonds, that piece cost James B. Duke \$110,000; Cartier provided all of the stones. A copy of this invoice is located in the Duke University Rare Book, Manuscript, and Special Collections Library.
13. We would like to thank Bonnie Selfe at Cartier for noticing that the bracelet on this watch is by Cartier and not by the maker on the dial, Charlton & Co.
14. Newark's Henry Blank & Co. provided such diamond-studded *sautoir* and lapel watches for both Tiffany and Cartier at this period. For an illustration of a *sautoir* watch from an unknown maker from the early 1920s, see Janet Zapata, "Jewelry at the Toledo Museum of Art," *The Magazine Antiques*, vol. CLVIII (October 2000): p. 511.
15. Quoted in Benjamin Zucker, *Gems and Jewels: A Connoisseur's Guide* (New York: Thames & Hudson, 1987), p. 33.
16. Even though the finest emeralds come from the mines in Colombia, they are commonly associated with India. The maharajahs, fascinated with the stone, bought the rarest and best examples. In the nineteenth century, Westerners purchased emeralds that had been exported to India.
17. Quoted in Sylvie Raulet, *Art Deco Jewelry*, (New York: Rizzoli International Publications, Inc., 1985), p. 271.
18. These paintings served as inspiration for many designers such as Charles Grosjean at Tiffany & Co., who designed a flatware set for William Randolph Hearst with dancing Indians on the handle. For illustration, see William P. Hood, Jr. with Roslyn Berlin and Edward Wawrynek, *Tiffany Silver Flatware 1845-1905: When Dining Was an Art* (Woodbridge, Suffolk: Antique Collectors Club, 1999), pp. 258-261.
19. When the chessmen were first offered, they sold out quickly, bought by prominent society ladies. For more information and illustrations of other examples, see Patricia Corbett, *Verdura The Life and Work of a Master Jeweler* (New York: Harry N. Abrams, Inc., 2002), pp. 110-111.
20. For illustration of the necklace by Coco Chanel, see Patrick Mauriès, *Jewelry by Chanel* (Boston, Toronto, London: Little, Brown and Company, 1993), cover illustration. For illustration of vine necklace by Paul Flato, owned by Lily Pons, see Penny Proddow, Debra Healy and Marion Fasel, *Hollywood Jewels Movies-Jewelry-Stars* (New York: Harry N. Abrams 1992), p. 115.

21. Janet Zapata telephone conversation with Ward Landrigan, February 2003.
22. Around 1924, Cartier introduced a line of jewelry known as “tutti frutti” or “fruit salad.” The design was based on the Chinese continuous vine with a diamond-stem from which “grew” engraved rubies, sapphires and emerald leaves. For illustration, see Judy Rudoe, *Cartier 1900-1939* (New York: Harry N. Abrams, Inc. and Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1997), p. 226-227.
23. Janet Zapata telephone conversation with Stanley Silberstein, David Webb, Inc., February 2003
24. Stephanie Mansfield, *The Richest Girl in the World*, (New York: G. P. Putnam, 1992), p.155.
25. *The Richest Girl in the World*, p.154.
26. Oppi Untracht, *Traditional Jewelry of India*, (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1997), p. 343.
27. Untracht, *Traditional Jewelry of India*, p.343.
28. Untracht, *Traditional Jewelry of India*, p. 349.
29. Untracht, *Traditional Jewelry of India*, p. 264.
30. Untracht, *Traditional Jewelry of India*, p. 347.
31. The Polish opera soprano Ganna Walska sang with Enrico Caruso and played for Arturo Toscanini in the early-twentieth century. For more information, see Ganna Walska, *Always Room at the Top*, (New York: Richard R. Smith, 1943).
32. Untracht, *Traditional Jewelry of India*, p.324. Lac is produced by an insect indigenous to India. It is the only natural resin of animal origin. It is used as a red dye, as a setting for stones, and is the main ingredient of shellac.
33. For illustrations of Cartier jewelry based on Indian prototypes, see Hans Nadelhoffer, *Cartier Jewelers Extraordinary* (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1984), color plate 35.
34. Untracht, *Traditional Jewelry of India*, pp. 270, 404.
35. Manuel Keene, et. al., *Treasury of the World: Jewelled Arts of India in the Age of the Mughals* (London and New York: Thames & Hudson, 2001), p. 18.
36. Untracht, *Traditional Jewelry of India*, pp. 348-349.
37. Untracht, *Traditional Jewelry of India*, p. 323.
38. For more information and an illustration a *nagaraja* attached to a jeweled piece, *Traditional Jewelry of India*, p. 50-51.
39. A.G. Mitchell, *Hindu Gods and Goddesses* (New Delhi and London: UBS Publisher's Distributors Ltd., 1982), plate 47.