

## HISTORICAL-ARTISTIC REPORT (Current Progress)

Alfonso Pleguezuelo Hernández (transl. from Sp. to Eng. by Charlotte Andersen)

### INTRODUCTION

Art history serves a support-role in the interpretation of the excavated materials, and helps us define two main objectives:

1) To give historical-artistic documentation of the chosen sites. In cases like ours where previously (historically) unidentified buildings are being excavated, this objective is difficult to realize. Later, however, we will see that one of the sites suggests a hypothesis for identification of the topography; this will, if it is confirmed, certainly renew interest in the work. This objective, with an obvious load of scientific and tangible evidence could be complemented by the following objective:

2) To enrich the material's historical representation, as elaborated by archaeology, by analyzing the material from an art-history perspective.

One problem with attempting this type of analysis is the difference between units of study in archaeology and in art history. In archaeology, schemata and methodological models are applied to "sites," while the field of art history, as traditionally interpreted, has always preferred the convenient choice of a set of "character units." This set is supposedly closed, as with a single work of art, an artist, a period, or historical problems with very clearly defined spacial-temporal limits. This "focus" is precisely opposed to the intrinsically open character of a site: incomplete and fragmentary in the material it offers the archaeologist. The current site is no exception, especially because the work is undertaken as urban rescue archaeology, and is therefore not systematic.

On the other hand, these three sites have allowed us to study the typological characteristics and chronology of the finds which they yield. These characteristics are considered ideal with respect to this project's topic of study. In no case, however, has particular evidence been systematically sought out in order to elucidate this extremely limited subject. The concept of a "site" has, in our case a limited definition, due to the operating necessities of urban rescue archaeology.

With these considerations, we have attempted to justify the lack of a methodological model, from an art-history perspective that is common to all of the sites. It seems more practical and viable to begin with the material excavated from the sites, and to extract only a few threads from the complicated tangle that is the history of ceramics in Seville in the 16th and 17th centuries. Each of the sites offers materials that are sufficiently significant to allow us to establish an enormous inventory of problems without solutions, as well as unfinished hypotheses, and ideas to be supported or refuted. In this first short report we are forced to be very selective in choosing the pieces that will be discussed, and can therefore not discuss the fragments in the detailed manner they deserve.

The analyzed materials can be grouped according to chronology and other characteristics. On a general level, we can divide the finds into two groups. The first group consists of questions suggested by the finds from the site located between Pureza and Pelay streets (we will call it "Pureza"). The chronological placement of this site is the first half of the 16th century, with only one theme lasting until 1600.

The other group consists of pieces that are similar to those at other sites: San Vicente, Segura, Tintes and Lirio streets. These sites have yielded generally more recent materials (16th and 17th centuries), and show styles that

are unknown among the older finds, like those at Pureza. This discussion is not included in this document, as it has yet to be drafted.

## 1. THE PUREZA STREET SITE

Of the seven sections of the dig at the Pureza site, numbers 2,3 and 4, found in three juxtaposed areas, are the most interesting. We will not describe the concrete aspects of the excavation, as they are already described in the work of the archaeologist who found the site (Lorenzo, 1987). We will only stress the importance of the discovery, at this site, of a kiln of traditional arab type. The kiln is partially preserved, and contains a collection of wasters that were apparently buried when the kiln collapsed. The wasters appear to be from the same time, as indicated by the similarity of the excavated material inside to the material outside the kiln itself. The kiln has been dated to the 16th century by Lorenzo (1987). This date is supported by the materials that have appeared in the context of the kiln, and may be definitively established upon further analysis. Consequently, it will be possible to arrive at the date of the construction of the kiln itself.

### 1.1 SMOOTH, POLYCHROME "AZULEJOS"

Of all of the finds in section #4 of the site, four fragments of azulejos stand out because of their historical importance [translator's note: "azulejos" are smooth-surfaced, glazed, polychrome tiles, about 4" by 4", designed to be mounted on walls (Lister and Lister, 1976: 21)]. These tiles are without a doubt from the workshop of Francisco Niculoso Pisano. They were not all found inside the kiln, nor all-together, but the contexts in which they were found are very similar, and in all cases they were found in conjunction with similar ceramics. This leads us to believe that the sherds are all the same age.

One of the sherds (412-1736) not only possesses all the characteristics of other Pisano tiles (with regards to thickness, paste, glaze, colors and style), but also belongs to a specific series of Pisano's works: the octagonal tiles that he designed for mounting on the altar that he made in 1518 for the convent of Tentudia in the province of Badajoz (Frothingham, 1964: 17, fig.26). Only one corner of the tile showing one fourth of the eight-petalled flower remains. We believe that these tiles occupied the spaces left by the artisans who imitated the work of Renaissance carpenters. The evidence is sufficient for us to attribute the tiles to Pisano.

On another sherd (422-2165), the decoration is a spear and some ribbons that tie it to an only partially present coat-of-arms. It is probably related to one of the military trophies that this artist used to make "candelieri" (italian for candlesticks). We have not yet found another tile exactly like this one, but descriptions of lost tiles assure us that they were used in this manner. One such description is that of the classical template on which the image of St. Paula appears. This was found on the exterior facade of the Sevillian convent of Santa Paula (Davillier, 1865, in Gestoso, 1903: 198).

The third fragment (447-2911-12) is the largest in size, and although the scale of the decoration makes it difficult to identify, the existing part indicates the approximate size of the complete tile. This confirms our suspicions that the piece was of the same large format that Pisano frequently used in works of a certain size. It is difficult to identify the individual motifs, although they resemble the branches of Gesse's geneological tree, a theme Pisano used on more than one occasion to mark his altar-piece scenes.

The fourth tile that we can tie to Pisano is one of the above type. Unfortunately, a mistake during firing has resulted in the loss of a large portion of

its decoration, so that only the physical characteristics remain to indicate that it was made by the same person as the third fragment.

In the same complex we have found a relatively large number of green-glazed "alizares" [translator's note: "alizares" are rectangular tiles used in the corner-angles of walls (Lister and Lister, 1976:15)]. As is widely known, they were used to protect and finish off the corners of the walls, the edges of a garden, or windowsills. Pieces of this type were probably already in use during the Middle Ages, but we have only found pieces glazed all in green among the works of Pisano. These pieces were found in conjunction with cuenca tiles, all of which can be dated to the first four decades of the 16th century. After 1560 tiles glazed in this way were no longer used; instead the vessels were brush-painted in either blue or polychrome on a white background.

In addition to the above mentioned sherds, a great number of other azulejo fragments have been found; some are white-glazed, and some with blue glaze. We know that Pisano made white and green tiles to decorate the of the Cimbório (Gestoso, 1903:181).

## 1.2 GLAZED TERRACOTA

In one sector, away from the polychrome azulejo tiles, there is a piece of great importance. Three pieces of sculpted terracota covered with a milky white tin glaze were found there. The largest of the pieces (419-2024) can be identified as the lower section of a Crucifix. The feet of Christ, nailed to a slanted 'support' on the vertical beam of the Cross can be identified.

We have found a complete statue of Christ on the Cross that is probably the same type as the above fragment. It resembles a sculpture in the church of San Bartolome in Villalba del Alcor (Huelva). This sculpture was

previously located in the attic of the facade of the former church of the Misericordia. Our fragment is probably part of a simplified model made for the portal of Santa Paula at approximately the same time. The statue was removed and taken to the Cloister of the parroquia to be restored (ABC de Sevilla, July 5, 1983).

There may have been a statue of this type over the portal to the church in the convent of Santa Paula itself (Dr. Amores, personal communication). In fact, upon careful examination of the area above the portal, it is clear that all the cherubs and balusters are creamy-white-glazed terracota figures; all except for the Cross. The stone Cross stands on a base of rocks and a skull, all made of glazed terracota. Both the material and the design of the Cross clash with the overall character of the decorative group.

We are unable to take measurements of the base from which the original sculpture was removed because the figures are too far off the ground. The sculpture at Villalba, however, has allowed us to estimate that the diameter of the original Cross is the same as the Cross whose fragment we have discovered. In addition to the coincidence of measurements and physical characteristics, there are other similarities between the fragment, the work at Villalba and the portal of the Sevillian convent.

The Cross is cylindrical, and is finished at the extremities with "bracelets" of leaves of the same type that Pisano used in blue in some of his scenes. The four points of the Cross are crowned with conical pieces glazed in the same green as the thorn-crown on the head of the sculpture. On the external corners of the intersection of the apses there are triangular pieces, decorated with fine plants that coil around some flowers. These pieces serve to consolidate the

stability of the work. This motif and motifs like it are almost identical to the flowers that appear on the pedestals of the cherubs at Santa Paula.

Although the Cross is a Renaissance style cross, the iconographic type of the sculpture is similar to examples of late Gothic works which dominated Sevillian sculpture until ca. 1500. The closest parallels we have found are the Crucifixes that we believe are attributed to the circle of Pedro Millan (Pleguezuelo, 1981:75-83). One of his works is, perhaps not coincidentally, found in the church of the convent: the church of Cristo de los Corales.

Studies of the works of Francisco Niculoso Pisano (Gestoso, 1882; Frothingham, 1964; Morales, 1977:25) conclude that the artist combined Gothic flamenco (for the figures) and Renaissance (for the decorations) styles with the greatest fluidity. This work, like the rest of the terracotas at Santa Paula can be included in this description.

Several ideas emerge from all of this. Firstly, we have an additional argument to support the idea that the materials excavated at the Pureza site are from the workshop of Pisano.

Secondly, Pisano produced his terracotas in the same place that he made his azulejo tiles. The archaeological evidence confirms what could have been deduced from a document, dated 1510, in which a certain Claudio de la Cruz, perhaps a Frenchman, empowered Gyralte Veles to collect a number of tiles from Niculoso. These tiles were to symbolize "all of the time that the above mentioned person was in office, in which there is a figure in the fayance of said Niculoso" (Gestoso, 1903: 173).

Although it has demonstrated that terracotas were also made in his workshop, the above document leaves some important questions as to involvement of Niculoso in the actual design of these works. The designs in question are the

gothic borders surrounding the circular reliefs of Santa Paula, and the degree of similarity between the relief motifs and those painted by him on his tiles. Perhaps he supplied the designs for these ornamental objects himself, but then the question remains: what takes place in the scenes, who is responsible for the flaming character on some of the tiles signed by Pedro Millan, and, who is responsible for the classical tone of the Nativity relief.

As you can see, the subject of Pisano's glazed terracotas is still very confused. Recently, Ray has presented some interesting considerations, proposing a direct connection between the young Pisano and the workshop of della Robbia (Ray, 1988: in the press). According to Ray, Pisano was considered the producer of the largest number of renaissance-type pieces of anyone in his group. This hypothesis fits well with the evidence of technical ties between the works of Pisano and those of della Robbia, and with other arguments proposed by the author. The question remains, however, how can one explain that in his painted scenes, Pisano does not use Italian iconographics, but uses more Flamencan styles instead. It is something to think about, even though it is certain that the art of Seville at this time was affected by the two styles, and sometimes even by a third style: the Moorish influence, as is the case with the facade of Santa Paula.

Claudio de la Cruz calls Niculoso a "maker of statues" in the cited document, thus supporting the idea that Pisano was a sculptor. Although our theory is very similar, we wish to bring up a small matter of semantic that can lead to mistakes. The term "imagero" which has remained isolated in the world of religious processional sculpture, is best understood in its historical context. In the 16th century the term "de ymaginaria" was applied to those artists who used a style that today is called "figurative." There was, at the time, opposition to the abstract style of the Moorish ornamentation, just as there is opposition to modern



art today. From there, for example, the renaissance artists who painted polychrome human figures came to be called "painters of imagination," with the freedom to paint flat surfaces of three-dimensional works. Pisano's style should have been new in Seville because it united two elements that had traditionally been separated. The original name for a locally unprecedented professional profile came about through the use of the clay (olleria), and the figurative "language" (of sculpture). In conclusion, we believe that the expression "ollero de ymaginaria" does not refer to the materials used and made, but instead refers to the elements of the style.

But, let us leave this digression and return to the thread that interests us and aids us in formulating an idea of how to interpret this series of coincidences between the excavated material from the Pureza site, and the work of Pisano, especially with regards to Santa Paula.

### 1.3 LOCATING NICULOSO'S WORKSHOP

Before making a definitive judgement, let's consider some other dates. For example, we can attempt to track down the home of Francisco Niculoso Pisano using documents from that time. Unfortunately we do not have enough information to reconstruct the layout of the neighborhood of Triana as it was in the 16th century, and even less data with which to determine ownership of the lots in the neighborhood. The scattered dates that we have may, however, be of some help.

In 1508 Niculoso and his wife Elena del Villar declared that they had bought "... some houses with their rooms, and vestibule and gardens that are located on Santa Agna Street, adjacent to the houses of the descendants of Juan de... whom God has taken and on the other side the houses of Don Alfon... the elder

and in front the King's Street"(Gestoso, 1903:171). As you can see, the description is sufficiently incomplete in the names of the neighbors, but it also supplies a useful date, as well as the name of the street and the description of the open areas, probably located to the rear of the building. Years later, in 1529, Pisano's widow returned to record that she and her husband had bought a house on Santa Ana Street (Gestoso, 1903:180). In another document from the same year, there is a reference to a dispute at a neighboring house on the same narrow street (Gestoso,1903:180). In the Census of Triana of 1533 (Macias, 1986:40) a "francisco nycolaso" appears to have lived in the narrow street (Santa Ana Street). This is almost certainly a son of the celebrated potter. The narrow Santa Ana Street is documented in Pureza from 1875 (Mena, 1973:199). The King's Street that is described, as being in front of the Pisano houses in the 1508 document is cited as a public way as opposed to the private nature of the adjoining plots (Prof. Oliver Carlos, personal communication). Lamentably we are lacking dates for the architectural structures from the excavated site. These are needed to analyze more specific aspects of the accommodations and workshops that made up the Pisano's supposed houses. We can only guess that the excavated sector could have been part of this conglomerate.

In accordance with other dates, it appears that Pisano owned another house on the Betis Street (previously "vera del rio"). In 1551, a rental agreement between a Martin de Viena and Maria Hurtado involving some houses on that street, states that these houses adjoin those Elena del Villar (the widow of Niculoso?). In the cited Census of 1533, the widow of Pisano appears in a list of widows, but does not list a domicile. On the same street, "vera del rio," a "juan picano" is listed, and very close to him a certain Hernando del Villar. We do not know whether he has any connections to the family of Pisano or that of his widow.

Ray suggests that this Juan Picano should not be equated with the potter's son named Juan Bautista Pisano (Ray, 1988: in the press). In reality there are too few dates to prove anything, and as Ray reminds us, the last name "Pisano" was used as a generic term applied to any Italian. It is, however, important to keep this street in mind in future excavations.

In conclusion, and independently of this uncertain second domicile, we can say that the coincidences between the street cited in the documents and the location of the excavation sites on Pureza Street allow us to augment our suspicions that the excavated kiln belongs to Pisano's workshop.

#### 1.4 CUENCA TILES

Also of interest are the materials making up a splendid collection of cuenca tiles that have appeared in the same context as the pieces we attribute to Pisano. Two ideas emerge from the association of these two sets of finds. Firstly, within a broad set of limits, is the question of dating the cuenca tiles. Not only for these tiles in particular, but also to date the archaeological strata in which they appear. The second idea, which appears confusing in conjunction with the first question, is whether to support or challenge the idea that Pisano was not only the painter of magnificent azulejo tiles, but that he also made cuenca tiles.

There is little information about the dates of the production of these tiles. There are two theories as to the date for the beginning of this production: Gestoso says that it began in the early 16th century (Gestoso, 1903:189), and Sancho Corbacho proposes that this technique came into use in the last quarter of the 15th century. He bases this on examinations of samples from his own collection, which we have yet to study, but have been visually dated to just prior to 1475.

There are various pathways we can pursue to verify these theories. In the first place we can attempt to create a time-line using cuenca tiles whose production dates are well documented. Secondly, we can determine which artist initiated this technique.

#### 1.4.1 DATED GROUPS OF CUENCA TILES

They are not great in number, although a lengthy and broad study would certainly yield more accurate dates, especially for the cuenca tiles exported to America and Portugal in the beginning of the 16th century. Although we cannot accurately determine the technique used in production of some of the tiles with known origins, it is very possible that they were cuenca tiles. The following dates are irrefutable:

-1504 The Brothers of the Cartuja de Portacoeli in Valencia solicited tiles in Seville (Gestoso, 1903:257). This indicates that Sevillian tiles were sufficiently renowned that they were sought after, even from an important ceramics-production center like Valencia. There is no evidence to say whether the tiles were cuenca tiles or plain tiles. It is important to remember, also, that at that time the "claustrillo" was being built in the Cartuja of Seville. This "little cloister" was decorated with the splendid mouldings of cuenca tiles that remain intact today.

-1505 Included in a description of the riches of the Order of Christ, with the Convento de la Concepcion in Lisbon, is a room whose walls are decorated with azulejo tiles (Meco, 1984:32 citing Santos Simoes). Since all the tiles imported by Portugal at this time came from Seville, we can safely assume that the tiles were either cuenca tiles or plain tiles.

-1508 This year the overseer of the works in the Convent of Nossa Senhora da Pena (Sintra, Portugal) bought large quantities of tiles (Conde de

Sabugosa, 1903:209). At this time azulejo tiles were being manufactured and were placed in the Palacio Real de Sintra near the convent. In all the buildings large numbers of azulejo tiles are preserved; most of them are cuenca tiles.

-1518 The altar made by Niculoso, and presumably the rest of the azulejo tiles that decorate the steps leading to the altar, were placed in the conventual church of Tentudia (Badajoz). We have already discussed this.

-1532 The cloister of the Sevillian convent of Santa Clara was repaired, and its azulejo tiles were put in place (Valdivieso and Morales, 1980:63).

-1535-40 The years during which the cloister of the convent of Santa Ines is built and a group of cuenca tiles are installed (Valdivieso and Morales, 1980:83).

-1536 At this time, the Hall of the Azulejos in the Sevillian palace of the Marquis de Tarifa (Casa de Pilatos) is already noted. In 1538 another contract is signed between the Marquis and Diego and Juan Polido for his workshop to supply all of the tiles for the palace (Sancho, 1953).

-1542-43 Diego Polido supplies cuenca tiles for the Banquet Hall of the Emperor in the gardens of the Fortress of Seville (Gestoso, 1903:259).

-1542-44 During these years, the Polidos' workshop supplies cuenca tiles for the decoration of the Alhambra of Granada (Gestoso, 1903:259).

-1543 The cuenca tile mouldings in the Coimbra Cathedral (Portugal) were probably in place by this date, as the promoter of the work, Archbishop Jorge de Almeida, died this year (Gestoso, 1903:265).

These are the main documented collections of cuenca tiles. The documentation verifies the production of the tiles from the beginning of the 16th century to the 1540's or so. It is possible that the tiles were produced before and after these dates, but not much before 1500 or after 1550. With the arrival of

Frans Adries (Francisco Andrea) and the consequent reinstatement and spread of tiles with smooth surfaces, production of cuenca tiles ceased until the 19th century, and then proceeded again, but using different technology.

It is very risky, based on our current knowledge, to attempt to establish sub-divisions for different techniques, designs, format or colorations within this extended period of smooth-tile production.

#### 1.4.2 THE ORIGINATORS OF CUENCA TILES

Contrary to previous theories, we believe that this type of tile is an indigenous product. The dates for original production in Toledo or Muel (Aragon) are even more spread apart than in Seville. The possibility of tying the introduction of this new technique to a specific artisan is still a controversial idea.

Gestoso suggests that Ferran Martinez Guijarro (ca. 1423-1509) is the originator. Guijarro provided the tiles for the works in the Reales Alcazares, and according to a 1479 document (Pisano probably wasn't in Seville yet), is considered the premier artisan within this specialty field. Literally, it is said of him that "there is none who compare in this kingdom. . ." (Gestoso, 1903:149), and that "from Portugal and other areas they come to find him and take his works all over the kingdom. . ." Gestoso, using a 1503 document that describes how Martinez exported tiles "de labores" to Coimbra, comes to the conclusion that those same tiles are those in the Cathedral of Coimbra (Gestoso, 1903:150). The term "de labores," in ceramics and other decorative arts, is equivalent to ornamented, as opposed to plain (without decoration, in only one color). Although Gestoso, in part, bases his theory on this fact, it is important to consider that the "azulejos de labores" (decorated tiles) could be either cuenca tiles or tiles decorated by separating the glazed sections with greased lines, another experimental technique during this

period. Unfortunately there are no preserved works attributable to Martinez or his son Pedro de Hervera, the existence of which would remove our doubts.

It is likely that from the arrival of Niculoso in Seville, until the death of Guijarro in 1509, the two at least knew each other, since they lived on the same street and moved in the same circles of tile-makers. The possibility exists, too, that their relationship was one of competition between the old, widely supported artist and the newcomer. Perhaps the contracts that Guijarro signed, with chemists specializing in ceramics glazes, during the last years of his life are related to his intention to surpass Niculoso's work (Gestoso, 1903:159 and 162). On the other hand, from 1492 to 1503 Martinez Guijarro bought six or seven houses located near Pisano's home, although the two may not yet have known each other (Gestoso, 1903:157).

What is clear is that the beginning of the 16th century witnessed a true artistic and technological revolution in Sevillian ceramics; at least as far as architectural decorations were concerned. From the achievements of these years, probably encouraged by the expected commerce in the port, came what would become the first great expansion of Sevillian ceramics into the Mediterranean, the rest of Europe, and, above all, America.

Pisano, the other great figure in ceramics during these years is well known for his production of innovative smooth polychrome tiles, and it is possible that he produced other types of ceramic works to supplement the usual products of his workshop. This would explain the rest of the material found at the Pureza excavation. The production of wheel-thrown ceramics has never been noted in connection with Pisano, and is still an unknown theme, although the ideas about cuenca tiles do not count as a kind of hypothesis Gestoso mentions this possibility based on a contract from 1518 in which Pisano agrees to produce 6000 azulejos "de

cuatro labores", and 1000 rectangular corner-tiles for the convento de San Pablo in Seville. Using the expression "de labores" in the same way that we have already described, Gestoso deduces that the works are cuenca tiles (Gestoso,1903:178). The fact that only two types of tiles, azulejo and alizar (rectangular corner-tiles) tiles, are mentioned in the contract casts doubt on this hypothesis. These two types of tiles are precisely those that Pisano uses in his works that are made of smooth tiles. It would have made more sense to ask for "verdiguillos" (long, narrow tiles used for borders) and "adeseras" (small tiles used in friezes), since these are the elements customarily used in borders made of cuenca tiles.

Morales supports Gestoso's theory using more convincing arguments to conclude that cuenca tiles appear with sets of azulejo tiles in Santa Paula, Flores de Avila and Tentudia, just as they do in other works by Pisano. These works also show a recurrence of some renaissance designs (Morales,1977:59). Here we should state that also among pieces found at the Pureza site there are close similarities between pieces by Pisano and pieces of cuenca works. In addition, there was a clause in the contract for San Pablo freeing the client to purchase the tiles from another potter in the event that Pisano could not complete the work. Since, in 1518, Pisano was the only artist in Seville with a mastery of the technique of applying polychrome paints to ceramics, we believe that the contract referred to another type of azulejo tile, a type that more than one artisan was capable of making at this time.

Pisano effectively combines brush-painted tiles with cuenca tiles in several of his works. According to Gestoso, one example of this existed in the Palacio de los Condes del Real in Valencia. There were three halls of tiles in relief (Gestoso,1903:209), among which some showed Pisano's signature. Gestoso, who never actually saw any of these tiles, is a bit confusing here, because the tiles with



Pisano's signature are smooth, painted tiles, later identified by Frothingham (1969:12), and currently located in the National Museum of Ceramics in Valencia.

In Flores de Avila both smooth and cuenca tiles are used in combination, although in a very disorderly way, due to arbitrary rearrangements.

Finally, in the collection from Tentudia there is a great number of preserved cuenca tiles that merit description because of the possibility of dating some of them. They are also important because of the similarities in design and color between these tiles and some of the pieces found at the Pureza site.

From a technical point of view, the collection from Tentudia combines the smooth tiles with the cuenca tiles. They were placed in two or three phases, and herein lies an interesting controversy.

The altars in the small chapels next to the main chapel (the chapels of San Augustin and Santiago) were the last to be decorated, aside from the decoration of the sepulchre by Pelay Prez Correa. The altars date from 1575 and belong to the second period of Sevillian smooth-tile production, which begins in 1561. The principal altar-piece, signed by Pisano in 1518, has borders of cuenca tiles mixed with some smooth tiles, and the flooring of the whole main chapel, as well as the high choir, all of which date from the first decades of the 16th century. It is unclear whether these works, like the work signed by Pisano, are actually from 1518. The debate is centered around the chronology of these cuenca tiles and attributing them to a particular artist.

Gestoso, who was not directly familiar with the work, hardly stops to consider the existence of these, since he is preoccupied with correcting errors in Morgado's description of the smooth tiles. While studying the azulejo tiles from the Castle of Sant' Angelo, Lane finds several designs that are repeated in Tentudia, and thinking that those tiles were the work of Pisano, also attributes the Roman

tiles to him (Lane, 1939:32). Lane defends the idea of Pisano as a producer of cuenca tiles, citing the same contract for San Pablo as Gestoso. Lane interprets the word "azulejo" to mean only cuenca tiles and not smooth tiles. This is a gross error caused by a misreading of Gestoso's aforementioned hypothesis. The Sevillian historian, as we have already mentioned, concerned himself with the expression "de labores" and not the term "azulejo."

On the other hand, he commits another error in thinking that the of the altar-piece in the Alcazar, with a design of curved loops, consists of cuenca tiles. They are, in fact, smooth tiles. This error may be due to the fact that he worked with photographs of the tiles instead of with the tiles themselves. Gestoso wanted, using this case as evidence, to tie Pisano to this Arabic motif, which dominated the designs on the cuenca tiles of the Papal coats-of-arms in Sant Angelo; this would establish that Pisano produced the tiles in question.

Although some of the bases for Lane's arguments are somewhat confusing, he displays great intuition in making a connection between the tiles from Rome and those from Triana, and may not be entirely mistaken in attributing the works to Pisano.

Based on Gestoso's attribution of the Portuguese collection to Ferran Martinez Guijarro, Frothingham proposes that the tiles from Tentudia are the work of Guijarro. This is in spite of the indications that the artist had at that time been dead for more than a decade. Morales suggests that the cuenca tiles in question are the works of Pisano for the same reasons. Without negating this attractive hypothesis, we would like to express sincere doubts that are prompted by our detailed examination of the collection, and to state that the theory is also interesting in regards to the cuenca and smooth pieces found at the Pureza site.

Among the tiles Lane recognizes as belonging to the series of Sant' Angelo was one ornamental tile and one heraldic tile. The latter, a reproduction of the Medici coat-of-arms, belonged to Leo X and decorated the front of one of the steps leading to the pulpit. Lane did not notice that in the chapel of San Augustin, a few meters away, there were two more examples of that same polychromic series. Both of these examples were made by the same person. One shows a lion, and the other a yoke. The three motifs (the Medici coat-of-arms, the lion and the yoke) are all surrounded by curves, and are painted with blue and purple on a mainly white background. We have not found tiles of this type in any of the Sevillian collections. These tiles are probably an attempt to make the Sevillian tiles "fit" with the rest of the tiles in the flooring of the Papal Palace; those tiles were made by Manises. Oddly enough, colored tiles of this form, with the same type of decorations, have been found at the Pureza site. This remains an interesting coincidence, as none of the tiles show the already mentioned heraldic motif.

There are other designs shared by the tiles from the monastery and those of the Pureza site. If our site is, in fact, Pisano's workshop, then we now have an additional argument in favor of attributing the tiles from Tentudia, and consequently those of the Castle of Sant' Angelo, to Pisano.

We can as a result corroborate the dates for the strata in which these materials were found, since Pisano's smooth tiles can be dated to the period 1500-1529. We can date the cuenca tiles with the noted designs and chromic characteristics to the years 1523-1521, the dates of Leo X's Papacy. Leo X commissioned the tiles for Sant' Angelo. All of the excavated materials appear to date from the same period.

Although we may cloud some of the coherence of this whole plot, we need to expound on a strange stroke that does not appear to have been repaired by

any of the historians studying the Tentudia collection. This stroke affects not only the design of the series of painted octagons, but also the smooth-tile fragments found with the kiln.

The smooth tiles actually decorate the lower front of the presbytery, one side of the altar-table ( the opposite side is decorated with cuenca tiles of various designs, arranged in an arbitrary fashion), and the top band of a pillar in the nave next to the . It is clear that this strange arrangement is due to a rearrangement following the original positioning of the tiles. We believe that the original location of the tiles must have been the altar-table, which is today covered with white and gilded tiles in an octagonal design. If our assumption is correct, Pisano's azulejo tiles were made for the altar-piece and the altar-table, as is true of some of his other works. The fact that these dispersed tiles occupy a total surface area equivalent to that of the altar-piece and table supports our hypothesis. To say this, however, implies that the cuenca tiles were placed after 1518. Furthermore, the arrangement must have occurred between 1518 and 1529 ( the year of Pisano's death), if Pisano is to continue to be tied to this collection of tiles. This period may not be sufficiently long for the work to deteriorate to the point of needing to be replaced, unless there was an accident that we have no knowledge of at this time.

The idea that the octagonal polychrome tiles formed the original altar-table makes sense, since painted tiles were more highly regarded and more costly than cuenca tiles. This is a problem without an easy solution, and it will not permit us to conclude that Pisano made the cuenca tiles of Tentudia, although the aforementioned "coincidences" tend to indicate this.

We believe that we have, with our reasoning, reinforced Lane's and Morales' hypotheses, at the expense of Frothingham's, by introducing a new element of doubt. In any case, the materials excavated at the Pureza site greatly

enrich the scope of the controversy, and, for the moment, do little to provide a final solution. A quantitative study of the "coincidences" between the cuenca designs found at the site and those of Pisano's preserved collections would probably give a positive result with regard to this interesting assertion.

### 1.5 LA CERAMICA DE TORNO

The Pureza site has also yielded an abundance of relatively varied ceramics not used in architecture. Practically all known series that are discussed in American publications are represented here. Given the chronology of most of the material (16th century), the dominant group is (using Goggin's terminology) Morisco Ware. Well represented are the subtypes Isabella Polychrome, Columbia Plain, Yayal Blue on White and Santo Domingo Blue on White. In addition, there are fragments of gilded Lusterware and cuerda seca pottery, as well as some examples of more Italian renaissance majolica from Seville, such as Sevilla White, Sevilla Blue on White and Sevilla Blue on Blue. There are also some very interesting types that have, so far, not appeared at any American sites (we will discuss these in section 2).

In order to avoid overlapping the more archaeological facets of this project, we will not concentrate on each one of the different types, as these have already been widely described and analyzed in specialized literature. Instead, we will concentrate on an incident unrelated to the site, but which connects us with three types discovered there. These types are those with the greatest aesthetic value, and the most controversy surrounding their process of production and the dates they were produced. This episode in the history of ceramics in Seville is of great importance, and will serve as the basis for some hypotheses related to the Pureza site materials, although it will not offer actual conclusions.

We are referring to architectural ceramics that are preserved on the buildings of the Sierra de Huelva. The three that have so far been located are the following:

- 1) The main facade and the dome of the Ermita of the Corterrangel close to Aracena (Huelva),
- 2) the dome of the church of Santa Maria de la Asuncion in Aracena (Huelva), and
- 3) the dome in the church of San Martin in Almonaster (Huelva).

Of these collections, we have been able to thoroughly examine the facade of the Ermita of the Corterrangel, and, although the dome of this small, rural church is coated with lime, it is possible, with difficulty, to assess the texture of some bands in the mortar. The dome of the Almonaster is in the same condition. Without a doubt, the dome of the main church in Aracena contains the best preserved and most abundant materials. On the other hand, the dome is so far off the ground that visibility is limited.

On the facade of Corterrangel we made use of a ladder to manually clean the surfaces of some of the pieces of bleached ceramics. Based on this initial inspection, the tiles were probably Isabela polychrome, Sevilla blue on blue and a polychrome fragment of a dotted type.

The facade is an interesting example of classic Sevillian architecture whose origin has been attributed to the Andalusian renaissance architect Hernan Ruiz II who is, among other works, responsible for the renaissance period alterations of the tower of the Cathedral of Seville: la Giralda. This originally led us to believe that the inlaid pieces of ceramics in the borders of the facade were part of Ruiz' project, which must date from about 1565. In Ruiz' architectural manuscript (edited by Navascues, Lams XIV, CX, CXI, CXII, CXIV, CXV, CXVI) motifs

similar to those on several of the facade tiles appear to be represented, although the drawings of bases that appear to be covered with tiles do not exactly coincide with those of Corterrangel. On the other hand, a find of this stylistic intensity could only come (at this time) from the architectural genius of Ruiz.

The 1565 date for the inlaid ceramics is too late for some of the types, and other arguments oblige us to reassess this date once again.

1) In the first place, there is a panel of tiles on the pediment of the facade representing the Madonna and Child that we have (for stylistic and technical reasons) dated to the end of the 16th century or the beginning of the 17th century. This panelling seems to clash with the otherwise tidy architectural design of the facade. It is not logical, however, to treat this decoration separately from the rest of the ceramic decorations. This dates the whole collection to the indicated time period.

2) Secondly, the dome of the Church of Santa Maria de la Asuncion in Aracena is decorated with this same type of ceramics. On these decorations there are painted models of brands and a large date: 1603. This is the date of the production of this decoration, and probably the year of completion of the dome.

3) Finally, in this same collection from Aracena, there are small polychromic tiles interspersed among tiles of the previously discussed types. These tiles are all in a band around the dome. The small tiles can be attributed to the workshop of Hernando de Valladares or one of his contemporary tile-makers, ca. 1600.

These arguments lead us to consider that these decorations may be the work of Vermondo Resta, a Milanese architect living in Seville, and to consequently date these ceramics to the year 1603. There is documentation to indicate that this is also the year in which Resta visited the churches of the region

(Pleguezuelo, 1987, unpublished thesis). Finally, this theory is supported by the fact that a few years ago we saw this same type of material used in small pieces in the Fuente de Grutescos in the gardens of the Reales Alcazares. This work has already been attributed to Vermondo Resto, who planned it at the beginning of the century and executed it until 1612. Unfortunately, the tiles have since been painted over, obscuring the decorations. Tiles of the same type as those in the dome of Aracena do exist, however, in the flooring of the adjacent summerhouse.

The tendency to use Resto's hauling materials shows up in buildings from this time that we know to be his. To give his buildings a final lavishness and exotic touches, Resto, who emulated Hernan Ruiz in many techniques, probably chose the most decorative and showy types produced in Seville at the time. He may have acquired them as "defective" hollow ware. These materials were more economical, as they cost less than the panels that came out of the kiln in perfect condition. In spite of the confusion caused by the production of Isabela at such a late date, we have difficulty imagining that they were selected from antique works, and that they were sought out for the project. In this last case, there would be a greater variety of types, and never distinct fragments from one piece, like the ones we have attempted to hypothetically reconstruct. The search at archaeological sites for evidence that Resto knew local humanists, such as Rodrigo Caro who already figured in classical antiquities, is hardly sustainable. The number of pieces and the advanced date of some of the types, for example, Sevilla Blue on Blue, eliminate this possibility. It is more likely, given the amount of ceramic material used, that he found them according to need in some potter's workshop, or that he acquired them as damaged panels.

If we accept this hypothesis on the origin of the pieces, we must accept two ideas:



1) With respect to the idea of provenance, the thesis that maintains a Sevillian origin for the Isabela type should prevail over the idea that the origin is actually Catalan. The work of Ray (1987: 306-308) has reinforced once again the idea of Sevillian origin already held by Goggin, Lister & Lister, and Magetti, among others. Among the pieces from Corterrangel there are compositions and motifs that are repeated in the examples belonging to the Victoria and Albert Collection, those of the museum of Barcelona, in the Godia Collection (Barcelona), in the Don Juan Institute for Valencian Studies in Madrid, as well as the pieces found at the Pureza Street site (scales, zigzags, stripes, spirals, large pinecones, thickness of blue and purple lines, etc.). With respect to the type Sevilla Blue on Blue, the theory that it was not made in Seville, but was imported from Genoa, Italy, has been cast aside. Finally, these collections demonstrate the very real production of gilt ceramic panels in Seville, previously materially ignored but known to be documented. Complementary to this set of types is the fragment of the dotted type, whose provenance is yet unclear: Puente del Arzobispo (currently the most probable), Seville (currently without archaeological evidence), or both. We expect that some of the results of the analysis in the current project will definitely confirm some of these extremes.

2) The dating of these types, as it affects Isabela, remain justified by the chronology of the strata in which the fragments were found in the Caribbean by Goggin (Goggin, 1968: 128), or by Lister & Lister in Mexico (Lister & Lister, 1982: 53).

The importance of these groups lies in the possibility of an independent monographic study that could present an interesting picture of what the Sevillian potters produced and exported in 1603. All of these items were

produced and exported assuming, of course, that we believe that our hypothesis concerning the provenance of these collections of ornamental tiles is correct.

#### 1.6 PROPOSAL FOR TAXONOMY

In order to guarantee the value of any taxonomic code, it must be voluntarily accepted and used by all those who use that specific vocabulary. The taxonomy of types of Sevillian ceramics from the 16th and 17th centuries is derived from the pioneering work of Goggin, and has been accepted by later investigators because of its irrefutable scientific rigor. These taxonomic references have without a doubt been useful in the initial studies, but should be revised to reflect the advancing levels of knowledge. In this sense it would be interesting to change taxonomic classifications as more knowledge is acquired. This should obviously not be taken lightly, as it is a subject that all specialists treat with prudence and care.

Ray has already suggested the use of the term "Sevilla Blue on Purple" for the type we currently know as Isabela Polychrome (Ray, 1987: 308), named for the site in the Caribbean where many pieces were found. Perhaps it would be better to substitute "Common White" for Columbia Plain, "Common, Striped Blue on White" for Yayal Blue on White, "Common Blue on White with Figure" for Santo Domingo Blue on White, just as some examples to initiate a debate on the subject.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Conde de Sebugosa. O Pago de Cintra. Lisbon, Portugal, 1903, pp. 205-209.
2. Frothingham, Alice Wilson. Tile Panels of Spain. New York, 1969.
3. - . "Tile Altars by Niculoso Pisano and Other at Tentudia." The Connoisseur, (January, 1964): 29-36.
4. Gestoso y Perez, Jose. Estudios Sobre Ceramica Sevillana. Seville, Spain, 1882.
5. - . Historia de los Barros Vidriados Sevillanos. Seville, Spain, 1903.
6. Lane, Arthur. "Matonelle Spagnole in Castel Sant'Angelo." Faenza, (1939): 27-34.
7. Lorenzo Morilla, Jose. "Informe Memorie de las Actividades Arqueologicas Realizadas en c/ Pureza # 44 y c/ Pelay Correa # 15-17-19 de Sevilla" Sevilla, (April 1987) (unpublished).
8. Macias Miguez, Manuel. "El Padron de las Viudas Ano de 1533." Triana, 18 (July, 1986): 39-49.
9. Magetti, Westley and Olin. "Provenance and Technical Studies of Mexican Maiolica Using Elemental and Phase Analysis." American Chemical Society, (1984): 151-191.
10. Meco, Jose. "Azulejos de Lisboa" en Cat. de la Exp. Azulejos de Lisboa, Lisbon, (1984): 15-82
11. Mena, Jose Maria de. Las Calles de Sevilla. Seville, Spain, 1973.
12. Morales Martinez, Alfredo Jose. Francisco Niculoso Pisano. Seville, Spain, 1977.
13. Pleguenzuelo Hernandez, Alfonso. "Crucificados Sevillanos del Circulo de Pedro Millan." Archivo Hispalense, 1696(1981):75-83.

14. - . La Arquitectura en Sevilla (1590-1650). Unpublished Doctoral Thesis, University of Seville, 1987.
15. Ray, Anthony. "Fifteenth-Century Spanish Pottery: the Blue and Purple Family" The Burlington Magazine (May, 1987): 306-308.
16. - . "Francisco Niculoso Called Pisano." in Papers on Italian Renaissance Pottery. British Museum Colloquium (September, 1987), in the press.
17. Sancho Corbacho, Antonio. La Ceramica Andaluza: Los Azulejos Sevillanos del Siglo XVI de Cuenca. Casa de Pilatos. Seville, 1948.
18. Valdivieso Gonzales, Enrique and Alfredo Jose Morales Martinez. Sevilla Oculta: Monasterios y Conventos de Clausura. Seville, 1980.