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It is no coincidence that the first Roman emperor born in the provinces, Trajan, hailed from southern Spain. The Iberian littoral integrated early in the Roman imperial project, and there the assemblage of custom, culture, and values, which the Romans termed Romanitas (Roman-ness), took deep roots. Romanitas was not unchanging though. Each one of these monographs addresses how Romanitas evolved on Iberian soil in the twilight of antiquity.

The first of these studies, Jerónimo Sánchez Velasco’s *The Christianization of Western Baetica* investigates the process through which Christianity became a key feature of the physical and social topography of the western portions of the Roman province of Baetica (modern Córdoba, Badajoz, Seville, and Huelva). The main argument of this detailed archaeological study is that the Christianization of Baetica “happened faster and deeper than generally admitted” within the immediate 75 years after Constantine’s Edict of Toleration, 313 CE (25). As the author succinctly puts it, “[i]n this short period (even less) Romanitas and Christendom became one” (308). Putting aside the blatant anachronism of the term “Christendom” in the late Roman context, Sánchez Velasco makes a cogent case for a rapid and sometimes violent Christian displacement of traditional Roman civic religion in the archaeological record:

Basilicas consecrated to the martyrs took over the necropolises. Churches and cemeteries arose in urban centres, on forums and baths, whose pagan decoration was destroyed. Episcopal complexes occupied large areas of the city (25).

Even the countryside, often seen as the last refuge for paganism, fell under Christian sway more quickly than one might suppose. This work, then, is a regionally-specific study, but one with heady implications for the larger Christianization of the Western provinces of the Roman Empire.

The book is divided into three uneven parts with twelve total chapters. Part 1 consists of three introductory chapters respectively on the initial Romanization of Baetica (Ch. 1), the urban geography of the province (Ch. 2), and major developments between Constantine and the Islamic Conquest (711 CE). The bulk of the book lies in the second part, which consists of a series of intensive archaeological chapters on the individual dioceses of western Baetica (Cordoba, Cabra, Écija, Seville, Italica, and Niebla). With ample illustrations and photographs, these dense chapters exhaust the available material evidence for these
dioceses. Confessedly, these chapters are highly technical, and the author presumes much of his reader’s familiarity with both art historical terminology and early Christian practices. The lay reader might wonder, for instance, what a “mensa for the refrigeria” is (a table for a funerary meal in an early Christian graveyard) or what opus vittatum mixtum is (a type of Roman walling)—brief explanations of technical jargon would make these chapters much more accessible. Nevertheless, from these chapters a clear composite image emerges of an explosion in Christian architecture and funerary monuments across Baetica over the fourth and fifth centuries.

The last section of the book, entitled “Christianization: An Archaeology of Ecclesiastical Power,” attempts to extrapolate from the surviving archaeological evidence a general profile of the Christian Church’s footprint in Baetica. The first chapter of this section (Ch. 11) indexes the various types of Christian buildings uncovered across Western Baetica, categorizing them by building-type, e.g., churches or funerary structures, and by form, e.g., tau-shaped or quadrangular baptistries. This section will be of great use to art historians and archaeologists. The last chapter explores the socio-economic structures that facilitated and catalyzed Christian building programs in Baetica. Prime among these structures were the burgeoning land-portfolios of bishoprics, new habits of patronage among the Christian Roman aristocracy, and the emerging ecclesiastical funerary industry. Sánchez Velasco’s emphasis on the Christian burial trade is particularly welcomed since historians tend to focus on the pious largesse of elites at the expense of the modest payments made for burial by the general Christian population. As the author astutely points out, “[e]veryone needed to be buried somewhere” (302).

That said, Sánchez Velasco’s discussion of ecclesiastical finances and the Church’s novel prominence in the late ancient economy lacks in both detail and citations. This is the result of his almost telescopic focus on Iberian sources. In contrast to other parts of the Roman Empire, little evidence survives for ecclesiastical finances in late ancient Spain; however, ample evidence survives for the Church’s economic activities in Egypt and to a lesser degree in Italy. Comparanda would very much flesh out Sánchez Velasco’s correct case that the Church’s new economic power materialized in the architectural domination of urban and rural spaces. Why Sánchez Velasco’s does not reference A. H. M. Jones’ 1960 publication on late ancient church finances or his economic and administrative survey, The Later Roman Empire, is perplexing. It is equally as baffling why there are not more references to studies on aristocratic patronage or on the Christianization of the aristocracy such as Michele Renee Salzman’s The Making of a Christian Aristocracy.

Sánchez Velasco’s transition from archaeology to an “archaeology of ecclesiastical power” is at times vague and clumsy. For instance, throughout Sánchez Velasco characterizes the Church as “an institution that behaves as a
State,” arguing ultimately that “[b]ishops overtook the urban curiae [city councils] and the State in the administration of cities and territories” (297). While the increased prominence of bishops in late antiquity is historiographical gospel, even in the most “lawless” former provinces of the Roman Empire bishops shared the “administration” of territories with military and civilian potentates. I would also like clarification on what services and functions were entailed by “the administration of cities” (the author does not specify). His most prominent example for the Church’s new administrative role is the proximity of a monastery to the main port of Seville: “the possible location of a monastery in the port of Seville can only be in response to the effective control by the Church of the economic activity generated by the port” (309-310). This is a plausible hypothesis, but I would prefer there to have been examples of other bishoprics that were involved in administering former state-operated facilities. It is well-documented, for example, that the patriarchate of Alexandria in Egypt had a leading role in that city’s grain trade—it even possessed a fleet of riverboats to facilitate the provisioning. A similar observation holds for the author’s assertion that the sixth-century emission of unofficial, small denomination coins after Roman imperial withdrawal “is undoubtedly the work of the bishoprics” (319). As Michael Kulikowski among others has stressed, we simply do not have sufficient evidence for how the cities of Spain were administered after the provinces succumbed to barbarian rule.

A few other points will irk some scholars of late ancient Iberia. For example, I would like to know what ancient source implies that Bishop Isidore of Seville was “probably of Jewish descent” (61). Most critics, however, will concentrate on Sánchez Velasco decision to gloss over the distinction between “Catholic” Romans and heretical “Arian” Visigoths in this period. A plethora of ancient sources make it clear that Arian barbarians patronized their own ecclesiastical hierarchies and even conducted the liturgy in their own Germanic language. Were some of the fifth or sixth-century buildings discussed in fact built by Arian elites? Sánchez Velasco simply disregards any attempt “to partition Iberian elites” into closed groups as “a methodological error” (58). There are many defensible reasons not to distinguish elites by their ethnicity or theological persuasion, but I wish that Sánchez Velasco had spent a few more pages of exposition as to why this thought-provoking study chose to avoid these “methodological errors.”

In distinction, the “identity politics” of the early Middle Ages lie at the heart of Erica Buchberger’s Shifting Ethnic Identities in Spain and Gaul, 500-700, a volume also published in the Late Antique and Early Medieval Iberia series. In this delightfully readable monograph, Buchberger address a perennial question of the early Middle Ages, namely how did entire populations of individuals once identified as Romans come to be labeled under the Germanic ethnicities of their respective barbarian kings? As Buchberger explains in her lucid introduction, for some thirty years most historians have accepted the consensus view that over the
sixth and seventh centuries ethnic barbarian labels such as Visigoth and Frank steadily lost their limited “ethnic meaning” and took on a more “inclusive political meaning” (9). Subjects of barbarian kingdoms regardless of their actual ethnic background were simply folded into the “ethnic group” of their barbarian king, with Roman-ness being subsumed into new political identities. Buchburger challenges this scholarly consensus as an over-simplification of more intricate cultural developments. Across an impressive range of texts (histories, hagiographies, legal codes), she enumerates the complex, multivalent, and even paradoxical ways that authors in the Visigothic and Frankish kingdoms deployed and renegotiated prima facie “ethnic labels.”

Part 1 of the book concerns Visigothic Iberia. The first chapter explores the dynamic relationship between religious and ethnic identity in the periods preceding and following the mass “conversion” of the Visigoths from heretical Arian Christianity to Catholicism under the royal mandate of King Reccared I in 589 CE. In this chapter Buchberger highlights a strong tendency across Iberian sources ca. 600 CE to promote religious unity over ethnic divisions. Reccared’s predecessor Leovigild, for instance, attempted to impose Arianism on both his Roman and Visigothic subjects after he had; in turn Reccared in the celebrated Third Council of Toledo foisted Catholic unity upon his diverse subjects. At the same time “ethically” Roman authors began to emphasize the Catholic solidarity shared between Romans and righteous Visigoths. Importantly, as Buchberger notes, these “authors associated Roman identity almost exclusively with the Byzantines” who perceived as the foreigners conquers of southern Spain (50).

The second chapter focuses on the emerging political and religious consensus after the unification of the Catholic and Arian churches. The main proponent of this new unity was the kingdom’s most important bishop, Isidore of Seville, brother of Bishop Leander of Seville who himself had presided over the Visigothic conversion. Buchberger, very much following the insights of Jamie Wood, maps Isidore’s ideological influences on his fellow bishops in ecclesiastical legislation issued at kingdom-wide episcopal councils at the royal city of Toledo. As she emphasizes, the decrees of these semi-regular councils attended by bishops, nobles, and kings were crucial in fusing Catholic identity with political Gothic identity—much to the detriment to the kingdom’s Jews who found themselves increasingly categorized as both religious and political outsiders (73-74). The final chapter of part I investigates the period after the issue of the so-called Visigothic Code (654 CE), in which the distinctions between Roman and Visigoth finally disintegrated. It is in this period that the political / religious hopes of the architects of unity (Reccared, Leander, Isidore, etc.) fulminated as the inclusive title of Visigothic came to signify all political subjects of the Visigothic monarchy.

The second part of Buchberger’s study focuses on the Merovingian Frankish kingdoms. This portion, like the first, is concise but scrutinizes a much
wider range of authors: the prolific and sometimes impenetrable Gregory of Tours (ch. 4); the poet and hagiographer Venantius Fortunatus (Ch. 5); the chronicler Fredegar (Ch. 6); and three anonymous hagiographers who composed the notable saints lives of Caesarius of Arles, Gaugeric of Cambrai, Eligius of Noyon (Ch. 7). Across these chapters Buchberger shows that Gallic authors had a strong proclivity to reference ancestry, parental lineage, and local origins, even as an obvious trajectory emerged for Gallo-Roman authors to identify with their Frankish rulers. Noting that a person was of Roman stock or from an illustrious family of local Roman aristocrats merely became a way of emphasizing noble heritage. Such remarks were devoid of any connotation about the person’s cultural or political allegiances. In this practice, Frankish Gaul diverged from Visigothic Spain where Roman identity entirely disappeared in seventh century sources. The overall argument of part 2 is convincing, but some readers will be skeptical about the final chapter’s use of anonymous authors to prove “that the focal shift from a Roman to a Frankish society was not solely the invention of a few cunning authors but a trend occurring throughout their society” (165). All the authors in part 2 were clerics or monks within institutions patronized by Frankish elites, if not by members of the reigning Merovingian dynasty. How much those below the lay and ecclesiastical elites appreciated the transition from Roman to Frankish society is difficult to assess. That said, Buchberger makes an elegant case that among the upper strata of the Visigothic and Frankish kingdoms identities were pliable and multifaceted with many valences (ethnic, political, religious, civic, genealogical). On these last two points, I would have preferred more fulsome discussions on family naming practices and civic affiliations in the post-Roman landscape—though this likely would have required the incorporation of other forms of evidence beyond the work’s scope such as funerary inscriptions and charters.

Norman Underwood
New York University

For many years now, most historians in general (and those of the Iberian realms specifically) have known that geographical and/or chronological constructs such as “Spain,” the “Middle Ages,” “1492,” and similar generalizations are not to be trusted at all. Their deployment often reflects erroneous ideological and cultural projections of the present into the past. The same applies to such hackneyed concepts as the emphasis on a Muslim/Christian dichotomy in Iberia and elsewhere, or the even more tired and nefarious idea of the “clash of civilizations.” From its opening pages till its conclusion, Jean Dangler’s *Edging Towards Iberia* inveighs against such categories and constructs. While many of us do not need such reminders or, at least, do not need them all the time, it is always salutary to frequently hear these admonitions and to remember how very easy it is to fall prey to, or to fall into, these generalizations that tell us nothing useful about the past.

Within this framework, Dangler in her short and well-argued book emphasizes four specific aims. First, to provide a critique of the manner in which some scholars often embrace descriptions of the past that rely on modern notions of geography and chronology. These are the same issues described in the first paragraph of this review, as well as the reifying of ideas about religious and ethnic identities that have nothing to do with the reality of the past. This she does with a great deal of vigor and by invoking an exhaustive list of secondary sources and theoretical literature in support of her arguments.

Second, there is a methodological thread that runs throughout her work. Dangler often reminds us (in Part One and elsewhere in her book) of the importance of seeing the past, in this case, the evolving history of Iberian realms, people, and culture(s), within well-defined theoretical structures. Above all, Dangler argues for “network theory”—mostly a revised version of Castells’ arguments and, to a lesser extent, for Immanuel Wallerstein’s “World Systems Analysis” (a methodological approach towards world history that, borrowing from Braudel’s works on capitalism and material life and from neo-Marxist social history, enjoyed prominence in the 1970s and early 1980s, though far less at the forefront of historical analysis today). The author revisits these methodological tools, emphasizing their importance as the appropriate framework to examine anew the making of Iberia. Although she places far more emphasis on network analysis and spends considerable amount of time detailing the theoretical and historiographical implication of economic and cultural networks than she does on Wallerstein’s World Systems, it is not always clear how different the manner in which historians have written about networks, sans these deep theoretical musings, differs from her
reliance on Manuel Castells and other proponents of that theory. As Dangler herself states, some of these theoretical approaches (Castells’ in particular) aimed to explain present societies and not past ones.

Third, Parts Two and Three of Dangler’s book seek to re-examine a discreet set of issues – many of them already well explored by previous historians – in the context of these theoretical approaches. These particular topics are the Islamic trade networks, the nature of travel networks (though in the Islamic and Christian worlds [and even in the Silk Road] these two categories often overlapped), and issues related to “feudalism, slavery, and poverty.” While the theorizing of commercial and travel networks fits perfectly with Dangler’s aims the other three themes are far less convincing.

While, on the one hand, most historians of the period (and of these categories) are quite well informed about the nature of intra-faith trade and the complicated commercial networks that linked different areas of the world at specific geographically and chronologically diverse exchange sites (a la Abu Lughod’s influential book, or the new histories of the Silk Road by several historians, most notably by Frankopan) without setting them into theoretical frameworks; on the other hand, I found Dangler’s descriptions of the travel networks and the reasons for, or categories of, travel (mostly in the Islamic world) quite engaging, relevant, and easily translatable to the modern world.

Furthermore, it may be prudent to note that discussions of “feudalism, slavery, or poverty,” especially in the context of an evolving Iberia, are veritable minefields. These are topics that have been examined and debated over the last three decades almost ad nauseam and that are often inflicted with questionable ideological nuances. For one, it is doubtful that the term “feudalism” can be deployed or that it is at all useful to explain social relations in the peninsula. Slavery is another debatable category. Slavery: Where? When? Who? By whom? How did it evolve over time? Poverty is an even more complicated subject in the context of western Christianity, the Islamic world, and the multi-ethnic and religious Iberian Peninsula’s views on charity and assistance to the poor or, even, the classification and representations of poverty and the poor. While the author is very careful to note diversity of positions on the subject(s), her dealings with these themes represent more of a summary of received opinion than a close reading and explication of sources.

Her concluding chapters seek to examine, once again in the context of network and world system analysis, the still much-debated issues of overlapping notions of identity and culture in the multi-ethnic and multi-religious (and one should add multi-lingual) worlds of pre-modern Iberia. Here, the author excels. In conclusion, there is much to praise in spite of my comments. Dangler’s book is animated by a thorough familiarity with a vast secondary literature. She has exhaustively mined the work of others in the field; most notably the late and much
missed Olivia Remie Constable. Her reading of the secondary literature is always nuanced, generous and polite. If there are small areas of disagreements (and they tend to be small), the author articulates them in a most civil and engaging fashion. True, it may have been better to hear Dangler’s voice more often and relegate most of the names of her sources to the footnotes. For example, between pages 23 and 29, a mere 4 ½ pages, the author invokes nineteen different authors (some of them more than once) to buttress her call for a new methodological approach. While Dangler does justice to these scholars, her voice, which we only hear fully in the concluding chapters, is, I think, the most important part of her book.

In spite of these comments, Dangler’s book is an excellent reminder that we must approach the history of pre-modern Iberia with great caution. Words have meanings. Words are important. History, now more than ever, matters. Rather than impose notions of geography, chronology, and inter-faith relations that have been mostly generated by our understanding of the modern world, let us, as Dangler proposes, see the past as the people who lived in it and wrote about it did. And, in this regard, no category is as more deserving of revision than that of Muslims and Christians as part of the fluid and shared society of pre-modern Iberia (or, at least, shared for too brief a time).

Teofilo F Ruiz
University of California, Los Angeles

The ill-fated English Armada of 1589 has traditionally received less attention from scholars than the Great Armada that Philip II sent against England in 1588. Both military campaigns have been treated differently from a historiographical point of view; the failure of the Spanish Armada has been idealized and interpreted as the beginning of the end of the Spanish Empire in the Atlantic, and the rise of England as a maritime power. The fiasco of the English Armada, on the other hand, has been normally neglected or ignored in the majority of English historical literature with a few exceptions. The book written by Luis Gorrochategui, a philosophy professor in a Spanish secondary school and the author of several articles regarding Spanish history, aims to rectify this situation by providing a detailed account and analysis of the English Armada based on primary Spanish and English documents. Gorrochategui also attempts to explain the reason the English Armada received such an unequal historiographical treatment in comparison to its Spanish counterpart.

The book is divided into three parts, totaling 36 chapters and an epilogue, with the majority of the chapters rarely exceeding 10 pages. The first part of the book summarizes the episode of the Spanish Armada in four chapters based on previous published works, challenging the traditional interpretations of the main events that led to its failure and return to Spain. The second part, the most extensive with 27 chapters, covers the English Armada almost on a daily basis from its departure from Plymouth, the attack on La Corunna, the siege of Lisbon, to its dramatic return to England. This section is based principally on Spanish primary sources, while the English primary references are from the documents compiled and published in Wernham’s book about Drake and Norris’ expedition to Spain and Portugal. The third part is composed of five chapters describing the later stages of the Anglo-Spanish War after the English Armada until the Spanish attempt to invade of Ireland that led to the signature of a peace treaty in 1604. In the epilogue the author discusses the reasons the English Armada has not received the attention that it deserves from a historiographical point of view.

In his analysis of the Spanish Armada, Gorrochategui claims that the Spanish were never defeated. Rather, their failure was because of a lack of a suitable port for the Spanish ships in the area to resupply the fleet in order to maintain naval operations. Although this interpretation has been already outlined by other authors such as Mattingly, Fernández-Armesto, and Casado Soto, it challenges traditional hypotheses based on the alleged superiority of the English vessels and ordnance.

In the second part of the book, the author states that the English expedition was a worse disaster than in the case of the Spanish, because of the higher number
of men and ships that were lost. Gorrochategui calculated the number of losses based on English and Spanish documents, although he did not include a table to compare the composition of both Armadas, which would have been a valuable addition. Even so, the English almost completely destroyed La Corunna despite being eventually defeated, and went on to later siege Lisbon. The author also emphasizes that the expedition did not accomplish any of its objectives—the destruction of the Spanish fleet, turning Portugal into an English protectorate and getting access to its overseas territories, and the capture of the West Indies fleet in the Azores. The economic interests of the expedition leaders prevailed over the military objectives, while poor organization and logistics also contributed to the English failure. The author even questions Drake’s ability to command large naval forces against an organized defense.

In the final section, Gorrochategui suggests that the exculpatory, fictional, and propagandistic character of the English documents toward the failure of their expedition has biased later historical interpretations. In contrast, Spanish documents have become the foundation of 16th-century naval history because of their more objective approach, especially in the case of the Spanish Armada. The majority of Anglo-Spanish War studies began in England during the late 19th and early 20th centuries, when England was at the peak of its economic and political power, and Spain had lost its international relevance. Therefore, historical studies about both Armadas suffered from the nationalistic bias that allowed England to construct its national historical narrative as maritime power starting with the so-called defeat of Spanish Armada, in which there was no place for mention of incompetence or failure in their own expedition.

Gorrochategui’s work serves as a necessary counterpart to Wernham’s book which uses primarily English documents. Together, these publications allow for a comparative analysis between both Spanish and English primary accounts regarding this expedition. The juxtaposition of the two books demonstrate how primary sources provide completely different accounts of the same event depending on the nationality of the document. Although the author intends an objective analysis and interpretation of the failure of English Armada, it is clear that the subject is approached from a Spanish perspective. However, Gorrochategui’s analysis presents less bias than other classic English studies about the Spanish Armada.

The book is a black-and-white paperback edition. While black-and-white printing is not an issue for the maps, it lowers the quality of the original color photos of the real battle locations, photos of the captured English banners, and the underwater images of the English wrecks. Although the figures and maps are numbered, they are not cited in the text. Rather, they are placed near the paragraphs which refer to them. The maps, however, do not appear near their corresponding text because they summarize all stages of the battles described throughout multiple
chapters and paragraphs. All the figures include captions describing the images and their source, although the levels of detail vary. For instance, not all the images are credited except in the case of the maps which were drawn by the author.

Gorrochategui presents a well-written, detailed, and engaging account of one of the most misconstrued episodes of the Anglo-Spanish War, traditionally neglected from a scholarly viewpoint. The quantity and quality of primary sources and selected bibliography referred by the author would indicate that the book is written for scholars rather than for the general public although its style suits general audiences as well. The book is a valuable addition to the bibliography of the Anglo-Spanish War because it provides a different and well-documented interpretation of the English Armada. Such books are necessary to acquire objective knowledge of this historical period, through the comparative analysis of primary sources and novel historical interpretations. Finally, this publication also restores the historical importance of the English Armada within the context of Anglo-Spanish War.

José Luis Casabán
Institute of Nautical Archaeology

The bewildering title phrase that appears in quotation marks is aptly chosen, as it illustrates the contingent and shifting optics that rendered things Moorish with often contradictory valences in the century and a half following the conquest of the Nasrid Kingdom Granada in 1492. The present monograph offers a rich and exhaustively researched meditation on the dislocations and puzzling constructs accorded to Moorish otherness at a time when former Iberian Muslims and their descendants became an internal colony at the heart of early modern global empires. The phrase in question, taken from Luis del Mármol Carvajal’s 17th-century history of the Alpujarras rebellion, illustrates not only the arbitrariness of the designation, moro — at once a religious tag used in lieu of “secta de Mahoma,” as Islam was commonly called, and a confused bundle of geopolitical spaces that could range from a neighboring village in Andalucia to a North African town, and, as in Mármol’s treatise, farther afield to denote the Ottoman Turks. Irigoyen-García elucidates with an encyclopedic array of sources both the material and symbolic economies behind so-called Moorish attire. While many recent studies on this and related issues in post-Reconquest Iberia endeavor to interrogate the essentialism that characterized a dominant strain of 20th-century scholarship indebted to Cirot’s coinage of “Maurophilie littéraire,” very few, in my view, have elucidated the historical record as fully and, simultaneously, offered insightful (re)readings as conclusively as the present monograph. One old chestnut, in particular, is central to the present study—to what extent was Moorish attire a distinctive sign of ethnic otherness? Was there in fact, such a thing as sartorial Moorishness? Rather, as Irigoyen-García demonstrates, the Moorish-derived equestrian outfits worn by Christian knights, noblemen, and those with upwardly mobile aspirations conveyed the sense of élite status—or, as in the case of striving courtiers, their ambitions for such—while repressing the religious culture in which these exercises in masculine prowess had their origins. In Habsburg Spain, we now learn, male Moorish sartorial style was an enabling vehicle for those claiming Old Christian status; the sporting connotations of savoir-faire and equestrian prowess were embraced in towns and at court, but rarely, if at all, in the aljamas. And here the study’s generous cultural approach pays off handsomely, as the author provides a highly nuanced account of the role of Moorish equestrian practices as they were adopted by élites (or bounders) who were so enamored of the juego de cañas [game of canes] that it became synonymous not with Moorishness, but with an exclusive brotherhood bound by knightly values and aspirations. As Barbara Fuchs recounts in Exotic Nation: Maurophilia and the Construction of Early Modern Spain (2008, pp. 98-99), in 1554 the future monarch Philip II traveled to London, accompanied by a
large retinue of superb riders, where they displayed for the benefit of the English court and his royal bride, Mary Tudor, the ne plus ultra of masculine gallantry. The groom and his companions put on quite a show of juegos de caña power-dressed in colorful and lavishly adorned marlotas. Irigoyen-García, who has previously collaborated and studied with Fuchs, turns his attention to the domestic uses and resonance of this peculiarly Iberian appropriation of Moorish inflected masculinity, while also detailing the logic behind the exclusion of male Moriscos from such finery as silk garments, marlotas, sayos vaqueros or gineta mounts that had been associated with the male élites of the then recently conquered Muslim kingdom of Granada. “Moorishness,” he concludes, “was constitutive of aristocratic status in Old Christian society” (87). The author also offers a fresh reading of the “cultural cleansing” (100) that Philip II sought to impose with the Islamophobic decree of 1567, which forbade the use of Arabic and barred male and female Moriscos from wearing Moorish garments (100). The author interrogates not just the decree but its subsequent misreadings in the historiographic tradition of the Alpujarras rebellion. From its earliest descriptions in contemporary accounts, this bloody conflict has traditionally been interpreted as a direct Morisco response to sartorial prohibitions. While there probably were more urgent material motivating factors, this and the other sweeping provisos sought to “white out” the signs of Morisco ethnic distinction. The author is right to point out the gender imbalance at the heart of the sartorial taboos, since the visibility of Moriscas’ bodies and their distinctive garments (almalafa, e.g.) was much greater than that of the men, whose attire was unremarkable; in fact, the garb of Morisco male “commoners,” as the author dubs the subaltern colonized population, is largely absent in the large corpus of sources examined, including documents scattered in over a dozen municipal archives.

The monograph addresses two broad questions. In Part One, titled “Morisma nueva de Christianos”: Iberian Christian Moorish Clothing, we encounter derivations and redefinitions of Moorish sartorial practices across diverse cultural locations— the juego de cañas, the comedia in general and Lope de Vega in particular, historiography, poetry, and prose fiction. In Part Two the perspective shifts from hegemonic appropriations to the repressive policies imposed on Moriscos, which range from “cultural cleansing” to sumptuary regulations, such as those proscribing silk garments (100). The latter represents a blatant effort to reinforce Moriscos’ subordinate and abject condition. An intriguing lesson drawn in this section is that Morisco bodies are subjected to strategies that render them as episodically invisible. As noted, we have only the vaguest sense of what would be male Morisco attire, rather than regional or class-based wardrobe possibilities available to them in such varied locations and climates as Granada, Valencia, Murcia or Toledo. Especially incisive is the close reading accorded to the decree’s restrictive language, which is riddled with inconsistencies regarding the gender of
those affected by the harsh measures, a feature that persists in subsequent historical accounts of the ensuing Alpujarras rebellion.

Irigoyen-Garcia’s study amplifies with scholarly rigor our understanding of early modern Iberian cultural politics in ways that resonate with our own cultural locations as scholars at a time of heightened ethnic and national tensions. Although he flags a remarkable gender imbalance in the manner in which Morisco sartorial culture was both depicted and policed by Philip II and his descendants, there is still much left to consider. One such possible path would be the male homosocial dimension of “aristocratic performance” as enacted in the juego de cañas (39). If Moorishness is in fact that which is instrumentally repressed in these sporting festivals, is this a uniquely effective form of silencing? Is there no “return of the repressed” in these homosocial festivals of privilege?

Isabel Burshatin
Haverford College

The interdependent relationship between early modern theater and social-charitable institutions is taken up as a point of departure in Rachael Ball’s ambitious 2016 study, *Treating the Public: Charitable Theater and Civic Health in the Early Modern Atlantic World*. In a concise and provocative read, Ball establishes a comparative framework to trace the development of early modern theater and a variety of social-charitable institutions. She pairs the following cities under the broad “Atlantic World” lens, each pair comprising the topic of the first four chapters of her book: Madrid and London, Seville and Bristol, Mexico City and Dublin, and Puebla de los Angeles and colonial Williamsburg. At its start, the book asks readers to explore this interdependent relationship as a model that is circulated across a variety of contexts: “to establish the uniqueness and importance of the system of public theater and charitable hospitals that developed in Castile and that Spaniards exported to their American colonies during the early modern period” (7). Ball skillfully brings together a diverse array of source material for her readers, including royal decrees, town council minutes, theater contracts, hospital records, sermons, letters, diaries, and play-texts. Throughout the volume, she emphasizes how “the charitable function of playhouses,” meaning the taxation of revenue as a way to fund a variety of social-charitable institutions, including hospitals, serves as a way to “legitimize and popularize theater” (154).

There are a number of exciting aspects of Ball’s project. The book synthesizes multiple theater histories, with deft attention to theater as text as well as process: featuring actors and actresses, a variety of performance spaces, descriptions of audience, discussion of reception, censorship, popularity and morality. It is also compelling for the way it connects theater to larger ideas around early modern civic or public health. Not only does the book stress “the fundamental connection between hospitals, ideas about care for the poor, and the financing of public theaters,” but it establishes multiple avenues to view theater as an instrument of healing (9). Throughout the book, Ball outlines specific examples from early modern plays that reference local geography or current political events as a way to demonstrate the relationship between playwrights and their audiences (see for example pp. 44-45). For the context of the book’s larger concerns with health, it would also be compelling to discuss at more length the representation of health issues within and across national theater traditions (the representation of medicine or treatment practices on stage, for example).

*Treating the Public* is a deeply interdisciplinary project, its potential impact conceptualized as an “analysis of ways that urban dwellers experienced and used
theater as a social, cultural and economic institution” (11). Perhaps due to this ambitious reach, some of the discussions around disciplinary work can feel murky, where for example Ball differentiates between literary and historical approaches to the topic at the close of the introduction. Similarly, the project’s innovative and necessarily revisionist commitment to Atlantic World over national perspective could benefit from a bit more nuanced engagement with existing historiography, if not specific to theater history. These minor concerns should not deter the reader from engaging with this important volume, rather they should emphasize the difficulty and importance of this kind of larger scope work.

It is worth highlighting the fifth chapter of the book and its discussion of early modern antitheatrical treatises. The lively discussion of gender politics, and its potential connections to health and illness, make the chapter an especially thought-provoking read. Ball writes for example, “opponents of the stage feared that men would take on womanly characteristics that would have corporeal effects for them individually and for the body politic as a whole. Womanliness equated with sickness” (141). Attention to these gendered dynamics at play in this discussion of theater and health sets the stage for ongoing scholarship in this field, and the book overall raises a number of compelling and interrelated questions for future work. The interdisciplinarity of Treating the Public ensures its appeal to a variety of audiences including theater scholars, historians of medicine and science, and early modernists from a variety of national traditions that are not always in conversation with one another: Spain, England, Latin and North America.

Margaret E. Boyle
Bowdoin College
In *Nuns Navigating the Spanish Empire*, Sarah Owens makes a significant contribution to growing bodies of scholarship on nuns and early modern women’s writing. She retraces the journey of a group of female religious, as they traveled from their convent in Toledo to the Philippines to found a convent of Poor Clares in Manila. Owens accesses their fascinating history through rare book and archival research. Her key source is a 450-folio manuscript written by one of the convent’s co-founders, Sor Ana de Cristo. Although Owens does not provide a translation of this document here, she draws upon it to examine the life of its author and one of its primary subjects, Sor Jerónima de la Asunción, whose exemplary piety made her a candidate for sainthood. She contends that nuns used literacy to negotiate expectations and rules about their behavior in order to make their way through the diverse spaces of the Spanish Atlantic and Pacific Worlds.

The first chapter focuses on the initial leg of the nuns’ journey, from Toledo to Cadiz. It also traces some important background about some of the nuns selected to found the first female convent in the Philippines. Owens sets the scene with rich details and provides clear explanations of Tridentine rules of enclosure and definitions for the Poor Clares. This early chapter also discusses convent patronage. Sor Jerónima’s sanctity became widely known, and this fostered ties between the convent and the outside world of Spanish aristocrats and even members of the royal family. Donations provided the means for commissioning paintings, reliquaries, and other devotional items. These lavish and visible elements of early modern Catholic piety coexisted with Sor Jerónima professions of poverty and donations of money to the poor. Owens describes another recurring issue: the stark contrast between Sor Jerónima’s body, which was weak from self-imposed abuse and fasting, and the real necessity that the nuns have the physical fortitude for the journey. As the author points out, the hagiographic nature of the text emphasizes Jerónima’s weakness over her strength and health.

Following Chapters continue to trace the nuns’ journey. In Chapter Two, the author highlights the presence of lay and religious women, including many of color, such as innkeepers and visionaries, encountered by the entourage of nuns as they traveled through the Caribbean and Mexico. Clergy, friars, and nuns transformed the ship headed to the Philippines into “a floating convent worthy of enclosed nuns.” (76) The third Chapter also covers details that will interest historians of medicine, as Owens considers the impact of epidemics, discusses some disease symptoms and common cures, and speculates on the cause of the illness and death of one of the nuns, Sor María de la Trinidad.

Readers will appreciate the richly detailed descriptions of the physical landscape and of the social milieu of Manila. The newly arrived nuns faced numerous challenges, from a half-hearted donor to resistance from the local elite. High-ranking colonists needed
to consider the local marriage market and did not want their daughters performing their own chores or living under the more restrictive First Rule of Saint Clare, which Sor Jerónima hoped to implement and to extend to women of color. Conflicts over the convent led the Franciscan provincial to excommunicate Sor Jerónima and to depose her as abbess. It took letters and petitions to other authorities, including the monarch and commissary general of the Franciscan Order, for the saintly cofounder to be reinstated. Owens discusses Sor Ana’s rhetorical strategy of appending the letters written by authorities in response and her own commentary to help make the case for Sor Jerónima’s sanctity.

Finally, the book turns to the inclusion of other nuns’ voices into Sor Ana’s text. Owens considers the broader context of early modern religious women’s rhetorical strategies and use of writing to memorialize their convents. The final Chapter of the book examines this broader “complex landscape of literacy, writing, and inspirational role models” for conventual histories and sacred biographies (118). Owens returns to a close examination of Sor Ana’s account and concludes that it constitutes “a hybrid genre of writing that is as much biographical as it is autobiographical” (135). The book ends with an epilogue that briefly traces the fate of the convent through centuries of natural disasters, invasions, wars, and eventual relocation.

Occasionally, Owens extrapolates from sources about later groups of female religious to fill in gaps in Sor Ana’s text. In general, she does this with caution and care. In part because this book is directed to a broader audience, there are a few times when a bit more detail might be warranted. For example, in her section on the sisters’ time in the islands of Guadeloupe, the author could engage more in the broader historical context of and debates over the capacity of indigenous peoples as well as the growing body of work on the history of race in the Spanish Empire. However, these minor issues should not detract from the book’s achievements. Owens is successful in showing how this particular group of Poor Clares used their own writings in the process of dealing with the challenges of building and administering a new convent and maneuvering socially, politically, and spatially within the Spanish Empire.

Nuns Navigating the Spanish Empire is a welcome addition to the field. It provides a lesser-known case study to reexamine some oft-explored topics in early modern Iberian historiography. Although some of the conclusions drawn about religious women’s writing, trade networks, and the tensions between theory and reality for enclosed communities, especially those on the move to found new religious houses in the Spanish Empire, are not especially new, this book makes these complex themes accessible. This book could easily be assigned to students in graduate seminars or undergraduate classes focused on the Iberian World or on early modern women.

Rachael Ball
University of Alaska Anchorage
La diatriba entre virtudes y vicios es una oposición binaria que ha ocupado, junto con otras conocidas disputas medievales y renacentistas, el espacio cultural canónico europeo. Se trata de una falsa batalla donde, al platónico modo, “siempre gana la casa”. *Ambiguous Antidotes* dilucida cómo el imaginario cultural planta cara al reto, como parte de un proceso médico-moral con ramificaciones pedagógico-religiosas donde virtudes y vicios se van desglosando y reconfigurando en diferentes esquemas. La profesora Hilaire Kallendorf aprovecha su amplísimo conocimiento en el campo de la casuística y la comedia áurea para enfocar una lente más precisa sobre la presencia de esta dicotomía, que creíamos solucionada.

Esta monografía comprende aspectos como los remedios ofrecidos por la materia medicinal, entendiendo sus beneficios como extrapolables al comportamiento humano; la perfecta correspondencia entre vicio y virtud; los antídotos disponibles en la botica, incluidas sus falsificaciones; y la equivalencia entre el veneno y la triaca, que desemboca en la idea esencial de la proporción y el término medio como *ratio* virtuosa. El término “antídoto ambiguo” o *pharmakon* seleccionado para servir de título, explica Kallendorf, apela a la posibilidad de obtener el efecto contrario al deseado, esto es, a desembocar en un vicio a través de la práctica excesiva o incorrecta de una virtud, problema que se plantea como base para más de un capítulo. No sé si “ambiguo” es la opción más clara para definir un resultado contrario al deseado pero, en todo caso, resulta interesante la predominancia de este giro, especialmente en el contexto tardo barroco, lejano al orden y la proporción y más tendente a los extremos que a la *mediocritas*.

Los seis capítulos en que se divide *Ambiguous Antidotes* no se corresponden, evidentemente, con las siete virtudes catequéticas tradicionales, prefiriendo anclarse en problemas que bien podrían abarcar varias connotaciones simultáneamente. Por ejemplo, la humildad no cuenta con capítulo propio, mientras que la castidad y la fortaleza se desarrollan por separado cuando podrían haber formado parte de una misma sección. Esta organización huye del encasillado tradicional para dotar de flexibilidad a la argumentación estableciendo conexiones múltiples que amplían el eje de coordenadas. Así sucede en el primer capítulo, dedicado a la justicia y sus relaciones con la moderación y la prudencia, todas ellas poderosas alegorías en la escena áurea española. A través de distintas comedias se configura una serie de valores y defectos, así como una presencia física de objetos, gestos, iluminación y vestuario que construyen el ideal de justicia más allá de lo terrenal, al tiempo que se exponen las contradicciones de su práctica. Las páginas dedicadas a la fortaleza, identificada como “virtud masculina”, podrían haber sido ocasión para poner de manifiesto la posición de España como la primera potencia...
bélica global dominante, sobrada de re militari de producción propia (sí se dedican algunas páginas a la milicia romana en el epílogo) que sirviese como filosofía de base para cuanto refleja la escena, en una corte donde los poetas decían haber sido soldados y los soldados querían ser poetas. El tercer capítulo está dedicado a la contradicción entre la práctica de la caridad, el egoísmo y el orgullo o presunción, peligro del que ya habían alertado los clásicos que se cimenta en múltiples ejemplos cuyos matices han sido muy bien seleccionados y satisfarán a los amantes de la casuística. La prudencia, señalada como virtud preponderante cargada de ecos bélicos, se aborda desde la teoría del buen gobierno y su conexión con la madurez y la razón propia de los arbitristas u hombres de estado encargados de estudiar grandes cambios en un sistema político complejo como es el español durante los siglos de dominancia. En lugar de centrarse en los acostumbrados libros de educación de príncipes, Hilaire Kallendorf prefiere indagar en piezas dramáticas para descubrir que la esta virtud, antídoto de la cólera, se combina con otras hasta el punto de competir entre sí en lugar de contrarrestar los vicios. El último capítulo debate el esfuerzo antitetimológico del término “virtud” como derivación de “virs”. Se echa en falta el impacto de las virtuosas e claras mugeres de Álvaro de Luna, puntal importante para los siglos posteriores, al tiempo que Kallendorf es capaz de ver más allá de la castidad/fortaleza como única virtud femenina para encontrar representaciones donde las mujeres superan a los hombres en virtud por mor de su naturaleza, no de su linaje familiar, sugiriendo un debate que añía sexo y clase social. La conclusión recoge una serie de fuentes imprescindibles para entender la monografía, como el importantísimo Juan de Mena en contraste con el Gracián finisecular. Tanto ésta como el epílogo apuntan otras líneas igualmente cautivadoras entre las que se encuentra el rol de los “hacedores profesionales de mal” como las falsas beatas o el Anticristo, la excesiva práctica de la virtud, la relación entre un aspecto bello y un comportamiento pernicioso, y otras prácticas que ponen a prueba la línea entre virtud y vicio, terminando por probar el acertado uso de la “ambigüedad”, farmacología aparte.

Las notas finales y las veinte ilustraciones que acompañan al texto dan una buena idea de la variedad de comedias y la imaginaria preponderante relacionada con las virtudes cardinales analizadas dentro del universo hispánico, su raigambre grecolatina y su implantación en América, empresa considerada intelectualmente como una oportunidad para practicar ideales muy viejos en tierras “nuevas”. Dentro de ese espíritu, la profesora Hilaire Kallendorf sigue lanzándonos cabos de los que tirar.

Elena del Río Parra
Georgia State University

Marta V. Vicente’s new book about the eighteenth-century scientific turn on sex and gender is an elegant narrative that places the Spanish Enlightenment in its larger European context. This is a thorough analysis of how gender distinctions proved essential to articulate the nature/society relationship. Vicente demonstrates how for eighteenth century thinkers the essence of things resided in their utility, and reproduction constituted the most important function for human survival. Through reproduction, women and men’s bodies remained crucial in the perpetuation of the species and the social order. Hence the formulation of an “objective” justification of social roles based on biological distinctions was born. Biology became destiny so that what was once only considered sin also turned into a medical aberration and threat to social stability and peace. Bodies outside the new normative outlook were regarded as sick and/or criminalized.

Divided in five chapters, the book is based on extensive archival research. Vicente examines criminal and inquisitorial records which deal with individuals accused of sexual crimes; medical reports dealing with hermaphrodites or crossdressers as well as descriptions of “improper” anatomical traits. A number of illustrations by Spanish artists such as Diego Ribera’s painting of “Magdalena Ventura with her husband;” engravings by Crisóstomo Martínez or Matía Iralia for anatomical studies; portraits of the period’s key scientists like Martín Martínez, Benito Jerónimo Feijoo, or Manuel de Porras; and historical figures such as actress María Ladvenant add visual depth to this indispensable study of the history of scientific discourses in eighteenth century Spain. Three concepts run through the narrative of the five chapters: nature, utility and social order. These three concepts articulate the arguments proposed by scientist (more specifically anatomists), lawyers, philosophers and theologians as well as educators when formulating the closed correlation between nature’s universal laws and the stable social order they aspired to establish. In their attempt to create a “brave new world” the Enlightenment thinkers forged an iron-clad isomorphism between the human body and social order. In so doing, scientific discourse had to bridge the difference between the theory of what was considered normal and practice as the medical profession confronted bodies that did not fit the new norm.

The main case studied is that of Sebastián Leiredo López, a twenty-four-year old inn keeper also identified as a Madrid actress named Maria Teresa Garrido whom he had served at the age of fourteen. Leiredo was arrested in Madrid in November 1769 and his trial ran for four months. Vicente examines Leiredo’s story in two chapters. In Chapter 2, when explaining the scientific discourse and relation between theory and practice, Vicente’s narrates the medical reports describing Leiredo’s male genitalia and the trouble authorities had in making sense of his
feminine appearance as he lacked facial hair and spoke with a female voice. Because his body confirmed he was a man, his social behavior as a woman made him a threat to society. In Chapter 4, Vicente tells us about legal aspects of Leiredo’s case to illustrate the concept of social utility mentioned above. She shows, through the analysis of sodomy, how the Spanish legal system had trouble moving towards the separation of crime and sin in the case of Leiredo. The judges condemned him to ten years in prison at the Castillo de la Plaza in Pamplona, Navarra and labeled him a sinner. His lover was sentenced to four years of service in the Spanish Navy. While the Inquisition had sentenced to death sodomites in the past the new courts regarded sodomy rather as a social transgression. Sodomy transgressed the social expectation for reproduction as the ultimate utilitarian function of sex/gender differentiation hence constituting a crime against social prosperity.

Leiredo’s is not the only story Vicente tells us about ambiguous bodies. Enlightenment thinkers and law makers encountered. In chapter 3, “Nature, Nurture, and Early Modern Sexuality,” she explores the debate among philosophers and educators resulting from new anatomical discoveries and how they influenced the cultural milieu. They trusted that education would guide individuals in their quest for proper sexual behavior to fulfill the reproductive utility. In this chapter Vicente tells us about the case of Antonio Lozano a breastfeeding father from Cumaná (Venezuela) a peasant who out of necessity had been able to breastfeed his son making it proof of how nature would be accommodating to habit and obligation.

The final chapter in the book focuses on the legacy of the eighteenth century and its impact on feminist discourses in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. Some of the feminist theorists discussed throughout the book include Simone de Beauvoir, Judith Butler, Monique Wittig, and Iris Marion Young, to mention a few. The debate between sameness and difference sparked in the 1980s has produced fertile intellectual discussions on the binary nature/nurture inherited from the Enlightenment and informing identity politics to this day. In the final analysis, as Marta Vicente points out, feminist have demonstrated that the promise of progress, happiness and stability put forward by eighteenth century thinkers has not been fulfilled. The question remains, stability, progress, and happiness for whom? Reading Marta V. Vicente’s book helps us get closer to be able to answer this question.

Aurora G. Morcillo
Florida International University, Miami
El tema de este libro de Antonio Feros, según anuncia en su introducción, es la autopercepción de los españoles. Lo cual plantea problemas de sensibilidad histórica, porque parece dar por supuesta la existencia de los españoles a través de los tiempos. Y el territorio al que hoy llamamos España (que no es lo mismo, desde luego, que Hispania, porque esta incluía a la actual Portugal) no ha sido sede de un grupo humano único y constante, sino escenario durante milenios de una tormentosa sucesión de invasiones, mezclas étnicas y fragmentación política. Hasta finales del siglo XV, donde inicia este libro su recorrido, la Península estuvo dividida como mínimo en cinco reinos, aparte de dar cobijo a tres religiones. Sólo a partir de entonces se unieron las coronas y casi a la vez fueron expulsados los no cristianos. Con una monarquía y una religión únicas se pudo por fin empezar a hablar de “españoles”.

Ese fue justamente el debate entre los siglos XVI y XVIII, al que Feros dedica un tercio de su obra. ¿Producio aquella unión realmente un sentimiento de comunidad “española” o siguieron dominando las identidades políticas y religiosas previas?

En términos generales, sostiene este autor, creo que acertadamente, entre 1500 y 1800 nació y fue creciendo un sentimiento de identidad común. Un sentimiento apoyado por elaboraciones intelectuales, como la historia de Juan de Mariana, explicitamente titulada de España, que partían de mitos bíblicos, como Babel y Túbal, y de las excelsas cualidades del territorio cantadas por los laudes Hispaniae, para pasar a narrar las sucesivas invasiones y la resistencia frente a ellas, generadoras de una forma de ser colectiva, marcada por la frugalidad y el sentido del honor. La referencia a los visigodos certificaba la antigüedad del reino, aunque también podían inventarse reyes legendarios anteriores a Cristo.

Como Feros observa, esa identidad global en construcción se enfrentaba con múltiples problemas: el primero, y menos complicado, la distinción entre “España” y los territorios “españoles”, o dominados por la monarquía de los Habsburgo, llamada por los demás española aunque no fuera ese su título oficial. El segundo, que atrae más nuestra atención actual, la innegable castellanización de la monarquía y el malestar de los restantes reinos peninsulares. El tercero, el más amenazador según criterios de la época, la integración de las “castas” de conversos y moriscos, descendientes de las minorías judía y musulmana convertidas en teoría al cristianismo; aunque este último problema era de origen religioso, pasó a ser puramente racial al centrarse en su sangre “impura” (lo cual, según Feros, no era aún racismo moderno). Y en cuarto y último lugar, el problema específico que planteaban los territorios americanos del imperio, comenzando por los criollos,
descendientes de españoles nacidos al otro lado del Atlántico, y culminando en los indios/mestizos y negros/mulatos.

El planteamiento es, como puede verse, complejo y apasionante. La principal objeción que le opondría es que el autor llama desde el primer momento “nacional” a esa identidad en construcción y sin embargo no define el concepto de nación. No hay duda de que se usaban en la época términos como “natío” o “nación”, pero su significado era distinto al actual. Porque se referían al conjunto de nacidos en un territorio y hablantes de una misma lengua; pero faltaban Rousseau y Herder para llegar a la nación moderna, grupo humano que, a partir de unos rasgos culturales comunes, se siente soberano del territorio en que habita.

Una segunda parte del libro se dedica al siglo XVIII. El autor comienza por calificar la época de “tremendamente compleja e inestable”, afirmación genérica que no justifica (p. 153; como tampoco su referencia a la excepcional brutalidad de la Guerra de Sucesión, 157). Pero sobre lo que explica a continuación hay acuerdo: hubo centralización administrativa y unificación legal (excepto en las provincias forales vasco-navarras, ojo; un vasco que lea este libro se sentirá postergado), las Reales Academias se propusieron como objetivo crear una lengua nacional y una historia nacional y estos esfuerzos estuvieron más impulsados por élites intelectuales, de Feijóo a Capmany, que por la monarquía, que mantuvo su retórica prenacional y su prolija titulación medieval.

Este plan resultó especialmente difícil de aplicar en América, donde las reformas borbónicas pretendieron controlar y explotar mejor las “colonias”, reforzar sus defensas, nombrar a peninsulares para sus altos cargos y convertirlas en un mercado cautivo para los productos españoles. Los criollos, los más perjudicados por este plan, lo recibieron con reticencias y, a su vez, fueron acusados de estar “contaminados” por mezclas raciales. Pero el mayor problema era la integración de los indios y negros en el discurso. Un discurso muy antiguo, de origen clerical, sobre indios infantiles e inocentes que requerían la protección de la corona, pero en el que entraban también elementos provenientes de la visión racial moderna, como las referencias a su indolencia y escaso intelecto. Se lanzaron, pese a todo, algunas políticas de promoción de mestizos y mulatos prominentes, a las se opusieron sobre todo los propios criollos. El discurso, en resumen, se fue haciendo cada vez más racial, aunque Feros insiste en que seguía sin ser todavía un racismo moderno. Vuelvo a echar en falta una definición más precisa de los conceptos de “raza” y de racismo “moderno”.

La última parte del libro está dedicada al siglo XIX. Este se inició con una crisis política a la que llama revolucionaria, y que quizás fue más bien un vacío de poder un tanto fortuito. Pero lo cierto es que culminó en una convocatoria de Cortes y la elaboración de una Constitución que intentó, sí, reinventar España como nación, con ideas nuevas envueltas en terminología antigua, a partir de una idealización de la monarquía medieval como un régimen limitado y participativo.
El problema crucial, en todo caso, como Feros señala, fue querer convertir un imperio de enorme diversidad racial y territorial en una nación moderna.

El libro concluye con una breve referencia a la actualidad. El independentismo catalán ha sacado a la luz los problemas irresueltos de la construcción nacional española. Algo ratificado, según Feros, por unas tensiones migratorias que creo exagera, porque no son comparables a los de otros países europeos. En la historia española, concluye Feros sensatamente, hubo menos convivencia pacífica y más desigualdad y discriminación racial de lo que suele aceptarse. Un replanteamiento de su historia en términos más críticos permitiría quizás a los españoles repensar su relación con sus “otros” (internos y externos) y resolver sus problemas presentes y futuros, tanto con el independentismo catalán como con la inmigración.

José Álvarez Junco

Pamela Radcliff is a historian of twentieth-century Spain, whose works on 1930s political mobilization, women’s politics, and 1960s and 1970s civil society have greatly contributed to our understanding of the country’s past. With the book under review, the American historian enters the selective club of scholars capable of writing single-authored general histories of modern Spain. Before Radcliff, Raymond Carr in the 1980s, Francisco Romero Salvadó in the 1990s and Charles Esdaile and Mary Vincent in the 2000s had all embarked on the difficult task of surveying Spain’s modern history for English-speaking students with positive results. Radcliff’s *Modern Spain* is a welcome addition to this field, as the book provides a fresh perspective on the country’s two last centuries.

The novelty of *Modern Spain* partly lies in its structure. The book focuses on four main areas, namely politics, economics, society and culture, and how they interact with each other. Radcliff argues that no area was the driving force of historical activity, as different realms were prime historical motors at different times and the balance of elements changed from one society to another. Accordingly, economic, social and cultural developments are separated from political narrative and analyzed in different chapters taking a long-term perspective. Thus Chapters 6 and 7 deal with economic, social and cultural changes in the 1830-1930 period and Chapter 12 also takes a long view to explore these non-political realms between the 1930s and 1970s, whereas the rest of the chapters follow a more traditional chronology set by political events.

The book is also innovative in that every chapter is introduced by a comparative section, which situates different political regimes and historical developments in relationship with the rest of Europe. These comparative sections are not only useful to the reader but also a central part of the author’s concept of the book. For Radcliff, the task of the monograph “is to chart the complex interaction of local, regional, national, European and international developments that produced Spain’s specific version of modern history” (xiv). From this standpoint, the comparative perspective becomes “an indispensable feature of national histories in a global age,” in a sharp contrast with those narratives promoting an insular vision of Spain’s modern history (xiv). The European comparison is also used to challenge the “failure narrative,” that is, the old historiographical position which claimed that Spain had failed to follow a ‘normal’ path to modernity.

The book is divided into four parts. Radcliff begins by exploring the era of the liberal revolution (1808-1868), continues with an analysis of the emergence of mass politics (1868-1923) and then moves to study the social, economic and cultural changes from 1830 to 1930. The last section of the book delves into the dictatorship of Primo de Rivera, the Second Republic, the Civil War, the Franco dictatorship and the current constitutional system, covering a long chronological span between 1923
and 2016. Throughout the book the author displays a comprehensive knowledge of the historiographical debates about diverse themes in nineteenth and twentieth century Spain. The emergence of a constitutional culture in the 1810s; the reasons behind the nineteenth-century agricultural expansion; the functioning of the Restoration regime and its collapse in 1923; the nature of the Franco dictatorship; and the 1970s transition to democracy are among the most important scholarly debates considered in *Modern Spain*. It is precisely when dealing with the transition to democracy that Radcliff is at her best. The author’s analysis of the 1970s recognizes the powerful effects of popular political engagement and grassroots mobilization on conditions leading to democratization, in contrast to much of the literature that until recently saw the process as mainly elite-driven. *Modern Spain* also questions the very existence of a Spanish model of transition to democracy that could be emulated elsewhere and, therefore, the very idea of a universal blueprint of democratization.

Radcliff does not shy away from more controversial debates, such as the nature of the Second Republic. She acknowledges that navigating this topic is a convulsive undertaking and argues that both left-wing and conservative interpretations have incorporated their reading of the Second Republic into opposing grand moral narratives on the history of democracy in Spain, which hampers the possibility of reaching any sort of academic consensus. Considering the historiography of the Second Republic in political terms is entirely justified. After all, the democratic regime has re-emerged as a key political episode among historians in recent years and unleashed a “memory war” in the broader society. However, including the neo-Francoist version of the Popular Front era as part of the academic discussion unintentionally grants the dictator’s propagandists a professional status as historians that they actually lack. Regarding the discussion on why democracy did not consolidate in 1930s Spain, Radcliff contends that there is “no single turning point or fatal decision, but instead a complex story of both missed opportunities and impossible conundrums” (161). This reading of the reasons behind the failure of the Second Republic is logical and fair, yet slightly vague. Perhaps Radcliff’s account would have benefitted from a more defined analysis in which the author clarified what specific factors led to that convoluted story of democratic failure.

Despite these quibbles, the book is an instructive synthesis of the history of Spain over 200 years. *Modern Spain* not only debunks the old ‘failure narrative’ but also complicates the larger European narrative, by undermining the very idea of a European model. The monograph merits a place among the best single volume analyses of the thorny history of contemporary Spain and will be very helpful for undergraduate and postgraduate students alike.

**Alejandro Quiroga**  
Newcastle University
Every cultural historian has experience taking artworks or other artifacts and situating them in a social or political milieu. Eugenia Afinoguénova goes one step further. Her richly contextualized and impressively researched institutional history *The Prado: Spanish Culture and Leisure, 1819-1939* places the building that houses such artifacts into its broader context, refusing to isolate the museum from the city that surrounded it and shaped it. Debates about the way that art should be displayed and understood in the museum converged with debates over how to regulate the activities taking place on nearby streets and fields. These debates over the role art should take in the wider leisure life of Spaniards were part of larger socio-political debates as the country lurched from absolutism to parliamentary democracy to republicanism in the century preceding the Spanish Civil War. Building on a solid historiographical framework that demonstrates how Spain was taking part in European-wide debates over making art accessible to a broad population, *The Prado* demonstrates how cultural institutions like museums have always played a vital role in shaping civil society.

Afinoguénova subdivides each of her chronological chapters into five sections that trace the various changes the Prado underwent during Spain’s long nineteenth century (24-25), but her overall narrative arc encompasses two broad themes. The first is the relationship between the Prado and Spanish politics. Because the museum began life as the art collection of the royal family, the Prado became a key institution as Spain transitioned from absolutism to constitutional monarchy—and then into the era of mass politics and republicanism. Debates over what pictures should be displayed and how the collection should be arranged were part of larger political debates over ideas like the value of liberalism, what role the monarchy should have in a parliamentary system, or how to incorporate the masses into the body politic. Since the museum was administered by the Spanish government, the ways in which the Prado displayed its treasures “became a measure of the state’s ability to represent the nation” (104).

Discussions over mundane matters like admissions policies and prices could reflect the growing political hegemony of the bourgeoisie and their status-driven anxiety over what access the working classes should have to cultural (and thus political) institutions. Concerns over how new actors were to be incorporated into the public sphere also informed the gender politics of the Prado. The presence of female nudes in the collection created a problem for patrons in a moralistically Catholic society, and the Prado constantly teetered between the prurience of male patrons who wanted to see some flesh and their worries about corrupting women who might also view said paintings. And yet, because women could come to the...
Prado to copy paintings and because the museum was opening itself up to wider audiences by the early twentieth century, the museum provided an avenue for some women to enter into the public sphere. By tracing the political history of the Prado, Afinoguénova demonstrates how civic institutions reflect the ways in which Spanish civil society has struggled with inclusivity.

The other theme that Afinoguénova follows is the way in which the Prado mediated between the city and countryside. When the museum building was constructed in the early nineteenth century it stood on the edge of Madrid. The surrounding fields were used for verbenas and the Prado quickly became a space of mediation between the countryside and the rapidly urbanizing city. Was the Prado a site of education or of entertainment? This question haunted many cultural institutions during the nineteenth century, before modern perceptions of what elite and popular culture were had settled. The question itself arose from the problems of order and control caused by the modernization of the city and the resultant influx of workers from the countryside: “when the age-old pastimes of looking at exhibits in the museum and spending time on the Promenade met mass politics, the distinction between autonomous art and the messy world surrounding it became hard to sustain” (184). Here is where the true originality of the arguments being made in The Prado shine forth: Afinoguénova traces the wider influence the museum had on Spanish culture, from the way it inspired theatrical designers in the nineteenth century to the displaying of copies of paintings by the Misiones Pedagógicas in the 1930s, placing seemingly arcane cultural questions at the center of Spain’s sometimes painful efforts to build a mass civil society.

One could make minor criticisms of The Prado—the narrative construction imposed by the chronological organization of the chapters becomes choppy at times—but in the end, there is only one significant problem with the book: it ends too soon. Afinoguénova concludes her story in 1939 by noting how transferring the Prado from the Republic to the Franco régime is proof that it had become a truly national institution (239). This is a perfectly logical endpoint, and yet one wonders what the author could tell us about the intersection of National Catholicism and international tourism at the Prado; about the battles over the establishment of the Museo Reina Sofia and ultimate location of Picasso’s Guernica; or about the implications of the development of Madrid’s “museum triangle” in a world where art is business. There are books on these topics, but I would very much like to see what Afinoguénova’s eye for historical detail and skill with creative analysis could do for the post-Civil War period. The Prado is a rich and richly rewarding book, and one looks forward to the author’s future work with great anticipation.

Clinton D. Young
University of Arkansas at Monticello

Pedro Rújula and Javier Ramón Solans have edited an excellent volume examining the persistence of absolutist political ideas and the emergence of modern conservatism in Europe between the French Revolution and the late nineteenth century. *El desafío de la revolución. Reaccionarios, antiliberales y contrarevolucionarios (siglo xviii y xix)* presents the liberal revolution from the perspective of its opposition, demonstrating how resistance to liberalism shaped the development of political ideologies, social movements, and national identities. Although the principal focus of the book remains steadfastly Spanish in nature, the contributors offer perspectives and comparisons drawn from other European states, Spanish American colonies, and newly independent nations.

In their introduction, Rújula and Ramón Solans examine the “paradoxes of reaction” and point to the prevalence of the “revolutionary paradigm” that has dominated writing on the political history of postrevolutionary Spain since its invention by liberals themselves. This paradigm has served to reduce narrative interpretations of complex historical events in an overly simplistic fashion, omitting the role of reactionaries, antiliberals, and counterrevolutionaries and relegating them to the status of the defeated. Consequently, Rújula and Ramón Solans seek to properly historicize the political conflicts that marked the end of the *antiguo régimen* and the birth of modernity in Spain. As Rújula and Ramón Solans argue, the liberal myth of a deep rupture with the past has obscured a well-reasoned appreciation of historical continuities and, in particular, conservative contributions to modern Spanish political culture.

To scholars who are familiar with the great historiographical debates of the 1980s that fundamentally altered the significance and larger study of the French Revolution, there ought to appear a striking similarity. Like the Furetian assault on the “Jacobino-Marxist Vulgate,” Rújula and Ramón Solans likewise seek to undermine a conventional treatment of the liberal revolution in Spain that dates to the nineteenth century and predominates today. Their central focus in this regard dispenses with the importance of class, already the subject of work by other scholars, and turns instead to the role of political culture. Put another way, Rújula and Ramón Solans attempt to historicize the concepts of modernity and reaction in a manner that sees them as neither mutually independent from one another nor isolated from other influences.

The volume’s first article, written by Rújula and titled “The Challenge of Revolution in Spain,” examines three important historical moments when popular support for the Bourbon monarchy in Spain impeded the arrival of liberal ideas from abroad and stymied the work of reformers and revolutionaries. In particular,
Rújula considers the ease whereby conservatives were able to recruit for the Spanish army in 1793 during the War of the Convention against revolutionary France, mobilize resistance to the French occupation in 1808 during the War of Independence, and animate a sense of popular support for absolutism in 1814 during the restoration of Fernando VII. Each of these moments serves as a reminder that there was nothing neat or linear about the rise of liberalism in Spain. Throughout much of the early nineteenth century, liberal elites in Spain confronted a populace that was opposed to rapid change and which supported the preservation of the Old Regime.

The first section (Chapters 2-5), “Bourbon Monarchies in the Twilight of the Old Regime,” considers the fate of Bourbon regimes in Peninsular Spain, Spanish America, and southern Italy. Following an opening chapter by Rújula, the section continues with a chapter by Ivana Frasquet that explores the persistence of conservatism in the nascent states of Latin America. She reminds the reader that independence for new states in Latin America often marked the preservation of conservative rule and cautions against confusing those events with a supposed liberal victory. As she makes clear, independence proved the only possible means to preserve traditionalism at home in the face of liberal successes in Europe. A chapter by Jean-Philippe Luis presents contradictions in Spanish Treasury policy during the reign of Fernando VII between 1814 and 1833. Rather interestingly, he argues that Treasury officials pursued semi-progressive policies to confront financial crisis from within an ultra-conservative political regime. Although creative in their approach to resolving the situation, these same officials failed to appreciate that the crisis was symptomatic of larger structural problems inherent to the regime. The section concludes with a chapter by Silvia Sonetti on the collapse of Bourbon rule in the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies. Acknowledging that Neapolitans increasingly came to see the Bourbon regime as an intransigent force incapable of building consensus, she persuasively argues that traditionalists found themselves supporting liberalism as a last resort.

The volume’s second section (Chapters 6-10), “Mobilization: From the Local to the International,” examines the extraordinary scope of social mobilization ranging from the local to the transnational. In the section’s first chapter, Álvaro París Martín attempts to explain widespread support for the persecution of liberals during the second restoration of 1823-1833. París Martin explains that the category of negro (liberal) was created as a kind of “other” by a public acting outside of royal sanction in a manner that built upon earlier liberal strategies of mobilization. Thus, conservative successes in this period ironically owed, in part, to the earlier strategies of liberals. The second chapter, co-authored by Andoni Artola, Javier Esteban Ochoa de Eribe, and Koldo Ulibarri examined the writings of José Pablo Ulibarri (1775-1847). Writing in the early nineteenth century, Ulibarri offered Basque as a pure language worthy of conservatism, as opposed to Castillian, which
he branded as the language of the devil due to its association with liberalism. In the third chapter, Gregorio Alonso traces the efforts of the Spanish nuncio and others to raise a sizeable number of recruits to protect the temporal power of the pope in 1850. Their failure represented the weakness of political support for clergy and papal aspirations. In the fourth chapter, Alexandre Dupont builds a convincing case for framing European conservative movements in the latter half of the nineteenth century in a linked, transnational frame. Interestingly, Dupont argues that the emergence of a kind of “conservative international” after 1848 reflects a conscious appropriation of liberal strategy by conservatives and an evolution of the conservative ideal. The section’s final chapter, by Carmine Pinto, frames the afterlife of Fernando II’s regime during the 1860s. Although the Bourbons were unable to restore an independent Kingdom of the Two Sicilies, Pinto makes clear that the movement, nonetheless, proved a considerable political challenge to political unity and the success of the Risorgimento.

The third section (Chapters 11-16), “The Battlefield of Ideas,” explores the role of language in framing the development of conservative intellectual ideas. It draws heavily on the legacy of Javier Fernández Sebastián, whose name is referenced in Chapters 12 and 13. To open the section, Carolina Armenteros examines the work of five French political theorists: Marie-Charlotte-Pauline Robert de Lézardièire (1754-1835), Joseph de Maistre (1753-1821), Jacques Benjamin Bins, Count of Saint Victor (1772-1858), François-Dominique de Reynaud, Count of Montlosier (1755-1838), and François-René de Chateaubriand (1768-1848). Her analysis makes clear that these figures attacked the legacy of Louis XIV owing to his destruction of political liberty. Although well-known conservatives, these men identified as staunch anti-absolutists who sought to restore a kind a kind of conservatism unadulterated by the likes of Louis XIV. In the second chapter, Gonzalo Capellán de Miguel presents the life of Swedish Jesuit Lorenzo Ignacio Thjulen (1746-1833), author of *Nuovo vocabulario filosofico-democratico* (1799). Capellán de Miguel argues that Thjulen provided a common vocabulary whereby conservatives were able to counter liberal discourses. Subsequently, Fernando Durán López examines another interesting personality in Miguel María Panés y González Quijano, Marquess of Villapanés (1751-1825), perhaps the strongest voice of opposition to liberalism in the Cortes of Cádiz. Durán López persuasively argues that efforts to silence or censor the writings of Villapanés triggered early and important discussions over freedom of the press in Spain. A chapter by Marie Salgues turns to the subject of the theatre. She argues that theatre served as a vital link between the monarchy and the public, and an important avenue to effectively rewrite history. Gonzalo Butrón Prida’s chapter studies *El Restaurador* (1823-1824) as a case study to examine how the absolutist press mobilized popular support for the restoration of the monarchy in 1823. To close the section, Antonio de Francesco used popular French-language publications
of the 1870s and 1880s to frame how interpretations of the French Revolution were cast in a counterrevolutionary context. His chapter speaks to the role of the liberal revolution in the larger political debates of the nineteenth century.

Section four (Chapters 17-20), “Catholicism and Modernity: A Paradoxical Relationship?” challenges the notion that modernism and secularism were interchangeable and examines attempts to reconcile the two. A chapter by Antonio Calvo Maturana presents the unique story of Sebastián Sánchez Sobrino, an “enlightened reactionary.” The case of Sánchez Sobrino disproves the presumed causal relationship between Enlightenment thought and political liberalism and serves as a reminder that the Enlightenment in Spain had important Catholic undercurrents, which do not fit within narratives of secularism. A subsequent chapter by Daniele Menozzi attempts to make sense of Vatican policy towards liberalism through an exploration of public declarations. Ultimately, she explains that the Church failed to appreciate the sacred place of the nation as an alternative to traditional Catholicism. In the volume’s penultimate chapter, Roberto Di Stefano takes the reader to Argentina to present one of three possible routes towards secularization. Although Roman Catholicism was not declared a state religion in Argentina, a special relationship prevailed there along a “Galican” model that served as an alternative to either total separation or complete fusion. Finally, Raúl Mínguez Blasco closes the volume with a fascinating look at gender and Church strategy. He argues that Church officials confronted the reality that men were essentially lay figures, and that women could prevent the spread of secularism by preserving Christian worship in the home. To this end, Mínguez Blasco claims that a “feminized Catholicism” took shape towards the end of the nineteenth century as a kind of “modern” response to the threat of modernity.

The place of Spain could have been more evident throughout the volume. Although not invoked in the title, the editors clearly reference Spain and Spanish political culture in their introduction. Not including the introduction, the volume includes 19 chapters. Edited volumes of this length certainly stretch the structural and organizational limits of even the best editors. The section headings are helpful in this regard and serve to present useful topical foci. All the same, attention to several areas of historical scholarship appears lacking. For instance, no chapter devotes space to Portugal despite its proximity to Spain and common Iberian experiences during the same period. Likewise, an exploration of British political currents is largely absent with the exception of Frasquet’s chapter, despite the significance of London as a meeting place for Spanish liberals in exile. Several chapters invoke the word historiography and present quite original contributions to scholarship on individual nation-states and the field of conservative studies. Two chapters, by Carmine Pinto and Silvia Sonetti, present the collapse of the Bourbon monarchy in the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies. While comparisons of mid-
nineteenth century Italian and Spanish political culture certainly warrant consideration, clear connections are not always apparent.

Readers seeking a definite typology of conservatisms or a kind of ideological family tree will be disappointed. The use of terms like “reactionary,” “antiliberal,” and “counterrevolutionary” are not clearly defined or connected to larger, transnational political currents. Scholars often subsume these ideological strands of thought into the general category of political conservatism. At least insofar as the title is concerned, the presumed intent of the editors was to note that there existed a complicated and diverse array of sometimes contrasting political ideas on the right as opposed to a single and monolithic movement. This point is a fair one and a much-needed corrective to the standard revolutionary narrative that the editors seek to correct. However, it could be stated more clearly.

So where does the study of nineteenth-century Spanish political culture head from here? The diversity of topics presented in this volume suggests that there exists ample room for further study. In particular, a clearer sense of how modernity and conservatism operated in Spain during the early nineteenth requires extended attention in monograph form. Only with a much clearer understanding of domestic political culture will connections with other parts of Europe make clearer sense. In the interim, Rújula and Ramón Solans have established an exciting, new path for future scholarship.

Charles Nicholas Saenz
Adams State University

*The Politics of Representation* brings together eight chapters to explore the form and function of parliamentary politics in Portugal and Spain for the period from 1875 to 1929. It constitutes one of the few English-language collections on liberalism in this Iberian context for the half century before both nations fell under the heavy-handed rule of dictatorships, that of António de Oliveira Salazar in Portugal and Francisco Franco in Spain. These essays take as their collective starting point the following questions: how is the liberal constitutional order stabilized or consolidated in the last decades of the nineteenth century, and why does it fall apart in the 1920s? To approach an answer, the essays focus on parliamentarism and electoral behavior. Collectively, the authors reject the notion that parliaments and elections were of little consequence for Iberian public life and set out to show how these components of institutional and political development mattered. Taken together, the contributions highlight both the symbolic and practical importance of ballot boxes and parliamentary chambers, as well as their impact on national politics.

Editors Pedro Tavares de Almeida and Javier Moreno Luzón emphasize the importance of this joint discussion of Spain and Portugal because of the historical parallels between these two countries, as well as the similarities across their political cultures. For Spain, 1875 marked the beginning of the Bourbon Restoration under Alfonso XII, which closed decades of civil wars and political instability. This new political system put an end to this turmoil with the system of *turnismo*, an informal pact between the two major parties to alternate power. This system survived almost fifty years, yet it was gravely weakened in 1898 with Spain’s loss of Cuba, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines. It finally came undone in 1923 with the military coup staged by General Miguel Primo de Rivera. Portugal’s political history shares much in common with Spain’s in these years, but with key differences. The year 1878 marked the consolidation of the constitutional monarchist regime with political reforms. This new system also functioned with *rotativismo* between two leading parties – the Regenerator and Progressive Parties – that mirrors the Spainish *turnismo*. But Portugal diverged from Spain in 1910 with the overthrow of the Monarchy and establishment of the Republic. This First Republic fell short of its promises for full political democratization and was plagued by turmoil until it too was deposed in May 1926, by the military *coup* that gave rise to Salazar’s *Estado Novo*. While this timeline presents fertile ground for comparison, the editors might have gone further in explaining the value of studying
Spain and Portugal side by side, and thereby intervening in wider debates on political liberalism and its crises in the early twentieth century. The epigraph that opens the Introduction implores: “Compare yourself with other! Know what you are!” (1). Still, each of the volume’s chapters focuses on a single country, with none featuring a comparative methodology. The Introduction might have been expanded to include a dialogue across these chapters in order to highlight to readers what is learned about the political practices of liberalism from this comparative exploration.

The book has eight chapters, organized in two parts. Part One discusses electoral behavior and parliamentary recruitment patterns. Portugal’s voting system implemented in 1884 is directly influenced by the Spanish 1878 law. Despite this convergence, as well as similarities in terms of weak civic participation and prevailing clientelism, important differences marked electoral patterns in each country. Of particular interest, Portugal greatly expanded electoral suffrage in 1878, and then steadily restricted this suffrage in the decades to come. Spain, on the other hand, moved in the opposite direction: it implemented a restrictive census-based suffrage in 1878, but then re-implemented universal suffrage in 1890. This seems to be an important divergence between the two contexts, and one that could have been further explored. Part Two is dedicated to parliaments, namely its internal procedures, political role, and legislative actions. Here, contributing authors explore the political dynamics of parliaments and representations of parliaments in the public sphere, specifically in novels, cartoons, and photography.

Chapter One, “Elections and Parliamentary Recruitment in Portugal” by Pedro Tavares de Almeida, considers the primary trends in electoral reforms in the period from 1878 to 1926, as well as the profile of parliamentary deputies. In total, eleven electoral laws were passed in this period, which resulted in an incredible amount of instability given that the “rules of the game” were constantly changing (8). Specifically, the 1878 law expands suffrage dramatically, to its peak (for this period) of about 19% of the total population (9). For political elites, the calculation seems to have been that expanding suffrage was a way to respond to rising criticism from socialist, republican, and other radical political campaigns, without truly opening up the political arena. Electoral institutions remained heavily influenced by caciquismo, which was especially strong in rural areas, with the rural electorate far outnumbering more radical urban voters. Over the next fifty years, various laws were passed to restrict and expand suffrage, with universal male suffrage never established in Portugal for the period in question. The change in regime from Monarchy to Republic did not appreciably impact this trend, even as the sociological profile of deputies expanded to include individuals of more modest social origins and those employed in commercial and liberal professions. Almeida suggests that this fifty-year sequence of reform without change contributed to the
“symbolic erosion and political delegitimization of the representative institutions” (32).

Chapter Two, “Elections in Spain” by Carlos Dardé, outlines changes to electoral rules during the Bourbon Restoration. Dardé suggests that with turnismo, elections were not “superfluous or irrelevant,” but they were also not the linchpin of the political system (39). The chapter analyzes the three electoral laws passed in this period: in 1878, 1890, and 1907. The first of these laws, implemented by a Conservative government, restricted suffrage; the second, issued by a Liberal government, decreed universal male suffrage; while the third, presented by another Conservative government, aimed to eradicate corruption from the electoral system, namely the entrenched caciquism. Dadré also highlights other trends that impacted parliamentary recruitment, namely the importance of family ties and the “professionalization of politics” (60).

Chapter Three continues the discussion introduced in Chapter Two regarding the economic, social, and professional characteristics of deputies in Spain. In “Prosopography of the Spanish Deputies,” María Antonia Peña and María Sierra consider the personal and professional profiles of this political class in order to better understand the political processes of the Restoration. The authors present an overview of the methodological and analytical value of prosopographic studies as part of a “new political history” that is attentive to “sociocultural explanations of political action” as well as the role of the “individual as a historical subject” (69). The authors emphasize the major challenges they face: limited records available to fulfil a complete and systematic study of this group numbering almost 3,500 deputies. With the available data, Peña and Sierra present preliminary assessments on the length of parliamentary service and the professional background of Spanish deputies, emphasizing the importance of combinatorial methods. By taking into account the diversification of assets and the linkages between sectors – rather than insist on classifying individuals according to fixed and exclusive categories – the authors highlight the economic transformation taking place. This more encompassing approach to professional interests, as well as the observation that liberal professionals increased their election to government in these years, allows the authors to dispel the “historiographic cliché” that deputies were captured by an uneducated agrarian elite (85).

The following five chapters explore the functioning of parliaments in Portugal and Spain, as well as their representations in the public sphere. Chapter Four by Paulo Jorge Fernandes, “The Political Role and Functioning of the Portuguese Parliament” considers the formal role and activity of Parliament in Portugal from 1878 to 1926. It aims to go beyond the negative assessments often launched against Parliament as a weak, corrupt, and ineffective institution, criticisms that were mobilized by the anti-liberal Estado Novo dictatorship and that have survived to the present-day. Fernandes both explains the relation between
Parliament and other branches of government as well as the work dynamic within its Chambers, including legislative initiatives. The chapter outlines that Portugal’s transition from Monarchy to a Republic brought greater parliamentary instability, making it more difficult for this organ to exercise its constitutional responsibilities.

Chapter Five, in turn, grapples with the continuities and discontinuities of Parliament in Portugal, to account for the impact of the 1910 Republican Revolution. Fernando Catroga, in “The Parliamentary Model of the First Portuguese Republic: Legacies and Discontinuities,” considers the impact of republicanism on political life. The author links the rise of republicanism in Portugal to nineteenth-century intellectual and scientific currents – like positivism, biological and social evolutionism, and secularism – and to the rise of the social question. The revolutionary potential of republicanism came to the forefront with the 1910 overthrow of the Monarchy. While the new republican regime departed from the old one in significant ways – especially in terms of the separation between church and state – the liberal Constitution of 1911 failed to address the social question and included few mechanisms to regulate and resolve political conflicts. The Estado Novo would amplify these weaknesses in order to legitimize its overthrow of this liberal order, and benefit from how the seeds for alternatives to parliamentarism (like corporatism) were already influential in 1911.

Chapter Six considers some of these questions for the Spanish case. Miguel Martorell Linares, in “Legislation, Accountability and Consensus in the Spanish Parliament” discusses the role of Parliament by addressing a critique often launched against this institution: in the words of one contemporary, “‘here one discusses but does not legislate’” (157). The author explains both why it was difficult for the Cortes to pass legislation – the difficulty of obtaining large parliamentary majorities – but also contends that legislating was not the primary duty of this organ. Rather, Parliament was a venue for public debate, and less a “legislative machine.” This is because the liberal state, with its limited fiscal resources, did not have the capacity to issue much legislation. The Cortes played an important role in organizing political elites into the two-party system, channeling political conflict through this institution, and also was the organ for oversight over the government, holding its members accountable (158). This system broke down in 1923, in part because it had failed to respond to the crises of World War I with legislative action, and in part because of the breakdown of turnismo as new parties gained force.

The final two chapters consider the representation of parliamentary politics in literature, iconography, cartoons, and other media. Paulo Silveira e Sousa and Maria Manuela Tavares Ribeiro, in “The Images of Parliament in Portugal: Literature, Iconography and Politics,” discuss what literary and artistic representations reveal about politics. While literature and art should not be taken as factual representations of society, they reveal – often with irony or mockery – the moral and political shortcomings of the liberal parliamentary system, as well as
critiques of the perceived “backwardness” of Portugal (197). Novelists and poets were often themselves very close to power, part of Portugal’s intellectual and political elite. With the rise of positivism, naturalism, and social realism in the late nineteenth century, these literary representations increasingly exposed political scandals, economic misery, and the pernicious impact of corruption, yet often with the disparaging portrayal of popular classes as “an infantilized and often brutal mass” (204). These criticisms of representative democracy were echoed in the cartoons and photography that circulated in Portugal’s public sphere. Such indictments of Portugal’s political culture contributed to the crisis of parliamentary liberalism and to rising enthusiasm for anti-liberal and authoritarian forms of governance in the 1910s and 1920s. Chapter Eight, “Literary and Cartoon Representations of Spanish Parliamentarism” by Javier Moreno Luzón, examines cultural production for the Spanish case. These literary and visual representations of parliaments, like in the Portuguese case, highlighted the vices and faults of the political class. An important branch of this literature focused on provincial life in rural Spain, highlighting the corruption and manipulation on account of local caciques that “subjected the nation to an unbearable tyranny” (221-222). This pessimism increasingly pervaded art and literature on politics in the early twentieth century, which in turn inspired public calls to eradicate Parliament rather than attempt reform. Both of these chapters present a thorough overview of the importance of literary representations for understanding the crisis of parliamentarism in Portugal and Spain. Still, how did the levels of illiteracy for both countries impact the relative importance of texts versus image in the public sphere? Did visual representations impact popular engagement with politics, or popular sentiments about parliaments?

This volume provides important and compelling analysis of two cornerstones of the liberal constitutional regimes of Spain and Portugal: voting and parliaments. It considers the political transformations and institutional developments of Iberia in the fifty years before both countries fell to long-lasting corporatist and authoritarian dictatorships. Collectively, the essays go beyond simplistic explanations for the “crisis of liberalism” that led to the rise of Franco and Salazar by exploring the function and practice of parliaments, giving texture to these critical years that are too often skimmed over. We now have a comprehensive collection of figures, data, and qualitative evidence to understand the political instability of this period. In other words, we now have a clearer picture of what the crisis of liberalism looked like for Spain and Portugal.

Still, certain important events were left untouched in the volume. Spain’s loss of Cuba, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines is mentioned only in passing, even though this loss of empire in 1898 was no doubt a moment of intense crisis for Spain’s domestic political life. In a similar vein, Portugal’s own imperial crisis in 1890 with the British Ultimatum is absent from this political history. How did
parliaments absorb or react to these geopolitical shocks? While the overthrow of Portugal’s Monarch in 1910 receives adequate attention in chapters on Portugal, the authors might have gone further to contend with how regime change impacted political life. Elections and parliamentary life also sometimes appeared detached from the wider economic and social transformations faced by both countries in these years. How were these parliaments vessels for, or expressions of, the tensions, conflicts, and anxieties that marked the rise of industrialization, the social question, and imperial crises? Concluding remarks might have provided an opportunity for the editors to reflect on some of the wider implications of this collection of scholarship, not just for the historiography of modern Spain and Portugal but also for the study of liberalism and political development at this crucial juncture.

These questions now become fertile ground for future research, opened up by this valuable collection. Overall, this is a welcome addition to the political history of Portugal and Spain. It will be especially relevant to scholars who work on liberal constitutionalism and its practices, political culture, and political development, as well as scholars interested in contextualizing the roots of the Franco and Salazar dictatorships.

Melissa Teixeira
University of Pennsylvania

Despite being told that press histories were passé at an academic conference in 2007, such studies have long been a vital part of historical research on Spain since Pedro Gómez Aparicio’s path-breaking *Historia del periodismo español* in 1967. Pol Dalmau’s *Press, Politics and National Identities in Catalonia* is a well-written, concise, yet thorough look at the leading Catalan daily newspaper from the mid-Restoration to the beginning of the Second Republic. More specifically, Dalmau follows the fate of the Godó family as they guided *La Vanguardia* from its origins as a political party mouthpiece to its birth into a source of news and information for the masses that became the largest circulation paper in the country. Dalmau is concerned with the Godó’s as symbols of the “press oligarchy” and liberal elites and how they attempted to maintain social and political leadership even as the masses were becoming increasingly educated and politicized. His book situates the family’s efforts to maintain their social and political position of leadership in Catalonia in the larger historical context of the “Crisis of Liberalism” during the last quarter of the nineteenth century through the first third of the twentieth century. Dalmau’s aims to revise the way historians have typically interpreted the various crises of liberal states in Europe with the Godó’s and *La Vanguardia* as his case study. His argument is that liberal elites were able to exercise their social and political power for a longer period of time by using daily newspapers to influence mass opinion by helping to create and attempting to direct that complex entity known as public opinion. Dalmau is largely successful in this effort due to his deft touch in combining Catalan and Spanish primary sources of information with secondary sources gleaned from elsewhere in Europe (primarily British, French, German, and Italian historical and press studies).

Dalmau elaborates his story via an introduction, seven chapters, and an epilogue that total 198 pages of relatively fast-paced text. The introduction reconciles two separate strands of research on periodicals: historians’ work that mostly employs the press as a source of information, but not an entity with agency, and media scholars who do not often integrate press transformation into broader political history (3). It also presents the Godó and *La Vanguardia* and entwines that history with the broader history of press and politics in late-nineteenth-century and early-twentieth-century Europe. The key to understanding the European liberal elites during this period is that they wanted to exercise “politics without democracy” and they were swimming against the tide of political democratization sweeping Europe at the time (6). Thus, elites had to find vehicles to combat the democratic challenge of the masses typified by the growing professionalization of
politics and the continuing independence, popularization, and professionalization of the press. Chapter One recites the founding of La Vanguardia in 1881, the humble beginnings of the Godó family, and their rise to prominence in Catalonia. The newspaper was initially the mouthpiece, or vanguard, for the Constitutional Party that was eventually coopted by Sagasta’s Liberal-Fusionist Party during the Restoration. It also develops the origins of modern journalism as a transnational effort that combined professionalization of reporting with changes in the organization of language, content, and format that exemplified mass consumption by emphasizing entertainment over political content (45). La Vanguardia was a leader in providing and highlighting international news, which led to steadily increasing circulation numbers and rising respect as a source of news and information. In 1888, partly as a result of the Godós failed efforts to gain political office and sufficient influence within the Liberal Party, La Vanguardia was launched as an independent, commercial newspaper. Chapter Two focuses on the now familiar identification of newspapers with patriotic causes, particularly in wartime. The Godós advocated for a larger presence of Spain in Morocco via La Vanguardia’s pages by coming out in favor of the short-lived War of Melilla in 1894. The decision to do so symbolized changes newspapers were undergoing in terms of content and direction, from partisan press to business orientation and the persuasion and influence of public opinion. According to Dalmau “it was about attracting new readers and making profits, but also about endorsing private interests while doing so” (70). The third chapter develops that theme further by elucidating the Godó family’s business interests in Spain’s remaining trans-oceanic empire (Cuba, Puerto-Rico, and the Philippines). La Vanguardia advocated expanded trade policies and later, in the face of Cuba’s War of Independence and the eventual Spanish American War, pro-war sentiments that, simultaneously, served national, patriotic, and family interests. Chapter Four reveals how defeat in 1898 forced further changes in newspaper operation as liberal politics, and the newspapers that supported them, were discredited in the aftermath of the war. Defeat demonstrated that influence was reciprocal and the public held more power than newspaper owners and editors might have imagined, especially when many newspapers collapsed due to plummeting circulation. The mediatization of politics and the Godó family response is the primary topic of the fifth chapter. The new mass politics was accompanied by a public concern for political corruption. Therefore, the Godó’s newspaper ownership and political ambitions and offices became incompatible in the public’s mind and forced the family to abandon politics, preserving the paper’s credibility in so doing. Chapter Six further explores the way liberal elites were forced to adapt to the new mass politics as the institutions they counted on to maintain their social and political influence were transformed by rising popular authority and increasing democracy. Chapter Seven explains the expansion of La Vanguardia into the largest circulation newspaper in Spain.
between 1905 and 1920 and the maneuvering of the Godó family to save their position, and their newspaper, as Catalanism and semi-revolutionary labor politics converged in Barcelona. The epilogue wraps up the story of the Godó’s and *La Vanguardia* with the death of Ramón Godó Lallana (1864-1931) who had piloted the family and the newspaper through the more tumultuous moments of their personal and national history, re-emphasizing the elements of the story that are illustrative of the way European elites accommodated the changing social and political circumstances prompted by the crisis and eventual demise of classic liberalism.

Pol Dalmau’s study is a penetrating look at the inner workings of an elite family trying to maintain power in the face of transformations that threaten to diminish it. It also is a revealing examination of how the objectives of newspapers changed, professionalized, and modernized in general and as instruments of elite socio-political influence. Dalmau adroitly and succinctly tells a complex story that is fascinating, entertaining, informative, and makes a significant contribution that will appeal to scholars of press studies in Spain, Europe, and elsewhere.

**David Ortiz, Jr.**

**University of Arizona**

A thoughtful compilation of essays on twentieth-century representations of Spanish collective identity, *Metaphors of Spain* is a deep reflection on the way these representations were forged and transformed. The book traces the conflicting and changing understandings of the symbols, icons, and images that have conferred meaning to Spanish identity. In a chronological recounting, the authors examine how representations of Spain were shaped during the period of the Restoration, from *fin de siècle* Regenerationism during the Primo de Rivera dictatorship, the Republic, and the Franco dictatorial regime. The authors also analyze the democratic period, reporting the difficulties encountered in redefining or breaking with some representations of Spain inherited from Franco’s dictatorship.

In the first of the twelve essays in the collection, Álvarez Junco introduces Spanish history and the essences of the nation from the perspectives of influential historians of various traditions. The second chapter by Moreno-Luzón and Núñez Seixas focuses on two contested but resilient symbols of the nation: the rojigualda flag and the anthem. The authors revise the official and social uses of these symbols as well as the controversy they raise in sub-state nationalisms. Chapters Three and Four reflect on two opposing metaphors of Spain: one successful, the monarchy; the other unsuccessful, the republic. Duarte explains that the republic is a metaphor for a Spain that could have succeeded and changed the course of Spanish history. Its failure contributed to forging its myth, and even today it remains very present in the collective imaginary of many Spaniards. In “The King of All Spaniards?” Moreno-Luzon draws parallels between the reigns of Alfonso XIII and Juan Carlos I and their attempts to become a symbol of the nation, concluding with a brief reference to the difficulties of the new king, Felipe VI, to reinvent himself as such.

In Chapter Five, “Gender and the Spanish nation”, Blasco Herranz discusses the way in which the different political regimes incorporated men and women in the Spanish nation. In Chapter Six, Vincent depicts the relationship of the Spanish nation and the Catholic Church, one that became entangled during Franco regime and relaxed during the first period of the democracy. In “The Language(s) of the Spanish Nation,” Nuñez Seixas details the increasing relevance gained by the Spanish language as a core value of the Spanish identity, and describes the contentious relationship of Castilian and other Spanish languages. Chapter Eight by García Sebastiáni and Marcilhacy covers the position the Americas and the celebration of October 12 have occupied in official Spanish nationalism. Núñez Florencio devotes Chapter Nine to bullfighting. The author abandons the chronological structure of other chapters in the book to present various understandings of bullfighting: as a liability to modern Spain, as an expression of
the national essence, and as a form of art. In Quiroga’s chapter two narratives of sports appear—fury and fatalism—instrumentalized by Franco to conjure a particular image of Spanish collective identity. In Chapter Eleven Holguín focuses on music and the disputes over the genres that represented the nation in the century. Finally, in the last chapter in the collection, Storm examines the difference between the marketable image of Spain derived from tourism and the image held by the citizens of Spain.

Individually, each chapter is undoubtedly a valuable contribution to the book; however, as a whole the book presents three main problems. First, the book disregards an idea that has pervasively permeated the Spanish collective imaginary during the twentieth century: the idea that there is not a single Spanish nation by two antagonistic, contentious nations—las dos Españas (the two Spains)—the conservative and the liberal, the traditional and the modern, the rural and the urban, the official and the real, the monarchic and the republican, the nacional and the roja, la de derechas and la de izquierdas. To be completely fair, Álvarez Junco devotes a few words to this idea in his chapter, and two other chapters include examinations of the role that the Republic and the King have played as representations of Spain. Regardless, the editors have missed the opportunity to dedicate a monographic chapter to this metaphor, that is ingrained in the Spanish collective identity and has become even more evident in the twenty-first century.

Second, the authors examine the manner in which the political and intellectual elites in Catalonia and the Basque Country responded to the representations of Spain forged in the hegemonic center during the twentieth century, but the book fails to provide a deep and broad analysis of the metaphors of Spain produced and reproduced at the periphery—in the stateless nations that dispute the loyalty of Spanish citizens—during the same period. Even when Nuñez Seixas transcends the timeframe of the book to report on the unsuccessful metaphor of the “plural Spain,” flagged by Rodríguez-Zapatero to praise a multicultural Spain that Aznar’s governments had marginalized, attention is given to the metaphors of Spain in the center, not to those at the periphery (e.g., the idea of Spain as an asymmetric federation, or the idea of Spain as the oppressor state).

An element unevenly discussed in the chapters that constitute this book is the extent to which these metaphors of Spain are representations “for” or “by” the “real” Spain. The book centers on metaphors of the Spanish identity created by political, intellectual, and cultural elites but omits the Spanish people’s perception and celebration of these metaphors as part of their identity. Perhaps this goal exceeds the scope of the book, but readers would have appreciated a deeper analysis of this issue in the introductory chapter of the book as well as in some of its chapters.

Despite these limitations, Metaphors of Spain is indisputably an extraordinary collection of Spanish history in the twentieth century, convincingly
accomplished by reviewing representations of Spanish national identity. In
addition, the book offers a deep and detailed description of the project of nation
building undertaken by the political and intellectual elites during the twentieth
century. The book is recommended for both the general public and the specialized
public who want to broaden their knowledge of the formation of the contemporary
Spanish national identity.

In the first two decades of the twenty-first century, events such as the
economic crisis, the corruption scandals involving the monarchy, the succession of
the king, the victory of the Spanish team in the 2010 World Cup, the pro-
indepedence movement in Catalonia, and conflict within the Spanish government
have undoubtedly impacted representations of Spanish national identity. These
events and many others serve as an invitation to the editors of this volume to
develop a new one in which the authors can examine the way these economic,
political, and institutional transformations have further changed the metaphors of
Spanish national identity in the twenty-first century.

Maria Jose Hierro
Yale University

The Moroccan soldiers in Franco’s Army of Africa loomed large in the Republican imaginary. They monopolize the opening stanza of the song *No pasarán:* “Los moros que trajo Franco/En Madrid quieren entrar/Mientras queden milicianos/Los moros no pasarán.” And one of the most famous Republican posters, *Los Nacionales,* includes two Moroccans among the five figures on the deck of the good ship “Junta de Burgos,” with three smaller ones peeping out of the port holes. This contemporary concern has not carried over into the historiography, which includes very few studies devoted to the subject, and almost no works at all in which the Moroccan voice can be heard. (Even though it was not about the Civil War itself, Sebastian Balfour’s *Deadly Embrace: Morocco and the Road to the Spanish Civil War,* is a rare exception.) In his new book, *Guns, Culture and Moors,* Ali Al Tuma proposes to remedy this situation, restoring these forgotten combatants to the center of the story and, especially, making their voices audible.

That most Moroccan soldiers were illiterate makes this an imposing task and Al Tuma draws on two principal sources to confront it. One is an archive of interviews with Spanish Civil War veterans conducted in the 1990s by Moroccan historian Mustapha El Meroun and fourteen interviews the author himself conducted in 2011. The other consists of the transcripts of interviews of 147 Moroccans from French Morocco carried out by French military officials after these men had left Spain. Al Tuma is very much aware of the pitfalls of such sources and takes care to explain their limitations to his readers.

Al Tuma’s main concern is the relative weight of two factors in the wartime encounter between Spaniards and “moros:” the perception of the otherness of the Moroccan soldiers by Spaniards, mostly Nationalist but also Republican, and the ability of these soldiers to exercise agency: “to exert influence on their own affairs, along with and sometimes despite the policies of the colonial power” (4). His conclusion is that even though the relationship between Spaniards and Moroccans was an unequal one, both factors were important. On the one hand, the ways in which Spaniards understood Moroccans as “other” were significant in determining the ways in which they were used as soldiers: they were believed to have a distinctive psychology and particular abilities that made them excellent warriors, but only in certain roles and only as subordinates. It also led Nationalist authorities to create separate “Moroccan spaces”: hospitals with halal kitchens, cafés, and even brothels with Muslim prostitutes, both to respect their religious sensibilities, which they sometimes overestimated, and to prevent potentially dangerous interactions with Spanish civilians, especially women. On the other hand, Moroccan soldiers welcomed,
and even demanded, such separate spheres; often sought to engage with Spanish society beyond the limits the authorities thought proper; and were capable of protesting when dissatisfied with their conditions. They were “active agents… not completely hapless victims” (229).

Al Tuma is also concerned to address what he calls two “points of contention” in the existing literature around the Moroccan presence in Spain: their motivation for fighting for Franco and charges of crimes against civilians and POWs (11). On the first, he rejects arguments made by Balfour and María Rosa de Madariaga, among others, that the Moroccans were simply mercenaries, finding that motives were mixed and that defense of religion was a factor for some. On the second he concludes that the horror stories “ascribed” to the Moroccans were “partly true, partly imaginary and partly deliberate fabrications” (58). Tellingly, he quotes a speech by La Pasionaria intended as a means of urging Republicans to fight to the end that was laced with racist stereotypes of uncontrollably violent, sexually savage Moors.

Al Tuma also includes a comparative aspect, looking at how the Nationalists’ use of colonial soldiers compared with that of other European nations, especially France and Great Britain during the two World Wars. The big picture was, he finds, very similar: the ways in which these soldiers were used were shaped by perceptions of race; military authorities tried to be sensitive to what they believed were the religious feelings of their colonial troops, especially the Muslims; and all sought to hinder sexual encounters between these soldiers and white women which, they felt would undermine European prestige. However, in the Spanish case there were three important differences: Nationalists made assertions of bonds of religion, blood and history with Moroccans that were unique; were more successful in persuading their colonial troops to accept their portrayal of the war, in this case as a religious struggle against communism; and Moroccan troops were more visible and widely accepted in Spain than in other European countries. In Nationalist Spain, at least. Republicans had a much more negative view of North Africans, even those few who offered their support. I initially found Al Tuma’s assessment that “right wing Spain was more tolerant of and less racist towards the Moroccans” shocking but, on reflection, came to concede that it is probably on the mark (227).

Largely due to the fragmentary nature of the available sources, in the end Al Tuma is unable to provide more than provisional answers to the questions he asks. Nevertheless, merely by posing the questions and then bringing the voice and agency of Moroccan soldiers into the discussion, by giving human depth and nuance to people whose portrayal has rarely escaped the realm of stereotype or cardboard villain, he has made an original contribution to the study of the Spanish Civil War, itself no mean feat.

Adrian Shubert
York University

Los dos libros que se reseñan aquí comparten dos características. Una es que ambos son ejemplos de magníficos trabajos de archivo. La otra, es que también son buenos ejemplos de la madurez intelectual de dos reconocidos especialistas del periodo franquista. Quien lea estos libros y recuerde cómo era este campo hace solo veinticinco años, cuando más o menos estos investigadores comenzaron su carrera profesional, se dará cuenta de la enorme evolución de la historiografía española que le ha llevado a equipararse sin complejos a la del resto de los países europeos, incluidos aquellos que en su día fueron una meca en el aprendizaje de los historiadores jóvenes. La situación presente no es fruto del azar, y ni siquiera de meros esfuerzos individuales por notables que estos hayan sido. Es producto de factores más amplios y colectivos como fueron la expansión del sistema universitario español en el último cuarto del siglo pasado, la apertura y dotación de archivos y, por supuesto, la ruptura con la insularidad intelectual que -por obra de la dictadura franquista y del monolingüismo de nuestros académicos- constreñía la vida intelectual del país.

Ni Francisco Sevillano ni Emilio Grandío necesitan mucha presentación en España, y es de esperar que estos libros contribuyan a una mayor proyección internacional de sus trabajos. El primero ya destacó al filo del nuevo siglo con sus importantísimos y pioneros libros sobre la propaganda y la opinión popular bajo la dictadura franquista. A estos siguieron otros sobre la represión franquista, enfocados a menudo desde un punto de vista de historia cultural. Es en esta trayectoria en la que se inserta el libro que reseñamos aquí. Más que monografía tradicional, este trabajo es una colección de ensayos en los que el autor explora aspectos diversos pero conectados entre sí por la temática del valor de la imagen y la opinión para comprender cómo funcionaba la ideología franquista y cómo esta justificaba la represión de los vencidos. El autor explica, por ejemplo, el discurso de la derecha en las elecciones de febrero de 1936, la estigmatización de los vencidos en el discurso público de postguerra, la construcción del héroe en la ideología franquista, etc. Ahora que, gracias al avance enorme de España y a la instauración —contestada a raíz de la crisis económica de 2008 y la política que esta desató— de una cultura de paz y de tolerancia en el país, cuesta creer la violencia verbal y las acciones inhumanas que eran la norma bajo la dictadura. Este libro debería servir para recordarnos tanto el valor y el precio de la democracia española que, a pesar de todos los aspectos criticables, nada tiene que ver con aquella miserable y cruel que nació de la Guerra Civil. Uno no puede sentir más que escalofríos cuando, por ejemplo, lee (48-52) lo que el supuesto elegante escritor...
Wenceslao Fernández Flórez escribía en el periódico ABC en mayo de 1939, al denunciar que Madrid “olía a rojo” y luego equiparaba a las cucarachas con el marxismo. Y ello porque sabemos que a menudo el primer paso para segar una vida humana es su deshumanización. Esto sucedía en un momento en que la Iglesia Católica se esforzaba en hacer una encuesta oficial (143-144) encaminada a la “glorificación de sus mártires” de la pasada guerra mientras que rezaba los ojos y los oídos a las descargas que tras las tapias de los cementerios anunciaban más muertos cada mañana.

Emilio Grandío es probablemente el mejor especialista de la República y la Guerra Civil en Galicia. Con este libro, previamente editado en español, se da a conocer al fin al público internacional. Esto se debe en gran medida a los muy meritorios, y a menudo ignorados, esfuerzos del editor de la colección, el historiador Nigel Townson, encaminados a publicar en Sussex obras de autores hispanos. En este caso, el mismo Townson ha hecho la traducción -que es bastante buena aunque contenga algunos pequeños gazapos: por ejemplo, confunde (16) barcos de guerra “warships” con acorazados o “battleships”-. Basado en una enorme labor de trabajo de archivo, en España y en el Reino Unido, este trabajo de Grandío provee una fascinante, hasta hora prácticamente desconocida, descripción de la enorme red de espías e informadores que los británicos establecieron en España durante la guerra mundial, y que las autoridades franquistas, asistidas por los nazis, intentaron exterminar a toda costa. Hay casos que, por complejos y hasta inverosímiles, parecen pertenecer más al género novelesco que al de la historia. Este es el de de la red liderada por Lorenzo Sanmiguel (96-117) que abarcaba todo el norte de España. Sanmiguel, como otros bravos antifascistas, pagó con su vida su contribución a la causa aliada.

Hay algo de muy triste en las historias narradas por Emilio Grandío: un sentimiento de olvido e ingratitude que no solo inunda, por su ausencia, la falta de una Historia Pública en España que cuente a sus ciudadanos, y célebre, que en el país de Franco hubo muchos héroes anónimos que lucharon por la libertad sino también en la visión estatalizada y nacionalista en el Reino Unido y en otros países occidentales de la Segunda Guerra Mundial, donde no cabe celebrar a los hombres y mujeres sin patria o perseguidos que dieron su vida a cambio de nada que no fuese la ingratitude. En este sentido, solo en Francia ha habido un cierto reconocimiento de estas personas mientras que en realidad lucharon contra el fascismo por toda Europa, desde la misma España a países que aparecen tan lejanos como Noruega (donde hay cientos de españoles enterrados con el uniforme de la Legión Extranjera francesa caídos en abril y mayo de 1940). En todos estos casos resulta curioso tanto olvido generalizado de quienes, por no creer demasiado en la lealtad impuesta por el lugar de nacimiento sino la que dicta la causa de la Humanidad todavía hoy no caben en la memoria oficial europea que sigue estando fraccionada artificialmente por la historia nacional.
En resumen, gracias a los profesores Sevillano y Grandío, hoy sabemos más no solo de lo que se escribe en España sino de lo que no se debe olvidar aquí y en otros lugares en estos tiempos cuando, amparadas por la ignorancia y el prejuicio, renacen las ideologías xenófobas, nacionalistas y hasta supremacistas.

Antonio Cazorla-Sánchez
Trent University


Dr. Rogozen-Soltar’s monograph is the result of extensive field work over various years in the southern Spanish city of Granada. Rogozen-Soltar’s knowledge of Spanish and Arabic, as well as her acute observation skills and wonderful writing style, makes her particularly well suited to carry out an ethnographic study of the interactions between three sets of people: ethnic Spaniards converted to Islam, immigrants from Muslim majority countries, and the ethnic Spanish community at large.

While Rogozen-Soltar’s book is well grounded in anthropological theory, it is not dragged down by jargon or theoretical disquisitions unrelated to the subject matter at hand. On the contrary, Rogozen-Soltar centers her narrative on the analysis of field experiences and uses theory to enrich and contextualize her analysis. Field notes drive her narrative and facilitate the connection with the reader.

Rogozen-Soltar directs her gaze to observe how Granadino culture and everyday interactions among residents intersect with historical narratives and myths. She identifies two contradictory positions among Granadinos: the *convivencia* position “casts contemporary Granada as a site of successful multiculturalism rooted in a history of peaceful pluralism,” while the *malafollá* position considers Granada as “an exclusionary, inhospitable society resulting from a history of unholy unions and cross-cultural interactions gone awry” (xvii). Her initial questions are why would a city define its ethos and character so specifically in terms of its engagement with cultural and religious diversity and why would it do so in such contrasting ways?

As opposed to other scholarship on conversion and migration that tends to separate these two phenomena and focus primarily on one or the other, Rogozen-Soltar examines them together to see foreign-born Muslims and non-migrant Andalusians (Catholics, converts, and secular) as co-producing one another’s subjectivities and social positions. Looking at converts and Muslim immigrants together allows Rogozen-Soltar to identify their differing experiences of belonging and exclusion, as well as the tensions that arise between them. Rogozen-Soltar explains that children born to convert parents refer to themselves as converts.
despite having been born into the faith. This is because the terms convert and migrant have become social categories tied to relations of inequality. Ethnic, racial, national, gender, and class boundaries separate Granada’s Muslims and allocate them different placements within competing, historically rooted imaginaries of Muslim Spain.

Rogozen-Soltar’s Chapter 1 examines what she calls “everyday historiography.” Her aim is to trace how residents articulate narratives about Granada’s Muslim past and how these narratives impact current Andalusian regional identity and the place of Islam in the region. In Chapter 2, “Paradoxes of Muslim Belonging and Difference” and Chapter 4 “A Reluctant Convivencia: Minority Representation and Unequal Multiculturalism,” she describes the strategies used by converts and Muslim migrants to carve out space for Islam in the city. Their strategies diverge and exclude each other at times. While converts claim that Islamic conversion is an inherently Spanish process, they are merely following the historical precedent of medieval Iberians. Migrants articulate their pride and sense of belonging as descendants of the Moorish conquerors that build the city and are thus cast as dangerous, unacceptable, and un-Spanish.

Chapter 3 is an original take on spatialization of religious and racial inequalities. By studying two neighborhoods, the touristic Albayzín, sometimes called “Little Morocco” or “Muslim Disneyland”, and compare it to a peripheral post-industrial zone called the Polígono, a notorious “Moroccan Danger Zone,” Rogozen-Soltar argues that, contrary to superficial analysis that would assign Islamophilia to the former and Islamophobia to the latter, the exclusion of Muslims occurs within the celebratory context of the Albayzín, while they are included as members of the neighborhood in the marginal Polígono.

Chapter 5, “Embodied Encounters: Gender, Islam, and Public Space” explores prevalent racial and gendered discourses about Islam, the body, and proper public sociability. It reframes headscarf controversies in Andalusia by considering them in relation to other bodily practices central to the embodiment of normative sociality in urban Granada, for instance consuming pork and wine while socializing in public places or showing public displays of affection. While headscarves are often considered “obstacles” to inclusion, the other normalized practices that entail subtle but pernicious social exclusion as well go unnoticed.

Rogozen-Soltar’s monograph is overall excellent. I would just have combined Chapters 2 and 4 and added a missing chapter on “Embodied Encounters” for men. While Rogozen-Soltar covers very well issues of gender as they pertain to women, the analysis of masculinity is sorely lacking. Overall, however, Rogozen-Soltar proves how Europe’s Muslim past continues to influence its presence and questions monolithic rosy narratives that herald Spanish convivencia (interfaith harmony) as the answer to Europe’s multicultural challenges.
Avi Astor’s *Rebuilding Islam in Contemporary Spain: The Politics of Mosque Establishment, 1976-2013* is a well-researched and well written monograph, the first one entirely dedicated to the conflicts over Mosque construction in Spain. Astor also spent many years doing field work in Spain and he also finds a good balance between sociological theory and analysis of the plentiful evidence he gathered during field work. Astor places the historical narratives on Islam in relation to contemporary concerns about internal migration, urban development, social inequality, and the marginalization of working-class neighborhoods.

It may not be as well-known as it should that hostility toward mosques since the 1990s has been greater in Catalonia than in other Spanish regions. Astor aims to find out why.

Chapter 1 analyses Spain’s open and inclusive policy towards Islam in the 1980s and 1990s and how the official recognition of Islam translated into political support for the construction of major mosques and a revival of Spain’s Islamic heritage that acted as a magnet for tourism. Chapter 2 explains that an increase in the number of Muslim arrivals, as well as a perception of them as threats after the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, halted previously welcoming narratives and increasingly framed Islam as a social problem to be managed and controlled, rather than an aspect of Spanish history to be celebrated and recovered. Chapter 3 delineates how internal Spanish migrants have been positioned socially and spatially in Catalonia. Chapter 4 shows how the social and spatial marginality of these internal migrants complicates the reception of Muslim immigrants and mosques in towns such as Badalona. Since not all anti-mosque campaigns have occurred in marginal areas, Chapter 5 looks at the conflicts in Mataró and Santa Coloma de Gramenet, where anti-mosque backlashes occurred in neighborhoods with high standing. In Chapter 6, Astor argues that the low incidence of anti-mosque campaigns in Madrid is due to the weaker socio-spatial divisions, as the urbanization of Madrid is more recent and even than that of Barcelona, and the absence of notable cultural and linguistic distinctions between internal migrants and native population in Madrid. In Chapter 7, Astor returns to Catalonia to address how public institutions have dealt with religious diversification by focusing on the approval of the pioneering regional law regulating centers of worship in 2009.

Astor convincingly proves that hostility towards mosques in Catalonia has been most pronounced in peripheral neighborhoods inhabited by internal Spanish migrants and their children. Astor draws on theories of prejudice and place-protective action to explain anti-mosque reactions. Building on Herbert Blumer’s classic theory of prejudice as a “sense of group position”, Astor explains that internal Spanish migrants in Catalonia felt socially alienated and discriminated against and opposing mosques became a means of contesting the boundaries that reinforce their marginalization. Anti-mosque campaigns have served as
mechanisms for marginalized communities to gain visibility and contest the neglect by public institutions of their neighborhoods. Narratives of urban injustice, compounded with Islamophobic positions fueled by anti-immigrant parties, emerged particularly in areas traditionally marginalized.

For residents of higher status neighborhoods, opposing mosques is a “means of preserving the boundaries that shield their communities from the social stigma and urban problems associated with immigration and ethno-religious diversification” (12). A mosque is constructed as a threat to their community because it could lower the values of their properties, act as a magnet for future migrant neighbors (associated with higher crime and social conflict) and divert into religious use space public funds that could be used for needed infrastructure.

One of the strengths of Astor’s monograph is to highlight “how meso-level factors particular to distinct regional and local settings amplify or mitigate the extent to which generalized prejudices become active social forces” (13). This approach would have been even more effective had Astor delved deeper into how regional narratives of belonging interconnect with anti-mosque campaigns. One of the factors that is sorely missing from the analysis is how Catalan nationalism has contributed to reinforce anti-immigrant sentiments in the region. First, by marginalizing socially and spatially those areas where internal migrants from other Spanish regions settled. Second, by setting a political and social agenda that prioritizes the socioeconomic concerns and cultural needs of ‘native’ Catalan speakers. Since Astor focuses on urban injustices and neighborhood grievances between peripheral areas and city halls, the responsibility of higher political levels becomes invisible.

In two instances, responsibility for an outcome that deprived Catalan Muslims of their religious rights cannot be solely squared in local politics. First, regional political leaders and institutional authorities alike were complicit in depriving the local Muslim community in Premià de Mar from building what would have been in 2000 the first purpose-built mosque in Catalonia in modern times. While Premià de Mar was not the first anti-mosque conflict, it was the first one that drew all political levels and parties. By forcing the local Muslim community to renounce its plans to build a mosque in the central plot it owned and had all legal permits for, Premià de Mar set a precedent that the religious rights of Catalan Muslims were contingent on anti-mosque activism. While Astor acknowledges that former president of the Generalitat, Jordi Pujol, tried to position himself in the middle and Pasqual Maragall, leader of the Socialist Party of Catalonia, “accused political elites and parties on the Right of exploiting issues of immigration for political gain,” a discussion of the role of Catalan nationalists, both on the right and left of the political spectrum, in anti-mosque conflicts is lacking (39).

Second, Barcelona is, together with Athens and Liubjana, one of only three large cities in Europe without a grand mosque. Astor rightly explains the lack of a
grand mosque in Barcelona by suggesting that the window of opportunity in the 80s and 90s that was used in other cities like Madrid or Valencia closed without having built one and the new transformed environment against Islam made it politically fraught to pursue it afterwards. I have argued elsewhere, however, that Catalan nationalists, both on the left and the right, are to be blamed for the Barcelona “mosque that never was” because they have prioritized the historical connection of Catalan nationalism with Catholicism over the rights to equal treatment of Catalan Muslims and have disregarded the symbolic power that a great mosque could offer their city. After reading Astor’s monograph, a reader unfamiliar with Catalan politics could be forgiven for concluding that Catalan nationalists have had little to no role in anti-mosque campaigns.

The academic study of Muslims in Spain has been elevated by the anthropological work of Rogozen-Soltar and the sociological approach of Astor. We are lucky in the field of Spanish migration studies to have such theoretically refined and empirically rich monographs in our hands. Make sure to enjoy them as much as I did.

Aitana Guia
California State University Fullerton