The Search for a New Art. Pre-Hispanic and Colonial Revivals in the Americas

Gutiérrez Viñuales, Rodrigo. "The Search for a New Art. Pre-Hispanic and Colonial Revivals in the Americas". En: Alonso, Idurre; Casciato, Maristella (eds.). *The Metropolis in Latin America, 1830–1930: Cityscapes, Photographs, Debates*. Los Ángeles, The Getty Foundation, 2021, pp. 213-223. ISBN: 978-1-60606-694-2

Architecture and Identity in the Nineteenth Century: Europe, a Necessary Context

Inquiring into origins, recuperating history, reinforcing identity. These are some of the obsessions that, coinciding with the fall of monarchies, began to spread over Old Europe at the end of the eighteenth century. Their repercussions were felt in other geographies of the world, shaping from then on certain features that in various and changing forms have survived until today.

The eighteenth century was the epoch of the formation and consolidation of academies, the triumph of the Enlightenment, the expansion of encyclopedism, and the supremacy of neoclassicism in the arts. The Enlightenment was succeeded by Romanticism, with its radical conceptual variations. The paradigmatic shift was evident: the Enlightenment conviction of being able to control nature by means of the exhaustive knowledge of all the species was replaced by the idealistic certainty of human submission to it. Romantic travelers, very active in the Americas during the nineteenth century, changed their perception, eagerly submitting to being subjugated by the Other, by the different, by the exotic.

European textual and visual cultural demonstrated its avarice for this type of imagery. In architecture, the growing questioning of neoclassical rigidity allowed other variables retrieved from Europe's own past to come into play, incorporated into the development of an identity focused and nationalist consciousness. The medieval revival spread among Central European nations like an identity signifier; while in the third quarter of the nineteenth century Germany considered the completion of the Cologne cathedral to its great national project, in France Eugène Viollet-le-Duc carried out the restoration and reconstruction of the fortified town of Carcassonne, not without polemics. Many other such cases permitted overcoming the derision that since the Renaissance had been poured on epochs like the Romanesque and Gothic.

By then, other historicist fashions had carved out a space for themselves within the recuperative architectural fervor, such as the exoticisms of neo-Egyptian or neo-Arabic styles, the latter established in England, where it was known as the Moorish style.[1] During the 1830s, the British architect Owen Jones made several trips to Granada, Spain, to visit and record the decorations of the Alhambra, resulting in his book *The Grammar of Ornament* (1856).[2] Apart from its technical aspect, this work evidences Jones's intention of practical application, as he had already demonstrated in the construction of the Alhambra Court for the 1851 World's Fair in London, where the decorative elements were subordinated to the use of new building technologies and to his color theories. This attitude obviously minimized any hint of strictly archaeological reverence in favor of a total liberty in the use of modern materials and decorative elements, even mixed with ornaments taken from other sources. It characterized an architectural praxis that must be taken into account in order to understand what would be, decades later, the proposals that interest us in this case: those of the neo-pre-Hispanic[3] and of the neocolonial or US-American Spanish revivals[4] in their different variants.

The context of the World's Fairs is vital for understanding this process in which architecture, history, and identity were amalgamated. Initiated with the abovementioned Great Exhibition in London in 1851, a constant and surprising succession of "ephemeral cities" popped up, constructed rapidly and of short-lived duration. Two exceptions to this ephemerality will be central to our argument: the exhibitions in San Diego (1915) and in Seville (1929), whose buildings were preserved as an ensemble. Indeed, these exhibitions—which concentrated in a specific urban location the representation of different nations, with the nations displaying their technological advances and culture—also became laboratories for architectonic styles, in some cases unusual ones, and sites for experimentation with formulas that were later transferred, or not, to the actual cities. The fairs offered the exhibiting nations to represent themselves with their own historical styles, seeking ones that would distinguish them as much as possible from other nations. This was the case with Spain, for example, which often presented itself with pavilions containing Islamic reminiscences—that is, characteristics that distinguished Spain from other European countries.

Some of the Latin American nations, joining these events at later dates, made use of their pre-Hispanic roots in the world's fairs celebrated in Paris —including, for exemple, Peru in 1878 and Mexico and Ecuador in 1889. This represented the beginning of a process of reinterpretation of pre-Columbian art and architecture, based on a growing interest in that period, as evidenced in academic treatises of the École de Paris. One such work was the *Histoire des styles d'architecture dans tous les pays* (1891; History of the styles of architecture in all countries) by Jean Étienne Casimir Bárberot, which discussed the *style mexicain* and *style peruvien.*[5] Both styles had been present in the form of ideal houses at the 1889 World's Fair. At the same time, this interest was manifested in the increase of scientific expeditions to archaeological areas, with teams of historians, draftspeople, and photographers tasked with recording the architectural and artistic relics that had survived. Many of these enterprises, above all those traveling to Mexico, were sponsored by US-American universities. The outcomes were books that chronicled these experiences and the graphic repertories recorded in situ, which sometimes served as manuals of decorative forms to be used by architects in new building projects, at a moment when the fervor for the facade imposed itself on functional sound judgment.

The Dawn of Neo-Pre-Hispanic Architecture in Latin America

Various neo-pre-Hispanic works were erected in the last third of the nineteenth century, above all in Mexico, with milestones such as the monuments to Cuauhtémoc on Paseo de la Reforma in 1887 and to Benito Juárez in Oaxaca in 1894. These were state undertakings in which the governing powers promoted national identity by means of autochthonous styles. In the same period, at the southern end of the continent, the architect Tebaldo Brugnoli Caccialuini constructed a neo-Aztec pantheon in the Cementerio General in Santiago de Chile, while Frederick Ward Putnam, director of the archaeology section of the World's Columbian Exposition in Chicago (1893), proposed including Maya decorations in the Anthropology Building. In Mexico, dissident voices soon rose up against these neo-pre-Hispanic practices, questioning the usefulness of modern buildings conceived in the manner of pre-Columbian ones. The claim was that, except for nonutilitarian works such as commemorative monuments, neo-pre-Hispanic structures were inadequate for contemporary needs.

One such detractor was the architect Manuel F. Álvarez, who in his writings anticipated the vision of Adolf Loos in the latter's "Ornament und Verbrechen" (1908; "Ornament and Crime"). In 1900, Álvarez published *Las ruinas de Mitla y la arquitectura nacional* (The ruins of Mitla and national architecture), in which he declared:

> Recently we have seen the appearance of Aztec letters, as if the Indians had known the alphabet and letters with adornments like ours had not existed in the Middle Ages, as one can see in Jones's *Grammar of Ornament.* We have also seen a Zapotec piano, as though the piano had been known in that period. . . . It will not be far off before one day we see an Aztec electric wagon, because the outside is painted with Indian fretwork. Enough of improper and even ridiculous uses; let us dedicate ourselves instead to disseminating the art of drawing, to knowing and appreciating the beauty of an artwork, to correctly treating and encouraging the development of art, and to successfully attaining utility, truth, and beauty, that trinity of art.[6]

In general, the neo-pre-Hispanic was not employed in the celebrations of the 1910 centennial, with notable exceptions, and it seemed to be doomed in Mexico. However, a decade later, it was resuscitated by the architect Manuel Amábilis in Mérida, Mexico, with works such as the façade of the Masonic lodge in the old temple of Dulce nombre de Jesús or Jesús María (disappeared) and the Sanatorio Rendón Peniche (1919), in collaboration with the engineer Gregory Webb.

The Hispanization of Architecture in California

While this was happening in the revival of the pre-Columbian, other paths were taken in the context of what was perceived to be Hispanic. After the Mexican-American War (1846–48) and the annexation of Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and California, the United States had inherited the missions, which began to be recuperated as an architectural heritage, in particular from the 1880s on, with the increased settlement of California. This rediscovered heritage led to the acquisition of symbols, such as the Alamo by Texas (1883); the restoration of original buildings, some of them in ruins; and the emergence of the mission style. Such an architectonic strategy allowed the multiplication of aesthetics of the past, which became, as Susana Torre notes, "mere symbols of an invented regional identity."[7] The process was stimulated by the publication and commercial success of *Ramona* (1884) by Helen Hunt Jackson, a novel set in the old missions. California found here the opportunity of not only acquiring the vestiges of a foreign history of Mexican roots but also transforming it into a substantial component of its own identity.[8]

In the following years, the mission style increasingly triumphed in California, adopting as a model the traditional adobe houses of Indigenous villages from New Mexico, disseminated in specialist journals such as *Architecture News,* launched in 1890 by Willis Polk in San Francisco, in which various articles and drawings were published on the California missions. The use of elements such as bell gables, bell towers, tiles, wrought-iron grilles, porches, balconies, windows with latticework, patios with fountains, and tiles of Sevillian origin became fashionable, the style applied to private residences, hotels, theaters, libraries, and train stations.[9] For the 1893 World's Fair in Chicago, the California Pavilion, with its mission features, established this tendency as the visual paradigm of the region. By then, Florida was enthusiastically

emulating Hispanic styles too, always marked by a high degree of eclecticism, imparting the colonial imaginary to residential and holiday zones such as Saint Augustine. Pioneering works of Spanish revival were erected in that city by architects such as John Carrère, Thomas Hastings, and Franklin Waldo Smith in the 1880s.

This Spanish revival would embody another variant within the so-called California style,[10] very different from the mission style: the constructive and ornamental modesty of the latter, born out of its popular nature, contrasted with the decorative baroque exaggeration of the Spanish revival, which was based primarily on colonial Mexican churches. Some architects alternated both variants in their production. This was the case with Julia Morgan,[11] the first woman admitted to the École des Beaux-Arts in Paris, from which she graduated in 1902. Once back in California, Morgan became the favorite architect of the Hearst family, designing the building of the *Los Angeles Examiner* in mission style. Her most outstanding work, Hearst Castle (1919–47), located in San Simeon, integrates features of the Spanish revival with others drawn from the Mediterranean region.

Various towns in California were architecturally molded by the Hispanic fever, with entire neighborhoods styled in the neocolonial fashion. But not only that: in the 1920s, this entire process would be accompanied by a massive edition of books on Mexican baroque architecture, including studies, plans, and abundant photographic reports, with the dual purpose of providing knowledge about it and facilitating repertories to architects and interior designers who desired to apply the principles and ornamentation of this style to modern buildings.[12]

For all of this to be possible, it was necessary to take trips to the Mexican interior to make documentary and graphic surveys. One of the first to recognize the potential of such surveys was the architect Bertram Grosvenor Goodhue, author of the book *Mexican Memories* (1892), which recounts some of Goodhue's experiences in different regions of Mexico and includes his own drawings.[13] Goodhue later assumed the task of drawing the plans for the most important publication in this field, *Spanish-Colonial Architecture in Mexico,* published beginning in 1901 by Sylvester Baxter, with a volume of text and eleven boxes containing photographs of Mexican monuments by Henry Greenwood Peabody.[14] Goodhue was commissioned to design Balboa Park in San Diego on the occasion of the Panama-California Exhibition of 1915, transforming this space into a "city within a city" characterized by its Spanish revival architecture, the result of Goodhue's fascination with colonial Mexico.

The publication of *The Franciscan Mission Architecture of Alta California* by Rexford Newcomb in 1916, and its ensuing widespread dissemination in the Americas, set a new landmark in this process of the Hispanization of architecture, boosting the labor that various Latin American architects had been carrying out in theory and in practice. Newcomb's objective was evident: "to assist, in a practical way, the cause of architecture by recording by means of notes, drawings and photographs, the real spirit and detail of these buildings. . . . The writer was convinced that many architects were designing in the style who, if they had ever seen the old buildings, were making poor interpretation of the spirit in which they were erected."[15]

Revaluations of the "Hispanic" in Latin America: Theory and Practice

In the 1920s, the diffusion of studies such as *Spanish Homes of California* (1925)[16], the development of Hollywood cinema, and the presence of Hispanic-style buildings in architecture journals broadened the repertoire of references for architects drawn to these forms. These trends exerted notable influence all over the Caribbean, especially in

Cuba, Santo Domingo, and Puerto Rico. In the latter, architects trained in the United States such as Pedro Adolfo de Castro and Rafael Carmoega were proponents of Hispanophilia.[17] In Cuba, the tendency was represented by Evelio Govantes Fuertes and Félix Cabarrocas Ayala, authors of, among other works, the Cuban pavilion at the Exposición Iberoamericana in Seville in 1929. After their return from Spain, Govantes and Cabarrocas designed a splendid neo-Maya theater in Rancho Boyeros, surely inspired by the Mexican pavilion erected by Manuel Amábilis at that Sevillian exhibition.

By the time Newcomb's books began to be disseminated, the rescue and appreciation of the "Hispanic" in Latin America was undergoing a timid process of consolidation as an assimilable cultural alternative within national identity. It was not at all an easy process: after independence and during the nineteenth century, everything Spanish had been regarded with suspicion, if not antagonism. American baroque, the obvious testimony to the cultural integration between Europe and the New World in the colonial epoch, had been treated since the end of the eighteenth century with indifference and had even been opposed by the academies—starting with those founded by the Spanish themselves. Baroque forms survived almost solely in an underground manner and subsisted in the hands of artisans working in popular art forms and in , the prints by travelers from European Romanticism.[18] It is worth quoting Jorge Alberto Manrique when referring to the latter: "By painting or lithographing urban landscapes, they very often included baroque churches or palaces, in part because these remained, despite everything, the dominant urban landmarks, and partly because their bizarre baroqueness also possessed the exotic quality they were seeking."[19]

Latin American urban architecture of that period was sunk in evident confusion, uncritically adopting foreign, classical, or European models, in apparent contradiction with its own roots.[20] This is noticeable in emblematic buildings, official seats of government, and state public works, which contrasted with the modesty of popular architectures dispersed in neighborhoods and villages of the interior, without a doubt more genuine. The baroque and the autochthonous kept alive a flame that would resurge in the first decades of the twentieth century, when the celebrations of the centennials and their subsequent revision of the history and culture of the Americas once more revealed the intrinsic value of a past that had reached the present along sinuous paths. The European crisis of 1914 and the outbreak of war strengthened the sense of belonging and identity-based affirmations even more. The two most characteristic epochs of the past, the pre-Hispanic and the colonial, and specifically their architectonic and artistic forms and languages, not only contributed toward crystallizing the process itself but also set the tone for a modernization grounded in tradition.

The mammoth work of Sylvester Baxter laid solid foundations for the diffusion of the Mexican baroque in the United States, in particular among the architects engaged in transforming it into historicism. In Mexico, comparable foundations were established thanks to photographic documentation of the country's churches was carried out by the German photographer Guillermo Kahlo. The photography was commissioned by the Dirección General de Monumentos, and resulted in twenty-five volumes of *Templos de propiedad federal* (1909; Temples of federal property), published at almost the same time as the construction of one of the first neocolonial works, the Capilla del Panteón Inglés (chapel of the English Pantheon) in Mexico City (1908–9), on the eve of the centennial celebrations and the outbreak of the Revolution. Documentary work similar to Kahlo's was completed a few years later by Martín Chambi Jiménez in the region of Cuzco, the brothers Carlos and Miguel Vargas Zaconet in Arequipa, and Luigi Domenico Gismondi in La Paz.

In Mexico, the architect Federico Ernesto Mariscal Piña published in 1915 his essay *La patria y la arquitectura nacional* (The fatherland and national architecture), in which he ardently promoted the recuperation of colonial Mexican architecture,[21] and in 1917 the government of Venustiano Carranza decreed an exemption from taxation for all those who built in the colonial style.[22] In the 1920s, under the secretary of education José Vasconcelos, the indigenist agenda, expressed primarily in mural painting, coexisted with support for neocolonial architecture. The latter was evident in the Mexican pavilion for the centennial exhibition of Brazilian independence in Rio de Janeiro (1922), designed by Carlos Obregón Santacilia and Carlos Tarditi, as well as in the construction of the Colonias Polanco and Lomas de Chapultepec neighborhoods.[23] This practice of instituting neocolonial architecture was not without its detractors, however, among them Diego Rivera, who saw in it a simple and false imitation of Hollywood sets.[24]

Similar to the above-cited Federico Mariscal in Mexico, a variety of architects in other Latin American countries promoted the reevaluation of the colonial past in publications, lectures, and architectonic practice, in notable concurrence. In Argentina in 1913 and 1914, the architects Alejandro Christophersen and Martín Noel highlighted the values of colonial architecture in various talks; they were joined in successive years by Ángel Guido and Héctor Greslebin. In 1914, the Portuguese architect Ricardo Severo lectured on the topic at the Sociedade de Cultura Artística in São Paulo. Shortly afterward, the physician José Marianno Carneiro da Cunha Filho, influential in official circles during the 1920s, sponsored trips by Lúcio Costa and other students to the Minas Gerais region, with the goal of "discovering" colonial villages and churches. The neocolonial style became established, as can be seen in the Brazilian pavilions for the World's Fair in Philadelphia (1925) and the exhibition in Seville (1929). In Peru, Héctor Velarde Bergmann stood out with works such as the Universidad Mayor de San Agustín in Arequipa (1936-40) and the Nunciatura Apostólica in Lima (1940-42), among many others projects.

Hispanic-Indigenous Fusion and the Search for a Genuine Style

The debates on a national architecture, with terminologies often similar to those employed in the visual arts, drew attention to the colonial past while also focusing on the pre-Hispanic. This occurred even in countries like Argentina, which, despite its more modest pre-Hispanic legacy as compared to Mexico or Peru, still became a leading exponent of neo-pre-Hispanic design, as demonstrated not only in the applied arts but also in the illustration of books and magazines.[25] In the field of architecture, the outstanding figure was Héctor Greslebin, creator of various unrealized projects and some that were built, such as his own house, the house of his brother César, and that of Alberto Colombo, all in Buenos Aires.[26]

The social implications of both styles, neocolonial and neo-pre-Hispanic, should not be ignored. The "Hispanic," as Pedro Belaúnde has noted for Peru, was principally supported by the oligarchy and elites in power, while the indigenista movements were backed by progressives who asserted the necessity of a society grounded in the Indigenous culture rejecting the colonial past.[27] Personalities of the stature of José María Arguedas, José Carlos Mariátegui, and Víctor Raúl Haya de la Torre participated in this debate. With both historical tendencies nurtured by separate bases, theoretical and practical proposals arose for a fusion of both, regarded as a valid path toward a proper and original "American art." This was claimed by the Argentinian writer Ricardo Rojas in his book *Eurindia* (1924), in which he envisaged the

convergence of "European technology" with "Latin American emotion".[28] Rojas thus joined a current of thought established by the Mexican anthropologist and archaeologist Manuel Gamio in *Forjando patria* (1916; *Forging the Homeland*) as a path toward a "national art": bring the aesthetic criteria of the Indigenous class closer to art of a European type and push the middle class toward Indigenous art. Gamio wrote, "When the middle-class individual and the indigene have the same sensibility in art, we will be redeemed culturally."[29]

The middle years of the 1920s saw a high concentration of important theoretical texts relating to the concept of the Indigenous and the Hispanic. This is when Ángel Guido published his *Fusión hispano-indígena en la arquitectura colonial* (1925; Hispanic-Indigenous fusion in colonial architecture), defending, among other positions, the fact that the *métissage* that they proposed in their works was not a contemporary "invention" but had occurred during the colonial period.[30] At the same time that he published his *Orientación espiritual de la arquitectura en América* (Spiritual orientation of architecture in the Americas) in 1927, Guido initiated the construction of one of his most exceptional works, the house for Ricardo Rojas in Buenos Aires.[31] This house was conceived as a work in the Euroindio style, putting into practice "Hispanic-Indigenous Fusion". The year before, his colleague Martín Noel had brought out his *Fundamentos para una estética nacional* (1926; Fundamentals for a national aesthetic), while in 1930 Rojas himself published his *Silabario de la decoración americana* (Syllabary of Latin American decoration).[32] The Hispanicizing fever affected not only architecture but also the recuperation of colonial furniture to equip the private spaces with a taste in concordance with the container, stimulating the development of a broad industry of neobaroque furniture and tiles for interiors, patios, fountains, and benches.

Pre-Hispanic Design, Applied Arts, and School Pedagogy

The integration in the arts of architecture and the applied arts mentioned above in regard to the neocolonial style was equally evident in the neo-pre-Hispanic tendency, which was taken up again in the 1910s, coinciding with the First World War and the resulting inward gaze of Latin Americans. The echo of the postulates regarding artisanal traditions espoused by William Morris and his epigones in the Arts and Crafts movement reached Latin America, thanks to the widespread dissemination of journals such as *The Studio* from London, and inspired the planning, foundation, and promotion of various Arts and Crafts schools all over the American continents. These schools seemed destined to resurrect the notable work of the old colonial workshops, buried by the classicizing actions of the fine-arts academies.

In this context, the recuperation of pre-Hispanic languages turned into the principal leitmotiv, being applied to textiles, furniture, everyday utensils, the graphic design of posters, books, and magazines, and of course to architecture, sculpture, and painting. These schools and workshops found in the salons of decorative and applied arts a showcase for dissemination at the social level, fostering a taste for their productions. A list of artists (some well known and many others unknown) and of works would be interminable, but at least a handful can be cited, to recall the furniture and ceramics produced in Argentina by Alfredo Guido, José Gerbino, and Adolfo Travascio; the *marajoaras* ceramics of the Portuguese artist Fernando Correia Dias in Brazil; the carved wooden doors that the Peruvian Mariano Fuentes Lira made for the Warisata School in Bolivia; the stage sets by Pedro Pablo Traversari Salazar in Ecuador; the works of the Escuela Libre de Escultura y Talla Directa in Mexico, headed by

Guillermo Ruiz and Gabriel Fernández Ledesma; and the Escuela de Artes y Oficios promoted by Pedro Figari in Uruguay.

These efforts did not remain merely local; they found an international stage enthusiastically receptive to their innovations. Paris, the nerve center of the arts at that moment, had been experiencing since the end of the nineteenth century a sense of exhaustion regarding formal Western resources, so the city was casting its gaze to other geographies. The Japanese print as a path toward synthesis and the African mask as the symbol of primitivism were joined by an art expression that would be revolutionary: the appearance in 1909 of the Ballets Russe of Serguéi Pávlovich Diáguilev. The ballets emerged on the horizon as the paradigm of the Gesamtkunstwerk: painting, sculpture, architecture, graphic design, stage sets, music, theater, dance, costuming, and so on. All of these cohabited in a harmonious integration of mediums, shattering the tyrannical hierarchy of the three fine arts upheld by the academies and blazing a clear path to modernism and the avant-gardes.

A number of Latin American artists based in the French capital—among them the Argentinian Rodolfo Franco, the Mexican Adolfo Best Maugard, the Uruguayan Carlos Alberto Castellanos, and the Columbian Rómulo Rozo, to name only a few—began to grasp the suggestive potential of the pre-Hispanic art at the Musée d'Ethnographie du Trocadéro and in private collections. The stimulation from these works inspired the formation of Indigenous ballets such as Campañia Incaica, formed in Cuzco by the historian and anthropologist Luis Eduardo Valcárcel Vizcarra, which had great success with its Quechua drama *Ollantay* in Peru, Bolivia, Argentina, and Uruguay in the early 1920s. A similar case was the Ballet Caaporá, of Guaraní inspiration, created in 1915 in Buenos Aires by Ricardo Güiraldes and Alfredo González Garaño, who were responsible for the libretto and designs, respectively.

The recuperation of pre-Columbian motifs and art did not remain a mere exercise of the intellectual elite; rather, its creators strove to generate an awareness at the base, that is, to situate their reflections in school themselves, at the same time circulating these reflections via magazines, a clearly avant-garde attitude. Artists who had lived in prewar Paris—such as the abovementioned Best Maugard, with his *Método de dibujo: Tradición, resurgimiento y evolución del arte mexicano* (Drawing method: Tradition, resurgence, and evolution of Mexican art); and the Argentinian Gonzalo Leguizamón Pondal, with his six notebooks *Viracocha,* produced together with Alberto Gelly Cantilo —were the authors, in 1923 and now thousands of kilometers apart from each other, of manuals that used folk and Indigenous arts to teach drawing in schools.[33] Similar and slightly later works were created by the Peruvian Elena Izcue in her *El arte peruano en la escuela* (1926; *Peruvian Art in the School*) and Abel Gutiérrez with *Dibujos indígenas de Chile* (1928; Indigenous drawings of Chile).[34]

Epilogue: Toward an Architectural Modernity of One's Own

The aesthetic spheres sketched in the preceding paragraphs traced the paths along which the avant-garde and tradition intersected, permitting that Latin America make concrete its own search for modernity. The fundamentally geometric patterns of pre-Columbian art perfectly accommodated the postcubist precepts and art deco of the mid-twentieth century, as well as the new architectonic proposals of the emerging modernist movement, which can be appreciated in the formulations of Frank Lloyd Wright and Robert Stacy-Judd in California.[35] The salons and architecture journals were populated with projects, ultimately realized or not, that made use of pre-Columbian ornamental principles. The architect Manuel Amábilis in Mérida, Mexico, the sculptor Manuel

Piqueras Cotolí in Lima, the archaeologist Arturo Posnansky in La Paz, and Héctor Greslebin in Buenos Aires made the taste for such forms of expression patent in various buildings.

The Exposición Iberoamericana in Seville of 1929 can be cited as the culmination of this process, as a space where the neocolonial, the neo-pre-Hispanic, and the Hispanic-Indigenous fusion converged. Today the exposition is the outstanding open-air museum of these styles, where artists such as Govantes and Cabarrocas, Amábilis, Noel, Piqueras Cotolí, the Uruguayan Mauricio Cravotto, and the Spanish-Chilean Juan Martínez Gutiérrez—all recognized architects of Latin American modernism—left their mark in diverse national pavilions.

The advances of rationalism would increasingly capture the interest of successive generations of architects. Nonetheless, the neocolonial style, freed of decorative excesses and approaching the simplification typical of folk architecture, would go on to discover new spaces of formulation and harmonious coexistence with functionalism. Key figures of Latin American modernism, such as the Brazilian Lúcio Costa, the Mexican Luis Barragán, and the Venezuelan Carlos Raúl Villanueva, drew on colonial reminiscences as part of their initial repertoires. This can be seen in their respective projects: the Argentinian embassy in Rio de Janeiro (1927), the house for Efraín González Luna in Guadalajara (1928), and the settlement El Silencio in Caracas (1945). This tendency was accompanied by the so-called California style, often used in plans for residences and singular buildings in the 1930s and 1940s, constituting a renovated process whose vicissitudes would extend well into the following decades.

Notes

This essay was translated from the Spanish by David Sánchez Cano.

1. Rafael López Guzmán and Rodrigo Gutiérrez Viñuales, eds., *Alhambras: Arquitectura neoárabe en Latinoamérica* (Granada: Editorial Almed, 2017).

2. Owen Jones, *The Grammar of Ornament* (London: Day and Son, 1856).]

3. Marjorie Ingle, *Mayan Revival Style: Art Deco Mayan Fantasy* (Salt Lake City: Peregrine Smith, 1984); and Rodrigo Gutiérrez Viñuales, "Arquitectura historicista de raíces prehispánicas," *Goya,* no. 289–90 (July–October 2002): 267–86.

4. Aracy Amaral, ed., *Arquitectura neocolonial: América Latina, Caribe, Estados Unidos* (São Paulo: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1994); and Rodrigo Gutiérrez Viñuales, "Arquitectura de raíces hispanas: Entre los 'estilos californianos' y el neocolonial (1880–1940)," in *Baja California: Herencia, memoria e identidad patrimonial,* ed. Miguel Ángel Sorroche Cuerva (Granada: Universidad de Granada, 2014), 281–307.

5. Jean Étienne Casimir Bárberot, *Histoire des styles d'architecture dans tous les pays: Depuis les temps anciens jusqu'a nos jours,* 2 vols. (Paris: Baudry et cie, 1891).

6. Manuel F. Álvarez, "Creación de una arquitectura nacional," in *Las ruinas de Mitla y la arquitectura nacional* (Mexico City: n.p., 1900), 273–82.

7. Susana Torre, "En busca de una identidad regional: Evolución de los estilos misionero y neocolonial hispano en California entre 1880 y 1930," in Amaral, *Arquitectura neocolonial,* 48.

8. See Katherine Manthorne, ed., *California Mexicana: Missions to Murals, 1820–1930,* exh. cat. (Laguna Beach, CA: Laguna Art Museum, 2017).

9. Arrol Gellner, *Red Tile Style: America's Spanish Revival Architecture* (New York: Viking Studio, 2002).

10. Elizabeth McMillian, *California Colonial: The Spanish and Rancho Revival Styles* (Atglen, PA: Schiffer, 2002).

11. See, among other works, Sara Holmes Boutelle, *Julia Morgan, Architect* (New York: Abbeville, 1988); and Mark Wilson, *Julia Morgan: Architect of Beauty* (Layton, UT: Gibbs Smith, 2007).

12. Ramón Gutiérrez, "México como modelo regional de identidad en Estados Unidos / Mexico as a Regional Identity Model in the United States," in *La arquitectura y los jardines en la Exposición de San Diego / The Architecture and the Gardens of the San Diego Exposition* (Madrid: Kalam, 2017): 204–40.

13. Bertram Grosvenor Goodhue, *Mexican Memories: The Record of a Slight Sojourn below the Yellow Rio Grande* (New York: G. M. Allen, 1892). See also Charles Harris Whitaker, ed., *Bertram Grosvenor Goodhue: Architect and Master of Many Arts* (New York: Press of the American Institute of Architects, 1925); and Romy Wyllie, *Bertram Grosvenor Goodhue: His Life and Residential Architecture* (New York: W. W. Norton, 2007).

14. Sylvester Baxter, *Spanish-Colonial Architecture in Mexico,* 10 vols. (Boston: J. B. Millet, 1901–2).

15. Rexford Newcomb, "Preface," in *The Franciscan Mission Architecture of Alta California* (New York: Architectural Book Publishing Company, 1916), v.

16. *Spanish Homes of California* (Long Beach, CA: Roy A. Hilton Co., 1925).]

17. Enrique Vivoni Farage and Silvia Álvarez Curbelo, eds., *Hispanofilia: Arquitectura y vida en Puerto Rico* (San Juan: Editorial de la Universidad de Puerto Rico, 1998).

18. Rodrigo Gutiérrez Viñuales, "Barroco americano y contemporaneidad: Persistencias, resignificaciones, escenarios (1810–1945)," in *Arte y patrimonio en Iberoamérica: Tráficos transoceánicos,* ed. Inmaculada Rodríguez Moya, María de los Ángeles Fernández Valle, and Carme López Calderón (Castellón de la Plana: Universitat Jaume I, 2016), 321–41.

19. Jorge Alberto Manrique, "México se quiere otra vez barroco," in Amaral, *Arquitectura neocolonial,* 36.

20. Ramón Gutiérrez, *Arquitectura y urbanismo en Iberoamérica* (Madrid: Cátedra, 1983), 365–491.

21. Federico E. Mariscal, *La patria y la arquitectura nacional* (México City: Stephan y Torres, 1915)

22. On these topics, see Rafael R. Fierro Gossman, *La gran corriente ornamental del siglo XX: Una revisión de la arquitectura neocolonial en la ciudad de México* (Mexico: Universidad Iberoamericana, 1998).

23. *El neobarroco en la Ciudad de México* (Mexico: Consejo Nacional para la Cultura y las Artes, 1992).

24. Diego Rivera, "Sobre arquitectura," *El Universal* (Mexico), 28 April 1924.

25. Rodrigo Gutiérrez Viñuales, *Libros argentinos: Ilustración y modernidad (1910–1936)* (Buenos Aires: CEDODAL, 2014), 84–90.

26. Daniel Schávelzon, *La tambería del inca: Héctor Greslebin, una búsqueda americana* (Buenos Aires: ASSPHA, 2013), 81–88.

27. Pedro A Belaúnde, "Perú: Mito, esperanza y realidad en la búsqueda de raíces nacionales," in Amaral, *Arquitectura neocolonial,* 81.

28. Ricardo Rojas, *Eurindia: Ensayo de estética sobre las culturas americanas* (1924; Buenos Aires: Editorial Losada, 1951).

29. Manuel Gamio, *Forjando patria* (Mexico City: Porrúa, 1916), 39–40.

30. Ángel Guido, *Fusión hispano-indígena en la arquitectura colonial* (Rosario, Argentina: La Casa del Libro, 1925).

31. Ángel Guido, *Orientación espiritual de la arquitectura en América* (Rosario, Argentina: Talleres Gráficos La Tierra, 1927).

32. Martín S. Noel, *Fundamentos para una estética nacional* (Buenos Aires: Talleres Rodríguez Giles, 1926); and Ricardo Rojas, *Silabario de la decoración Americana* (Buenos Aires: Librería "La Facultad", 1930).

33. Adolfo Best Maugard, *Método de dibujo: Tradición, resurgimiento y evolución del arte mexicano* (Mexico City: Departamento editorial de la Secretaría de Educación, 1923); and Gonzalo Leguizamón Pondal and Alberto Gelly Cantilo, *Viracocha: Dibujos decorativos americanos* (Buenos Aires: n.p., 1923).

34. Elena Izcue, *El arte peruano en la escuela* (Paris: Excelsior, 1926); and Abel Gutiérrez, *Dibujos indígenas de Chile* (Santiago de Chile: Imprenta Universitaria, 1928).

35. Regarding these issues, see James Oles, "Reviving the Pre-Hispanic Past from Mexico to California," in *Found in Translation: Design in California and Mexico, 1915–1985,* ed. Wendy Kaplan, exh. cat. (Los Angeles: Los Angeles County Museum of Art, 2017), 127–61. On Stacy-Judd, see David Gebhard, *Robert Stacy-Judd: Maya Architecture; The Creation of a New Style* (Santa Barbara: Capra, 1993).