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Neal focusses his study on five works of diverse genres from the years of Spain’s Enlightenment development: Benito Jerónimo Feijoo’s “Españoles Americanos,” José Cadalso’s *Cartas marruecas*, Gaspar Melchor de Jovellanos’ *El delincuente honrado*, Pedro de Montengón’s *Eusebio*, and José Blanco White’s “Conversaciones americanas sobre España y sus Indias” appearing in his London journal *El Español* (1810-1814). However, Neal richly goes to other writings such as those of Pablo de Olavide and Juan Sempere y Guarinos for information on the developing consciousness among members of Spain’s intellectual and artistic class of the importance of the country’s American colonies as they reconsidered how its essential identity might be modernized.

Neal is at pains to demonstrate how that consciousness contradicts old ideas about that literature’s aridity, indebted as we have commonly thought to French Neoclassic aesthetics, lingering Baroque taste and Nordic sentimentalism. He notes that *literateurs* have customarily jumped over the century, arguing that because no canonical authors appeared its literature does not deserve consideration. Yet the topic of America, emerging as a concern in those writings, importantly permitted those authors, he argues, to reconsider the impact on the country of its mercantilist policies which by the eighteenth century had produced an aristocracy sunk in luxurious consumption, and to contrast them with the economic theories behind the imperialisms of England, France and Holland, then reaping rewards. The seriousness of that effort, Neal asserts, goes far toward redeeming that literature’s value. Creativity consisted of picking up remnants of Spain’s history and not only criticizing them but reworking them into workable designs for the future.

In this Atlantic approach to Spain’s historical crisis – cultural uncertainties under Bourbon rule throughout the century but also at its close occupation under Napoleon’s troops and liberal innovation as constitutionalists meeting in Cádiz where Spain’s American colonies were demanding reforms – Neal avoids much of what Atlantic history has become. His sources do not guide him to talk about slavery, for example, or increasing trade freedoms in the Caribbean and Spanish political
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involvement in British America’s revolutionary war. Instead they afford glimpses into how writers began to refute European (principally French) naturalists’ claims that the Americas were unhealthy regions and that criollos were affected by that geography. Older ideas about the inferiority of indigenous peoples were thus updated, reinforcing judgments of scientists like Buffon and historians like William Robertson that Spain’s culture was inferior, made so by American components and its backward Catholicism. Thus Spain’s writers attempted to counter such views by introducing sometimes fictionalized Americans into their works as worthy citizens, equal in their civilization to Europeans. Neal notes the appearance of the Peruvian-born Olavide as a voice bringing common sense and reason to intellectual conversations in the mother country, demonstrating that birth and circumstance did not affect men’s minds and Spain was enriched by its American colonials. However, writers had to skirt the restrictions of the Inquisition and the capricious politics of prime ministers like Manuel de Godoy as they expressed unorthodox ideas, so that Neal’s reader is made to understand that fiction and the dialog it permitted were often invented to confuse and elude censure.

Dialog in theatrical and novelistic works thus can be seen to have served to express criticism and venturesome opinion. Characters such as Arab visitors to Spain in Cartas marrucas and the indiano in El delincuente borrado slid ideas into the public ken in a way that explicit statement perhaps could not have done. Neal does not generally discuss the venues which released such thought – though his statement that Eusebio sold 60,000 copies before the Inquisition banned it in 1798 points to an emerging receptive public and commerce that supported this literature.

Neal’s discussion of Eusebio is particularly interesting. He considers the novel’s dramatization of language usage by means of an international plot. As the central character, a Spaniard, moves to Philadelphia, England and France, he must learn other languages so as to be able to function humanly, and commercially, with others. His classical formation in Latin and Greek helps him to gain acceptance as a civilized cosmopolitan in those other cultures, suggesting the forming of an international elite. Spain could no longer be content in proclaiming the universality and functionality of Castilian.

However, Blanco White faced perhaps the greatest challenge in rethinking Spain’s place in the world. By the time “Conversaciones” was published, revolution had begun in the American colonies. Written principally for release to American readers, the essay, again in dialog, tried to reaffirm Spain’s influence on those former possessions while also allowing for self-government. Blanco was much influenced by the example of England’s constitutional monarchy, and by the regional demands of South Americans like Francisco de Miranda, Simón Bolívar and Andrés Bello whom he knew personally. Neal might have benefitted from also considering Mexico’s revolutionary path which Fray Servando de Mier
represented and whom Blanco also knew. Mexico received ideas from thinkers in the United States who were developing their own national government, and Londoners like Jeremy Bentham had grand utopian ideas for projects in those newly independent areas so that Spain’s influence can be seen to have been variously challenged.

Central to Neal’s study is his definition of “literature”. He writes: “In Spain, texts that were literary in nature, in contrast to official discourse, offer some of the most compelling testaments of the complex negotiation underway in Spanish eighteenth-century literary production. . . Compared to historiographical works, literary texts were a medium that was not always tied to state-driven financing or to coordinated administrative, educational campaigns, and therefore could be written without the same pressure of producing objective, transparent discourse geared to prescribed ends” (xxx).

The definition establishing his focus on “literature” is significant, not only for setting off the limits of Neal’s study but also for appreciating his methodology. A vogue in literary studies has lately trained scholars in formalist techniques, to look solely to the text for considerations of genre, rhetorical traditions, narrative strategies, etc. As a consequence, the field has often become closed as focus narrowed and critics invoked one another’s approaches to the same works. Neal generally escapes this pitfall of circular exchange, though his book is sometimes bogged down by the weight of such references in his analysis. Although handsomely produced, the book could have been improved by more careful copy-editing.

Another consequence of thinking that writing can be divided in this way—a perception that Neal usefully introduces though perhaps not realizing fully its implications—is his recognition of division in the academic world. Historians have often ignored the work of their literary colleagues, assuming that their sources are “transparent” and can be read literally; even if “artistic” works are consulted they are only useful at face value, as supplementary testimony. However, one can argue that all writing is “literature” and historiographical forms must also be subjected to considerations of levels of discourse, intentionality for a designated readership, rhetorical convention, etc. Historians can benefit from applying literary analysis to their documents, but literary scholars can also be helped by avoiding circularity and by considering the historical/cultural factors surrounding their texts. Nevertheless, Neal admirably stretches beyond the confines of traditional Spanish literary scholarship to read European authors such as Raynal and Rousseau, and offer suggestions about applying findings of non-Spanish theorists of modernity such as Jürgen Habermas to authors in this period in Spain’s development.

The originality of Neal’s book lies in his suggestion that a flow of ideas went from the Americas to Spain in the eighteenth century. We are accustomed to thinking of that flow in terms of its transport from Europe to the New World. Science, technology, political theory, we have thought, originated in the Old World. Yet evidence shows that that intellectual
repository was challenged, and enriched, by the lived experience of Americans, by their equally qualified thinkers and now-grown-up populations. That Spain was later forced to rethink a way to reassert control over its former colonies and maintain some semblance of imperial competitiveness with other powers, showing its reluctance to surrender to the historical triumph of that American flow, is developed in Neal’s concluding focus on the nineteenth century and its invention of Hispanism—repossessing them with that racial and cultural myth.


María Jesús García Garrosa
Universidad de Valladolid

Siguiendo la línea de trabajo iniciada con las ediciones de Hamlet en España. Las cuatro versiones neoclásicas (2010) y Macbeth en España. Las versiones neoclásicas (2011), Ángel-Luis Pujante y Keith Gregor ofrecen ahora las de otra obra de Shakespeare, Romeo y Julieta. El objetivo central de la publicación es la edición de las tres versiones denominadas 'neoclásicas', y el estudio que las precede trata lo que es esencial a ese fin: los testimonios que existen de cada uno de los textos españoles, y las propuestas de autoría y original adaptado por cada uno de ellos, pues ninguna de las versiones procede directamente de la obra inglesa.

La abundante bibliografía sobre la presencia de Shakespeare en España no había resuelto de manera inequívoca la autoría, original trasladado y fechas de composición de varias versiones españolas de Romeo and Juliet de los inicios del siglo XIX, en parte por la confusión de títulos y por el hecho de que las ediciones o manuscritos conservados son anónimos. En el trabajo que ahora presentan, Pujante y Gregor distinguen de manera clara y argumentada la existencia de tres versiones en las dos primeras décadas del siglo: Julia y Romeo, tragedia urbana estrenada en Madrid en diciembre de 1803, la tragedia Romeo y Julieta, estrenada en Barcelona en 1817 y repuesta en Madrid en 1818, y la ópera Julieta y Romeo, no estrenada pero probablemente trasladada para tal fin en 1805. Para la primera, conservada en dos manuscritos con finales diferentes, apoyan la atribución a Dionisio Solís de estudiosos anteriores, y centran su investigación en determinar qué fuente utilizó el autor de la versión española. Considerada generalmente una adaptación libre de Jean-François Ducis (del que proceden otras versiones españolas de obras de Shakespeare: Hamlet, Otelo, Macbeth), pero con el que
muestra unas libertades que los críticos anteriores no sabían cómo interpretar, o de Louis-Sébastien Mercier (Les tombeaux de Véron), Pujante y Gregor van cotejando Julia y Romeo con las versiones francesas de la obra inglesa, especialmente la de Mercier, hasta concluir que el original de Solís fue Romeo und Julie (1768), del alemán Christian Felix Weisse, a través de la versión francesa de Georges-Adam Junker (1785), del que también derivaría la obra de Mercier. Basan su atribución en un cotejo de la estructura de la versión española, de episodios concretos, de detalles del desenlace, que demuestran convincentemente la utilización, aunque libre, del autor español de este original alemán vía Francia.

En el caso de Romeo y Julieta, puesto que la autoría y el original trasladado no ofrecen dudas (fue atribuida a Manuel García Suelto en el periódico madrileño que anuncia su representación en 1818, y es adaptación clara de Roméo et Juliette de Ducis), los autores se limitan a destacar algunos cambios operados por García Suelto (la omisión de pasajes demasiado grandilocuentes, la españolización de los nombres, el uso del endecasílabo, la “despolitización” de su versión, que elude referencias al contexto político de la acción e intenta convertirla en una tragedia familiar), y la reescritura del final de la obra, con un desenlace mucho más dramático y efectista.

Para la ópera Julieta y Romeo, el estudio parte de nuevo de las atribuciones del texto y el original debidas a estudiosos anteriores, para presentar luego la fuente más probable localizada por los editores modernos: una ópera francesa en tres actos estrenada en 1793, Roméo et Juliette, con libreto de Joseph-Alexandre de Ségur y música de Daniel Steibelt. Su propuesta es que los recitados, que siguen muy de cerca el texto francés, serían de Dionísio Solís, y las partes musicales, muy pobres literariamente, probablemente de los propios intérpretes. En cuanto a la fecha, aunque no hay datos sobre su representación, apuntan a 1805: uno de los manuscritos conservados lleva el reparto de la compañía que debía representarla en el teatro de los Caños del Peral, que se disolvió en mayo de ese año, abortando así el estreno previsto.

A la “Introducción” (pp. 13-37) en la que se abordan estos problemas le siguen unas “Notas complementarias” (pp. 39-51) que inciden de nuevo en aspectos relativos a la autoría de las tres versiones pero en las que Pujante y Gregor se ocupan esencialmente de los testimonios materiales de las mismas, para indicar qué texto se edita de cada una de ellas. En el caso de Julia y Romeo es el del manuscrito de la Biblioteca Histórica Municipal de Madrid, un apuntamiento teatral que presenta un final feliz, al que se ha añadido, en otras hojas independientes, el final trágico más cercano al original que se traduce, y que es el que recoge el manuscrito de la Biblioteca Nacional de España. Ambos desenlaces pueden leerse en esta edición moderna. De Romeo y Julieta de García Suelto existen dos ediciones barcelonesas, de 1817 y 1820, muy similares, y se conservan cuatro manuscritos, apuntes de teatro para diferentes representaciones. Pujante y Gregor reproducen la edición de José Rubió de 1817, con algunas
referencias a los manuscritos. Finalmente, siguiendo los manuscritos del libreto y la música de Julieta y Romeo de la Biblioteca Histórica Municipal de Madrid, ofrecen una edición de esa ópera que integra recitados y cantables.

Los textos se presentan a continuación, sin anotar, salvo algunas notas que remiten a las diferencias entre los manuscritos y los impresos, en su caso, a las que ya se había aludido en el estudio previo. Se cierra el volumen con un repertorio de las “Traducciones y adaptaciones castellanas de Romeo y Julieta y selección de obras derivadas, realizadas en España (1803-2016)” (271-273) realizado por Jennifer Ruiz-Morgan.

El trabajo de Ángel-Luis Pujante y Keith Gregor resulta de especial interés por la luz que arrojan sus investigaciones sobre los modelos europeos que adaptaron los dramaturgos españoles de principios del siglo XIX. Como ellos mismos concluyen, “Romeo y Julieta acabaría siendo ‘de Shakespeare’ cualquiera que fuese el texto del que se hablase” (37), a pesar de que ninguna de las versiones que se conocieron en España de su obra provenía directamente del texto del autor inglés; pero conocer la índole de estas “desviaciones” es siempre esencial en el estudio de la transmisión y recepción culturales. Igualmente valiosa es la edición de las tres versiones de la historia de los amantes de Verona, accesibles ahora para quienes quieran seguir indagando en la recepción española de Shakespeare y en el papel de su dramaturgia en la transición de la estética neoclásica a la romántica.


Tara Zanardi
Hunter College, CUNY

In 1977, the Hispanist Nigel Glendinning published Goya and His Critics, which was translated into Spanish in the early 1980s. While much Goya scholarship has emphasized the artist’s biographical details as the central interpretative framework for analyzing his works, often in a highly romanticized manner, Glendinning’s book studied the reception of Goya’s paintings, prints, and drawings in the nineteenth century. Using this lens, Glendinning broadened the examination of Goya’s works and considered the myriad ways in which they were viewed, admired, understood (or misunderstood), and criticized by nineteenth-century artists and authors, including Charles Baudelaire, Richard Ford, and Impressionist painters,
among many others. Throughout his lengthy career, Glendinning contributed significantly to the reassessment of Goya’s art as part of a larger scholarly undertaking of eighteenth-century Spanish art and literature.

Jesusa Vega and Sarah Symmons, both foremost Goya scholars in the field, have re-released the Spanish edition of Glendinning’s *Goya and His Critics* and essay “El problema de las atribuciones desde la exposición de Goya de 1900,” along with their own essays about Glendinning and his work on Goya, and a foreword by the art historian Valeriano Bozal. This publication not only offers a new audience a fresh look at Glendinning’s writings, but also provides rich contextual analysis about Goya, Glendinning, and this seminal text.

Bozal sets the stage with a tribute to Glendinning’s various contributions as an academic, professor, and researcher of Hispanic visual and literary history. He gives a brief overview of many of Glendinning’s publications and some of the central themes featured in these works. As a scholar championed in Britain and Spain, Glendinning’s oeuvre has played a significant part in the transformation of eighteenth-century Spanish studies. Bozal provides a biographical portrait of Glendinning, from his early years in Cambridge to his many esteemed positions and honorary titles that celebrate his accomplishments. Photographs of Glendinning receiving an honorary degree (‘Doctor honoris causa’) at the Universidad Complutense de Madrid in 2006 accompany the forward.

Both Vega and Symmons offer generous memoirs dedicated to Glendinning and his scholarship. They celebrate his thoughtful analysis of Goya’s imagery and his profound intellect that made a substantial impact on scholarship of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Spanish art history. Vega places Glendinning’s studies in an historiographic context beginning with the first public exhibition dedicated to Goya in 1900 sponsored by the Ministerio de Fomento (and later Ministerio de Instrucción Pública y Bellas Artes). She traces the shifts in the perspectives and theories about and approaches to Goya and his work from the nineteenth and twentieth centuries in museological and academic settings. Vega considers these methodologies and they ways in which the specific time period’s political climate shaped the study and employment of Goya as an artistic figure and why particular objects garnered favor or were ignored. She addresses the polemics circulating around attribution debates, including deattributions put forth by the Museo del Prado, and Glendinning’s participation in these often-contentious disputes. In addition, Vega traces Glendinning’s Hispanist formation in the tertulia of Antonio Rodríguez-Moñino at the Café Lyon in Madrid and recounts her first meeting with the British academic in 1986 as she was just beginning her career as an art historian.

Symmons continues some of the same themes, including the vital role *Goya and His Critics* played in the modern formation of Goya scholarship and of art history as a discipline overall, presented by Bozal and Vega. Glendinning, as she argues, brought expert research and critical discussion
of Goya to an English-speaking academic community. His efforts broadened knowledge of Goya’s images beyond Spain’s borders. Particularly important was his inclusion of objects little studied. For example, Symmons emphasizes Glendinning’s critical attention to the artist’s fascination with and study of Diego Velázquez. As a court artist, Goya had access to paintings by the Golden Age hero held in royal collections. Symmons proposes such considerations made Goya the protagonist of serious art historical scrutiny in Glendinning’s writings and placed the artist in a specific Spanish enlightenment context. In addition, Symmons suggests that Glendinning was uniquely qualified to draw fundamental links between Goya’s satirical imagery and the satirical writings of his contemporaries, including José Cadalso, Jonathan Swift, and the Moratins as a means to enact social and political commentary.

In the three essays, Bozal, Vega, and Symmons stress Glendinning’s interdisciplinary approach, impeccable scholarship, and collegial generosity. The international reach of his studies has made (and continues to make) a lasting influence on the ways in which scholars and curators consider Goya’s objects. The authors describe Glendinning as a thoughtful mentor to younger generations of Hispanists and as a professor who valued the importance of academia’s communal spirit of sharing well-researched arguments and ideas.

Against the backdrop of these three homages to Glendinning’s erudition is the Spanish edition of *Goya and His Critics*. The essays by Bozal, Vega, and Symmons give new weight and meaning to this substantial text. The prologue to the Spanish edition indicates some of the changes made since the work’s initial publication in English, including additional bibliography and engagement with new sources. Situated within this laudatory context, Glendinning’s *Goya y sus críticos* shines anew. The book as a whole—Glendinning’s writings in concert with Bozal’s, Vega’s, and Symmons’ essays—is not only useful for Goya specialists, but also for academics in the field of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century art and a wider demographic of historians interested in historiography and reception theory. Students at both the undergraduate and graduate level will also benefit from engaging with Glendinning’s work and the evaluations of his scholarly impact. This text presents an opportunity to commemorate Glendinning’s scholarship and generosity, and a vehicle to underscore his dedication to exhaustive research and cogent analysis.
Un desafío de toda historia local o regional es el de lograr complementariedad en el marco de su correspondiente historia nacional, o en contextos más amplios, sin dejar por ello de informar acerca de las particularidades de sus propósitos y de su objeto de estudio. En *Oligarquías urbanas, gobierno y gestión municipal en la España cantábrica durante la Edad Moderna*, sus coordinadoras Faya Díaz, Anes Fernández y Friera Álvarez superan esa dificultad, reuniendo un conjunto de artículos acerca de la administración pública en la España cantábrica que se propone dar cuenta del tránsito de esa región hacia la “modernidad”.

La primera parte se dedica al estudio de las formas de gobierno municipal en la España cantábrica. Fernando Martínez Rueda abre la sección con un análisis de conflictos de poder ocurridos entre el regimiento de Bilbao y autoridades externas en el siglo XVIII, y cómo estos condujeron a la centralización y crisis del régimen de fueros. Continúa Margarita Serna Vallejo, quien presenta un panorama comparativo de la organización de barrios, concejos y unidades supraconcejiles, así como del papel político de gremios marítimos mayores, especialmente en las Cuatro Villas de la Costa, en Cantabria, entre los siglos XV y XVIII. Por su parte, María López Díaz indaga acerca del modelo de funcionamiento del gobierno urbano en Castilla, básicamente durante el siglo XVI y principios del XVII, presentando como principal conclusión el señalamiento de la heterogeneidad del régimen municipal gallego. Seguidamente, Marta Friera Álvarez investiga la justicia local en el contexto de pluralidad jurisdiccional y corporativismo que caracterizarían a Asturias durante el XVIII. Para ello, enfatiza en la pregunta acerca de quiénes cuentan por entonces con el derecho de representación para ser elegidos como justicias ordinarias. Manuel de Abol-Brasón y Álvarez-Tamargo cierra esta parte con una muy documentada historia narrativa, y biográfica, acerca del proyecto de creación, durante la última década del siglo XVI, de una jurisdicción especial para vecinos pobres en Asturias.

La segunda parte complementa el interés de la colección en las estructuras de la justicia al concentrarse dialécticamente en su funcionamiento, a través del estudio de la participación de las oligarquías urbanas en la gestión municipal en Asturias. María Ángeles Faya Díaz abre esta sección investigando la inversión en la enseñanza municipal del Ayuntamiento de Oviedo durante el siglo XVIII. Para ello se vale de un
minucioso análisis contable de los ingresos y sobrantes de las rentas de la hacienda municipal y en especial del fondo de ingresos de la Obra Pía de Escuelas y Estudios, institución que reemplazó, tras su expulsión, la labor educativa de los jesuitas. Lo que resta de esta parte lo ocupan tres artículos dedicados complementariamente al estudio urbanístico y artístico de obras asociadas a la distribución de agua en ciudades asturianas entre el siglo XVI y el XVIII. Primero, Cristina Heredia Alonso presenta sus investigaciones acerca de las soluciones arquitectónicas para el abastecimiento de agua en Oviedo, Avilés y Gijón ejecutadas en el último tercio del siglo XVI. Así destaca la labor del maestro arquitecto fontanero cántabro Gonzalo de la Bárcena, por su combinación de funcionalidad y ornato en el marco de un urbanismo moderno. En esa misma línea de investigación, Yayoi Kawamura estudia el papel desempeñado en el desarrollo de la industria hidráulica en Oviedo, durante el siglo XVII, por maestros fontaneros como Domingo de Mortera, Gonzalo de Güemes Bracamonte, Melchor de Velasco e Ignacio de Cajigal. Como cierre al tema del abastecimiento de agua, Vidal de la Madrid Álvarez presenta la reconstrucción de una cronología detallada de la fontanería de mantenimiento en Oviedo, a través de la caracterización y valoración de la labor de una extensa sucesión de maestros fontaneros a lo largo del siglo XVIII.

Finalmente, la tercera y última parte de esta colección analiza temas heterogéneos en relación con la sociedad cantábrica y su movilidad social. Inicia Enrique Mallada Álvarez con una evaluación estadística rigurosa de la pobreza en Asturias en el siglo XVIII, la cual relaciona con la gestión del Ayuntamiento y la Audiencia de Oviedo; a la vez que registra la aparición de una asistencia social de carácter ilustrado. El trabajo de Ramona Pérez de Castro Pérez continúa este interés en la asistencia a los pobres, basándose en el análisis de los intereses económicos, de prestigio personal o familiar, o caritativos, que condujeron a sectores de la nobleza titulada e hidalga a crear fundaciones particulares benéficas de interés público en la Asturias del XVIII. El artículo de Lidia Anes Fernández cierra esta parte y, a la vez, el libro. Su trabajo continúa la línea de estudio sobre la nobleza cantábrica pero desplazándose a escenarios americanos. La investigadora estudia las actividades económicas, comportamientos sociales, y redes familiares y de paisanaje de emigrantes cantábricos, residentes en la Nueva España y el Perú en el siglo XVIII, que recibieron títulos de nobleza.

Como cierre a estas consideraciones, es de señalar que conceptos como “Edad Moderna” o “Antiguo Régimen”, centrales en la formulación de esta colección de ensayos, hubieran requerido de una mayor discusión crítica. Desde el punto de vista de la organización, se habría requerido también de más homogeneidad temática de sus partes, uniformidad en la extensión de los artículos, normalización de la descripción bibliográfica, así como la inclusión de un listado de archivos consultados. El libro cuenta, sin embargo, con abundantes fotografías a color que se insertan como láminas y provee con un útil índice onomástico.
Para concluir, *Oligarquías urbanas, gobierno y gestión municipal* constituye un importante aporte a la historia de la administración municipal. Pero no lo es sólo para la zona cantábrica, sino extensivamente como modelo metodológico para la España de los siglos XVI al XVIII. Esta colección de ensayos constituye también un abarcador esfuerzo de revisión de los archivos de la región que puede resultar de utilidad para investigadores de diversas áreas del conocimiento.


Madeline Sutherland-Meier
The University of Texas at Austin

As the title indicates, the focus of Joaquín Álvarez Barrientos’s fascinating book is Madrid in the long eighteenth century, that is, from the arrival of Felipe V, the first Bourbon monarch, to the end of the reign of Fernando VII. The title calls our attention to two events of this period that would affect the development of the city in important ways. The first was the fire that destroyed the Alcázar de Madrid on Christmas Eve, 1734. A fortress dating to the ninth century, the Alcázar was expanded over the centuries, eventually becoming a royal residence and the home of the Court. Following the Alcázar’s destruction, the neo-classical Palacio de Oriente was built on the same spot. Carlos III was the first king to occupy the new palace, moving there in 1764. The other event the title singles out was the creation of the topographic model, or *maqueta*, of the capital. Following an order from Fernando VII, a team led by the military engineer and cartographer León Gil de Palacio constructed this exquisite, minute model made primarily of wood and paper between 1828 and 1830. Not only does the *maqueta* (which can be seen in the Museo de la Historia de Madrid) show all of the city’s streets and plazas, it reproduces all of the buildings with their façades and registers the differences in elevation between different parts of the city. It became, in Álvarez Barrientos’s words, “un elemento indispensable para comprender el aspecto de la capital que cambiaría notablemente con la desamortización de Medizábal en 1836” (79).

Madrid became the capital of Spain (and its empire) in the 1560’s, during the reign of Felipe II. This was late in comparison to Paris and London, which were capital cities by the late twelfth century. What interests Álvarez Barrientos is how, during the period under study, Madrid consolidated itself as a capital and as a modern city. Thus the history of Madrid during the long eighteenth century “es la historia de cómo la ciudad...”
toma conciencia de ser el centro de un imperio y de cómo esa corte evoluciona hacia la capitalidad burguesa mediante cambios urbanísticos y arquitectónicos, económicos, simbólicos, institucionales y de protagonistas” (20). He is interested in culture as the driver of change, and his study is organized topically, which makes it far more interesting and accessible than a simple chronological presentation would have been. It is also amply illustrated.

After a preliminary discussion of the period under study, Álvarez Barrientos looks at images and representations of Madrid in the works of artists such as Paret and Goya and writers such as Ramón de la Cruz, Mesonero Romanos, and Larra. These images are ideological and often satirical; nonetheless, they show certain realities of the city. He then moves to what census data from the period reveal about the people who lived in the capital in terms of numbers, social class, occupations, and the drastic changes the city underwent during the long eighteenth century. For example, at the end of the eighteenth century Madrid had 180,000 inhabitants, 43% of whom were servants. By 1825, the population had grown to 200,000. A sizeable number of the inhabitants were foreigners — some 80,000 around 1745, according to the Marqués de la Villa de San Andrés — and a high number of people who came into Madrid every day to work or sell their wares left at night (25-26).

The next topic he addresses is the urbanization of Madrid, which was largely a result of the centralization of the government in the capital. The infrastructure to run an empire had to be housed, so new administrative buildings such as the Casa de Correos and the Casa de la Aduana were built. Notable changes took place especially along the Calle de Alcalá, the Paseo del Prado, and later along the Paseo de Atocha. The city began to expand beyond its medieval walls (which would remain in place until 1869). Of course, the construction of public works and palaces was also a way for the monarchs to display their grandeur, and through all of this Madrid became a political symbol as well as a monumental city.

In the chapters that follow, we are taken out into the streets and other public spaces where people worked and also spent leisure time. Sociability is a long-standing interest of Álvarez Barrientos. In these chapters, he describes the sights, sounds, and smells of the city — the church bells ringing, the blind men singing and selling ballads, the cries of vendors hawking their wares. An interest in public health developed in the eighteenth century and one of the results was that Madrid, like other European cities, became a cleaner, healthier, safer, and more attractive place to live, as the dumping of waste in the streets was prohibited, drainage systems were built, and street lighting was installed. Fashion for men and women is also discussed, how the madrilenos dressed and carried themselves as they walked in the gardens of the Retiro or along the shaded paseos, and the “cultura de apariencias” (101) that emerged in which evaluation and competition were constants as everyone was looking at everyone else.
Clothing and accessories were important indicators of social standing and
of identity for people across the social spectrum. We are also taken inside
homes to observe changes in interior decoration as a preference for the
baroque gave way to the neo-classical.

Two figures who played important roles in the development of Madrid
and who appear frequently throughout the book are José I and Mesonero
Romanos. Much of what Álvarez Barrientos calls the política urbanística of
José Bonaparte was brought to fruition later in the century by Mesonero.
Bonaparte was interested in modernizing the city; during his reign buildings
were demolished in order to create large open spaces where new streets
were created and fountains were installed in order to beautify the city and
make it look more like Paris or other European capitals. He intervened in
the cultural sphere as well, working, for example, to erect a statue to
Cervantes in Alcalá de Henares (it was eventually placed in Madrid in the
Plaza de Las Cortes in 1835) and to create a Panteón de Hombres Ilustres.
Mesonero, in Álvarez Barrientos’s view, was an heir to the ilustrados in his
desire to convert Madrid into a monument that represented the nation.

Finally, a few words about the maqueta are in order. We do not know
why Fernando VII ordered models made of Madrid and other Spanish
cities, but we do know that the intent was to display them in the Real
Gabinete Topográfico y Artístico del Retiro. Álvarez Barrientos writes that
the Gabinete was “un intento de representar al reino en su capital, de forma
panorámica y, a la postre, simbólica: los edificios, sus imágenes exteriores,
figurarian las ciudades” (236). This miniature reproduction also allowed
madrileños to see the place in which they lived in its entirety and to
understand its symbolic function as capital.

In conclusion, this excellent, highly readable book offers a wealth of
information about Madrid during an important period in its development.
Although it will obviously appeal to specialists in the eighteenth century,
anyone interested in the history of Madrid or contemplating a trip there will
find it interesting.
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This book sets out to examine Enlightenment in the Iberian empires of
Spain and Portugal. Its author, Brian Hamnett, frames his study both in
relation to networks of Enlightenment ideas and reforms spreading
throughout Europe, as well as to internal social and political networks of thinkers and reformers within the national and regional contexts in question. As Hamnett states in the book’s introduction: “We are not dealing with the abstract flow of ideas (...) but with individuals, networks and linkages, groups or factions, advocating or opposing reforms perceived to be necessary within the state” (3).

Hamnett begins his study of Enlightenment Iberia and Ibero-America in chapter one with an overview of important precursors to Iberian Enlightenment from sixteenth century Spanish humanists and sixteenth and seventeenth century arbitristas, to late seventeenth century novatones. Well known early (or “first”) Enlightenment figures such as Feijoo and Mayans, are studied alongside lesser known figures —physicians, engineers, government officials, and clergymen—, followed by discussion of later Enlightenment political, economic, scientific, and cultural thinkers from Jovellanos and Olavide, to Cabarrús, Moratin and Quintana. Hamnett emphasizes regional networks of Enlightenment—Valencia, Asturias, Seville, Lisbon, and Madrid—and their key players. Chapters two and three tackle questions such as the struggles between regalism and papalism, and the relationship of Enlightenment reform and empire. Chapters four through seven focus on Portugal and Portuguese America, as well as on Spanish America, with individual chapters on Mexico (New Spain) and Peru that highlight contributions in scientific knowledge and technological innovation important both to the colonies and their imperial centers. Hamnett includes discussions of key figures such as Portugal’s Melo e Castro, Brazilian Alexandre de Gusmão, Gamboa and Clavijero of Mexico, and Baquíjano and Luna Pizarro in Peru, as well as of influential institutions including the Lisbon Academy of Science, the Colegio de Minería in Mexico and the Lima Sociedad de Amantes del País. Chapters eight and nine examine the tensions between monarchy and calls for representative government models, that culminated in the Cortes de Cádiz in Spain and eventually to independence for the American colonies. Hamnett traces the connection of Enlightenment to liberalism, against which a “Counter-Enlightenment” emerged, with the return of absolutist monarchs and the resurgence of the Inquisition, eventually leading to civil wars in both Portugal and Spain and political divisions in the newly independent countries in the Americas. Hamnett’s concluding chapter compares Iberian and Ibero-American expressions of Enlightenment to each other as well as to other European Enlightenments. He concludes that Enlightenment in Iberia and Ibero-America arose as much from internal pressures as from external influences, and that its main accomplishments where changes in the areas of education and scientific knowledge.

Throughout the book, Hamnett challenges some commonly held opinions about Enlightenment in general, and in the Iberian/Ibero-American context—the supposed incompatibility of Enlightenment and Catholicism, the existence of “enlightened despots” among the Spanish
and Portuguese monarchies, the relationship of Enlightenment and revolution or the impulse towards liberalism, and Enlightenment as the beginning of modernity. Hamnett sees Iberian Enlightenment as “a dialectic between transformation and tradition, becoming increasingly more virulent against the background first of generalized European war after 1793 and widespread civil conflict in Ibero-America from 1808 and well into the 1820’s” (263).

Experts in various areas related to Iberian and Ibero-American Enlightenment will probably find Hamnett’s book lacking in their areas of research, or missing important bibliography. Missing too are discussions of topics fundamental to a complete understanding of Enlightenment in the Iberian world, especially in regards to gender and race. However, the book’s combination of information about Spain, Portugal, and their former colonies is unique and interesting. The Enlightenment in Iberia and Ibero-America provides a good overview for scholars or students with little knowledge of the Enlightenment in Spain, Portugal, and their colonies across the Atlantic (and to a lesser extent in Africa and Asia), by focusing more on the ideas, networks of key figures and groups, and attempts at reform. As such, Hamnett achieves what he states as his aim of his book in its introduction, to respond “to those who say that they had no idea there was any Enlightenment in Spanish and Portugal and their American territories (. . .) and to set discussion of it into the historical mainstream” (1).

---------------------------------

Matthieu P. Raillard
Lewis and Clark College

The author of this volume will in all likelihood need no introduction to dieciochistas; Miguel Ángel Lama has been an indefatigable scholar of the Spanish eighteenth century, with published studies on García de la Huerta, Cadalso, and Forner, among many others. His focus has often been on literature and poetry from Extremadura, and so it is little surprise that Lama again turns his attention to the works of perhaps the most celebrated extremeño poet, Juan Meléndez Valdés. As he notes in his introduction, Meléndez has long been on his mind: “a lo largo de treinta años el escritor ilustrado ha estado siempre en el centro de mi interés como estudioso de la literatura española del siglo XVIII” (14). And so the aim of this volume is to contribute to the already impressive body of scholarship on the most
studied poet in the Spanish eighteenth century. As Lama notes, he is metaphorically standing on the shoulders of giants, and in this work, “no descubrimos nada, simplemente—y no es poco—, contribuimos a ampliar el conocimiento de un autor y poner las bases para que se desvelen nuevos datos” (13-14).

The six chapters that comprise this volume are previously-published essays on Meléndez Valdés, spanning over thirty years. As the author notes, he has in a number of instances brought the bibliographic references up to date and organized the essays “para formar un estudio sobre Meléndez Valdés que tenga cierta coherencia” (14). While chapters deal with often different topics, he largely succeeds in providing his public with a readerly experience. This is in part due to the first chapter, a short biography titled “El poeta, el magistrado,” which offers readers a synoptic and very helpful overview of Meléndez’s life. I suspect students and scholars will find this of particular value, since it is detailed yet concise, and helps to contextualize the scholarship that follows.

The remaining essays cover a lot of ground and focus on a great variety of aspects of Meléndez’s production. The first is an analysis of his Discurso de apertura de la real audiencia de Extremadura, which Meléndez delivered in 1791. While this speech is far-less read than his poems, it is a moving example of an enlightenment call-to-arms, which underscores the need for reform and progress. Lama views the Discurso through the lens of classical rhetoric, which is both appropriate and far-too infrequent in modern studies; after all, “los más destacados retóricos de la antigüedad y del Siglo de Oro eran bien conocidos por Meléndez Valdés” (34). Carefully guiding the reader through form, structure and content of the speech, Lama gives life to a text that remains relevant to this day.

A second chapter examines the ordering of Meléndez’s poems, and argues for a poetic “argumento” in how poems were organized. While though-provoking, it is perhaps a bit less flesh-out than the third chapter, “La oda XXXIX de Juan Meléndez Valdés.” The author is at his best when he acts as a literary detective; in this instance, he investigates the role of corrections between different editions of this famous poem. He takes a similar tack in the following chapter, “La primera edición expurgada de una letrilla,” which serves up a comparison of editions of one of Meléndez’s letrillas. In both of these chapters, Lama makes Meléndez Valdés and his texts come alive, and allows us to glimpse at a reconstruction of the creative process by which the poet wrote.

The final chapter, titled “Presencia de Meléndez Valdés en Espronceda,” is chronologically the oldest essay in this volume, though it remains a convincing and important read. Arguing that Espronceda’s early production was influenced by the poetry of Meléndez Valdés, Lama searches for the “huellas valdesianas en los versos de Espronceda” (117). Scholars might find this chapter’s focus on the link between periods and poets intriguing but ultimately a bit thin when it comes to including or
discussing secondary scholarship. It is important to remember that it was first written over thirty years ago, and should be judged as such. Many of the points raised serve to sketch out the dynamic and problematic shift between enlightenment and romanticism, and echo some of the scholarship of Russell Sebold, among others.

The volume includes an onomastic index, as well as one of first verses and poems cited. Sadly, there is no bibliography, which would have been quite useful (readers will instead have to find sources in the footnotes). Su clara luz recibe. Estudios sobre Juan Meléndez Valdés is more than a compendium of Miguel Ángel Lama’s scholarship on Juan Meléndez Valdés; it is also an important work of research in its own right, and deserves a place in the bookshelves of many a dieciochista.