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This thesis establishes the connection between painting and performance as crucial for understanding eighteenth-century representations of the historic marriage of the Inca ñusta (princess) Beatriz Clara Sairitupac and her Spanish husband Martín García Óñez de Loyola. During the eighteenth-century, the marriage was repeatedly commemorated through both paint and theatrical performance as part of the mythologization of the early history of the Viceroyalty of Peru. My study addresses the only two paintings known to remain in their original locations: the Compañía de Jesús in Cuzco and the Beaterio de Nuestra Señora de Copacabana in Lima. I analyze both paintings in conjunction with corresponding theatrical performances to demonstrate how representations of the historic marriage drew audiences into a dynamic and forceful partnership with an idealized view of history.

The first painting and performance were commissioned by the Jesuit order in Cuzco, the former capital of the Inca empire. In contrast, the painting and performance in Lima were commissioned by indigenous nobles in the viceregal capital city dominated by Spanish and criollo society. Both social groups, the Jesuits in Cuzco and the indigenous nobility in Lima, claimed to be symbolic heirs of the Inca and Jesuit union. The Jesuits in Cuzco traced their connection to Martín, who was the nephew of San Ignacio de Loyola, the founder of the Society...
of Jesus. They represented the marriage as a means to bolster their local authority and management of the land granted to the descendants of Beatriz and Martín. For the indigenous elites in Lima who sought to increase their rights and privileges as nobles, the familial union of Inca and Spaniard symbolized the equality of Spanish and indigenous nobility. They celebrated Beatriz as the last member of the Inca royal line at Vilcabamba and united behind an inclusive interpretation of the Inca as a symbol of pan-indigenous nobility.
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INTRODUCTION

Picture a family gathering that never happened: a mother, father, daughter, son-in-law, uncles and grandparents celebrate the alliance of the Incas and the Jesuits. The scene is the marriage of the Inca princess (or ñusta in Quechua) Beatriz Clara Sairitupac to a Spanish noble, Martín García Óñez de Loyola, nephew of the founder of the Jesuit order. The marriage took place in 1572 in Cuzco, Peru, but it was not depicted until over a century later. At the turn of the eighteenth century, the scene was reproduced in several paintings (fig. 1 and 2). Repeatedly commemorated through both paint and theatrical performance, the union became a central cultural trope in the later narration of the early history of the Viceregal era in Peru.

The paintings and performances of this familial scene were commissioned by communities that could claim only distant genealogical ties to the family. Aiming to assert local authority or noble privilege by associating themselves with figures in the scene, different social groups played on the role of portraiture in articulating aristocratic families’ claims to noble lineage in the early modern Spanish world. Even without direct lineage, different eighteenth-century social groups positioned themselves as descendants of the various identities included in the painting. Some of these same communities also commissioned theatrical works as corroborating forms of official memory that reinforced their claims of authority as represented by the individuals in the marriage scene.

My analysis traces how this single historical episode, the marriage, was represented through painting and public theater by two different constituencies in two cities in eighteenth-century Peru: the predominantly European Jesuit community in Cuzco and the indigenous nobility in Lima. Of the multiple extant paintings of the marriage, the two paintings examined in this study are the only two known to remain in their original locations: the Compañía de Jesús in Cuzco and the Beaterio de Nuestra Señora de Copacabana in Lima. Those primary contexts allow us to better examine each works’ commission, display, and viewership. Further, differences between the two lead to the question: how did two distinct social groups in two different cities each depict the same historical union through two different media? The answer to this question is grounded in the historical contexts of the paintings and performances.

The first half of this thesis examines the connection between the painting and performance commissioned by the Jesuit institution dominated by criollo nobles in Cuzco, a historically indigenous city. The analysis begins with the first representation of the family, a painting hung in the church of the Compañía de Jesús, the primary Jesuit church prominently located in Cuzco’s main plaza (fig. 1). The painting illustrates Beatriz and Martín with their respective Inca and Jesuit forebearers, particularly highlighting Martín’s connection to his uncle San Ignacio de Loyola, the founder of the Society of Jesus. The couple’s daughter, Ana María, and her husband are also present, even though both Beatriz and Martin died during her childhood. By anachronistically picturing family members from multiple generations together, the Jesuit commissioners of the painting sought to visually tighten the genealogical connection between the order and the Inca line. This first painting shares both purpose and physical proximity with a theatrical reenactment of the same subject that took place in the Compañía in 1741.
To analyze the theatrical event of 1741, I rely on a description written by the eighteenth-century criollo Diego de Esquivel y Navia in his chronicle of Cuzco. He writes that the scene composed of live actors corresponded with the painting of the marriage in the Compañía. The Jesuit orchestrators of the performance took a scene rendered in paint and made it flesh. The representational repetition was staged during a crucial historical moment regarding prized agricultural lands in the Yucay Valley owned by the remaining descendants of Beatriz and Martín and administered by Jesuit priests. In an attempt to highlight their regional authority, the Jesuit order in Cuzco reified the shared family history through performance. By connecting the rhetorical conceit of the painting and performance with the contentious Yucay Valley property, I propose a narrowed date range for the creation of the painting as between 1735-1741.

The second half of the thesis addresses the representations of the marriage organized by indigenous nobles in Lima, a city dominated by Spanish and criollo society. Here the focus is on a painting housed in the Beaterio de Nuestra Señora de Copacabana in Lima, home of a tertiary order of Franciscan indigenous women who chose to live a semi-cloistered life of religious devotion (fig. 2). To situate the painting in Lima’s Beaterio de Copacabana, I turn to the treatment of the marriage found in a contemporary theatrical manuscript produced in Lima. The dramatic work was commissioned by the indigenous cabildo in Lima and written by the criollo playwright Fray Francisco de Castillo y Tamayo (1716-1770) for the 1748 celebration in Lima of Fernando VI’s proclamation as the new king of Spain.

In Lima, the family and dynastic history of Beatriz and Martín took on a different meaning. In both painting and performance, the native nobility in Lima adopted the imagery of the historical family to advocate for their own rights and privileges. For the indigenous nobility, Inca descendants or otherwise, recalling this family helped them bolster the relevancy of their
own noble ancestry to strengthen their claims to privilege in the Viceroyalty of Peru.\(^2\) The metaphor of the painting shifted from representing genealogical authority and order in the Cuzco region to emphasizing the historical prestige of the indigenous nobility throughout the former Inca empire. The marriage painting offered an important and useful example from which to draw political and cultural authority from the pre-colonial royalty while simultaneously displaying Catholic devotion and loyalty. The broad constituency of Lima’s multi-ethnic indigenous nobility strategically coalesced as a unified body of noble “Inca.”

Considering these multiple evocations of the same historical union in two distinct geographical and social circumstances, I trace how these multiple paintings and performances influenced the viewer’s understanding of and relationship to the history of the Viceroyalty of Peru. Representations of the historical marriages of this single family drew audiences into a dynamic and forceful partnership with history. Both paintings and performances effectively wed a fictional scene from the past with the viewers of the present. This past operated as a malleable allegory that used historical figures to advocate for utopic visions of the future in which either the Jesuit order or the indigenous nobility, or both, consummated their privileged authority under Spanish rule.

\(^2\) Dean, *Inka Bodies*, 98.
HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The cultural works I examine excise the history of violent conflict between the Inca and the Spanish. The tranquil figures in the paintings conceal certain historical realities. In fact, the marriage between Beatriz and Martín was the resolution of decades of Inca resistance to Spanish rule in the southern Peruvian highlands. Much of the conflict surrounding the family line began long before Beatriz’s birth and revolved around a fertile piece of land in the Yucay Valley near Cuzco. The familial connection to this land began with Beatriz’s great-grandfather Huayna Capac, the Inca who developed Yucay as a royal estate. Huayna Capac died in 1524 prior to the arrival of the Spanish in Peru. After his death, his sons Huascar and Atahuallpa fought a civil war of succession. Atahuallpa won only to be taken captive by the Spanish and executed in 1533.

After Atahuallpa’s death, another brother, Manco Inca (Beatriz’s grandfather), was recognized as the Sapa Inca by the Spanish until he led an uprising against them. He retreated to the Yucay Valley and finally to Vilcabamba, where he declared political and cultural independence from Spanish viceregal authority, founding a “Neo-Inca state.” Francisco Pizarro

4 After Huayna Capac died in Quito, his body was carried to Cuzco and then to the Yucay Valley where his mummy was to stay. R. Alan Covey and Christina M. Elson, “Ethnicity, Demography, and Estate Management in Sixteenth-Century Yucay,” *Ethnohistory* 54, no. 2 (April 1, 2007): 307.
6 Covey and González, *Imperial Transformations*, 25.
took Yucay as his personal *encomienda* in 1539.\(^7\) The Pizarro family held on to the Yucay possession until Gonzalo’s defeat in 1548, at which point the Spanish crown assumed ownership.\(^8\) In 1544, while the Pizarros still controlled the Yucay *encomienda*, Diego de Almagro supporters assassinated Manco Inca.\(^9\) After the death of Manco Inca, Beatriz’s father Sayri Túpac succeeded him as the Inca in Vilcabamba.\(^10\)

Importantly for later generations, Sayri Túpac was a keen negotiator: in 1557 he pledged loyalty to Philip II in exchange for the right to re-assume ownership of the Yucay Valley.\(^11\) When Sayri Túpac died in 1561 his infant daughter Beatriz inherited the title to all those lands.\(^12\) While still a child in Cuzco, Beatriz’s uncles ruled Vilcabamba in succession: first Titu Cusi Yupanqui (from 1563-71), then Túpac Amaru (from 1571-72). After years of ongoing conflict, negotiation between the Incas at Vilcabamba and Spanish authorities deteriorated. Viceroy Francisco de Toledo (1515-1582) ordered an attack on Vilcabamba in June of 1572. Martín García Óñez de Loyola, in his role as captain of the guard for his uncle Viceroy Toledo, led the chase after a fleeing Túpac Amaru. After the successful capture, Toledo arranged Martín’s marriage to young

\(^7\) Francisco Pizarro appointed the Cañari leader don Francisco Chilche to oversee the land. The Cañari come from Ecuador but had been living in the Yucay valley as laborers since Huayna Capac’s reign. The Cañaris supported Huascar against Atahuallpa and allied themselves with the Spanish to fight against the Inca in Vilcabamba. See Covey and Elson, “Ethnicity, Demography, and Estate Management,” 315.

\(^8\) Covey and Elson, “Ethnicity, Demography, and Estate Management,” 308. After Francisco Pizarro’s death in 1541, his brother Gonzalo managed his estate and lived off the income from the Yucay encomienda. Gonzalo was defeated in 1548, but the profits continued to support Pizarro’s children who were exiled to Spain. Pizarro’s children who benefit from Yucay estate also had Inca princesses as mothers. See Covey and González, *Imperial Transformations*, 24.

\(^9\) Covey and González, 25. For the conflict between the Almagros and the Pizarros see Gonzalo Lamana, *Domination without Dominance*.

\(^10\) Covey and González, 25.

\(^11\) Covey and González, 25.

\(^12\) Ibid., 25.
Beatriz as a reward. The couple was married, and Beatriz’s uncle Túpac Amaru was beheaded.

Viceroy Toledo granted the couple the possession of the repartimientos and right of primogeniture of the Yucay Valley. The couple also sought legal action to claim 250 additional tribute workers in the Yucay Valley. This petition was grounded in Beatriz’s rights under the Spanish legal system, rather than Inca hereditary practices. Her claim to the tributary laborers was based on the repartimiento given to her father under the Spanish system, not out of indigenous fealty to Beatriz as the great-granddaughter of Huayna Capac. Neither Beatriz or Martín lived to see the case settled, but the court eventually ruled in favor of their only child, Ana María. As part of the ruling, the Yucay estate became the Marquisate of Oropesa and Ana María gained the title of the first Marquesa of Oropesa.

---

16 Covey and Elson, “Ethnicity, Demography, and Estate Management,” 311,
17 Covey and Elson, “Ethnicity, Demography, and Estate Management,” 311.
18 Ibid.
19 Ibid., 312. Covey and González, Imperial Transformations, 30. King Philip III established the Marquisate of Santiago de Oropesa under the influence of the house of Borja. Timberlake, 455. For the first comprehensive treatment of the marquisate see Lohmann Villena, “El Señorio de Los Marqueses de Santiago de Oropesa,” 5–116.
The paintings omit any trace of historical conflict. Instead, they illustrate only a tranquil marriage scene. Túpac Amaru sits placidly on a throne in the upper left corner, without hint of his protest or his violent end. The image’s eighteenth-century origins in Cuzco account for the visual suppression of violence and the prominence of the Jesuit order.
PART I:

CUZCO

Both Spaniards and Incas (by blood or by right) in the vice-regal city of Cuzco took pride in the city’s prestige as the former capital of the Inca empire and recognized the Inca as a symbol of the city’s preeminence.\(^{20}\) Although the indigenous population was never a homogeneous group in the viceroyalty in general, nor within the city of Cuzco itself, indigenous families “became” more Inca during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, through aristocratic symbols, vestments, and pageantry.\(^{21}\) Within a Spanish system that privileged Inca nobility, Cuzqueños (and indigenous elites throughout the viceroyalty, as evident in the following chapter) benefited in performing indigeneity and nobility in a way that Spanish authorities could recognize and understand.\(^{22}\) While indigenous nobility elevated their elite status through their association with the former authority of the Inca empire, they also served as political leaders and religious stewards of the general indigenous population.\(^{23}\) Thus, the Spanish religious leaders of Cuzco and missionaries throughout the viceroyalty had a vested interest in establishing close relationships with indigenous nobility and provincial leaders.


\(^{21}\) Garrett, 80.

\(^{22}\) Dean, 164.

The Jesuits and the indigenous elites found allies in one another, as the Jesuits advocated for indigenous rights and indigenous leaders helped promote Catholicism. In the early seventeenth century, Viceroy Francisco de Borja y Aragón, prince of Esquilache, a descendent of the Jesuit San Francisco de Borja, founded two schools for the sons of native nobility: San Francisco de Borja in Cuzco in 1619 and Príncipe in Lima in 1620. Both schools were Jesuit. The foundations in educational mission sought to cultivate the students’ own noble identity. Pupils wore Inca-inspired uniforms, while the decoration of the building included invented Inca heraldry and its halls displayed portraits depicting past Inca rulers.

The Society of Jesus fostered local community bonds in an effect to insert the Order within the local political structure. Globally, the Jesuit evangelization efforts relied on the ability to adapt their teachings to the specific social and cultural needs of a community. This cultural “accommodation” was developed in practice, if not as an explicit theory. Historian Jeffery Muller characterizes the order’s evangelical success as the fruit of two main strategies. First, Jesuit missionaries prioritized local language acquisition. Second, they captivated their

---

25 Chang-Rodríguez, 89. Francisco de Borja was married and had several children prior to joining the newly formed Society of Jesus after his wife’s death. See John O’Malley, *The First Jesuits* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1993), 72.
26 In the mid-eighteenth century, over twenty sons of Inca nobles and caciques attended the colegio de San Francisco de Borja. Garrett, *Shadows of Empire*, 84.
29 Such as the capability to preach and take confession in local vernaculars and contribute to the creation of dictionaries and grammars. Muller, “The Jesuit Strategy,” 461.
audiences with engaging multi-sensorial performances. Throughout Latin America, those performances were adopted to the particular locations and audiences. In one sixteenth-century performance in Lima, Jesuits unearthed indigenous mummies to populate a macabre scene in the theatrical performance of a play titled Historia alegorica del Anticristo y el Juicio Final. While not all performances were quite as intense, they were still an effective tool for converting and influencing their audiences.

In addition to purely theological performances and imagery, the Society of Jesus in Cuzco also invested in a re-telling of Peru’s evangelization—that is the colonization process. As Luis Eduardo Wuffarden contends, the Jesuits designed “a complete reinvention of the Andean past.” For the celebration of the beatification of Ignacio de Loyola in 1610, indigenous groups carried out secular performances of history. The Cañari and Incas reenacted battles and Inca descendants impersonating historical Inca rulers paraded through the city. They reframed the marriage of Beatriz Clara Sairitupac and Martin García Óñez de Loyola as a symbol of Jesuit authority in the region and strategically focused attention on this union by commissioning several painted renditions.

The first painting created of the subject is located in the Jesuit church in Cuzco. Construction of the Iglesia de la Transfiguración, currently referred to as the Iglesia de la

seventeenth century, the Jesuit Diego González Holguín published a Quechua-Spanish dictionary and grammar.
30 Muller, 463.
31 Susan P. Castillo, Colonial Encounters in New World Writing, 1500-1786: Performing America (New York: Routledge, 2006), 42.
32 Inca Garcilaso de la Vega describes the actors and themes of the performances organized by Jesuits in Comentarios Reales from 1609 and 1617. See 1, bk. 2, ch. 28, 127. Chang-Rodríguez, Hidden Messages, 33.
33 Wuffarden, 189.
Compañía de Jesús began in 1576. A major earthquake destroyed the church in 1650, and it subsequently underwent a rebuilding and redecoration.\(^{35}\) In 1668, the church celebrated its consecration and the installation of the Eucharist, relics, and art works such as a polychrome sculpture of San Ignacio de Loyola, the founder of the Jesuit order, and a series of lunettes illustrating the cycle of his life.\(^{36}\) The secular painting of the marriage of Beatriz and Martín is located in the sotocoro, the area beneath the choir balcony at the entrance of the church. It is one of the first images that viewers see as they enter the building.\(^{37}\) The viewer leaves the public plaza of Cuzco to enter a Jesuit precinct. Inside, the viewer is met with a view of history on Jesuit terms.

i. CUZCO:

Painting in the Compañía de Jesús

The painting depicts an ahistorical path, a mythic Jesuit utopia.\(^{38}\) It reorients the narrative of the marriage of Beatriz and Martín to that of the Jesuit order by emphasizing Jesuit branches in the family tree. In a collapse of historical time, two important Jesuit leaders stand between the two couples at the center of the composition, with Beatriz and Martín to the left and their daughter, Ana María, and her husband, Juan Enríquez de Borja, to the right. The Jesuit on the left

---

\(^{35}\) Post-1650 rebuilding efforts were headed by Jesuit priest Juan Bautista Gillis called Egidano from Ghent, Flanders. See Timberlake, 295-296.


\(^{37}\) Timberlake provides a reading of the painting in relationship to the other paintings that surround it. The marriage painting hangs adjacent to an image of San Ignacio defeating the Heretics, which Timberlake interprets as a parallel for Martín’s defeat of Túpac Amaru and Inca pagans. Timberlake, 315-318.

\(^{38}\) Tom Cummins describes the painting as: “a vision of utopia inhabited by historical figures.” Tom Cummins, “A Sculpture, a Column, and a Painting,” 374.
is San Ignacio de Loyola, the founder of the Society of Jesus and Martín’s uncle. The Jesuit on the right is San Francisco Borja, an early member of the order who was canonized in 1670 and the great-grandfather of Juan Enríquez de Borja. Thus, this next generation of the prominent family tree united the Inca nobility with the Jesuit order for a second time. By uniting the houses of Loyola and Borja, foundational families for the Jesuit order, with the last lines of the Inca nobility, the Jesuits positioned themselves as the rightful heirs to the Inca empire.

Stationed at the center of the composition, the two Jesuit patriarchal forebears preside over the couples. They lend their sacred authority to the two marriages. Their presence argues implicitly that the marriages were sanctioned not only by the Jesuit order, but by its original founders. The Society sanctifies the converging genealogy that unites the members of the central group. The union of the Inca rulers with the Jesuit order appears seamless and inevitable. Figures from across time and space converge on a single stage beneath the glowing emblem of the Society of Jesus. In the anachronous setting, family members represent entire traditions of faith, institutional power, and dynastic authority. Their union affirms the universality of the Jesuit order, including their power in the Cuzco region.

The left side of the painting presents Beatriz’s Andean ancestry. Her uncle Túpac Amaru sits between her parents, Sayri Túpac and Cusi Huarcay. The ancestral trio appears in front of a geometric architectural structure whose broad appearance echoes the Compañía de Jesús in Cuzco. Unnamed princes and attendants stand around them. The entourage of theatrical figures or stage-hands that emphasize the theme of aristocratic Andeaness. Behind the seated figures, a

---

39 Timberlake contends that place is identified as the Compañía de Jesús by its escudo. See Timberlake, 31.
dwarf holds a feathered parasol, a motif that connotes the privilege of Inca royalty.\textsuperscript{40} The parasol of tropical bird feathers emphasizes Beatriz’s family as indigenous, while simultaneously announcing the nobility of the seated figures relative to the lower socially-ranked attendants. A second dwarf squats at the leftmost edge of the painting holds a parasol that extends out of view. Two more small indigenous figures occupy the lower left corner. One blows a conch shell while the other appears in profile, facing the center of the composition. That figure rests a hand on the cartouche bearing a written description of the central figures. These two figures also remain unnamed and serve to draw attention to the dignity of the painting’s principal actors. The conch shell aurally heralds their presence while the profile and gaze of the other figure directs the viewer’s eye toward the next nearest figures, Martín and Beatriz. The cartouche’s lengthy text reiterates the scene for any literate viewers.\textsuperscript{41}

While the left side of the painting is dedicated to Beatriz, the right side is dedicated to her daughter. On the right, a bishop conducts the marriage ceremony of Ana María and Juan Enríquez. The ceremony is depicted as if in Spain where they married. Between these two scenes, Ana María and Juan Enríquez appear twice. Raised between Cuzco and Spain and illustrated here in both locations, Ana María represents the convergence of the roots of her two parents. I agree with Anna Ficek that this painting aimed to reproduce the social significance of Ana María’s birth and instruct viewers in the Jesuit’s familial ties to the Inca empire.\textsuperscript{42}

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{40} Timberlake, 219.
  \item \textsuperscript{41} The Jesuits strategically chose painting rather than text to tell the story of the marriages for an illiterate audience. See Gisbert 153-157; Timberlake, 28.
\end{itemize}
As Beatriz and Martin’s only child, Ana María was of paramount importance for the continuation of the family line. She was a crucial actor in securing the property, prestige, and future of the family, as her biography will reveal. Before turning to her activity in the Cuzco region, her role in the painting merits additional examination. Her role as daughter and painted subject is best understood through the words of seventeenth-century Spanish painter and theorist Francisco Pacheco.

Pacheco proposes that art is like reproduction of offspring in the natural world. He wrote:

“… just as nature […] ordered that there be children, so that in them, as in identical portraits, the brevity of life be extended, and the limited become perpetual and shining in everyone’s view, in the same manner the art of painting ordered that images be painted of things so that in them lay figure and similitude, and their memory be perpetuated and its knowledge and notice extended.”\(^{43}\)

Pacheco asserts that both painting and children contribute to the endurance of the memory of the subject they represent. Paintings represent people, objects, or historical events, as children represent their parents. The Matrimonio painting is, of course, a painting, and functions in accordance with Pacheco’s theory. According to Pacheco’s comparison of paintings and children, its star figure is certainly Ana Maria. The Matrimonio paintings offer us three generations, each progressively symbolizing their parentage. Thus, Beatriz represents the Inca royal line into which she was born while Martín represents his Jesuit forebearers. The union of Beatriz and Martín endures through their daughter, who extends “the brevity of life” of her parents by symbolically signifying all that their marriage represented to the Peruvian audience. In the body of Ana Maria, the memory of her parents became “perpetuate and shining in

\(^{43}\) Translated by Bass quoting Pacheco, 65-66.
everyone’s view,” as Pacheco suggests it does in all children and in all portraits. In the genealogical painting, the viewer understands each successive generation through their offspring.

A similar concept is at play in a portrait of the genealogy of the Spanish monarchy from around the same date as the genealogical painting of Inca and Jesuit marriages. Laura Bass has shown how the portrait of *Charles II Surrounded by Images of His Ancestors* from 1670 (fig. 3), attributed to Sebastián Herrera Barnuevo, stresses dynastic continuity through a series of portraits within the portrait, picturing Charles II’s monarchical antecedents and family members as well as ties to the other Catholic dynasties illustrated by his sisters’ husbands. Likewise, the portrait in the Iglesia de la Transfiguración stresses dynastic continuity established with Beatriz’s forebears and transferred to the following two generations of daughters (Beatriz and Ana María) in order to bolster the Jesuit authority through their unions, even though the Jesuit figures themselves were not monarchs.

Both paintings also asserted the legitimacy of their subjects in the face of unease. In the case of the portrait of Charles II, the genealogical function of the portrait worked to legitimate the authority of the weak young boy who struggled to fulfill the expectations required of a king. The anxiety surrounding the king’s abilities proved legitimate, as he died without an heir, naming the Bourbon Philip of Anjou as his successor, which instigated the War of Spanish Succession. In Peru, Ana María’s presence proved contentious during her lifetime and her image still held symbolic weight at the turn of the eighteenth century, when the group portrait celebrating the marriages was painted.

---

44 Bass, 77.
Following the death of her parents (in 1598 and 1600), the young orphan Ana María moved to Spain.⁴⁵ There, she married Juan Enríquez. When the couple travelled to Peru in 1615, Ana María’s presence in the Yucay Valley was not welcomed by local interests.⁴⁶ Viceroy Francisco de Borja y Aragón, prince of Esquilache, who was Juan Enríquez’s first cousin, feared that the unique privilege of the first Marquesa of Oropesa would elicit social unrest among Cuzqueño families with claims of Incan nobility.⁴⁷ He attempted to recall the couple to Lima and requested that the king summon them to return to Spain.⁴⁸ Clearly Ana María’s noble title and unique genealogical position wielded power within the social climate of the viceroyalty during the first half of the seventeenth century. The couple returned to Madrid in 1627 and, from then on, their descendants controlled the Yucay Valley from afar.

Ana María’s significance evolved over the century as she came to symbolically represent the “Hispanicized Peru.”⁴⁹ By the end of the century, she had transformed into a symbol well-suited to represent the interests of both the Jesuits and sectors of the Andean elite, who each saw her as a distinguished and important member of their families. The lucrative endowment of the Yucay Valley likely contributed to the Jesuit interest in Ana María. In 1711, the Marquisate of Oropesa had passed into the hands of Ana María’s great-grandson, don Pascual Enríquez de Cabrera y Almansa, Marques de Alcañices and Marques de Santiago de Oropesa (c.1682-1739). Pascual Enríquez appointed the rector of the colegio of the Compañía de Jesús to oversee the Yucay repartimiento.⁵⁰ When he died in January of 1739, his sister, María de la Almudena

---

⁴⁵ Covey and González, *Imperial Transformations*, 30.
⁴⁶ Timberlake, 417.
⁴⁷ Lohmann Villena, “El Señorio de Los Marqueses de Santiago de Oropesa,” 433.
⁴⁸ Ibid.
⁴⁹ Ficek, 45.
⁵⁰ Lohmann, 443.
Enríquez de Cabrera, became marquesa. She too continued to entrust the Jesuits with her property.\(^1\) Administration of Yucay brought in significant revue for the Jesuits and their tie to the property may suggest a post-1735 date for the painting in the Compañía in Cuzco.\(^2\) The reference to the marqueses in the cartouche in the lower left-hand corner supports this dating.\(^3\) If the post-1735 date stands true, the painting presents two cases in favor of the Jesuits as authorities in the Cuzco region. The first is the union of the Inca and Jesuit bloodlines illustrated through the body of Ana María. The second is their alliance with her descendants and involvement in the Yucay Valley.

Furthermore, the importance of the Yucay estate also comes to the fore as a possible instigation for the second Jesuit treatment of the marriage: the theatrical rendition in 1741. The Marquisate of Oropesa reverted to the Crown with the death of the heirless Marquesa at the end of July 1741.\(^4\) Only two and a half months later, a short time considering the transatlantic time

---

\(^1\) Lohmann, 443. Records specifically name two Jesuit priests Simón Fuster and Juan Esteban de Celayarán as having full power over the administration and property of the Marquisate.


\(^3\) The text concludes: “Con este matrimonio [de Ana María y Juan Enríquez] emparentaron entre sí y con la real casa de los reyes yngas de Peru las dos casas de Loyola y Borja cuya sucesión esta oy en los exmos sres marquestes de Alcanises grandes de primera clase.” Trans.: “With this marriage [of Ana María and Juan Enríquez] they linked together the royal house of the Inca kings of Peru with the two houses of Loyola and Borja, whose succession is today in the honorable lords of the Marquesas de Alcañices, grandees of the first rank.” English translation my own.

\(^4\) Neither Pascual nor María had any children. Following the end of Beatriz’s family line, a genealogical dispute over who deserved right to the land began in 1742 and continued throughout the entire eighteenth century, contributing to the 1781 rebellion of Túpac Amaru II. Jesuit involvement in the litigation is not apparent in the surviving records. Covey and González, *Imperial Transformations*, 30. Timberlake, 443. Soler Salcedo, Juan Miguel. *Nobleza Española Grandeza Inmemorial 1520* (Madrid: Editorial Visión Libros, 2012), 291.
lag of information, the Society of Jesus in Cuzco organized a tableau vivant of the marriage painting. This performance symbolically exhibited Jesuit authority in the Yucay Valley and highlighted the order’s family ties to the late Marquesa of Oropesa.

ii. Cuzco:

Performance in the Compañía de Jesús

The few remaining clues regarding the live re-enactment of the marriage exist in a chronicle of the city of Cuzco written by Diego de Esquivel y Navia. He writes that, “a representation of the marriage of Martín García Loyola and the daughter of Felipe Tupac Amaru,”55 was performed in 1741 on October tenth, the day of San Francisco de Borja, who himself is pictured in the painted version. The feast day presented an apt occasion to assert the Jesuit ties to the Inca family line that ended months prior with Beatriz’s great-great-great-granddaughter. The liturgical celebration called attention to the relationship shared between the Society of Jesus, the historical Inca family, the city of Cuzco, and its noble indigenous denizens.56

While Esquivel’s description of the performance is brief, the few details that he does include reveal some of the elements of the event regarding the importance of genealogy, the interpretation of history, and the audience’s experience. First, Esquivel names the actors who played Martín and Beatriz. He identifies each only by their first name and the identity of their

55 “…una representación del casamiento de don Martín García Loyola, y la hija de don Felipe Tupac Amaru” in Diego de Esquivel y Navia, Noticias Cronológicas de La Gran Ciudad Del Cuzco (Lima: Fundación Augusto N. Wiese: Banco Wiese, 1980), 43.
56 Garrett, 88.
father. Pedro, the son of don Gabriel Arguelles, played Martín and Narcisa, the daughter of an unnamed cacique, played Beatriz.\(^5\) Mentioning the fathers of the actors exposes the continued importance of family lineage in establishing identity.

Notably, Esquivel gets the family history wrong. He mistakes Túpac Amaru as Beatriz’s father rather than her uncle. This simple historical blunder reveals how closely Beatriz was identified with Túpac Amaru. Through their close association in the painting, and likely in the performance as well as popular recounting of the history, the genealogical distance between Beatriz and her uncle shrunk. The name and story belonging to Túpac Amaru resonated more profoundly with eighteenth-century Peruvians than that of Beatriz’s biological father, to the point that her uncle symbolically usurped the role of patriarch. By referencing Narcisa’s father by his position as cacique but not by name and falsely naming Beatriz’s father as Túpac Amaru rather than Sayri Túpac, Esquivel overlooks the specifics of indigenous individuals, both contemporary and historic, to craft a simplified interpretation of history. Esquivel’s version of the history simultaneously emphasizes the importance of familial lineage and disregards the distinguishing facts of Túpac Amaru’s resistance to Spanish control in the Cuzco region. The redaction glosses over Túpac Amaru’s execution in the plaza just outside the front door of the Compañía.

Esquivel also includes a few clues that help reconstruct how the spectacle was staged within the church. He names two of the notable figures in attendance: the Corregidor of Cuzco and the Marqués de Valle Umbroso. Those men, Esquivel notes, entered from the sacristy without accompaniment to be seated in their designated seats. This comment, however trivial it may seem, affirms that important members of the audience participated in the theatricality of the

\(^5\) Esquivel y Navia, *Noticias Cronológicas*, 43.
event. Important figures in effect performed as themselves, blending the pomp of the event with the past of the historical reenactment. 58

Esquivel’s attention to the audience resonates anthropologist Victor Turner’s assertion that, “Ritual, unlike theatre, does not distinguish between audience and performers.” 59 In a real Catholic marriage ritual, the act of watching, of observing, constitutes a crucial action for the completion of the marriage sacrament. The gaze renders the viewer complicit. It makes them an actor. If they do not agree with the partnership, or possess information that would nullify the marriage, they are obliged to interject and stop the ceremony.

In the context of the Viceroyalty of Peru, a Catholic marriage ceremony functioned as a socially controlled event that required audience participation through a “communal act of surveillance,” notes Tom Cummins. 60 In reducciones, forced relocation settlements, marriage rituals were performed before the entire community. 61 Prior to the marriage ceremony, the priest would hold three masses during which he would address the entire indigenous community and inquire about the degree of kinship between the couple, encouraging community participation in policing one-another regarding the Catholic laws of consanguinity. 62 Cummins states that such, “ritual performance standardizes and thereby disciplines and orders diverse pre-Hispanic social practices…” within the context of a tightly controlled and surveilled environment of the colonial

58 Esquivel does not name the cacique in attendance at the performance, which “suggests that not all in Cusco conceded to the Incas the standing they sought.” Garrett, 82.
61 Cummins and Rappaport, 227. See also González and González, Christianity in Latin America, 85-86.
62 Cummins and Rappaport, 228.
In this social environment, audience participation fulfilled an integral part of the marriage sacrament.

The prominence of audience participation in the sacrament following the Council of Trent shaped how seventeenth and eighteenth-century viewers experienced and understood the sacrament of marriage across a variety of contexts. In the Andes, the crucial role of the audience would have been on the minds of Catholics, from rural parishioners and the curates who oversaw them to the high-ranking institutional leaders of the religious orders in Cuzco and Lima. While Beatriz and Martín were married in Cuzco, not in a reducción, the eighteenth-century viewers of their marriage reenactment would have recognized their position as witnesses to the sacrament.

Performance theorist and theatrical director Richard Schechner offers insight on the question of audience. His analysis of integral and accidental audiences helps elucidate how the experience of an audience attending a marriage ritual differs from how Cuzqueños might have responded to the spectacle held in the Compañía. Schechner suggests, “The best way to understand the relationship between ritual theater – such as initiation rites, marriage ceremonies, funerals, etc. – and aesthetic theater is to appreciate the variety of roles the audience plays.” He draws a distinction between two categories of audiences: integral and accidental. Schechner defines an integral audience as “necessary to accomplish the work of the show” and attends a performance out of requirement or special significance, such as the family of a bride and groom, critics at a premier, or political dignitaries present at the signing of treaties. An accidental

---

63 Cummins and Rappaport, 220.
64 For a seventeenth-century Peruvian treatment of the subject see Juan Pérez Bocanegra, Ritual formulario, e institucion de curas (Lima: Geronymo Jerónimo de Contreras, 1631).
66 Schechner, 195.
audience is what we might consider a general viewer who voluntarily attends the show. No particular accidental audience member is crucial for the existence or success of the performance. The integral audience determines a performance as ritual, while the accidental audience determines it as aesthetic. Schechner clarifies that these two types of audiences can intermingle and that a performance can be both ritual and aesthetic.

The spectacle that took place in the Compañía on October 10, 1741 involved both aesthetic and ritual theater. The audience functioned as both “accidental” and “integral” as they simultaneously enjoyed the wonder and spectacle of the live actors and their uncanny correlation with the painted image and symbolically participated in the marriage ritual through their gaze. The viewer’s status was “doubled” as they first watched an aesthetic representation of a historic ritual, and second when they suspended disbelief to enter into the performance of that ritual as an integral part of the audience of community members needed to administer the sacrament. Per Hans-Georg Gadamer, the viewer engaged in the seriousness of play. Likewise, Schechner asserts: “…only during live performances do artists and audiences co-create together in exactly the same time [and] space.” Thus, the 1741 audience-members in the Compañía, both distinguished and unnamed, played themselves. The doubled audience actively performed their own roles as complicit witnesses to the historical marriage sacrament and to history. They affirmed their acceptance and support of their current colonial circumstances which were a result of that history. Consistent with the evangelical theater that began in the preceding centuries, the

---

67 Schechner, 195.
69 Schechner, 203.
performance concluded with a mass.\textsuperscript{70} At that point, the audience transitioned from a hybrid accidental-integral audience to a purely integral body of viewers required for the existence of the Catholic mass and the raison d’être of the Jesuit church.\textsuperscript{71}

In his chronicle of Cuzco, Esquivel acknowledges the relationship between the performance and the painting of the marriage located within the same space. He notes that the performance “conformed with what was found painted in a painting at the entrance of the said church.”\textsuperscript{72} In other words, the painting acted as a mirror for the performance. Beatriz and Martín, embodied by the actors identified by the chronicle as Pedro and Narcisa, looked at Beatriz and Martín in the painting. The painting looked back, witnessing its own reflection in the flesh. The painting likely resembles the performance more than it does any historical event. The figures portrayed in the painting were separated by decades and oceans. They never met in real life, as they did through the actor’s dramatic representation in 1741.\textsuperscript{73} Additionally, the background of the painting looks much more convincing as a theatrical set than it does a real geographical location. The shallow, disproportionately small buildings are raised on a multistep platform. Behind them, solid ground drops off abruptly and a hazy cityscape hangs flatly in the distance. This is neither Cuzco nor Madrid; it is a fictional square constructed in paint to stage two partnerships that occurred on either side of the Atlantic.

\textsuperscript{70} Esquivel y Navia: “Siguiose la misa con sermo; con que se dio fin a la fiesta.” See also Chang-Rodriguez, Hidden Messages, 33.

\textsuperscript{71} Notably, Schechner argues that “By and large, the accidental audience pays closer attention than does an integral audience.” Schechner, 195. Although the audience likely took pleasure in marveling at the actor’s sumptuous costumes and comparing them to the painting by the door, they likely failed to critically reflect on the implications of their role as audience members and sacramental witnesses.

\textsuperscript{72} “…conforme se halla pintado en un cuadro que está a la entrada de dicha iglesia.” Esquivel, 43.

\textsuperscript{73} Recall that neither Beatriz nor Martin lived to see Ana Maria past the age of seven.
Even though the creation of the painting preceded the 1741 performance, I suggest that the concept of illustrating history based off theatrical productions should not be entirely out of the question. As Laura Bass notes painters Juan Bautista Maíno and Diego Velázquez did just that. *The Recapture of Bahia* (1634-35) and *The Surrender of Breda* (1634-35) were both based on stage productions authored by Lope de la Vega and Caledrón de la Barca of the historical events which had occurred ten years prior.\(^4\) Whether or not the painter of the historical scene in the Jesuit Compañía in Cuzco was intentionally referring to theatrical representation, I argue that the interconnectedness of the flat painted image and the live three-dimensional performance is crucial for understanding the how the audience experienced each representation.

The choice of the word *representation* used in the chronicle to describe what the actors did that conformed to the painting at the entrance of the church substantiates this point. The word “representation” does not privilege one media over another. Instead, it posits them as equivalents. Two early modern Spanish dictionaries do the same through two different means. The first, from 1674, defines the verb *to represent* (*representar*) as “to enclose another person within oneself as if they were the same, to follow them in all their actions and rights, as a son represents the person of the father.”\(^5\) This definition parallels Pacheco’s assertion that portraits and children functioned similarly in their representation of a person (the sitter or the parent).

\(^4\) Bass, 4-5.

\(^5\) “Representar, es encerrar en si la persona de otro como si fuera el mismo, para sucederle en todas sus acciones, y derechos, como el hijo representa la persona del padre.” Translation is my own. Sebastián de Covarrubias Orozco, *Tesoro de La Lengua Castellana, o Española* (Madrid: Melchor Sanchez, 1674), 160, http://archive.org/details/tesorodelalengu00covauoft. Recall that when naming the actors and the personas they adopted for the performance, Esquivel named the actor’s fathers and confused the identity of Beatriz’s father, displaying a perspective of kinship that emphasizes the link between parent and child while discounting the individual. Here too, the dictionary diminishes the child’s individuality to bolster the continuity of the familial identity through the patrilineal line.
Like painted portraits, the actors fully embodied the people they represented. The actors Narcisa and Pedro suspended their own identity to become one with Beatriz and Martín. The parallel between the effect of painting and performance is also expressed in a 1737 dictionary, which defines *representar* as “to make something present in words or figures . . . / to recite a history or tragedy in public, pretending to be the real people, or to be an image or symbol of something or to imitate it perfectly.” Following this definition, both representations, the painting and the performance, rendered Beatriz and Martín present in the Jesuit church over a hundred years after their deaths. The second part of the definition includes the significance of the audience’s role by requiring the recitation to take place in public, that is, with an audience.

On October 10, 1741, the audience moved easily between two representations, participating in both. Laying eyes on the painting, a representation of an ahistorical “past,” the viewer saw a two-dimensional sort of vision that anticipated the imminent performance. Notably, the painting’s location within the church guarantees that the audience would view the painting prior to the performance. The painting is historical, not devotional, and so it is not hung at an altar but rather in a liminal area marking the transition from the outside to the inside of the church. It is the first image that a visitor glimpses as they enter. Thus, on October 10, 1741 the painting greeted each audience member with a vision in two dimensions of what they would soon see recreated live and in three dimensions. When the actors entered and the figures of the painting stood live before their audience, they carried the marriages of the past into the present. On that day, history was re-enacted on multiple planes and the audience performed multiple

---

76 “Hacer presente alguna cosa, con palabras o figuras…/ recitar en público alguna historia o tragedia, fingiendo sus verdaderas personas/ ser imagen, o Símbolo de alguna cosa, o imitarla perfectamente.” Translation is my own. *Diccionario de Autoridades*, vol. 5 (Madrid: Francisco del Hierro, 1737), 584.
roles. Almost two and half centuries separated the 1741 viewer from the event of the historical marriages, but standing in the Compañía, the viewer foresaw the past painted in two-dimensions and then lived in it in three during the performance. They looked, watched, listened, and gave their consent as witnesses to a marriage performed in paint and in flesh.

Paintings are meant first and foremost to be looked at, however, under certain circumstances, paintings (and particularly portraits) can invert the subject-object dynamic to serve as watchful observers or even as actors. As Laura Bass describes, a painted portrait occasionally played the active role of the Spanish king during events that he could not attend in person. One such occasion was the 1622 proclamation ceremony in Lima announcing Philip IV as the new monarch. For the event, a full-length portrait of Philip sat on a canopy-covered throne in Lima’s Plaza Mayor. Bass connects the portrait substitution to the role that the king’s physical body played within the theater. She writes, “The theatrics of power staged around the portrait of the king in real life was in many ways mirrored in the theater itself.” Bass explains that when attending a performance in both the Real Alcázar or at the Buen Retiro, the king sat under a canopy, as his portrait did in Lima’s plaza. As Bass compares:

“…arrival and departure from the theater was conducted with the same ritual formality with which the king’s portrait was carried to the throne set up for the proclamation ceremony in Lima’s Plaza Mayor. Once seated, the king did not move more than his eyes; he became his own living portrait.”

While viewing a theatrical production, the king (in this case, Bass refers to Philip IV) is both audience and spectacle. The portrait of the king in the case of the proclamation in Lima is at once

---

78 Bass, 81.
79 Bass, 81.
painting, audience, and actor. Within the marriage paintings, the Inca royal family assumes the place of the king seated under their canopy-like parasols on the dominant left side of the painting. Like Philip IV, they play the part of both audience and spectacle.

Instead of directing their gaze toward the central figures, the Inca dynasts stare outward toward the viewer as the viewer looks back at them. Their presence testifies to their historical importance as the last stewards of the Inca empire. Their tranquil expressions reaffirm the Jesuits at the center of the composition as the righteous new leaders of the Cuzco region. The eighteenth-century painting pictures celebrates the Jesuit (Spanish) triumph before an audience of dynastic Inca witnesses. And yet, looking Túpac Amaru in the eye today reminds us that it is against a backdrop of the violent conflict and then tenuous union between Inca and Spaniard, of evangelical theater, and of marriage ritual as instrument of social control, that the Society of Jesus organized an aesthetic performance that sought to reproduce and represent the specific historical ritual that wed the Inca princess with the Spanish captain and joined the two bloodlines in holy matrimony.
PART II:

LIMA

The second portion of this paper turns to Lima to observe another painting of the historic couples and for the celebration of another Spanish monarch’s arrival to the throne. Lima, the political capital of the colonial viceroyalty, did not share the same history that Cuzco embodied. Whereas Cuzco had been a bastion of Inca imperialism, culture, and monumental stone architecture, Lima, first named the City of Kings (Ciudad de Los Reyes) by its Spanish founders, was the center of vice-regal bureaucracy and Spanish society. In 1535, purely geographical reasons guided the Spanish in choosing the plot of land that would become their colonial capital with access to both river and harbor.\textsuperscript{80} Without prominent cultural or structural features to contend with, Lima sprouted up according to plan, following a gridded design and featuring ostentatious buildings constructed from expensive imported wood.\textsuperscript{81}

Although the political center of power shifted to Lima during the colonial era, Cuzco remained a cultural capital, exporting literature and visual art. \textsuperscript{82} Cuzco maintained the historical

\textsuperscript{80} Cummins, 159.
\textsuperscript{81} Cummins, 159, 163-4.
\textsuperscript{82} Cummins, 166.
prestige as the capital of Tawantinsuyu, the Inca empire, while Lima boasted the viceregal court and the seat of the archbishop. The cities competed culturally, which was sometimes expressed through the extravagance of their citywide celebrations. A publication from 1748 documenting the festivities of Lima celebrating Fernando VI’s royal proclamation, declared that the city’s preeminence was as central to the Spanish empire as the Earth was to the universe.

If Lima was the center of the Spanish empire, then how did the social order within the city reflect the macrocosm? On the surface, all aspects of city life were definitively organized under Spanish control. However, the Spanish population did not comprise the majority of the city’s inhabitants. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, almost half the population of Lima was of African descent. There was also a substantial indigenous population including curacas who came from the northern coast, from various valley communities, and from Cuzco. The indigenous population was relegated to segregated schools, monasteries, and other social organizations. However, the indigenous nobility argued for the right to enter and participate

---

84 Jouve Martín, 205.
85 “En este Imperio, pues, de las delicias es Lima lo que la Tierra respecto del Universo, porque es el centro, y la Capital del Perú, que es el mejor de sus Dominios, y la que preside à quanto es Colonia venturosa de la España…” original text from José Antonio Manso de Velasco, ed., El Día de Lima. Proclamation Real, Que de El Nombre Augusto de El Supremo Señor D. Fernando El VI, Rey Catholico de Las Españas, y Emperador de Las Indias, N.S.Q.D.G. Hizo La Muy Noble y May Leal Ciudad de Los Reyes Lima, Cabeza de La America Austral, Fervorizada a Influso Del Zelo Fiel, Del Cuydadoso Empeño, y de La Amante Lealtad (Lima: n.p., 1748), 78, http://archive.org/details/eldiadelimaprocl00mans. Quote also referenced by Jouve Martín.
88 Wuffarden, 230.
fully in Spanish institutions. The *real cédula* of 1693 had teased Inca descendants with the permission to be granted the full privileges of nobility without providing any means of enforcement.\textsuperscript{89} Yet, this possibility of dissolving the boundaries between the Spanish and indigenous republics “provoked an explosion of personal and collective revindications,” which were supported in solidarity by mestizos and criollos.\textsuperscript{90} Indigenous nobles of various origins and affiliations united for common social interests and developed a narrative of shared history revolving around the visual and literary symbol of the Incas to support their common agenda.\textsuperscript{91}

The native nobility adopted the imagery of the marriage of Beatriz and Martín to represent their own history and illustrate their rights as nobility through historical basis, modeled after the Jesuit commissions in Cuzco. Yet, as Cummins reminds us, “The differing colonial nature of Cuzco’s and Lima’s public spaces called for different interpretive acts by the colonial viewer. These spaces were not… neutral theaters of display; rather, each city’s walls, streets, and plazas manifested in their very appearance and material substance the different histories (and meanings) of colonization.”\textsuperscript{92} The representations of the historic marriage in Cuzco and in Lima addressed different audience in different spaces for different purposes. Whereas the Jesuit commissions in Cuzco promoted the order’s location-specific genealogical authority (a Spanish message in a historically Inca imperial capital city), the indigenous commissions in Lima sought to eliminate geographical divisions and to support a unified multi-ethnic nobility (a pan-indigenous message in the Spanish vice-regal capital city).

\textsuperscript{89} Juan Carlos Estenssoro Fuchs, “Construyendo La Memoria: La Figura Del Inca y El Reino Del Perú, de La Conquista a Túpac Amaru II,” in *Los Incas, Reyes Del Perú* (Lima, Peru: Banco de Crédito, 2005), 163.
\textsuperscript{90} Estenssoro Fuchs, 163.
\textsuperscript{91} Wuffarden, “La Descendencia Real,” 230.
\textsuperscript{92} Cummins, “A Tale of Two Cities,” 169.
i. LIMA:

Painting in the Beaterio De Copacabana

Until the late eighteenth century, indigenous men and women were not allowed to enter Spanish convents and monasteries as normal monastics, although they were permitted to work as volunteers and servants. At the end of the seventeenth century, Charles II passed a cédula de los honores which afforded new privileges to indigenous nobles including entrance to seminaries and universities, but it was not enforced until the late eighteenth-century, leaving the native nobility frustrated. There was a great desire among native elites to manage their own sacred spaces and educational institutions, which they sought to do through political appeals to the Council of Indies. Indigenous devotees to the Virgin of Copacabana in Lima petitioned for thirty years to be allowed to build their chapel in the San Lázaro neighborhood, a historically indigenous sector of the city in which they thought it belonged. They finally succeeded in 1633. They also wanted to build a beaterio, a cloistered space for female devotees, adjacent to the Church of Nuestra Señora de Copacabana, which required another slow and arduous campaign.

---

95 Dueñas, 185. Ximena Gómez explains that in the sixteenth-century San Lázaro developed as a multiracial neighborhood populated by poor Spanish and free afro-descendants in addition to the indigenous community. In 1590 the indigenous residents of San Lázaro were relocated violently and inhumanly to El Cercado where they remained until the 1630s. See Ximena Gómez, “Fashioning Lima’s Virgin of Copacabana: Indigienous Strategies of Negotiation in the Colonial Captital,” in A Companion to Early Modern Lima, ed. Emily Engel, vol. 2, Brill’s Companions to the Americas: History, Societies, Environments and Cultures (Leiden: Brill, 2019), 340–53.
96 Dueñas, 185.
The beaterio, dedicated to the education of indigenous girls, was finally established in 1691. The official founder was Francisca Ignacia Carbajal Manchipula (1615-1693), born in Lima to a cacique and a noble indigenous woman. The beaterio was primarily founded for the daughters of the members of the indigenous cofradía (brotherhood) of Copacabana in Lima, but it also housed women from a wide area along the northern coast. The beaterio functioned similarly to educational institutions for the sons of caciques, such as the Colegio de San Borja in Cuzco, teaching women to read and write in Spanish and Latin, as well as arithmetic, prayer, and song. Within beaterios, indigenous women were afforded positions of leadership and authority not possible in any other contexts.

As Kathryn Burns explains, beaterios were the only religious institutions “endowed by and for native Andeans,” which created opportunities to display the decency and respectability of indigenous elites. The indigenous elite of Lima celebrated the foundation of the beaterio as a great achievement in the process of fulfilling their social needs and saw it as a reference point and inspiration for future social goals and demands. Burns asks, “What more can we learn

---

97 Espinoza Soriano and Baltasar Olmeda, “Los Beaterios En La Lima Colonial,” 138–39. Beaterios functioned much like colegios for indigenous boys such as the Colegio de San Borja. See also Timberlake, 353.
98 Copacabana website. “hija de Don Pedro Carbajal, Cacique y gobernador del Puerto del Callao y de Doña Isabel Nipan Manchipula, india noble de aquel puerto.”
99 Kathryn Burns, “Andean Women in Religion: Beatas, ‘Decency’ and the Defence of Honour in Colonial Cuzco,” in Gender, Race and Religion in the Colonization of the Americas, ed. Nora Jaffary (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2007), 90. The Copacabana beaterio was also allowing non-noble indigenous women to enter as illustrated by the archival documentation of a man who thought it cost too much for his noble daughter to enter. See Burns, 90-91.
102 Burns, 85.
103 José Rodríguez Garrido, “Guerra y Orden Colonial En Los Dramas Sobre La Conquista Del Perú de Calderón de La Barca y Francisco Del Castillo,” Guerra y Paz En La Comedia
from this activity [endowing beaterios] about Cuzco’s indigenous elite – their shifting colonial fortunes, affiliations, identities?"104 Any answer to this question certainly includes that beaterios served as an investment in the indigenous community. Indigenous families, noble or not, who could afford to invest in such institutions demonstrated their dedication to indigenous women, children, and families, while also displaying their own respectability and piety.105

Although the beaterio de Nuestra Señora de Copacabana was an indigenous institution, it still operated under Spanish control. The cofradía struggled to obtain almost every element needed for the functioning of the Church and the beaterio. They fought to employ a chaplain who spoke Quechua, which they were finally able to appoint in 1704.106 They selected a mestizo from Arequipa, Juan Núñez Vela de Rivera, an outspoken champion of indigenous rights who had been able to gain his ecclesiastical position.107 Prior to his appointment as the chaplain for the beaterio de Nuestra Señora de Copacabana, Núñez Vela de Rivera had traveled to Madrid to advocate for indigenous rights directly before the king.108

In 1691, the same year that the beaterio was founded, Núñez Vela de Rivera wrote a memorial that was fundamental in advocating for the legal inclusion of indigenous people in social institutions such as the church, schools, and military.109 In this memorial, he used first

---

104 Burns, 89.
105 Burns, 89.
106 Dueñas, 185.
107 Dueñas, 154.
108 Ibid.
109 Ibid.
person plural “we” to refer to indigenous people and mestizos (as he himself was a mestizo).\textsuperscript{110} He also argued that Spaniards and indigenous people alike share a past of paganism, and that therefore, those Andeans whose ancestors had converted to Christianity centuries prior deserved to be considered “cristianos viejos,” along with all the rights and privileges that status that entailed.\textsuperscript{111} Historian Alcira Dueñas contends that the royal \textit{cédula} of 1693 directly resulted from Núñez Vela de Rivera’s activism including his writing and advocacy in Spain.\textsuperscript{112}

Núñez Vela de Rivera’s presence at Nuestra Señora de Copacabana supports arguments by scholars Rodríguez Garrido and Estenssoro Fuchs that the beaterio functioned as a symbolic center for the advocacy of indigenous rights.\textsuperscript{113} One way that the beaterio symbolized its advocacy for native nobility was through its decorative program. The beaterio displayed portraits of abbesses and daughters of important curacas as well as one of the marriage paintings of Beatriz and Martín alongside a painting illustrating the succession of the Inca dynasty culminating with the succession of the Spanish monarchs (fig. 6).\textsuperscript{114} The examples of both the marriage painting and the dynastic painting located in the Copacabana beaterio vary slightly from other paintings treating the same subject matter, further supporting the argument that they represented the indigenous elite’s particular interest in referring to history as evidence for their social and political rights.

\textsuperscript{110} Dueñas, 155.
\textsuperscript{111} Ibid., 155-56.
\textsuperscript{112} Ibid., 217.
\textsuperscript{113} See Rodríguez Garrido, “Guerra y Orden Colonial,” 275–95 and Estenssoro Fuchs, “Construyendo La Memoria.”
\textsuperscript{114} Espinoza Soriano and Baltasar Olmeda, 142; Ficek, 40; Teresa Gisbert, \textit{Iconografía y Mitos Indígenas en el Arte} (La Paz, Bolivia: Gisbert, 1980), 156.
I will begin with the marriage painting before introducing the dynastic painting. In comparison with the more common composition of the marriage painting, as seen in the Cuzco example, the most striking difference of the marriage painting in the Copacabana beaterio is the reorganization of the couples. In the Cuzco painting, Martín and Juan Enríquez stand on the left side of their wives. In the Copacabana painting, the husbands and wives flip, so that the women stand on the left side. Traditionally, in European portraiture the position on the viewer’s left (dexter) represents the dominance of the sitter. In her dissertation about the marriage paintings, Marie Timberlake chose to analyze these positions in terms of the Quechua concepts of hanan and hurin, or upper and lower. In the Quechua cosmovision these two positions represent a spatial binary as well as a gendered binary of upper masculine dominance and lower female subordination. Timberlake also notes the change in hand position, in which Beatriz authoritatively places her hand on top of Martín’s instead of the other way around.

Recently, Marina Mellado Corriente published an analysis of the significance of these compositional changes. Corriente argues that these changes, and particular the alteration to the hand positions, serve to identify the marriage as between two individuals of equal social ranks, rather than a morganatic marriage depicted in the Cuzco painting type. She explains that a morganatic marriage was a legal agreement for a marriage of unequal ranks in which spouses

---

115 Wuffarden also notes this difference as intentional for the specific audience of the beaterio.
116 The two paintings housed in the La Compañía in Arequipa and the Museo de Pedro de Osma paintings follow the same format.
117 The Marangani version is also organized this way.
119 Timberlake, 372.
121 Timberlake, 372.
kept their original social standing. The spouse with the lower rank, along with any children of the union, was not allowed to inherit property, rank, or titles of the higher positioned spouse, which was typically the husband. Morganatic marriage was sometimes referred to as a “left-handed” marriage because it was symbolically represented by the groom (or higher-ranking spouse) extending his left hand to his bride. Corriente asserts that the marriage paintings that depict Martín taking Beatriz’s hand with his left intentionally represent Beatriz as socially inferior to Martín through the symbol of the morganatic marriage. In reality, their marriage was not morganatic because their daughter inherited titles and property from both her parents.

Corriente contends that it is “implausible” that artists would mistakenly or unintentionally alter the iconography of marriage for a Jesuit commission. Thus, in the case of the painting in the Compañía in Cuzco, the Jesuit order actively chose to re-write history through the inaccurate illustration of the union between Beatriz and Martín. While the Jesuits in Cuzco and elsewhere chose to picture their authority over the indigenous population, the Copacabana cofradía in Lima used the same subject to convey a different meaning.

The painting in the Lima beaterio presents a marriage of equals between Beatriz and Martín. Their hand position follows the iconographical convention for the wedding of Mary and Joseph as described by Francisco Pacheco. He writes that the convention dictates that the couple “give each other their right hands with great honesty.” Consistent with this custom, Beatriz

\[122\] Corriente, 356.
\[123\] Corriente, 356.
\[124\] Corriente, 355-6.
\[125\] Corriente, 357.
\[126\] Corriente, 355.
\[127\] Francisco Pacheco, *Arte de La Pintura, Su Antiguedad y Grandezas: Descriuense Los Hombres Eminentes Que Ha Auido En Ella, Assi Antiguos Como Modernos ... y Enseña El Modo*
and Martín hold their right hands, with Beatriz’s hand positioned on top in the Copacabana painting. The second couple also displays a more endearing unity. Juan Enríquez rests his right hand on top of Ana María’s hand, as opposed to the Cuzco painting in which they do not hold hands at all. In addition to the hand position, Corriente identifies concrete visual differences that address the painting’s primarily indigenous audience. She points out that Ana María has a darker skin tone than in the other paintings, emphasizing her race as mestiza, and that positioned on the left, Beatriz maintains a closer physical proximity to her family, which re-enforces her indigenous lineage and connection with the Inca nobility. These details in the Copacabana painting serve to produce an image of history in which the marriage between Beatriz and Martín was a consensual union of equals. Although the painting depicts the hand position that more accurately reflects the economic terms of the marriage, it still ignores the context of violence and political pressure that led to the marriage. The Copacabana painting idealizes the agency of Beatriz and her daughter.

The social order presented in the Copacabana painting eliminates the hierarchies of the Cuzco version, and instead illustrates equality between the sexes, a powerful message for the women living in the beaterio, as well as equality between indigenous, Spanish, and mestizo nobility. In this version, Ana María acquires more prominence which is conducive to an

---

128 The anomaly of the hand position in this painting requires further investigation. Technical imaging is needed to determine if the position of the couple’s hands has been repainted. Beatriz’s left hand appears awkward in comparison to all the other peoples’ hands in the Copacabana painting and all the other paintings which render Beatriz’s hands with delicate fingers and rings.

129 Corriente also comments on details of the architectural background, Martín’s staff, and the garments of Beatriz’s family. See Corriente, 352-54

130 Wuffarden argues that the marriage paintings in general illustrate social equality between the figures. He writes: “De un modo inequivoco, la republica de españoles y la republica de indios...
interpretation of her body as a metaphor for a unified elite composing of both indigenous and Spanish nobles. The indigenous elite of Lima may not necessarily have wanted to marry into Spanish nobility and produce mestizo children, but they did want to attain greater social equality as symbolized by Ana María. Ana María, a single noble body that was both Spanish and indigenous, represented the ideal society that indigenous nobility strove to actualize in which they shared the same rights, privileges, and dignities afforded to Spanish nobles.

Formally, a few compositional changes concentrate attention on Ana María in the Copacabana painting. Standing to her husband’s right (the compositional left), Ana María becomes a more central figure. This change also brings her closer to her parents, as her husband no longer stands between them. Furthermore, the gap between the right couple and the saints behind them disappears. In the Cuzco painting, Juan Enríquez stands a pace apart from San Francisco de Borja, distancing the couple from the rest of the group, whereas in the Copacabana painting, Ana María’s body overlaps San Borja, uniting them compositionally. Her bell-shaped red skirt cuts across his black robes in a stark diagonal and the curve of her elbow nearly graces the skull he holds. This overlap unites the Ana María and San Borja compositionally, increasing Ana María’s compositional prominence near the center of the canvas and suggesting her piety and close spiritual and genealogical connection to her venerated relatives. Thus, the symbol of the mixed-ethnic utopia (Ana María) merged with the symbol of Catholicism (the saints) to

aprecen aqui en pie de igualdad, como dos mitades complementarias de un indissoluble cuerpo social.” [In an unequivocal manner, the Spanish republic and the indigenous republic appear here standing on equal footing, as two complimentary halves of an indissoluble social body.] Wuffarden, 191-2. Translation my own. I move beyond this analysis to agree with more recent scholars that the painting in Cuzco lacks the social equality between figures as seen in the Copacabana version.

39
suggest the importance of the faith in the formation of a just society. This association was likely inspirational for the women in the beaterio, who could identify with Ana María.

The compositional shift also brings Ana María’s name, labeled on the ground under the central most edge of her skirt, closer to the center of the composition. In contrast, Beatriz’s name is integrated inconspicuously into the bottom of her skirt. The names of both husbands fit neatly into the spaces between their feet. Pentimenti are now visible, revealing that both men’s legs were previously positioned slightly to the right.131 In the earlier version, Martín stood closer to the saints with his legs were shifted slightly to the left. The same is true for Juan Enríquez, who stands slightly closer to his wife in the final version. As a mirror to Ana María’s compositional position in the present version, Martín’s stance toward the left contrasts with, and accentuates, Ana María’s centrality and closeness with the saints. Likewise, Juan Enríquez’s present proximity to his wife helps direct attention to her, as his right leg and foot point even more toward her body, further emphasizing the attention he directs toward her with his gaze.

All these compositional details place the compositional focus on Ana María without setting her apart from the group or creating any connotation of superiority of any of the figures. Rather, they contribute to the unity of the cluster of family members. The absence of the peripheral figures present in the Cuzco painting (the woman on the far right and the two small indigenous figures on the left) also streamlines the composition and bestows a clarity and solidarity to the two couples and their saintly relatives. In the Copacabana painting, mother,
father and daughter, or indigenous, Spanish, and mestiza unite as a single integrated family and social class.

The parents and child stand in line on the same plane as an orderly row of peers. This format evokes the compositional order of the painting of the royal succession of Peru that also hung in the beaterio de Nuestra Señora de Copacabana. The painting of the royal succession, sometimes referred to as *Efigies de los ingas y reyes del Perú, Genealogía de los reyes ingas del perú, or translato imperii* (meaning “transfer of rule”), follows the format of a 1725 engraving designed by Alonso de la Cueva (fig. 7).132 In this design, indebted to European genealogical traditions, the busts of thirteen Incas and nine Spanish monarchs are organized into a neat grid pattern consisting of three rows following their chronological succession. Each box includes a decorative arch at the top, labels the ruler with their name above their heads, and presents biographical information written with black text on a white background beneath each ruler’s bust. This ordered sequence between Inca and Spanish rulers gives the impression of a seamless transfer of power or *translato imperii*.133 Much like the paintings of the union between Beatriz and Martín, the *translato imperii* image omits the conflict and violence that the indigenous people suffered at the hands of the Spanish conquistadors. In the painting, Atahualpa, the last Inca, becomes a transitional figure who extends his scepter to Carlos V.134 In reality, the Spanish executed Atahualpa in 1533, as they did Beatriz’s uncle, Túpac Amaru, in 1572. Both paintings

---

134 Estenssoro Fuchs, “Construyendo La Memoria,” 163.
ignore the complexity and violence of Spanish invasion in favor of picturing a history that held indigenous people and Spaniards as equals and allies.

One artist likely painted both paintings around the same time, prior to 1747. Together these paintings depict a cohesive view of an orderly and peaceful history in which indigenous people and mestizos (Beatriz and Ana María) stand in line on equal footing with Spaniards (their husbands), share a close relationship to important Christian figures (saints Loyola and Borja), and ruled Tawantinsuyu, the Inca empire, in anticipation for the arrival of their Christian counterparts to whom they complicity handed over their power. The Inca past cordially gives way to an equitable union of Spanish and indigenous nobility grounded by the Catholic faith. The linear compositions of both paintings celebrate the historical social status of indigenous nobility prior to and during the early period of colonization and offer their eighteenth-century audience a vision of the respect they deserved at the expense of forgetting the horrors of the past.

The rhetoric of these two paintings was replicated in other commissions by the indigenous nobility in Lima. Compared to the marriage painting in the Compañía in Cuzco, the two paintings in the beaterio of Copacabana share a slightly less direct, but nonetheless poignant connection with theatrical performance. José Rodríguez Garrido sees the two paintings as an “implicit nexus” between the Peruvian playwright Fray Francisco del Castillo’s Conquista del Perú (1748) and renowned Spanish playwright Pedro Calderón de la Barcas’s La aurora en Copacabana (1664-65), a comedia about the indigenous Christian icon, the Virgen de Copacabana, to whom the beaterio was dedicated. Devotion of the Virgen de Copacabana

---

135 Wuffarden, “La Descendencia Real,” 240. The image of Ferdinand appears to be by a different hand and was added after his proclamation.
136 Rodríguez Garrido, “Guerra y Orden Colonial,” 286.
originated in Potosí (present-day Bolivia) and involved the veneration of the Virgin through a statue carved by the Andean sculptor Francisco Tito Yupanqui. This particularly Andean form of Catholic reverence incorporates homage for the mountain of Potosí. Thus, Calderón de la Barca tackles a specifically Andean topic and also shares some of the plot points and themes addressed in Castillo’s Conquista del Perú. In addition to the connection with these dramas, the two paintings also align with the 1748 celebration in Lima of Ferdinand VI’s coronation, which I will address in the following section.

ii. LIMA:

Performance in the Viceregal Capital

The death of Philip V and Ferdinand VI’s ascension to the throne provided the indigenous elite of Lima with the opportunity to tell their story in another medium. The festivities are recorded in a publication titled El día de Lima written by the Jesuit priest Juan Antonio Ribera. The celebrations were divided into two main portions, with the second occurring after Easter and organized by the indigenous leaders of the cabildo of El Cercado, a segregated indigenous neighborhood in Lima. El día de Lima describes that the indigenous organizers

138 Timberlake, 354.
139 Rodríguez Garrido, 287-8.
140 News of Philip’s death arrived in Lima four months after a devastating earthquake struck the city. Lima tried to use the obsequies for Philip V and coronation of Ferdinand VI as momentum for a rebuilding campaign. As the city worked to reorganize and rebuild itself structurally, the indigenous cabildo advocated for their place within the social structure of the city, and the empire. See Jouve Martín and Soledad Barbón, 150-151.
141 Soledad Barbón, Colonial Loyalties, 151; Alcira Dueñas, Indians and Mestizos in the “Lettered City,” 196.
wanted to arrange something new “never seen before, and never to be seen.” Maria Soledad Barbón argues that the newness alluded to in *El día de Lima* references the commission of the play written by Castillo, since the cabildo of El Cercado had never organized a theatrical performance for public celebration before. However, the commissioned play, *La Conquista del Perú*, was never performed. Instead, *El día de Lima* explains that the corregidor appointed to oversee the cabildo prevented the organization’s unprecedented patronage, “persuading” them to perform the more standard Inca procession instead. I will return to the Inca procession, the performance that actually took place, in the following section, but first the unperformed drama warrants attention.

The drama and its accompanying *loa* communicate a message consistent with the marriage paintings, *translatio imperii* paintings, and Inca processions like the one performed instead of Castillo’s drama. All these paintings and performances rely on history to craft a vision of the native nobility as socially equal to Spanish nobility. The multiple iterations of using Cuzqueño history in eighteenth-century Lima demonstrate that indigenous elites were adopting visual rhetoric and theatrical traditions established in Cuzco and applying them for their own purposes. The play commissioned for the 1748 celebration of Ferdinand VI provides one

---

144 The corregidor was Don Casimiro de Beytia who “para dirigirlos, les persuadió, que nunca podrían inventor nuevo, ni mas ilustre regocijo, que el que mas de veinte años antes havían ofrecido al Publico en igual Regia Celebridad, porque aun era todavía un encarecimiento continuo de la ponderacion en la memoria de los que lo gozaron.” Manso de Velasco, *El Día de Lima*, 239.
example of a diverse group of indigenous nobles employing Cuzqueño history to represent themselves. Although Castillo’s *Conquista del Perú* was neither performed nor published, I concur with many other scholars that its subject and text deserve analysis.\(^{145}\)

Of particular interest, the plot of Castillo’s drama is preceded by a *loa*, typical of celebratory commissions. The *loa* centers around allegorical characters corresponding to the letters spelling FERNANDO: Fama, Europa, Regocijo, Nobleza, Amor, Nación Peruana, Dicha, Obligación (Fame, Europe, Delight [Rejoicing], Nobility, Love, the Nation of Peru, Happiness, Obligation). Each wear their respective letter on a badge and enter the scene one by one.\(^{146}\) When Peru arrives in the form of an “*india,*” the other allegorical characters inquire after her identity. They ask brusquely: “What is this?” and “Who are you and why have you come?”\(^{147}\) The accurate answer is not so simple. Who is the Nation of Peru? This is the very question that the indigenous council of El Cercado sought to answer through the commissioning of this original drama. Peru herself does not answer the question directly, but I believe the text reveals subliminal answers.

To begin with, the name *Nación Peruana*, is a choice necessitated by the nonselective collection of letters forming the new monarch’s name. Most of the letters are represented by

\(^{145}\) Despite his respectable education and legitimate lineage from Spanish father and noble limeña mother, Fray Castillo’s oeuvre, including *La conquista del Perú*, remained largely unpublished, and was primarily shared in manuscript form. Publication proved difficult for many colonial playwrights, perhaps because of the high cost of printing, the rigorous censorship in Peru and a cultural climate of intellectual decline. *La conquista del Perú*, in particular, would have been subjected to additionally strict regulations for works about the Americas under the direction of the Consejo de Indias in Spain. See Concepción Reverte Bernal, *Aproximación crítica a un dramaturgo virreinal peruano: Fr. Francisco del Castillo (“El Ciego de la Merced”)* (Cádiz: Universidad de Cádiz, Servicio de Publicaciones, 1985), 17–32.  

\(^{146}\) The badges are referred to as *tarjas*.  

abstract concepts: Fame, Love, Happiness, etc. Only two, E and N become proper nouns, distinguishing them as key characters. Although FERNANDO includes neither an S for Spain or a P for Peru, Castillo orchestrates their presence by way of the E and N. Thus, Spain becomes the more generalized *Europe* and her opposite becomes the *Nación Peruana*, as a unified whole.

What qualities does the *Nación Peruana* embody? The description of her allegorical human form simply reads “*de india,*” which I believe constitutes a deliberate argument for the essential role that indigenous people inhabit within the colonial “nation.” In Castillo’s *loa*, the *Nación Peruana*, one of the broadest units of political organization, symbolizes the indigenous population at large. The allegorical figure unites diverse social and ethnic groups across thousands of miles of territory, including Limeños descendant from coastal ethnic groups alongside Cuzqueños claiming Inca ancestry. The *Nación Peruana* illustrates the unity of an indigenous nation through one single female body. Further on in the *loa*, nobility emerges as her other salient feature.

In the dialogue that follows the blunt inquiry into the identity of the Nation of Peru, one of the main themes of the *loa* becomes the questioning of the love that Peru feels for Europe. Europe interrogates Peru, asking what reason or basis she has for attempting to celebrate to unite with Europe.148 Peru responds by asserting that the king belongs to her, as well. Europe argues that in order to unite, they must first dismiss the disparities between their origins. At this point, the allegory of Nobility (*Nobleza*) arrives with a history lesson to explain that Peru and Europe have already been united through the marriage of Don Martín de Loyola and Beatriz Clara Coya,
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148 “…qué razón o fundamento tiene la nación peruana cuando intenta este festejo para adunarse conmigo…” Castillo, *Obras*, 225.
a woman of “high nobility.” Nobility extols at length about each of their lineages, then about their daughter and her husband and his lineage, and about their offspring and their titles. Finally, after explaining all these marriages, Nobleza says “I won’t give you any more tests proving our bonds [encadenamiento]… it’s certain that nobody could find faults in our chain.” While the metaphors of bondage and chains can also connote enslavement and degradation, here Castillo uses them to demonstrate strength, forcefulness, and continuity through time. The chain represents the generational links of the multiple noble families that bind Peru and Spain through marriage and blood. Nación Peruana declares that Peru and Spain can never be separated and now form a unified identity. This history lesson nestled within the lengthy allegory serves to highlight the importance of nobility in the unification of Peru and Spain. Thus, the loa presents an argument for the equality of the native and European nobility and the responsibility they share for the development of the colonial territory under the Spanish monarchy.

In her textual analysis, Soledad Barbón describes the loa as an “exaltation of the Amerindian aristocracy” that takes “a bold and confident step further by claiming that Spanish, Creole and Indian nobility, were in fact, one and the same.” This is the very reason that
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150 Castillo, Obras, 228–30.
151 “y, en fin, Europa, por no molestarte más, pretendo no dar más pruebas acerca de nuestro encadenamiento…” Castillo, 230.
152 “… Ya soy contigo tan una que la separación niego porque la union de la sangre casi identidad se ha hecho…” Castillo, 230.
153 Soledad Barbón, Colonial Loyalties, 153; María Soledad Barbón, “‘Never before Seen, and Never to Be Seen’: Fray Francisco’s La Conquista Del Peru and the Royal Celebrations for Ferdinand VI,” Romanistisches Jahrbuch 64 (2014): 298. Although Fray Castillo himself is
Soledad Barbón offers as to why Castillo’s play proved undesirable in the viceroy’s eyes. In particular, she points to a quote from the allegory of Nobility that argues that it is impossible to distinguish between or to separate the Spanish nobility and the Inca nobility: “If of different liquors/ You mix two cups, it is true/ That to undo their mixture/ Is an impossible endeavor.”  

Through the marital and sexual union of Martín and Beatriz, the liquors of the Andean and Spanish nobility were thoroughly mixed. Whether the Spanish nobility approved of the concoction or not was irrelevant for it could not be undone.

Although the characters and plot of the play differ entirely from the loa, it still presents a similar version of Peruvian history in which an Inca past consensually accepts Spanish rule and Catholic faith. Important parallels between the drama and the loa include the emphasis on indigenous nobility and the consensual union between Inca and Spanish powers. Castillo illustrates a peaceful transfer of power through three main plot devices: a prophecy, the actual exchange, and the allusion to marriage. The reference to marriage in the loa, and the drama, as in many plots of Spanish Golden Age comedias, signals resolution and the “return to the prevalent social order.”

Regarding plots that deal with the Spanish conquest of the new world, marriage

criollo, Emmanuel Velayos notes that criollos are absent from the allegorical categories, from the drama as a whole, and from the other art works that seek to define national identity centered around elite indigenous interests. He suggests one reason for this absence may have been that indigenous elites saw criollos as a “destabilizing” element in their pursuit of social advances because some criollos sought to displace indigenous elites from their leadership positions and increase their own political authority. See Emmanuel Velayos, “Porque su derecho no perdieran”: la representación de la elite indigena (y la marca criolla) en la loa y la comedia de La Conquista del Perú (1748) de Francisco del Castillo” in Ciberletras: Revista de crítica literaria y de cultura 24 (2010): 146-172.

154 “Si de distintos licores/ dos vasos mezclas es cierto/ que el deshacer su mixtión/ es un imposible intent.” Castillo, La conquista del Perú, 211. Soledad Barbón, Colonial Loyalties, 154.

serves to emphasize the conquest as peaceful and consensual transfer of power facilitated by both indigenous and Spanish nobility.

The symbol of marriage as architect of social order translates back into the paintings of the historic marriages. In an allegorical reading of the paintings, all of the principal characters from the loa take shape in the bodies of various figures. Europa corresponds to the Spanish men, Martín, Juan Enriquez and the Jesuit forebearers, while Nación Peruana is equivalent to the members of the Inca lineage concluding with Ana María. Nobleza does not embody one single figure, but rather is composed of all the family members, both Spanish and indigenous. In the loa, Nobleza addresses the topic of history; whereas in the painting, it is History, as represented through the bodies of the ancestors of both the Inca and Jesuit lineages, that produces Nobility. The only additional allegorical character in the painting would be Catholicism, personified by the two central saints. All the same key elements are present and contribute to the same message. Both the loa and the paintings, especially the one located in the beaterio de Copacabana, illustrate how marriage unites two distinct historical lineages and produces a social order of equality between individuals of different genders and ethnicities who all belong to a unified elite social class.

Ultimately, the connotations of radical equality for the multi-ethnic nobility may have led to the censorship that prevented the staging of Castillo’s Conquista del Perú and to the “persuasion” in favor of the Inca procession. If the “persuasion” was an act of censorship due to the content and message of Conquista del Perú, it does not seem successful. The Lima procession did not argue as boldly for the equality of indigenous and Spanish nobility, but it did
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156 Rodríguez Garrido supposes the change might have been due to cost based on his interpretation of the explanation in El día de Lima. See Rodríguez Garrido, 282.
accomplish the same proclamation of indigenous unity through the symbol of the Inca. In Lima, a wholly colonial city that had no historical connection with the Inca empire, the indigenous community worked to borrow the prestige of an empire their ancestors may never have participated in. Indigenous elites in Lima with no genealogical connection to the Inca nobility dressed as Incas, a privilege reserved exclusively for actual Inca descendants in Cuzco. Most actors in the procession in Lima could not claim descendence from an Inca lineage, yet members of distinct ethnic groups and geographical origins rallied together under the symbol of the Inca. For elite indigenous Limeños, participating in the Inca procession was a visceral way to align themselves with the Inca empire as part of an elite pan-indigenous community. They also employed other tactics of unification by inviting nobles from Cuzco to play some of the most important Incas such as Manco Capac, the founding-father of the Inca empire, and incorporating aspects of local coastal history with the Inca line of succession.

Basing their procession on the Cuzqueño tradition, the indigenous cabildo in Lima attempted to adopt (or appropriate) Cuzco’s historic authority. However, in transposing the tradition to Lima, its meaning shifted in the new context. The city of Cuzco was legendarily founded by Manco Capac. To march in an Inca procession in Cuzco was to walk the same streets that Incas walked and to concretize the city’s mythological origins. Inca processions in Lima achieved an inverse operation. To hold a procession in Lima was to perform Inca-ness on the coastal edge of the Inca empire 575 kilometers away from the Inca center of power in Cuzco. Processions in Lima generalized, idealized, and Inca-fied the city’s concrete vice-regal structure.

---

157 Dean, 107-108.
158 Dueñas, 207.
159 Soledad Barbón, 142.
While Cuzco had been staging Inca processions for centuries, the concept was still novel in eighteenth-century Lima. There was an Inca reenactment procession in Lima in 1659, but it remains unclear whether it was put on by Spaniards, criollos, or indigenous people.\textsuperscript{160} 1723 was the first instance of indigenous people petitioning to organize their own celebration for a citywide festival as an ethnic group rather than as guild members.\textsuperscript{161} They were allotted a space in the main plaza in which they presented two processions of Inca kings.\textsuperscript{162} In that iteration, Manco Capac was played by the Cuzqueño noble Don Ventura Sonco Cusi-Huallpa.\textsuperscript{163} Working together with nobles from Cuzco offered an opportunity to strengthen relationships between the indigenous elites of the two different cities. Cuzqueños also participated in the 1748 procession, the second known indigenous-organized Inca procession in Lima.\textsuperscript{164} Manco Capac was played by don Felipe Huaman-Navarro from Cuzco.\textsuperscript{165} Several other Cuzqueños also represented other Incas. All their names and home cities are recorded in \textit{El día de Lima}.

The publication also describes the order of the procession, the costumes of the Incas, their wives, attendants, and dancers, and the music and other features of the parade. Many of these elements contributed to the amalgamation of the indigenous identities. Careful attention is devoted to the details of each of the costumes, usually consisting of finely woven garments, cumbi and mantas, pinned with metal topos for the women, and the royal fringe. The description of these elements are consistent with representations of Incas and Coyas such as Beatriz’s family

\textsuperscript{160} Soledad Barbón, 137
\textsuperscript{161} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{162} Soledad Barbón, 137-8. See also Cummins and Rappaport, “The Reconfiguration of Civic and Sacred Space.”
\textsuperscript{163} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{164} Ibid., 142.
\textsuperscript{165} \textit{El día de Lima}, 256.
in the marriage paintings. Other details recorded in *El día de Lima* that are not specifically Inca but that represent indigeneity more generally, are bare feet and the use of feathers.

Further relocation of Inca culture to Lima includes actresses portraying ñustas who sang in their native language, Quechua. Singing in Quechua celebrates an element of culture that spread to many diverse communities of indigenous people through imperial conquest carried out under the Inca empire and then again by Catholic missionaries under the Spanish empire. Thus, the Quechua language itself represents the linguistic unification of the indigenous population under two imperial regimes. Finally, the procession included not only Andean people but also llamas, bringing the fauna of the highlands to the coastal city.

The procession concluded with a triumphal cart pulled by eight horses and decorated with gilded reliefs and paint. The book describes some of the imagery including an Imperial eagle and flag with the insignia of the sacred cross above “figuras de Indios” dressed with colorful feathers and playing flutes. Another part of the cart illustrated the “principal provinces of the kingdom of Peru.” Based on this description, the decorative scheme of the triumphal cart celebrates Peru generally, including multiple geographical regions and an inclusive and generic group of indigenous people. Also present at the end of the parade was a placard announcing, “Long live the Catholic Monarch Ferdinand the Sixth, King of Spain and Emperor of the Indies”
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166 For further analysis of Inca costumes see Soledad Barbón and Carolyn Dean for analyses of costume designed by the students, sons of caciques, at San Borja Jesuit school in Cuzco.  
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and people reciting a poem that ended with shouts of “Viva el rey!” Thus, the parade culminated in a celebration of Peru, its indigenous population, and the Spanish king. Ferdinand’s symbolic location at the end of the procession demonstrates the procession’s similarity to *translatio imperii* imagery.

The initial description of the procession in *El día de Lima* reads much like a description of a *translatio imperii* painting might. It describes the parade as: “a representation, in which they reduced the history of the series and succession of the known past kings who from triumph to surrender, came in magnificent pomp to sacrifice their crowns to the Inca of two worlds, who they recognized as their master.” This “representation” (the same generic term that Esquival y Navia uses to describe the 1741 performance in the Compañía in Cuzco) functioned as a live embodiment of the *translatio imperii* imagery.

The procession in Lima differed in one key aspect in that it included local lords impersonating Incas as well as the Chimu monarch, who marched as the first noble figure in the procession. The Chimu culture was located on the northern coast of Peru and conquered by the Inca in the late fifteenth century. By including a Chimu leader as the first monarch, a place normally occupied by Manco Capac, the Limeños asserted the importance of coastal indigenous nobility on the same level as the Incas, even presenting them as an older and thus more...
authoritative society. In the context of an Inca re-enactment in Peru, stationing a Chimu at the head of the parade and the Spanish king at the end, creates the appearance that coastal lords are part of a sequential and consensual transfer of power beginning with the Chimu and ending with the Spanish, recalling the linear organization of the translatio imperii paintings.

Further complicating the transfer of power in the Lima procession, is the reversal of the chronological order, beginning with the Chimu, followed by the Inca rulers organized in reverse chronological order to end with Manco Capac as the last Inca prior to the Spanish monarch or “Inca of two worlds” who ruled over both the old and new world. The previous chronological processions were actually more similar to a translatio imperii painting, which represent a panorama of the passage of time. In a chronological sequence of Inca, time moves with their steps as they parade through the streets and plaza. In the 1748 procession, time falls apart in an awkward ahistorical series that highlights the importance of the Chimu and the Spanish as the bookends of Peruvian history. Thus, the slightly scrambled history of the 1748 parade crosses the orderly linear organization of a translatio imperii painting with the collapsed genealogical history of a marriage painting, especially considering the inclusion of the female ñustas and coyas.

The kinetic format of the procession alters the viewer’s experience of the history. Rather than occupying a static seated position in a church or amphitheater, the audience watching a parade is free to move in the outdoor space. During the festivities, paintings, tapestries,
placards and sculptures periodically became part of the exterior decoration of the city. Human bodies also served as part of the celebratory decoration through costume, procession, dance, and theater. In an unusual feat for the city of Lima, the passage of time came alive as the cabildo of El Cercado glorified Peru as a nation indebted to its indigenous forebearers and their present descendants who marched proudly through the entire historical span of the Inca empire. The public outdoor location increased the size of the accidental audience that was able to see the show, allowing for a large and diverse viewership to receive the cabildo’s message promoting the coastal elite’s participation in a unified indigenous nobility. The audience was likely primarily composed of primarily indigenous viewers, as well as Afro-descendants, and some Spaniards and criollos. While most of the audience would not be included as members of indigenous noble class, they could serve as crucial allies in working toward the cabildo’s goals.

Even though the paintings and performances representing the union between Inca and Spanish nobility in Lima did not confront each other in the same space, they still functioned in conversation with one another, addressing related audiences and conveying similar messages about indigenous heritage, nobility, authority, and rights.

transformed and the plaza reorganized as a stage for the mourning of the Spanish monarch Philip and the celebration of his successor, Ferdinand VI. Cummins, “Tale of Two Cities,” 169.
Although clergy and indigenous elites alike wished the future would produce the peaceful union represented in the artworks and performances of history, their vision was not realized. In the latter half of the eighteenth century, rebellions erupted throughout the viceroyalty. The years following Fernando’s proclamation saw both indigenous unity and insurrection. Shortly after the 1748 celebration, Fray Calixto de San José Túpac Inca, an unusually accomplished Franciscan intellectual and Inca descendant, met with the El Cercado cabildo. A few months later, he traveled to Cuzco to consult with the caciques of the indigenous cabildo there and the Jesuits at San Borja, where he was received with support and encouragement.\textsuperscript{180} In 1749 Calixto printed his \textit{Representación verdadera}, a document denouncing the widespread social and institutional abuses of indigenous people and advocating for the implementation of the indigenous right to join the priesthood.\textsuperscript{181} Calixto then traveled to Spain and delivered the text to the king.\textsuperscript{182} In June of 1750, a conspiracy to assassinate the viceroy was uncovered, implicating members of the El Cercado cabildo, who were present at the 1748 meeting with Calixto.\textsuperscript{183} Due to this connection, bans were placed on performances of Incas, which the local government in Lima realized.

\textsuperscript{180} Dueñas, \textit{Indians and Mestizos in the “Lettered City,”} 67.
\textsuperscript{181} Dueñas, 68.
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\textsuperscript{183} Dueñas, 73.
inspired sadness and nostalgia for indigenous rule and a desire to see the Inca in power once again. The following month rebellion broke out in Huarochirí.

Tension continued to seethe in the following decades. A new marriage painting representing an entirely European subject was installed in the Compañía directly across the nave from the first, perhaps to “neutralize the local content of the previous composition that began to be perceived as potentially dangerous.” The new painting also focused on important figures in the Jesuit order, but illustrated no connection to local history. However, not even the powerful Society of Jesus was safe from the Spanish monarchy. In 1767, Charles III banished the order from his empire. All Jesuit property became state property, causing Jesuit paintings to be rehoused throughout the viceroyalty, including all of the Jesuit-commissioned marriage paintings apart from the one in the Compañía in Cuzco.

Despite Charles III’s long-awaited enactment of the cédulas in 1776, social instability continued to mount. Túpac Amaru II, a cacique who had attended San Borja in Cuzco, identified as a devout Catholic, filed claims to the lands and title of the Marquisate of Oropesa
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and led an uprising in Cuzco during 1780-1.\textsuperscript{190} His rebellion resulted in his public execution in the plaza in Cuzco and the banishment of representations of Incas, including paintings, costumes, and performances.\textsuperscript{191} Officials recognized the nature of representations of Incas in multiple types of media as persuasive and influential in the argument for indigenous rights. Paintings of Inca kings were destroyed in Cuzco, the center of the 1781 rebellion, but spared in Lima.\textsuperscript{192} In response to the ban, some paintings were painted over with religious scenes to obscure the likenesses of the Inca rulers and protect them from total destruction.\textsuperscript{193} In 1782, another cédula banned the circulation and reading of Inca Garcilaso de la Vega’s \textit{Comentarios Reales}, a major source of Inca history that informed works such as Castillo’s \textit{Conquista del Perú}.\textsuperscript{194} In spite of the bans, people were intent on continuing to represent the Inca. Archival sources attest to the use of Inca costumes after 1780 and into the nineteenth century.\textsuperscript{195} Overall, the suppression of representations of Incas during the eighteenth century demonstrates the gravity of their role in late colonial Peru. Viceregal authorities linked both paintings and performances to political agitation and censored their display on multiple occasions and yet people continued to reproduce

\textsuperscript{190} Túpac Amaru II held respect for the Church and its clerics but was angry at colonial authorities for being bad Christians. Dueñas, 222. For Túpac Amaru II’s claim to the Yucay territory and Marquisate of Oropesa see David Cahill, “Una Nobleza Asediada: Los Nobles Incas Del Cuzco En El Ocaso Colonial,” in \textit{Élites Indígenas En Los Andes: Nobles, Caciques y Cabildantes Bajo El Yugi Colonial} (Quito: Ediciones Abya-Yala, 2000).
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them. Their predominance and survival over centuries attest to their centrality in the Peruvian historical narrative.
CONCLUSION

The words of Anthony Cascardi may help us reflect on the psychological impetus for the multiple representations of the historic marriages. Cascardi suggests that the remarkably high literary productivity of Golden Age Spain may have arisen from “the impossible and unfulfillable desire to ground the present in the past.”¹⁹⁶ I propose that the artistic repetition of the marriage scene in the Viceroyalty of Peru reverberates with a similar sentiment. The multiple marriage representations reveal a yearning for a more harmonious reality. They attempt to reinvent a past that justifies the actualization of the desired present and future. This idealized vision of the past was, of course, false, but the truth was not an obstacle. Again, as Cascardi remarks, “…the role of some of the most powerful “ideologies of history” at work in the Gold Age was to produce imaginary worlds in which historical conflict is itself eliminated.”¹⁹⁷ In Peru, the marriages modeled a fabricated vision of a virtuous and conflict-free past. The conjugal scene was repeated throughout the viceroyalty and celebrated by distinct groups because of its power to symbolize a unifying historical narrative that could satisfy Spaniards, diverse groups of indigenous people, mestizos, and religious orders.

In addition to the institutional commissions presented thus far, paintings of the subject also appear in private family collections. A notable example is documented in the 1777 inventory of the possessions of the Inca noblewoman Doña Josepha Villegas Cusipaucar y Loyola, herself a descendent of Beatriz and Martín. The painting stands as a testament to her desire to celebrate the history of her family, to recognize and display her own social and political privilege garnered as a consequence of that history, and to envision herself as intimately connected to, or even as a participant in, that history. The family of Doña Josepha was so intrigued with the possibilities offered by an idealized past that they also commissioned portraits of themselves wearing historical clothing. By representing themselves with the authority and prestige of an idealized past they hoped to achieve in paint what may have felt unstable in the present.

While Doña Josepha could claim descendance from the figures portrayed in the marriage paintings, other indigenous viewers who could not, perhaps women in particular, still felt inspired by the imagery. They may have looked at the painting in the home of Doña Josepha, in the church in Cuzco, in the beaterio in Lima, or in another location and felt a connection to their own family history. Here, I would like to pause to reflect on the roles of female bodies in the narration of the history of the Viceroyalty of Peru. All the primary sources representing history that I examine in this paper, visual, textual, or dramatic, were principally organized and executed by men. Men left clearer documentary evidence about male contribution to such representations, but women also participated as patrons, actors, and viewers.


The traces of several women grace the remaining written records that relate to the seventeenth and eighteenth-century portrayals of the historical partners: Narcisa, the actress who played the “wife” in the Cuzco performance; Francisca Ignacia Carbajal Manchipula, the founder of the beaterio in Lima and the women who lived alongside the painting displayed there; the many women both named and unnamed who performed as ñustas and coyas to march and dance their way through Inca history during the 1748 procession in Lima; and Doña Josepha Villegas Cusipaucar y Loyola who owned a painting of the marriage scene. Additionally, the female description “india” indicates that the *Nación Peruana* in Castillo’s loa was embodied by a woman.\(^{200}\) The feminization of Peru extends to the allegorical reading of the painting in which the majority of the indigenous figures are female and a mother and daughter take center stage to represent Peru and the indigenous nobility. The marriage paintings and performances offer rare instances in which artists represent women as crucial to the broad historical narrative.

In recognizing the rarity of the appearance of women in male-dominated narratives of history, we can perhaps begin to understand the radical inclusiveness that the family story offered to eighteenth-century viewers in Peru. By illustrating only a few individuals, the entire past, present, and future of the viceroyalty and its diverse population could be visualized. The artistic representations proposed a vision of proto-nationalistic unity. Fray Calixto, the devoted indigenous-rights advocate, expressed the same vision when he wrote in *Representación verdadera* that he hoped for a time when “Spaniards and Indians united and all together became one, and loved each other, marrying among themselves and becoming one whole people and one

\(^{200}\) Dean notes that women were “generally excluded (following European custom) from festive performance.” Dean, 174.
nation…”201 Although Fray Calixto does not recall the members of the Sairitupac-Loyola family by name, he evokes the same concepts foregrounded in the paintings. His statement can be understood both literally and symbolically. In one sense, he may have been advocating for legal marriages and sexual reproduction among mixed-race couples. In another, his message refers to a Christian notion of love and relies on the symbol of marriage as a metaphorical evocation of a unified society composed of distinct groups harmoniously united under God.

Fray Calixto, like patrons and audience members of artistic representations, exalted the symbol of the married couple because of the forceful impression it left on the reader or viewer. Most eighteenth-century inhabitants of Peru likely did not consciously interpret the symbolic power of the marriage. They did not articulately record descriptions of the viewers’ experience in books such as Noticias cronológicas or El día de Lima or write treatises on audience participation. Nevertheless, the close relationship between the depiction of the historic marriage in paint and in live performance reveals an understanding on some level of the power of the representation of marriage to produce an enchanting and influential experience for the viewer.

One final object epitomizes the importance of the connection between the historical marriage and performance. An eighteenth-century silver placard depicts a man and woman holding hands in lower relief (fig. 8). The man, presumably Martín, wears Spanish garb. A ruff rings his neck; a sash and chain cross his chest; his sleeves split; a sword hangs from his waist. He holds a baton and a plumed hat. With his left hand he grasps at the woman’s wrist, presumably his wife, Beatriz. Her clothing marks her as indigenous. Her hair, parted in the middle, frames her face in two thin braids. A mantle drapes around her shoulders. A long skirt

201 Translation from “Representación verdadera” (1749-50) as quoted in Dueñas, Indians and Mestizos in the “Lettered City,” 220.
with geometric patterns reaches her ankles. Her feet are bare. She holds a spindle whorl which symbolizes her matrilineal authority within the royal lineage. A dwarf attendant with a gaping grin shades her with a feathered parasol. A parrot sits on the attendant’s head and other animals indigenous to either the jungle or the altiplano populate the lower edge of the silver piece along with a second indigenous dwarf figure. The silver background is burnished flat, which emphasizes the single couple. The other principal figures represented in all of the paintings of the marriage scene, the saints and the second couple, are absent, as are Beatriz’s parents and uncle. The simplified composition highlights a generic indigeneity represented through Beatriz’s bare feet, woven clothing lacking tocapu, the attendant and parasol, and the animals. This reduced composition was likely meant to be appreciated up close, but also to be seen from a distance as it glinted in the light during a performance.

Palmer and Pierce identify the object as a breastplate originating from Cuzco or Bolivia. It could have adorned the body of a performer, producing an intriguing argument for the importance of the body as both conveyer and witness to the history told through the marriage story. Was the silver plate worn specifically during a performance of the marriage or of a different subject? Could it have been worn by an allegorical character like those in Castillo’s loa such as Nobleza? Timberlake argues that the object is not a breastplate, by rather a placard to be

---
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tied at the end of a pole.\textsuperscript{206} In this function, it could have been paraded in the air to enhance a procession. In fact, the style of the silver plate corresponds with the decoration of the triumphal cart that concluded the 1748 procession in Lima. The cart was “embellished all with fine and delicate painting with gilded profiles and reliefs.”\textsuperscript{207} While the odd quadrangular shape suggests that the silver placard did not adorn a cart or a more architectural structure, it may have served as an accoutrement or costume piece for a performer who accompanied such a construction. If the object was displayed in any fashion during an Inca procession, it would insert Beatriz and Martín into the dominant mode of performing Inca history and fully combine the popular \emph{translatio imperii} form with the marriage scene. In the case of the Limeño procession, any decorative representation of the couple would reinsert them into the festivities after they were omitted due to the exclusion of Castillo’s drama.

Any theatrical context evoking Peruvian history that included the placard or similar decorative images exemplifies how the static and the bodily can work together to provide a multi-dimensional performance of history. Most performances include some form of static media that is expressly designed to accompany or enhance bodily performance such as props, painted sets, backdrops, or costumes. The painting in Compañía in Cuzco complimented the representation that actors performed their while wearing costumes that matched the painting. The allegorical characters in Castillo’s \textit{loa} wore their corresponding letters and carried props (such as Amor who held a bow and arrow or Peru who dressed as an “india”). The Incas and Coyas in the Inca procession also wore their specific costumes and carried sumptuous props. In all these

\textsuperscript{206} Timberlake, 367.  
\textsuperscript{207} “embellezido todo de fina delicada pintura con dorados perfiles y relieves” from \textit{El día de Lima}, 260. Translation is my own.
instances, bodies in motion activated the images and objects that contributed to the execution and success of the performance. Considering the bodily, the kinetic, and the theatrical helps resituate the human body’s relationship to static art forms such as painting. As this thesis argues, an understanding of the marriage paintings is not complete without such an analysis.

Even in the absence of the actors, the paintings aroused a sense of performativity and invited the audience to participate in a more animated form of viewership. They evoked the ritual of the Catholic sacrament and thus the audience necessary to fulfill that sacrament. Unlike the devotional paintings in churches, the marriage paintings did not ask for interaction through prayer but were activated through the viewer’s gaze and through their silence. To gaze in silence at the marriage paintings in the eighteenth century was to allow one’s mind and body to travel back in time, to witness a desirable past, to confirm the reality of that past, to commend it as just, to unite it with the present, and to feel hope for the future.
Figure 1. Unknown artist, *Matrimonio de D. Martín de Loyola y Beatriz Clara Coya*, early eighteenth century (1735-41). La Compañía de Jesús, Cuzco.
Figure 2. Unknown artist, *Matrimonio de D. Martín de Loyola y Beatriz Clara Coya*, first half of the eighteenth century. Beaterio de Nuestra Señora de Copacabana, Lima.
Figure 3. Attributed to Sebastián Herrera Barnuevo, *Charles II Surrounded by Images of His Ancestors*, 1670.
Figure 4. Juan Bautista Maino, *La recuperación de Bahía*, 1634-35.
Figure 5. Diego Rodríguez de Silva y Velázquez, *La rendición de Breda*, 1635.
Figure 6. Unknown artist, *Genealogía de los reyes ingas del peru*, first half of the eighteenth century. Beaterio de Nuestra Señora de Copacabana, Lima.
Figure 7. Alonso de la Cueva, *Genealogía de los reyes ingas del peru*, 1725. Engraving.
Figure 8. Unknown artist, *Ornamental Plaque*, eighteenth century. Silver.
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