

12.

# Plural Existences: Feminists' Epistemologies and the History of Architecture

---

PATRÍCIA SANTOS PEDROSA\* & LIA GIL ANTUNES\*\*

\* Centro Interdisciplinar de Estudos de Género, Instituto Superior de Ciências Sociais e Políticas, Universidade de Lisboa e Departamento de Engenharia Civil e Arquitetura, Universidade da Beira Interior

\*\* Centro Interdisciplinar de Estudos de Género, Instituto Superior de Ciências Sociais e Políticas, Universidade de Lisboa e Departamento de Arquitetura da Universidade de Coimbra

## RESUMO

Quando estudamos a História da Arquitetura portuguesa do século xx encontramos uma ausência de mulheres arquitectas que as histórias globais da disciplina também perpetuam. Este trabalho dialoga com algumas das linhas genealógicas que podem ser úteis para desenhar um modo diverso de fazer História, de fazer História das Mulheres Arquitectas. Partindo de contribuições da historiografia feminista em geral, passando pelas suas concretizações na Arte e na Geografia, tece-se uma metodologia situada que amplia fontes, vozes e narrativas. O objetivo da proposta é a construção de uma metodologia feminista para a História da Arquitetura que considere as existências plurais e que saiba acolher múltiplos modos de se ser e fazer arquitetura.

**ABSTRACT**

When we study 20th-century History of Portuguese Architecture we notice the absence of women architects, a reality replicated in the global history of the discipline. This work dialogues with some genealogical lines that can be useful in sketching a different way of making History, namely the History of Women Architects. We propose a situated methodology that expands sources, voices and narratives, drawing on contributions from feminist historiography in general, including their materialization in Art and Geography. The goal of this proposal is to contextually frame a feminist methodology for the History of Architecture in Portugal that considers plural existences and welcomes multiple ways of embodying and making architecture.

When you hear the news that your research project has received funding, you are immediately taken over by enthusiasm and excitement. Soon after, a weight of responsibility for the project and its goals sets in. Euphoria is then replaced by apprehension. In your decades-long career researching in the History of Architecture, you know that you have consolidated frameworks and methodologies, that you have laid foundations that have influenced your way of conducting research until now. When the *W@ARCH.PT*<sup>[1]</sup> became a reality — with funding, a team, milestones, etc. — our first challenge was figuring out what do to with these methodologies that had been previously consolidated; how to understand and respond to the new conceptual challenges in order to write the History of Women, more specifically the History of Portuguese women architects. Since the beginning, it became clear that the development of this research would count on two interrelated worlds working alongside one another: on the one hand, an intense methodological and epistemological conception that is necessarily self-questioning; on the other, the broad recollection of different work materials.

The questions that we approach belong to multiple and interrelated spheres. The realization that doing research cannot be a monolithic and unquestionable enterprise carries obvious difficulties. Within this context, to assume the contributions of feminist epistemologies and theories — considering that this is a research project in Architecture, namely its History — is to challenge the prevailing practices, narratives and methodologies. There is now a strong questioning tradition, but it is insufficient when placed alongside accepted praxis. To reflect on this issue, we need to understand the impact of the devaluation of women's work,

---

1. *W@ARCH.PT: Women Architects in Portugal: Building Visibility, 1942-1986* is a research project funded by the FCT. It has been developed, since 2018, in the Interdisciplinary Center for Gender Studies (ISCSP, University of Lisbon) and is coordinated by Patrícia Santos Pedrosa.

but also the reactions to the loss of privileges and the shift in power structures. This is a broader challenge, in the sense that we need to dismantle the patriarchal mechanisms that exclude and silence certain individuals and practices from accepted and taught histories. Therefore, our long-term task entails challenging language and its values, the stereotyped and reductive images of the profession, unpacking the presences and absences in official texts and academic curricula and, above all, claiming the construction of a new discourse, complex, dynamic and expanding, with other bodies, practices and narratives.

From this complex and challenging place, many questions arise and will remain before our eyes and in our minds, as travel companions. Can there be a feminist gaze on Architecture and its History, capable of questioning patriarchal, universalizing and excluding values? How can we fight the profession's only voice and homogeneous image? Who was left out? Why and how does one make invisible, exclude and marginalize? How can we build architectural knowledge that is plural and inclusive? How can one practice, disseminate and teach a History of inclusion and diversity?

The conception of the *W@ARCH.PT* project, more than containing these questions, embodies these questions. Our goal of challenging the traditional writing of the History of Architecture after Western premises — heroic, male, white — is founded on a methodologically feminist practice, putting forward a possible historiography of Architecture. Therefore, the *W@ARCH.PT* is feminist research focused on the intersection of individuals, objects and historical contexts. Given that it is a situated and partial project, it is also a work in process, continuously subjected to (self)critique, and its epistemological and methodological framework is under constant revision. In this sense, this article intends to offer ideas to sustain this reflection, both from Architecture and other disciplines. It is not our goal to provide an exhaustive critical collection of all that has been produced within the theoretical and epistemological references that we chose. Instead, we offer a map of the proximities and concerns that sustain this ongoing research and the reflective proposals that close the text.

## 1. The critical legacy of writing women's history

Historical production is not ideologically neutral. More than a mere account of facts, History has developed and perpetuated various power relations, constantly

valuing the groups considered the winners, as well as certain spheres of activity. The Argentinian architect Zaída Muxí refers that historical construction “is always based on premises that are influenced by who writes them, their context, cultural background and life experience, and it is from these prejudices that one determines what is valid or not” (2018, p. 263). When produced within a patriarchal system — alongside a colonial and capitalist one — the historiographical practice, its teaching and dissemination, rests on dominant and hierarchical conceptions of the political, military, and economic spheres. The undervaluing of the social and cultural domains and of a broader mentality are, for many authors, some of the reasons why women are excluded from History (Pinto & Alvarez, 2014, p. 16). A language fraught with values, i.e. the ways in which individuals are referenced and sources cited, also reinforce these issues. The universalization of the masculine gender in Portuguese grammar and the use of surnames disassociated from first names — both in references to historical personalities and in bibliographies — contribute to a perceived lack of women as makers and participants in the events of the world that we inhabit.

The History of Women has a unique genealogy composed of topics and critical reflections that contaminate and consolidate each other. The feminist movements brought the critique of several paradigms — e.g. universality, progress, neutrality, human nature — into the theoretical and methodological debate of the Social Sciences and, in the 1970s, they inaugurated the possibility of producing knowledge centred on the specific contribution of women to human development (Pinto & Alvarez, 2014, p. 9). Portugal, mostly under French and Italian influences, engaged in this phenomenon descriptively: inquiring into the place of women in the historical process, giving visibility to their activities, roles, and functions (Vaquinhas, 2002, p. 202).

In a second phase, the question of representation has led to the reinterpretation of society as a whole and established the perspective of a relational and critical History.<sup>[2]</sup> The categories of traditional history were called into question, new questions were posed, and the uniform concept of women was debated, demanding a repositioning of the History of Women, given the diversity and complexity of this social group [Gisela Bock (1989) quoted by Pinto & Alvarez, 2014, p. 11]. In the first decades of the 21st century, the topics studied in the History of Women and Gender were broadened. In Portugal, among the new approaches

---

2. On the question of representation and its failures, see, for example, Pinto & Alvarez, 2014.

that emerged, a line of research focused on women's contributions to several professions and to the historical construction of disciplinary knowledge. The Portuguese historian Irene Vaquinhas rightly describes it as the creation of a "citizen memory" that strives to "rescue memories, give visibility to the participation of women in economic, social, political and cultural life, i.e. integrate them in public space, with the view to overcome gender discrimination and contribute to a fairer and more democratic society" (Vaquinhas, 2019, p. 47).

The rewriting of History by feminists has proven indispensable and complex. As a category of analysis and research, the social group of women has called for theorization. We must consider its volatility and heterogeneity in our work if we want to promote the diversity of historical players. In the second half of the 1980s, the gender variable entered the writing of History as a category of analysis and became a "new scientific framework" (Françoise Collin quoted by Pinto & Alvarez, 2014, p. 12). With the introduction of the dimension of power in the concept of gender (Scott, 1986), the History of Women became autonomous from Social History (Pinto & Alvarez, 2014, p. 12). The consideration of unequal gender relations demanded that we consider the role and significance of other social systems — economic, political, power-based, etc. — and understand the many levels of oppression. Despite the issues inherent in the definition and uses of gender, its meaning will have to be understood in each historical context. For the historiographical production, it is important to refocus this concept, so that we can understand the several relations at play — both between women and men, and intragroup — and realize that different times correspond to different gender-producing mechanisms (Tedeschi, 2014, pp. 22–23).

Different types of feminism have devised practices and methodologies for recovering the existences that were neglected by traditional sources, as a way of integrating women in the study and teaching of History. Oral History is one of the preferred methodological tools. Speaking through one's own voice makes it possible to create a collective memory and often demonstrates the non-linear and complex trajectories of women's lives. In this process, women may also gain an awareness of themselves through History, an experience derived from historical (self-reflection). By valuing female experiences and focusing on the distinct factors affecting women's lives, Tedeschi points out that "the retrieval of women's collective and individual memories accomplishes a particular goal — the reconstruction and collective appropriation of the past, which helps us to understand

the historical present, favouring the formulation and reformulation of current projects and realities” (Tedeschi, 2014, p. 35).

Oral History is also a form of cultural and creative resistance to the biases of official history. As the Canadian scholar Joan Sangster says,

[...] we need to explore the construction of women’s historical memory. Asking why and how women explain, rationalize and make sense of their past offers insight into the social and material framework within which they operated, the perceived choices and cultural patterns they faced, and the complex relationship between individual consciousness and culture. (Sangster, 1994, p. 6)

Moreover, this author draws attention to the role of intersectionality<sup>[3]</sup> and cultural values in the construction of historical memory. The structural and ideological relations that underpin gender, race and class systems generate differences in how we remember and recount our lives and, consequently, influence our ordering and prioritization of events. On the one hand, the role of political ideology in moulding women’s memory and histories must be placed within the social relations and power structures construed as real and known. On the other hand, the revelation of this ideological context and the prevailing gender ideals that structure women’s worlds — away from the supposed filter of the present — is essential in highlighting contradictory effects and showing “how women understood, negotiated and sometimes challenged these dominant ideals” (Sangster, 1994, p. 10). The interview, as a historical document, is one of the methods for establishing narratives in one’s own voice. An interactive process subjected to permanent re-evaluation, the interview demands both the contextualization of language and narrative, of social and personal agendas — existing social patterns and cultural discourses —, and the layered reading of individual stories.<sup>[4]</sup> From conception to content analysis, all its stages are necessarily situated and critical. Among others, it is vital to consider the privileged place occupied by the woman interviewer, the power relations at play, the interactions between interviewer and interviewee and, last but not least, the level of control that the latter should have over the final product.

---

3. Within this research project, we employ the concept of intersectionality as it was originally understood by black feminists.

4. In other words, it is important to focus on the ways of telling — expressions, intonation, metaphors and contradictions, and why they happen — i.e. the meanings, silences and omissions that emerge in these stories told by women. They can result from violence, harassment or shame, which were often labelled differently in the past, or even denied as a way of escaping pain (Sangster, 1994, p. 9).

Feminist historiographical production is fuelled by and founds a broader political project. Critical and intersectional perspectives build new discourses grounded on new values, while acting on previously raised issues, reformulating concepts, sources and questions, but also ways of working, processes and meanings. As María Rivera says (2007, p. 28), besides the obvious right to reveal that women have a History and have participated in important political events, feminist historiography also demands theoretical formulations and critical frameworks for reinterpreting the past and the present, at the same time as it considers personal experiences and public activities. In this way, we realize that it is crucial to go beyond the limits of descriptive approaches if we want to disrupt and transform prevailing disciplinary concepts.

## 2. On the feminist historiography of art and geography

With the expansion of the range of topics and the diversity of historical players, feminist historiography has seeped into several areas of knowledge, developing applied conceptual and methodological tools. Considering that architecture is a discipline that touches many other areas of expertise, in terms of both education and professional practice, it is essential to understand the approaches of feminist historians to Art and Geography, as critical reflections and proposals. In the first field, we mostly focus on strategies designed to give visibility to women artists. In the second, we are interested in the consequences of the discipline's academicization and professionalization as a way of marginalizing women.

In Art, the feminist historiographical project began in the 1970s, mainly in the U.S. — with the academic course on women's Art taught by the art historian Linda Nochlin — and in the UK, with extra-institutional and collective initiatives that, until the 1990s, worked on creating a common space for sharing and testing the limits of the historical knowledge of Art (Horne & Tobin, 2014, p. 82). Nochlin opened up the debate by deconstructing the falsehood of the question posed by the seminal article "Why Have There Been No Great Women Artists?" (1971), confronting it with the notion of grandiosity, linked to genius, talent and mastery. Drawing on this contribution, the production of a socially critical historiography of Art revealed, for the first time, the existing gender asymmetries, through the denaturalization of the hierarchies that structure the art system and the abolition of the autonomy of Art History in relation to other disciplines.

Despite the importance of creating and reinterpreting female biographies, these have proven to be insufficient<sup>5]</sup>, demanding an in-depth look at the modes and mechanisms through which the patriarchal system produced and consolidated discriminations against women artists.

Since the 1980s, in the UK, the theorist Griselda Pollock and the art historian Rozsika Parker investigated the problems raised by mainstream Art History and proposed possible feminist strategies.<sup>6]</sup> Besides unpacking the ideological, cultural and structural limitations of the historiography of Art, the authors problematized the definition of the subject within feminisms and the historical category of women, arguing that women as producers constitute the main object of this feminist revision. At the same time, they proposed a revision of the artistic fields based on a critical reading of the dominant model and an evaluation of the genealogy of power intrinsic to Art History and social practices. Without pretending to expand the canon, the proposal was to produce counter-histories. This revision would align with feminist interventions in the Histories of Art<sup>7]</sup> that prepared new conditions for the production and reception of women's work. The collective mode of knowledge production was proposed as an organizational model of critical intervention, capable of disturbing the belief in an objective, singular truth. This model allows the encounter between various voices, experiences and positions. The defence of feminist political content within a situated historiography also demands that we pay close attention to political forms of accumulation and transference of knowledge in academia (Horne & Tobin, 2014, p. 77).

---

5. Since we are talking about situated knowledge, it is important to stress that when there is, like in the Portuguese case, a delay of decades regarding the writing of a history of women architects we believe that the biographical approach is still pertinent. Coupled with other strategies, biographies allow us to build a complex picture of this knowledge.

6. See, for example, Griselda Pollock and Rozsika Parker (1981), *Old Mistresses; Women, Art and Ideology*, London: Routledge & Kegan (1987), *Framing Feminism: Art & the Women's Movement 1970-85*; Pollock (1987), *Vision and Difference: Femininity, Feminism, and Histories of Art*, London: Routledge, and New York: Methuen.

7. The use of precise terminology was a long-debated issue, relevant in the articulation of the political imperatives at play when one investigated the historical representation of gender differences, recreated historical narratives of Art from a feminist perspective, and questioned the subject of feminist artistic practice, i.e. the theoretical and methodological field where knowledge is produced. Instead of "Feminist Art History" or "Feminist Art", which were considered reductive, they proposed (i) art "informed by feminism" (Mary Kelly), (ii) "feminist problematic in art history" (Lisa Tickner) or (iii) "feminist interventions in art history" (Griselda Pollock). (Horne & Tobin, 2014, p. 77)

In the field of Geography, particularly since the 1990s, feminists have raised other relevant questions within the specificities of the discipline's history. Feminisms have expanded the definitions of what is construed as Geography and seen as adequate subject matter. The British geographer and scholar Linda McDowell states that the integration and consideration of topics related to women's conditions and the mutual constitution of gender, class and race brought significant changes to the discipline (McDowell, 1992, p. 404). Women were and are producers of important and innovative work, but they are absent from canonical forms of recognition (Maddrell, 2013, 2015). Drawing on the contributions of Victorian explorers, the American geographer and scholar Mona Domosh investigated the reasons for the exclusion of women from the History of Geography made by and of men. Even though women participated in the activities of the discipline, the origin of female marginalization within this context relates to the academicization and professionalization of Geography<sup>[8]</sup>. Besides being barred from formal education, they were excluded from the Geographer title granted by the profession's regulatory bodies. In fact, Domosh concluded that

The fieldwork of "professional" geographers was codified and regulated in order to advance scientific learning. Fieldwork as geographic inquiry was limited to a few, elite, white males and was fostered in the male club atmosphere of the Royal Geographic Society (RGS) in England and the American Geographical Society in the United States. (Domosh, 1991, p. 97)

The codification and regulation of the fieldwork of professional geographers, supposedly to advance scientific knowledge, limited access to these clubs to men. The few women who were able to access them were exceptions to the rule. Without institutional recognition and support, they travelled at their own expense.<sup>[9]</sup> If they initially proposed their own language and vocabulary to describe their experiences, they later often signed as men, so that their exploratory language might be validated. To be recognized within the male exploratory tradition meant the legitimization of their work. Nonetheless, it is essential to note that colonialism, but also class, represented other forms of power. As Mona Domosh

---

8. One of the questions that needs to be answered in the future is knowing if that professionalization and academicization had similar repercussions for the women who devoted themselves to architecture.

9. Generally when they were older, after fulfilling their family duties, and with other goals: "discovery" per se, in the sense of discovering new lands, was not one of them" (Domosh, 1991, p. 97).

says, these women realized that power and control over their lives stemmed from their privilege as white women: “Colonialism allowed women to be powerful as representatives of the white race; it created a structure for a type of power dependent on race, not on sex.” (Domosh, 1991, p. 98). Therefore, white Victorian women explorers occupied an ambiguous position:

At home they were outsiders [of the structures of power] by virtue of their sex; in the field they were outsiders by virtue of their race. And they realized the precariousness of that position. Their authority in the field was derived from their role as outsiders — as representatives of the white race — yet the basis of that authority is what made them insiders in a culture in which they had no authority. (Domosh, 1991, pp. 98-99).

The conditions behind these women’s complex existences cannot be underestimated and should be included in contemporary research (in Architecture too).

Feminist geographers provide clues for a critical historiography of the discipline and the conception of feminist methods aligns with broader values and goals. Linda McDowell explains the importance of using more collaborative methods, capable of rebalancing the problematic power relations between researcher and subject. Engaging with difference, being aware of the lives and feelings of the people studied is essential in the “construction of committed, passionate, positioned, partial but critical knowledge” (McDowell, 1992, p. 413). Once more, it becomes clear that a critical and feminist historiography will have to consider the relations and representations of gender present in the social construction of knowledge, whether in its practices, theories or methods. The intersectionality of the produced inquiries and proposals is indispensable if we want to develop feminist strategies in research.

### **3. Of the history of architecture: searching for a practice made of plural existences**

When we read the foundational work of Doris Cole (1973) and Susana Torre (1977), we realize that they both pose questions related to the representation of women in the History of Architecture as part of a broader context of women’s struggles and demands. The fundamental existential paradox — existing without existing — and the aspirations associated with these works are more substantial than the

limits of the discipline itself. It is along that line of reflection and action that we position ourselves and have been consolidating our research. Among others, we owe to the various genealogies previously mentioned in this article and we are interested in understanding how these are put into action in our work.

In the context of Portuguese architecture, this problematization has undoubtedly arrived with a delay of decades. In the Western context, the 1960s and 1970s were rife with questions and struggles. Similarly to the pacifist and anti-racist struggles, broader feminist struggles occupied the public space. In Portugal, the long dictatorship (1926-1974), exacerbated by the multiple colonial wars in Africa initiated in 1961, resulted in all efforts being concentrated in the antifascist struggle. With the passage from the dictatorship to the democracy in 1974, thanks to the Carnation Revolution, complex and intense years of democratic consolidation ensued. The studies about women arrived late and were not directly influenced by the feminist movements. They first arose institutionally in the second half of the 1970s, with the Commission for the Female Condition, and two decades later with the Portuguese Association of Women Studies (Tavares, 2008, p. 659). Concerning Portuguese Architecture, the dire housing conditions observed in the country were the main focus of architects. The numbers suggest that in the mid-1960s another 500000 houses were needed for rehousing due to overcrowding or insufficient conditions (Ruy José Gomes and Nuno Portas, quoted by Pedrosa, 2010b, p. 209). Housing, alongside the identity of national architecture, were the main concerns in the following decades. Four decades after the arrival of democracy in the country and the groundbreaking American studies that we have mentioned, the issue of women architects in Portugal was finally deemed relevant.<sup>10</sup>

Similarly to other countries, a central part of 20th-century History of Portuguese Architecture is based on ideas arising from a place of power and the networks of proximity of those who occupy that place. If we consider that the construction of this knowledge is based on the narrative of a few about the so-called whole, we realize that non-representation amounts to absence. In other words, the account made from the centres of knowledge, action and production leads to the simplification of the voices present in the official narrative. The idea

---

10. In Portugal, we can say that 2010 was a decisive year regarding these issues. On the one hand, the text "Being a Female Architect in Portugal: A Short introduction to a Long Ride" (Pedrosa, 2010a) appears within the International Meeting of the European Architectural History Network (Guimarães); on the other, the event Women in Architecture is organized at the University of Coimbra, from which results the first issue of the *Joelho* magazine (Figueira, 2010).

of the single gaze, mentioned by Daniela Arias (2018, p. 281), which intimately dialogues with the concept of “hero as individual creator” and that prevails in official 20<sup>th</sup>-century historiography, is also reproduced in the Portuguese case.<sup>[11]</sup> This centralizing point of view constructs a history that expands, generalizing and contaminating every sphere of thinking, teaching and making architecture: it standardizes heroes and their productions.

The invisibility of women architects and their work has multiple and inter-related causes. The way in which the professional practice of architecture is organized in studios, shaping the teamwork and public faces of that work, produces evident omissions. The aforementioned traditional idea of a single creative genius effectively erases the collaborative work that sustains the professional practice. In this sense, women architects are generally members of the invisible teams behind any production, and only exceptionally does their work bear their signature.<sup>[12]</sup> This marginalization is also a reality within other professional dimensions, which have become peripheral due to a hegemonic view of what is construed as architecture. Therefore, architectural programs seen as less relevant, as well as less traditional professional practices are equally marginalized. In the case of women architects, this invisibility occurs on multiple overlapping planes. When they focus on architectural programs with less visibility — interior design, for example — or activities that do not constitute the core of the discipline — curatorship, teaching, among others —, this pressure for non-existence is reinforced. They are not seen as important, nor is their work seen as pertinent for the profession, therefore, what they do is irrelevant and beneath recognition or study. In a word, they are subjected to multiple forms of inexistence.

As we have referred in our analysis of the contributions of Griselda Pollock and Rozsika Parker, fighting the omission of these women by writing their individual stories is not enough for creating significant structural changes in the production of knowledge. Only by questioning the causes behind these historical disappearances can we create change. It is essential to change what we believe is worthy of history — people, productions and professional areas — as well as the ways in which one chooses, gathers and treats the data. When we scientifically

---

11. Here we find the groundbreaking and paradigmatic studies on 20th-century Portuguese History by José-Augusto França (1974) and Nuno Portas (1974), and others that draw from them.

12. In the case of couples of architects, often also couples in their private lives, these questions present other nuances, but historically there are countless situations where authorship and recognition are granted to the male architect.

disregard or undervalue some methods for establishing narratives we are excluding from the realm of visibility those who were not identified by the documents construed as the only bearers of truth.

Considering that facts do not exist in a vacuum, but derive from a reading, a table containing the number of women architects enrolled in a professional association is just as important as the individual account of a female architect. The importance of these narratives pertains both to concrete professional careers and to a general history of absence and exclusion from architecture. In other words, in order to understand the profession, we also have to observe who has never practised it, who has abandoned it, who followed non-traditional professional paths and, obviously, why and in what contexts these existences took place. Another central dimension is figuring out who these women are, whether by studying their socio-cultural, familial and geographical origins or by writing their chronological and generational histories.<sup>[13]</sup> The multiple forms of privilege at play obviously give rise to diverse personal and professional trajectories, therefore they should be taken into account in any transversal reading.<sup>[14]</sup>

The possibility of a total and single History, encompassing and giving voice to everything is unthinkable. But it is essential to further the knowledge about life experiences within the profession and their contribution to the complex reality that it entails. The awareness about the variable content of this knowledge is a fundamental piece in non-exclusion, in the fight against the “corset” of what is valued. The reorganization of these forms of knowledge implies accepting their gradation. In other words, a dynamic map with voices, discourses and data originating from plural sources whose diverse clarity or intensity are just that: diversity, and not relative importance.

Unpacking the construction of the History of Architecture founded on the canon (and the characters and works validated by that canon), it is crucial to recognize, in the paths and experiences of the architectural practice, other contributions to Architecture as a complex discipline. Against a history of exceptional

---

13. Irene Vaquinhas (2019, pp. 48-49) points out the absence of generational issues and the central aspect of female history and memory. By not approaching personal history and care-taking roles, we are contributing to incomplete and belittling narratives about these women.

14. This article intersects with complex questions that will not be developed here, but that are inexorably tied to this research. Since Portugal is a peripheral European country, with a colonial history and significant social inequality throughout its history, the knowledge produced by this research will necessarily have to consider the whiteness, elitism and patriarchy that frame architectural production.

and brilliant events, we are interested in a History of diverse existences. This is the work that remains to be done — it is decades late and we must tackle it: a history of plural existences in Portuguese architecture. In a word, the still eccentric proposal that a diversity of people, profiles and productions make the History of Architecture richer and more representative, i.e. more fundamental. Going back to the beginning of this article, as Susana Torre (1977, p. 11) says, we have the duty to rescue our cultural past. Only then can we guarantee a plural future for the profession and its production: from the object to the territory, including every possible immateriality of spatial, architectural and urban knowledge.

This article and its translation were funded by the Portuguese Foundation for Science and Technology (FCT, PTDC/ART-DAQ/32388/2017).

## References

- Arias Laurino, D. (2018). La construcción del relato arquitectónico y las arquitectas de la modernidad. Un análisis feminista de la historiografía [Tesis doctoral]. Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya BarcelonaTech. Escola de Doctorat.
- Figueira, J. (Ed.). (2010). *Joelho 01. Mulheres na Arquitectura* (Vol. 01).
- França, J. A. (1974). *A Arte em Portugal no Século XX (1911-1961)*. Bertrand.
- Domosh, M. (1991). Toward a Feminist Historiography of Geography. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 16(1), 95–104. JSTOR. <https://doi.org/10.2307/622908>
- Horne, V., & Tobin, A. (2014). An Unfinished Revolution in Art Historiography, or how to Write a Feminist art History. *Feminist Review*, 107(1), 75–83. <https://doi.org/10.1057/fr.2014.7>
- Maddrell, A. (2013). Treasuring classic texts, engagement and the gender gap in the geographical canon: Dialogues in Human Geography, 2(3), 324–327. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2043820612468548>
- Maddrell, A. (2015). To read or not to read? The politics of overlooking gender in the geographical canon. *Journal of Historical Geography*, 49, 31–38. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhg.2015.04.013>
- McDowell, L. (1992). Doing Gender: Feminism, Feminists and Research Methods in Human Geography. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 17(4), 399–416. JSTOR. <https://doi.org/10.2307/622707>
- Muxí, Z. (2018). *Mujeres, casas y ciudades: Más allá del umbral*. Dpr Editorial. <https://www.laie.es/es/libro/mujeres-casas-y-ciudades/9788494752360/872367>

- Nochlin, L. (1971). *Why Have There Been No Great Women Artists? Em Women, Art, and Power* (pp. 145–178). Harper and Row.
- Pedrosa, P. S. (2010a). Being a female architect in Portugal: A short introduction to a long ride. 1st International Meeting EAHN European Architectural History Network – CD of Papers, 234–240.
- Pedrosa, P. S. (2010b). Habitar em Portugal nos anos 1960: Ruptura e antecedentes, un caminho pelo interior do discurso. Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya - Escola Tècnica Superior d'Arquitectura de Barcelona.
- Pinto, T., & Alvarez, T. (2014). Introdução: História, História das mulheres, História de género. Produção e transmissão do conhecimento Histórico. *ex aequo - Revista da Associação Portuguesa de Estudos sobre as Mulheres*, 30, 9–21. <https://doi.org/10.22355/exaequo.2014.30.01>
- Portas, N. (1978). A evolução da arquitectura moderna em Portugal. Uma interpretação. Em B. Zevi (Ed.), *História da Arquitectura Moderna* (Vol. 1–2). Arcádia.
- Rivera Garretas, M. M. (2007). La historia que rescata y redime el presente. El pensamiento de la experiencia en la escritura de historia. *DUODA: estudis de la diferència sexual*, 33, 27–39.
- Sangster, J. (1994). Telling our stories: Feminist debates and the use of oral history. *Women's History Review*, 3(1), 5–28. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09612029400200046>
- Scott, J. W. (1986). Gender: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis. *The American Historical Review, Oxford University Press*, 91(5), 1053–1105. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1864376>
- Scott, J. W. (1996). Gender: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis. Em J. W. Scott (Ed.), *Feminism & History* (pp. 152–180). Oxford University Press.
- Tavares, M. M. P. F. (2008). Feminismos em Portugal (1947-2007) [Doutoramento em Estudos sobre as Mulheres - Especialidade em História das Mulheres e do Género]. Universidade Aberta.
- Tedeschi, L. A. (2014). Alguns apontamentos sobre história oral, género e história das mulheres. UFGD. <https://catalog.princeton.edu/catalog/10252985>
- Vaquinhas, I. (2002). Linhas de investigação para a história das mulheres nos séculos XIX e XX. Breve esboço. *Revista da Faculdade de Letras, História*, 3(1), 201–221.
- Vaquinhas, I. (2019). História das mulheres e de género em Portugal: Horizontes temáticos e desafios actuais. *G. Género na Arte. Corpo, sexualidade, identidade e resistência, Número Extra*, 37–55.