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In 1932 and 1933 The Metropolitan Museum of Art acquired three pieces of liturgical silver mistakenly thought to have been made in Spain. One of them, a gilded seventeenth-century silver monstrance (see Figure 11), bequeathed to the Museum by Michael Friedsam as a Spanish object, was eventually reassigned to colonial Mexico. However, research for the Museum’s 1990 Mexican exhibition cast doubt on this classification, and the monstrance was then tentatively reassigned to Peru, a change subsequently confirmed by Cristina Esteras, who presents her evidence in the preceding essay. My discussion is intended to illuminate the context in which her information is best understood and to amplify the significance of her discovery, which in effect identifies this monstrance as a “missing link” in the transmission of Spanish peninsular style to the Andean region and in the evolution of the Peruvian Baroque. However, it will be shown that the other two misattributed Hispanic pieces in the Museum’s collection do in fact originate in viceregal Mexico, or Nueva España (New Spain), as it was called before 1821.

Clear stylistic distinctions of origin for silver crafted in the New World could not, until recently, be easily made for objects produced in the first century of Spanish rule. Only with the blossoming of a local Baroque idiom very late in the seventeenth century did recognizable Mexican or Peruvian styles emerge. Only then did silversmiths begin producing objects or styles that aficionados associate with Spanish colonial silver. Some pieces were functional in purpose, including South American domestic implements—maté cups, sahumadores (domestic incense burners), and topes (large garment pins); others added a new, locally evolved aesthetic plumage to traditional religious objects, as in the fabulously wrought monstrances of Mexico and the Andean region.

Before this emergence of their own fully Baroque regional styles, the production of colonial workshops more nearly resembled silverwork made in the Iberian peninsula, exhibiting striking elements of Renaissance, Mannerist, and so-called Purist workmanship. As our understanding of artistic traditions has sharpened, many such examples of liturgical silver previously taken for Spanish have now been correctly identified as products of the Americas. Among the most notable of these recently identified objects are several mid- to late-seventeenth-century monstrances, a few of which are illustrated here (see Figures 7, 10, 12, 13). The correct placement of the Friedsam monstrance in their ranks has further amplified our growing understanding of the stylistic progress of Hispanic viceregal silver, from its origins as a colonial clone to its zenith as an independent offshoot—distinctive, eccentric, and often flamboyant.

Beneath its lavish sunburst “gloria,” or nimbus, surrounding the enclosure for the Host, the Friedsam monstrance reflects the austere Purist style that marked much Spanish silverwork of the first half of the seventeenth century, a uniquely Hispanic interlude between the Renaissance and the full Baroque. The sobriety of such work no doubt reflects the influential dourness of the Escorial, Philip II’s monastery/palace, where Purism first emerged as a full-blown Spanish architectural style in the mid-sixteenth century. In the world of silversmithing, Purism primarily affected processional crosses and so-called piezas de astil, a term that refers to objects with baluster stems, such as chalices, ciboria, and monstrances. These objects show their Purity, so to speak, through characteristically dynamic permutations and combinations of unworked geometric shapes—truncated cones, spools, molded vase forms—of swelling and contracting volumes and of bold contrasts of light and shadow. Although its earliest manifestations date to the last third of the sixteenth century and the reign of Philip II, it was only later, at the court of Philip III, that the Purist
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silver style reached its full maturity. It then spread to the Crown's outlying peninsular regions and its American viceregencies during the second quarter of the seventeenth century. Transported overseas by immigrant silversmiths, Purism was perpetuated by craftsmen of both Spanish and indigenous descent; 6 outside of Spain, aspects of the style lingered, intertwined with persistent Mannerist ornamentation, long after their popularity had waned in Europe.

At its most pristine—at court after about 1600 and throughout the rest of the Iberian peninsula from about 1625—Purism was a style purged of nearly all of the sixteenth-century ornamental repertoire. In place of old-fashioned embellishments, silversmiths introduced a highly restrained ornamental vocabulary in keeping with the new austerity. Applied enameled bosses accent the gleaming, gilded, smooth-surfaced baluster stems and bases, augmenting the chiaroscuro effect of the swelling and shrinking forms. On occasion, pointillé cartouches, C-scrolls, and framed panels, pricked with a chasing tool, contribute a ghostly, stippled texture, enriching the smooth-surfaced forms without mutating the bold articulation of the Purist volumes. Also on occasion, some of the simpler, more geometric elements of the Mannerist vocabulary, such as raised panels, ribs, and tight handlelike forms (which the Spanish call contrafuertes), were retained.

As their ornamental repertoire became simpler, many silversmiths abandoned the earlier, more labor-intensive hand techniques of chasing and embossing, as well as the exuberant and fantastic ornament of sixteenth-century Spanish Renaissance design and the intricate abstractions of Mannerism. In doing so, they surrendered the aesthetic language through which they had expressed their artistic personalities. Not only are individual styles of Purist silversmiths largely unidentifiable, but even their work is often hard to localize. Because of the lax enforcement of hallmarking in many parts of seventeenth-century Spain, it is often difficult to tell if something was produced in, say, Castile or Andalusia, much less in Mexico or Peru. 7

A paradigm of this intercontinental indeterminacy can be found in another Friedsam object, a gilded seventeenth-century Hispanic silver chalice with applied oval enamels (Figure 1). Even more than the Friedsam monstshape (Figure 11), it displays classic features of the early-seventeenth-century style, and for years the chalice has been exhibited as Spanish. In each of its parts, it is worked with slightly different systems of ornamen-

![Figure 1. Chalice. Mexican, mid-17th century. Silver-gilt with enamels, h. 27.1 cm. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, The Friedsam Collection, Bequest of Michael Friedsam.](image)

Figures 2, 3. Details of the chalice in Figure 1, showing indistinct Mexican marks of locality (Mexico City?): a crowned head (?) between pillars of Hercules (only one visible).
pounced cartouche designs frame the enamels on the knop and the foot but not on the cup itself. The enamels also differ slightly from one area to another. There seems to be little stylistic evidence of provinciality to indicate that this chalice was made in the Americas. Like many examples of this austere style, it fell victim to an assumption that categorized all Purist silver as Spanish, faute de mieux, an assumption that has been increasingly challenged by some recent scholarly discoveries.

Despite the fact that the Friedsam chalice bears fragmentary marks—on the foot and on the tang fitted into the spool-like element above the foot (Figures 2, 3)—which appear to indicate that it was made in Mexico City, a preliminary classification as Mexican was discarded in 1934, when the eminent Spanish scholar José Ferrandis apparently insisted on its peninsular manufacture. Nonetheless, the Mexican attribution is no longer surprising, as scholars continue to identify a considerable body of liturgical objects, at once technically refined and formally correct, originating in viceregal Mexico. Dating to the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, they are variations of Renaissance, Mannerist, and Purist models, indistinguishable at first glance from those produced in the motherland (Figure 4). Among the Purist pieces from New Spain are several versions of the type exemplified by the Friedsam chalice (Figure 5).

Also among these Mexican pieces are a number of monstrances with enamel-decorated baluster stems, such as the example from Tepotzotlán (Figure 7), generically related to peninsular examples, such as the one in the Victoria and Albert Museum (Figure 6). Some eccentric Mexican examples also loosely resemble the Friedsam monstrance, which may explain in part why this slightly-too-elaborate-to-be-Purist object was also believed to be Mexican. The other reason for the failure to identify the Friedsam monstrance as Peruvian is that, unlike their Mexican contemporaries, Peruvian silversmiths rarely appear to have marked their wares.


Figure 5. Chalice. Mexican, ca. 1670. Silver-gilt with enamels, h. 28.7 cm. Mexico City, Museo Franz Mayer
Accordingly, the identification of liturgical silver produced in Peru had long been confined to the flamboyantly Baroque works, most still in Peru, dating from the eighteenth century, when the Peruvian national style had fully evolved.\textsuperscript{16}

This extravagant body of work, however, does not present a complete picture of the silver produced in Peru. As a further complication in the study of Hispanic silver, it is necessary to realize that a great deal of earlier, in many cases more conservatively styled, seventeenth-century viceregal silver from all over Latin America did not remain in its birthplace, having experienced a sort of reverse mi-

---

Figure 6. Monstrance. Spanish, about 1620. Silver gilt with enamels and crystals, h. 35 in. (89 cm.). London, Victoria and Albert Museum, Alfred Williams Hearn Gift (photo: Victoria and Albert Museum)

Figure 7. Monstrance. Mexican, ca. 1650–75. Silver-gilt with enamels, h. 65 cm. Tepotzotlán, Mexico, Museo Nacional del Virreinato (photo: Suter/Almeida)
gration from America to Europe. Many objects found their way back to Spain as gifts of peninsular expatriates, the gachupines who formed the bulk of the political, administrative, or ecclesiastical hierarchies in the colonies and who would customarily present to their native parishes objects reflecting the vast riches of the overseas empire on which Spain’s prosperity depended. Over the course of time, the sources of their gifts were forgotten and the pieces languished, unregarded and unrecognized by scholars, undistinguished from their peninsular cousins, in the treasuries of cathedrals and parish churches located in outlying regions of Spain. Many such gifts have now been studied and identified as Mexican or Peruvian in origin through an analysis of style, marks, inscriptions, and archival documents. Together with material still in America, this evidence makes up a newly defined and still growing corpus of material that has significantly enriched our knowledge of the Baroque (not only in Mexico but also in the Peruvian centers of Lima and Cuzco) and our understanding of the international flow of ideas that influenced this style.17

Of particular relevance to the Friedsam monstrance has been the rediscovery of a range of Peruvian monstrances (Figures 10, 12)18 distinctly less ornate than the types previously held to be standards of the Baroque style (Figure 13). The Friedsam monstrance, once considered Mexican for lack of any parallel pieces from Peru, may now be seen as a link between these recently identified late-seventeenth-century pieces. Its firm association with a Lima provenance not only suggests the production of comparatively “uninflected” silverwork in Peru as early as the mid-seventeenth century but also establishes the early presence in Peru of nascent design elements that would come to characterize the numerous, more obviously Peruvian monstrances of the full Baroque. As a transitional work,19 the Friedsam monstrance helps chart the evolution of distinctly Mannerist and Purist peninsular motifs into stylistic hallmarks of the Peruvian Baroque monstrance style, a style that was less truly Baroque than an accretion and explosion of Mannerist detail and Purist form.20

The Friedsam monstrance displays in embryo
many of the characteristic tendencies and forms of embellishment that were eventually codified in Peru. Thus, in addition to the severe underlying structure of its Purist stand and the voluted buttresses appended to the shaft (a Mannerist survival also typical of Spanish Purist silver), a number of its quasi-Purist ornamental elements are more elaborate than in their traditional peninsular counterparts. The applied champlevé enamel plaques, for example, already show the ornate outlines characteristic of the efflorescent Peruvian Baroque. Also notable are the projecting foliate-scroll “handles” that protrude downward from the base of the gloria and the set of four earlike beaded “handles” curving upward in the middle of the shaft. This striking eruption of peculiarly organic and flamboyant sprouts appended to the ribbed knop of the monstrance anticipates the profusion of delicate and airy projections that came to encage monstrances in Cuzco and Lima during the later Baroque.

These scrolled handle forms are among several features on the Friedsam monstrance that have led Dra. Esteras to pronounce it a more evolved work by a goldsmith who crafted another monstrance in Embid de la Ribera, Zaragoza (Figure 10). While the square bases of the two monstrances—with
incurved, truncated pyramids, similar ball-and-foliate-scroll feet, and a similar disposition of applied enamels—are virtually identical, indicating the same craftsman, the Zaragoza piece lacks the numerous projecting handles that link the Metropolitan Museum's monstrance to later Peruvian examples. Another forward-looking element that appears more prominently on the Friedsam monstrance is the series of naturalistic leafy scrolls supporting the lacy gloria. Most suggestive of all is the elaborate, enameled rayed gloria itself, which dominates and nearly overwhelms the sober structure below.

The elaborate sunburst provides the most striking point of comparison with the Embid monstrance. The finial-tipped scrollwork of the Embid gloria looks to the past and may be construed as a descendant of late Renaissance/Mannerist works, such as

---

Figure 12. Monstrance. Here called Peruvian, last quarter of the 17th century. Silver-gilt with applied plaques of blue enamel, h. 52.1 cm. On the art market, London, 1989. (photo: © 1989 Sotheby’s, Inc.)

Figure 13. Monstrance, attributed to Luis de Lezana. Peruvian, Cuzco, ca. 1690. Silver-gilt with enamels, h. 70 cm. Santander, Spain, Cathedral
those by Cristóbal Beccerril and his followers in Cuenca (examples now in London, Requena, and Chicago) (Figure 8). But even more, in its clear-cut design of double cruciform axes, the form of the Embid gloria resembles the alternating patterns of finial-crowned scrolls and tablets engraved on Spanish patens and salvers of the early seventeenth century (Figure 9), patterns hardly ever adapted to peninsular monstrances in the seventeenth century.

By comparison, the gloria of the Friedsam monstrance, while not devoid of these links to Mannerist style, appears far more evolved, not so much truly Baroque as an accretion of Mannerist details. Although its glittering fretwork still falls a bit short of the uniform effect conveyed by later fully Baroque Peruvian examples, its composition is more diffuse and edges further into the future than does the clearly articulated Embid piece. The underlying Mannerist formalism of the Friedsam monstrance is also clearly enlivened by a freer incorporation of naturalistic foliage. Thus its gloria (although descended from a type already out-of-date in Spain) constitutes a nearly mature version of the extravagant aureoles that would eventually become a trademark of the Peruvian Baroque.

A comparison between this Peruvian example and one of the contemporary Mexican monstrances with which it was once confused (Figure 7) shows how even at this stage Peru was developing a taste different from Mexico's. Although Mannerist and Purist styles dominated seventeenth-century monstrance production in both regions, they developed in different directions virtually from the start. The specific areas in which their distinctive approaches are displayed—the glorias, the bases, the massing of the elements, and the general outline—forecast the wider divergences of the eighteenth century.

The lacy roundels that constitute the signature of Peruvian monstrances differ from the conventional form of the "sol" in mid-seventeenth-century Mex-

Figure 14. Rafael Jimeno y Planes, Spanish (ca. 1757–1825; to Mexico, 1794). Portrait of the Silversmith José María Rodallega, after 1794. Oil on canvas, 113 x 83 cm. Mexico City, Collection of Felipe Siegel, Anna and Andrés Siegel (photo: The Dallas Museum of Art)

Figure 15. José María Rodallega, Mexican (1772–1812). Chalice. Marked by Antonio Forcada, assayer 1790–1818. Mexico City, dated ca. 1795. Silver with silver-gilt cup, h. 24.5 cm. Mexico City, collection of Isaac Backal (photo: Suter/Almeida)
Figure 16. Chalice. Mexican, ca. 1795–1800. Silver-gilt, h. 24.1 cm. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Bequest of Alphonso T. Clearwater. 1988.98.120.68a

Figure 17. Detail of the chalice in Figure 16, showing three marks on the foot: crowned M, flying eagle, and FCDA (Antonio Forcada y la Plaza, Assayer, Mexico City, 1790–1818)

Mexico, where goldsmiths adopted the Spanish taste for a simple burst of alternating straight and wavy rays (often tipped with jewels). The emphatically four-square base, a type often encountered in Seville, also points toward the variant ultimately embraced in Peru, where monstrances are generally set on square bases and raised, most frequently, on paw feet. Although square bases were not unknown in Mexico, even by the middle of the seventeenth century taste in the northern viceroyalty was favoring the circular or octagonal pedestals that became customary in eighteenth-century Mexico. In addition, Mexican seventeenth-century monstrances tend to present a more solid appearance; wide, flattened ribs and scrolled appliqués adhere more closely to the body of the piece, and the individual Purist forms of the shaft are themselves composed in a denser, more compacted manner than in Peru.

The enamels on the Friedsam monstrance also exhibit a taste for the formal variety that proliferated as the Baroque style matured in Peru, evolving beyond the rhomboidal and obelisklike shapes still predominant here into undulating forms with florid, scalloped outlines and naturalistic patterning. In contrast, the enamels on most Mexican silver continue to follow earlier peninsular style: they are colored versions of the self-contained Mannerist oval bosses of the sixteenth century. Conservative Mexican craftsmen regularly applied these ornaments through the end of the century, long after the fashion had died out in Spain, much as they continued to indulge the taste for densely chased Mannerist strapwork ornament on many objects.

The grip of the sober Purist style eventually relaxed even in the Americas, and by the early eighteenth century effervescent regional variations of the Baroque had begun to emerge there. In Mexico
embossing returned with a vengeance to enliven curvaceous Baroque forms, including those of monstrances, with a profusion of ebullient, florid decoration.26 In eighteenth-century Peru as well, dense carpets of raised ornament cover the buoyant surfaces of many types of silver objects. Peruvian monstrance design, however, continued along the path set in the seventeenth century. The underlying geometric shapes of earlier times, reiterated, bedecked with scrolling projections, and occasionally embossed with foliate patterns, continued to survive in Lima and Cuzco. Beneath an overlay of Baroque ornament, the ghost of Mannerism lingered on.

Toward the middle of the eighteenth century, the mature Baroque styles of Mexico and Peru were once again subjected to the imposition of imperial standards as new European tastes encroached. When the Bourbon monarchs shattered the insularity that had marked Spain under Hapsburg rule, the overseas empire was likewise exposed to alien influences, influences somewhat less strictly mediated by Spanish prototypes than in the seventeenth century. First the spirit of the French Rococo and then the various waves of Neoclassical style made their inroads, and American artists were stimulated to formulate their own responses to the new stylistic currents sweeping across international frontiers.

The result may be seen in yet another previously misidentified silver object in the collection of the Metropolitan Museum, a silver-gilt chalice bequeathed by Alphonse T. Clearwater in 1933 (Figure 16). Although Judge Clearwater, whose collection consisted primarily of North American colonial silver, believed this chalice might have been English, curators here correctly recognized its Hispanic style but mistook its marks inside the base molding (Figure 17) for those of Madrid. In fact, they are three of the marks regularly applied to silver by the chief assayer of Mexico City between 1790 and 1818, Antonio Forcada y la Plaza,27 and this chalice can be seen to represent a significant moment in the transition between the last phases of viceregal style—the moment when the flamboyant Mexican Baroque was finally ground down by international academic classicism.

In 1789, the newly arrived Spanish viceroy Revilla-gigedo declared that apprentice silversmiths as well as practitioners of the fine arts would be required to attend drawing classes at the recently founded Academy of San Carlos, established to teach the international modern Neoclassical style to the painters and architects of the “retrogade” provinces. Even silversmiths who matured before the imposition of this academic instruction eventually fell in with the new style. The famed José Maria Rodallega (1741–1812), known primarily for his work in the Rococo style, chose to be portrayed by the Valencian painter Rafael Jimeno y Planes at work on a commission designed in the new mode. The flaring conical foot of the piece is densely embossed with wreathed medallions (Figure 14).

The model shown in the painting, however, while popular in peninsular Spain well into the nineteenth century,28 appears to have found less favor in Mexico, where “transitional” silver tended to follow the pattern of early Louis XVI style, represented by the foot of the Clearwater chalice (and in much of Rodallega’s own transitional work) (Figure 15). The style’s classicizing pastoral ornament included delicate naturalistic garlands of ribbons and flowers, rosettes, and laurel wreaths, all superimposed on curvaceous Rococo bodies. Typical of the late Rococo in New Spain, the doubly curved, bell-shaped form of the Clearwater chalice is embellished with crisply faceted and polished spiral pleats. Also, typically, a touch of creeping Neoclassicism appears: between these swirling ridges are wide panels showing pendant bouquets that displace the sinuous cartouches of the high Rococo style.

Standing in sharp contrast to the syncopated rhythm of the foot, however, the upper portion of this piece embodies the standard formula for the Mexican Neoclassical chalice, a compilation of simple forms embellished with even bands of repetitive pattern. The cup’s flattened bowl, in this case chased with radiating lanceolate leaves, is joined to a smoothly flaring lip by a vertical band, here graced with a motif of twisted ribbon. The typical circle of silver beading around the cup itself (called “pearls” —perlas—in Spanish descriptions, although more luxurious examples occasionally feature diamonds or other jewels) is left ungilded, in austere contrast to the gilded body. The cast stem, with its simple drum-shaped knob, is of a type encountered on countless other chalices of the era (Figure 18).29

Such a combination of Rococo and Neoclassical features might suggest a pastiche, a cobbled together of disparate upper and lower parts, were it not for the clearly classical resolution effected by the circular molding at the very base of the chalice foot, which further diminishes its Rococo effect. Rather than following the mixtilinear30 profile generated by the pleated bell, as is typical with this form in Mexico (Figure 15), the lowest edge is purely circu-
lar, bearing quatrefoils arranged in a continuous diaper pattern, a classicizing motif repeated in miniature on the lowest molding of the stem itself.

The Clearwater chalice, its rocaille-curved foot dominating an otherwise up-to-date design, displays in a particularly vivid manner the persistence of the Rococo in Mexican liturgical design. It makes clear that stylistic lags in Spain's overseas empire, in the sixteenth century as in the seventeenth, resulted less from a lack of awareness of new modes than from a deeply conservative positive attachment to the old ones, once-new modes that had been thoroughly assimilated and converted, on some level perhaps, experienced as emblems of regional identity.

NOTES

1. Dated, on the basis of its inscription, to 1649; the numeral 9 is scratched over the final digit of the date, which originally read 1646.

2. By 1943, according to internal Museum records, it had been reclassified as Mexican, in comparison with a monstrance said to be Mexican, 1655, in Santo Domingo de la Calzada, published by Manuel Romero de Terreros, Las Artes industriales en la Nueva España (Mexico City, 1923) p. 33. A number of losses have somewhat diminished the complexity of the Friedsam monstrance. On the sunburst itself only one of the finials that originally terminated in alternate rays survives, a loss that affects the composition's articulation and structural organization. In addition, the corners of the base also apparently bore superimposed mounts, presumably foliate scrolls, which would have curled up over the top surface of the foot, as indicated by the holes pierced in each corner and intended for the pins that would have fastened them.

3. These two categories constitute the majority of objects drawn from Peruvian collections in Three Centuries of Peruvian Silver: Objects from the Viceroyalty Through Early Independence, exh. cat., Smithsonian Institution and MMA (Washington, 1967–68). See also A. Taullard, Platería sudamericana (Buenos Aires, 1941), and J. A. Lavalle, Platería virreinal: Colección artes y tesoros del Perú (Lima, 1974), again drawn exclusively from South American collections.


José Cruz Valdivinos (Catálogo de Platería del Museo Arqueológico Nacional [Madrid, 1981]) distinguishes three major styles that flourished during the final decades of the 16th century, all contained under the rubric of Mannerism. The first of these styles, of Italian origin, is marked by elaborate figured-relief ornament, of which hybrid grotesques form the most prominent feature; the second, also ultimately Italianate, features more abstract surface ornament exemplified by interlace strapwork patterns derived via imported Flemish design books from the school of Fontainebleau; the third is distinguished by an even greater tendency toward architectonic structural simplification and narrowly defined areas of formal ornament.

Dra. Esteras applies the term Mannerist to works in the 17th-century style, as well as to earlier works. María del Carmen Heredia Moreno (La Orfebrería en la provincia de Huelva [Huelva, 1980] 1, pp. 75–85) outlines the difficulties with this imprecise usage, proposing that there are distinctions in the way silver was conceived before and after 1600. She sees "Mannerism" as a broad phenomenon that encompasses widely varied tendencies and that in silver is signaled by the use of cartouches and enameled bosses. She calls the period in which the first element dominates "Late Renaissance," inasmuch as it derives from Fontainebleau and includes a strong contingent of Renaissance elements; she terms "Purist" the later period (1600–50) in which enamels dominate. We have followed her in this distinction, assuming that an ideal form of Purism exists despite its frequent melding in practice with earlier forms of decoration.

5. See Oman, The Golden Age, for a discussion of links between Herreran architecture and Hispanic silver style.


7. In fact, however, silver was more consistently marked in Mexico than in Castile itself during this era; Oman, The Golden Age, pp. xxxi–xxxiv. For a recent discussion of the absence of marking in Seville, see José Cruz Valdivinos, Cinco Siglos de Platería Sevilla [Seville, 1992] pp. lxxiii–lxxvi.

8. At some point in its history, perhaps when provided with a new bowl, the upper segments of the chalice (from the knop upward) were filled and attached together in a way that precludes easy disassembly. This may account for the failure of the parts to align properly.

9. An early note on its catalogue card refers to a similar mark identified as Mexican in P. M. Artiñano y Galdácano, Catálogo de
la Exposición de Orfebrería Civil Española (Madrid, 1925) p. 85. Since that time there has been much more extensive publication of Mexican marks (see note 11 below), but the marks on the Friedsam chalice, although of the general type indicating locality on silver from New Spain, are too fragmentary to identify with any specific published examples.

10. It now seems clear that this form of mark was not used in Spain. The chalice was published as Spanish by Ada Marshall Johnson (Hispanic Silverswork [New York, 1944] p. 101, fig. 80), who noted its enamel bosses as a sign of the increasing trend toward ornamentation as the style evolved.


12. Identified as probably from Mexico City, 1650–75, by Cristina Esteras in MMA, Mexico: Splendors of Thirty Centuries, exh. cat. (New York, 1989) cat. no. 175, p. 402, and idem, “Platería virreinal,” cat. no. 38, pp. 202–203. Illustrated are other comparable Mexican monstrances now in Spain, one in Castromochico (Palencia) dated 1634 (cat. 30, pp. 186–187) and another in Higuera de la Real (Badajoz), ca. 1662, cat. 42, pp. 210–211.


15. Most Mexican monstrances are stylistically more subdued than the one in Santo Domingo de la Calzada illustrated by Romero de Terreros, note 2 (first published by Anselmo Gascone de Gotor, El Corpus Christi y las custodias procesionales de España [Barcelona, 1916] p. 122, pl. 18), which appears to have originally prompted the Mexican attribution of the Friedsam example. This piece, however, has recently been called Peruvian by Carmen Heredia Moreno, La orfebrería en la provincia de Huelva, II, p. 290.


18. The monstrance shown in Figure 12, here identified as Peruvian, was sold at Sotheby’s, London, April 20, 1989, lot 273, as Spanish or South American.

19. The earliest (1646) dated monstrance to be identified as Peruvian (by Heredia Moreno, “Problematica de la orfebrería,” pp. 342, 346) is in Portuguese (ill. J. Ybarra y Berge, Catálogo de monumentos de Vizcaya [Bilbao, 1958] p. 194, pl. 261); it shows no signs of its regionality.

20. Heredia Moreno (“Problematica de la orfebrería,” p. 344) formulates the analysis of Peruvian Baroque as an accretion of Mannerist form and detail on an archaizing structure rather than the organically linked development of voluptuous form and detail that characterizes the Baroque in Europe.


22. Fernández et al., Encyclopaedia, pp. 470–471. This circular motif was also current in Mexico on salvers and alms plates. See Lawrence Anderson, The Art of the Silversmith in Mexico 1519–1936 (New York, 1941) II, figs. 84, 85.

23. See José Manuel Cruz Valdivinos, Cinco Siglos de Platería Sevilla, exh. cat., Real Monasterio de San Clemente (Seville, 1992) cat. no. 58, pp. 96–98, for a monstrance made in Seville in 1619, presented to a parish church by a wealthy Vizcaíyan merchant family with extensive American ties. Seen as a major prototype of the Peruvian monstrance form in its square, truncated pyramid base, etc.

24. It seems likely that such scrolling foliate enamels did, in fact, also once augment the corners of the Friedsam monstrance (see note 2).

25. In Peru it appears that the enamel plaques tend to be pinned to the silver base, while in Mexico they are set into soldered rims.

26. Many entirely plain objects show the Baroque spirit only in their rhythmically curving outlines.

27. The crowned M is said to resemble a mark illustrated in Pedro de Arquínano y Galdácano, Catálogo de la Exposición, p. 84. Two crowned M marks are there identified as Madrid marks, but one appears to be a 19th-century Murcia mark (Fernández et al., Encyclopaedia, p. 182, nos. 864–868), and the other must in fact be Mexican. The simple crowned M (without the profile head or pillars of Hercules) came into use in Mexico in the late 18th century. Variations of this mark were employed by Forcada, as illustrated by Fernández (pp. 506–508, nos. 1719–1738), who also shows similar makers’ marks and variations of the flying eagle in the flat octagon. These are also illustrated in Anderson, The Art of the Silversmith in Mexico, I, p. 349. The upper portion of the crowned M in the MMA chalice is unclear but is close to that shown in Anderson’s mark 11. The flying eagle is that of his mark 12.


30. From the Spanish mistilino, originally an architectural term employed to describe an arch of broken outline, often of alternating pointed and lobate forms.