

Race and the Built Environment in the Iberian World, ca. 1400–1800

Editor's Introduction: Epistemologies of Race and Architecture in the Iberian World

In his meditations about Peruvian architecture a century after that country's independence, the twentieth-century architect, urbanist, critic, and historian Emilio Harth-Terré intertwined notions of identity, modernism, and—unlike most of his contemporaries—race.¹ Harth-Terré penned his words before postcolonial theory emerged. Since then, there have been efforts to decenter the field, although amid abiding epistemological challenges. Most of the architectural histories of the American, Asian, African, and European territories of the Iberian world in the period around 1400 to 1800 have centered on canonical architecture and buildings designed by perceived “white” European architects. The implementation of official languages, urban design regulations, and cartography—or the way the world was represented and understood—consistently tried to efface both racial and religious minorities.² Blood purity statutes established segregation between Old Christians and New Christians, the latter being former Jewish or Muslim people forcibly converted to Catholicism. These statutes had a tremendous impact on regulations across the Iberian world.³ Contributors to this roundtable demonstrate that a nuanced analysis of race and architecture in this period in the Iberian world must also encompass identity, religion, and culture, as distinctions were not always grounded in skin color.⁴

The Iberian world was composed of vast, contrasting geographies and regions, and steeply hierarchical societies; the building trades were indeed hierarchical social structures as well. Legislation that required the segregation of European populations from “other” residents in cities and that prohibited racial and religious minorities from partaking in the building trades across many locales in the Iberian world had important reverberations for these groups, but

also projected imperial ambitions. Recent scholarship on Mexico City and Quito, for example, has demonstrated that Amerindians and their descendants actively participated in and sometimes dominated the building trades.⁵ Similarly, contributors to this roundtable also show that prevailing views on the lack of primary sources about the role played by racial and religious minorities in the building trade have been overestimated. Nevertheless, the task ahead is not without difficulties, as the names of Indigenous, Black, and Brown architects, master masons, carpenters, and stonemasons were purposely silenced in the records.⁶

The greater challenge, however, is epistemological, as the social histories of architecture have privileged a biographical model and the artist–patron relationship, and above all have insisted on placing Europe as the *umbilicus mundi* of architectural production. With the global turn, the study of the circulations of architectural knowledge, or how designs traveled, has become a popular analytical lens. At the same time, this model risks perpetuating the notion of “expansion” by focusing on how so-called European images and designs reached “peripheral regions” of the world. Plenty of evidence challenges this model of studying architecture in a connected world. The architecture of many cities across the former Spanish and Portuguese Empires, from the seventeenth century, sometimes earlier, developed in parallel ways.⁷ Thus, we need to rethink how we engage with the many regions with rich architectural cultures that preceded the arrival of the Portuguese and Spanish in colonial settings, which also means reconsidering existing traditions in the Iberian Peninsula. Complex architectural traditions preceded European contact, and sophisticated architectural cultures thrived beyond the feeble boundaries of the Iberian world. Furthermore, we need to dispel the notion that only some places, some people (those of particular descent, lineage, identity, or religious background), certain forms of built architecture, and certain kinds of generated knowledge are worth studying.

This roundtable presents eleven essays, organized in roughly chronological order, that engage with existing debates and challenge long-held myths. Barbara E. Mundy demonstrates that imperial ideals of urban spatial

Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians 83, no. 3 (September 2024), 268–286, ISSN 0037-9808, electronic ISSN 2150-5926. © 2024 by the Society of Architectural Historians. All rights reserved. Please direct all requests for permission to photocopy or reproduce article content through the University of California Press's Reprints and Permissions web page, <https://online.ucpress.edu/journals/pages/reprintspermissions>, or via email: jpermissions@ucpress.edu. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1525/jsah.2024.83.3.268>.

segregation did not correspond to the lived realities of colonial Mexico City, Lima, and Manila. Other contributors address the memorialization of architectural *spolia* in Oaxacan churches and period writings of Islamic and Visayan architecture in postconquest Spain and the Philippines (Pilar Regueiro Suárez and Juan Luis Burke, Antonio Urquizar-Herrera, Amy Y.T. Chang). Scholars in this roundtable also study how architects, engineers, and patrons of African and Indigenous descent emerged in Goa, Brazil, and Havana (Sidh Losa Mendiratta, Miguel A. Valerio, Rosalía Oliva Suárez and Karen Mahé Lugo Romera, Alice Santiago Faria). Essays about the significant contributions of African and Indigenous builders, carpenters, and smelters and their descendants in Angola, Peru, Ecuador, Bolivia, and Lisbon showcase research methods for a social history of architecture that bring us closer to the realities of the built environment of the time (Sandra M. G. Pinto, Francisco Mamani-Fuentes, Crislayne Alfagali). Authors of this roundtable demonstrate that research on the intersections of race and architecture is not only pressing but can also fundamentally shift our understanding of how architecture emerged and functioned at the time.

Laura Fernández-González
University of Lincoln

Notes

1. My thanks to Alice Tseng, David Karmon, and *JSAH*'s editorial board for their feedback and support during the preparation of this *JSAH* Roundtable. I am also grateful for the generous research fellowships and grants from the Leverhulme Trust (2022–23) and the Society of Antiquaries–London (2022–25), and for the collaboration of CIRIMA (Circulation of Images in the Early Modern Hispanic World, Spanish Ministry of Science and Innovation, PID2020-112808GB-I00).

Emilio Harth-Terré, *El indígena peruano en las bellas artes virreinales* (Lima: Editorial Garcilaso, 1960); Emilio Harth-Terré and Alberto Márquez Abanto, *El artesano negro en la arquitectura virreinal limeña* (Lima: Librería e Imprenta Gil, 1962).

2. Walter D. Mignolo and Arturo Escobar, eds., *Globalization and the Decolonial Option* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2010).

3. See, among others, João Figueirôa-Rego, *A honra alheia por um fio: Os estatutos de limpeza de sangue no espaço de expressão ibérica, sécs. XVI–XVIII* (Lisbon: Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian, 2011); Mercedes García-Arenal and Felipe Pereda, eds., *De sangre y leche: Raza y religión en el mundo ibérico moderno* (Madrid: Marcial Pons, 2021).

4. Ananda Cohen-Aponte, "Making Race Visible in the Colonial Andes," in *Envisioning Others: Race, Color, and the Visual in Iberia and Latin America*, ed. Pamela Patton (Leiden: Brill, 2016), 187–212.

5. Susan E. Webster, *Quito, ciudad de maestros: Arquitectos, edificios y urbanismo en el largo siglo XVII* (Quito: Abyla Yala, 2012); Barbara E. Mundy, *The Death of Aztec Tenochtitlan, the Life of Mexico City* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2015).

6. Abilio Ferreira, ed., *Tebas: Um negro arquiteto na São Paulo escravotira* (São Paulo: Instituto para o Desenho Avançado, 2018); Heta Pandit, *Hidden Hands: Master Builders of Goa* (Porvorim, Goa: Heritage Network, 2003).

7. Laura Fernández-González, *Philip II of Spain and the Architecture of Empire* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2021).

Urban Fantasies of Racial Segregation in Spanish America and the Philippines

The Spanish Habsburgs centered political control in a vast network of cities and towns. In these places, they attempted to segregate residents of Spanish descent from others, be they Indigenous, Black, or Asian. Some scholars have focused on these policies as the primary mechanism through which racialized categories were created and enforced.¹ But was the racially segregated city a lived reality? And do such representations of cities as racially segregated simply reinforce a hegemonic discourse necessary to the empire? Mexico City, Lima, and Manila offer evidence that lived experience contradicted the Habsburg ideal.

Mexico City was the largest and most important American city for the Habsburgs; its sixteenth-century urban core was memorialized in the twentieth century. A schematic representation created in the 1930s retrospectively expresses the policy of separation between *pueblos de españoles* and *pueblos de indios* (Figure 1). The latter were to be populated exclusively by Indigenous peoples and represented politically by "Indian" town councils. People of European (particularly Spanish) descent were to reside in the *pueblos de españoles*, the town councils (*cabildos*) of which were staffed by "Spanish" men. When many of the *pueblos de indios* were called upon to represent themselves for the crown in the 1580s, they mapped their towns on idealized gridiron plans, depicting ordered urban spaces that conformed to Habsburg juridical discourse and ecclesiastical expectations.²

But a strict spatial segregation between *indios* and *españoles* was impossible in Mexico City, a place founded upon Aztec (or Mexica) Tenochtitlan. Throughout the sixteenth century, its Indigenous residents outnumbered Spaniards and others. By about 1540, the city had three *cabildos*, two of them representing Indigenous residents. San Juan Tenochtitlan and Santiago Tlatelolco married the names of the city's two pre-Hispanic polities with those of Christian saints, and their *cabildos* made decisions in the interests of Indigenous men and women in the postconquest city. Men and women of all classes and ethnicities moved freely through the urban sphere.

While Lima had been founded upon the lands of the Indigenous lord Taulichusco, its smaller population made it easier for the authorities to attempt racialized urban segregation. By 1571, Indigenous residents were corralled into a new urban neighborhood, Santiago del Cercado. With thirty-five blocks arranged around a large central plaza where a church stood, it housed approximately one thousand people. Some of the neighborhood's residents had long-term ties to the area, but others were brought to the city by Viceroy Toledo's *reducciones*, which forced Indigenous tributaries into new towns under religious supervision.³

Notes

1. Paul Niell, *Urban Space as Heritage in Late Colonial Cuba: Classicism and Dissonance on the Plaza de Armas of Havana, 1754–1828* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2015). This essay has been translated from the original Spanish by Laura Fernández-González.
2. The bibliography is too extensive to cite here in any detail. For one example, see Alejandro de la Fuente, “Slaves and the Creation of Legal Rights in Cuba: *Coartación and Papel*,” *Hispanic American Historical Review* 87, no. 4 (Nov. 2007), 659–92.
3. Alicia García Santana, *Los modelos españoles de la casa cubana*, vol. 1 (Havana: Ediciones Polymita, 2022); Carlos Venegas Fornias, *Ciudad del Nuevo Mundo* (Havana: Instituto Cultural Juan Marinello, 2012).
4. To cite one example, see, Acta del Cabildo de La Habana, del 13 de junio de 1676, Libro 15 trasuntado, fol. 140.
5. Rosalía Oliva Suárez, “Los espacios domésticos habaneros entre 1650 y 1750” (PhD diss., University of Granada, 2014).
6. Francisco Prat Puig, *El pre barroco en Cuba: Una escuela criolla de arquitectura Morisca* (Havana: Burgay y Cia, 1947).
7. “Lorenza de Carvaxal le hace donación a la liberta parda Juana de Carvajal,” Escribanía de Ortega, 1698, fol. 037v, Archivo Nacional de la República de Cuba (hereafter ARNAC).
8. “Lorenza de Carvaxal le hace donación a la liberta parda Juana de Carvajal,” fol. 037v. On women in Cuba, see María del Carmen Barcia Zequeira, *Mujeres al margen de la historia* (Havana: Ciencias Sociales, 2009).
9. Antigua Anotaduría de Hipoteca, Libro 4, fol. 155v, ARNAC.
10. Antigua Anotaduría de Hipoteca, Libro 3, fol. 183r, ARNAC.
11. Antigua Anotaduría de Hipoteca, Libro 3, fol. 188, ARNAC.
12. Carta Arqueológica, 2011, Gestión del Patrimonio Arqueológico, Gabinete de Arqueología de la Oficina del Historiador de La Habana, La Habana Vieja, Cuba.

Knowledge, Race, and Architecture in the Portuguese Empire

Attempts to foster the teaching of military architecture and engineering in colonial settings across the Portuguese Empire, from Brazil to India, Angola, and Cabo Verde, occurred from the early 1760s onward.¹ The role of the crown and the importance of educating the “children of the land” have been emphasized in the historiography along with successful examples of architectural and engineering pedagogy in Brazil. However, examining the case of Goa, which had no immediate success, provides insight into the interconnected dynamics of knowledge, race, and architecture that would shape the built environment of the former Portuguese imperial territories. The first engineer to be appointed, in February 1675, to Estado da Índia (Portuguese India) with teaching responsibilities was Manuel Barreto da Ponte.² The engineer’s teaching assignment faced opposition from Goa’s government, which feared that the graduates might work for competing empires in the region. Despite Lisbon’s insistence on admitting “the naturals of the land” as students, the viceroy of India resisted; the teaching would be limited to *casados* (married Portuguese) resident in Goa.³ In January 1677, the Overseas Council accepted this proposal but pointed out its disadvantages. Yet the persistent resistance from Goa and the lack of records about teaching lead us to believe that Barreto da Ponte never taught military architecture in Goa.

The *casados* are at the genesis of the “children of the land,” an expression that was used in several territories of the Portuguese Empire to identify those who were born and raised in particular places, *mestiços* in culture and ways of living.⁴ The children of the land could be people of Portuguese or mixed Portuguese and Indigenous descent. Thus, these colonial subjects represented a unique link between colonial power and local reality across the former Portuguese Empire. Goan elites were normally divided into three main groups: “naturals of the land,” descendants, and *reinóis*, who were the Portuguese from Europe. The “naturals of the land” mentioned by Lisbon in archival records were specifically the Goan Hindu elites who had converted to Christianity.⁵

Despite numerous earlier attempts, the regular teaching of military architecture and engineering in Goa did not begin until 1807. A formal teaching structure was established in 1817 with the creation of the Military Academy. Numerous descendants of Portuguese people in India studied and taught at the academy and in subsequent teaching establishments. Through the army and military schools, the descendants wielded influence over public works; they became teachers, directors of public works, and designers, thus establishing their presence across the Portuguese Empire in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.⁶ Power clashes among several elites of Goan society, but also among the descendants themselves, related to “purity of blood” issues resulted in the dissolution of the Portuguese Indian army in 1870 and the closing of the military schools.

At the turn of the 1700s to the 1800s, a significant political, administrative, and territorial reconfiguration occurred in Estado da Índia and across the empire. This facilitated the organization of military education and enabled a network of experts—descendants, born and trained in Goa—to play a significant role in transforming the built environment across various regions of the former Portuguese Empire in the nineteenth century. They restructured the urban landscapes of Goan villages and were responsible for the design of the majority of churches and civic buildings throughout the territory, such as the courthouse in Margão, the administrative buildings in Quepém and Pondá, and the archbishop’s palace in Pangim.

When working in different parts of the empire, experts from Goan schools normally served for long periods. Engineers who circulated across the empire and had important hierarchical roles in imperial public works also attended the military school in Lisbon. This illustrates a disparity in diploma recognition between Goan military schools and the teaching establishments in Lisbon, as well as the hierarchical social organization of the empire. Constantino José de Brito (b. 1836, Goa; d. 1914, Lisbon) and Alcino António Sauvage (1844–1914, Goa) represent two distinct groups

within the descendant community. Brito also studied in Lisbon and reached higher echelons in his career. He was director of public works of Macau and Timor from 1881 to 1884, and he designed and built the Taipa Church in Macau and the Barracks in Timor, among others. Sauvage only attended Goan schools and served in Macau from 1874 to 1893 as subdirector and substitute director for several periods. An exceptional example is Claudino de Sousa e Faro (b. 1840, Goa; d. 1919, France) who served in Angola (1873–76), Cabo Verde (1876–81), São Tomé (1881–84), and India (1893–95). As far as it is known, he studied only in Goa, but he had long-standing family connections across the Portuguese Empire, especially between Africa and India. He designed and built the Maria Pia Hospital in Luanda, Angola, and the Governor's Palace at Cidade da Praia, Cabo Verde; he also coordinated several cartographical projects in all the territories where he served. Thus, the study of the careers of these Goan-born engineers and architects can provide insights into the circulation of knowledge and social and racial hierarchies in the Portuguese Empire in the nineteenth century.

ALICE SANTIAGO FARIA
Nova University of Lisbon

Notes

1. Among many others, for a recent overview see Renata Araújo, Margarida Tavares da Conceição, and Alice Santiago Faria, "Building Expertise: Learning Places in the Early Modern Portuguese Empire," in *Technical and Scientific Training in the Construction of Empires: On the Quest of Learning Places* (New York: Routledge, forthcoming, 2024).
2. Consultas da Índia, Cod. 212, fol. 43, 1675, Arquivo Histórico Ultramarino, Conselho Ultramarino (hereafter AHU, CU).
3. "Naturais da terra," AHU.CU.058.cx054, Índia, 1675–79, 4 fols., AHU, CU; AHU.CU.058.cx054, Índia, 1675–79, 28 Jan. 1677, doc. 128, AHU, CU; Consultas da Índia, Cod. 212, fol. 58, AHU, CU.
4. The term in Portuguese is *filhos da terra*. See António Manuel Hespanha, *Filhos da terra: Identidades mestiças nos confins da expansão portuguesa* (Lisbon: Tinta da China, 2019).
5. See, for example, C. R. Boxer *Portuguese Society in the Tropics: The Municipal Councils of Goa, Macao, Babia, and Luanda, 1510–1800* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1965); Maria de Jesus dos Mártires Lopes, "Naturais, reinóis e luso-descendentes: A socialização conseguida," in *O império oriental, 1660–1820*, ed. Maria de Jesus dos Mártires Lopes (Lisbon: Editorial Estampa, 2006), 2:15–70.
6. See Alice Santiago Faria, "O papel dos luso-descendentes na engenharia militar e nas obras públicas em Goa no longo século XIX," in *Goa: Passado e presente*, ed. Artur Teodoro de Matos and João Teles e Cunha (Lisbon: CEPCEP e CHAM, 2012), 1:225–37. See also Alice Santiago Faria, "Administração colonial e obras públicas: As direcções de obras públicas nos territórios do antigo oriente português (1869–1926)," in *Ciência, tecnologia e medicina na construção de Portugal*, vol. 3, *Século IX*, ed. Ana Carneiro, Teresa S. Mota, and Isabel Amaral (Lisbon: Tinta da China, 2021), 237–59.