

Historiography and the retracing of Latin American art history

A Review of Ray Hernández-Durán, *The Academy of San Carlos and Mexican Art History. Politics, History, and Art in Nineteenth-Century Mexico*, London and New York: Routledge, 2017, 174pp, 16 b. & w. illus. ISBN 978-1-4094-3412-2 (hbk).

Claudia Mattos Avolese

The Academy of San Carlos and Mexican Art History presents an account of the complex cultural and political circumstances surrounding the installation of the first colonial gallery of art at the Academy of San Carlos in mid-nineteenth-century Mexico City, as well as the publication (based on the works in this gallery) of the first art history of colonial Mexico. The research is grounded in extensive archival material, and should be welcomed as a rare example of fine scholarship on nineteenth-century Mexican art and culture in the English language. However, this is not the only strength of the book. By considering the local discourses and practices present in the Academy of San Carlos *not* as derivative products of Spanish traditions transplanted into the Americas, but rather as unique responses to the cultural and political atmosphere specific to Mexico in this period, Hernández-Durán recovers the central role played by specific historical developments in Mexico for the complex unfolding of the field of Latin American art history across national and regional borders.¹ The gallery of Mexican colonial art, and the publication based on its display, can be seen as a matrix for many of the categories that still frame our understanding of Latin American art. Given that the nineteenth century remains one of the most neglected historical periods within Latin American art history, I would argue that this book cleverly reveals the “repressed origin” of many of the classifications that continue to shape contemporary scholarship. The new perspective offered by Hernández-Durán, placing nineteenth-century art historical discourse in Mexico as significant for the development of our current concept of Latin American art, is a welcome first step in the urgently needed revision of traditional historiographical approaches to Latin America.

Hernández-Durán makes the centrality of historiographical inquiries for his book evident from the very start: he states in the preface that his research was triggered by an ‘interest in further investigating the origin of the study of arts from the colonial period and the legacy of that formative phase of art historical practice on the reception of colonial art today’.² Hernández-Durán then frames the whole book with a first chapter that considers the state of contemporary scholarship on Latin American art, and more specifically on colonial Mexico, trying to understand the reasons for its marginal status within the discipline of art history, and proposing historiographical research as a strategy for understanding this diminished importance.

Chapter one opens with a discussion of the value of historiography as a critical tool, praising its capacity to question established grand narratives. Hernández-Durán suggests

¹ Here Hernández-Durán acknowledges the importance of Tom Cummins’s advice to “understand colonial culture as also being generative rather than merely derivative”. *The Academy of San Carlos*, 4.

² *The Academy of San Carlos*, xi.

that the marginal condition of Latin American art should be attributed, at least in part, to an insufficient interest in historiography on the part of art historians.³ Disinterest in studying how 'disciplinary practice has developed over time and why' helps to maintain in place traditional art historical narratives, which originated under the specific political and ideological conditions that framed the historical development of art history.

In its traditional form, and through its established canon, Art History works to reify the idea of a coherent development of the West, from antiquity to the present. In this Eurocentric discourse, Latin America occupies an uncertain place. Hernández-Durán shows how, even today, the majority of art historical surveys reaffirm the traditional canon by situating Latin American art (when it is treated as art) completely outside the Western tradition – in chapters reserved for indigenous art – or as derivative to the art of the Iberian peninsula. He also discusses the more specific place of Mexican colonial art in the map of art history, unpacking some of the historical and political reasons for its persistently marginal status. The author argues, for instance, that the myth of the conquest of the "Wild West," created in the United States in the nineteenth century and associated with even deeper historical strata (such as the confrontation of Protestants and Catholics, during Reformation and Counter-Reformation) transformed Mexicans into unwanted foreigners living "south of the border," thus obscuring the existence of a shared historical legacy by both nations. As the author puts it, 'The legacy of these earlier encounters is manifest in contemporary attitudes towards communities or descendants of formerly subjugated, primarily non-white, mixed-race populations, including their histories and cultures, as well as those associated with the Iberian and Ibero-American Catholic world'.⁴

After delivering this opening analysis on the genesis of Latin American marginality within Art History, Hernández-Durán proceeds to discuss possible actions that could contribute to solving the problem. Repositioning the subfield of Latin American studies within the map of Art History would produce vast transformations in the traditional narratives that sustain the discipline, since the connections between Europe and the Americas are intimate and undeniable: 'By acknowledging the Americas during this long period (late fifteenth through nineteenth centuries) and integrating them into the larger disciplinary discussion, one has to contend with the articulation of alternate yet legitimate perspectives that may ignore, contradict, or even invalidate conventional historical narratives'.⁵ This new history, he continues, would certainly reveal the intimate connections between colonial exploitation and the development of modern, "enlightened" Europe. It would also help to disclose how political variables determined ethnic and geographical relations embedded in the structures of the field. For example, Rome or Paris are usually viewed as centres relative to Madrid, but when dealing with the Americas, one sees Madrid as the metropolis and Mexico City as periphery. In turn, within Latin America Mexico City tends to be considered as central relative to other more distant cities in New Spain, all this in spite of the obvious fact that from the perspective of someone living in New Spain in the eighteenth century, Mexico City was the real metropolis, and Madrid often just a distant

³ In Hernández-Durán's own words: 'two probable reasons to explain this condition [of marginality] may include the underdeveloped state of historiographical research in the colonial area, especially in English, and what seems to be insufficient interest in historiography'. *The Academy of San Carlos*, p.1.

⁴ *The Academy of San Carlos*, 12.

⁵ *The Academy of San Carlos*, 13.

concept. Chapter one ends by affirming historiographical research as a powerful tool for revising the premises that sustain grand art historical narratives today: 'Historiography plays a central role in the critical engagement with the kinds of intellectual and political issues here noted by facilitating the recognition of shifts in thought and practice, and consequently, the formulation of critical questions and the application of new approaches'.⁶ Here Hernández-Durán inscribes his own research as a contemporary effort towards this urgently needed historiographical revision of Latin American art history.

The following chapters of the book present Hernández-Durán's archival research on the conceptualization and installation of the first colonial art gallery at the Academy of San Carlos, and its associated publications. Chapter two introduces the reader to the complex ecosystem within which the program for the gallery developed. It opens with a description of the political and economic instabilities that characterized Mexico in the period after independence, and how the ruling elite came to see the necessity of producing a "corporate" national narrative through the writing of history as a strategy for political survival. In spite of the plurality of political agendas of the time, the histories produced by white elites (and propagated mostly through the press) were written mainly from two contrasting positions: the liberals and the conservatives. As Hernández-Durán makes clear, these positions reflected not only different perspectives on contemporary issues, but also projected themselves into the past, creating debates about how to write the narrative of the nation's origin. Two main issues were at stake: which moments of history should be regarded as significant for the development of Mexico as a nation, and who should be considered the main agents in this development. Central to these debates was how to understand the colonial period. While liberals saw the three hundred years of Spanish domination as violent and oppressive, conservatives praised the viceregal period as the formative years of what became modern Mexico. These two positions generated two diverging grand narratives regarding the history of the country. On the one hand, liberals such as Lorenzo Zavala and José María Luis Mora saw pre-Hispanic cultures as the distant origin of what would become Mexico, attributing the uniqueness of the country to its indigenous past. The colonial period was understood as a moment of violence and oppression for the Mexican people, which ended with the independence of Mexico, and its introduction into the community of modern civilized nations. As a consequence, liberals believed that Mexico should distance itself from Spain and Spanish traditions, turning to other countries such as France and the United States as progressive models.

On the other hand, conservatives such as Lucas Alamán saw Mexican history starting with the events of conquest. They understood this moment as beneficial to indigenous peoples, who could finally partake in the process of civilization. Consequently, the viceregal period was seen as the essential formative moment of Mexican identity and culture, which should be treasured as an important stage in the development of Mexico as a nation. Above all, conservatives believed that the Church should continue to have a prominent role in modern Mexican society, as it did during the colonial period.⁷

⁶ *The Academy of San Carlos*, 17.

⁷ Hernández-Durán singles out Lorenzo Zavala, José María Luis Mora and Lucas Alamán as example of historical writing in the period, also elaborating on the nuanced differences between the more radical positions defended by Lorenzo de Zavala (1788-1836) and more moderate stands expressed by José María Luis Mora (1794-1850), although considering both of them liberals.

Both these narratives, each in its own way, promoted a tripartite division of Mexican history, which could be loosely associated with developments in European history. The pre-Hispanic past paralleled the classic Greco-Roman period, viceregal Mexico corresponded to Medieval Europe, and post-independent Mexico was seen as achieving modernity and catching up with the pace of civilized nations. Such comparisons would inform historical and art historical discourses on Mexico, surviving in today's subdivision of Latin American art history into pre-Hispanic, Colonial and Modern.⁸

In the disputes between liberals and conservatives regarding how to interpret history, an important development occurred on the conservative side, when conservatives turned to historical patrimony as a strategy for emphasizing the importance of the colonial period.⁹ The pages of conservative newspapers and magazines started to display lithographic illustrations of the facades and interiors of churches and convents, accompanied by detailed descriptions and explanations of the architecture. This innovative practice opened up a whole new chapter of the dispute over history, since it inaugurated a process for the resignification of material culture, transforming it into evidence for a specific reading of the past. This significant step inevitably pushed the Academy of San Carlos to the centre of debate. As Hernández-Durán describes it: 'Although a historical narrative provided the ideal framework for re-inscribing selective cultural exemplars, a series of physical operations had to take place first in order to begin realigning those elements so that they could fit into the new historical narrative and actualize their new signifying potential. Those operations involved the institutional space of the Academy of San Carlos and the creation of a carefully vetted collection of art'¹⁰. With these comments, the author introduces the main subject of his third chapter: the creation of the gallery of colonial art at the Academy of San Carlos as a conservative strategy of reification for their reading of the colonial past.

Chapter three opens with a brief history of the Academy, from its foundation in 1781 to the independence period. The Academy of San Carlos was established as one of the institutions designed by the newly installed Bourbon government to secure Spanish control in the colonies. It was created to embody and disseminate Spanish ideals in New Spain, serving as propaganda tool for the metropolis. With its centralized authority, controlled from Madrid by the Academy of San Fernando, it worked to dismantle the old workshop system that had organized previous art production under Hapsburg domination.

In spite of its centrality for the art ecosystem of late colonial Mexico, the Academy faced great financial difficulties during and after independence, to the point that it came to depend on faculty pocket money to continue its activities. This situation was finally reversed in 1843 when President Valentín Canalizo, in a gesture to try to save the institution, gave it control over the national lottery. Good administration in subsequent years revived the Academy and re-established its significance in Mexico's cultural life, now with the new aim of becoming 'the modern nation's primary art school and museum' and playing an

⁸ The categories that were first applied to Mexico were expanded to whole Latin America, probably because of the centrality of Mexican studies within the field.

⁹ The author mentions that the use of art and material culture as ways to naturalize a specific historical narrative was embraced only later by liberals.

¹⁰ *The Academy of San Carlos*, 54.

important role in the 'generation of a locally defined national history and cultural identity'.¹¹ In this new task, as Hernández-Durán shows, the Academy art collection played a seminal role.

The idea of establishing an art collection for teaching students and instructing the public was present in the Academy since its foundation. Documents demonstrate the early attempts to build a collection through donations, including a significant donation, in 1786, of artworks that had been confiscated from the Jesuits after their expulsion from New Spain. In the mid-nineteenth century, after recovering economically, the Academy renewed its interest in forming an art collection, but now working within the contingencies imposed by the conservative elite that dominated the institution. Understanding the opportunity offered by the art collections for the Academy, the conservative elite invested in the institution as a tool for naturalizing and legitimizing their specific interpretations of Mexican history. Conservatives realized that 'in addition to writing narratives, such a history could be materially embodied by carefully selected, strategically re-inscribed historical artefacts present in an institutional frame that would legitimize it in the eyes of its citizens'.¹²

In 1849, and once again in 1855, conservative Mexican president Antonio López Santa Anna suggested the creation of a gallery of art in the Academy of San Carlos to promote the glory of Mexican painting. His second petition was sent directly to conservative lawyer José Bernardo Couto, who was president of the Academy at the time. Couto immediately started working on the project of the gallery, contacting churches and convents looking for donations. Between 1856 and 1863 he received art works from various sources. The most significant body of works, however, came from the transfer to the Academy of collections of art seized from the church decades earlier, and stored at the convent of La Encarnación: 'it was from this eclectic assortment that Couto drew exemplars of the Old Mexican School, manifesting his totalizing vision of the earlier period's [i.e. colonial] artistic production'.¹³ Couto worked hard assembling the collection to present the "old" Mexican school of art as predecessors for the "new" modern Mexican school represented by the Academy of his time. As we saw, this reading was totally in accordance with conservative interpretations of the past. Approximately 42 works from the La Encarnación collection were hanging in the gallery at the Academy when it opened to the public from 1855 to 1857, and again (after renovations) in 1862. Unfortunately, no contemporary register of the gallery survived, but Hernández-Durán located two pictures of the installations, dated 1897, that give us an idea of the collection and its form of display. The photographs present two different views of the old gallery, where we can see many artworks considered canonical today. Judging from what can be seen in these two photographs, Couto organized his collection by artists, and probably also in some loose chronological order. As for their themes, due to the origin of the works the gallery displayed almost exclusively religious art. This is extremely relevant for the argument of the book, since one of its main theses is that the exclusion of all other genres of colonial art production – such as landscapes, portraits, allegorical images, decorative art – from this first collection of colonial art generated the still-prevailing perception of Latin American art as essentially religious.

¹¹ *The Academy of San Carlos*, 79.

¹² *The Academy of San Carlos*, 79.

¹³ *The Academy of San Carlos*, 83.

In terms of the criteria used by José Bernardo Couto to select the works for the gallery, Hernández-Durán (citing a previous study by Joana Gutiérrez Haces) concludes that the president of the Academy 'looked for classical qualities in viceregal works – that is, naturalism, decorum, correct drawing, chiaroscuro, perspective, and anatomical accuracy –, characteristics that would imply a commensurability between the older material's formal elements and the rules propagated by the Academy of San Carlos in the mid-nineteenth century'.¹⁴ This continuity between past and present helped to support the anachronistic idea that colonial painting had been produced by national masters who shared national qualities with modern Mexican artists. Couto insisted on this cultural continuity to reaffirm the historical significance of the colonial period as the formative moment of Mexican identity, in accordance with conservative political views.

With the opening of the old masters gallery in the Academy of San Carlos, the integration of the colonial past into Mexican history gained a solid material basis. However, to guarantee the correct reading and understanding of the 'metaphorical significance of the displayed work'¹⁵, in 1861 José Bernardo Couto turned to the new historiographical project, which resulted in the publication of his *Diálogo sobre la historia de la pintura en Mexico*. The analysis of this fundamental art historical text is the subject of the last chapter of this book.

Chapter four opens with an overview of the historiography of art produced from the colonial period to the mid-nineteenth century, before concentrating on the analysis of Couto's dialog. The author follows what is described as an "epistemological shift" regarding the perception and reception of images, from its early ekphrastic and performative uses in sermons and other literary genres, to the more formal and rational interpretations developed in the late colonial period and throughout the nineteenth century.¹⁶ This historical shift in perception is exemplified by the literature on the Virgin of Guadalupe, which even today is considered the most iconic religious image from the colonial period. The author shows how early texts hardly mention the physical or formal qualities of the sacred image, concentrating instead on the story of its performed miracles. In the late eighteenth century, however, the materiality of the image starts to gain importance. This late development can clearly be seen in Miguel de Cabrera's *Maravilla Americana* (1756), which describes the results of the expertise of prominent artists of the period on the authenticity and singularity of the Guadalupe image. As Hernández-Durán comments, 'The most fascinating aspect of this document is its contributors' attempt to prove its divine nature – an otherwise indefinable, ineffable quality – by addressing and qualifying the image's visual and material characteristics using contemporary academic criteria and historical references'.¹⁷

Finally, to characterize the immediate ecosystem within which José Bernardo Couto's dialog on colonial art was produced, Hernández-Durán resumes his discussions on the nineteenth century press introduced in chapter two, offering a closer analysis of the architectural descriptions that frequently figured in the pages of newspapers and magazines at the time. The detailed rendering of the monuments, through language and lithographic

¹⁴ *The Academy of San Carlos*, 89.

¹⁵ *The Academy of San Carlos*, 97.

¹⁶ Hernández-Durán relies on the distinctions between ekphrasis and interpretation proposed by David Carrier in his *Principles of Art History Writing* (Pennsylvania University Press, 1997) to describe the observed epistemological shift regarding the reception of images.

¹⁷ *The Academy of San Carlos*, 118.

reproduction, as well as the abundant historical and cultural information offered in these articles, consolidated and popularized a new form of relating to art. It also promoted a straightforward association between patrimony and nation also found in Couto's text. In many ways, therefore, Couto's book could be seen as a direct product of his time.¹⁸ However, Hernández-Durán argues that its singularity lies in the unique connection it maintained with the gallery of old masters installed at the Academy. He points out that the crucial interdependence of word and image is expressed directly in the text when Couto suggests 'that through the creation of a painting gallery, the history of art in Mexico could be seen and not just read, articulating a modern museological approach to cultural and historical representation'.¹⁹

Couto's *Diálogo sobre la historia de la pintura en Mexico* (1872) presents a conversation between three historical characters: the poet José Joaquim Pesado, the Catalan painter and instructor at the Academy at the time, Pelegrín Clavé, and himself. They meet in the gallery of the Old Mexican School during the process of its installation, and start a conversation that touches on central problems of art history, such as criteria for the selection of the pictures, their relevance as models for the students at the Academy, and their quality and significance for the history of Mexican art. At a certain point of the dialog the three scholars touch on the central issue of how to understand the developments of the arts in Mexico. They agree to delegate pre-Hispanic artefacts to archaeologists and historians, since those works did not meet the established criteria for art. As a consequence, the viceregal period was presented as the starting point of Mexican art history, designing a tripartite view of the historical developments in the region, that encompassed a pre-Hispanic, a colonial, and a modern period. The dialog proceeds by having the scholars inscribe the art exemplars present in the real gallery at the Academy within the newly designed historical framework, connecting and comparing the works with one another (and with great artists of the Western tradition) to develop a coherent narrative. Since the narrative was tightly connected to and exemplified by real works of art, it also resulted in the creation of a canon.²⁰

Summing up Couto's accomplishments, Hernández-Durán writes: 'By writing and publishing the dialog, Couto achieved a number of things: 1) he initiated the development of a modern canon; 2) he nationalized viceregal material; 3) he reinforced the emerging tripartite historical narrative: pre-contact indigenous state, European intervention, and modern nation; and 4) he modelled for Mexican citizens how to behave in a museum, and how to look at and talk about art.'²¹

The specific art historical account and canon established by Couto in his work in the gallery and in his book became a key reference for art historical writing in Mexico and elsewhere, determining much of today's approach to the field. As Hernández-Durán points out, Couto's dialog was reedited in 1947 by Manuel Toussaint, the founder of the Instituto

¹⁸ To emphasize this point, the author mentions another contemporary of Couto, Dr. Rafael Lucio Nájera, who equally writes a book on Mexican art in the colonial period. *The Academy of San Carlos*, 122.

¹⁹ *The Academy of San Carlos*, 123-24.

²⁰ 'The production of a canon is not an operation that can be carried out in thought alone. It requires the perceptual and special malleability of selected objects that can be (re)classified and viewed in relation to one another; only then are they resonant with the requirements of canon construction.' *The Academy of San Carlos*, 127.

²¹ *The Academy of San Carlos*, 128.

de Investigaciones Estéticas at UNAM, and in 1965 the art historian Xavier Moysén acknowledged Couto's influence by stating that 'After Couto, other art historians have repeated, more or less, what he said.'²²

Hernández-Durán's concluding remarks offer the reader a quick overview of the reception of colonial art during and in the aftermath of the Mexican Revolution. In the early twentieth century, the representation of *mexicanidad* was transformed through new narratives, associated with a renewed Mexican state, as can be observed in the writings of the anthropologist Manuel Gamio. The new political elite reappraised pre-Hispanic art, viewing it as the main source for the development of a national mestizo culture. In this context, the colonial period was identified with Spanish domination and repression, and generally devalued. Hernández-Durán argues, however, that this negative reception of the colonial period was balanced by a positive attitude towards colonial architecture, which was read as a product of *mestizaje*, and an index of indigenous evangelization. This more positive approach opened the opportunity for someone like Toussaint to focus on the study of colonial material, eventually founding an academic program dedicated to colonial art. Nevertheless, as the author concludes, 'As a consequence of the nationalistic identity politics of the early twentieth century, many Mexicans neither completely rejected their viceregal heritage nor fully embraced it. They instead expressed an ambivalent posture towards it.'²³

For scholars working in the field of Latin American art, one of the most difficult tasks is to deal with the huge gap that separates local scholarship from international – mainly North American and European – understandings of the field. The very concept of a "Latin American Art" as it stands today is perceived as inappropriate by most scholars working in the region, who strongly feel that local specificity is erased in the established narratives that structure the field internationally. Hernández-Durán's research suggests that a close examination of local historiographical traditions, and their contribution to the larger field of art history, could start building bridges between these two scholarly worlds. As the author argues, historiography can be used as critical tool to revise the history of the development of the field of Latin American art history, promoting insights about the political and ideological circumstances of its formation. This exercise could result in a profound revision of the canon that structures the discipline and promote a new, richer and inclusive understanding of what constitutes Latin American art history. In this respect, perhaps one of the weaknesses of the book is its concentration exclusively on a Mexican example, as this ultimately reiterates the central position Mexico occupies today within Latin American art history. For a revision of the prevailing narratives that structure the field, it might have been useful to look comparatively at less known, but still significant, generative centres of discourse on art in the nineteenth century. For example, Bernardo Couto's art historical account of the colonial period in Mexico is not, in fact, 'the first history of art in what today is understood as Latin America.'²⁴ Similar debates on the origin of a "Brazilian School" were ongoing in the Imperial Academy in Rio de Janeiro, leading Manuel Araújo Porto Alegre (a professor and future director of the Brazilian Academy) to publish his *Memória sobre a antiga*

²² *The Academy of San Carlos*, 127.

²³ *The Academy of San Carlos*, 140.

²⁴ *The Academy of San Carlos*, 81.

Escola Fluminense de Pintura in 1842, an account of the history of art in Brazil during the colonial period.²⁵

By looking at these parallel developments, we also begin to understand the centrality of art Academies for the production of art historical discourses in nineteenth-century Latin America. In this respect, Hernández-Durán's book could have profited from a more detailed examination of Couto's position within the Academy of San Carlos. As director, he was involved with the Academy in many levels, and one would have liked to know more about his alignments and misalignments within its theoretical and political landscape. We know, for instance, that the Old Mexican School gallery was not the only gallery created at the time. It was part of a larger project of renovation of the institution's quarters under Couto's supervision, a renovation which also involved, for example, the installation of a series of galleries designed to house the Academy's collections of plaster casts.²⁶ It would have been fascinating to hear about the place that colonial art history occupied within this larger museum project, and to understand how these multiple endeavours related to one another. In the same way, by privileging the connections between Couto and the conservative political elite, Hernández-Durán underplays the specific academic debates in his narrative. For example, in Chapter four (which looks closely at Couto's *Dialogo*) I would have liked to have a better picture of how this text related to broader traditions of academic writing, especially in Spain. This seems particularly relevant since Couto stages his dialog within the space of the Academy of San Carlos, and makes Pelegrín Clavé, the (Catalan) professor for painting at the Academy, one of his characters.

But none of these open inquiries are meant to distract from the quality of Hernández-Durán's work. On the contrary: a book can be considered excellent when it not only answers questions but also poses many new ones. Hernández-Durán's book is certainly one of these significant, generative contributions to scholarship. His capacity to connect detailed archival research to theoretical discussions in so many levels is admirable, and will be instrumental for future scholars, particularly those interested in Latin America.

Claudia Mattos-Avolese is Professor of Art History at the University of Campinas (UNICAMP), and board member of the Comité International d'Histoire de l'Art (CIHA). She holds a Ph.D. from the Freie Universität Berlin, and publishes primarily on nineteenth- and twentieth-century Brazilian art and art theory. Her recent essays include 'Geography, Art

²⁵ Manuel Araújo Porto Alegre, "Memória sobre a antiga Escola Fluminense de Pintura", *Revista do Instituto Histórico e Geográfico Brasileiro*, Rio de Janeiro, 1841. (<http://www.ihgb.org.br/rihgb/rihgb1841t0003.pdf>). For an analysis of Porto Alegre's text, see Leticia Squeff, "Quando a História Revisita a Arte: A Escola de Pintura Fluminense," *Rotunda*, n.1, 2003, 19-31. For the discussions about a modern "Brazilian School of art" in the Imperial Academy, see Leticia Squeff's recent book, *Uma Galeria Para o Império. A coleção Escola Brasileira e as Origens do Museu Nacional de Belas Artes*, São Paulo: EDUSP, 2012.

²⁶ For a discussion of the plaster cast galleries at the Academy of San Carlos see Elisabeth Fuentes Rojas, "Art and Pedagogy in the Plaster Cast Collection of the Academia de San Carlos" in: *Plaster Casts: Making Collecting and Displaying, from Classical Antiquity to the Present*, eds. Rune Frederiksen and Eckart Marchand (New York: De Gruyter, 2010). The book is included in Hernández-Durán's bibliography.

Claudia Mattos Avolese Historiography and the retracing of Latin American
art history

Theory, and New Perspectives for an Inclusive Art History', *Art Bulletin* (October 2014), and 'Existe-t-il un art brésilien?' *Perspective* (2/2013). At the moment Mattos-Avolese is a visiting scholar at the Department of the History of Art and Architecture at Harvard, working on a project on art and ecology in Brazil.



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/)