ISCTE IUL
REPOSITÓRIO
INSTITUTO UNIVERSITÁRIO DE LISBOA

Repositório ISCTE-IUL

Deposited in *Repositório ISCTE-IUL*:
2026-04-06

Deposited version:
Accepted Version

Peer-review status of attached file:
Peer-reviewed

Citation for published item:
Grancho, N. (2025). Public shared places and private absent divides: Identity and space of colonial urbanism under Portuguese, French and Danish Rules: Diu, Pondicherry and Tranquebar. In Alice Price, Emily Burns (Ed.), The Routledge companion to art and challenges to empire. (pp. 320-339).: Taylor and Francis.

Further information on publisher's website:
10.4324/9781003562672-20

Publisher's copyright statement:
This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: Grancho, N. (2025). Public shared places and private absent divides: Identity and space of colonial urbanism under Portuguese, French and Danish Rules: Diu, Pondicherry and Tranquebar. In Alice Price, Emily Burns (Ed.), The Routledge companion to art and challenges to empire. (pp. 320-339).: Taylor and Francis., which has been published in final form at https://dx.doi.org/10.4324/9781003562672-20. This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with the Publisher's Terms and Conditions for self-archiving.

Use policy

Creative Commons CC BY 4.0
The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a link is made to the metadata record in the Repository
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Serviços de Informação e Documentação, Instituto Universitário de Lisboa (ISCTE-IUL)
Av. das Forças Armadas, Edifício II, 1649-026 Lisboa Portugal
Phone: +(351) 217 903 024 | e-mail: administrador.repositorio@iscte-iul.pt
https://repositorio.iscte-iul.pt

VERSÃO ACEITE

PUBLIC SHARED PLACES AND PRIVATE ABSENT DIVIDES. IDENTITY AND SPACE OF COLONIAL URBANISM UNDER PORTUGUESE, FRENCH, AND DANISH RULES: DIU, PONDICHERRY AND TRANQUEBAR

Recently, the question was asked as to how to write about art and empire without replicating imperial ideologies and hierarchies, naturalizing the historical subjugation of colonized peoples, or re- inscribing the empire's organizing principle of center and periphery.[1] It requires consideration of power dynamics in historical and contemporary contexts. One possible approach is to center the perspectives and experiences of marginalized communi-ties and resist the temptation to view art solely through the lens of dominant power struc-tures. Another I choose here is to acknowledge the complex and often contradictory ways in which art and architecture can reinforce and challenge power systems.

A theoretical framework grounded in the decolonization of art history, informed by post-colonial theory, critical race theory, and feminist theory, and critically engaged with the materiality of artworks, physical manifestations of imperialism, and sustainability is necessary. This method enables a nuanced and complex understanding of the historical imbrication of architecture, urbanism and empire by addressing the colonial legacies of empire in architecture and urbanism with a constantly evolving process of skills acquisition to be clustered and reconfigured in response to a question dependent on language, field-work, and the architecture and cities to consider

Toward these ends, this chapter delves into the unique urban dynamics of three European colonial cities in India: Diu, Pondicherry, and Tranquebar. Diu was a Portuguese colonial city from 1535 to 1961, located in today's Gujarat, on the western coast of India; Pondicherry was a French colonial city between 1674 and 1954; and Tranquebar was a Danish colonial city from 1620 until 1845, both located in today's Tamil Nadu, on the

eastern coast of India. Diu, Pondicherry, and Tranquebar were shared between Europeans, predominantly Christians, and Indians, typically non-Christians. Their enmeshed demographics signal an idiosyncrasy that runs counter to the paradigm of the European colonial city in South Asia, which traditionally sees a stark divide between "Black"/"White" towns.[2]

The separation between the urban space inhabited by Europeans and non-Christians in the European colonial cities in India was not universal. I analyze this idiosyncrasy by studying city plans, architecture, urbanism, and empire. I ask the following questions: why is there a lack of a clear separation between the urban space inhabited by Europeans and non-Christians in Diu, Pondicherry, and Tranquebar? How did these spatial dynamics affect the social, economic, and political life of these cities? How did the inhabitants of these cities perceive and negotiate between the private and the public in these layouts? What are its implications for the histories of European colonial empires in India? Studying these contests of European imperial ideologies promotes a more inclusive, nuanced knowledge of colonial histories by showing how inhabitants experienced colonial cities.

In Diu, Pondicherry, and Tranquebar, fewer European colonizers drastically changed the cityscape's dynamic. Furthermore, in cities that pre-date the eighteenth century, one finds something that the British presidency cities in India lack. Europeans in these outlier cities negotiated their living and working arrangements differently: carving out new spaces for the European urban settlements, dividing public and private areas, or reworking the fort concept to different ends, whether public or private.[3] Moreover, existing Indian populations in these cities asserted their spatial, economic, and political presence, often directly shaping how the Europeans structured colonizing spaces. Diu, Pondicherry, and Tranquebar's histories and status allow for paths through existing dichotomous notions of the European colonial city, revealing new insights into the shape and history of urban space in colonial cities.

How these cities upend clear spatial divides between public and private sheds light on the atypical coexistence of communities, races, ethnicities, and religious groups, and explores the implications of this on colonial urbanism and social dynamics.[4] The coexistence of the "Black"/"White" towns within the area circumscribed by city walls opened a nuanced urban landscape complicated by power dynamics. This has influenced urban development, social dynamics, and political processes in Diu, Pondicherry, and Tranquebar to this day. The blurred boundaries between public and private spaces put pressure on the "Black"/"White" towns conceit;[5] they are crucial exceptions to standard thinking about the imposition of colonial urban environments with implications for how we theorize space and empire within the dichotomy between the public and the private.[6]

History and Theorization

The earliest European empires in Asia—the Portuguese (Goa, 1510) and the Spanish (the Philippines, 1565)—had papal support and were motivated not only by a desire for profit but also by a militant anti-Islamic crusader spirit linked to the reconquest of the Iberian Peninsula from Muslim rule. The Portuguese promoted a particularly ruthless conquest mode fueled by a culture of knightly chivalry and a quest for conflict.[7] The British and the Dutch, which operated through chartered companies rather than royal enterprises—the British East India Company (founded in 1600) and the Vereenigde Oostindische Compagnie (VOC, founded in 1602)—were more interested in stealing Portugal's trading posts than in the gospel or expansion.[8] However, the VOC pursued a "warlike policy" that was "coordinated, well-financed, and forceful," lending ships to the Dutch

Republic in times of need in exchange for state support for aggression in Asia, particularly against the Portuguese.[9]

France's entry into Asian trade was hesitant and slow. Before the early sixteenth century, the French had only a "vague and distorted" understanding of Asia, even though products from the Spice Islands (now Maluku Islands, Indonesia) had made their way into France as early as the fourteenth century.[10] Soon after the Portuguese established direct contact with India (1510) and by circumnavigating the Cape of Good Hope (1513), the business people of Rouen petitioned King Francis I (r. 1515–47) to challenge the Portuguese monopoly.[11]

The Danish East India Trading Company (Østindisk kompagni) was established in Denmark in 1616 to gain a Danish foothold in the European trade between India and Europe. Ove Gjedde commanded a Danish expedition to India and Ceylon to establish a colony. In 1620, the trading post of Tranquebar was established in the Kaveri River delta on India's Coromandel coast. A treaty was signed on behalf of King Christian IV of Denmark-Norway between Ove Gjedde and the *Nayaka* (local ruler) Ragunatha of Thanjavur (Tanjore) to allow the Danes to settle and fortify a stretch of land by the mouth of the river and surrounding areas.[12] This was formalized by a *peshcash* (annual tribute) from the king of Denmark-Norway to the Nayak of Thanjavur and later to the Marathas (which in 1676 succeeded the Nayak).[13]

European colonial powers had different approaches to architecture and urbanism. The British Empire had the most significant impact on India due to its vast territorial control and the length of its rule. Their approach to architecture and urbanism prioritized imposing authority and reinforcing imperial identity through monumental buildings and organized urban layouts. This paradigm was particularly influential in the three Presidency cities of Madras, Calcutta, and Bombay. In these cities, the fort, from the first days of settlement, marked out the presence of an occupying colonial power. The fort shaped an urban design in which defense considerations remained important, and privacy was demarcated. For example, in Madras, Fort Saint George encloses the governor's house and is at the center of a designated "White Town" that a wall separates from the more densely populated "Black Town," where the Indigenous population lived. The "White Town" included private housing for the European residents and public buildings (churches, hospitals, and commercial buildings). As the city grew, a new section of "Black Town" emerged to accommodate Indigenous artisans.[14] However, the town's European and Indigenous sections shared little in relation to social or economic institutions in the Presidency cities.

On the other hand, Diu, Pondicherry, and Tranquebar were established, built, and operated differently due to the varied nature of the European powers in India. The French, Portuguese, and Danish empires had limited territorial control and generally focused on trade, leading to different approaches to governance, interactions, and legacies over the places they ruled. The Portuguese combined European and local elements (especially in Diu), resulting in a hybridity of architectural styles and a blend of public and private spaces. The French followed a more structured approach and sought to adapt European architectural styles to display a conceit of superiority.[15] The Danes exhibited a more detached, pragmatic, and localized attitude focused on minimal change and "soft power."

Diu, Pondicherry, and Tranquebar featured urban arrangements that differed from the harshly divided models of British colonial cities. A European-occupied fort contingent to a *non-aedificandi* esplanade was a buffer zone between the colonizer and the colonized, the fort, and the pre-existing settlements. Significantly, the public urban settlement within fortified walls was inhabited by both European Christians and non-Christian communities.[16]

Intersections between the colonizer and colonized in the city were blurred and intertwined. Hybridity emerges from translations on the margins of culture and between cultures as a space where cultural elements are continually re-articulated and reconstituted.[17] The proximate intermingling of colonized and colonizers in Diu, Pondicherry, and Tranquebar sets up conditions where hybridity—the constant transformations resulting from sustained cultural interaction processes—was not homogenous or static, but varied and dynamic. Historically, it has changed due to its geographic displacement and interaction between cultures, yet it remains distinct in many aspects.

Other scholars called attention to the nuances of these colonial cities. Susan Neild Basu and Swati Chattopadhyay challenge prevailing dualistic approaches. Neild Basu's work on how Madras moved beyond rigid boundaries demonstrates the importance of identifying subtle changes in the dynamic cityscape.[18] Chattopadhyay's analysis of Calcutta points to a tension between "Native" and "White" urban spaces.[19] "By emphasizing the duality of black and white," she observes, "one misses the idea that the critical aspect of colonial cities resided not in the clarity of this duality, but in the tension of blurred boundaries between the two."[20] Both challenge the dominance paradigm and prompt a re-evaluation of colonial urbanism.

As applied here, architectural heterogeneity and the cultural coding of hybridity seemingly prevented European attempts to impose a single authoritarian encoding of space, pivoting to create newer, pluralistic, eclectic, and hybrid spatial patterns. As argued by Amar Acharaïou, this contextualized and historicized viewpoint should give us insights into the complex nature of hybridity as a historical truth, a discursive practice, and a political and ideological production.[21]

During European penetration into the subcontinent, India was not a nation. The Mughal Empire was crumbling fast, and many rulers were dispersed throughout India. No nation existed, irrespective of their linguistic, religious, racial, and cultural differences.[22] In short, nationalism did not take root in India until the eighteenth century, unlike in Europe, where nations had emerged based on territory, religion, language, and ethnicity since at least the twelfth century.[23]

Diu's Subversion of Dualism

Diu was one of India's most eccentric Portuguese Empire showcases of architecture and urbanism. The island was commissioned in 1534 to transfer the territory's sovereignty from the sultanate of Gujarat to the Portuguese Empire. The city located in the eastern extremity of the island of Diu embodied the rationality of imperialism in its aesthetics (refined, functional classicism), science (a healthy and ordered landscape), and politics (an authoritarian, hierarchical society and a solid private realm).

Colonialism's impact on the city was not systematic and continuous. After the seventeenth century, the city faced challenges adapting to the Portuguese Empire's modernity.[24] Diu became a prototypical "modern" subject on the margins of the established narratives of European colonial urbanism in India.[25] The material reality of these modern utopic visions after the Enlightenment did not acquiesce to the will of the Portuguese Empire.

At the administrative, bureaucratic, and governance levels, Diu's colonial landscape was dominated by the older city to the west of the administration buildings. Set against the neoclassical monumentalism of the governor's palace and the sterile, geometric spaces of the *Torres Novas* road (the urban structural axis of the "Portuguese/Catholic' urban

settlement), Diu was an organic and dynamic space of tradition and community where the *Banyans*, the Diuese urban elite of private merchants prevailed as a result of the commercial opportunities created by colonialism. Urban life happened on congested and winding public streets linking the Hindu, Jain, Muslim, Zoroastrian, and European Catholic communities. Bereft of extensive sanitation and infrastructure built during the nineteenth century, Diu was a haptic and sensory city of smells, sights, and cultural contact that bewildered and delighted Portuguese and Gujaratis alike.[26]

The historical record denoting "Gujarati" and "Portuguese/Catholic" urban settlements implies perceived opposition between the Gujarati and the Europeans that might be oversimplified as the binary "Black"/"White" towns. Instead, these territories demonstrate Diu's ethnic and cultural heterogeneity.[27] The "Portuguese/Catholic" urban settlement developed to the east, between the fort and the "Gujarati" urban settlement, which spread concentrically from the gate's wall. The former was intended to house the Portuguese, Eurasian Indigenous Catholics, and the Parsi, while the latter was designed as the settlement for the city's Gujarati inhabitants.

The settlement patterns initially followed a hierarchical structure and order. As colonial administrators, the Portuguese found managing Gujaratis through ascriptive private corporate organizations essential.[28] The councils of Banyan elders became an effective institutional model for Diu's communal government and a tool to strengthen each community's identity. The Banyans were the wealthiest ethnic group of Gujarati Diuese and resided in the older part of Diu, the core of its Gujarati urban settlement. The colonial administration of the city, including the customs house and court, was located north of the city in a riverine cluster of buildings. The distinct urban pattern between the "Portuguese/Catholic" urban settlement and the "Gujarati" urban settlement characterized the subsequent change in Diu.

João Gabriel Dechermont drew a map of Diu before February 1790 based on a survey by João António Sarmento from 1783 (Figure 16.1). The map suggests that both aspired to indicate Diu's urban duality, consisting of a division between the Portuguese and the Gujarati, and a boundary between the private and the public. The map splits roughly in half between dispersed colonial urban settlements and enclaves, and the city's core with the Gujarati urban settlement. The Gujarati and Portuguese divide was expressed in text on the upper-left corner, "the curved dotted line divides the Christians from the gentiles." The line aimed to distinguish between the Portuguese, Catholic, and "White" domains and the "threatening and heathen" Gujarati territory outside the fortress of Diu. The fort and esplanade buffer are visible to the east. The esplanade is encircled by a ring of "infrastructures of colonialism," including churches and a hospital. The dense network of interconnected housing blocks to the west is surrounded by open space.

Its conceptual power stemmed from the Portuguese Empire and culture's unwavering acceptance of the cartographer's framing of Diu and the consolidation of the map as providing an accurate, truthful, and—most importantly—unproblematic statement of the physical and spatial environment concerning race, ethnicity, and religion. Thus, it exemplifies how colonial discourse maneuvered in the late 1700s, shifting and realizing that historical conflicts and spatial boundaries were established by recognizing racial, ethnic, and religious tensions.

In addition to serving an administrative and functional purpose, it is an example of cartography, pinpointing, and surveying settlements with the unprecedented innovation of a



Plan of the Fortress and City of Diu, which by order of the Most Excellent Lord D. Frederico Guillermo de Souza was drawn by Captain Engineer João Antonio Sarmento (*Planta da Fortaleza e Cidade de Diu, Que por ordem do Ill. Exmo. Senhor D. Frederico Guillermo de Souza a tirou o Capitão Engenheiro Ioão Antonio Sarmento*), 1783, Oporto Public and Municipal Library, Porto, Portugal, under reference C.M.&A., Pasta 24(35).

denoted line of apparent separation. The line transecting the city on a north-south axis was a boundary between Diu's subjects and space. The line creates a difference, even though the Gujarati spoke Portuguese and adopted "western" discourse. The discrimination through spatialization reinforced the Portuguese hold on power. As a result, the Gujarati were simultaneously disowned and differentiated from the Portuguese, who were supposed to become "like them." The ambivalence used in creating the maps of Diu's modernity was the simultaneous operation of identification and disavowal.

This account reveals a colonial city seen through the eyes of a European elite. More than a concept, the European and Gujarati separation was a physical entity restricted by notional and natural spaces. The Gujaratis shaped the urban landscape with neighborhoods of caste and occupation where retainers settled in private clusters around their patrons. These alternate mappings of the city's divisions show how people interpret, imagine, and experience Diu. Contrastingly, the Portuguese lived in open and low-density environs between the customs and the fort.

In Diu, as in other European colonial cities, the fort was physically separated, meaning entirely outside the "Gujarati" urban settlement. It housed colonial officials, served as the

headquarters for colonial governance, and became central to the colonial administration. This led to the development of Diu's fort surrounding areas to support these needs with the "Portuguese/Catholic" urban settlement. However, the fort inside Diu's walls attracted merchants, artisans, and laborers, leading to the growth of markets and commercial districts such as the "Gujarati" urban settlement, the Bazaar and customs, and the Parsi neighborhood (Figure 16.2).

The fort had social and cultural impact on Diu. The city's planning and development influenced its location. Roads, bridges, and other riverine infrastructure, as well as Catholic churches, were built to connect it with other parts of the "Gujarati" urban settlement and with the Gujarat hinterland. It was a symbol of power and authority, imposing first the Islamic and later the western Renaissance architectural styles on the urban landscape, since it was a hybrid product of architectural alterations of an Islamic fort. This imposition sometimes led to the displacement of local populations and the restructuring of urban spaces.

A print of a city as viewed from the water (Figure 16.3) is a typical composition of colonial-era imagery of India. The drawing's focus is the fortress. However, one can also see the esplanade (*non-aedificandi* area), other buildings, while a small boat is shown in the foreground. Other illustrations depict views of the fort, ramparts, and governor's



Jacques Jacottet with Adolphe-Jean-Baptiste Bayot, *View of Part of the City of Diu Taken from the Ramparts of the City* (*Vue d'une partie de la ville de Diou prise des Remparts de la Citadelle*), lithograph, 27.8 x 39 cm, printed in *Documents sur l'histoire, la géographie et le commerce de l'Afrique orientale* (Paris: Arthus Bertrand, 1856), vol. 4, atlas, pl. 13, Portuguese Overseas Historical Archives, Lisbon, Portugal, ref. AHU_ICONi_058_I, D. 654.



Eugène Cicéri, *View of the East Part and the Fortress of the Island of Diu (Vue de la partie est et de la forteresse de l'ile de Diou*), lithograph, 24.5 x 40.2 cm, printed in: *Documents sur l'histoire, la géographie et le commerce de l'Afrique orientale* (Paris: Arthus Bertrand, 1856), vol. 4, atlas, pl. 11, Portuguese Overseas Historical Archives, Lisbon, Portugal. ref. AHU_ICONi_058_I, D. 616.

mansions.[29] The churches, some large, overwhelming installations of buildings dating back to the early seventeenth century, are situated in the proximity of the older suburbs of Diu. Like flags of Christianity facing the East, they impinge on the urban landscape with white-washed walls, classically orderly façades, and elaborated hybrid orientalist ornamentation.[30] The churches interrupt the potential for a dichotomous "Black"/"White" towns' construction of Diu.[31]

The buildings and their depiction indicate the colonizers' interventions as clean, neat, organized, controlled, and omnipresent, marking a tension between imposed order and the actual complexities of terrain and culture. Diu's unique position subverts the "Black"/"White" towns' dichotomy, calling for a more nuanced understanding of urbanism. This deeper exploration reveals complexities that defy easy categorization.

Mapping Tranquebar

Before the Danes' arrival, Tranquebar consisted mainly of fishermen's huts and a few houses inhabited by Portuguese and Muslim merchants. There were also pagodas, a mosque, and a Catholic chapel. During the 1620s, the Danes erected a fort located south of the Tamil village and christened it "Dansborg" (Figure 16.4). It housed the Danish East India Company employees, the fortification's soldiers, and, later, the eighteenth-century Danish Asiatic Company.[32] The main building, practically unaltered until today, housed rooms for the governor,



East View of Fort Dansborg, Tranquebar, India, 1620 © Nuno Grancho, 2023.

merchants, and chaplain on the first floor, while the entire lower floor was a warehouse.[33] After the fort's construction, Tranquebar rapidly expanded and doubled by 1650.

A clear urban settlement pattern emerged, and Tranquebar housed about 300 Europeans, 200 of whom were Danes. Europeans lived in foundation-walled houses in the streets near Fort Dansborg and toward the fort parade ground. Colonial Tranquebar briefly comprised King's Street, from the land gate to the seashore, and Prince Jørgens Street, which runs parallel behind it on the northern side of the city, and the now eroded Pile Road and Prince Frederik's Street, closer to the coast. Additionally, Admiral Street, New Street, and the southern side of Queen's Street also appear as scattered and uneven grounds, especially near the walls, where the Indian population lived.

After February 1733, a map of Tranquebar (Figure 16.5) was drawn in Copenhagen by First Lieutenant Gregers Daa Trellund, who in 1715 was taught how to illuminate plans of fortresses, proportion maps, and lay them out in both large and small format. There are three extant copies of the same map. The Royal Danish Library copy reproduced here has cartouches with neatly and regularly written keys, and includes letter designations on the left and number designations on the right. The two cartouches flank a n i nsignia-s tyle m edallion capped with a crown and framed by two vertical columns, each balancing on a cannonball and resting on a plinth inscribed with the motto "Deo et Populo (God and the People)." The depth of coloring enlivens the rendering indicating clear contours harmoniously rendered.

Strictly speaking, the source value of the Trellund map is nominal; it does not show how Tranquebar was in 1733. However, it is an attempt to show an apparently distinguished Danish town in the East Indies. A draft of Tranquebar from a publication from the 1690s was sent to Trellund in 1733.[34] He functioned as an illuminator and possibly also as a copyist. Trellund's map includes inaccurate details, such as fortifications and dimensions.[35] It lacks extant structures in 1733, such as the church of Zion (1701), and the New Jerusalem church, built by the Mission in 1717. Trellund's map portrays a beautiful, orderly, crowded city, drawn up as propaganda for the Asiatic Company. It features street names common to most Danish market towns that mark the position as north or east (Nørregade, Østergade), royalty (Kongensgade, Dronningensgade), or descriptive as new or ramparts (Nygade, Voldgade). At first glance, Trellund's map is reminiscent of the contemporary model of Copenhagen that stands today at Copenhagen's City Museum.



Gregers Trellund, *Map of Tranquebar with Dansborg*, 1733, 111.2 x 177.1 cm, Royal Danish Library, Denmark, KBK Gamle danske besiddelser, Trankebar-0-1733, Shelf mark: Kortskab 2C, 2.

Census records add detail to the visual. They indicate that religion trumped ethnicity as the primary marker of differences among the colony's inhabitants and reveal segregation and intermixing across Tranquebar. In 1706, the first Protestant missionaries arrived in Tranquebar, and their evangelizing and teaching activities soon made an unmistakable mark on the city. In the north, the housing became more mixed. In Admiral Street, 14 Christian households are recorded. Four of them had heads with European names, and of these, three can be identified as seamen; four were Indians connected with the mission; four were Indians from the Catholic congregation of the city, and, finally, two Indians have been entered, one of whom it is added was a poor wretch and that several poor people inhabited the house. The Catholics of Tranquebar were predominantly Portuguese or were of Portuguese origin.[36]

The Tamils were locally situated based on faith. Hindus were by far Tranquebar's largest demographic and occupied most of the city, mainly to the northeast. They inhabited Queen's Street, Goldsmith Street, Perumal Kovil Street, some parts of Admiral Street, and close to the most important Hindu temple, Masilamani Nathar. The Masilamani Nathar Temple dates from at least 1300, and, 200 years later, was counted among the 11 most important places for trade across the Bay of Bengal. About half of the Tamils were designated as "Malabar," a shared label for Indigenous population on the east coast of India regardless of religion. Chetti Street and Troquedor Street suggest that wealthier *Chetti* merchants and money

changers lived to the south, close to the Danish urban settlement. Seventy-one households were occupied by *pintadors*, making them Tranquebar's largest occupational group and testifying to the importance of the textile trade.[37] Tamil Muslims inhabited an equally vital area in the central western part of Tranquebar. On the other side of Admiral Street, around the mosque and in the northwest of the city, was the Muslim neighborhood, comprising Muslim Street, Maraicar Street, Nagutha Street, and the northern end of Queen's Street.

Although Fort Dansborg continued to have official residence status, it gradually became customary for the Governor to stay in a private house in the city, which would later become the Governor's house.[38] The new Governor's residence was built in a neoclassical "European style" but with modifications to suit the hot and humid climate. The original deed of sale describes the house as "a dwelling house with several Godowns Offices & Garden & other Grounds."[39] European houses typically had four to five rooms. Most had a garden or courtyard at the back, and a small number were built on two floors. In the back, the houses had godowns, which functioned as storehouses for food and alcohol imported from Europe.

The social hierarchies underlying colonial urbanism continued to carve out spaces of focus and to inscribe detached disciplinary zones. Unlike the British dual-city model, segregation in the mid-eighteenth-century colonial Tranquebar was far more complex than the impression conveyed by a model of hermetically bounded urban worlds for the colonizer and colonized. The strategies devised under late Danish imperial rule demonstrate how colonial urbanism incorporated differently configured parts of the city into unitary schemes. No strict separation happened between the Europeans and the Tamil population, and non-Christian communities were allowed to reside within the city walls.

Planning Pondicherry

Puducherry, a fishing and weaving village, had been a thriving port of trade with Southeast Asia.[40] It was unique among Tamil urban settlements in that it was constructed on the coast rather than inland, which suited the French for their seaborne trade.[41] Sher Khan Lodi, governor of Valikondapuram, had ceded the city to Benoît Bellanger de Lespinay in 1672 in exchange for French financial and military support against the Dutch and their allies, the sultan of Golconda, on the condition that they would respect the customs and traditions of the Tamil people.[42]

The Dutch redesigned Pondicherry. Archival plans show that they wanted to make Pondicherry their main settlement on India's Coromandel coast (Figure 16.6). From 1693 to 1699, they painstakingly planned an urban settlement on Pondicherry's western outskirts, with a geometric layout of blocks of houses separated by straight streets intersecting at right angles. This corresponds almost entirely to Pondicherry's modern plan and today's urban layout.

The Dutch set the framework for a separation based on religion between the Tamil and the European urban settlements and planned a distribution of the Tamil communities. The Dutch were familiar with and knowledgeable about the Indian social structure. They intended to settle the Tamil weavers, craftspeople, and high caste *Brahmins* to the north of the Upper River close to their temple on the location of the Mission Press, and the merchants (*Komuttis, Chettis, Kavarais*), farmers (*Reddis, Pallis, Vellalas*), and the remaining craftspeople to the south.[43] The southern land south of the Upper River, covered at the time with fields, groves, and gardens, was also included.



Plan of the Fortress and Town Poedechery as It Is Currently Being Built, November 20, 1694, National Archives, The Hague, Foreign map collection, Leupe, VEL 1098.

Pondicherry became the jewel of France's Asia, the only "colonie" (as opposed to a "comptoir" (counter)) and the only place with an architectural program that rivaled, if not exceeded, that of its prosperous French American colonies.[44] The Compagnie Française des Indes Orientales (CIO) established its factory in Pondicherry in 1674.[45] Though the French came primarily for trade, conversion to Christianity and political indoctrination were secondary activities. The Capuchin brothers and the Jesuits were the first religious orders to set up missions. In 1693, during their occupation of the city, the French devised a gridiron plan of the western Tamil urban settlement to attract merchants and artisans: a utopian weaving city. In 1699, François Martin sent a report to the CIO recommending religious tolerance with Hindus. The French were given the land for Pondicherry under the condition that they maintain religious freedom assured to all society in 1816. However, preferential treatment was given to converted Christians.

As Gwendolyn Wright has explained, idealistic private individuals like Martin and Joseph-François Dupleix shaped French colonial policy in the eighteenth century. The city's gridiron plan and its elegant and restrained European private residential style reflected the desire to promote prestigious architectural projects, notably France's willingness to advertise itself as a place of high culture while meeting the more practical needs of the colonists and the colonized alike.[46] The ostentatious design of Dupleix's Government House, destroyed in 1761, mirrored what had been the ambitious French idea to colonize India. The failure was echoed in the subdued design of the new Government House.

The separation of the Europeans from the Tamil settlement demonstrated the French policy of public non-interference and allowed Indigenous quarters to reflect Tamil social divisions. The location of Christian missions and French schools served the colonizer's policy of Christian conversion and education to attend the private French interests. Changes after 1815 reflected a more settled period of French administration, as Pondicherry became merely a center of trade on Coromandel's coast of India.[47]

Because of Pondicherry's isolation, the French depended seriously on the Tamils for the colony's rule and development. It made sense for the French to maintain good relations with them, since they were vastly outnumbered and did not have the money or manpower. As an occupying minority, non-interference in caste and the promotion of good relations came to be reflected in Pondicherry, particularly in constructing a canal that separated a Tamil town, organized along traditional caste lines, from a European town. The population was settled as follows: along the seashore, the French lived in a small rectangular fort (Fort Barlong) in brick houses built toward the sea; the Tamils were distributed to the north of the present Bharati Park, and mainly consisted of weavers and artisans of the five castes (*kammalar*), carpenters, masons, etc.; to the south, there were trading castes and Muslims, with two mosques and one graveyard near Baslieu street; and at both edges, there were fishermen and outcasts; on the western tract—today's Puducherry—artisans settled along irregular lanes. This dispersion indicates that the eastern part of Pondicherry was mainly inhabited by Tamils and not a "French/Catholic" urban settlement. Tamils mainly inhabited it, and in 1693, after 20 years of French occupation, Pondicherry's streets or lanes followed an irregular pattern with no shape or symmetry.[48]

Modern-day Pondicherry was laid by the Dutch and adapted by the French. The French urban settlement along the coast retained the pre-1693 settlement's slightly uneven streetscape. The fort did not clearly demarcate the "Tamil" and "French/Catholic" urban settlements. People of non-Christian religions under French colonial rule shared the same space, which the French would later separate by a canal as a "cordon sanitaire." The grid plan played a crucial role, enabling Pondicherry's effective colonization, which expanded in the eighteenth century.[49]

Since the Dutch had the project to move the Tamil community to the west of the settlement, the Dutch, not the French, were responsible for creating the grid pattern of Pondicherry. They also initiated the idea of separating the Tamil settlement from the European houses. This undertaking was unfinished when the Dutch left Pondicherry four years later. Only the northwest corner of the new city was inhabited, and farming continued to be practiced on the entire tract south of the Upper River.

By 1721, Pondicherry almost stretched the limits of the old Dutch plan.[50] The French managed to carry out this by forcing the inhabitants to build rectangular blocks separated by lines intersecting at right angles, except for the Muslim neighborhood. The separation between Europeans and Tamils remained a deliberate policy for almost a century after Pondicherry's founding. The French may have refrained from interfering with the social structure of the Tamil portion of the colony, which is a possible explanation.

Comparison and Conclusion

Diu, Pondicherry, and Tranquebar are idiosyncratic European colonial cities—unstudied together and compared. The blurred separation between the private and public spaces

inhabited by Europeans and non-Christians had implications for their social, economic, and political lives. Europeans, Gujaratis, and Tamils shared a "contact zone" that broke down partialities and promoted tolerance.[51]

They offer alternate readings. Here, walls were not only physical structures but also tools of colonial governance, shaping the social and urban landscapes. Europeans were placed in the more fortified parts of the city. Still, Indigenous populations were not merely relegated to the peripheries: the colonizer/colonized boundaries were blurred, and their connection was ambivalent. People practicing non-Christian religions—Hindus, Jains, Muslims, and Zoroastrians—shared urban space within the walls under the same and concomitant colonial rule. The lack of strict separation manifested resistance and adaptation. This reveals a contradiction inherent in the production and exercise of colonial authority. It shows that the spatial patterns were much more complex than binary and retained a remarkable presence. It is a form of ambivalence. As Homi K. Bhabha argues, by adopting, imitating, mocking, and subverting the dominant essentialist ideology of the empire, there is a "third space" that "terrorizes authority" and enables the colonized to escape the binary relationship of colonist/colonized and center/periphery: "the ambivalence at the source of traditional discourses on authority enables a form of subversion, founded on the undecidability that turns the discursive conditions of dominance into the grounds of intervention."[52]

Beyond the processes of making the built environment, including both obvious western stylistic influences on local architecture, but also more insidiously, the colonial government's power to selectively read the cultural landscapes created by local inhabitants, renders the landscapes of the latter as potentially inconsequential. Who claimed ownership of private and public space? Was there any litigation in this respect? Was there evidence of clustering of settlements in this respect? How did Europeans become "White" when they were amongst visibly "composite" populations, as a term denoting hybridity, multiples, and as a collectivist effort by many cultures rather than any monocultures, is a question? The "displaced," then, refers to notions of being out of place and, like Edward Said writes in *Out of Place*, something irrecoverable, a feeling of dissonance, and an inability of finding your identity in one particular place.[53]

Diu, Pondicherry, and Tranquebar had no boundary between the existing and newly built European settlements. These cities comprised a fort inhabited exclusively by Europeans, an esplanade, and "Black"/"White" urban settlements, all within a wall, inhabited both by Europeans and Tamils/Gujarati. The European urban settlement was near the fort, while the non-European communities were further away. The layout reflected the colonizer/colonized power dynamics, with the European urban settlement occupying a fundamental and dominant position. But, unlike other colonial cities, no "Black"/"White" towns prescribed urban settlement boundaries were drawn, and no social segregation existed. The absence of regulated divisions allowed for a negotiation of urban space between the European and Indigenous communities, and a more fluid and adaptive space.

The area within the perimeter wall created a comparable threshold between private and public. However, Tranquebar and Pondicherry were built during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, more than a century and a half after the establishment of the Portuguese in Diu. The urban settlements within fortified walls inhabited by European Christians and non-Christian communities formed an integrated spatial organization that allowed for cultural exchange, interaction, and the development of hybrid identities.

The blurred boundaries of urban space challenged the balance between the colonizer and the colonized and created opportunities for Indigenous contention, negotiation, and challenging of

colonialism. The colonized had a role in shaping the space they inhabited, and their presence within the fortified walls signified value for the colonizers. By showing how the colonized resisted and adapted to colonialism, we can challenge the idea that they were solely passive. This unique spatial arrangement challenges the conventional understanding of European colonialism as a monolithic and hegemonic force, and sheds light on the colonizer/colonized complexities and interactions.[54]

The blurring of boundaries between "Black"/"White" settlements shaped the architecture(s) and urbanism(s) of Diu, Pondicherry, and Tranquebar. The coexistence between the colonizer and the colonized likely contributed to a unique architectural style and urban culture that blended European/Indigenous influences. The cohabitation of Europeans and non-Christians enabled sharing knowledge, technologies, and trade practices. This led to the adoption of European spatial cultures by the Indigenous communities and vice versa, showcasing the ability of the colonized people to adapt and assert their agency within a colonial setting. The colonized population's proximity to the colonial administration allowed them to negotiate interests, voice concerns, and express grievances, potentially influencing decisions and policies.[55]

Diu, Pondicherry, and Tranquebar challenge the bias that the European empires' colonial cities in India were merely places of oppression and exploitation. These cities were also places of exchange, interaction, and complexity. A reliance on dichotomous structures in colonial urban analysis raises questions about the true nature of colonial space, the actors (individuals, groups, or institutions), their arguments, their positions and how they change and progress over time, the private and public spaces they develop, and the potential for blurred boundaries and hybrid architecture and urbanism that defy easy categorization. European colonial powers had different colonial attitudes and behaviors in India, and a combination of historical context, cultural factors, political considerations, and economic interests influenced their approaches to constructing cities and social dynamics.

Notes

This chapter was made possible by the funding and support of the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation program, under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement No. 895924 and of the Danish National Research Foundation (DNRF138). It was made at the Centre for Privacy Studies (PRIVACY), a Centre of Research Excellence established in 2017 and housed at the Faculty of Theology, University of Copenhagen, in collaboration with the Royal Danish Academy—School of Architecture, Design and Conservation. I want to thank the core scholar, Peter Thule Kristensen, for his supervision and support, the head of administration, Maj Riis Poulsen, for logistical support, and the Centre's director, Mette Birkedal Bruun, for her trust and support. I would like to express my gratitude to Emily Burns and Alice Price for the encouragement, discussions, and comments. I am also grateful to Emily Burns for inviting me to participate in this project.

1 Charlene Villaseñor Black and Tim Barringer "Decolonizing Art and Empire," *Art Bulletin* 104, no. 1 (2022): 6–20.

2 On "Black"/"White" town historiography, see Janet Abu-Lughod, "Tale of Two Cities: The Origins of Modern Cairo," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 7, no. 4 (July 1965): 429–57; Robert Redfield and Milton Singer, "The Cultural Role of Cities," *Economic Development and Cultural Change* 3, no. 1 (1954): 53–73; Ronald Horvath, "In Search of a Theory of Urbanization: Notes on the Colonial City," *East Lakes Geographer* 5 (1969): 68–82; and Anthony King, *Colonial Urban Development* (London: Routledge, 1976). On urban history in India, see also Janaki Nair, *The Promise of the Metropolis: Bangalore's Twentieth Century* (New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2005); and Prashant Kidambi, *The Making of an Indian Metropolis: Colonial Governance and Public Culture in Bombay, 1890–1920* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007).

3 N. Devi Prasad, *Fort Cochin and Mattancherry: A Monograph* (New Delhi: Indian National Trust for Art and Cultural Heritage, 1994).
4 Hybridity theory began with critical theorist Homi Bhabha's *Location of Culture* (1994). See Homi K. Bhabha, *The Location of Culture* (London: Routledge, 1994), especially 85–93; and Homi K. Bhabha, "Signs Taken for Wonders: Questions of Ambivalence and Authority under a Tree outside Delhi, May 1817," *Critical Inquiry* 12, no. 2 (1985): 144–65.
5 On "blurring the boundaries" in the colonial built environment, see Swati Chattopadhyay, "Blurring Boundaries: The Limits of 'White Town' in Colonial Calcutta," *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 59, no. 2 (2000): 154–79. https://online.ucpress.edu/jsah/article/59/2/154/58409/Blurring-Boundaries-The-Limits-of-White-Town-in; and Swati Chattopadhyay, *Representing Calcutta: Modernity, Nationalism and the Colonial Uncanny* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2005).
6 Norbert Elias argues that the delineation of a private sphere is inherent to civilization, showing how courtly ideals of the centralized early modern state spurred on a private realm. Arendt discusses the public-private distinction as analogous to political realm and household. See Norbert Elias, *The Civilizing Process: The History of Manners* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1978); Norbert Elias, *On the Process of Civilisation: Sociogenetic and Psychogenetic Investigations* (Dublin: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012); Hannah Arendt, *The Human Condition* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 2018).
7 Roger Crowley, *Conquerors: How Portugal Seized the Indian Ocean and Forged the First Global Empire* (London: Random House, 2015), 14.
8 Jason Sharman, *Empires of the Weak: The Real Story of European Expansion and the Creation of the New World Order* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2019), 72–87.
9 Glenn Ames, *Colbert, Mercantilism, and the French Quest for Asian Trade* (DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 1996), 9.
10 Philippe Haudrère, "Présences françaises en Inde et dans l'océan Indien aux XVIIe et XVIIIe siècles," in *Présences françaises outre-mer, XVI^e-XXI^e siècles*, eds. Philippe Bonnichon, Pierre Gény, and Jean Nemo (Paris: Académie des sciences d'outre-mer, Karthala, 2012), vol. 1, 225; and Philippe Haudrère, *Les Français dans l'océan Indien, XVIIe–XIXe siècle* (Rennes: Presses universitaires, 2019).
11 Philippe Haudrère, "Premiers pas français," in *Les compagnies des indes*, ed. René Estienne (Paris: Gallimard, 2013), 21.
12 During the dual monarchy of Denmark and Norway until 1814, many colonial commanders, soldiers, and merchants were Norwegian. Nevertheless, to be clear, here I use the terms "Denmark," "Danes," and "Danish.".
13 On the *Nayaks* of Tanjore, see V. Vriddhagirisan, *The Nayaks of Tanjore* (Madras: Asian Educational Services, 1995 [1942]).
14 Stephan Smith, "A Prospect of Fort St.George and Plan of the city of Madras," *British Library*, blog (February 1, 2018), https://blogs.bl.uk/untoldlives/2018/02/a-prospect-of-fort-stgeorge-and-plan-of-the-city-of-madras.html; Bodleian Library Gough Maps 41 No. 138—'A prospect of Fort St. George and Plan of the City of Madras actually surveyed by order of the late Governor. T. Pitt …' c. 1730.
15 Gauvin Bailey, *The Architecture of Empire: France in India and Southeast Asia, 1664–1962* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2022).
16 This aligns with Bhabha's hybridity; see Bhabha, *Location of Culture*.
17 Bhabha, *Location of Culture*; and Bailey, *Architecture of Empire*, 25–33.
18 Susan Neild, "Colonial Urbanism: The Development of Madras City in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries," *Modern Asian Studies* 13, no. 2 (1979): 217–46.
19 Chattopadhyay, "Blurring Boundaries," 154–79; and Chattopadhyay, *Representing Calcutta*.
20 Chattopadhyay, "Blurring Boundaries," 154.
21 Amar Acharaïou, *Questioning Hybridity, Postcolonialism and Globalization* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011).
22 Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London: Verso, 2016).
23 Brian Jenkins and Spyros Sofos, *Nation and Identity in Contemporary Europe* (London: Routledge, 1996).
24 See *Planta da Fortaleza e Cidade de Diu, Que por ordem do Ill. Exmo. Senhor D. Frederico Guillermo de Souza a tirou o Capitão Engenheiro Ioão Antonio Sarmento. 1783*, Porto Public and Municipal Library: C.M. & A., Pasta 24 (35).
25 Nuno Grancho, "Diu: A Social Architectural and Urban History" (PhD diss., University of Coimbra, 2017).

26 António Bocarro, *Livro das Plantas de todas as Fortalezas, Cidades e Povoaçoens do Estado da Índia Oriental com as Descripçoens da Altura em que Estão…* (Lisbon: Imprensa Nacional Casa da Moeda, 1992) (Codex COD. CXV/2-X Évora Public Library, 1635, facsimile); Pedro Dias, "Diu em 1634. Documentos e Notas para um Retrato de uma Praça Portuguesa no Guzarate," in *Arte Indo-Portuguesa: capítulos da história* (Coimbra: Almedina, 1992), 217–19.
27 João de Barros, *Da Ásia* (Lisbon: Livraria Sam Carlos, 1973–75 [1552]); João de Castro, *Roteiros de D. João de Castro* (Lisbon: Agência Geral das Colónias, 1939–40 [1538–41]); and Gaspar Correa, *Lendas da Índia*. (Almeida: Lello & Irmão, 1975 [1546]).
28 *Bulletin from Governo do "Estado da India,"* 52, Nova Goa, July 7, 1857.
29 Ciceri also drew: VUE DE LA FORTERESSE DE DIOU, PRISE DE LA MAISON DU GOUVERNEUR / lithogr., en noir; 19 x 33,5 cm (im.), 33 x 52,5 cm (f.). In *Documents sur l'histoire, la géographie et le commerce de l'Afrique oriental e*(Paris: Arthus Bertrand, 1856), vol. 4, atlas, pl. 12.
30 See Saint Paul's church and the monastery of the Holy Spirit persistently epitomized in the history of Portuguese architecture as one of the most important buildings in Indo-Portuguese architecture and Catholic religious buildings in Asia and outside of Europe (left side). At the center is Saint Thomas church, and on the right is the former church and monastery of Saint Dominic. Grancho, "Diu," 167.
31 Grancho, "Diu," 167–72.
32 Philippus Baldæus, *A True and Exact Description of the Most Celebrated East-India Coasts of Malabar and Coromandel and Also of the Isle of Ceylon* (New Delhi: Asian Educational Series, 2020 [1703]).
33 See Rigsarkivet records including *Kancelliets brevbøger*; Admiral Ove Giedde's archive 1616–50 (box B244); Captain Claus Rytter's accounts for the period 1639–50 (box 245), https://www.sa.dk/ao-soegesider/da/other/index-creator/192/103799/22696360; and Captain and Governor of Tranquebar Wilhelm Leyel for 1639–48 (box 246), https://www.sa.dk/ao-soegesider/da/other/index-creator/192/103799/23436633. See also Ove Giedde, "Fortegnelse paa alt, hvis paa denne Indianske Reise …," in *Samlung zur Dånischen Geschichte*, ed. J. H. Schlegel (Copenhagen: Sander und Schröder, 1773), vol. 1, 31–37, https://www.digitale-sammlungen.de/view/bsb10452498?page=30%2C31.
34 The omission of the Zion Church dates Trellund's map to the 1690s.
35 In the 1730s, a palisade replaced the walled rampart due to coastal erosion.
36 Nikolaus Dal et al., *Nachricht von den Portugiesen in Indien* (Halle: Franckesche Stiftung Foundation, 1734), Ref.: M 1 C 18: 43, https://digital.francke-halle.de/fsdhm/periodical/titleinfo/171712; Gérald Duverdier, "Portugais ou Indo-portugais. Le choix des missionaires de Tranquebar," *Arquivos do Centro Cultural Português* 22 (1986): 115–39.
37 The maker of *pintado*, the resist-dyed and mordant-painted cotton textiles similar to *chintz*. Pintados were used to make quilts, carpets, tablecloths, chair covers, wall hangings, curtains, and cushions and derived from *pintado* Portuguese fabric (spotted, speckled, or painted).
38 Esther Fihl, ed., *The Governor's Residence in Tranquebar: The House and the Daily Life of Its People, 1770–1845* (Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press, 2017).
39 RA. Det kgl. Ostindiske Guvernment, Kommisionkarter ang, koloniernes overdragelse til Kongen, no. 1510, Edward Stevenson's deed, April 3, 1775.
40 Sinnappah Arasaratnam, *Merchants, Companies, and Commerce on the Coromandel Coast, 1650–1740* (New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1986), 24.
41 A. Madalai Muthu, "Urbanisation of Pondicherry during the French Colonial Rule from 1673 to 1816" (PhD diss., Pondicherry University, 1982).
42 Raphaël Malangin, *Pondicherry That Was Once French India* (New Delhi: INTACH Pondicherry, 2015), 22; Haudrère, "Présences françaises," vol. 1, 231; Douglas Gressieux, "Les établissements français de l'Inde de 1640 à 1914," in *Présences françaises outre-mer*, eds. Philippe Bonnichon, Pierre Gény and Jean Nemo (Paris: Académie des sciences d'outre-mer, Khartala), vol. 1, 269; Jean Deloche, *Le vieux Pondichéry (1673–1824) revisité d'après les plans anciens* (Pondicherry: Institut Français de Pondichéry et École française d'Extrême-Orient, 2005), 11–13; Gabriel Duval, *Pondichéry: Histoire d'un Comptoir* (Pondicherry: Éditions le Lycée Français de Pondichery, 1997), 30; Pierre Bourdat, *Eighteenth-Century Pondicherry. Pondichéry XVIIIe siècle* (Pondicherry: Pondicherry Museum, 1995), 1–5; Ayyasamy Ramaswami, *History of Pondicherry* (New Delhi: Sterling Publishers, 1987), 59; Arasaratnam, *Merchants, Companies, and Commerce*,

92; Marguerite Labernadie, *Le vieux Pondichery 1673–1815: Histoire d'une ville coloniale française* (Paris: E. Leroux, 1936), 1–4; and Henri Froidevaux, "François Martin et Pondichéry de 1674 à 1686," *Outre-Mers: Revue d'histoire* 87 (1932): 193–216.

43 In the nineteenth century, there were 12 Christian printing presses in Tamil Nadu, India. The priests felt the need to have a press for their Mission, so they appealed to the French government to start one. The French government gave permission and donated the printing machine and ink. Fr. Dupuis started the Catholic press in Pondicherry and named it Mission Press.

44 Alfred Martineau, *Correspondance du Conseil Supérieur de Pondichéry avec le Conseil de Chandernagor* (Paris: Société de l'histoire de l'Inde, 1919), vol. 1, 10, 30.

45 Chandra Mukerji, *Territorial Ambitions and the Gardens of Versailles* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 98–106, 115–24. Quoted in Olivier Chaline, "A King and His Gardens: Power and Sociability," in *André Le Nôtre in Perspective*, eds. Patricia Bouchenot-Déchin and Georges Farhat (Paris: Editions Hazan, 2014), 30; and Robert Berger, *A Royal Passion: Louis XIV as Patron of Architecture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 20–23.

46 Mukerji, *Territorial Ambitions and the Gardens of Versailles*, 98–106, 115–24.

47 Gwendolyn Wright, "Tradition in the Service of Modernity: Architecture and Urbanism in French Colonial Policy, 1900–1930," *Journal of Modern History* 59, no. 2 (1987): 291–316; and Gwendolyn Wright, *The Politics of Design in French Colonial Urbanism* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991).

48 Nicholas de Fer, *Map of Pondicherry on the Coromandel Coast Occupied by the Royal Company of the East Indies*, Paris, 1704, engraving, 29 × 40 cm, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Paris. This map shows Fort Barlong and the gridiron plan introduced by the Dutch in 1693–94.

49 Jean Deloche, *Origins of the Urban Development of Pondicherry According to a Seventeenth Century Dutch Plan* (Pondicherry: Institut Français de Pondichéry, 2004), 36–42. This counters J. More's claims that the French created the grid pattern. See J. B. P. More, *Pondicherry, Tamil Nadu and South India under French Rule: From François Martin to Dupleix 1674–1754* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2021), 47.

50 On colonial urban planning, see Robert Home, *Of Planting and Planning: The Making of British Colonial Cities* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2013), 8–35.

51 Marie Louise Pratt, "Arts of the Contact Zone," *Profession* (1991): 33–40.

52 Bhabha, *Location of Culture*, 112.

53 Edward Said, *Out of Place: A Memoir* (New York: Vintage Books, 1999).

54 Christopher Pinney, "Colonialism and Culture," in *The Sage Handbook of Cultural Analysis*, eds. Tony Bennett and John Frow (London: Sage Publications, 2008), 382; and Zeynep Çelik, *Empire, Architecture, and the City: French-Ottoman Encounters, 1830–1914* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2008).

55 In 1857, the Gujarati Diuese opened the subscription of a petition to raise funds to commemorate the visit to Diu of António César de Vasconcelos Correia (1855–64), Governor-General of Estado da Índia. The Portuguese colonial authorities responded to the submitted petition by defending the city's modernization as a service to the community's well-being. *Bulletin from Governo do "Estado da India,"* 52, Nova Goa, July 7, 1857.

Bibliography

Abu-Lughod, Janet. "Tale of Two Cities: The Origins of Modern Cairo." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 7, no. 4 (July 1965): 429–57.

Acharaïou, Amar. *Questioning Hybridity, Postcolonialism and Globalization*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.

Ames, Glenn. *Colbert, Mercantilism, and the French Quest for Asian Trade*. DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 1996.

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso, 2016.

Arasaratnam, Sinnappah. *Merchants, Companies, and Commerce on the Coromandel Coast, 1650–1740*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1986.

Arendt, Hannah. *The Human Condition*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2018 [1958].

Baldæus, Philippus. *A True and Exact Description of the Most Celebrated East-India Coasts …* 1703. Reprint, New Delhi: Asian Educational Series, 2020.
Bailey, Gauvin. *The Architecture of Empire: France in India and Southeast Asia, 1664–1962*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2022.
Berger, Robert. *A Royal Passion: Louis XIV as Patron of Architecture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
Bhabha, Homi K. *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge, 1994.
Bhabha, Homi K. "Signs Taken for Wonders: Questions of Ambivalence and Authority under a Tree outside Delhi, May 1817." *Critical Inquiry* 12, no. 2 (1985): 144–65.
Black, Charlene Villaseñor, and Tim Barringer. "Decolonizing Art and Empire." *Art Bulletin* 104, no. 1 (2022): 6–20.
Bocarro, António. *Livro das Plantas de todas as Fortalezas, Cidades e Povoaçoens do Estado da Índia Oriental com as Descripçoens da Altura em que Estão …*, 3 vols. 1635. Reprint Codex COD. CXV/2-X Évora Public Library, 1635. Lisbon: Imprensa Nacional Casa da Moeda, 1992.
Bonnichon, Philippe, Pierre Gény, and Jean Nemo, eds. *Présences françaises outre-mer, XVIe-XXIe siècles*, vol. 1. Paris: Académie des sciences d'outre-mer, Khartala, 2012.
Bourdat, Pierre. *Eighteenth-Century Pondicherry*. Pondicherry: Pondicherry Museum, 1995.
Bulletin from Governo do "Estado da India." 52, Nova Goa, July 7, 1857.
Çelik, Zeynep. *Empire, Architecture, and the City: French-Ottoman Encounters, 1830–1914*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2008.
Chaline, Olivier. "A King and His Gardens: Power and Sociability." In *André Le Nôtre in Perspective*, eds. Patricia Bouchenot-Déchin and Georges Farhat, 25–31. Paris: Editions Hazan, 2014.
Chattopadhyay, Swati. "Blurring Boundaries: The Limits of 'White Town' in Colonial Calcutta." *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 59, no. 2 (2020): 154–79. https://online.ucpress.edu/jsah/article/59/2/154/58409/Blurring-Boundaries-The-Limits-of-White-Town-in.
Chattopadhyay, Swati. *Representing Calcutta: Modernity, Nationalism and the Colonial Uncanny*. London: Routledge, 2005.
Correa, Gaspar. *Lendas da Índia*. 1546. Reprint, Almeida: Lello & Irmão, 1975.
Crowley, Roger. *Conquerors: How Portugal Seized the Indian Ocean and Forged the First Global Empire*. London: Random House, 2015.
Dal, Nikolaus et al. *Nachricht von den Portugiesen in Indien*. Halle: Franckesche Stiftung Foundation, 1734. Ref.: M 1 C 18: 43. https://digital.francke-halle.de/fsdhm/periodical/titleinfo/171712.
De Barros, João. *Da Ásia*. 1552. Reprint, Lisbon: Livraria Sam Carlos, 1973–75.
De Castro, João. *Roteiros de D. João de Castro*. 1538–41. Reprint, Lisbon: Agência Geral das Colónias, 1939-1940.
Deloche, Jean. *Origins of the Urban Development of Pondicherry According to a Seventeenth Century Dutch Plan*. Pondicherry: Institut Français de Pondichéry, 2004.
Deloche, Jean. *Le vieux Pondichéry (1673–1824) revisité d'après les plans anciens*. Pondicherry: Institut Français de Pondichéry et École française d'Extrême-Orient, 2005.
Dias, Pedro. *Arte Indo-Portuguesa: capítulos da história*. Coimbra: Almedina, 1992.
Duval, Gabriel. *Pondichéry: Histoire d'un Comptoir*. Pondicherry: Editions le Lycée Français de Pondichery, 1997.
Duverdier, Gérald. "Portugais ou Indo-portugais. Le choix des missionaires de Tranquebar." *Arquivos do Centro Cultural Português* 22 (1986): 115–39.
Elias, Norbert. *The Civilizing Process: The History of Manners*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1978.
Elias, Norbert. *On the Process of Civilisation: Sociogenetic and Psychogenetic Investigations*. Dublin: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012.
Fihl, Esther, ed. *The Governor's Residence in Tranquebar: The House and the Daily Life of Its People, 1770–1845*. Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press, 2017.
Froidevaux, Henri. "François Martin et Pondichéry de 1674 à 1686." *Outre-Mers: Revue d'histoire* 87 (1932): 193–216.
Gjedde, Ove. "Fortegnelse paa alt, …" in *Samlung zur Dånischen Geschichte*, ed. J. H. Schlegel, 1: 31–37. Copenhagen: Sander und Schröder, 1773. https://www.digitale-sammlungen.de/de/view/bsb10452498?q=%28Coromandel+med+Naichen+of+Tanjour%29&page=30,31.
Grancho, Nuno. "Diu: A Social Architectural and Urban History." PhD diss., University of Coimbra, 2017.

Gressieux, Douglas. "Les établissements français de l'Inde de 1640 à 1914." In *Présences françaises outre-mer*, eds. Philippe Bonnichon, Pierre Gény, and Jean Nemo, *Présences françaises outre-mer, XVIe-XXIe siècles*, 1: 267–74. Paris: Académie des sciences d'outre-mer, Khartala, 2012.
Haudrère, Philippe. *Les Français dans l'océan Indien, XVIIe–XIXe siècle*. Rennes: Presses universitaires, 2019.
Haudrère, Philippe. "Premiers pas français." In *Les compagnies des indes*, ed. René Estienne, 21–24. Paris: Gallimard, 2013.
Haudrère, Philippe. "Présences françaises en Inde et dans l'océan Indien aux XVIIe et XVIIIe siècles." In *Présences françaises outre-mer*, edited by Bonnichon, Gény and Nemo. 1: 225–52.
Home, Robert. *Of Planting and Planning: The Making of British Colonial Cities*. Abingdon: Routledge, 2013.
Horvath, Ronald. "In Search of a Theory of Urbanization: Notes on the Colonial City." *East Lakes Geographer* 5 (1969): 68–82.
Jenkins, Brian, and Sofos, Spyros. *Nation and Identity in Contemporary Europe*. London: Routledge, 1996.
Kidambi, Prashant. *The Making of an Indian Metropolis: Colonial Governance and Public Culture in Bombay, 1890–1920*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007.
King, Anthony. *Colonial Urban Development*. London: Routledge, 1976.
Labernadie, Marguerite. *Le vieux Pondichery 1673–1815: Histoire d'une ville coloniale française*. Pondichéry: Bibliothèque publique; Paris: E. Leroux, 1936.
Malangin, Raphäel. *Pondicherry That Was Once French India*. New Delhi: INTACH Pondicherry, 2015.
Martineau, Alfred. *Correspondance du Conseil Supérieur de Pondichéry avec le Conseil de Chandernagor*. Paris: Société de l'histoire de l'Inde, 1919. https://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bpt6k58427640.
More, J. B. P. *Pondicherry, Tamil Nadu and South India under French Rule: From François Martin to Dupleix 1674–1754*. Abingdon: Routledge, 2021.
Mukerji, Chandra. *Territorial Ambitions and the Gardens of Versailles*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
Muthu, A. Madalai. "Urbanisation of Pondicherry during the French Colonial Rule from 1673 to 1816." PhD diss., Pondicherry University, 1982.
Nair, Janaki. *The Promise of the Metropolis: Bangalore's Twentieth Century*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2005.
Neild Basu, Susan. "Colonial Urbanism: The Development of Madras City in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries." *Modern Asian Studies* 13, no. 2 (1979): 217–46.
Petersen, Sophie. *Danmarks gamle Tropekolonier*. Copenhagen: Det kongelige Geografiske Selskabs Kulturgeografiske Skrifter, 1946.
Pinney, Christopher. "Colonialism and Culture." In *The Sage Handbook of Cultural Analysis*, eds. Tony Bennett and John Frow, 382–405. London: Sage Publications, 2008.
Prasad, N. Devi. *Fort Cochin and Mattancherry: A Monograph*. New Delhi: Indian National Trust for Art and Cultural Heritage, 1994.
Pratt, Marie Louise. "Arts of the Contact Zone." *Profession* (1991): 33–40.
Ramaswami, Ayyasamy. *History of Pondicherry*. New Delhi: Sterling Publishers, 1987.
Redfield, Robert, and Milton B. Singer. "The Cultural Role of Cities," *Economic Development and Cultural Change* 3, no. 1 (1954): 53–73.
Said, Edward. *Out of Place: A Memoir*. New York: Vintage Books, 1999.
Sharman, Jason. *Empires of the Weak: The Real Story of European Expansion and the Creation of the New World Order*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2019.
Smith, Stephan. "A Prospect of Fort St.George and Plan of the City of Madras." *British Library*. Blog (February 1, 2018). https://blogs.bl.uk/untoldlives/2018/02/a-prospect-of-fort-stgeorge-and-plan-of-the-city-of-madras.html.
Vriddhagirisan, V. *The Nayaks of Tanjore*, 1942. Madras: Asian Educational Services, 1995.
Wright, Gwendolyn. *The Politics of Design in French Colonial Urbanism*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991.
Wright, Gwendolyn. "Tradition in the Service of Modernity: Architecture and Urbanism in French Colonial Policy, 1900–1930." *Journal of Modern History* 59, no. 2 (1987): 291–316.