

This article was downloaded by: 10.2.97.136

On: 26 Sep 2023

Access details: *subscription number*

Publisher: *Routledge*

Informa Ltd Registered in England and Wales Registered Number: 1072954 Registered office: 5 Howick Place, London SW1P 1WG, UK



Edited by Javier Muñoz-Basols, Laura Lonsdale and Manuel Delgado

## The Routledge Companion to Iberian Studies

Javier Muñoz-Basols, Laura Lonsdale, Manuel Delgado

### The Modern City, 1850 to 1900

Publication details

<https://test.routledgehandbooks.com/doi/10.4324/9781315709895.ch25>

Benjamin Fraser

**Published online on: 28 Mar 2017**

**How to cite :-** Benjamin Fraser. 28 Mar 2017, *The Modern City, 1850 to 1900 from: The Routledge Companion to Iberian Studies* Routledge

Accessed on: 26 Sep 2023

<https://test.routledgehandbooks.com/doi/10.4324/9781315709895.ch25>

**PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR DOCUMENT**

Full terms and conditions of use: <https://test.routledgehandbooks.com/legal-notices/terms>

This Document PDF may be used for research, teaching and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproductions, re-distribution, re-selling, loan or sub-licensing, systematic supply or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden.

The publisher does not give any warranty express or implied or make any representation that the contents will be complete or accurate or up to date. The publisher shall not be liable for an loss, actions, claims, proceedings, demand or costs or damages whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with or arising out of the use of this material.

## 25

THE MODERN CITY,  
1850 TO 1900Urban planning and culture in Barcelona,  
Madrid and Bilbao*Benjamin Fraser*

Urbanization in nineteenth-century Spain – particularly as it unfolded during the second half of the century – was a cultural process as much as it was a material one. This is true both in the general and in the particular senses.

First, that is, the plans for restructuring cities were themselves inevitably cultural from the outset. Here, it is necessary to adopt a broad and interdisciplinary perspective on culture, one that focuses not merely on artistic expression but also on its ties with historical, social, geographical, political and economic forces and circumstances. From this perspective, all human activity may be considered cultural in nature – to one degree or another, perhaps. To wit: Hispanic Studies – a traditionally literary field – has been rejuvenated in recent decades by cultural studies approaches pushing for just this sort of broad and interdisciplinary understanding of culture. The volume you are presently reading is, in fact, testament to the growing primacy of this approach.

Second, however – and more importantly – it is the task of this chapter to delve into the cultural dimensions of Spain’s urbanization in a more specific way. There are two complementary parts to the understanding of the urban phenomenon charted out herein. One part concerns the “culture of urban planning” itself, while the other part concerns “urban culture.” Each is related to the other, such that neither should be viewed in isolation. Rather than precise terminology, these terms are mere provisional instruments for making sense of a larger process. Grasping this larger process entails returning urbanization to the wider context of human history. Doing so reveals that in producing urban environments we humans have been refashioning ourselves. This is true at once at both the grand scale of urban design and also at the scale of the everyday. Even though this chapter emphasizes the cultures of urban planning over urban culture considered more generally, it does make the effort to link the two together.

The cultural processes of designing and building urban environments find their complement in the everyday cultural processes by which we inhabit and live in cities. To see this, we must not take the city as a static object. That is, the city is not a mere container for our activities. Instead we must recognize that, just as we shape the city, the city shapes us in return. In fact, this reciprocal influence between human beings and our urban environment has long been a central part of the discourse of urban culture – one that can be traced through the twentieth century to the present day (e.g., Harvey 2012; Park 1968; Simmel 2010). Nevertheless, late

nineteenth-century urban planning and urban culture remain a privileged moment even in twenty-first century understandings of the city, as it was then that the urban became synonymous with the cultural project of modernity (Berman 1982; Choay 1969; T. Hall 1997; Harvey 2006; Larson and Woods 2005; Lefebvre 1995).

### The culture of urban planning

The “culture of urban planning” as it developed in the second half of the nineteenth century was clearly tied to a nexus of historical, political and economic circumstances (Lefebvre 1996; Sennett 1992, 2008). Waves of industrialization had effected rapid technological change, increasing the density of urban areas as well as contributing to the uneven geographical development of the city (Mumford 1938, 1961). That is, variation in the contours of the urban form tended to produce both areas of lower density with upper-class residents and also areas of higher density where poor living conditions often went hand in hand with poverty and disease (Cerdà 1991; Engels 1935, 1987; P. Hall 2002; Riis 1996). Governments launched systematic urban improvement projects both to combat the poverty and disease that unevenly affected urban populations and also – as had been evidenced already by King Carlos III’s late eighteenth-century beautification of Madrid, for example – at once to reimagine urban environments as emblematic triumphs of the modern age (Afinoguénova 2013; Fraser 2007a). The rise of the modern urban planner in the nineteenth century was thus linked organically to the technological changes wrought by industrialization and the renewed focus on the importance of cities as centers of economic trade and political power.

The role played by the planner in nineteenth-century society was also a direct result of the bourgeois specialization of knowledge that accompanied the increasing class division of capitalist labor (Lefebvre 2003). It may be noted that Hispanic Studies as a discipline has traditionally used the rhetoric of exceptionality to downplay both the spread of Enlightenment ideals in Spain and the presence there of bourgeois revolution (Carr 1970, 2000; Subirats 1981). Nevertheless, such a traditional approach has been critiqued by a strong recent tendency within the discipline (Afinoguénova and Martí-Olivella 2008; Ginger 2007; Lewis 1999). The strength of Spain’s planning traditions provides ample evidence that the country was very much subject to the same social dynamics that affected Western Europe during the 1900s (Chueca Goitia 2011; Fraser 2011a). As a specialized class endowed with the social power to shape urban space, European planners appeared to embody the scientific rationality of the Enlightenment tradition. In this sense, at least, Spain was no exception.

As a cultural practice, European planning activities were carried out in a decidedly social, political and economic context. Readers may be familiar, for example, with Baron Georges-Eugène Haussmann’s urban restructuring of central Paris in the second half of the nineteenth century (Choay 1969; Harvey 2006). That is, it is frequently said that the broad avenues produced by Haussmann’s urban renewal scheme had been designed to facilitate the march of a modern metropolitan police force, thus aiding in the control of potentially unruly and politically motivated urban crowds (Miles 2007). Yet even if the planner’s work was not driven directly by political power, it was necessarily a product of a certain class-inflected vision of the city.

Empowered by the metaphor of the city as an organism – following the seventeenth-century debates surrounding the circulation of blood through the body – nineteenth-century planners often envisioned the city as a vast circulatory system (Cerdà 1867; Fraser 2011b; Sennett 2008). Seen through this metaphorical thinking, streets became arteries, and part of the planner’s job

was to assure the free, unimpeded movement of traffic throughout the city. The insistence on maintaining this flow of traffic, of course, belied a commitment to intensified trading activities and capitalist commerce. Yet, the city was simultaneously a respiratory system, and the harmonious integration of green space into the urban fabric was also seen as paramount. The reasons for this had to do both with the realities of disease in dense city areas and also with the culture of urbanism (Cerdà 1867). That is, on one hand, trees and vegetation acted as the city's green lungs, keeping the air fresh and, it was believed, minimizing the potential for disease transmission. On the other, through planned green spaces, the city was turned into a garden of sorts. As was the case with public gardens already existing in Spain – modeled on the British and French traditions – the urbanite could visually consume the city's urban fabric and at once appreciate the domination of culture over nature (Fraser 2013; Frost 2008).

Emboldened both by these metaphors and by the social power they enjoyed, nineteenth-century planners cultivated a distanced, rational, even geometrical form of spatial thinking (Fraser 2011b; Resina 2003; Sennett 1992). Problematically, however, this thinking in essence reduced a living organism to a two-dimensional diagram (Lefebvre 1995). In this way, they dealt not with the city in time but with the city as a simple spatial object. The planned city manipulated in blueprints and representations was an abstracted, conceived space (Lefebvre 1995). Acting as surgeons, planners operated on the city as they might have a cadaver. They cut into the city's urban tissue and believed that in changing the built environment alone they might solve the greatest problems of humanity (Cerdà 1867; Fraser 2011a, 2011b; Soria 1996). In the end, the spatial and fragmenting approach to the city evident in urban plans from Spain's nineteenth century can be best understood as one particular way in which scientific bourgeois knowledge in general reduced a complex social totality into a number of presumably isolated parts (Lefebvre 2003).<sup>1</sup>

Building on the foregoing necessarily concise articulation, the following subsections – on Barcelona, Madrid and Bilbao – are intended to give neither a totalizing nor chronological account of the rise of city planning and urban culture in Spanish cities. Instead, these brief vignettes are to serve as privileged points of entry into key moments and aspects of urban transition in Spain. This account of the country's urban transitions illustrates the dynamics associated with European planning as a whole, but is related also to the astounding urban population growth affecting Spain's cities in particular during the second half of the nineteenth century. By the beginning of the twentieth century, that is, Barcelona's population had topped half a million inhabitants, and Madrid's population had almost doubled, increasing from under 300,000 in 1850 to more than 500,000 in 1900 (Fox 1989; Ugarte 1996). Spurred on by an industrial boom, even Bilbao's population almost tripled leading up to the turn of the century, surpassing 50,000 residents by 1900 (Basurto Ferro 1993; Zulaika 2003). Of course, the interested reader is advised to explore the readings listed in the works cited at the end of this chapter to acquire a more thorough background in the dynamics of urban change in nineteenth-century Spain.

### Barcelona

Perhaps more than any other nineteenth-century planner in Spain, the extensive urban writings of Ildefons Cerdà (1815–1876) provide insight into the connections between culture and planning outlined previously. Renowned for reportedly having coined the word *urbanización*, the Catalan planner was the author of numerous theoretical works on the nature of the urban phenomenon such as *Teoría de la viabilidad urbana y reforma de la de Madrid* (1861) and the two-volume *Teoría general de la urbanización* (1867) (Choay 1969; Degen 2008; Fraser 2011a,

2011b; Hughes 1992; Resina 2008). Cerdà is most well known, however, for his nineteenth-century design masterpiece: an expansion of Barcelona's central core (or *casco medieval*) known as the Eixample. Outlined, in part, in the *Teoría de la construcción de las ciudades aplicada al proyecto de reforma y ensanche de Barcelona* (1859), for this project he drew on his own statistical study (from 1856) of the poor living conditions of the working class in Barcelona. Following up on Friedrich Engels' already completed study of *The Condition of the Working Class in England* (1987 [1844]) – and anticipating Danish-born photojournalist Jacob Riis' polemic titled *How the Other Half Lives* (1996 [1890]), which would document life in the tenements of New York at the century's close – Cerdà hoped to apply the bourgeois science of urban planning to effect real social change where it was needed.

Interestingly, Cerdà's theoretical musings knowingly harnessed the organic metaphor of the city's environment so popular in nineteenth-century urban discourse. In his *Teoría general*, he purposely cast himself in the role of urban surgeon, proclaiming that “Introduciendo el escalpelo hasta lo más íntimo y recóndito del organismo urbano y social, se consigue sorprender viva y en acción la causa originaria, el germen fecundo de la grave enfermedad que corroe las entrañas de la humanidad” (1867, I: 16–17). In line with what would become known as the Haussmannization of Paris, Cerdà's rational and rectilinear vision subjected the city to a geometrical grid, touted the benefits of broad avenues and incorporated green space into the urban fabric of the Eixample at regular intervals. In fact, one of the planner's dictums cited the need to “urbanizar lo rural, ruralizar lo urbano [urbanize the rural, ruralize the urban].” Additionally, his invention of the *xamfrà*, or truncated corner – also implemented in Bilbao's nineteenth-century urban reform – was conceived as a way of allowing traffic to flow more freely through intersections in the city. This innovation not only anticipated the importance of automobile traffic in the early twentieth-century city, but it was also motivated by his realization that the construction of urban-built environments had been driven historically by modes of transportation and patterns of circulation (Cerdà 1867; Epps 2002; Fraser 2011b; Resina 2008; Soria 1996).

And yet, the contradiction visible in the Cerdà plan was one common to nineteenth-century planning as a whole. That is – perhaps despite his utopian socialist-inspired conception of the city and sympathy for the working class – the famed Catalan planner separated the lived city from the conceived city. Despite its originator's emphasis on mobility and movement, the plan – which was clothed in the triumphant and triumphalist rhetoric of modernity (Lefebvre 1996) – nevertheless reduced the city to being a simple object or set of static structures. The result was an area soon inhabited by the middle class and progressively distanced from the working-class culture that had fueled industrialization and concomitantly the urbanization of the modern nineteenth-century city. Robert Goldston puts it well: “The entire district is removed from the sight, smell and sound of the factories from which its wealth was drawn. Businessmen living in the Ensanche had no need to be aware of the hideous slums growing up in other parts of the city; they lived a suburban life, abandoning the central city to commerce, industry and the makeshift life of the poor” (1969, 78). Manuel Vázquez Montalbán would later remark that the planner's legacy is “an Eixample which has turned out to be as far from Cerdà's dreams as it is from the malevolent schemes of the speculators” (1990, 76).

## Madrid

In contrast to Barcelona (and Bilbao), Madrid boasted relatively little industry even by the mid-nineteenth century. Nonetheless, it, too, was soon subjected to the planner's blueprints

for urban change. The political center of Castillian Spain ever since Felipe II had named it the Spanish capital in the sixteenth century, Madrid's built environment was similarly reimagined as part of the process of cultural modernization that affected other cities in Spain. As the authors of the book *El ensanche de Madrid: historia de una capital* explain:

A mediados del siglo XIX, las principales ciudades europeas parecían decididas a traspasar el umbral de la Modernidad, afrontando una serie de profundas transformaciones que alteraría por completo las formas de vida del hombre urbano. [. . .] En la década anterior a la aprobación del Ensanche, los tejados madrileños vieron elevarse alguna columna de humo industrial (la fábrica de Gas); la plaza de Oriente pasaba de inhóspito descampado a regio espacio público; la sede de la soberanía se erigía sobre las recias columnas del Congreso; abría sus puertas, por fin, el Teatro Real, escaparate de lujo y envidias, escenario de anhelos de ascenso social; la Puerta del Sol dejaba de ser calle, se desperezaba y desenrollaba, a su vez, alguna de las arterias que venían a desembocar en ella; nuevos burgueses ricos plantaban sus palacetes, cual medallas a su triunfo social; las fuentes daban la bienvenida a las vivificadoras aguas del Lozoya; reverberaban los primeros silbidos del ferrocarril, y el gas, al tiempo que iluminaba cafés, lujosos salones y escaparates con la nueva moda venida de París, alumbraba miserables barridas y sucias callejuelas, un panorama, en definitiva, lleno de luces y sombras.

(Carballo *et al.* 2008, 59–60)

These historical and cultural shifts that accompanied urbanization during the second half of the nineteenth century in particular brought increased attention on the central areas of the city.

A new wave of urbanism sought to connect the centrally located (and then newly renovated) Puerta del Sol with the area that is today known as Callao and also with what is now the Plaza de España (Baker 2009; Haidt 2005). These urban changes, which were of course directly experienced by numerous Madrilenians, were captured on film by photographers intrigued by the city's refashioning as driven by the ideal of the modern city (Fontanella 1981). The Castro plan of 1860 had been an important attempt to formalize the city's expansion, and other, more ambitiously conceived plans were to follow (*Guía de la ciudad lineal* 2011; Fernández de los Ríos 1868). Importantly, the opening of the city's central areas occurred alongside the development of new transportation systems such as the tranvía – whose first line opened in 1871 and was dramatized in a prose work by Galdós (*Madrid en Galdós* 1988, 198–199) – which connected newly constructed peripheral areas to Madrid's urban core. Of course, in connecting bourgeois neighborhoods with the city center, this modern transportation also allowed the city's uneven geographical development to persist.

Another important outcome of this focus on rethinking Madrid's central neighborhoods was the idea to construct the Gran Vía beginning at Calle de Alcalá's intersection with the Palacio de las Comunicaciones (commonly referred to as Cibeles). Construction on the Gran Vía began on 4 April 1910 and, at a short 1362 m, the road would in time become synonymous with twentieth-century urban modernity in Spain (Baker 2009; Baker and Compitello 2003; Larson 2011; Ramos 2010). Importantly, however, although the 1907 plan used for the Gran Vía officially was the work of architects Francisco Andrés Octavio and José López Sallaberry, the idea for the road dates back to an 1886 plan by Carlos Velasco and, some say, can be traced back even as far as 1856 (Baker 2009; Fernández Cifuentes 2003).

## Bilbao

Conceived during a population boom that began in the second half of the nineteenth century, the 1876 Expansion plan for Bilbao was designed by engineers Pablo Alzola and Ernesto Hoffmeyer and the architect Severino Achúcarro (Basurto Ferro 1993; Cruz 2011; Zulaika 1999, 2003). As it had been with Haussmann's Paris and Cerdà's Barcelona, the plan for Bilbao was very much guided by an abstract, geometrical visual logic which saw the city as a set of static structures that needed to be opened up to increase movement and flow. An additional issue in this case, however, was that the city was envisioned in quite reductive terms, making its further expansion problematic.

Quizás lo más sorprendente del Plan de Bilbao era la ausencia de una visión metropolitana. Ciertamente que el Plan debía atender al territorio del ámbito municipal; igualmente cierto es el hecho de que no existía ningún ente de rango superior aglutinante de prioridades para los municipios de Bilbao Metropolitano. [...] Como consecuencia de esa falta de visión o vocación metropolitana de Bilbao, el plan estrangulaba el desarrollo de la ciudad con la proposición de un cinturón de ronda, un anillo, en una estructura, la del Bajo Nervión, de carácter lineal. La lectura del plano reflejaba cómo se había extraído la ciudad de Bilbao de su contexto metropolitano. Se había abordado el plan como si de una isla se tratara. Cuando la realidad era bien diferente. (Cenicacelaya 2009, 20–21)

As evident in this description, the fact that the Nervión River runs through the city on its way to the Cantabrian Sea did not sufficiently figure into the plan for Bilbao. But another problematic aspect of the plan – once again, one common to many urban plans of the nineteenth century – came from the way in which it dealt with the city's static structures alone and left the human city out of the equation. Of note here is the brief polemic, for example, evident in the pages of a Bilbao periodical appropriately named *El Nervión*, which involved Miguel de Unamuno (1864–1936). Therein, Unamuno – who has long been regarded as one of Spain's most noted authors, poets and philosophers – alleged that the urban reforms were motivated by the potential benefits they held for increased collective rents (Rivero Gómez 2008; Serrano 1986; Unamuno 1999). In the end, urban planning in Bilbao – just as in Madrid and Barcelona – was a much more complex process than the specialized scientific knowledge base of planning which was so widespread during the nineteenth century was able to admit.

If the work of contemporary critic Manuel Delgado Ruiz (1956–) is any indication, critics of urbanism in Spain today continue to draw attention to the distance between the city as conceived from above and as lived on the ground (Delgado Ruiz 1999, 2007a, 2007b; Fraser 2007b, 2011a). It may thus also be said that the main problem planners faced in the nineteenth century persists even today in the twenty-first century. That is, there is still a need to more fully recognize the social, political and economic context and implications of urban planning, just as there exists the need to define the city not merely as a set of structures, but also as a complex human organism.

## Urban culture

Although this chapter has focused more on the culture of urban planning, it is important to keep in mind that the pressures that urban population growth put on Spain's urban environments were not merely a matter for planners to consider. Their effects were palpable and were

felt by a cross-section of urbanites. That is, we must not overlook that at the same time that the specialist class of urban planners was dealing with the city as a conceived space, nineteenth-century urbanites were engaging with the city as a lived space. There were new forms of art, culture and social life – new ways of thinking and being in cities – that manifested themselves amongst urban populations. It is fair to say that the increased attention given to the urban form by specialized planners found its complement in the increased emphasis placed on city life by authors and artists.

In canonical examples of Spanish literature, authors turned increasingly toward representing the city (Baker and Compitello 2003; Frost 2008; Parsons 2003). In the first half of the nineteenth century, for example, public literary figures had emerged whose work privileged the urban environment (Baker 1991; Haidt 2005). Among these were Mariano José de Larra (1809–1837) and Ramón de Mesonero Romanos (1803–1882), who both resided in the Spanish capital and shared a similar interest in the city's streets. Mesonero was himself simultaneously a writer and also an active planner who helped to shape Madrid's urban fabric in no small way. While Mesonero saw the city as a triumphant and quintessentially human accomplishment, however, Larra tended to see in the everyday life of the city streets a darker side informed by the consequences of powerful institutions, which humans had created (Fraser 2011a, 2011c).

Building implicitly on such earlier costumbrist depictions of urban life in Spain, the second half of the century undoubtedly saw the cultivation of a modern sort of metropolitan aesthetic in prose works and the arts (Haidt 2009, 2011). Thus many writers either explored the textures of everyday life in the Spanish city directly (most significantly, author Benito Pérez Galdós in Madrid; as well as Narcís Oller, in Barcelona) or else interrogated this rapidly urbanizing society somewhat indirectly by focusing on the city-country opposition (e.g., the work of Emilia Pardo Bazán or Juan Valera) (Baker and Compitello 2003; Cruz 2011; Frost 2008; Mercer 2013; Resina 2008; Williams 1973). Importantly, too, literary products by these and other authors set an urban tone that was to be discernable, also, in early twentieth-century works (see Baker and Compitello 2003; Fraser 2011a; Larson 2011; Ramos 2010; Ugarte 1996).

It must be acknowledged, of course, that there is a difference between urban culture, on one hand, and the culture of urban planning, on the other. Above all else, this means accepting that studies of the monumental city alone are, in reality, a study of those same power structures and cultural assumptions (social, political and economic assumptions) which drove urban reform in the nineteenth century. In the prologue to his fundamental study *Materiales para escribir Madrid* (1991), Edward Baker regards narrow definitions of urban culture with suspicion for their potential complicity with non-democratic power: “Este punto de mira supone el rechazo de la concepción pseudomonumentalista y sacralizadora de la capitalidad, y parte del convencimiento de que Madrid es y debe ser cada día más villa que corte, movimiento necesario hacia el control colectivo, aún más lejano, de las condiciones en que se desenvuelve la existencia de cuatro millones de madrileños” (1991, xiii). Appropriately, this comment may be taken both as a specific critique of Francisco Franco's monumental urban nationalism and also as a more general call to democratize the notion of urban culture in the monumentalized forms that have endured from the nineteenth century until the present day (see also Baker 2012).

In truth, the connections between cultural texts (whether literary in the traditional sense or not) and their nineteenth-century urban contexts have not been sufficiently explored as of yet. It is significant that interdisciplinary work on urban culture in Hispanic contexts can claim a history dating back at least three decades. For example, two days in late October 1983 – at the ninth annual Hispanic Literature conference on “Los escritores y la experiencia de la ciudad moderna” – twenty-eight scholars presented a series of original and quite novel papers on the



city, edited for publication by Dr. Juan Cruz Mendizábal. Hispanist scholars have increasingly turned to investigating the urban culture of the twentieth century in Spain, more often than not focusing on Madrid or Barcelona, and likewise the urban cultures of cities across Latin America. Still, there remains much work to be done in the exploration of the urban phenomenon as it relates to Spanish cultural studies in the nineteenth century in particular (Fraser 2012; Graham and Labanyi 2000).

As emphasized throughout this chapter, it is important to see the modern city as a construction stemming from two complementary cultural forces: on one hand, the culture of urban planning as it was conceived by a specialist class, and on the other, the urban culture experienced by inhabitants in that city. It is true that, because of the often divergent social, political and economic interests that shape each of them, these two forces may be seen as necessarily antagonistic to each other. Yet it is the concept of culture that links them both. Ultimately, a more capacious view of culture is necessary if we are to understand the complexity of Spain's nineteenth-century urban modernity.

### Note

- 1 Françoise Choay builds on discussion of Ildefons Cerdà and Eugène Haussmann specifically to enumerate three relevant points that define the nineteenth-century planning process in general and which are supremely important for understanding urbanism as it unfolded in Spain. These are “(1) the city is conceived as an object: both theoretically and in its reality, the modern city came out of the same type of reflective effort that produced the nineteenth-century concepts of art and labor. [. . .] As a consequence of this process and of the century's general awareness of history, the concepts of historical monument and preservation of the past were created;” “(2) An analytical method is used, both in the study of the object and in the elaboration of projects. The key words are *classification* and *system*. Its use of classification, in which visual factors were extremely important, appears to have been borrowed from the natural sciences. Moreover, the concept of function evolved by the new biology becomes the basis of the systems created by the city planners who also apply to the city biological images such as circulation, nucleus and cell;” and “(3) Two objectives are given exclusive priority: traffic and hygiene” (Choay 1969, 26–27).

### Works cited

- Afinoguénova, Eugenia. 2013. “Liberty at the Merry-Go-Round: Leisure, Politics, and Municipal Authority on the Paseo del Prado in Madrid, 1760–1939.” *Journal of Urban Cultural Studies* 1 (1) 85–106.
- Afinoguénova, Eugenia and Jaume Martí-Olivella, eds. 2008. *Spain Is (Still) Different*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Baker, Edward. 1991. *Materiales para escribir Madrid: Literatura y espacio urbano de Moratín a Galdós*. Madrid: Siglo XXI.
- . 2009. *Madrid cosmopolita: La Gran Vía, 1910–1936*. Madrid: Marcial Pons y Fernando Villaverde.
- . 2012. “Madrid de *caput regni* a capital nacional: toponimia y cultura conmemorativa de 1812 a 1840.” In *Capital Inscriptions: Essays on Hispanic Literature, Film and Urban Space in Honor of Malcolm Alan Compitello*, edited by Benjamin Fraser, 105–22. Newark, DE: Juan de la Cuesta.
- Baker, Edward and Malcolm Alan Compitello, eds. 2003. *Madrid. De Fortunata a la M-40: un siglo de cultura urbana*. Madrid: Alianza.
- Basurto Ferro, Nieves. 1993. “El primer ensanche de Bilbao: oportunismo y vacío legal.” *Cuadernos de Sección Historia-Geografía* 21: 229–242.
- Berman, Marshall. 1982. *All that Is Solid Melts into Air*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Carballo, Borja, Rubén Pallol, and Fernando Vicente. 2008. *El ensanche de Madrid: historia de una capital*. Madrid: Editorial Complutense.

- Carr, Raymond. 1970. *Spain 1808–1939*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . 2000. *Spain: A History*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cenicacelaya, Javier. 2009. “Bilbao y la urgencia de un urbanismo sostenible.” In *Urbanismo en el siglo XXI*, edited by Jordi Borja and Zaida Muxí, 17–33. Barcelona: Escola Tècnica Superior d’Arquitectura de Barcelona.
- Cerdà, Ildefons. [1859] 1991. *Teoría de la construcción de las ciudades aplicada al proyecto de reforma y ensanche de Barcelona*. In *Cerdà y Barcelona*, 107–450. Madrid: INAP/Ajuntament de Barcelona.
- . [1860] 1991. *Pensamiento económico. Cerdà y Barcelona*, 457–71. Madrid: INAP/Ajuntament de Barcelona.
- . [1861] 1991. *Teoría de la viabilidad urbana y reforma de la de Madrid. Cerdà y Madrid*, 45–280. Madrid: MOPT/Ayuntamiento de Madrid.
- . 1867. *Teoría general de la urbanización*. 2 vols. Madrid: Imprenta Española.
- Choay, Françoise. 1969. *The Modern City: Planning in the Nineteenth Century*. Trans. Marguerite Hugo and George R. Collins. New York: George Braziller.
- Chueca Goitia, Fernando. 2011. *Breve historia del urbanismo*. Madrid: Alianza.
- Cruz, Jesús. 2011. *The Rise of Middle-Class Culture in Nineteenth-Century Spain*. Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University Press.
- Degen, Mónica Monserrat. 2008. *Sensing Cities: Regenerating Public Life in Barcelona and Manchester*. London: Routledge.
- Delgado Ruiz, Manuel. 1999. *El animal público*. Barcelona: Anagrama.
- . 2007a. *Sociedades movedizas: pasos hacia una antropología de las calles*. Barcelona: Anagrama.
- . 2007b. *La ciudad mentirosa. Fraude y miseria del “modelo Barcelona.”* Madrid: Catarata.
- Engels, Friedrich. 1935. *The Housing Question*. New York: International.
- . 1987. *The Condition of the Working Class in England*. Edited by Victor Kiernan. London and New York: Penguin.
- Epps, Brad, ed. 2002. “Barcelona and the Projection of Catalonia.” Special section of the *Arizona Journal of Hispanic Cultural Studies* 6: 191–287.
- Fernández Cifuentes, Luis. 2003. “Fachadas del 98: la reconstrucción del escenario metropolitano a raíz de las guerras coloniales.” In *Madrid de Fortunata a la M-40: un siglo de cultura urbana*, edited by E. Baker and M. A. Compitello, 87–113. Madrid: Alianza.
- Fernández de los Ríos, Ángel. 1868. *El futuro Madrid*. Madrid: Imprenta de la Biblioteca Universal Económica.
- Fontanella, Lee. 1981. *La historia de la fotografía en España desde sus orígenes hasta 1900*. Madrid: El Viso.
- Fox, E. Inman. 1989. “Introducción.” In *Aventuras, inventos y mixtificaciones de Silvestre Paradox*, edited by Pío Baroja, 9–44. Madrid: Espasa-Calpe.
- Fraser, Benjamin. 2007a. “Madrid’s Retiro Park as Publicly – Private Space and the Spatial Problems of Spatial Theory.” *Social & Cultural Geography* 8 (5): 673–700.
- . 2007b. “Manuel Delgado’s Urban Anthropology: From Multidimensional Space to Interdisciplinary Spatial Theory.” *Arizona Journal of Hispanic Cultural Studies* 11: 57–75.
- . 2011a. *Henri Lefebvre and the Spanish Urban Experience*. Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press.
- . 2011b. “Ildefons Cerdà’s Scalpel: A Lefebvrian Perspective on Nineteenth-Century Urban Planning.” *Catalan Review* 25: 181–200.
- . 2011c. *La urbanización decimonónica de Madrid: textos de Larra y Mesonero Romanos*. Doral, FL: Stockcero.
- . 2012. *Capital Inscriptions: Essays on Hispanic Literature, Film and Urban Space in Honor of Malcolm Alan Compitello*. Edited by Benjamin Fraser. Newark, DE: Juan de la Cuesta.
- . 2013. “Madrid, Histological City: The Scientific, Artistic and Urbanized Vision of Santiago Ramón y Cajal.” *Symposium: A Quarterly Journal of Modern Literatures* 67 (3): 119–134.
- Frost, Daniel. 2008. *Cultivating Madrid: Public Space and Middle-Class Culture in the Spanish Capital, 1833–1890*. Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press.
- Ginger, Andrew. 2007. “Spanish Modernity Revisited: Revisions of the Nineteenth Century.” *Journal of Iberian and Latin American Studies* 13 (2): 121–132.

- Goldston, Robert. 1969. *Barcelona: The Civic Stage*. London: Collier-Macmillan Ltd.
- Graham, Helen and Jo Labanyi, eds. 2000. *Spanish Cultural Studies: An Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Guía de la Ciudad Lineal. [1928] 2011. Valladolid: MAXTOR.
- Haidt, Rebecca. 2005. "Visibly Modern Madrid: Mesonero, Visual Culture and the Apparatus of Urban Reform." In *Visualizing Spanish Modernity*, edited by Susan Larson and Eva Woods, 24–45. New York: Berg.
- . 2009. "Flores en Babilonia: los 'Gritos' de Madrid y el imaginario urbano hacia 1850." *Journal of Spanish Cultural Studies* 10 (3): 299–318.
- . 2011. "Commodifying Place and Time: Photography, Memory, and Media Cultures around 1850." In *On Photography, History and Memory in Spain*, edited by Maria Nilsson. *Hispanic Issues On Line Debates* 3: 10–29.
- Hall, Peter. 2002. *Cities of Tomorrow*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Hall, Thomas. 1997. *Planning Europe's Capital Cities: Aspects of Nineteenth – Century Urban Development*. London: E and FN SPON.
- Harvey, David. 2006. *Paris: Capital of Modernity*. New York: Routledge.
- . 2012. *Rebel Cities*. London: Verso.
- Hughes, Robert. 1992. *Barcelona*. New York: Knopf.
- Larson, Susan. 2011. *Constructing and Resisting Modernity: Madrid 1900–1936*. Madrid and Frankfurt: Iberoamericana/Vervuert.
- Larson, Susan and Eva Woods, eds. 2005. *Visualizing Spanish Modernity*. Oxford: Berg.
- Lefebvre, Henri. 1995. *Introduction to Modernity*. Translated by John Moore. London and New York: Verso.
- . 1996. *Writings on Cities*. Edited and translated by E. Kofman and E. Lebas. Oxford, Blackwell.
- . 2003. *The Urban Revolution*. Translated by Robert Bononno. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Lewis, Tom. 1999. "Structures and Agents: The Concept of 'Bourgeois Revolution' in Spain." *Arizona Journal of Hispanic Cultural Studies* 3: 7–16.
- Rodríguez Puértolas, Julio. 1988. *Madrid en Galdós, Galdós en Madrid*. Work by Galdós (*Madrid en Galdós* 1988: 198–199). Madrid: Comunidad de; Madrid: Consejería de Cultura.
- Mercer, Leigh. 2013. *Urbanism and Urbanity: The Spanish Bourgeois Novel and Contemporary Customs (1845–1925)*. Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press.
- Miles, Malcolm. 2007. *Cities and Cultures*. New York: Routledge.
- Mumford, Lewis. 1961. *The City in History: Its Origins, Its Transformations, and Its Prospects*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World.
- . 1970. *The Culture of Cities*. 1938. New York: Harcourt, Brace Jovanovich.
- Park, Robert. 1968. "The City: Suggestions for the Investigation of Human Behavior in the Urban Environment." In *The City*, edited by R. E. Park, E. W. Burgess and R. D. McKenzie, 1–46. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Parsons, Deborah L. 2003. *A Cultural History of Madrid: Modernism and the Urban Spectacle*. Oxford: Berg.
- Ramos, Carlos. 2010. *Construyendo la modernidad: Escritura y arquitectura en el Madrid moderno (1918–1937)*. Lleida: Universitat de Lleida.
- Resina, Joan Ramon. 2003. "From Rose of Fire to City of Ivory." In *After – Images of the City*, edited by Joan Ramon Resina and Dieter Ingenschay, 75–122. Cornell, NY: Cornell University Press.
- . 2008. *Barcelona's Vocation of Modernity: Rise and Decline of an Urban Image*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Riis, Jacob. 1996. *How the Other Half Lives: Studies Among the Tenements of New York*. Edited by David Leviatin. Boston, MA: Bedford Books of St. Martin's Press.
- Rivero Gómez, Miguel Ángel. 2008. "Desarrollo político en el joven Unamuno: Antecedentes de su etapa socialista." In *Miguel de Unamuno: estudios sobre su obra III*, edited by Ana Chaguaceda Toledano, 165–79. Salamanca: Ediciones Universidad Salamanca.

- Sennett, Richard. 1992. *The Conscience of the Eye: The Design and Social Life of Cities*. New York: W. W. Norton.
- . 2008. *The Craftsman*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Serrano, Carlos. 1986. “Unamuno y El Nervión de Bilbao (1893–1895).” In *Volumen-Homenaje cincuentenario de Miguel de Unamuno*, edited by María Dolores Gómez Molleda, 303–322. Salamanca: Universidad de Salamanca.
- Simmel, Georg. 2010. “The Metropolis and Mental Life.” In *The Blackwell City Reader*, edited by Gary Bridge and Sophie Watson Malden, 103–110. Oxford: Wiley – Blackwell.
- Soria y Puig, Arturo. 1996. *Cerdà: las cinco bases de la teoría general de la urbanización*. Barcelona; Madrid: Fundació Catalana per a la Recerca; Sociedad Editorial Electa España.
- Subirats, Eduardo. 1981. *La ilustración insuficiente*. Madrid: Taurus.
- Ugarte, Michael. 1996. *Madrid 1900: The Capital as Cradle of Literature and Culture*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Unamuno, Miguel de. 1999. *Escritos Bilbainos (1879–1894)*. Edited by José Antonio Ereño Altuna and Ana Isasi Saseta. Bilbao: Erando/A. G. Rontegui.
- Vázquez Montalbán, Manuel. 1990. *Barcelonas*. Translated by Andy Robinson. London: Verso.
- Williams, Raymond. 1973. *The Country and the City*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Zulaika, Joseba. 1999. “‘Miracle in Bilbao’: Basques in the Casino of Globalism.” In *Basque Cultural Studies*, edited by William A. Douglass, Carmelo Urza, Linda White, and Joseba Zulaika, 263–274. Reno, NV: University of Nevada/Basque Studies Program.
- . 2003. *Guggenheim Bilbao Museoa: Museums, Architecture and City Renewal*. Reno, NV: University of Nevada/Center for Basque Studies.

