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Chapter 3

Decolonizing the Global Renaissance: A View from the Andes

Ananda Cohen-Aponte

The development of Global Renaissance art history has had an undeniable impact on the field of colonial Latin American art. Some of the earliest manifestations of this disciplinary partnership can be found in exhibitions, monographs, articles, and edited volumes produced around the quincentennial of Christopher Columbus’s 1492 voyage. Exhibitions such as Circa 1492 at the National Gallery and a wave of scholarly publications addressed the cataclysmic impact of the European invasion and subsequent colonization of the Americas at an epistemological, linguistic, political, biological, and aesthetic level. The year 1992 precipitated an outpouring of critical reflection on the history of colonialism in the Western hemisphere and its enduring legacies both within Latin America and its diasporic communities.1 It also brought social action, as evidenced by the massive Columbus Day protests, demonstrations, and performances that year in the United States, Mexico, Guatemala, Argentina, and other countries across Latin America.2 Inspired in part by decolonial writings produced by Latin American intellectuals long before the quincentennial,


from Felipe Guaman Poma de Ayala’s seventeenth-century manuscript directed at King Philip III protesting the abuses of Spanish colonialism in Peru, to Edmundo O’Gorman’s 1958 provocation that America was not discovered, but rather invented, scholars from a range of disciplines began to challenge the utility of a discovery-oriented model for approaching European colonial expansion.3

In the realm of art history, Claire Farago’s 1995 edited volume Reframing the Renaissance made a critical intervention into the field, offering a new model for approaching works of art produced on both sides of the Atlantic in the wake of European expansion and colonization. Using the quincentennial as a point of departure, the contributions to the volume carved out new possibilities for expanding the geographical and conceptual parameters of Renaissance art.4 The essays in Reframing the Renaissance succeeded in creating a bridge between scholars working across the disciplinary divide of European and Spanish colonial art. Perhaps its most enduring impact is that it confirmed the existence of many Renaissances and many Baroques whose artistic fruits spilled into territories across the Americas and Asia. The cultural relativism accorded to colonial art, made possible in part through the paradigm offered by a Global Renaissance model, has helped to broaden our lens on the entangled art histories of the early modern period.

Interest in the cross-fertilization of visual languages between Europe and the Spanish Americas has continued unabated, indicated not only by the plethora of scholarship on the subject over the past two decades, but also by the exponential increase in conference panels on Global Renaissance topics. Art historians trained in the Italian Renaissance and the Southern Baroque have successfully taken on colonial Latin American topics, examining the means by which artists in the Americas transformed European visual languages in the creation of new artistic traditions. This shift in scholarship is also

---


reflected in recent hiring practices, as openings in what were once traditional Renaissance and Baroque faculty positions have begun to specify a preference for candidates with a specialty in early modern Europe and its global manifestations. Indeed, the annual conferences of the Renaissance Society of America (RSA) and the Sixteenth Century Society and Conference (SCSC) have become a veritable haven for colonial Latin American art historians, whose expanded definitions of the early modern world have opened up a generative space for cross-disciplinary dialogue between Europeanists and Latin Americanists.

Nevertheless, there still remain unresolved issues within the realm of Global Renaissance discourse that require further consideration. One is the question of temporality. Colonial Latin American art historians have been grappling with the utility of European periodizations for the viceregal art of Mexico and Peru since the 1920s and ’30s, a debate that continues into the twenty-first century. In the Andes in particular, the usage of the terms Medieval, Renaissance, Mannerist, and Baroque serve primarily as stylistic markers, since these periodizations enjoyed a continued presence on South American soil for decades and even centuries after their heyday in Europe. Art-historical terms like “Mestizo Baroque,” the “Global Renaissance,” or even “Early Modern Latin America” do succeed in breaking free of anachronistic boundary-policing of artistic practices. However, these terms gloss over the distinct economic, cultural, and above all, colonial conditions under which the Renaissance’s global products manifested themselves in Latin America. This essay problematizes some of the terms and frameworks of a Global Renaissance model of art history. Our reliance on seemingly innocuous terminology such as “cross-cultural encounter” or even the “New World,” which remain ubiquitous in early modern art-historical scholarship, invariably erases asymmetries of power inherent to the creation of new artistic languages and traditions in colonized regions. To illustrate these points, I offer a case study of racialized inequality within

---

the artistic landscape of seventeenth-century Peru in order to complicate the ways that we understand visual encounters and exchanges in the early modern world.

**From Reframing to Decolonizing the Renaissance**

One of the challenges of writing colonial art histories within the rubric of the Global Renaissance is that the terminology itself assumes Europe (and specifically Italy) as its geographical and temporal starting point; the Renaissance becomes an entity that is exported and subsequently received by societies across the world. This framework may seem relatively benign; it is, as one may say, how the story goes. But locating the origins of colonial art history in fifteenth-century Europe brings along with it two major historiographical caveats. First, this narrative frames colonial visual exchanges as a meeting between an innovative artistic “movement” fitted with a heavy armature of historiography and theorization (the Renaissance), and a temporally murky, nearly ahistorical artistic “tradition” (the art of the Americas). The practices of indigenous artists over the course of several millennia prior to the Spanish invasion are thus emptied of their historicity and become little more than a foil for articulating new extra-European art histories. Simply de-nationalizing the borders of the Renaissance and Baroque does little to undo the inevitable temporal truncation of pre-Conquest artistic trajectories in the forging of new art histories.

The second consequence of an approach to early modern global art history that takes Europe as its point of genesis is the construction of the Americas as a willing receiver of Renaissance artistic models. By framing the act of artistic exchange as one of reception rather than imposition, we risk reaffirming a discovery-centered approach to artistic production generated under colonial rule. Over the course of the past few decades, Latin Americanist scholarship has reflected changing views on the making of the so-called New World, inspired in part by the critical reflection brought on by the events and publications surrounding 1992 (although for many communities across the Americas, there was never any question as to the violence inherent in this construction). The term “encounter” began to gain currency as a more neutral alternative, emphasizing the fact that the existence of the Americas was not contingent on its entrance into European consciousness.6 This term also attempted to “level

---

6 Although as Elizabeth Hill Boone notes, “...the Encounter that is mentioned so much in Quincentennial literature did not eventuate in equality for both sides.” See Boone, “Introduction,” 7. Some of the scholarship from the early 1990s use “discovery” and
the playing field” by placing Europeans and Amerindians on equal footing; an encounter implies a happenstance meeting or convening between two parties rather than one group’s wholesale declaration of the others’ existence.

Yet, as many have argued, the concept of encounter does not adequately convey the tremendous violence that lay at the heart of colonization: the military conquest and capture of territory; the genocide of indigenous people from disease and warfare; the enslavement of millions of Africans in the transatlantic slave trade; the forcible conversion of native peoples to Christianity; the physical destruction of pre-Columbian settlements, monuments, and religious objects; and the imposition of new aesthetic systems and forms of knowledge that sought to suppress indigenous epistemologies. When we speak of the “arrival” or “reception” of Renaissance and Baroque artistic models to the Americas, it parallels the purported neutrality of the encounter model, implying that all artistic systems were created equal. It may be tempting to cast aside the visual arts as somehow less complicit in colonial ideologies or systems of power. After all, the arts could inspire reverie, devotion, and contemplation, all of which could be seen as positive contributions that ensured the well-being of Latin America’s colonial subjects.

But artistic production cannot be disentangled from the enterprise of Spanish colonial rule. The visual arts formed a critical arm of the evangelizing tactics of European missionaries, who sought to translate Catholic concepts into visual form for easier comprehension among indigenous congregations. They also visually articulated new social imaginaries, codes of conduct, and ways of being and seeing that sought to supplant indigenous models for representing the world. And above all, the visual arts participated in newly formed systems of racialized labor extraction that were designed to privilege white Spanish and creole (American-born Spaniards) artists and patrons, which will be discussed at greater length below. Therefore, to extricate the visual arts from the conditions of colonialism within which they were produced and received would do a disservice to the complicated histories of aesthetic expression in colonial Spanish America. We must acknowledge, in the words of Walter Mignolo, “the mutual complicity between economic wealth and the splendors

“encounter” as marking different phases in the colonization of the Americas, with discovery signifying the initial entry by Europeans onto American territory and encounter referring to the interpersonal exchanges that subsequently took place. See, for instance, Marvin Lunenfeld, 1492–Discovery, Invasion, Encounter: Sources and Interpretations (Lexington, MA, 1991); and Anthony Pagden, European Encounters with the New World: From Renaissance to Romanticism (New Haven, 1993). Nevertheless, eventually the term “discovery” began to fall out of scholarly use in favor of more value-neutral language.
of the arts. It is perhaps the sheer beauty and exuberance of colonial Latin American works of art that make it easier to forget about the histories from which they emerge—crude, violent, messy histories of economic exploitation, and of profound racial and ethnic inequality—that beg for our attention.

I do not wish to imply that indigenous, mestizo, and afrodescendant artists did not willingly participate in the artistic process. Nor do I wish to deny their tremendous interventions in the localization and reformulation of European imported models that gave colonial Latin American art such a multifaceted character. Rather, I contend that we must introduce power and inequality into our paradigm for interpreting histories of artistic exchange between Europe and its colonial possessions during the early modern period. In the same way that the Spanish invasion, conquest, and colonization of Americas can hardly be described as a benign “encounter,” nor can the collision of visual systems that emerged out of these historical conditions. The globalization of the Renaissance was itself a series of visual conquests, as Serge Gruzinski has argued, that entailed the attempted destruction of pre-Columbian visual systems and the imposition of new visual languages, techniques, and media. To describe this contested terrain as a visual encounter would be to assume that indigenous artists and patrons had the choice to reject the onslaught of European images and the religious and cultural ideologies that they encoded. European art, both secular and religious, imported and locally produced, was upheld by a complex infrastructure that retained its legitimacy through territorial occupation and wealth extraction as well as religious and cultural repression.

Artificially conferring equal footing to indigenous, mixed-race or black artists with respect to their European counterparts in an effort to grant them agency in the artistic arena inevitably does just the opposite; it distorts the historical record by interpreting coercion as choice and hybridity as a peaceful convergence of visual systems. Gustavo Verdesio’s critique of Néstor García Canclini’s important work on hybridity is particularly apt here. He argues that we cannot celebrate hybrid cultures and practices without also acknowledging “the constitutive violence that lies at the origin of the social situation that serves as the framework for the aforementioned hybrid practices.”

---


9 Gustavo Verdesio, “Colonialism Now and Then: Colonial Latin American Studies in the Light of the Predicament of Latin Americanism,” in *Colonialism Past and Present: Reading and
examined the issue of hybridity in the art of colonial Latin America at length (and its analogue mestizaje, frequently used in Latin American scholarship); my desire is not to contest the utility of hybridity models to the phenomenon of cross-cultural fertilization in the visual arts. Indeed, these concepts have proven very fruitful for examining the transformations of iconography, style, and techniques within colonial contexts. Rather, a corresponding understanding of hybridity as grounded in epistemic violence sheds light on the more troubling aspects of cultural interaction and its visual manifestations. The visual arts have the ability to hold multitudes; a single object can express both the generative, creative aspects of the cross-cultural interactions that made the work possible while also standing as testament to the mechanisms of colonial control that uphold the socioeconomic milieu in which the artist participates. It is up to the historian to navigate the visual and archival record in a way that does justice to the varied historical and aesthetic forces that brought a given work of art into the world.

Decolonizing the Global Renaissance would enable us to take a step beyond expanding the geographical or temporal frame through which we view early modern artistic production. Following the contributions made by Walter Mignolo, Aníbal Quijano, Silvia Rivera Cusicanqui, Sylvia Wynter, and others, I see a decolonial model of early modern art history as one that is keenly attentive to the hegemonic systems of power that served to naturalize the subjugation of indigenous aesthetic practices. It sees the visual arts as inseparable


from the colonial worlds within which they are generated and received. And finally, a decolonial perspective would take the trauma of conquest and invasion as the ground zero for an art history of the colonial Americas rather than Renaissance Italy or an expansionist late medieval Spain. In so doing, we can begin to disassociate a globalizing Renaissance or Baroque from triumphalist narratives of splendor and cultural development. The gaze through which we view the Global Renaissance often matches that of the very social actors who extended Europe’s sphere of influence across the world and who promulgated, in the words of Quijano, “a view of the differences between Europe and non-Europe as natural (racial) differences and not consequences of a history of power.”

A decolonial approach to the history of art thus re-centers art histories that have been pushed to the periphery while still acknowledging the asymmetrical power relations at play between Europeans and their colonial subjects.

What would it mean to rewrite a history of art from the vantage point of the Global South, whose positionality at the receiving end of a globalized Renaissance differed considerably from Europe’s self-image that it projected onto the world? If we speak of a visual invasion of Renaissance and Baroque models into the Americas, then we can more productively assess the stakes of non-European participation in the art-making process. This approach would enable us to reorient our perspective on the way that visual models were imposed and received, willingly or not, by artists within the Americas. A decolonial perspective on Renaissance art during the age of colonial expansion would, in turn, also add nuance to the terms under which we understand Latin American art from this period. Viceregal art is often treated as art that just so happened to coincide with colonization. But if we simply change one word in that construction and rearticulate it as art produced under colonization, then we can see this body of work as causally connected to colonial projects rather than as a temporal happenstance.

In the pages to follow, I draw examples from the Andean region of South America, which became incorporated into the Viceroyalty of Peru in 1535, to provide a glimpse into the conditions faced by indigenous and mestizo artists in the production of religious artworks for ecclesiastical and private patrons. I look specifically at the city of Cuzco, Peru, the original capital of the Inca empire (known in its time by the Quechua term Tawantinsuyu), which remained...

---

an active center of artistic production throughout the colonial period. Scholars have written extensively on the artistic grandeur of colonial Cuzco, which boasts dozens of baroque churches filled to the brim with spectacular artworks that evince a dynamic and creative fusion of indigenous and European visual systems. The scholarly emphasis on the dazzling surface appearance of these works of art and architecture—our fetishization of their visual hybridity, as Carolyn Dean and Dana Leibsohn have argued—invariably distracts us from the conditions and circumstances of their production.\(^\text{13}\) This essay examines the economic toll and social costs of artistic hybridity. While the Cuzco context cannot speak for the entirety of colonial Latin America, it provides a case study into the difficulties of reconciling the visual splendor of colonial art and architecture with the little-studied labor conditions under which much of it was generated.

**Art, Labor and Inequality in Colonial Cuzco**

To illuminate these points, I discuss a series of artists’ contracts from the seventeenth century to address issues of racialized inequality in the domain of artistic labor. The specific circumstances under which Andean artists worked during the colonial period still remain poorly understood. This is due in part to the paucity of known archival documentation on artistic guilds. Moreover, scholars have suggested that digging deeper into the archives may not necessarily solve the problem; it appears that artists and patrons did not always resort to the legal system when they drew up contracts, and may have negotiated more informal, verbal agreements, especially by the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.\(^\text{14}\) Despite these challenges, the pioneering studies by Jorge Cornejo Bouroncle, Carol Damian, Ramón Gutiérrez, Maya Stanfield-Mazzi, and others have offered important insights into the socioeconomic dimensions of art making in colonial Peru, from which I draw here.\(^\text{15}\) What

---


I wish to contribute to this discussion is a specific focus on differential pay structures accorded to indigenous-descended and Spanish or creole artists and their broader implications for issues of agency, hybridity, and colonial domination in the artistic arena.

For the purposes of this essay, I have analyzed data from 240 artists’ contracts in Cuzco written between 1600 and 1704. The contracts feature a variety of artistic professions, including bricklayers, architects, stonemasons, carpenters, painters, gilders, organ makers, musicians, sculptors, and overseers. The vast majority of the commissions from this sample were religious in nature, destined for churches, convents, monasteries, and chapels within the city of Cuzco and its environs. The patrons included priests, administrators, mayor-domos (stewards) of various confraternities, indigenous caciques (local leaders), and artists themselves who sought assistants to complete their projects. Projects ranged from building retablos (altarpieces) to hauling stones from the Inca fortress of Sacsayhuaman for use in the construction of colonial churches. These documents offer a wealth of insight into the process of artistic production and patronage in mid-colonial Cuzco, not only in terms of the economic dimensions of Andean art during this period, but also with respect to local understandings of taste, talent, and beauty, as will be discussed shortly.

The 240 contracts yielded the following number of specialists: twenty-two architects, three blacksmiths, five bricklayers, twenty-seven carpenters, one dramaturge, fifty-one ensambladores (joiners, or more specifically, assemblers of altarpieces) as well as six ensambladores who also worked in carpentry or sculpture.

---


This sample was drawn from the pioneering work of Jorge Cornejo Bouroncle, who transcribed hundreds of conciertos (contracts) in Cuzco’s regional archive as well as 34 books of the Actas de Cabildos (meeting minutes of the governing council) from Lima, which were first published in a series of articles in the Revista del Archivo Histórico del Cuzco in 1951, 1952, 1953, 1954, 1957, and 1960, and together compiled into his 1960 book, Derroteros de arte cuzqueño. While scholars have widely cited a number of the contracts that appear in this invaluable book, this is the first publication to my knowledge to conduct a systematic analysis of the data from these contracts. It should be noted that the book includes contracts that span the sixteenth to the nineteenth century, but for the purposes of this study, I chose to only include contracts from the seventeenth century, with one exception of a contract from 1704. While Cornejo Bouroncle’s book could not possibly include every artistic contract produced in colonial Cuzco, his painstaking work in not only transcribing, but locating hundreds of contracts interspersed between hundreds of thousands of pages of archival documentation suggests that his book and the seventeenth-century contracts that I extracted from it for this study very much constitute a representative sample of Cuzco’s artistic life during this period.
four founders, twenty gilders (some of whom were also master painters), nineteen goldsmiths and silversmiths, one hauler, two locksmiths, twenty-three masons, one musician, twelve organ makers, one overseer, thirty-two painters, two passementerie makers, three roofers, seven sculptors, thirty-five stoneworkers, and two workers whose profession was unspecified (table 3.1).17

Table 3.1     Overview of artistic professions and wages in Cuzco, 1600–1704 (sorted alphabetically), from Jorge Cornejo Bouroncle, Derroteros de arte cuzqueño. Datos para una historia del arte en el Perú (Cuzco, 1960)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specialty</th>
<th>Number in sample</th>
<th># Spaniards</th>
<th># Indians or Mestizos</th>
<th>Unspecified or other</th>
<th>Wage range (lowest and highest)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Architect or Architectural Assistant</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40 – 2,250 pesos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacksmithing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50 pesos/year – 750 pesos/year + 2 black slaves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpentry</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10 pesos/year – 100 pesos/month (for 3 months)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dramaturgy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8 reales/day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundry</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100 – 600 pesos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilding</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13 pesos/month – 10,000 pesos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goldsmithing and Silversmithing</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 “de color pardo y natural de la ciudad de Trujillo”</td>
<td>1 real/ounce – 8 pesos/marco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hauling</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 reales/day and cloth for pants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joining</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1 indio “ladino en la lengua española”</td>
<td>4 reales/day – 100,000 pesos</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17 This number exceeds 240 because contracts often involved multiple artists.
### Table 3.1  Overview of artistic professions and wages in Cuzco, 1600–1704 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specialty</th>
<th>Number in sample</th>
<th># Spaniards</th>
<th># Indians or Mestizos</th>
<th>Unspecified or other</th>
<th>Wage range (lowest and highest)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Locksmithing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>unspecified – 1000 pesos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masonry</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6 reales/day – 7 pesos/day (950 pesos for 4 months)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musician</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>120 pesos/year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organ-making</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>170 pesos – 2,500 pesos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseeing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>300 pesos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painting</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6 pesos/painting – 90 pesos/painting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passementerie-making</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 peso/pound of passementerie – 100 pesos and daily food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roofing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>130 pesos – 400 pesos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sculpting</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10 pesos + clothing – 600 pesos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoneworking</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4 reales/day – 2 pesos/day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10 pesos/year + food – 170 pesos for 10 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 1 real = 8 pesos

* Indian/Mestizo category determined by ethnic label accorded to individual. If ethnicity not indicated, I included any individual with a Quechua surname within this category.
Each artistic specialty is classified according to three primary rubrics, in descending order of importance: maestro (master), oficial (journeyman who had been trained in a master’s workshop), or simply by the profession, such as pintor (painter) or escultor (sculptor). A fourth category emerges within this classificatory scheme: indio maestro (master Indian) or indio oficial (Indian journeyman). For instance, an indigenous sculptor at the master rank would be called an indio maestro escultor and an indigenous sculptor at the official rank would be labeled indio oficial escultor. This ethnic qualifier of indio always precedes the profession, carrying the implicit assumption that native masters would always be Indians first, and artists second. As Carol Damian contends, “when an Indian maestro was contracted, the designation of race preempted the status of accomplishment.” Spanish artists are rarely, if ever identified as such; they remain unmarked in the contracts, which underscores the unequal foundations upon which the guild system was built. To be an unmarked artist was to enjoy the social prestige of occupying the highest echelons of the profession in which your ethnicity was affirmed to the point of it being rendered unremarkable. This is particularly ironic in light of the fact that Spaniards were a minority in this indigenous and mestizo-dominated city.

The privilege of being unmarked becomes even clearer when we consider the case of certain artists who either chose not to represent themselves as indigenous or who were not even classified as native artists because of the success they had achieved in their profession. Take, for instance, the well-known indigenous sculptor and retablo-maker Juan Tomás Tuyru Tupac (also spelled Tuyrutopa; active 1677–1706). Tuyru Tupac completed a number of prestigious commissions in the city of Cuzco, including the pulpit and general design for the chapel of the Hospital of San Pedro and the famous sculpture of the Virgin of la Almudena. Indeed, he was celebrated by Cuzco’s famed Bishop and arts patron Manuel de Mollinedo y Angulo, (r. 1673–1699) as one of the city’s most talented artists. Mollinedo acknowledged his status as “noble Indian of Inca descent.” Tuyru Tupac’s illustrious indigenous ancestry merely heightened his prestige in Mollinedo’s eyes, who sought out native talent during his tenure as Bishop not only for their excellence in the arts, but perhaps also to demonstrate the successes of the Catholic church in cultivating indigenous artists who dedicated their lives to the production of religious works of art. Indeed, the trope of the indigenous artist as a faithful servant to God through

19 See Cornejo Bouroncle, Derroteros de arte cuzqueño, 81.
his production of images was well in place both in New Spain and Peru by the sixteenth century. But in the notarial archives, Tuyru Tupac appears to transcend a marked status and is consistently referred to as *maestro ensamblador y escultor*. Similarly, Tuyru Tupac’s contemporary, the celebrated painter Basilio Santa Cruz Pumacallao, was originally perceived by scholars as a Spanish artist because of his paintings’ naturalism and deft emulation of European baroque styles. Indeed, in the archival documentation of his work, he is often identified without his maternal surname, and simply as Basilio Santa Cruz, *maestro pintor*.

The case of Tomás Tuyru Tupac and others like it highlights the great care we must take in cross-referencing archival sources, since identities cannot always be ascertained by the artists’ name or title. Nevertheless, a few preliminary observations can be made from this sample. First, certain artistic specialties reside primarily in the domain of a single ethnic group, while others remain more mixed. For instance, all of the architects in the sample are of Spanish descent with the exception of one indigenous architectural assistant. Architects in colonial Latin America were frequently brought from Spain, and there remained a healthy competition among metropolitan centers to commission the most esteemed Spanish architects for construction of major churches and cathedrals. The rather prestigious position of *ensamblador* was also dominated by Spaniards and Spanish-descended workers; of the fifty-one *ensambladores* in the sample, only three were labeled as *indio maestro ensamblador*. Other indigenous artisans participated in the craft, but in the capacity as oficial or as assistants.

On the other hand, sixteen of the twenty-three masons (*albañiles*) who assisted in architectural projects are identified as indigenous (and we could reasonably increase that number to twenty-one, based on the Quechua surnames Aucuchupa, Guamán, Quicya Guamán, Rimache, and Vilcahuamán of masons who were not labeled as “indio”). Examination of these contracts reveals that indigenous masons received substantially less pay than their Spanish peers for equivalent projects, even when the indigenous mason carried a higher rank. To take one example, consider Francisco Sánchez, *indio maestro albañil*, who was commissioned to rebuild the entire church of Acomayo (a town located about

24 Cornejo Bouroncle, *Derroteros de arte cuzqueño*, 70–72.
25 Ibid., 39, 116, 137, 171.
65 miles southeast of Cuzco) from its foundations (levantar desde los cimientos) in 1663 for a total of 1000 pesos. By contrast, the Spanish artisan Juan de Pantones in 1600 was commissioned to build a refectory, high cloister, and the arches for the cloister of the Convento de la Merced in Cuzco. Pantones was ranked as oficial de albañilería, which is ranked below maestro. He was not only paid 1200 pesos for the job, but he was also promised two Castillian rams and a bushel of flour each month. In other words, Pantones still received greater compensation for an equivalent commission despite his lower rank. Other indios maestros albañiles fared far worse than Sánchez. For instance, another contract references Ambrocio Quispe, who in 1633 was paid a mere forty pesos over the course of three months to build houses on Calle Nueva, a street in Cuzco close to the main plaza.

The field of organ making presents us with another snapshot into race-based wage differentials. Both indigenous and Spanish artisans participated in the profession; in fact, we have an almost even split in the sample. Of twelve organ makers, it appears that six are indigenous or of indigenous descent; three contracts from 1663 involve the patronage of Pedro Huamán, who is identified differently in each one. He is listed as indio, Maestro organero (Indian, Master organ maker) in one contract; as natural de Arequipa, maestro organero (from Arequipa, master organ maker) in another; and finally, as Indio natural de Corahuasi (Indian from Corahuasi [which is located near Arequipa]).

Given the specialty and the fact that all three contracts are from the same year, it would be safe to assume that they all refer to the same individual. These variations in the way that Huamán presents himself to the notary reveal to us the fluidity of these labels and identities. Nevertheless, fluidity does not always translate into equity. The Spanish artists Martín Cabellas and Gabriel Cabezas received 2,500 pesos and 1,300 pesos for constructing new organs for churches in the towns of Acos and Coporaque, respectively. The indigenous masters Felipe Poma and Pedro Huamán, by contrast, received 500 and 700 pesos for similar commissions.

These wage discrepancies become even clearer when we consider the data for the top and bottom thirty earners of the sample. The top thirty earners in the sample received wages spanning 1,000 to 100,000 pesos for a single commission (table 3.2).

---

26 Ibid., 65.
27 Ibid., 118.
28 Ibid., 157.
29 Ibid., 63, 65–66.
30 Ibid., 137, 174–75.
31 Ibid., 39, 63.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artist</th>
<th>Specialty</th>
<th>Type of job</th>
<th>Payment</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Martín González</td>
<td>Maestro arquitecto</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>2,250 pesos</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>1627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan de Ezaguirre</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>1,100 pesos</td>
<td>3 months</td>
<td>1627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martín González de Lagos</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>Painting</td>
<td>2,200 pesos</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>1627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan Rodríguez Samanéz</td>
<td>Maestro de dorar</td>
<td>Gilding</td>
<td>5,000 pesos</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>1631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedro de Mesa</td>
<td>Maestro ensamblador</td>
<td>Joining</td>
<td>3,000 pesos</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>1633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabriel Cabezas</td>
<td>Maestro de hacer órganos</td>
<td>Organ</td>
<td>1,300 pesos</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>1633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martín Cabellas</td>
<td>Maestro de hacer órganos</td>
<td>Organ</td>
<td>2,500 pesos</td>
<td>In time for Corpus Christi</td>
<td>1634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martín de Torres</td>
<td>Maestro arquitecto</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>1,300 pesos</td>
<td>Due January 1, 1635</td>
<td>1634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan Ríos (camanejo) y Martín de Torres (maestro pintor y ensamblador)</td>
<td>Camanejo (Ríos) and Maestro pintor y ensamblador (Torres)</td>
<td>Painting and Joining</td>
<td>2,500 pesos</td>
<td>7 months</td>
<td>1637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martín de Torres</td>
<td>Maestro ensamblador</td>
<td>Joining</td>
<td>1,400 pesos</td>
<td>Finish in 1638</td>
<td>1637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martín de Torres</td>
<td>Maestro ensamblador</td>
<td>Joining</td>
<td>1,600 pesos</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>1644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francisco Domínguez de Chávez y Orellana [sic; Arellano?]</td>
<td>Maestro albañil</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>1,600 pesos</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>1649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorenzo de Pineda</td>
<td>Maestro cerrajero</td>
<td>Locksmithing</td>
<td>1,000 pesos</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>1651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedro Galeano</td>
<td>Maestro ensamblador</td>
<td>Joining</td>
<td>5,500 pesos</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>1659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan Calderón</td>
<td>Maestro dorador</td>
<td>Gilding</td>
<td>2,500 pesos</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>1659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lázar Pardo de Lagos</td>
<td>Maestro pintor y dorador</td>
<td>Gilding</td>
<td>4,500 pesos</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>1660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedro de Oquendo</td>
<td>Maestro ensamblador</td>
<td>Joining</td>
<td>19,000 pesos</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>1662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artist</td>
<td>Specialty</td>
<td>Type of job</td>
<td>Payment</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francisco Domínguez de Chávez y Arellano</td>
<td>Maestro arquitecto</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>750 pesos, 1 ram each week, 4 loaves of bread/day, and a bottle of good wine each month</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>1663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin de Loaiza</td>
<td>Maestro dorador</td>
<td>Gilding</td>
<td>1,100 pesos</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>1663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francisco Domínguez de Chávez</td>
<td>Maestro arquitecto</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>2,000 pesos, food and drink</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>1663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francisco Sánchez</td>
<td>Indio, maestro albañil</td>
<td>Masonry</td>
<td>1,000 pesos</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>1663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diego Martinez de Oviedo</td>
<td>Maestro mayor del oficio de arquitecto</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>4,600 pesos</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>1664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cristóbal López</td>
<td>Indio natural, maestro ensamblador</td>
<td>Joining</td>
<td>1,500 pesos</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>1668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cristóbal Clemente</td>
<td>Maestro pintor</td>
<td>Gilding</td>
<td>10,000 pesos</td>
<td>10 months</td>
<td>1670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedro de Oquendo</td>
<td>Maestro arquitecto</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>2,000 pesos in addition from previous contract</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>1674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mateo Tuyrotopa</td>
<td>Oficial dorador [indio or descended]</td>
<td>Gilding</td>
<td>1,200 pesos</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>1677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan Thomas Tuyrutopa</td>
<td>Maestro ensamblador y escultor [indio or descended]</td>
<td>Joining and Sculpting</td>
<td>Everything at his cost, only giving him an Indian to help each day; 100,000 pesos</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>1679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martín de Carbajal</td>
<td>Maestro carpintero</td>
<td>Carpentry</td>
<td>1,250 pesos</td>
<td>5 months</td>
<td>1679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedro Gutiérrez</td>
<td>Maestro ensamblador</td>
<td>Joining</td>
<td>2,600 pesos</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>1692</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Among these thirty artists, only two are identified as indigenous and an additional two are of indigenous descent but not labeled as such. These artists also occupy the lower limits of the group, earning 1,000 and 1,500 pesos for their work. Incidentally, the very highest earner also happens to be indigenous: the aforementioned Juan Tomás Tuyru Tupac, who was to receive a whopping 100,000 pesos to gild the main retablo and produce twenty-five sculptures for the Church of Santa Ana (although he was expected to cover the cost of materials).\footnote{Ibid., 81.} But on the whole, the highest wages were consistently given to Spanish artists. For some, compensation went beyond currency. In payment for spending a year at the Convento de Santo Domingo overseeing work on the choir, a certain Francisco Domínguez de Chávez y Arellano received 750 pesos as well as one ram and four loaves of bread a week, and “a bottle of good wine each month.”\footnote{“… se le pagará 750 pesos corrientes de a ocho reales, un carnero cada semana, cuatro panes cada día y una botija de vino bueno, cada mes.” Ibid., 63.}

Out of the bottom thirty earners, twenty are identified as “indio” and an additional two are indigenous based on their Quechua surnames (table 3.3).

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|l|l|l|}
\hline
Artist & Specialty/ethnicity & Type of job & Payment & Duration & Date \\
\hline
Gerónimo Gutiérrez and Miguel de Romani & Sculptor and painter and \textit{oficial pintor}, respectively & Sculpting and Painting & Clothing entirely made from cloth from Quito, a coat, a doublet from Motilla, a hat, a pair of silk stockings, two \textit{ruan} shirts, twelve pairs of shoes from Córdoba, ten pesos of silver, and food to eat for all year. & 1 year & 1618 \\
Juan Ruíz de Lara & \textit{Representante de comedias} & Theater & 8 \textit{reales}/day & 1 year & 1643 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Bottom 30 earners in artistic professions in Cuzco, 1600–1704 (sorted by year), from Jorge Cornejo Bouroncle, Derroteros de arte cuzqueño. Datos para una historia del arte en el Perú (Cuzco, 1960)}
\end{table}
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artist</th>
<th>Specialty/ethnicity</th>
<th>Type of job</th>
<th>Payment</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Felipe Santa Cruz</td>
<td><em>Indio oficial cantero</em></td>
<td>Stoneworking</td>
<td>6 <em>reales</em>/day</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>1645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martín Quispe</td>
<td><em>Indio</em> from Colquepata</td>
<td>Hauling</td>
<td>3 <em>reales</em>/day and baize cloth for pants</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>1645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan de Soria</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>Stoneworking</td>
<td>4 <em>reales</em>/day</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>1646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diego Fernández</td>
<td><em>Indio</em> from Oropesa</td>
<td>Stoneworking</td>
<td>4 <em>reales</em>/day</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>1646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan Maldonado</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>Stoneworking</td>
<td>4 <em>reales</em>/day</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>1646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francisco Aima</td>
<td><em>Indio</em> from Chinchaipucyo</td>
<td>Joining</td>
<td>6 <em>pesos</em>/year, a piece of clothing, a shirt, a mantle made from <em>abasca</em> (thick) cloth, breech-cloth, a common hat, and at the end of three years, he will be given an adze, saw, brush, and jointer</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>1646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pascual Quispe</td>
<td><em>Indio</em> from Parish of Belén</td>
<td>Stoneworking</td>
<td>6 <em>reales</em>/day</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>1646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedro Chama</td>
<td><em>Indio</em> from Chincheros</td>
<td>Stoneworking</td>
<td>3 <em>reales</em>/day</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>1646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan Puca</td>
<td><em>Indio</em> from Huasac</td>
<td>Stoneworking</td>
<td>4 <em>reales</em>/day</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>1646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan Martín</td>
<td><em>Indio</em> from Yucay</td>
<td>Stoneworking</td>
<td>6 <em>reales</em>/day, 5 <em>pesos</em> in advance</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>1646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan Hernández</td>
<td><em>Indio oficial cantero</em></td>
<td>Stoneworking</td>
<td>4 <em>reales</em>/day</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>1646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedro Pizarro</td>
<td><em>Oficial pintor</em></td>
<td>Painting</td>
<td>4 <em>reales</em>/day</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>1648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph de Béhar</td>
<td><em>Oficial de tirador de oro y plata</em></td>
<td>Goldsmithing and Silversmithing</td>
<td>8 <em>reales</em>/day and food on the days he works</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>1649</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.3  *Bottom 30 earners in artistic professions in Cuzco, 1600–1704 (sorted by year)* (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artist</th>
<th>Specialty/ethnicity</th>
<th>Type of job</th>
<th>Payment</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marcos Quispe</td>
<td><em>Indio natural</em></td>
<td>Joining</td>
<td>6 <em>pesos</em> the 1st year and dress made from cloth from Quito, mantle, breeches, shirt made from <em>abasca</em> (thick) cloth, hat, eight pairs of shoes, and daily food; 10 <em>pesos</em>/year for the next three years and clothing and food</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>1649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domingo Inquil</td>
<td><em>Indio natural</em></td>
<td>Carpentry</td>
<td>50 <em>pesos</em> and lodging at the hospital</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>1650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miguel Quicya Guamán</td>
<td><em>Maestro albañil</em></td>
<td>Masonry</td>
<td>6 <em>reales</em>/day, housing, and 3 <em>reales</em> per week to buy meat, and 10 <em>pesos</em> for account</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>1650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diego Quispe</td>
<td>Unspecified [indio or descended]</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>10 <em>pesos</em>/year and daily food</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>1650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melchor Benito</td>
<td><em>Indio from the Parish of Santiago</em></td>
<td>Masonry</td>
<td>1 <em>peso</em>/day</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>1650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martín Paucar, Salvador Topa, Martín Yupanqui, and Bernabé Paucar</td>
<td><em>Indios</em></td>
<td>Masonry</td>
<td>1 <em>peso</em>/day</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>1650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan Guamanán</td>
<td><em>Indio from Caicay</em></td>
<td>Masonry</td>
<td>6 <em>reales</em>/day (in silver)</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>1651</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Decolonizing the Global Renaissance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artist</th>
<th>Specialty/ethnicity</th>
<th>Type of job</th>
<th>Payment</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Melchor Guamán</td>
<td>Indio albañil</td>
<td>Masonry</td>
<td>6 reales/day (in silver)</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>1651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcos Quispe</td>
<td>Indio albañil y cantero</td>
<td>Masonry</td>
<td>6 reales/day (in silver)</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>1651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cristóbal Paucar</td>
<td>Indio, oficial pintor y yanacona de la iglesia mayor</td>
<td>Painting</td>
<td>8 pesos/month, and 20 pesos for account</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>1651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrés Paredes</td>
<td>From Huamanga</td>
<td>Painting</td>
<td>5 reales/day, food and dinner, 5 varas of cloth from Quito and 7 of ordinary ruan</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>1664</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The wages here range from ten pesos a year to less than one peso a day. Keeping in mind that indigenous males between the ages of eighteen and fifty were required to pay annual tribute to the Spanish crown, which on average, amounted to about five to six pesos per year, the wages that some indigenous artists earned would have barely enabled them to eke out an existence. In some cases, they would be forced to leave a commission midway through if called upon to participate in the mita, or rotational labor draft, at the Potosí mines, which was required of all able-bodied indigenous men. Some of the lowest-paid artisans were contracted on an annual basis to serve as assistant to a master. For example, in 1646, the Spanish maestro ensamblador Martín de Torres contracted Francisco Aima, an Indian from the town of Chinchaipucyo, to assist him in his work for a total of three years, receiving “six pesos each year, a piece of clothing, shirt, mantle, breeches, and a common hat, and at the end of the three years, he will be given an adze, a razor, a saw, and a jointer.”

---

35 Alcalá, “Fue necesario hacernos más que pintores,” 89.
36 “… ganando seis pesos cada año, una pieza de ropa, camiseta, manto de abasca, calzón de pañete y un sombrero común y al fin de los 3 años le ha de dar una azuela, un cepillo, una sierra y una garlopa.” Cornejo Bouroncle, *Derroteros de arte cuzqueño*, 148–49.
a year for construction projects at the Cuzco Cathedral, receiving three reales a day (one peso is equivalent to eight reales), plus cloth to make pants.\textsuperscript{37}

In numerical terms, Spaniards make up 86% of the top earners and indigenous Andeans make up 73% of the lowest earners. For each of the professions featured in table 1, Indian artists received the lowest wage listed in the wage range and Spaniards received the highest, with the exception of the “Joining” category, whose highest wage went to the aforementioned Juan Tomás Tuyru Tupac. When we consider the profound inequality built into the structure of the guild system during the seventeenth century, it makes it more difficult to conceptualize the artistic process as a cross-cultural “partnership” or “encounter.” For many, working in the artistic realm was a means of survival at its most rudimentary level. The contracts considered here remind us of the profound discrepancies in the earning potential and opportunities for advancement between indigenous and Spanish artists. This is not even to speak of Afro-Peruvian artists; in 1649 with the establishment of the painters’ guild in Lima, maestros pintores were prohibited from hiring Black, mulato (of African and European descent), and zambo (of African and indigenous descent) artists to work as their apprentices.\textsuperscript{38} While the success of artists like Diego Quispe Tito, Juan Tomás Tuyru Tupac, Basilio Santa Cruz Pumacallao and others confirms the tremendous influence of indigenous artists in colonial Cuzco, we must also keep in mind the hundreds of Andean artists who did not achieve such exceptional status, but whose participation in artistic commissions was no less vital to the development of the city’s aesthetic grandeur. Moreover, while Spanish and select few elite Andean artists could earn monetary compensation as a means of maintaining their livelihood and amassing capital, this generous compensation was made possible through the gross under-compensation of indigenous labor. The profound ethnic and racial inequalities that shaped the guild system in seventeenth-century Cuzco at a moment of intense artistic flourishment speaks to the contradictions of a model of cross-cultural encounter in the artistic fruits of the Global Renaissance. In a system that systematically devalued non-European labor and reserved upward mobility for only a smattering of indigenous elites, the terms under which we conceive of artistic innovation and creativity must be tempered with an understanding of the material realities of the majority of Andean artists and artisans. The socioeconomic conditions of Cuzco’s guild system improved significantly in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, particularly in the industry of painting with the founding

\textsuperscript{37} Ibid., 146–47.

\textsuperscript{38} Alcalá, “Fue necesario hacernos más que pintores,” 88.
of the Cuzco School. Yet further research still remains to be done in terms of the extent to which artistic notoriety and social capital among indigenous artists of this period translated into actual economic autonomy.

Andeans Forging their Own Art Histories

In light of these caveats and considerations of the economic landscape in which indigenous artists operated, can we trace a history of art in the colonial Andes as it was understood by artists, patrons, and viewers? Is it possible to find generative meaning in the production of colonial art that attends to both issues of power as well as periodization? A return to the archives may help us to begin to answer this question. A number of contracts and inventories from the eighteenth century make reference to perfection and beauty that have drawn on two centuries of artistic expression and development in the region. We find a growing recognition of the value of Andean artistic practice among its own patrons and practitioners. For example, in a 1694 document, maestro pintor Francisco Rodríguez de Guzmán was contracted to teach the art of painting to Andrés Mercado, “so he can teach him the said job of Painter[,] drawing the bodies of male and female saints with total perfection.”40 Other contracts expect the completed works of art to be completed “with total perfection and beauty” [con toda perfección y hermosura].41 These documents remain relatively mute on just what constitutes these locally-defined standards of beauty, but we can imagine that much of the art produced in eighteenth-century Cuzco conformed to these tastes. And indeed, many of the paintings from this period lack the same type of naturalism that had characterized the art of the seventeenth century, displaying instead a preference for rich depictions of fabric, bright color palettes, and flattened, idealized faces. Consider the following passage from the Fundación de la Real Audiencia describing painters of the Cuzco School: “it can’t be denied that these painters have a certain fire, imagination,

40 “… para que le enseñe el dicho ofissio de Pintor dibujando con toda perfección los cuerpos de los santos y santas.” Cornejo Bouroncle, Derroteros de arte cuzqueño, 106.
41 Ibid., 78.
and a certain kind of taste, but they entirely ignore everything related to the
instruction of art, they don't know how to ennoble nature, nor modulate with
their brushes; rather, their sacred images are agleam with imitation rather than
invention.”42 This statement was made in reference to the Spanish author’s
surprise when he found out that there existed a burgeoning market for Cuzco
School paintings in Italy. Yet “beauty” and “perfection” had a different meaning
for local artists and patrons. In a 1754 contract for a series of religious paintings,
the Cuzqueño patron Gabriel Rincón stipulates that they should be painted
“in rich colors, good faces” and executed “according to the customs of our art.”43
This statement is predicated on the idea that by the eighteenth century, there
existed a notion of an art that “belonged” to the Andes and which was mu-
tually understood as such. One which had resonance as a visual system that
dovetailed with and diverged from European practices at different moments in
time, but always with a honed eye to its own historical genesis.
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