



BRILL



LAURA U. MARKS

THE TAMING OF THE HAPTIC SPACE, FROM MÁLAGA TO VALENCIA TO FLORENCE

An Islamic aesthetics, and the modes of visuality to which they appeal, can be characterized by the use of haptic space and abstract line, terms that Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari derived from the work of late nineteenth-century art historians including Alois Riegl, Wilhelm Worringer, and Heinrich Wölfflin.¹ Haptic space and abstract line deploy form fluidly in a way that, even when figurative, privileges movement over figure and invites a relatively embodied response from the beholder. These aesthetics markedly counter the more prevalent aesthetics of optical vision that lends itself to depictive representation and a disembodied point of view. The contrast between these two modes, haptic-abstract versus optical, is not between nonfigurative and figurative but lies in different ways of treating figure and line in space: one relatively mobile and abstract, one relatively static and representational. European artists adopted an aesthetics of haptic space and abstract line from Islamic objects at numerous historical points, including the Italian Renaissance, eighteenth-century Rococo, and late nineteenth-century painting. This essay examines how abstract line and haptic space traveled in ceramics on the Iberian Peninsula and in the western Mediterranean basin. I examine how Andalusian ceramics engage haptic space and abstract line, how Christian clients took up these designs, and how, in Spanish and Italian adaptations, haptic space and abstract line gradually deepened out and thickened up into optical representations. Again, this is not a shift from nonfigurative to figurative but a shift in the way figure, line, and space are deployed. These changes occur not slowly but in saccades, in negotiations between the ceramists and their markets in the course of several centuries of shifting

political and economic conditions on the Iberian Peninsula.

In addition to the travels of forms, this essay deals with the travels of concepts: in this case, between art history and cinema studies. The conference “Gazing Otherwise” and this resulting volume have expanded on a growing body of scholarship of Islamic art that uses a concept very well developed in my home discipline of cinema studies: gaze theory. In turn, I borrowed into cinema studies a concept from art history, namely Alois Riegl’s concept of the haptic image (as adapted by Deleuze and Guattari). In both cases, the concept in question had been thoroughly worked over and finally more or less abandoned in its discipline of origin before it was transformed and taken up in another discipline. Thus we have a case of what Mieke Bal calls “traveling concepts.”² I will begin by discussing this.

TRAVELING THEORY: CONCEPTS OF VISUALITY BETWEEN ART HISTORY AND CINEMA STUDIES

Bal argues that a concept is a useful third partner in the dialogue between a critic and an object “when the critic has no disciplinary tradition to fall back on and the object no canonical or historical status.”³ Yet she cautions that a concept is useful only to the degree that it illuminates an object of study on the object’s own terms. Implying an impossible hermeneutic, this caution suggests we need to have a hunch of what our object of study is trying to tell us—what we might learn from it—in order to select the appropriate concept.

When concepts travel between disciplines, Bal writes, “their meaning, reach, and operational value differ.

These processes of differing need to be assessed before and after each ‘trip.’⁴ A concept’s itinerary enriches it. The pressing question is, when a concept ceases to be useful in one discipline, need that undermine its relevance when it travels to another? Following Isabelle Stengers, Bal points out that the role of concepts in the sciences is not to represent the facts truthfully but to organize phenomena in a relevant manner that allows observations of the phenomena to be interpreted (concepts’ de facto role) and to do so in a way the field recognizes as adequate (concepts’ de jure role). In both cases concepts are not disinterested but act to focus interest. Concepts function similarly in the humanities: they can innovatively reorganize a field of study focused around certain objects in response to certain interests. Let us apply these ideas in the context of the subject of this volume and consider the reasons why theories that fell out of use in one field made their reappearance in another.

What is called “gaze theory” developed from a selective reading of particular concepts in Lacanian psychoanalysis. Central among these, for the purposes of image studies, was Jacques Lacan’s concept of the mirror stage. The young child, who feels uncoordinated and disunited, identifies with its flat, unified image in the mirror with a flutter of jubilation. The mirror stage, Lacan wrote, has an orthopedic effect; it “situates the agency of the ego in a *fictional* direction.”⁵ This concept in turn relied on Lacan’s refinement of Sigmund Freud’s conclusion that the ego itself is based on an illusion, a fundamental lack. According to Lacan, we identify with, or are constituted by, a *gaze* upon us from outside, like the eye of God. Like the jubilant misrecognition that occurs in the mirror stage, this identification with an outside power is an attempt to cover our own powerlessness.

Cinema studies quickly adopted some of these concepts in order to characterize the cinema as a set of figurative representations that give rise to (largely subconscious) psychic responses. Christian Metz, Jean-Louis Baudry, and others, writing in French in the 1960s, described cinema as a machine that mimics the psychical apparatus.⁶ In this model, cinema reproduces deeply desired psychic pleasures. The combination of Lacanian psychoanalysis and apparatus theory gave film scholars in the 1970s powerful tools to argue that certain

spectators could be fooled into the pleasurable belief that they possessed the gaze (which, by definition, can belong to no one).⁷ The cinematic apparatus—that is, the complex of camera, projector, and point of view—allowed spectators to align themselves not only with the look of characters (secondary identification) but also with the unattributed, God’s-eye view of the camera itself (primary identification). However, according to Lacanian psychoanalytic film theory, only male spectators could enjoy this fiction. Male spectators could enjoy the fiction that they were not, in fact, castrated—as female spectators knew themselves to be—and could identify (mistakenly) with the capacity for desire that the gaze alone possesses. Yet according to apparatus theory, the spectator is interpellated willy-nilly by the ideology of the film—an ideology assumed to be regressive, which indeed often is the case of Hollywood film. The spectator thus privileged becomes the dupe of ideology. Another important characterization of the fictional gaze of mastery is that it is necessarily disembodied.

Yet let us not forget that individual looks are “propped” on the gaze.⁸

Part of the difficulty of Lacanian psychoanalytic film theory, of course, lay in the fact that you had to embrace the entire ball of wax in order to deploy it. If you did not believe that human subjects lose their individual powers upon the entry into language, at which time they became “castrated”; that this lack was necessarily gendered because patriarchy functioned as the very most fundamental ground of culture; that the ego is a fiction created to shelter the Imaginary from both the Symbolic and the Real; and, again, that that fiction is sold to men alone—then you could not deploy the valuable currency of film theory. Even the simplest concept, such as identification, relied on this entire theoretical edifice. Another reason film scholars started to turn away from Lacanian psychoanalysis is that it is so damnably difficult and complex.

But in the 1970s and 1980s psychoanalytic film theory was the only game in town in my home field of cinema studies. This meant, of course, that people made mistakes in applying it. The most notorious mistake was to forget that the apparent power some spectators gain from primary identification was a fiction. Hence the

term “male gaze” was born. The term was identified with Laura Mulvey’s landmark article of 1975, even though Mulvey herself clearly stated that she wished to destroy the source of male pleasure that lay in occupying that fictional position.⁹ People started to confuse the individual look with the inaccessible gaze and to think that men actually possess the gaze. This development constituted a film-theoretical disaster, as students started writing about films that were bad because they “gave” men the gaze, or good because they “gave” the gaze to women or other people excluded from power, when strictly speaking, these were looks (or glances),¹⁰ not gazes.

Uneasiness began to rumble in the discipline in the late 1980s. Scholars became uncomfortable with the ideological rigidity of gaze theory; plenty of male scholars complained that they preferred to have an individual look, even if it meant relinquishing the fictional power of the gaze. The concept of an oppositional look arose, to account for individual looks that did not align ideologically with the gaze.¹¹ Queer theory grappled in a most refined way with psychoanalytic film theory before abandoning it altogether: Douglas Crimp’s resignation from the editorial board of *October* in 1990 turned on this rift. At the same time, film historians and scholars of popular culture began to pay attention to actual audiences rather than to the reified psychoanalytic “spectator.” Audiences vary greatly. Scholars of African American moviegoing, Indian audiences, queer film festivals, and all kinds of nonmainstream cinematic experiences discovered a proliferation of looks, each with its own history, and nary a gaze. Also at this time, some critiques of Lacanian psychoanalysis began to ask, what is so wrong with not having a coherent ego? Psychoanalytic feminism, existential phenomenology, and the work of Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari all pursued this direction fruitfully.¹² So gaze theory dwindled in my home field of cinema studies, to be replaced by a diversity of other approaches.

Yet some aspects of gaze theory remain generally relevant and useful. In cinema studies, gaze theory has retained explanatory power—if one is willing to accept its psychoanalytic premises—for certain objects of study. Hollywood movies, web browsers, and social-media sites, for example, work skillfully to give viewers

the illusion that they are sovereign subjects in a way that “sutures” them ideologically, or simply makes them willing consumers.

So how might the concept of the gaze usefully inform studies of Islamic art? Moreover, how might its itinerary through one field, cinema studies, and visual culture studies more broadly, heighten its relevance to studies of Islamic art? Theories of the gaze that attribute it to an outside power, rather than to the viewer, do seem to help think about certain aspects of Islamic art and architecture. Combined with Michel Foucault’s concept of panopticism, gaze theory does convincingly account for the way people are constituted as *objects* of the gaze, not *subjects*. Spectacular art and architecture render the viewer a fragmentary and embodied object of a Subject who is elsewhere. They may attribute a gaze of mastery to the state or the ruler. And, of course, religious art that points to a deity beyond comprehension, whose gaze upon mortals constitutes or annihilates them, and religious architecture that seeks to seduce and terrify by reminding worshippers of their utter dependency on God—these bring the Lacanian theory of the gaze back to its cult origins. Thus gaze theory can shed light on the power relations of looking in religious, courtly, and state architecture in the Muslim world. Some of these ideas are examined in other contributions to this volume. In addition, a theory of the gaze could account for Islamic practices of protecting things from vision: if to be visible is to be subject (whether in fact or fictitiously) to the power of the beholder, then to be hidden deflects the power of the gaze.

In short, although gaze theory became less useful in cinema studies, the lessons learned in that field may have shaped it in a way that makes it relevant to other fields. Furthermore, new approaches to gaze theory untried by cinema studies may be developed in other fields, including the study of Islamic art.

TRAVELING THEORY: FROM ART HISTORY TO CINEMA STUDIES

Now let us consider the concepts traveling in the other direction. At the founding of art history as a systematic discipline in the late nineteenth century, scholars were

very much influenced by the new psychology of perception and wanted to suggest that art-historical periods could be characterized by the ways they perceptually evoked space. Robert Vischer, Wilhelm Worringer, and others proposed theories of empathy whereby a perceiver experiences an embodied similarity to the forms she or he perceives.¹³ Adolf Hildebrand distinguished the fashion in which distant and near vision apprehended their objects.¹⁴ Heinrich Wölfflin characterized Baroque art according to a set of terms, including painterliness, open form, and multiplicity, that privilege a relatively subjective and embodied form of perception.¹⁵

Alois Riegl occupies a contradictory place in this emergent discourse. On the one hand, as a curator of textiles and scholar of the history of ornament, Riegl was very sensitive to the perceptual qualities of nonfigurative art, including much Islamic art. On the other hand, he insisted that figurative art was the highest form of art. Riegl argued that the history of art consisted of a gradual shift from a haptic mode, appealing to close vision, in which figures clung to a nonillusionistic, material ground, to an optical mode, appealing to distant vision, in which the ground is abstract and figures populate illusionistic space.¹⁶ Influenced by G. W. F. Hegel's aesthetics, Riegl interpreted this historical shift teleologically. Yet Riegl made this argument against the current of the painting of his time, which was seeking alternatives to illusionistic figuration and drawing inspiration from the art practices of other cultures. These, including Islamic art, provided Western artists with attractive models for abstraction.¹⁷

Contemporary art history has largely rejected these early approaches, laden as they are with teleological and ethnocentric assumptions. Yet the psychology of perceptual form that early art historians developed proved attractive to thinkers working in other domains. As these concepts departed from art history, they traveled into philosophy. Deleuze and Guattari appropriated art-historical concepts for a theory of antirepresentational "nomad art." Haptic space, a term Deleuze and Guattari derive (and redefine) from Riegl, consists of a visual space that invites a close look, the eyes moving over the surface as though touching it rather than the distant and disembodied look solicited by optical space.¹⁸ Similarly,

adapting Worringer, Deleuze and Guattari called a line that is not tamed into a contour an abstract line, or "nomad line." Unconstrained by the need to depict a form, the abstract line travels freely, "precisely because it has a multiple orientation and passes *between* points, figures, and contours: it is positively motivated by the smooth space it draws, not by any striation it might perform to ward off anxiety and subordinate the smooth."¹⁹

Haptic space and abstract line became subsets of Deleuze and Guattari's category of smooth space, a space that is contingent, close-up, short-term, and inhabited intensively, free of an immobile outside point of reference. They opposed it to striated space, which is constituted extensively in reference to fixed coordinates: striated space is thus the space of representation. Haptic space and abstract line established a kind of visuality that corresponded to the open, nonunified, and nonmastering subject Deleuze and Guattari privileged.

The theory traveled again when the 1990s film theorists were looking for ways to argue that vision need not occupy the distance and mastery ascribed to it by the Lacanian-influenced "gaze theory." The concept of haptic space, both Riegl's original and Deleuze and Guattari's adaptation, contributed to this revision. Noël Burch and Antonia Lant adapted Riegl to describe the haptic look of shallow relief in early and experimental cinema.²⁰ I argued that haptic images in cinema close the distance between image and viewer and encourage an embodied and multisensory relationship to the image.²¹ I developed a theory of cinematic spectatorship in which the viewer, rather than seeking a distant mastery over the thing viewed, merges with it, pressing too close to the screen to even notice the film's narrative and ideological meanings. The theory of haptic visuality was welcomed with interest in cinema studies and traveled to other fields as well. Riegl's concept, adapted by Deleuze and Guattari and imported to cinema, innovatively reorganized cinema studies and gave us a fresh set of perspectives on our objects. By this time, in fact, the terms have been taken up with such enthusiasm in cinema studies that new caveats are in order to prevent a new orthodoxy from settling in to the field. For example, Grant Kester offers a pointed critique of Deleuze and Guattari's (as well as other poststructuralists') radical

bias against representation, pointing out that representation is necessary for practical political engagement.²²

In *Enfoldment and Infinity: An Islamic Genealogy of New Media Art* (2010) I argued further that haptic space and abstract line characterize many works of Islamic art and that Islamic art provides one of the sources whereby these forms came to inspire Western art.²³ My theorizing drew on formalism and perceptual psychology, approaches from the beginnings of art history. To apply them to Islamic art hearkens back to the now-questionable regional and ethnic formalisms that characterize the work of Worringer, Riegl, and their colleagues. So for me to introduce these concepts to Islamic art is to bring a seemingly outmoded—though, I would argue, alluringly reinvented—set of art-historical concepts to an art-historical culture that has long since abandoned them. Furthermore, it is a speculative, theoretical approach at odds with the empirical, social art history currently favored by most historians of Islamic art.

These gloomy portents in mind, let me suggest in the rest of this essay that haptic space and abstract line might nonetheless be useful concepts with which to approach Islamic art.

HAPTIC SPACE AND ABSTRACT LINE IN ISLAMIC ART

Significantly, Deleuze and Guattari turned Riegl's value system upside down. While Riegl is rare in his attention to craft and ornament, he nonetheless maintained, in *Problems of Style* (1893) that art with narrative content is superior to ornament. The depiction of illusionistic space is necessary for representation, that is, to promote a cognitive response to form that will give rise to meaning. Thus he argued that artworks need to have a proper balance of "argument" and "ornament"—which might be as simple a pairing as a pictured scene, the argument, and its frame, the ornament.²⁴ Ornament lacks the figure-ground distinctions necessary for representation. As Margaret Olin notes, Riegl held that in Islamic art and other abstracted motifs, "to rid the motif of its significance is to veil the relation between pattern and ground."²⁵ Yet Riegl maintained an interest in visually ambiguous patterns, such as counterchange, in which

alternating figures serve as the ground for the figures that border them. Olin notes that Riegl wrote an 1892 article on counterchange patterns in sixteenth-century Spanish appliqué.²⁶ Counterchange patterns, such as the reciprocal trefoil in a border, are a common motif in Islamic art, as Ernst Gombrich notes: "The supreme masters of counterchange were no doubt the Islamic designers who modified their grid patterns till figure and void corresponded in the most surprising way."²⁷ But in Riegl's thinking, a pattern that confounds figure-ground relations cannot produce a meaningful representation.

This privileging of discrete form, and its service to representation, is precisely what Deleuze and Guattari wanted to overturn. They argued that ideology penetrates to the most fundamental levels of perception, so that the recognition of form as signifying something is already vulnerable to ideology and control. Hence Deleuze and Guattari valued the way haptic space and abstract line refuse to be subordinated to meaning by delineating forms; they refuse to represent. Instead, they elicit perceptual and rhythmic embodied responses that occur prior to or in excess of meaning, for these are moments of freedom.²⁸

Abstract line engenders haptic space. In the beveled pattern of ninth-century Samarra and other kinds of overall ornament, line multiplies, branches, and doubles back on itself until it takes on an additional dimension, fractal style, suggesting the possibility of infinite growth. And when space has multiple access points, vision has a great deal of choice, as Gülru Necipoğlu has argued;²⁹ the eye itself draws abstract lines.

I suggest that these qualities of abstract line and haptic space solicit a tactile gaze. This understanding corresponds with the extromission theory of vision, circulating in the intellectual world of Islam during the formative period of Islamic nonfigurative aesthetics, wherein the eye sends out rays that touch the object of vision. But we can also consider that abstract line and haptic space align well with the later optics of Ibn al-Haytham (Alhazen, d. ca. 1040), in which the intromission theory of vision combined with the nonfocusing lens to place a great deal of visual freedom and responsibility with the viewer. Nonfigurative form, seen in terms of the faculties of judgment and imagination posited by Ibn al-Haytham, gives rise to a visuality in which

form and meaning are not imposed on the beholder but, rather, discovered and invented by the beholder in subjective acts of looking.³⁰ Ibn al-Haytham's theories do not seem to have had much influence in the Muslim world in the two centuries after his death, not until the scholar of optics Kamal al-din Abu'l-Hasan al-Farisi (d. ca. 1320) rediscovered them. However, as Jamal J. Elias argues, Ibn al-Haytham's scientific optics broadly accord with understandings of perception among theologians, jurists, Sufi metaphysicians, and poets during this time and attest to a general scholarly interest in perception.³¹ This argument suggests that Ibn al-Haytham's conception of an embodied and contemplative beholder was "in the air" at the time he made his experiments, as is often the case with scientific discoveries.

In these ways the haptic space and abstract line of Islamic art tend to undo representation and appeal to an embodied perception. Phenomenology supports this understanding in that it shifts the focus away from meaning and toward sensory experience. A phenomenological approach allows a beholder of our time to come up with an embodied approximation of how historical Islamic artworks may have appealed to their contemporary beholders. Valérie Gonzalez developed such a phenomenological approach to Islamic art in *Beauty and Islam* (2001). In her analysis of the Hall of Comares at the Alhambra, she demonstrates that an existential, embodied, and performative analysis of Islamic architecture suggests what a building may have meant to its contemporary visitors, in a way that iconic analysis cannot.³² Like Gonzalez, I offer embodied analyses of Islamic artworks in order to try to reconstruct others' experience of them, mindful (as existential phenomenology demands) that no single embodied response is normative.

The concepts of haptic space and abstract line avoid the figurative prejudice of art-historical discourse, typified in the term "horror vacui" coined in 1979 by Richard Ettinghausen to characterize the Islamic manner of diminishing the difference between figure and ground.³³ Ettinghausen's term has fallen out of use, perhaps because scholars recognized its ethnocentric tone, but not before Ernst Gombrich thoughtfully reversed it to "amor infinity."³⁴ These designs indicate no horror of anything but rather a creative interest in exploring

space intensively, for example by multiplying abstract lines to engender a haptic space.

HAPTIC SPACE AND ABSTRACT LINE IN ANDALUSIAN CERAMICS TO THE NASRID SULTANATE

Finally we are prepared to take up the travels of haptic space and abstract line within the aesthetics of Andalusian ceramics during the rise of Christian powers and the gradual repression and final expulsion of Muslims.

First let me contextualize the migration of ceramics and ceramists among the eastern Muslim world, the Mediterranean basin, and al-Andalus. A ninth-century innovation by Abbasid ceramists, tin and lead glazes, allowed potters to make shiny, opaque white surfaces on which ornament could play. (The opaque-glaze technique would come to be called *maiolica*, an Italian word based on either the production center of Málaga or the shipping port of Mallorca.)³⁵ Also in the ninth century, potters invented metal-oxide glazes that, when burnished, resembled gold. Scholars cannot determine with certitude whether the lusterware technique was first developed in Iraq, Iran, or Egypt, but they agree that it traveled widely.³⁶ In the itinerary that Anja Heidenreich has pieced together, beginning in the mid-tenth century Eastern potters emigrated to wealthier countries, mostly westward to North Africa, bringing the technique with them.³⁷ Traffic in North African ceramics increased during the Fatimid caliphate (909–1171): its dramatically figurative ceramics were imported through and to Andalusian ports.³⁸ In the eleventh century, North African ceramists emigrated or were invited to centers in al-Andalus; Heidenreich recounts that Abu'l-Walid b. Janah, a doctor from Córdoba, wrote that in the eleventh century immigrant potters arrived from the East and taught the local artisans new techniques.³⁹ There is evidence of lusterware production during the eleventh and twelfth centuries and of the export of Andalusian lusterware from these periods to Fustat and as far as Prague, as well as the import of Fatimid lusterware.⁴⁰ Later, ceramists emigrated from Kashan and Ray in Persia after the Mongol invasion in 1260.⁴¹

Andalusian cultural commerce with North Africa multiplied greatly in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries under the rule of the Almoravids and Almohads (1130–1269), as the rulers and their entourages traveled between their courts in al-Andalus and Marrakesh. Luxury lusterware produced during the Nasrid caliphate (1230–1492) was largely for export, not only to European markets but also to North Africa. Ádela Fábregas García demonstrates that, from the thirteenth to fifteenth centuries, a Granadan merchant fleet operated in the western Mediterranean and a Maghribi fleet followed the same route as Genoese, Venetian, and Catalanian-Aragonian trade ships, carrying ceramics as well as sugar, silk, and other commodities. Granadan merchants sold Andalusian ceramics in Cairo, Fez, and Tunis.⁴²

However, it was not until the Nasrids that the lusterware industry was thoroughly established, centered in Málaga.⁴³ Lusterware was costly to produce, given the expense of metallic oxides and the fuel needed for multiple firings (the metallic glaze is applied before the third firing), and it had a high failure rate; thus it needed heavy capitalization, which the Nasrid treasury provided.⁴⁴ In addition to the smaller dishes that this article discusses, Granadan ceramists produced massive and ambitious works in lusterware, including the luster tiles for the Alhambra and the Alhambra vases. Ibn Battuta (d. 1368–39) famously attested in 1350, “At Malaqa is made the wonderful gilded pottery that is exported to the remotest countries.”⁴⁵ Besides the North African destinations mentioned above, these export markets included the United Kingdom, France, and Italy.⁴⁶ Mariam Rosser-Owen notes that Eleanor of Castile received a gift of what was probably Málaga lusterware in 1289 and that, according to the Nasrid vizier Ibn al-Khatib, “all countries clamor for it, even the city of Tabriz.”⁴⁷ This boast suggests that Nasrid lusterware was as good as the luster ceramics made where the technique was first developed; Anthony Ray notes that later Valencian lusterware might have inspired Safavid potters to revive the luster technique.⁴⁸

Lusterware is an ideal medium to play with haptic effects, as its metallic shimmer confounds vision, making it difficult to distinguish patterns or the shape of a figure in a single glance. A viewer needs to physically move, or (if lucky enough to be able to hold it) to turn

the dish in his hands, in order to get a sense of what he is looking at. Thus the shimmer of lusterware demands a more embodied and temporal engagement. This effect is sometimes amplified by *sgraffito* patterns, scratched into the wet luster glaze in order to reveal the light glaze beneath. *Sgraffito* embeds a pattern in the shimmering luster, sometimes confounding the clarity of the image further and inviting the beholder to move in order to get a sense of the motif. Sometimes, however, *sgraffito* has the opposite effect, breaking up the shimmer of the luster and making it easier to take in at a single glance.

It is clear that for several centuries Christians in the region appreciated the aesthetics of Islamic ceramics. Spanish Christians received Islamic ideas and images in many ways, from assimilation to rejection, and sometimes both at once. Jerrilynn D. Dodds and María Rosa Menocal have written extensively about this ambivalent reception of Islamic culture on the Iberian Peninsula. Dodds, Menocal, and Abigale Krasner Balbale argue that a common culture developed from the interactions among Christians, Jews, and Muslims.⁴⁹ Some of the forms of this shared culture persisted in sixteenth-century mudéjar (that is, Arabized Christian) practices even after the expulsion of Jews and Muslims from Spain,⁵⁰ as we will see in the case of some seventeenth-century ceramics. An emphasis on lived experience rather than ideology also informs Francisco Prado-Vilar’s concept of the Gothic anamorphic gaze that characterized the intercultural relations of thirteenth-century Castile, which he argues was “informed by experience and direct knowledge of culture and religious diversity, rather than by dogma and ingrained stereotypes of alterity.”⁵¹ An anamorphic approach would be open to ideas and images from another religious culture yet interpret them in terms of its own: it would be seduced by another culture’s images and repress that seduction in order to fit those images into a more familiar context.

My focus in what follows is on the way the shape of the figure at the center of a dish and its interaction with the background motifs give rise to haptic space. The concave surface, often flattened in the center, of plates and bowls offers interesting creative challenges for ornament. The figure in a circular composition has plenty of precedents in Sasanian and Byzantine ceramics and metalwork, as well as in Late Roman and Coptic textiles,

and this heritage is evident in both Syrian and Andalusian Umayyad art. However, ceramists in the Muslim world from the Abbasid period on devised ways of filling the field with a human or animal figurative motif that depart from Syrian Umayyad representational conventions. In the new compositions, humans were depicted in postures that distributed their figure within the circular field, holding musical instruments, weapons, wine cups, or other props in ways that further filled the field.

Fatimid ceramics often depict a figure imaginatively posed to fill the circular space of the dish. For example, a dish at the David Collection, Copenhagen, from the eleventh to first half of twelfth century (fig. 1), with the background painted in reddish-brown luster and the figure left white, depicts a seated man pouring wine from a flask into a cup. His left knee rises to fill the right side of the dish, his right foot crosses his left to rest comfortably in the bottom part of the dish, and the tail of his turban loops up over the flask.⁵² The left side of the dish is filled by a conical plate of fruit from which a curving, leafy tendril springs; three small ornaments break up the remaining areas of the dark ground. The drinker looks to his right, inviting a beholder's eyes to follow his look and continue to circle counterclockwise around the dish. This arrangement, as well as the large curves of the drinker's body and the rounded ornaments, make looking at the dish a time-based act of easy, rhythmic movement.

Animal figures in a circular composition are often abstracted further by bending their limbs, ears, antlers, and tails to minimize empty ground, creating a sense of lively movement. The animal combat motif, in which two fighting animals circle each other in a closely reciprocal relationship, provides another satisfying way to distribute figures in the field. Willy Hartner and Richard Ettinghausen demonstrate that the ancient motif of a lion attacking a bull occurs in Sasanid art and was taken up in Umayyad art, as in a mosaic on the walls of the Khirbat al-Mafjar Palace depicting a lion attacking a gazelle.⁵³ The motif occurs in Iranian, Iraqi, Syrian, and Fatimid ceramics of the twelfth century.

Techniques abstracting figures to distribute them in a circle became newly emphasized in Andalusian ceramics through exchanges with Egyptian and Maghribi artists during the Taifa period and especially the



Fig. 1. Fragmentary earthenware bowl, painted in reddish-brown luster over an opaque, white ground. Egypt, eleventh century–first half of twelfth century. David Collection, Copenhagen, inv. no. 4/1992. (Photo: Pernille Klemp, courtesy of David Collection)

Almoravid and Almohad caliphates. (It is notable that the Almohads, despite their doctrinal austerity, had no objection to human figurative decoration in textiles, caskets, and ceramics.)⁵⁴ For example, a bowl from the second half of the tenth century, that is, the Taifa period, at the Museo Nacional de Cerámica Gonzáles Martí in Valencia, features a plump prancing gazelle with a slim bough in its mouth (fig. 2).⁵⁵ The elegant creature's bending legs differentiate the space of the lower part of the dish, its long ears the upper part, while the bough branches into two flowers on slim stems that curve about its body. The contour delimiting the creature gains freedom at the expense of naturalism, so that the liveliness of the line itself imparts life to the gazelle. The ground is unadorned.

In the thirteenth century, the city of Málaga in the Kingdom of Granada was the center of ceramic production. Málaga ceramics often feature the formal vegetal arabesques descended from Umayyad designs, as well as knot patterns, geometric patterns and interlace, and



Fig. 2. Tin-glazed earthenware bowl. Spain, second half of the tenth century. Museo Nacional de Cerámica Gonzáles Martí, Valencia, inv. no. 2.858. (Photo: Photographic Archives, Museo Nacional de Cerámica Gonzáles Martí)



Fig. 3. Luster-painted tin-glazed bowl. Málaga, 1425–50. Victoria and Albert Museum, London, museum no. 486-1864. (Photo: © Victoria and Albert Museum)

epigraphy. When they feature figures, these play against painted or *sgraffito* patterns of arabesques and abstracted plant forms. They include many variants of a broad dish at the center of which a hare, deer, or other animal cavorts or an archer or musician performs. In all of these, the creature's body, limbs, and ears gracefully bend to maximally fill the space, so that if you squint it seems to be occupied by regular variations of color and white ground. Florence C. Lister and Robert H. Lister characterize these ingenious designs a bit less charitably: "Motifs bent arbitrarily or twisted to fill prescribed spaces and thereby passed from realism to abstraction."⁵⁶ But we can say in a more prohaptic way that on these dishes figuration yields to the action of abstract line to produce a haptic space.

My next examples are not of human or animal figures but of ships. Andalusian potters treated ships as they did creatures, taking advantage of their curves and projections to creatively fill the circular space. On a bowl from the Taifa period, now at the Museo Nazionale di San

Matteo, Pisa, a seafaring scene occupies the entire decorative field. The sails and mast of the round-bottomed sailing ship curve to fit the circular dish, while below it a longboat with oarsmen fills the bottom part of the frame. Guillermo Rosselló Bordoy states that it is a typically Majorcan eleventh-century work, whose detail makes it possible to identify the ship as a sophisticated vessel from the Balearic Islands.⁵⁷ Since these islands were under Islamic control until 1229, this identification suggests the dish portrays a Muslim Andalusian merchant ship.

On the splendid thirteenth-century Nasrid bowl at the Victoria and Albert Museum (fig. 3), the curving prow and sails, flags, and mast of the ship fit elegantly into the roundness of the bowl and manage to depict the figure without distortion on the steep-sided bowl when you look at it straight on. Hair-like lines incised in the luster-brown sails and hull of the ship add realistic detail and also emphasize the curves of the dish, especially in the prow and sail that curve to the left and invite the

eyes to move clockwise.⁵⁸ Four big fish, the leftmost leaping to the left and the others leaping rightward, fill the space under the massive curving ship while also directing the look in both directions around the bowl. Rounded lozenges holding interlace motifs buffer the bowl's remaining edges and gently push the gaze back toward the middle. Between these forms, the painter has filled the ground with fine curls and flowers, so that while *sgraffito* lightens the dark luster figures, the background pattern diminishes the lightness of the ground, relieving the difference between figure and ground. The overall effect is of an equilibrated, abstract composition in a circle, which sends a beholder's gaze in spiraling paths from the figure in the center to the edges and back, springing from dark to light forms; when one looks closer at any part of the dish, its interior curving patterns invite the look to focus in on their detail and then send it spiraling back out. This work may have been commissioned by a Portuguese maritime merchant, as the ship bears the Portuguese royal arms.⁵⁹

A Nasrid dish from the late fourteenth century, painted with dark brown luster and showing St. George slaying the dragon, demonstrates that ceramists were capable of incorporating Christian Gothic figures into a circular composition that is well balanced and diminishes the difference between figure and ground. The dragon's body curls around half the rim of the dish, framing St. George's horse, its head rising at the left side of the dish, while the horseman bends toward the creature, his spear angling from the top of the rim. At the right of the dish a soldier holding a curved shield adds both narrative and compositional support. Additional spaces are filled by plants with large flowers and leaves. A stipple of dots minimizes the whiteness of the remaining background, while the hair, clothing, and armor of the men, the horse's mane, spots, and saddle, and the dragon's scales are indicated with *sgraffito*.⁶⁰

VALENCIA, FROM 1308 TO THE EARLY FIFTEENTH CENTURY: HAPTIC SPACE AND ABSTRACT LINE NEGOTIATE WITH OPTICAL IMAGES

In the early thirteenth century, when all of Muslim Spain except the Kingdom of Granada had fallen to Christian rule, craft maintained a fair degree of

continuity despite the political upheaval. Castilian ceramists had little technical knowledge because their region habitually imported pottery from Muslim manufacturers, so they continued to rely on Muslim ceramists.⁶¹ Muslim craftspeople living in Christian Spain continued to be valued for their skill, but for the most part they had little power or recourse. The decree by Alfonso X (r. 1252–84) in 1261 that the former Great Mosque of Córdoba (by then the Church of Santa Maria) be restored indicates a respect for this Islamic building the decree called “noble.” However, as Heather Ecker points out, the fact that Alfonso commanded all Muslim craftsmen to devote two days a year to working on it, threatened with imprisonment if they did not comply, in labor that continued for forty years, shows that the valued Muslim craftsmen could be treated as indentured laborers.⁶²

In Valencia, unlike the rest of the peninsula, Muslims remained the majority after the 1258 conquest, and they appear to have constituted the majority of the population in the fifteenth century. Moreover, Muslims in Valencia continued to speak Arabic, unlike their fellow Moriscos (Muslims forcibly converted to Christianity) elsewhere.⁶³ Muslims in Valencia lived separately and had their own legal bodies. And, since Manises in Valencia is a port, they were in communication by sea with other Muslim communities.⁶⁴ So we can imagine that for some time the Muslims of Valencia lived autonomously and were under little pressure to adapt to Christian customs. But as L. P. Harvey shows, Muslims in Valencia from the thirteenth century on suffered from vacillating policies of the Crown of Aragon: they were alternately pressured and prohibited to emigrate, as their labor was required but their religion was despised.⁶⁵

Muslim craftsmen were already producing lusterware in Valencia in the thirteenth century before James I (r. 1213–76) conquered the city. James promised Paterna and Manises to the nobleman Artal de Luna, who in 1304 sold them to Pedro Boil, a man intent on making a fortune from the pottery trade.⁶⁶ Upon negotiating peace after the siege of Almería in 1308–9 that led to the end of the first Nasrid dynasty, Boil retained the right to sell Nasrid lusterware. It may be his son Felipe who, after losing his father's lucrative prerogative, encouraged

Muslim potters from Málaga to settle in Valencia and produce “Málaga-style ware”; the first reference to Valencian lusterware occurred in 1325.⁶⁷ At the same time there was an exodus of Muslim craftsmen from Murcia, some of whom emigrated to Valencia.⁶⁸ Boil arranged to promote the mudéjar potters’ wares for export, keeping 10 percent of the profits.⁶⁹ Potters in Paterna, across the river from Manises, made similar but less sophisticated wares.⁷⁰ Organized trade passed from Manises, port of Valencia, to Pisa, port of Florence, through the transshipment point of Majorca.⁷¹ The Boil lusterware empire soon eclipsed that of the Nasrids for two reasons: Manises potters obtained a high-quality gold-colored luster that surpassed its Granadan counterpart; the Boil enterprise focused on quantity while Nasrid ceramists focused on quality, producing a small number of fine objects, including the Alhambra vases, for royal consumption.⁷² This trade advantage evidently brought massive profits to the Boil family: in 1372 Felipe Boil petitioned the king for a monopoly on Manises ware; the king’s response is not known.⁷³ After 1450 some Old Christians joined the Muslim potters.⁷⁴ The Boil enterprise follows the general pattern of Christian lordship over the Muslim inhabitants of Valencia, in which Muslims formed the majority of agricultural workers on Christian-colonized land.

Valencian ceramics from this period of almost two centuries vary widely in design and style, although initially they were so similar to Málaga ware that early works can be distinguished only by the different colors of the clay underbody.⁷⁵ Initially many decorative elements had precedents in Nasrid lusterware from the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, but the styles of lusterware from the two regions (Andalusia and Valencia) begin to diverge in the second half of fourteenth century as Marinid (1269–1465) potters brought new styles to Granada while Valencian potters developed their own repertoire.⁷⁶ Let us keep in mind that the artisans were under pressure to produce in volume for Boil’s business. Skill was necessary to paint the dishes quickly while maintaining their quality. Figures in circular compositions are often depicted with a few bold marks shaping the figure of a hare, deer, bird, or other creature, still balancing the suggestion of a figure with a sense of abstract design. It seems that initially figures were on the

front of the dish only, but later ceramists began to paint them on the back of the dish as well. For example, on the back of a luster-painted deep dish, probably made in Manises (1435–65), in the Cloisters Collection of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, a deer stands alertly, legs stick-straight but flanks and long neck curving, antlers streaming back from its head like long flowing locks (fig. 4). Three large light spots break up the dark form of the deer’s body. A few remarkably lively vines make large, loose spirals around the creature, terminating in graceful brushy flowers almost the size of its head. The effect again, I would argue, is less a figurative representation than a rhythmic composition.

New aesthetics entered as Valencian potters produced works for the changing demands of European customers, sometimes on commission from Spanish, French, and Italian royalty and nobility. In fifteenth-century ceramics it is evident that Manises potters, while continuing to develop new styles from the Islamic repertoire, increasingly produced works whose motifs and styles would appeal to a European, Christian clientele. They incorporated Latin text and Gothic motifs of knights, ladies, and monks.⁷⁷ New background motifs occur that sometimes interact with the figure so as to emphasize the figure-ground distinction. In some dishes Islamic motifs fill the space around Gothic lettering spelling “Ave Maria,” biblical quotations, and the Christian monogram IHS (fig. 5). Coats of arms dominate the center of dishes commissioned by noble families (fig. 6); many examples depict the Florentine lion rampant. Shields and monograms are symbols that can be easily read rather than experienced as plastic forms.

Interestingly, Valencian lusterware, with its more European style, was exported not only to European customers but also (like the earlier Granadan ceramics) across the Islamic Maghrib and to Egypt, succeeding the Nasrid export market. Fábregas García remarks that

even in the Islamic markets—where we might assume a ready acceptance of Nasrid stylistic models as the result of a related decorative culture—we find the same phenomenon that is common in the European markets: that is, the substitution from the middle of the eighth/fourteenth century of Granadan lustreware by the new blue and lustre products of Valencia. These Valencian products not only show signs of a considerable increase in the volume of consumption, but also of a typological and, above all, stylistic



Fig. 4. Back of a luster-painted tin-glazed deep dish. Manises, 1435–65. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, The Cloisters Collection, 1956, accession no. 56.171.71. (Photo: © The Metropolitan Museum of Art)



Fig. 5. Luster-painted tin-glazed bowl. Manises, 1430–70. Victoria and Albert Museum, London, Salting Bequest, museum no. C.2046-1910. (Photo: © Victoria and Albert Museum)

development, introducing decorative motifs from the Latin and Western European tradition, which are—perhaps curiously—also accepted into the Islamic markets.⁷⁸

The explanation she posits is that Italian merchants dominated the trade and thus were able to dictate the nature of the exports.⁷⁹ North African Muslim customers perhaps did not have much influence on the looks of Valencian lusterware and had to accept works designed with a Christian clientele in mind.

Dishes with heraldic motifs are especially interesting to examine, for often the obverse of the dish features bold lions, eagles, bulls, and other animals, “masterpieces of ceramic decoration in their own right”⁸⁰ in compositions that maintain relations of haptic space and abstract line that are constrained on the front of the dish. Rosser-Owen writes that these animal figures are Gothic motifs, such as the griffin,⁸¹ but some are also common in the Islamic repertoire. Several pieces from Manises dated to 1450–75 with a heraldic shield on the front of the dish show a large animal on the back that fills the space, as in traditional Islamic designs. For



Fig. 6. Luster-painted tin-glazed dish with arms of the Arighi family of Florence: “azure two pallets argent, on a chief a lion’s jamb erased in fesse azure.” Probably Manises, 1430–50. British Museum, London, registration no. G.571. (Photo: © Trustees of the British Museum)



Fig. 7. Luster-painted tin-glazed dish with arms of Cardona family. Manises, ca. 1435–60. Victoria and Albert Museum, London, museum no. 14-1907. (Photo: © Victoria and Albert Museum)

example, a dish circa 1435–60 features a heraldic shield bearing a thistle plant in which five blossoms spring on slim curving stems from two posed leaves, the arms of the Cardona family of Catalonia (fig. 7). The painter is clearly faithful to the iconography and symmetry of the device, but the painting style retains grace and ease. In any case, as a heraldic symbol, the device can be understood in a flash and need not be contemplated. A garland of large blue, four-lobed flowers joined by lozenge-like stem bundles, from which spring tri-lobed leaves, rings the shield; graceful gold, feather-like leaves and vines entirely fill the remaining space, their asymmetry giving a sense of motion to the otherwise rather static motifs. The back of this dish is filled by a ferocious eagle, a familiar heraldic animal in both Muslim and

Christian contexts but unbound by a framing shield (fig. 8). The bird spreads its wings, which fill the sides of the dish; its splayed legs and claws reach to the edge of the bottom third of the dish, and its broad tail fills the bottom. Each feather and leg is painted with one broad stroke, as are the head, curving beak, and darting tongue. Slender vines with large, pea-like flowers fill the remaining space, one vine-scroll inhabiting each of the recesses left by the bird's appendages, with smaller leaves occupying the spaces between its tail feathers, so that the overall effect is a rhythmic composition of color with little void. The composition invites the eye to follow the large swoops of the wings, be caught in a loose ringlet of vine, spring on to the bird's curved head, and so move around the dish in a looping alternation between figure



Fig. 8. Back of dish in figure 7.

and “ground” (although as this description suggests, the ground is once again not subordinated to the figure but equally visually engaging). In this looping mobility of vision, a beholder who turns the dish over experiences a somewhat more embodied visuality, which perhaps extends to feeling the curving movements in her head and neck as her eyes make the circuit of the dish.

It is tempting to interpret a metaphor in these potters’ decision to depict the requested motif on the front of the dish and to indulge in more free and expressive—even aggressive—abstract figuration on the back. Did the painters obey their patrons’ wish to depict a constrained heraldic animal on the front of the dish, and on the back paint it in a way that appealed more to their sense of plastic dynamism? Was there a more subversive intention, given the fierce appearance of some of the creatures? Rosser-Owen points out that some of the

dishes have holes for hanging on the wall, and they might have hung with the reverse facing out. So perhaps their owners prized the animal figure.⁸² On the other hand, Ecker suggests the animals painted on the back signified the potter, the workshop, or the batch, indicating they meant more to the maker than they would to the owner.⁸³ Or were the painters simply demonstrating their ease with simultaneous modes of image-making, one more legible, one more painterly?

Also in the fifteenth century, new background motifs appeared that resemble the flora of Gothic miniatures: bryony, parsley, thistle flowers, and roses, as well as “disk flowers,” a circle surrounded by disk-shaped petals.⁸⁴ These floral motifs have a neutral quality, less obviously Islamic than the abstracted vegetal motifs and interlace, while initially filling the same function as a background motif. Italian as well as Spanish clients



Fig. 9. Tin-glazed dish with arms of the Degli Agli family of Florence. Manises, ca. 1400–1450. Victoria and Albert Museum, London, Salting Bequest, museum no. C.2053-1910. (Photo: © Victoria and Albert Museum)

commissioned heraldic dishes with the bryony and parsley motif, as in a dish with the arms of the Degli Agli family of Florence whose background is populated by a regular pattern of small flowers and leaves contained by linear tendrils (fig. 9). An ivy-leaf background was popular with the Netherlands market; ivy-patterned Manises ceramics appear in paintings such as the *Annunciation* by Hugo van der Goes (d. 1482), now at the Uffizi Gallery, Florence.⁸⁵

In many fifteenth-century ceramics we can see the rise of a more figurative aesthetics. Some Valencian lusterware shows a new distinction between figure and ground: the line conforms more to the contours of the figure, and the background motifs are deployed differently. Sometimes they become smaller and more regular, relinquishing their interaction with the central figures; sometimes they become larger and act as figures on a ground. Bunches of grapes, ivy leaves, and other, larger motifs increase in size and move from the background. The haptic space and abstract line that confound

figure-ground distinctions and generate a visual rhythm begin to give way to distinct figures on a field. As a result, many later Manises ceramics appeal less to an embodied, temporal response and more to a narrative or cognitive understanding.

We can see the process of becoming figurative in a plate from Manises (ca. 1450) in the Musée du Louvre, Paris (fig. 10). In a motif that suggests love's archer, a smiling lady in stylish European dress has just drawn her bow, wounding a smaller male figure, also smiling, who clutches at the arrow through his neck. The figures, new to the repertory of figurative composition within a circle, sit rather awkwardly in the field of bryony flowers. The lady's skirts billow a bit to fill one edge of the circle, but the rest of her figure and the male figure float awkwardly in the space in a way that is quite different from the graceful filling of space in earlier works. This motif is also more narrative than most figures on Andalusian ceramics, suggesting a series of specific events that play out in time more than does an image of an animal or a musician.

In a similar work, a plate in brown and blue luster attributed to Valencia or Catalonia (ca. 1525–75) at the Hispanic Society of America, the figure of a horseman in Spanish costume, probably inspired by Italian majolica, floats on a background of large-leaved vines (fig. 11).⁸⁶ As in the Louvre plate, reciprocity between figure and background pattern is largely ignored, although both are painted with a sure hand. The rider's bonnet squashes into the top edge of the plate, while plenty of space remains below his horse's hooves in the lower half of the dish, suggesting that the painter was trying out a new motif.

THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY, THE EXPULSION OF MUSLIMS FROM SPAIN, AND THE TRIUMPH OF OPTICAL SPACE

In Granada in 1499 and Castile in 1502, edicts forced Muslims to choose between conversion and expulsion, and, in some cases, enslavement. Ferdinand of Aragon (r. 1479–1516) encouraged entry permits for Muslim refugees from the Granadan War of 1489 and promised to protect the *morerías* (segregated mudéjar



Fig. 10. Luster-painted tin-glazed plate. Manises, ca. 1450. Musée du Louvre, Paris, Legacy of Antonin Personnaz, 1937, inv. no. OA 9001. (Photo: Laura Marks)



Fig. 11. Tin-glazed earthenware dish with cobalt and luster. Valencia or Catalonia, ca. 1525–75. Hispanic Society of America, New York, inv. no. E688. (Photo: courtesy of the Hispanic Society of America)

neighborhoods) and not to force Muslims to convert, promises his successor Charles V (1516–56) repeated in 1518. All these measures served the financial interest of the nobility of Aragon, who relied on Muslim labor—mostly agricultural⁸⁷ but also evidently in the lucrative ceramic business. But finally in 1525, in part due to pressure from the Christian laboring class, Charles retracted his promise.⁸⁸ All mosques were converted to churches. The Moriscos continued to practice their religion secretly, supported by the compassionate provisions of the Oran fatwa of 1504.⁸⁹ Despite the conversions, in the early years of the sixteenth century a series of royal decrees from Ferdinand II and his daughter Joan of Aragon sought to strip Moriscos even further of their culture and their remaining economic power. These include the prohibitions, in 1526, on using written or spoken Arabic, bearing arms, and moneylending, among other professions.⁹⁰ Yet the Christian rulers blocked emigration, again because they needed the Muslim labor and taxes.

The forcibly converted Muslims of Aragon were also increasingly vulnerable to violence by Christian mobs.

In 1581, Diego de Arce y Reinoso (d. 1665), inquisitor of Valencia, calculated that if the Moriscos were expelled, Valencia would lose one-third of its population and two-thirds of its income and would suffer food shortages and a decline in the incomes of nobles. But he figured these problems could be dealt with by bringing in settlers from elsewhere in Spain.⁹¹ How it was calculated that Christian potters would be able to take over the ceramic industry remains a matter of speculation. Manises records from around 1500 give the names of twenty-five potters, half Muslims, half Old Christians. It is unknown to what degree Christians participated in the making of lusterware, but the names of Old Christians include two who would found pottery dynasties: Eximeno and Requeni.⁹²

So it is in this context of the official eradication of Muslim identity and autonomy, and profound insecurity for the Morisco inhabitants of Valencia, as well as changes specific to the ceramics industry, that Islamic aesthetics went into a final retreat. In the early sixteenth century, the demand for armorial lusterware began to fall because, with precious metals now imported from the new colonies in the West Indies, the wealthy could use gold- and silver-plated dishes instead of the lusterware that had substituted for them. Accordingly, potters began to make lusterware imitations of gadrooned and ribbed metalware. Works from this period often feature small, fussy, rather mechanical patterns, such as the dot and stalk or *solfa* (because it looks like a musical note, *sol-fa*) and the chainlike spur band, developed from an Islamic motif.⁹³ For example, on a bowl from Manises, circa 1475–1500, the repetitive *solfa* motif surrounds a squat little rabbit (fig. 12). On the back expands a freely painted fern motif, quite common in Valencian ceramics of this period (fig. 13).

How to account for these changes not only in style but also in finesse without resorting to essentialism, that is, a notion of a “Muslim hand” at work? We might characterize the change as a shift from mudéjar to Morisco style,⁹⁴ that is, from a style that displays its Islamic sources even as it adapts to Christian taste, to one that conceals them. Some ceramics made after the Expulsion clearly demonstrate a lack of practice. For example, a



Fig. 12. Luster-painted tin-glazed bowl. Manises, ca. 1475–1500. Victoria and Albert Museum, London, museum no. 19-1907. (Photo: © Victoria and Albert Museum)



Fig. 13. Back of bowl in figure 12.



Fig. 14. Tin-glazed dish. Manises, 1500–1700. Victoria and Albert Museum, London, Given by Mr. Henry Wallis, museum no. 331-1908. (Photo: © Victoria and Albert Museum)

dish from Manises dated 1500–1700 is regularly spotted with tiny flowers in the middle of which the painter has plunked a nine-leaved tree, erasing some of the flowers in the process (fig. 14). This rendition suggests that at least some Christian potters never gained the skill of their Muslim forebears. But others are painted with a sure hand, so the change in style and composition cannot be attributed to lack of skill. Therefore, I attribute the change in style to a change in taste. It might have been shared by the ceramists and their customers, driven in part by customers' demand for fashionable new styles and in part by ceramists' own experiments. The new taste for clearly delimited figures, often in a recognizable space, seems to have arisen in response to Italian imports as well as in a rejection of Islamic styles. Thus a brief digression on the Italian reception of Andalusian ceramics is necessary.

MEANWHILE, THE ABSTRACT LINE TRAVELS TO ITALY, AND FIGURATION TRAVELS BACK

Italian interest in Islamic ceramics is evident as early as the eleventh century, when Italy was importing *bacini* (painted bowls) from North Africa, Andalusia, Sicily, and Egypt to set into church façades.⁹⁵ (The large-figured Fatimid dishes that inspired innovation among the ceramists of al-Andalus also show up in Tuscan churches.)⁹⁶ In the period under discussion here, Italian ceramists copied and adapted Valencian designs: see, for example, the fifteenth-century dish from Faenza with simple vegetal motifs spiraling around what might be a coat of arms (fig. 15). By the fifteenth century these copies developed into indigenous products, as in the Tuscan figurative *zaffera* or oak-leaf ceramics, produced in quantity for hospitals and pharmacies, that clearly adapt the Valencian motif of animals romping on a field of bryony flowers (fig. 16).⁹⁷

In the later fifteenth century, decoration on Italian ceramics grew more typically Italian, as Catherine Hess notes.⁹⁸ Relinquishing the Valencian influence, they came to depict coats of arms, busts, emblems, and narrative scenes and adopted the new pictorial techniques of chiaroscuro, volumetric modeling, and linear perspective. New Renaissance motifs appealed to a new creative interest in clear figuration and, in the case of the complex biblical and mythical narratives, deep space. W. D. Kingery notes that technological advances allowed Italian ceramic painters to draw with precision and model figures. From 1430 to 1450, Italian ceramists developed paints made of insoluble pigment particles with just enough binder to hold them together. These allowed painters to draw with precision, shade figures, and even use *impasto*.⁹⁹

In sixteenth-century Italian ceramics, Islamic motifs such as arabesques and overlapping scallops maintained their presence among a host of decorative options. Often the arabesque enlarges and gets its own contour line, so that it becomes a figure in itself, as in the Deruta dish with a lance man, 1520–50, from the workshop of Giacomo Mancini (fig. 17). Similarly, a dish from Deruta, circa 1500–1525, at the British Museum, shows an unidentified coat of arms surrounded by firmly outlined arabesques.¹⁰⁰ The play of haptic space and



Fig. 15. Tin-glazed dish. Faenza, ca. 1425–1450. Victoria and Albert Museum, London, museum no. 1228-1901. (Photo: © Victoria and Albert Museum)



Fig. 16. Tin-glazed vase with *zaffera* motif. Florence, ca. 1430. Musée du Louvre, Paris, Former Collection of Henry Wallis, acquired 1904, inv. no. OA 5973. (Photo: Laura Marks)



Fig. 17. Tin-glazed dish. Deruta, ca. 1520–1550, from the workshop of Giacomo Mancini. Victoria and Albert Museum, London, museum no. 2595-1856. (Photo: © Victoria and Albert Museum)

abstract line diminishes, although these motifs never entirely disappear.¹⁰¹

But the ceramics of Deruta and Faenza had an irresistible new élan that spoke to emergent European sensibilities. They quickly developed a deep perspectival space in which figures could be represented, narratives enacted, and the psychology of characters developed. For example, a tin-glazed dish from the workshop of Giacomo Mancini in Deruta, dated 1545, depicts a scene from Canto IV of Ludovico Ariosto's *Orlando Furioso* (1516) (fig. 18). The composition is crowded, but fore, middle, and rear ground are clearly delimited by the outlines of low hills, the sea beyond them, and mountains on the horizon at the far edge of the sea. The painter has taken advantage of the new painting technology to crisply describe the figures of Bradamante, armed, preparing to fight the sorcerer riding the flying hippogriff, while Brunello, tied to a tree, watches helpless, and in the background Rinaldo and his esquire ride off with the rescued Ginevra.¹⁰² Cross-hatching gives the figures' limbs volume. This complex depiction of a narrative



Fig. 18. Tin-glazed dish, depicting a scene from the Canto IV of Ludivico Ariosto's *Orlando Furioso*, adapted from a woodcut published at Venice in 1542 by Gabriele Giolito de' Ferrari. Deruta, 1545, from the workshop of Giacomo Mancini. Victoria and Albert Museum, London, Salting Bequest, museum no. C.2198-1910. (Photo: © Victoria and Albert Museum)

scene occurring in deep space is all the more remarkable because it is adapted from another medium, a woodcut, that does not require the speed of execution that ceramic painting does. The plate is certainly sensuously appealing in its juicy colors and gold luster, but I would suggest that it appeals more to a cognitive recognition akin to reading. Here, interestingly adapted to ceramics, is practiced the Renaissance optical space that had come to dominate European painting. It is the space for narrative and identification that centuries later cinema would import and that the theory of the gaze would scrutinize.

The Renaissance influence entered Spanish ceramics, especially in Seville, after Italian ceramics entered the Spanish market. In 1484 Ferdinand and Isabella encouraged Italian and Flemish artisans to emigrate to Spain by granting them a ten-year tax exemption,¹⁰³ likely in the hopes of building an industrial base no longer reliant on Muslim expertise. Spanish potters studied with

Italian and Flemish masters. The Italian Renaissance influence is more evident in tile production than in hollowware, especially in the works of the Italian ceramic painter Francisco Niculoso (d. 1520). Niculoso's style was not followed until fifty years after his death, when Spanish potters began to take up both his and the Della Robbia family's Renaissance techniques.

Florence Lister and Robert Lister write that the Renaissance influence inspired a "shift in popular attitude, which would culminate in an incredible artistic flowering at Sevilla. Southern Catholics somewhat reluctantly began to realize that handwork could be accomplished proudly by Christians."¹⁰⁴ This statement is a bit difficult to parse. Does it imply that previously Christians had been willing to let Muslims retain the expertise in ceramics (as in other crafts) because they felt it was beneath them? That the entry of Renaissance figurative and narrative imagery into ceramics elevated the craft into an art? If so, it implies a distinction between fine art (figurative and narrative) on one hand, and craft (decorative and minor) on the other—a modern attitude characterized by Riegl's distinction between "ornament" and "argument."¹⁰⁵ But it may be that the practice came first and the attitude appeared later.

Anyway, the practice did change. In sixteenth-century Manises, Old Christians now dominated the industry, constituting more than half of master potters.¹⁰⁶ Mudéjar traditions declined.¹⁰⁷ New large motifs appear: big marguerites, passion flowers, shield-like forms. Sometimes, as earlier, the graceful abstract animal figures still fill the circular frame and interact with a swirling population of background motifs, maintaining a tactile rhythmicity. But many Valencian dishes from 1525 to 1560, though technically polished, look neat and static: they are crowded with small motifs that are often framed by square and shield shapes (a method termed "in reserve").

In September 1609 the Royal Council (having dismissed the notion of slaughtering or castrating adult Muslims or drowning them at sea) issued the Edict of Expulsion.¹⁰⁸ This Castilian decree was initially opposed in Valencia and Aragon, where many Muslims lived. In 1609 the lords of Valencia, where Muslims still constituted 35 percent of potters, sent two representatives to plead with the king against the expulsion, to no avail.¹⁰⁹



Fig. 19. Tin-glazed footed dish (*tazza*). Teruel, Aragon, 1650–1700. Victoria and Albert Museum, London, Given by Dr. W. L. Hildburgh FSA, museum no. C.425-1920. (Photo: © Victoria and Albert Museum)

But between 1609 and 1614, Spain expelled 300,000 Muslims, of a total of 330,000, from Aragon, Murcia, Catalonia, Castile, Mancha, and Extremadura. In L. P. Harvey's cautious estimate, this constituted 4 percent of the Spanish population.¹¹⁰ The evidence of Inquisition trials suggests that most converted Muslims (Moriscos) really did leave the peninsula. Morisco cases were the majority in tribunals of Saragossa, Valencia, and Granada in the second half of the fifteenth century, but between 1615 and 1700, only 9 percent of Inquisition judgments were against Moriscos.¹¹¹

The Expulsion was catastrophic for agriculture and crafts. It seems that few Christian potters had attained all the skills of their Muslim colleagues. The quality of Valencian pottery declined precipitously.¹¹² Yet it appears that Old Christian potters well versed in Islamic aesthetics continued to practice. For example, a very Valencian-looking hare leaps across a footed dish

(*tazza*) from Teruel on which large floral motifs release spiraling tendrils that fill the ground (fig. 19). Ray writes that this work maintains the “horror vacui” of the *muḍéjar* style;¹¹³ again, I contest the use of this term and suggest instead that the painter succeeded in relating figure and ground in a rhythmic harmony.

In many post-Expulsion ceramics, background motifs continue to get larger and leave more white space; they harden up, stop moving, and become stand-alone figures. The motifs lose their connection to each other and to the central figure, and there is far less sense of movement. For example, on a (nonfigurative) dish from mid-sixteenth century Manises at the Victoria and Albert Museum, whose central fourfold symmetry doubles to eightfold symmetry at the rim, fairly large motifs, evenly distributed on the ground, maintain their distance from each other (fig. 20). Eight shell-like motifs in reserve are distributed around the edge, echoing the



Fig. 20. Luster-painted tin-glazed deep dish. Manises, mid-sixteenth century. Victoria and Albert Museum, London, museum no. 379-1893. (Photo: © Victoria and Albert Museum)

rosette on a square in the center. The painting is accomplished, so the static and boxy effect is likely what the painter was after.

Landscape begins to organize the space, and the horizon line, something extremely rare in Islamic figurative ceramics, enters. A fascinatingly hybrid lusterware dish from Valencia, 1625–1700 or later, features a crowned lion that stands on hilly ground marked with crosshatches, in a nod toward Renaissance naturalistic depictions of space (fig. 21). At first glance it resembles the fifteenth-century Valencian dishes that placed European figures onto a ground of vegetal motifs without a great deal of attention to figure-ground relationships. However, in this case the figure and ground relate with a vengeance! Extremely lively and busy plant motifs crowd the surface of the dish, mimicking the lion's tail, curling eagerly into the spaces under its legs, and encroaching on its every contour. Yet the illusion of deep space that the ground line creates causes these plant motifs to seem to be floating in space, like giant flying insects, creating a fevered, hallucinatory quality.

Later sixteenth-century Spanish lusterware, now made largely for a local market, tends to be simply painted with large figures, often based on the Italian portrait profile. The figure-ground relationship in Spanish ceramics reached a *détente*, figure having pretty much won.

RESURGENCE OF HAPTIC SPACE AND THE ABSTRACT LINE

Thus the abstract line of Andalusian ceramics lost its independence and became more obedient to the contour, while its haptic space, in which figure and ground commingle rhythmically, gradually gave way to an optical space in which they are clearly distinct. In post-Expulsion Spain, the earlier Christian openness to Muslim culture was supplanted by what Prado-Vilar calls a “gaze of disavowal,” capable of ignoring the latent traces of Islamic aesthetics in European art.¹¹⁴ This whitewashing of Islamic presence from art occurred in the context of ethnic cleansing as Spain invented itself as a Christian nation. Islamic aesthetics went decisively out of fashion in the country where Muslims had governed for centuries, as though the Spanish could not bear to be reminded that their *sangre* lacked *limpieza*, that the Muslim presence had shaped their culture irrevocably.

Yet looking at the way these objects changed over a few centuries allows us to reconstruct the paths by which Islamic culture survived in Europe. The haptic space and abstract line went underground in Western art, appearing for centuries only as ornament, as background. In the visual territory that art staked out for narrative and psychological meaning, haptic space and abstract line were reduced, for some centuries, to perceptual vacation spots. Not until the late nineteenth century did Western artists rediscover them and, wittingly or not, bring Islamic aesthetics back into Western art.

I have argued that the concepts of haptic space and abstract line, in contrast to their companion form of optical space, usefully describe the ways in which Islamic aesthetics substitutes rhythm and embodiment for representation. I hope that these concepts, enriched by their long itinerary from art history to philosophy to



Fig. 21. Luster-painted tin-glazed deep dish. Valencia, ca. 1625–1700 or later. Victoria and Albert Museum, London, museum no. 24-1907. (Photo: © Victoria and Albert Museum)

cinema and back to art history, eventually find a bit of traction as concepts, de facto or de jure, for the study of Islamic art as well.

*School for the Contemporary Arts, Simon Fraser University
Vancouver, British Columbia*

NOTES

Author's note. An earlier version of this essay, Laura U. Marks, "From Haptic to Optical, Performance to Figuration: A History of Representation at the Bottom of a Bowl," appeared in *Islam and the Politics of Culture in Europe: Memory, Aesthetics, Art*, ed. Frank Peter, Sarah Dornhof, and Elena Arigita (Bielefeld: Transcript-Verlag, 2013), 247–63. Its intellectual companion is "A

Deleuzian *Ijtihad*: Unfolding Deleuze's Islamic Sources Occulted in the Ethnic Cleansing of Spain," in *Deleuze and Race*, ed. Arun Saldhana and Jason Michael Adams (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2013), 51–72. Hearty thanks to Olga Bush and Avinoam Shalem for their very helpful comments on earlier drafts of this essay and to Ann Grogg for her wonderfully thorough and thoughtful copyedit.

1. Laura U. Marks, *Enfoldment and Infinity: An Islamic Genealogy of New Media Art* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 2010); Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, "1440: The Smooth and the Striated," in *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, trans. Brian Massumi (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1987), 492–97.
2. Mieke Bal, *Traveling Concepts in the Humanities: A Rough Guide* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2012).
3. *Ibid.*, 13, citing Isabelle Stengers, ed., *D'une science à l'autre* (Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1987).
4. *Ibid.*, 24.
5. Jacques Lacan, "The Mirror Stage as Formative of the Function of the I as Revealed in Psychoanalytic Experience,"

- in *Écrits: A Selection*, trans. Alan Sheridan (New York and London: Norton, 1977), 1, 2.
6. See Christian Metz, "Identification/Mirror" and "The Passion for Perceiving," in *Film Theory and Criticism*, ed. Leo Braudy and Marshall Cohen (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992), 820–26, 827–30; Jean-Louis Baudry, "Ideological Effects of the Basic Cinematographic Apparatus," in *Movies and Methods: An Anthology*, vol. 2, ed. Bill Nichols (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1985), 531–42.
 7. Laura Mulvey, "Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema," in *Narrative, Apparatus, Ideology: A Film Theory Reader*, ed. Philip Rosen (New York: Columbia University Press, 1975), 198–209.
 8. Kaja Silverman, "Fassbinder and Lacan: A Reconsideration of Gaze, Look and Image" (1975), in *Male Subjectivity at the Margins* (New York and London: Routledge, 1992), 125–56.
 9. Mulvey, "Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema."
 10. Norman Bryson, "The Gaze and the Glance," in his *Vision and Painting* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983), 87–131.
 11. See, for example, bell hooks, *Black Looks: Race and Representation* (Toronto: Between the Lines, 1992).
 12. See, for example, Luce Irigaray, *An Ethics of Sexual Difference*, trans. Carolyn Burke and Gillian C. Gill (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1993); Vivian Sobchack, *The Address of the Eye: Phenomenology and Film Experience* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1992); Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, trans. Robert Hurley, Mark Seem, and Helen R. Lane (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1983).
 13. Robert Vischer, "The Aesthetic Act and Pure Form," trans. Nicholas Walker, in *Art in Theory, 1815–1900: An Anthology of Changing Ideas*, ed. Charles Harrison et al. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998) (first published 1927 in German); Wilhelm Worringer, *Abstraction and Empathy: A Contribution to the Psychology of Style*, trans. Michael Bullock (New York: Meridian, 1948) (first published 1908 in German).
 14. Adolf Hildebrand, *The Problem of Form in Painting and Sculpture*, trans. Max Mayer and Robert Morris Ogden (New York: G. E. Stechert, 1907) (first published 1893 in German).
 15. Heinrich Wölfflin, *Renaissance and Baroque*, trans. Kathrin Simon (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1966) (first published 1888 in German).
 16. Margaret Iversen, *Alois Riegl: Art History and Theory* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1993), 170.
 17. See also Laura U. Marks, "Haptic Aesthetics," *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Aesthetics*, ed. Michael Kelly et al. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 269–74.
 18. Deleuze and Guattari, *Thousand Plateaus*, 492–93.
 19. *Ibid.*, 496–97.
 20. Noël Burch, *Life to Those Shadows*, trans. Ben Brewster (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990); Antonia Lant, "Haptical Cinema," *October* 75 (Fall 1995): 45–73.
 21. Laura U. Marks, *The Skin of the Film: Intercultural Cinema, Embodiment, and the Senses* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 2000).
 22. Grant Kester, *The One and the Many: Contemporary Collaborative Art in a Global Context* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 2011), 43–61.
 23. Marks, *Enfoldment and Infinity*, chaps. 2–5.
 24. Alois Riegl, *Problems of Style: Foundations for a History of Ornament*, trans. Evelyn Kain (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1992) (first published 1893 in German).
 25. Margaret Olin, *Forms of Representation in Alois Riegl's Theory of Art* (University Park, Pa.: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1992), 144–45.
 26. *Ibid.*
 27. Ernst Gombrich, *The Sense of Order: A Study in the Psychology of the Decorative Arts* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1979), 89.
 28. In addition to the previously cited section of Deleuze and Guattari, *Thousand Plateaus*, see Gilles Deleuze, *Francis Bacon: The Logic of Sensation*, trans. Daniel W. Smith (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2004).
 29. Gülru Necipoğlu, *The Topkapı Scroll: Geometry and Ornament in Islamic Architecture* (Santa Monica, Calif.: Getty Center for the History of Art and Architecture in the Humanities, 1995).
 30. See the discussion in Marks, *Enfoldment and Infinity*, chap. 2.
 31. Jamal J. Elias, *Aisha's Cushion: Religious Art, Perception, and Practice in Islam* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2012), 196–97.
 32. Valérie Gonzalez, "Understanding the Comares Hall in the Light of Phenomenology," in her *Beauty and Islam: Aesthetics in Islamic Art and Architecture* (London: I. B. Tauris, 2001), 42–68.
 33. See Richard Ettinghausen, "The Taming of the Horror Vacui in Islamic Art," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 123, 1 (February 20, 1979): 15–28.
 34. Gombrich, *Sense of Order*, 80.
 35. Guillermo Rosselló Bordoy, "The Ceramics of al-Andalus," in *Al-Andalus: The Art of Islamic Spain*, ed. Jerrilynn D. Dodds, exh. cat., Alhambra and Metropolitan Museum of Art (New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1992), 101; Rosalind E. Mack, *Bazaar to Piazza: Islamic Trade and Italian Art, 1300–1600* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002); Catherine Hess, ed., *The Arts of Fire: Islamic Influences on Glass and Ceramics of the Italian Renaissance*, exh. cat., J. Paul Getty Museum (Los Angeles: J. Paul Getty Museum, 2004).
 36. Anja Heidenreich posits that the lusterware technique started in Samarra in the early ninth century and was taken up in Iran and Iraq. Anja Heidenreich, "Early Lustre Wares in the Mediterranean and Implementing the New Techniques in the Iberian Peninsula: An Approach," *Acts of the First International Congress of the European Network of Museums of Islamic Art* (Granada: Patronato de la Alhambra y Generalife, 2013), 404–20. However, Balbina M. Caviro posits equally Egypt, Mesopotamia, and Persia, and argues that the lusterwares found in Samarra were not made in Samarra. Balbina M. Caviro, "Golden Earthenware

- and the Alhambra Vases," in *Los Jarrones de la Alhambra: Simbología y Poder*, exh. cat., Museo de la Alhambra y Generalife (Granada: Capilla y Cripta del Palacio de Carlos V and Monumental de la Alhambra y Generalife, 2007), 282.
37. Heidenreich, "Early Lustre Wares," 406–9. Heidenreich demonstrates that one center of lusterware production was al-Behnasa in Egypt, likely the source of the lusterware found in Madinat al-Zahra. Linda Komaroff describes a similar itinerary, but with later dates. Linda Komaroff, "Color, Precious Metal, and Fire," in *Arts of Fire*, ed. Hess, 41–42, 47.
 38. Heidenreich, "Early Lustre Wares," 439.
 39. *Ibid.*, 415.
 40. Rosselló Bordoy, "Ceramics of al-Andalus," 99; Rebeca Bridgman, "Re-examining Almohad Economies in South-Western al-Andalus through Petrological Analysis of Archaeological Ceramics," in *Revisiting al-Andalus: Perspectives on the Material Culture of Islamic Iberia and Beyond*, ed. Claire D. Anderson and Mariam Rosser-Owen (Boston: Brill, 2007), 161; Mariam Rosser-Owen, *Islamic Arts from Spain* (London: Victoria and Albert Museum, 2010), 43, 146n50, 32.
 41. Guillermo Rosselló Bordoy, "Nasrid Ceramics and the Alhambra Vases," in *Al-Andalus*, ed. Dodds, 274.
 42. Ádela Fábregas García, "Other Markets: Complementary Commercial Zones in the Nasrid World of the Western Mediterranean (Seventh/Thirteenth to Ninth/Fifteenth Centuries)," *Al-Masaq: Journal of the Medieval Mediterranean* 25, 1 (2013): 135–53.
 43. The possibility remains that Nasrid lusterware was produced in Granada and Almería, but the center of production was without a doubt Málaga. Kilns existed in Granada but their purpose is not known. During the Taifa period lusterware production took place in several cities, including Almería. But workshops in Almería were destroyed between 1147 and 1157 during the Christian occupation, and it is not known whether the production revived. See Yvan Coquinot, Christel Doublet, Anne Bouquillon, Claire Déléry, and Isabel Flores Escobosa, "The Production of Lustreware in al-Andalus during the Nasrid Period," in *Acts of the First International Congress of the European Network of Museums of Islamic Art*, 424–28.
 44. Rosser-Owen, *Islamic Arts from Spain*, 64.
 45. Quoted in Summer S. Kenesson, "Nasrid Luster Pottery: The Alhambra Vases," *Muqarnas* 9 (1992), 93–94.
 46. Yvan Coquinot, Anne Bouquillon, Christel Doublet, and Claire Déléry, "Reflections on the Manufacturing Techniques and Production Locations of a Selection of Lustreware from the Nasrid period Preserved by the Museo de la Alhambra, the Victoria and Albert Museum and the Louvre," in *Acts of the First International Congress of the European Network of Museums of Islamic Art*, 335.
 47. Quoted in Rosser-Owen, *Islamic Arts from Spain*, 67, 69.
 48. Anthony Ray, *Spanish Pottery, 1249–1898* (London: Victoria and Albert Museum, 2000), 7.
 49. María Rosa Menocal, Jerrilynn D. Dodds, and Abigale Krasner Balbale, *The Arts of Intimacy: Christians, Jews, and Muslims in the Making of Castilian Culture* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008); see also Dodds, ed., *Al-Andalus*; María Rosa Menocal, *The Ornament of the World: How Muslims, Jews, and Christians Created a Culture of Tolerance in Medieval Spain* (Boston: Little, Brown, 2002).
 50. Jerrilynn D. Dodds and Daniel Walker, "Introduction," in *Al-Andalus*, ed. Dodds, xxii.
 51. Francisco Prado-Vilar, "The Gothic Anamorphic Gaze: Regarding the Worth of Others," in *Under the Influence: Questioning the Comparative in Medieval Castile*, ed. Cynthia Robinson and Leyla Rouhi (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 72–73.
 52. This is the Persian "scarf in the wind" motif; see Caviro, "Golden Earthenware and the Alhambra Vases," 282.
 53. Willy Hartner and Richard Ettinghausen, "The Conquering Lion: The Life Cycle of a Symbol," *Oriens* 17 (December 31, 1964): 161–71.
 54. Rosser-Owen, *Islamic Arts from Spain*, 30.
 55. Discussion and image in Rosselló Bordoy, in *Al-Andalus*, ed. Dodds, 236, pl. 29.
 56. Florence C. Lister and Robert H. Lister, *Andalusian Ceramics in Spain and New Spain: A Cultural Register from the Third Century B.C. to 1700* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1987), 89.
 57. Guillermo Rosselló Bordoy, catalogue note, in *Al-Andalus*, ed. Dodds, 238, pl. 31.
 58. On the *sgraffito*, see Guillermo Rosselló Bordoy, catalogue note, in *ibid.*, 361, pl. 114.
 59. Rosser-Owen, *Islamic Arts from Spain*, 70.
 60. Pictured in *Los Jarrones de la Alhambra*, 204, fig. 32.
 61. Lister and Lister, *Andalusian Ceramics in Spain and New Spain*, 72.
 62. Heather Ecker, *Caliphs and Kings: The Art and Influence of Islamic Spain*, exh. cat., Arthur M. Sackler Gallery, Smithsonian Institution (Washington, D.C.: Arthur M. Sackler Gallery, Smithsonian Institution, 2004), 7–8.
 63. L. P. Harvey, *Islamic Spain, 1250–1500* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990), 119, 7, 14.
 64. L. P. Harvey, *Muslims in Spain, 1500 to 1614* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005), 119, 15.
 65. *Ibid.*, 134–38.
 66. Caviro, "Golden Earthenware and the Alhambra Vases," 285.
 67. Jaume Coll Conesa, "Technical, Formal and Decorative Aspects of 14th-Century Valencian Lustreware: The Initial Series," in *Acts of the First International Congress of the European Network of Museums of Islamic Art*, 470.
 68. Coquinot et al., "Production of Lustreware in al-Andalus," 424.
 69. Mack, *Bazaar to Piazza*, 98; Lister and Lister, *Andalusian Ceramics in Spain and New Spain*, 92; Ecker, *Caliphs and Kings*, 151.
 70. Ray, *Spanish Pottery*, 50.
 71. Manuel Casamar Pérez, "The Almoravids and Almohads: An Introduction," in *Al-Andalus*, ed. Dodds, 101; Mack, *Bazaar to Piazza*, 95; Catherine Hess, "Brilliant Achievements: The Journey of Islamic Glass and Ceramics to Renaissance Italy," in *Arts of Fire*, ed. Hess, 12.

72. Rosselló Bordoy, "Nasrid Ceramics and the Alhambra Vases," 274; Caviro, "Golden Earthenware and the Alhambra Vases," 285.
73. Ray, *Spanish Pottery*, 50.
74. *Ibid.*, 58–59.
75. Rosser-Owen, *Islamic Arts from Spain*, 67.
76. Rosselló Bordoy, "Nasrid Ceramics and the Alhambra Vases," 273; Conesa, "Technical, Formal and Decorative Aspects," 471.
77. Ray, *Spanish Pottery*, 41.
78. Fábregas García, "Other Markets," 152.
79. *Ibid.*
80. Ray, *Spanish Pottery*, 60.
81. Rosser-Owen, *Islamic Arts from Spain*, 99.
82. *Ibid.*
83. Ecker, *Caliphs and Kings*, 154.
84. Ray, *Spanish Pottery*, 59, 60; Ecker, *Caliphs and Kings*, 155; Caviro, "Golden Earthenware and the Alhambra Vases," 285.
85. Ray, *Spanish Pottery*, 83.
86. Ecker, *Caliphs and Kings*, 159.
87. Harvey, *Muslims in Spain*, 48, 86.
88. *Ibid.*, 93–94.
89. *Ibid.*, 60–64.
90. Ecker, *Caliphs and Kings*, 9. That some Moriscos did grow rich by lending money, banking, and speculating is attested by records of debts that Christians owed them, which the Crown hoped to collect upon their expulsion. Harvey, *Muslims in Spain*, 252–55.
91. Harvey, *Muslims in Spain*, 298.
92. Ray, *Spanish Pottery*, 90.
93. *Ibid.*
94. *Ibid.*, 22; Ray is writing of a long shift in the ceramic styles of Talavera from 1248 to 1492.
95. Mack, *Bazaar to Piazza*, 95.
96. Heidenreich, "Early Lustre Wares in the Mediterranean," 415, citing C. Berti and S. Gelichi, "Mille chemins ouverts en Italie," in *Le vert et le brun: De Kairouan à Avignon, céramiques du Xe au XVIe siècle* (Marseille: Musée d'Art et d'Histoire de Provence, 1995), 128–63.
97. Jörg Rasmussen, *The Robert Lehman Collection*, vol. 10, *Italian Majolica* (New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1989), 5, 6, 10.
98. Hess, "Brilliant Achievements," 18.
99. W. D. Kingery, "Painterly Maiolica of the Italian Renaissance," *Technology and Culture* 34, 1 (January 1993): 28–48.
100. Tin-glazed dish, Deruta, ca. 1500–1525, British Museum, inv. no. 1855,0626.1.
101. I discuss the Islamic aesthetics of Italian ceramics in my "From Haptic to Optical."
102. Description on the Victoria and Albert Museum website, <http://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O161986/basin-mancini-giacomo/> (accessed September 14, 2013).
103. Lister and Lister, *Andalusian Ceramics in Spain and New Spain*, 118.
104. *Ibid.*
105. Riegl, *Problems of Style*.
106. Ray, *Spanish Pottery*, 157.
107. Lister and Lister, *Andalusian Ceramics in Spain and New Spain*, 127.
108. Anouar Majid, *We Are All Moors: Ending Centuries of Crusades against Muslim and Other Minorities* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press), 39; Harvey, *Muslims in Spain*, 296.
109. Ray, *Spanish Pottery*, 242.
110. Harvey, *Muslims in Spain*, 12–13.
111. Joseph Pérez, *The Spanish Inquisition: A History*, trans. J. Lloyd (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005), 217.
112. Lister and Lister, *Andalusian Ceramics in Spain and New Spain*, 150.
113. Ray, *Spanish Pottery*, 209.
114. Prado-Vilar, "Gothic Anamorphic Gaze."