Kaufmann, Thomas DaCosta

Flanders in the Americas : the challenge of interpretation

In: *Orbis artium : k jubileu Lubomíra Slavíčka.* Kroupa, Jiří (editor); Šeferisová Loudová, Michaela (editor); Konečný, Lubomír (editor). Vyd. 1. Brno: Masarykova univerzita, 2009, pp. 43-[58]

ISBN 9788021049727

Flanders in the Americas: The Challenge of Interpretation*

Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann

The interpretation of Flemish (more correctly Flemish and Brabantine) art and artists in the Americas challenges some fundamental assumptions and categories of the history of art. While it may seem that much of the basic "archival" work in the discipline (setting objects in spatial and temporal order, and relating them to appropriate documents and archaeological evidence) has been done,[1] this is clearly not true in this case, nor, arguably, with the studies of arts in the Americas in general. Only in the past few decades have scholars become aware of the extent of the phenomena of Flemish art in Latin America during the era from the first contact of Europeans to independence. Although comprehensive data is not yet available, it has been estimated that 24.000 paintings were shipped from Seville to the Americas during the second half of the seventeenth century[2] and many more prints, books, and manuscripts must have also been exported. Since the number of pictures sent from the Low Countries to Spain was huge (the Forchondt firm alone in just one year sent 1.500 oils and watercolors on canvas, 7.200 "small framed paintings" and 100.000 prints and devotional parchments[3]) a considerable portion of works exported to the Americas must have also been of Netherlandish origin, particularly if one takes into account that the workshops of Netherlandish painters such as Pieter Kempeneer and Ferdinand Sturm constituted an important artistic presence in Seville. Antwerp was also a major printing center, as exemplified by the Plantin press, and the amount of material is increased enormously if one adds the export of European books primarily containing pictorial content, or with some illustrations or illustrated title pages.[4] Furthermore, several Flemish artists, among them Simon Pereyns and Adrian Suster in New Spain, and Diego de la Puente (probably Verbrugghen or Van den Broecke) in Peru, were also active in the western hemisphere. It is also significant that the first art school in South America was founded in Quito by Joost de Ricke (Jococo Ricke) and Pieter (Pedro) Gossael.[5]

This information is not only noteworthy in itself, but also important because Netherlandish art and artists in the New World had a more general impact on the motifs, style and iconography of painting in the New World.[6] They also influenced decoration and, to a degree, forms of architecture.[7] Yet both archival studies, and what might be called archaeological searches for surviving works, as well as for the evidence of their impact, remain in a relatively rudimentary state. The fact that abundant evidence for European paintings on copper in Latin American collections, many among them of Flemish ori-

gin, has hardly been noticed to date is representative of the situation.[8]

One reason why such studies may not have been carried out so thoroughly yet is that the questions they raise pose problems for the parameters of the discipline. Precolumbian art and architecture have repeatedly caused art historians to reconsider their conceptions and theories about art and its history,[9] and protracted debates concerning the interpretation of post-conquest (or post-contact) art demonstrate that the later period can stimulate rethinking as well. This demonstrates how the Flemish presence can provoke reexamination of some basic categories within the geography of art.

Most fundamentally, it calls into question the meaning of the usual designation for the geographical area under consideration. This area is of course frequently known as Latin America, Spanish America, or Ibero-America. Clearly, Flemish art and architecture do not directly fit into any of these categories. In fact, Flemish art and artists provide an excellent example of Non-Iberian European contributions to the visual arts of the western hemisphere.[10]

"*Non-Iberian contributions*" evokes the conception of George Kubler that was employed in an important essay in which he tried "*to lift the invariant Spanish imperial mask from the countenance*" of Latin American architecture.[11] Kubler was challenging what he deemed ingrained tendencies in the history of Spain, Portugal, and the American countries related to them to see their art as distinctive and homogeneous. In the forty-plus years since Kubler's publication first appeared, a much more variegated picture has gradually emerged of the local differences, and accordingly of the extremely heterogeneous qualities of visual culture in the Americas. Yet despite the continuing illumination of multi-cultural and local qualities of the arts, the picture Kubler described about the way in which it was believed that "*the Peninsula and of its Latin American extensions*" possessed "*a complex of forms and institutions distinctly different from the rest of the world*" does not seem to have changed very much.

On the whole, recent efforts to deal with the complicated qualities of civilization in the Americas have elucidated and emphasized indigenous contributions, survivals, and traditions, or their intersection with the European. This means art in the New World is no longer regarded as derivative, but as distinctive. However, it might even be said that in concentrating more on indigenous, or mixed (to use the term as neutrally as possible, for the moment), forms of expression, recent tendencies have ironically perpetuated the view that arts in the Americas were distinctly different from those found elsewhere. It may well be true that arts in the Americas are distinctive, but it is nevertheless unclear how much this has to do with the notion of Spanish, or Latin, or Ibero-America – or any alternatives. Indeed, concern with the indigenous does not usually involve interest in the international: it is therefore unclear how much such a concern with the indigenous, or even its interaction with the European, could cast light on the individual aspects of European presences or their effects in any event.

To be sure, the importance of European art for painting and other forms in the Americas has long been noted. A few artists who were not of Iberian origin, for example the Italian painters Bernardino Bitti and Matteo Perez de Alessio, have been the subjects of monographs.[12] The international aspect of orders like the Jesuits, to which substantial numbers of men who were not Spanish belonged, has gained increasing attention and part of this attention has been cast on artists from other places in the New World.[13] Nevertheless, the specific significance of non-Iberian elements and of Flemish art in particular remains to be fully investigated.

The problem is finding geographically and historically appropriate ways of interpreting Flemish art and artists in the Americas. This investigation raises further questions concerning framing conceptions. Spanish, or Spanish colonial art (or Iberian) are probably no longer often taken to refer to universal, essential, unchanging, and homogeneous entities.

Similarly, older geographical notions of climate, geography, race, mental habits or the like may no longer be regarded as determining the particular identity of art in Spain or the New World, or elsewhere.[14] Still, in the light of the variety of notions (and nations) that it covers, the concept of Spain or Spanish in regard to the Americas can also be questioned. Even such alternatives to "Spanish colonial", a term now in disfavor because of what has been perceived as a negative connotation, do not necessarily provide satisfactory substitutes, either: a notable example is "viceregal", which might easily be decried because of its imperial connotations. While the value of an international perspective for the arts of the Americas, and conversely for Europe, has been explicitly recognized recently,[15] an interpretative model that could accommodate the importance of the Flemish in the New World still needs to be formulated.

One of the few book-length studies of the Flemish impact that transcends the monographic reveals the basic problem of interpretation.[16] This is a study of the influence of "Nordic Mannerism" on Mexican viceregal religious architecture. In treating the impact of designs invented in the Netherlands, this work regards Spain as a link between the north and Mexico. The same waves of influence that have an impact on Spain are also in the Americas, and even sometimes pass it by. The argument concerns the transmission of sources from books and decorative details, but the same point might be extended to other media.[17]

This account relies on the long-standing and often repeated recognition that Flemish art and artists have had a major impact in Spain. This is evident from the era of European contact (discovery) itself, and indeed before, in an age when Juan de Flandes and Juan Guas served as painter and architect of Ferdinand and Isabella: despite their names, they were both Flemish. Other examples, like that of the Bruges-trained Michael Sittow who was also a painter for the Spanish monarchs, could be adduced.[18] The taste for Flemish painting was very strong in Spain, as is suggested by the impressive collections of works by artists such as Gerard David and Roger van der Weyden, among them works assembled for the monarchs, still visible in Spain today. Furthermore, Flemish painting had a large affect on the development of art made in Spain. This is reflected in the existence of what has been deemed the "Hispano-flemish" school, represented by such artists as Bartholome Bermejo or Fernando Gallego: long a subject of study, these painters and their relation to voyages of artists and works of art have gained renewed attention.[19] Iberian artists responded to and adapted Flemish sources and motifs (and those from elsewhere). The American situation is regarded as an extension of the Spanish.

This account follows the path that art history has traditionally laid out for dealing with issues of how ideas, inventions, or forms are disseminated from a source of invention to another. They are said to reveal the influence of a source on a form of expression. The model of influence suggests, however, that the source is creative, and that influence flows from it to a recipient, which is largely passive. Hence it is implied that the source is superior, or central, and the recipient inferior, or peripheral. Which lends itself to the other side of the equation: that the recipient, and consequently the question of reception, is underestimated.

Problems with this model have been apparent for several decades, especially in studies of what used to be called colonial art, because of these implications. Other interpretations have been proposed to enable the ideas, inventions, or forms that were spread or adapted in the arts in the Americas to be more positively regarded. Emphasis has been placed on the receiver as well as the transmitter, and therefore on reception.[20] The concept of diffusion has also gained currency.

Diffusion is a well-established concept in many social sciences that has long had a special role in studies of social change, where it is used to describe the spread of notions of innovation, new ideas, or new practices.[21] Diffusion may be defined as the "*spread of ideas or knowledge from their origins to areas where they are adopted*".[22] The theory of diffusion has been frequently employed in studies of the Renaissance outside of Italy by scholars other than art historians. It has subsequently entered art history discussions,[23] significantly in order to handle what would otherwise be regarded as external influences.[24]

Diffusion is a broad notion, but it is also only one of several theoretical concepts employed by anthropologists and other social theorists to describe cultural transfer or transmission and it is only one of several of that art historians have utilized. Acculturation is another such concept, and indeed it has also been specifically invoked in reference to art in the Iberian peninsula.[25] Acculturation theory developed from studying situations of continuous and prolonged contact between people of different traditions. Yet it was pointed out quite early that there was also a problem with this model: it depended upon an element of dominance, of the military superiority of one culture over another.[26] Consequently, some anthropologists allowed for a more active role for the recipient in matters of selection, suggesting that even the recipient culture retained some choice about which elements of the new it would accept or reject.[27] It is significant that this modification of the theory was developed by Thomas Glick and Oriol Pi-Sunyer in reference to Spain, and that this work has been cited and applied to Spanish art history.

Scholars have also applied this anthropological model to considerations of the New World. It was previously used to describe the interaction of the indigenous and the European, but it has now been applied to other European forms that appear in Latin America. Accordingly, the term acculturation is not only used in reference to how Flemish art has entered and is treated in the Iberian peninsula, but how it has been subsequently transmitted to the American vice royalties.[28]

Yet the acculturation theory still is problematic. Despite the modifications of scholars like Glick and Pi-Sunyer, the concept of acculturation has continued to be subjected to critique, because it still assigns too passive a role to reception. The theory retains a model closely related to that of influence, and due to that still largely suggests an image of a dominant donor and a passive recipient.[29] By definition, acculturation assumes that there is a cultural change which occurs through one culture's interaction with another culture, but in such a way that the dominant culture continues to be the one that causes this cultural change.

That this assumption would be seen as problematic for scholars of Latin America who would not wish to underestimate the indigenous, even implicitly, is clear, and in the present context another difficulty with the concept becomes apparent. Even if we were to accept the model of acculturation theory, in what way could the Flemish be thought to be dominant? As a part of Spanish culture? Then how is it to be regarded as distinctively Flemish? And how, if the Flemish element is mediated through Spain, and acculturated there, can it be thought to be subject again

to a process of acculturation? What does this process mean, and how exactly does it occur? In fact, the discourse of cultural exchange, or cultural transfer,[30] long ago addressed these problems and proposed alternatives to acculturation theory. Actually, it was in the study of Spanish America that a number of alternative hypotheses to acculturation theory were proposed. In a 1940 study of Cuban sugar, Fernando Ortiz introduced transculturation to replace acculturation. Ortiz believed that the prefix "trans-" (meaning across) expressed better what was involved in cultural exchange, whereby new cultural phenomena were created from contacts between cultures, than did the "ad" (implying movement toward) as in acculturation. In his view, cultural interchange can be regarded as possibly affecting the occurrence of cultural change in a number of directions.[31] The noted anthropologist Bronislaw Malinowski approved of the term and added that acculturation was ethnocentric, whereas all exchanges involved both giving and receiving. According to Malinowski, transculturation was therefore a better explanation for complex phenomena such as cultural exchange, and other scholars have argued similarly.[32]

Transculturation theory appears to have gradually gained favor in more recent decades, perhaps because it emphasizes the importance of the indigenous more than acculturation does.[33] The question is how well even this concept fits the other side of the equation, namely the European. To a degree, cultural exchanges between the southern Netherlands and the Americas certainly existed. While Flemish art and artists went westwards, objects from the Americas came eastwards from an early date, as Albrecht Dürer's admiration of Aztec works in Antwerp reminds us. Such objects soon entered collections in the Low Countries.[34] Depictions of America and Amerindians also entered into European art, including Netherlandish imagery. An iconography of conquest and of the continents was developed.[35] But the exchange, such as it was, seems largely one-sided: in fact one aspect of Netherlandish image-making involving the Americas supported the construction of an ideology of European superiority.[36] Conversely, transculturation in these terms does not explain anything specific about the nature of the Flemish presence in the Americas, to which the phenomena mentioned here are only tangentially related.

In the meantime, still other notions have been developed to replace (or refine) the theory of acculturation. These focus not on production or diffusion, but, as Peter Burke has said about the reception of the Italian Renaissance elsewhere in Europe, on how cultural elements are assimilated, absorbed, reworked, domesticated, and transformed.[37] As has also been pointed out, post-colonial theorists employ other notions such as misinterpretation, mimicry, multiplication, and hybridity.[38] To these may be added the much-employed notion of syncretism. All these have been or can be applied to studies of the Americas.

However, none of them is particularly apt for present purposes. Misinterpretation and mimicry obviously have negative overtones, and suggest the inferior status of who or what is doing the interpreting or mimicry. Neither gets at the original, Flemish sources. Multiplication again does not necessarily define what or how is multiplied. And syncretism is also – at best – a controversial term, even though the notion has been widely used. Other scholars have avoided it, for "*it implies an interchange of ideas among equals, and surely the conquered Indians were not 'equal' to the Spanish in terms of raw military and political power*".[39]

Notions related to syncretism, hybridity, and its variants, especially *mestizaje*, are perhaps the most popular of such terms, but they, too, are based on shaky premises. The

context in which such ideas were first used was in effect negative, because the idea of mixing or hybridity originates as a description of how forms of provincial or folk expression occurred as part of a process in which one culture was gradually effaced by its conquerors.[40] Notions of hybridity have however been given a more positive valuation in recent scholarship,[41] where they have been related to the appearance of indigenous elements through recurrence or survival in the art and architecture of the colonial Americas.[42] In the Americas, hybrids have been described as forms of *Arte indocristiano* or *tequitqui*, which has even recently been connected with the notion of transculturation.[43] Most widespread is perhaps the notion of *mestizo* (and the related noun, *mestizaje*) first applied to people of mixed race, most often indigenous and European, and consequently to cultural products (among them works of art) that seem to present similar mixtures.

Nevertheless, in the end the notion of hybridity, as also expressed in the conception of the term *mestizo*, relies on racist conceptions, implicit or explicit. Among them is the assumption that some authentic local stock exists, on which something else is grafted, or with which it is combined, so that a hybrid results. A few earlier scholars criticized the term *mestizo* because of its racist origins, and its inadequate expression of the cultural mix.[44] More recently, the ideological implications of the notion of *mestizo* have been devastatingly exposed and undermined.[45] Its racial or essentialist implications in any event provide exceedingly unsatisfactory explanations for the complex processes of mediation involved in the transmission of Flemish art and artists to the Americas.

Still another potentially useful way of treating the processes of cultural interchange and transfer involving Flemish art has been advanced recently. It has been suggested that rather than treating art in the Americas as an extension of Spain, it be situated in a much larger context: one of the Spanish monarchy. Cultural interchange is thus seen to be interrelated with the political structure of the empire. Consequently, artistic transmission from other realms ruled by the monarchy, such as Flanders to Spain, is seen to be replicated in the process of retransmission from Spain to America. This thesis offers an explanation for the broader process, in as much as the Spanish monarchy is seen to constitute a cultural area.[46]

Although he is not cited in this discourse, the idea that the Spanish monarchy is a cultural area is redolent of the concepts of Leo Frobenius, who coined the term *Kulturkreis*, meaning cultural circle. Still more relevant to the argument of the cultural integrity or significance of the Spanish monarchy is Frobenius's idea of a *Kulturreich*,[47] meaning cultural realm (or empire), although Frobenius's meaning is not the same as that of a "cultural area". This notion of cultural area relates instead to other concepts of cultural or human geography, such as *Kulturlandschaft*, or cultural landscape.[48] In such views it is human culture, and not simply natural features of the environment, that determine the appearance of a landscape, which they may even alter. As represented by the tradition of Carl Sauer in the United States, this approach to cultural geography does not seek to find or start from premises determined by spatial laws, but from the experience of differences found in areas, which it attempts to describe and define.[49]

One does not have to follow Frobenius or Sauer to see how cultural areas of larger dimensions may be imagined. One such area is constituted by the Mediterranean, as illuminated by Fernand Braudel in a famous book. Braudel treated the history and geography of the Mediterranean and the lands around it as interrelated: certain established patterns and conditions existed in the *longue durée*,

the long run, against which the history of discrete events, *histoire événementielle* occurred.[50] In a posthumous work, Braudel traced the historical course of cultural developments even more directly against the geography of the Mediterranean lands.[51] This approach suggests that the Mediterranean is a cultural area. The Baltic Sea can also be viewed similarly: it has been seen as a geographical area around which the lands also form a common culture.[52] In fact, the concept of *Kulturkreis* has recently been related to the Baltic.[53] Moreover, both the Baltic and the Mediterranean have been regarded as constituting artistic regions. Significantly, Netherlandish art and artists have been considered key elements in both.[54]

Yet even though treating the Spanish Empire as a cultural area may avoid the pitfalls of earlier chauvinistic approaches, and provide a broader conceptual framework, this interpretation runs into difficulties on both the macro- as well as the micro-level. While it is true that because of the exclusion of other nations (notably the Dutch rebels), the Flemish enjoyed commercial advantages in the New World, why is their presence in the Spanish monarchy to be similarly privileged, as far as the geography of art is concerned? What makes the borders of the Spanish realm especially significant in regard to the Flemish presence?

Importantly, during the later sixteenth and seventeenth centuries the southern Netherlands had a very complicated position as a dynastic holding within the Habsburg realms. After the Habsburgs' domains were split in the mid-sixteenth century and they passed to the dominion of Spain. During the later sixteenth and seventeenth centuries members of the "Austrian" branch of the dynasty nevertheless frequently served as state holders of the Low Countries. These were Archduke Matthias from 1578 to 1581, Ernst in 1594–1595, Albrecht from 1595 to 1621 (jointly with Isabella, but their marriage obscures his connections with the Austrian line), all brothers of Rudolf II, and Ferdinand III's brother Leopold Wilhelm from 1647 to 1656. As a result of the treaties of Rastatt and Utrecht in 1713 and 1714 the southern Netherlands passed formerly into the hands of the Austrian Habsburgs, where they were to remain until the revolutions at the end of the eighteenth century.[55]

Furthermore, the southern Netherlands had also formed part of the Holy Roman Empire (of the "German Nation") until its dissolution at the beginning of the nineteenth century. The Low Countries were thus enmeshed in "Imperial" as well as Spanish imperial affairs. In this regard, it should be remembered that the treaties of Westphalia that put an end to the Thirty Years War also put an end to what is called the Eighty Years' War, thereby establishing *de iure* the independence of the United Provinces of the northern Netherlands, and splitting them from the southern Netherlands, which continued to be ruled by the Habsburgs, and remained in the Holy Roman Empire.

It should also be remembered that artists and art from Flanders and Brabant (and indeed the Netherlands in general) were as ubiquitous and as important in the lands of Central Europe comprised by the Holy Roman Empire as they were in Spain and its empire. To refer to some specific examples, the Austrian Habsburgs were at least as involved with Netherlandish art as were their Spanish relatives. Archduke Ernst owned pictures by Hubert van Eyck and Roger van der Weyden, the series of months by Peter Bruegel the Elder and other paintings by the master, and several notable works by Hieronymus Bosch. Rudolf II's massive collections of paintings, preceding those of other rulers of the seventeenth century, contained hundreds of Netherlandish works: by Bruegel, Quentin Massys, Aertsen, and many more masters.

Leopold Wilhelm amassed another large collection of works in Brussels, which were then brought to Vienna. And the story continues until the end of the eighteenth century with Archduke Albrecht, better known as Albert, who also resided for a while in Brussels and was the founder of the Albertina.[56]

Furthermore, the Austrian Habsburgs of the later sixteenth century (and succeeding periods) also brought many Netherlandish artists, including those from the south, into their service. A few examples may again suffice. Alexander Colijn was sculptor to Ferdinand of the Tyrol. Roelandt Savery, Pieter Stevens, and Bartholomäus Spranger, all also from the southern Netherlands, worked at Rudolf II's court in Prague.[57] Jan van der Hoecke and Christian Luycx were some of the artists who served Leopold Wilhelm in Brussels and they participated in a wave of artists, largely figures from Antwerp and Ghent, who were active at the Vienna Court.[58] The wave also continued into the eighteenth century.

It would far expand the limits of this paper merely to summarize the main aspects of the Southern Netherlandish presence in the Germanic lands, so again only a very few examples must do. As in Prague, Netherlanders were present at many of the German courts, in Munich, for example, where Engelhard de Pee (from Brussels) served along with Peter Candid (originally from Bruges), Frederik Sustris and Hubert Gheraert. Netherlandish painters formed colonies of artists in Frankenthal, Cologne, Nuremberg, and Augsburg.[59] They constituted almost twenty per cent of the population in Frankfurt am Main, where (as in Hanau) they also largely dominated the visual arts, painting still life as an independent genre.[60] In the seventeenth century Rubens was sought after in many places in Germany, as well as in Spain.[61]

A very brief survey of the southern Netherlandish presence in other European countries outside the Iberian peninsula or the Holy Roman Empire indicates that their impact was even wider. Painting in Britain was dominated by Netherlanders from the days of Marcus Gheeraerts through Anthony van Dyck to Peter Lely. Similarly Netherlandish sculptors from Nicholas Stone through Artus Quellinus III to Joseph Nollekens were central figures in this enterprise. Ambrose Dubois, the leading artist of the second school of Fontainebleau, was actually Ambrosius Boschaert from Antwerp. Netherlanders also formed part of the foreign colony in Rome for generations. The Antwerp-trained Dionysius Calvaert and many other Netherlandish of his time also settled elsewhere in Italy. Netherlanders were long regarded as specialists in landscape painting, and some landscape painters who worked in Italy also originated in Antwerp. In Scandinavia, Willem Boy and Steven van der Meulen were court artists in Sweden, and Hans van Steenwinckel, from Antwerp built many structures for the king of Denmark. The sculptor Willem van den Blocke was one of many Netherlandish artists to set up a workshop in the royal Polish city Gdańsk. Following that, like his master Cornelis Floris, he sent out sculptures throughout the region: the Baltic litoral bordered what became a Netherlandish lake.[62]

These are but a few reminders of the vast extent of the Flemish world-wide enterprise in art. Netherlandish artists and works of art were ubiquitous. Most important, effects or qualities were often quite similar wherever they were to be found. Many of the same sorts of works that appear in the Americas also appear elsewhere. It is moreover clear that Netherlandish artists were bound neither by confessional nor political borders. Take the case of Martin de Vos, whose works in Mexico have received special attention. De Vos also supplied a suite of paintings that were set up in the chapel of the Protestant

Welf ruler of Braunschweig-Lüneburg-Celle in his *Schloss* in Celle.[63]

Like Latinate culture in the form of Italian humanism, and works of art of an Italianate character, Netherlandish art and artists may therefore be said to have expanded throughout the globe by the late sixteenth century. Paintings, prints, and sculpture from many places in the Low Countries (many of them from Antwerp) went not only to the New World, but were spread from Macao to Narva during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Through prints, art made in Antwerp was also disseminated not only to the Americas but throughout Europe, and even to Asia. It reached many areas not under Spanish domination, and had an impact on the making of various aspects of art and architecture throughout Europe – not only in Spain – but in many places in the world. Moreover Netherlandish artists, among them many from Flanders and Brabant, were actively painting, drawing, printmaking, designing ornaments, fortifications, fountains, gardens, sculpture, and making buildings in many European countries, and worked on four other continents as well.[64]

In the light of such evidence, there are many reasons to question a primary emphasis on Spain, or rather the Spanish Empire, in dealing with Flemish art in the Americas, as elsewhere. For an even broader perspective exists into which Flemish art and artists may be put. Furthermore, recent interpretation of empires has even suggested that the imperial enterprise should be regarded within the context of planetary integration.[65] In this view, Flemish art could be considered one of many factors that led to the globalization of world culture and economy.

All this goes to suggest that it is questionable to think of the Spanish Empire (including Flanders) as forming a cultural area, even in the broad way that he Mediterranean or Baltic might be thought to do. For both historical reasons, and geographical ones, the validity of the concept of Spanish monarchy in reference to artistic geography may be questioned. Much goes to support the observation that George Kubler once made that "*artistic and political geography do not correspond* […]. *At this smaller scale the facts of artistic life and the facts of political existence betray no close correspondence. We encounter subtle organic affinities between far-flung regions whereas such unexpected accords are altogether surprising, like the derivation of much Peruvian architectural ornament form sources in the Low Countries and Portugal, or the presence of Central European Baroque themes in the northern Andes. What is the explanation of these astonishing transfers? They violate every expectation based upon political and economic facts*".[66]

As Kubler suggested, American artistic geography coincides with political geography only in the largest outlines, and as we have seen, even the larger outlines provided by the Spanish empire are questionable.

The point of this critique is to suggest that a broader perspective may alter our approach to the problem of interpreting the impact of Flemish art in the Americas. It may, first, return focus to an emphasis on the role of the Low Countries themselves as centers of production and diffusion. Historically, there are many reasons why Flemish art expanded throughout Europe and beyond. The social, economic, and cultural conditions affecting art in the Netherlands were favorable to the creation of a continuing supply of art and artists. Well- established crafts, and with them guilds and individual workshops, existed in the Low Countries. These produced an abundance of goods, and since an extremely competitive situation existed at home, there were good reasons to respond to market demands abroad.

By the later sixteenth century in some trades such as stone- and woodcarving opportunities had been reduced, because of the

previous plethora of production in Catholic areas, and because of a decreased demand in Protestant areas after the Reformation. Some of this decline is in fact related to the negative consequences of Spanish rule. From the mid-1560's events further led artists to leave Antwerp. Images were destroyed or damaged in Antwerp and other cities in waves of iconoclasm beginning in 1566 that led to revolt and warfare. Spanish reprisals, the repression of the Duke of Alba, and religious persecution came in their wake. Antwerp itself was taken and retaken by the warring sides, and sacked in 1576 by mutinous Spanish troops (the "Spanish Fury".) The Duke of Parma finally took the city in 1585, after which Protestants were forced to convert or leave, and the river Scheldt was blockaded by the Dutch. All this badly affected Antwerp's economy and that of other Southern Netherlandish cities. Many emigrants, including artists and artisans of all confessions, left.

Furthermore, Netherlandish artists possessed the skills, the methods of organization, and the means to supply the needs of new clients. These needs could not be met by local workshops, and ultimately Netherlanders surpassed local ateliers. What is more, the luxury goods made by Netherlanders would have been regarded as prestige items. They were thus in a favorable position to meet the demands and needs of numerous markets, from the Americas to the Baltic, where they were at first facilitated by and accompanied the growing Dutch dominance in the carrying trade. All of these features could be studied in reference to their impact in the New World.

There are, furthermore, many ways of interpreting these developments. Like the question of the diffusion of the Italianate, it might be worthwhile to consider what the worldwide implications of the Flemish (or more broadly, the Dutch) might be, and how this might be interpreted.[67] This is certainly a worthwhile task for the geography of art. Rather than embarking on such a project here, in conclusion, we might return to the specific question of how to interpret the presence of Flemish art and artists in the Americas. Here the telescope might be turned around once again, from the global question to the local.

Once again some ideas of George Kubler might be helpful, although they are not found where we might expect them. Rather, they are found in Kubler's suggestions of a number of categories for the ways that cultures could interact when he dealt with what he called the extinction of Precolumbian motifs in the colonial period. Kubler's approach is all the more pertinent to the present discussion, because as has been pointed out recently, "[…] *he saw the matter as multivalenced, divisible into at least five categories coexisting simultaneously, their differences depending on power relationships between colonizer and colonized in 'local' circumstances*".[68]

According to Kubler, objects produced by different cultures could appear in juxtaposition: forms coming from two different cultures could coexist without interaction. They could come in convergence, in which unconnected traditions produce similar patterns, for aims approved by the ruling group. They could occur as explants, examples of native behavior continuing to evolve; as transplants, isolated but meaningful parts derived from the ancient American past; and finally as fragments, isolated pieces of native tradition that were repeated without comprehension.[69]

Kubler's interpretation of extinction has met considerable resistance, but some of his conceptions of cultural interchange have nevertheless been occasionally employed.[70] By applying his model not to the classification of indigenous survivals, but to external (Flemish) intrusions in the New World, we might arrive at interesting results. Jux-

taposition and convergence have been seen as occurring where European and indigenous forms appear together,[71] but they might also be studied in the Americas not only when Flemish forms are placed next to indigenous ones, but in sites where the indigenous element is not so visible. Such is the case of the church of the Merced in Potosí, where the original church built c. 1570–1620 houses an *artesonado* ceiling, ultimately from the Mudéjar tradition,[72] two Italianate Renaissance portals (in addition to a baroque portal, and also mural painting which in fact are in the manner of Netherlandish patterns produced by Cornelis Floris and Vredeman de Vries.[73] Explants could be used as a good way of describing those artists, like Pereyns, who came to the New World and carried on painting in new contexts. Transplants would refer to those works which were transported, like altarpieces, and continued to serve as such, or as in other meaningful ways, for example the multiple instances of copper plates set into the walls of chapels or *retablos* in churches in Bogotá and Puebla.[74] Fragments might be more difficult to define in this instance, but could refer to any of the many instances in which a European, or more particularly Flemish prototype, was copied by an indigenous artist in a context for which the original would not have originally been intended to fit.

This list of suggestions is not meant to be comprehensive. But it does allow for some of the complexity and overlapping qualities of the Flemish presence in the new world to be approached in possibly fruitful manner. This essay has offered a critique of some of the previous approaches, but it has also attempted to suggest that the manifold problems involved open up larger questions which are worth further consideration. The question of Flemish art in the Americas calls for the negotiation of many specific issues, including dealing with the interaction of European and American cultures. It includes the awareness of the need to take into account even more of the world than those vast territories encompassed by the Spanish empire.

Vlámové v Americe – interpretační výzva (Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann) – resumé

V posledních desetiletích si badatelé uvědomili rozsah fenoménu vlámského umění v Latinské Americe v období od prvních kontaktů s Evropou až po nabytí nezávislosti. Přesné údaje dosud nejsou k dispozici, ale například ve druhé polovině 17. století sem bylo ze Sevilly dopraveno na 24 000 obrazů, z nichž značná část musela být nizozemského původu. Je rovněž příznačné, že první umělecká škola na jihoamerickém kontinentě byla založena Joostem de Ricke a Pieterem Gossaelem. Nizozemští mistři měli v Novém světě určující vliv na výběr motivů, ikonografii a formování stylu nejen v malířství, ale i v architektuře.

Jedním z důvodů, proč je toto téma dosud zastoupeno minimem studií, je problém vymezení parametrů disciplíny. Vlámské umění v tomto případě vybízí k přezkoumání základních kategorií geografie umění, protože je ukázkou neiberského příspěvku k vizuálnímu umění západní polokoule. Evropský vliv na zdejší umění je zaznamenáván dlouhou dobu, ale význam právě neiberského podílu na této aktivitě zůstává neprobádaný. Problém přitom přináší snaha nalézt vhodné interpretační přístupy k vlámskému umění v Americe.

Studie Fabienne Emilie Hellendoornové například chápe Španělsko, kde byla velká poptávka po vlámském umění, jako spojovací článek s americkým kontinentem. V jejím pojetí je Amerika popsána coby recipient španělského vlivu. Zdrojová oblast je v této koncepci vnímána jako centrum, přičemž pozice příjemce, ocitajícího se na periferii, je značně podceněna. Problém takto založené interpretace byl zjevný dlouhou dobu a značně vystupoval do popředí zejména ve studiích o tzv. koloniálním umění.

Jiné teorie chápaly pojem recepce pozitivněji, důraz v nich byl položen právě na příjemce a zprostředkovatele a jejich určujícím faktorem byl difúzní model. Ten je přijímaným a uznávaným konceptem v mnoha společenských vědách, užívaným například pro popis šíření inovací, nových idejí a praktik. Byl aplikován na výzkum renesance vně Itálie a představuje jeden z mnoha antropologických konceptů, který byl dějinami umění přijat.

Dalším je akulturace, pojem užívaný s odkazem na umění Iberského poloostrova. Teorie akulturace se vyvinula v rámci studia dlouhodobých vzájemných kontaktů lidí různých tradic, je ovšem založena na dominantním působení jedné z nich. Jen někteří antropologové vzali v úvahu aktivitu recipienta s ohledem na možnosti volby. I tato teorie má svoje úskalí. Stále totiž vykazuje příliš pasivní roli recepce, čímž má velmi blízko k teorii vlivu. Z pochopitelných důvodů je tedy kritizována především badateli Latinské Ameriky. Diskurs kulturního transferu dlouho poukazoval na problémy tohoto rázu a nabídl alternativu v teorii transkulturace, lépe postihující škálu kulturní směny.

Mezitím byla modifikována samotná teorie akulturace, jejíž pohled byl tentokrát upřen na otázky asimilace, přepracování a transformace (Peter Burke). Postkoloniální teoretici vypracovali teorie multiplikace, hybridity nebo synkretismu, jež byly nebo by mohly být aplikovány na studium situace amerických kontinentů. Žádná z nich však není příliš vhodná pro řešení zmíněných otázek. Snad nejrozšířenější je přitom teorie *mestizo* (některými kritizovaná pro odkaz na rasistické koncepce), aplikovaná původně na míšence, nejčastěji potomky domorodců a Evropanů, a v důsledku na kulturní produkty vykazující obdobné principy míšení.

Další potenciálně užitečná cesta vedoucí k analýze kulturní směny byla navržena nedávno. Snaží se brát v potaz široký kontext španělské monarchie a kulturu vnímat v politických souvislostech. Leo Frobenius mluví v tomto ohledu o kulturním okruhu (*Kulturkreis*) a kulturní říši (*Kulturreich*). Trochu jiný význam má idea kulturní sféry (*cultural area*) – jednu z nich, Středomoří, vykreslil Fernand Braudel ve své slavné knize, ukazující historii a geografii ve vzájemném vztahu. Je však nutno připomenout, že vlámské a brabantské umění hrálo podstatnou roli nejen v rámci španělské monarchie, ale i ve středoevropském prostoru ovládaném Habsburky. To dokazují například sbírky Rudolfa II. nebo Leopolda Viléma a dále fakt, že rakouští Habsburkové povolávali umělce právě z tohoto prostoru do svých služeb. Stejná situace panovala i na německých dvorech. Vliv těchto umělců sahal ještě podstatně dále, přičemž nebyl omezen ani politickými, ani konfesními hranicemi. Stejně jako latinský humanismus v italské formě se nizozemské umění rozšířilo v pozdním 16. století po celém světě (ať už se jednalo o obrazy, tisky, nebo sochy), a to i mimo území pod španělskou nadvládou. Tento fakt podporuje Kublerovu tezi, že umělecká a politická geografie si zcela neodpovídají (užitečná může být i další myšlenka tohoto badatele, a sice že objekty různých kultur mohou vedle sebe existovat bez vzájemné interakce, ve formě juxtapozice a konvergence). Při hledání odpovědí na dané otázky je proto především potřeba neomezovat se pouze na území pod vlivem španělské monarchie.

* This essay is intended as an homage to the recipient of this "Festschrift" in recognition of his contributions to the study of Flemish art. The material in this essay has been expanded in Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann, Painting of the Kingdoms: A Global View of the Cultural Field, in: Juana Guitierrez (ed.), *Pintura de los Reinos*, Mexico City 2008, pp. 87–135 (also in Spanish and Portuguese).

1 David Summers, *Real Spaces. World Art History and the Rise of Western Modernism*, London – New York 2003, p. 15. Summers's characterization is all the more important because it is not dismissive of such work: "*However the discipline of the history of art may have changed over the last few decades of theoretical and critical examination, it has continued to be an archival field* […]."

2 See Duncan Kinkead, Juan de Luzón and the Sevillian Painting Trade with the New World in the Second Half of the Seventeenth Century, *Art Bulletin* 66, 1984, p. 305.

3 These are the results of the research of Erik Duverger reported in Neil de Marchi and Hans J. Van Migroet, Exploring Markets for Paintings in Spain and Nueva España, *Nederlands Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek* 51, 2000, p. 106, note 1.

4 See Jan Materné, Ex Officina Plantiniana, in: Eddy Stols – Rudi Bleys (ed.), *Flandre et Amérique latine. 500 ans de confrontation et métissage*, Antwerp 1993, pp. 139–153.

5 See for further details: José Guadalupe Victoria, Présence de l'Art Flamand en Nouvelle-Espagne, in: Stols – Bleys (note 4), pp. 155–167. – José de Mesa – Teresa Gisbert, La Flandre et le Monde andin, in: Stols – Bleys (note 4), pp. 169–195. – José de Mesa, De Vlaamse invloed in de Andesschilderkunst, in: *America bruid van de zon. 500 jaar Latijns-Amerika en de Lage Landen*, exh. cat., Antwerp 1992, pp. 179–188.

6 For previous efforts devoted specifically to this topic, see those cited in the previous note, and also Francisco de la Maza, *El pintor Martin de Vos en México*, Mexico City 1971.

7 See especially Fabienne Emilie Hellendoorn, *Influencia del Manierismo-nordico en la Arquitectura Virreinal Religiosa de Mexico*, Delft 1980.

8 Clara Bargellini, Painting on Copper in Spanish America, in: *Copper as Canvas. Two Centuries of Masterpiece Paintings on Copper 1575–1775*, New York – Oxford 1999, p. 42: "*Scholars in Spanish America have looked cursorily at the European paintings on copper that are in local collections, and only a few European and United States scholars even know of their existence*." Similar comments may be made about the large numbers of paintings (and sculpture) by Europeans in the churches and missions of Latin America, and California!

9 See Summers (note 1), p. 19; the work of George Kubler in general admirably demonstrates this process of rethinking.

10 The echo of George Kubler, Non-Iberian European Contributions to Latin American Colonial Architecture, in: Thomas F. Reese (ed.), *Studies in Ancient American and European Art. The Collected Essays of George Kubler*, New Haven – London 1985, pp. 81–87, is deliberate. Kubler's essay first appeared as El problema de los aportes europeos non ibéricos en la arquitectura colonial latino americana, *Boletin del Centro de Investigaciones Históricas y Estéticas* 9, 1968, pp. 104–116.

11 Kubler, Non-Iberian (note 10), p. 81.

12 Earlier studies certainly dealt with the question of the relation of art in the Americas to the Old World. For a good summary, not however focused on Flemish painting, see Marcus Burke, Introduction: Mexican Colonial Painting in Its European Context, in: *Spain and New Spain. Mexican Colonial Arts in their European Context*, exh. cat. Corpus Christi, Texas 1979, pp. 15–59. Examples of monographs are Juan de Mesa – Teresa Gisbert, *Bitti un pintor manierista en Sudamerica*, La Paz 1974. – Eidem, *Il pintor Matteo Perez de Alesio*, La Paz 1972.

13 Representative of this growing interest is the large number of contributors of essays to a conference at Boston College, some of whose results were published in John O' Malley – Gauvin Alexander Bailey – Steven J. Harris – T. Frank Kennedy (eds.), *The Jesuits Culture, Sciences, and the Arts*, Toronto – Buffalo 1999, with further bibliography. – See further John W. O'Malley – Gauven A. Bailey – Giovanni Sale (eds.), *The Jesuits and the Arts: 1540–1773*, Philadelphia 2005. – For a monograph on an Italian architect in Jesuit service, see further Dalmacio H. Sobrón, *Giovanni Andrea Bianchi, un arquitecto italiano en los albores de la arquitectura colonial argentina*, Córdoba (Argentina) 1997.

14 Bargellini (note 8), p. 42.

15 For these issues see in general Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann, *Towards a Geography of Art*, Chicago – London 2004. – I am also reflecting here on the comments of Jonathan Brown, *The Golden Age of Painting in Spain*, New Haven – London, 1991, p. viii.

16 By which I mean articles or books such as Maza (note 6).

17 Hellendoorn (note 7).

18 Hellendoorn cites the example of Juan Guas, and also mentions Sturm, and other Flemish painters in Seville: ibidem, 183 n. – See also note 9.

19 See for example *El Renacimiento Mediterráneo. Viajes de artistas e itinerarios de obras entre Italia, Francia y España*, exh. cat., Madrid – Valencia 2001. – *La pintu-*

ra Gótica Hispanoflamenca: Bartolomé Bermejo y época, exh. cat., Barcelona 2003.

20 For the theoretical roots and importance of this conception in relation questions of cultural exchange see the comments in Peter Burke, *Kultureller Austausch*, Frankfurt am Main 2000, p. 16. – Idem, *The Renaissance*, Atlantic Highlands 1987, p. 28ff. The idea has of course been widely used.

21 See Everett M. Rogers, *The Diffusion of Innovations*, New York – London 1962, which surveys previous studies of diffusion, and the subsequent revisions of this work, including notably the second edition, Everett M. Rogers – F. Floyd Shoemaker, *Communication of Innovations. A Cross-cultural Approach*, New York – London 1971.

22 Harm J. de Blij – Alexander B. Murphy, *Cultural Geography*, New York – Chicago et al. 1997, p. 12.

23 For a general account, see Kaufmann (note 15), Chapter 6.

24 Brown, *The Golden Age* (note 15), p. vii.

25 Ibidem, footnote.

26 See the useful summary in Gauvin Alexander Bailey, *Art on the Jesuit Missions in Asia and latin America, 1542–1773*, Toronto – Buffalo – London 1999, p. 22.

27 Thomas F. Glick – Oriol Pi-Sunyer, Acculturation as an Explanatory Concept in Spanish History, *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 11, 1969, pp. 136–154.

28 For the use of acculturation theory in relation to interactions with the indigenous, see, also for further references, Bailey (note 26), 22f, passim. – See Jonathan Brown, La antigua monarquía española como área cultural, in: *Los Siglos de Oro en los Virreinatos de América 1550–1700*, exh. cat., Madrid 1999, 19–25.

29 Burke, *The Renaissance* (note 20), p. 27. As Peter Burke has remarked specifically in relation to the question of the "reception" or "diffusion" of the Renaissance abroad, it may seem that "*while the Italians were active, creative, and innovatory* […] *the rest of Europe was passive* […] *a borrower eternally in debt to Italy*".

30 See Burke, *Kultureller Austausch* (note 20).

31 See Fernando Ortiz, *Contrapunteo Cubano del tabaco y el azúcar (Advertendencia de sus contrastes agrarios, eonomicos, historicos y sociales*, Havana 1940, pp. 136, 142.

32 See Bronislaw Malinowski, Introduction, p. xvi. – Ticio Escobar, *La Belleza de los otros. Arte indigena del Paraguay*, Asunción 1993, pp. 34 ff., presents a similar critique of the theory of acculturation, in opting for transculturation.

33 See for instance the essays collected in Kenneth J. Andriean – Rolena Adorno (eds.), *Transatlantic Encounters. Europeans and Andeans in the Sixteenth Century*, Berkeley – Los Angeles – Oxford 1991.

34 See Paul Vandenbroeck, Amerindiaanse kunst-en sierevoorwerpen in adelijke verzamelingen. Brussel, Mechelen, Duurstede, 1520–1530, in: *America bruid* (note 5), pp. 99–119.

35 See Ernst van den Boogaart, Keizerin Europa en haar drie zusters. De Nederlandse uitbeelding van de Europese superioritetsclaim, 1570–1655, in: *America bruid* (note 5), pp. 121–127. – Bernadette J. Bucher, De Grands Voyages van De Bry (1590–1634). Europa's eerste uitgebreide reportage over America, in: *America bruid* (note 5), 120–140.

36 Van den Boogaert (note 35).

37 For this litany of terms see Burke, *The Renaissance* (note 20), p. 28.

38 Bailey (note 26), p. 22. – See for convenient definitions of these terms Ania Loomba, *Colonialism/Postcolonialism*, New York – London 1998.

39 Samuel Y. Edgerton, *Theaters of Conversion. Religious Architecture and Indian Artisans in Colonial Mexico*, Alberquerque 2001, p. 2.

40 See George Kubler, On the Colonial Extinction of the Motifs of Precolumbian Art, in: Reese (note 10), p. 67.

41 See for example Jeanette Favrot Peterson, *The Paradise Garden Murals of Malinalco*, Austin 1993, pp. 8ff.

42 In addition to Peterson, see for example the essays by Pauline Moffitt Watts, Languages of Gesture in Sixteenth-Century Mexico: Some Antecedents and Transmutations; Thomas Cummins, From Lies to Truth: Colonial Ekphrasis and the Act of Cross-cultural Translation; Cecilia F. Klein, Wild Woman in Colonial Mexico: An Encounter of European and Aztec Concepts of the Other; Dana Leibsohn, Colony and Cartography: Shifting Signs on Indigenous Maps of New Spain, in: Claire Farago (ed.), *Reframing the Renaissance*, New Haven – London 1995, pp. 140–174, 245–291. – See also Tom Cummins – Elizabeth Hill Boone (eds.), *Native Traditions in the Postconquest World*, Washington, D. C. 1998. – A balanced review of the historiography of the question and recent contributions in regard to architecture in Mexico is provided by Clara Bargellini, Representations of Conversion: Sixteenth-Century Architecture in New Spain, in: *The Word Made Image. Religion, Art, and Architecture in Spain and Spanish America 1500–1600*, Boston 1998, pp. 91–102.

43 For Indo-Christian art, see Constantino Reyes-Valero, *Arte indocristiano. Escultura del siglo XVI en México*, Mexico City 1978. – A dissertation by José Manuel Aguilar Moreno, *Tequitqui art of sixteenth-century Mexico: An Expression of Transculturation* (Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Texas at Austin), Austin 1999, but not available to me, is reportedly the most extensive discussion of the subject.

44 Notably George Kubler, Indianism, "mestizaje", and "Indigenismo" as Classical, Medieval, and Modern Traditions in Latin America, in: Reese (note 10), pp. 75–80.

45 Ronald Stutzman, "El Mestizaje": An All-inclusive Ideology of Exclusion, in: Norman E. Whitten, Jr. (ed.), *Cultural transformations and Ethnicity in Modern Ecuador*, Urbana – Chicago – London 1981), pp. 45–94. – For the meaning of *mestizaje* see recently Mary Weismantel, *Cholos and Pishtacos*, Chicago – London 2001.

46 Brown, La antigua monarquía (note 28).

47 Leo Frobenius, *Vom Kulturreich des Festlandes*, Berlin 1923.

48 See Wolfgang Schmid, Kunstlandschaft, Absatzgebiet, Zentralraum: zur Brauchbarkeit unterschiedlicher Raumkonzepte in der kunstgeographischen Forschung vornehmlich an rheinischen Beispielen, in: Jan von Bonsdorff (ed.), *Figur und Raum: Mittelalterliche Holzbildwerke im historischen und kuntgeographischen Kontext*, Berlin 1994, pp. 21–34. – *Kulturlandschaft* was the subject (and title) of the issue of *Kritische Berichte. Zeitschrift für Kunst- und Kulturwissenschaften* 28, 2000, no. 2.

49 See Carl Ortwin Sauer, The Morphology of Landscape, in: John Leighly (ed.), *Land and Life. A Selection from the Writings of Carl Ortwin Sauer*, Berkeley – Los Angeles 1965, pp. 322–323, essay was first published in *University of California Publications in Geography* 2, 1925, pp. 19–53. – Mike Crang, *Cultural Geography*, London – New York, 1998, provides a brief summary of this theory, as related here.

50 See Fernand Braudel, *The Mediterranean and the Mediterranean World in the Age of Philip II*, London – New York 1973, 2 vol.

51 Fernand Braudel, *Memory and the Mediterranean*, ed. Roselyne de Ayala – Paule Braudel, New York 2001.

52 Janis Kreslins – Steven A. Mansbach – Robert Schweitzer (eds.), *Gränsländer. Östersjön in ny gestalt*, Stockholm 2003.

53 For instance by Jan von Bonsdorff, "Global Aspects of Johnny Roosval's Concept of the Artedominium", *Crossing Cultures. 32nd Congress of the International Committee of the History of Art (CIHA)*, Melbourne 2009.

54 For the Baltic, see Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann, Das Ostseeraum als Kunstregion: Historiographie, Stand der Forschung und Perspektiven künftiger Forschung, in: Martin Krieger – Michael North (eds.), *Land und Meer. Kultureller Austausch zwischen Westeuropa und dem Ostseeraum in der frühen Neuzeit*, Köln – Weimar – Wien 2004, pp. 9–21.

55 Some of the complications of the situation of the Netherlands after their revolt are brought out in a recent account of the father of Ernst, Rudolf, Matthias, and Albrecht, Emperor Maximilian II: see Paula Sutter Fichtner, *Emperor Maximilian II*, New Haven – London 2001, pp. 156–172. – For Albrecht and his brothers see Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann, Archduke Albrecht as an Austrian Habsburg and Prince of the Empire, in: Werner Thomas – Luc Duerloo (eds.), *Albert & Isabella, 1598–1621: Essays*, Turnhout 1998, pp. 15–25. – For the origins of the relations between the Habsburgs in Central Europe and Spain see *Reyes y Mecenes. Los Reyes Catolicos. Maximiliano I y los Inicios de la Casa de Austria en España*, exh. cat., Toledo 1992. – Friedrich – Alfred Kohler (eds.), *Hispania Austria: Die katholischen Könige, Maximilian I. und die Anfänge der Casa de Austria in Spanien*, Wien 1993.

56 An overview of Austrian Habsburg collections, with many details, is best found still in Alphons Lhotsky, *Die Geschichte der Sammlungen (Festschrift des Kunsthistorischen Museums)*, Wien 1941–1945, part 1, 2 vol.

57 See for these and other artists, Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann, *The School of Prague. Painting at the Court of Rudolf II*, Chicago – London 1988.

58 See for Leopold Wilhelm's collections and patronage, and for further bibliography on Vienna, most pertinently Karl Schütz, Zeitgenössische niederländische Malerei in der Sammlung Erzherzog Leopold Wilhelms, *Zeventiende eeuw* 13, 1997, pp. 371–378.

59 For Frankenthal, see *Kunst – Kommerz – Glaubenskampf. Frankenthal um 1600*, exh. cat., Worms 1995. – For Cologne, Ilja M. Veldman, Protestant Emigrants: Artists from the Netherlands in Cologne (1562–1612), in: Thomas W. Gaehtgens (ed.), *Künstlerischer Austausch. Artistic Exchange. Akten des XVIII. Internationalen Kongresses für Kunstgeschichte Berlin, 1992*, Bd. 1, Berlin 1993, pp. 163–174, and idem, Keulen als toevluchtsoord voor Nederlandse kunstenaars, *Oud Holland* 107, 1993, pp. 34–58. – For Nuremberg, Jeffrey Chipps Smith, Netherlandish Artists and Art in Renaissance Nuremberg, *Simiolus* 20, 1990–1991, pp. 153–167. – For Augsburg, *Welt im Umbruch. Augsburg zwischen Renaissance und Barock*, 3 vol., exh. cat., Augsburg 1980.

60 For Frankfurt see Kurt Wettengl (ed.), *Georg Flegel 1566–1638*, exh. cat., Stuttgart 1993.

61 See Konrad Renger, *Peter Paul Rubens. Altäre für Bayern*, München 1990.

62 See Karen Hearn – Rica Jones, *Marcus Gheeraerts II: Elizabethan artist*, London 2002. – Netherlandish sculptors in England are the topic of continuing research by Leon Lock. – For the Baltic, Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann, "Ways of Transfer of Netherlandish Art", in: *Netherlandish Artists in Gdańsk in the Time of Hans Vredeman de Vries*, Gdańsk 2006, pp. 13–22. – For the more general phenomenon see Anna Jolly,

Netherlandish sculptors in sixteenth-century northern Germany and their patrons, *Simiolus* 27, 1999, pp. 119–141.

63 See Armin Zweite, *Marten de Vos als Maler. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Antwerpener Malerei in der zweiten Hälfte des 16. Jahrhunderts*, Berlin 1980, pp. 85–146.

64 See Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann, Antwerpen als künstlerisches Zentrum und sein Einfluß auf Europa und die Welt, in: *Hans Vredeman de Vries und die Renaissance im Norden*, exh. cat., München 2002, pp. 41–50 (also as De Kunstmetropool Antwerpen en haar Wereldwijde Invloed, in: *Tussen Stadspaleizen en Luchtkastelen. Hans Vredeman de Vries en de Renaissance*, exh. cat., Gent – Amsterdam 2002, pp. 41–50). The comparable argument about Italy is made in idem, Italian Sculptors and Sculpture Outside of Italy (Chiefly in Central Europe): Problems of Approach, Possibilities of Reception, in: Farago (note 42), pp. 47–66.

65 See George Raudzens, *Empires. Europe and Globalization 1492–1788*, Thrupp (Stroud) 1999.

66 For Kubler's definition, see George Kubler, Santos: The Religious Folk Art of New Mexico, reprinted in: Reese (note 10), p. 61. – For questions of artistic geography in general see Kaufmann, *Towards a Geography* (note 15).

67 See Kaufmann, Italian Sculptors and Sculpture (note 64), pp. 47–66.

68 Edgerton (note 39), p. 299, note 4.

69 See Kubler, On the Colonial Extinction (note 40), pp. 66–74.

70 Edgerton (note 39), p. 299, note 4, is notable. See further the next note. – For the general question of the reception of Kubler's ideas on artistic geography, see Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann, La geografía artistica en América: el legado de Kubler y sus límites, *Annales del Instituto de Investigaciones Estéticas* 74–75, 1999 (published 2001), pp. 11–27.

71 See specifically Jeannette Favrot Peterson, Synthesis and Survival. The Native Presence in Sixteenth-century Murals of New Spain, in: Emily Umberger – Tom Cummins (eds.) *Native Artiss and Patrons in Colonial Latin America*, Tempe 1995 (= Phoebus 7), pp. 14–35, and more broadly eadem, *The Paradise* (note 41).

72 See for an overview of this issue and references to other literature, see Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann, Islam, Art, and Architecture in the Americas: Some Considerations of Colonial Latin America, *Res* 43, Spring 2003, pp. 42–50.

73 For this church see José de Mesa and Teresa Gisbert, *Monumentos de Bolivia*, La Paz 1992 (revised edition), pp. 137–139, where however the style of the mural paintings is not mentioned (perhaps because they have been discovered more recently, as local authority has it). – For the designs of Floris see Christine Van Mulders, De prentenreeksen, in: Antoinette Huysmans et al., *Cornelis Floris 1514–1575. Beeldhouwer archiect ontwerper*, Brussels 1996, pp. 37–69. – For Vredeman's, Peter Fuhring, Hans Vredeman de Vries und das Ornament als Vorlage und Modell, in: *Hans Vredeman* (note 64), pp. 61–68.

74 See Bargellini (note 8), pp. 33, 41, ill. p. 37.