



Trials, Emergence and Consolidation of Social and Cultural Anthropology in Spain

Eloy Gómez-Pellón

Abstract. – Owing to the varying academic traditions in different countries, it is understandable that social or cultural anthropology, with those names or with others, has followed trajectories worthy of being studied. In Spain, academic compartmentalisation, scientific underdevelopment, opposition to acknowledging cultural diversity within the national state, and the lack of interest in exotic alterity after the loss of the colonial empire in the late 19th century are some of the reasons why social anthropology (also as ethnography or ethnology) was included, in a fragmentary state, in numerous pre-existing scientific fields until finally it became institutionalised academically in the 1960s, either associated with history as cultural anthropology or with sociology as social anthropology. [*Spain, history of anthropology, history of ethnology, history of social sciences, institutionalisation of anthropology*]

Eloy Gómez-Pellón, Professor of Social Anthropology at the University of Cantabria (Spain), PhD in Anthropology and Licentiate in Law and History. He is member of the Iberoamerican Institute at the University of Salamanca (Spain) where he is involved in the master's program in Latin American Studies, the master's program in Anthropology of Iberoamerica, and the doctoral program in Social Sciences. Furthermore, he taught at the University of Bordeaux (France) and the University of São José (Brazil). – His current research interests include plural identities, social change, and rural spaces in Spain and the Americas. He has published in several journals, including *Ethnologie française*, *AIBR – Revista de Antropología Iberoamericana*, *Revista Española de Antropología Americana*, *Revista de Antropología Social*, and *Gazeta de Antropología*. Together with Přemysl Mácha he is editor of the anthology “Masks of Identity. Representing and Performing Otherness in Latin America” (Cambridge 2013); see also Ref. Cit.

Introduction

The academic institutionalisation of social anthropology in Spain took place at a very late date. Be-

fore 1968, when the first permanent chair in cultural anthropology was created at a Spanish university, at Barcelona University, the presence of this field of knowledge in university life was very weak, although not non-existent. Indeed, although no course was taught in Spanish academic tradition that could truly be called social or cultural anthropology, some subjects, generally associated with History courses, partially covered this science under such names as ethnography and ethnology. Additionally, in philosophy courses subjects were taught that, directly or indirectly, corresponded to philosophical anthropology. Finally, another subject has formed part of natural sciences since the nineteenth century with the name of physical anthropology, and this has occasionally been of a generalist character.

1 Anthropologies and Anthropologists

The keys to an explanation of this situation are to be found in the second half of the nineteenth century when, within the scientific interest in all aspects of humankind and under the influence of evolutionist theories, a series of disciplines belonging to very diverse fields of knowledge claimed the right to study anthropology. Philosophy, law, educational studies, zoology, medicine, and other subjects competed in the institutionalisation of anthropology and, therefore, in the nineteenth century in Spain, instead of “anthropology” there were “anthropologies” (Gómez-Pellón 2000). The irreconcilable differences between them did not allow the necessary agree-

ment to make possible the academic advent of social anthropology.

Thus, the final years of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth century were marked by the attempt of zoology to lead a naturalistic anthropology, within the development of biological sciences that had occurred since the mid-nineteenth century after the triumph of the theory of evolution. Only the impossibility of reducing human beings to strictly naturalistic categories stimulated the interest of the naturalists themselves in constructing an anthropology that included the study of the cultural creations of humans as a complement to the physical aspect of the subject. The reason is that such scholars as Manuel Antón, Luis de Hoyos, and Telesforo de Aranzadi, among others, had been pupils of Quatrefages (Ortiz 1987) and, consequently, they believed that human qualities marked an important difference from those of other animals, which led to the supposed existence of the so-called *hominal kingdom*. This anthropology, far from producing a cultural viewpoint, led to a disarticulated subject, isolated from the main theoretical developments of the time, which finally resulted in an encyclopaedic anthropology, lacking in any profound reflections on human beings.

Under the pressure of this naturalistic anthropology, which was institutionalised academically in Madrid Central University (Universidad Central) in 1892, when Manuel Antón became the first professor in the subject, other anthropologies like those proposed by the faculties of medicine slowly disappeared. In this way, the anthropology *par excellence* in the academic world would be natural anthropology taught by zoologists. Going further back in time, an analogous conception of anthropology created out of the prestige of natural sciences is seen in the anthropological societies that were founded in the second half of the nineteenth century, such as the Spanish Anthropological Society formed in Madrid in 1865, Seville Anthropology Society, founded in 1871, Tenerife Scientific Cabinet, created in 1877, and Las Palmas Canary Islands Museum, established in 1879. All these institutions were encouraged by intellectuals and free thinkers influenced by transformist doctrines, and in all cases the underlying anthropology was impregnated by raciological conceptions and produced an anthropology based on generalities, very different from what we understand as social anthropology today.

For the same reason, the antecedents of modern social anthropology are not to be found in the Natural History Society created in 1871, the Anthropological Museum founded in 1875, the Natural History Museum established in 1883, or that profes-

sorship in anthropology created in the Natural Sciences Faculty of Madrid Central University in the last decade of the nineteenth century (Puig-Samper y Galera 1983). In Spain, where in the last quarter of the nineteenth century and first half of the twentieth century there was no scientific discipline devoted to the study of what we understand as social anthropology today, its origins can vaguely be traced in institutions dominated by Krausists in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. Krausist philosophy, with its roots in the philosophy of law created by supporters of the German philosopher K. C. F. Krause in Spain, headed by J. Sanz del Río, was almost unique in Europe and would lead its supporters to seek a positivism in accordance with the pragmatism they preached. In the early nineteenth century, when he published his “Urbild der Menschheit” (1811), Krause had maintained that the different historical forms are only the result of the evolution of humankind seen in institutions. These institutions form and develop at their own speed, and, therefore, it is not possible to know the social organism without understanding that it is a great unit integrating the behaviour of the organs and institutions forming it: family, nation, people, etc. (Gómez-Pellón 1996, 1997). The social transformism that was coupled with Krausist thought made it especially open to Darwin’s theory of evolution published in the mid-nineteenth century.

This concept of anthropology, closer to what in time would become social anthropology, is found within the activity carried out by the Free Institution of Education founded in Madrid in 1876 by these Krausist thinkers as a way of expressing opposition to the suppression of the freedom of university teaching that occurred in Spain in 1875, in a similar way to the temporary measure in 1867. In fact, one of the subjects taught in the Free Institution of Education by Francisco Giner de los Ríos after 1877 was called “Social Anthropology” when that name had still not been popularised in the United Kingdom (Lisón 1971).

The origins of Spanish social anthropology can also be found remotely in the work of Krausist professors (including Adolfo González Posada and Rafael de Altamira) in the Practical School of Legal and Social Studies founded as an extension to the Law Faculty at Oviedo University in 1895, in which they taught sociological and anthropological theory (Gómez-Pellón 1993: 504–509). It was precisely the pragmatism of their philosophy that caused them to value the knowledge of what they called “the new social sciences” (sociology and anthropology) in all their actions. In fact, this Practical School of Legal and Social Studies was a model inspired by the

“École Pratique des Hautes Études” in Paris, which was well-known to most Krausists. However, it was an ephemeral experience and the school closed in the early twentieth century.

A more direct attempt to achieve the academic institutionalisation of social anthropology occurred in 1900 when, due to the tenacity of the Krausist intellectuals, the first “Faculty of Law and Social Sciences” was established in Madrid Central University. This was to teach sociology and anthropology within a curriculum that would later reach all the law faculties (Gómez-Pellón 1996, 1997). Unfortunately, the plans soon were thwarted and thus the project of introducing into Spanish universities the studies of sociocultural anthropology,¹ inspired by English courses and proximate to French ethnology.

There is no doubt that all these experiences were not in vain and these Krausist intellectuals, from the professorships they held in Spanish faculties of law, encouraged and brought to life social sciences which until that time had had no place in the Spanish academic tradition. In this way, Gumersindo de Azcárate is regarded as one of the pioneers of sociology in Spain, while Manuel Sales y Ferré and Adolfo González Posada are considered the first true sociologists. Similarly, Rafael de Altamira is known as the founder of the history of science in Spain (Lisón 1971; Gómez-Pellón 1997). They were all Krausists and they all cultivated social sciences in general, even if they paid greater attention to some of them in particular, which is not different to the situation of followers of these sciences outside Spain, with Durkheim a good example in that respect. The fact is, that in the case of what is now understood as social anthropology, the work of Adolfo González Posada and other Krausists interested in promoting this social science did not take roots in the late nineteenth century and the early twentieth century. However, in Spain it is undoubtedly in the context of Krausism that the conception of anthropology, proximate to what today characterises the subject known as social anthropology, can be found, although academic institutionalisation did not occur by that route.

The reason why the institutionalisation of a field of knowledge coinciding with what we now call social anthropology did not take place can be sought, first, in the fossilisation of universities in Spain and, secondly, in the competition between the different anthropologies. Apart from social anthropology these were philosophical and zoological, medical,

educational, etc. (Gómez-Pellón 2000). These anthropologies hindered the possibility of forming an institutionalised social anthropology and tried to occupy its gnoseological place in academic life in the first decades of the twentieth century. In this way, they maintained their trajectory begun in the previous century, despite the efforts of the “Krausopositivists,” as they were known in Spain because of their positivist approach to social reality, going beyond mere speculations about it.

The reason why the scientific and academic emergence of a true social anthropology did not take place in Spain, neither in the late nineteenth century nor in the early twentieth century, is undoubtedly connected with the general atmosphere of crisis in the country at that time. Whereas the metropolises in the large colonial empires were experiencing a situation of expansion, which encouraged anthropologists to carry out their research with the financial support of governments and other institutions, Spain suffered the loss of its last colonies in a climate of pessimism and frustration, which climaxed in the decolonisation of Cuba and the Philippines in 1898. In the absence of the necessary institutional stimulus, the ideal conditions for the flourishing of interest in the study of other cultures could not exist. Instead, a kind of general reflection on humankind was made from very different standpoints, on a predominantly naturalistic basis and isolated from the great theoretical and methodological problems of social and cultural anthropology being debated in other European and American countries. It was only with great difficulties and thanks to the tenacity of intellectuals, at that time regarded as heterodox like A. Machado y Nuñez, that the transformist and evolutionist theories of C. Darwin, T. H. Huxley, and E. Haeckel (vide Caro Baroja 1973) reached Spain in the last quarter of the nineteenth century, in an atmosphere that was hardly suitable for arousing interest in the social evolutionism proposed by the sociology of H. Spencer and the anthropology of E. B. Tylor.

However, as the birth of a true sociocultural anthropology, supported on rigorous empiricism, did not take place, and while the different anthropologies opted to approach philosophy, law, medicine, etc., an interest in the study of regional cultures was taken up by students of folklore from very different perspectives from those of social anthropology and occasionally without the necessary theoretical framework. In the last quarter of the nineteenth century, the work of folklore scholars was stimulated in the regions of Spain that experienced the so-called “cultural renaissance,” spurred on by the rise of nationalism (Prat i Carós 1991). Indeed, folklore

¹ Because in Spain, as in other countries, anthropology is sometimes described as social and other times as cultural, in this text I shall use the term “sociocultural anthropology.”

became even more important in the first decades of the twentieth century when these studies were institutionalised in the different centres and institutes created by regional administrations in an attempt to stimulate the knowledge of vernacular cultures. Some examples are the “Arxiu d’Etnografia i Folklore de Catalunya” (founded in 1915, at the behest of Tomás Carrera i Artau, Professor of Ethics at the University of Barcelona), the “Sociedad de Estudios Vascos” (1918), and the “Seminario de Estudios Galegos” (1923).

It should also be recalled that in the late nineteenth century some university professors began to approach anthropology from philosophy. The most significant example is Miguel de Unamuno (Gómez-Pellón 1998), who initially became interested in ethnology through the standpoints of German cultural sciences and carried out fieldwork in the Basque Country. He thus contributed in Spain to the introduction of theoretical contents of the new social sciences within the Krausist field, in which he was active. Indeed, Unamuno was very familiar with Spencer’s work, because he was one of his translators into Spanish, and also with Durkheim’s, stimulated by the theories of both social evolution and natural evolution, which explains why he was one of the disseminators of Darwin’s theories in Spain. Another example is the equally important philosopher José Ortega y Gasset a few years later, who followed Unamuno by approaching ethnology theoretically through German cultural sciences under the influence of Leo Frobenius and Paul Schebesta. Like Unamuno, he also was aware of the French and English schools of sociology.

2 Permanences and New Tendencies

From the later nineteenth century onwards, Spanish universities taught subjects that were not given the name of anthropology but whose syllabuses partly coincided with what is now regarded as socio-cultural anthropology. The clearest examples were ethnography and ethnology, names that were used synonymously in Spain. Although these did not become separate studies, they were institutionalised academically together with prehistory and even formed part of the names of the corresponding university departments. In reality, this convergence had been the consequence of the application of a strategy in science, like European prehistory, not based on the study of written documentation, which was equally useful for the study of non-European primitive societies and which formed a major part of ethnography and ethnology. In this way, prehistory and

occasionally archaeology were responsible for the study of ethnography and ethnology in Spain from the late nineteenth century on, although unfortunately without giving it any preference. Instead, it was a complement, a discipline associated with prehistory. However, by the end of the first half of the twentieth century, ethnology, or ethnography, had become a subject in arts courses at many universities, albeit always on a secondary level.

It is obvious that most prehistorians and archaeologists who taught ethnography and ethnology lacked a specialised training and even the academic means to be able to satisfy the scientific knowledge of these subjects. Their specialities – prehistory and archaeology – required educational and research dedication, which did not allow them to study ethnology in greater depth. This is the reason why, in general, these lecturers were not aware of new developments in the field of ethnography and ethnology, and many of them continued to teach evolutionism and diffusionism in the mid-twentieth century. Functionalism had few followers, as the synchronic perspective in the movement clashed with the diachronic view that historians held of events. The political and intellectual isolation of Spain after the 1930s worsened the situation considerably. The climate of intellectual intolerance meant that many university professors chose to go into exile, including some with an interest in ethnological studies. Additionally, some students of folklore outside the universities were also forced to leave the country when they were accused of encouraging nationalism.

The first ethnological studies carried out after the Spanish Civil War, from the 1940s to the 1960s, ahead of the emergence of true social anthropology in the 1960s, confirmed the interest of Spanish ethnologists in studying national culture rather than exotic cultures. This was because of a series of reasons, some of which were decisive, such as an attachment to tradition in Spain, the scientific stagnation of Spanish universities, and the political isolation of the country. Spain’s decline in international politics meant that the countries, which had formed part of its old empire, received less attention, with a consequent temporary cooling of the former cultural community. In addition to the permanent economic crisis of the state during the period of autarchy that followed the Spanish Civil War, which lasted over two decades and resulted, among other things, in insufficient grants for researchers, especially for those hoping to make their career in the context of social sciences, these are the main reasons why the first Spanish social anthropologists, who began their studies in the 1960s, opted for continuity in researching Spanish culture.

In the mid-twentieth century, within a profound anthropological drought in Spain, the one outstanding exception is Julio Caro Baroja, a researcher trained as a historian and who through the prehistory taught by Hugo Obermaier at Madrid Central University came into contact with pre-Columbian archaeology and ethnography of America, taught by Hermann Trimborn at the same university. However, Caro Baroja deserves the credit for attempting to revive some of the institutions in which sociocultural anthropology subsisted, such as the Anthropological Museum and the Museum of the Spanish People in Madrid. The collaboration he started with the former in 1942 was continued when he became head of the latter in 1944. Both museums held large collections, as the former guarded the objects acquired by the Ministry of Overseas after the big expeditions in the second half of the nineteenth century and the second conserved the documentation from the national surveys made by Madrid Athenaeum, one of which was carefully studied by Lisón Tolosana (1977a, 1977b). The Museum of the Spanish People, despite attempts first of Luis de Hoyos Sáinz and later of Julio Caro Baroja, never developed and as it may now be said disappeared, meanwhile the National Anthropological Museum has become more important. In addition, Caro Baroja's long career left its mark on the Higher Council of Scientific Research (Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas [CSIC]), the Spanish research agency founded in the 1940s (Sánchez Gómez 1992) by making use of the infrastructure of the Council for the Enlargement of Studies, a typically Krausist institution, originally founded in 1907. As Caro Baroja was connected with the CSIC from its foundations, he was able to maintain intellectual leadership over the ethnological and oral literature studies carried out by this institution, generally under his directorship, through the Institute of Philology, the origin of the modern Institute of Language, Literature, and Anthropology in the CSIC.

At the same time as Caro Baroja faced such an adverse situation in post-war Madrid, Ramón Violant i Simorra, a student of folklore and influenced by the ethnology of Fritz Krüger, was working at the Museum of the Spanish People in Barcelona, and it might be said that the position of both was not very different from that of Jorge Dias in Portugal. Their publications compensated for an extremely difficult time for sociocultural anthropology in the Iberian Peninsula. Above all, in 1943 Caro Baroja published "The Peoples in the North of the Peninsula," which can be considered the starting point of his impressive personal career and the beginning of a new stage in Spanish anthropology, as it was fol-

lowed up almost immediately afterwards by "The Peoples of Spain" (1946).

This line of research, between ethnology and ethno-history and opened up by Caro Baroja, was in harmony with others proposed by professors of prehistory and archaeology, who often expressed the need to collaborate with ethnology. A true representative of this line, some years before, had been the renowned prehistorian and professor at Barcelona University, Bosch i Gimpera, who had trained at foreign universities with grants from the Council for the Enlargement of Studies (one of the institutions supported by Spanish Krausists), and who went into exile after the Civil War. Bosch i Gimpera, a permanent professor at the Autonomous National University of Mexico after 1941 and secretary general of the International Union of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences (IUAES) from 1953 to 1966, was not an exception in the interest in teaching ethnology.

It should be recalled that, at the same time, at both the Complutense University of Madrid and the University of Seville, a section of the History of America had existed since 1944, devoted mainly to studying the archaeology and history of America. In the case of Complutense University, in 1950, a "Spanish Seminar of Indigenous Studies" was soon founded, which immediately was associated with American ethnology. This seminar would subsequently foster an anthropology which, taught by these Americanists, captured tendencies that were already common in the whole of Latin America, and which was increasingly influenced by North American cultural anthropology. At the same time, after the arrival of one of these professors, José Alcina Franch, at the University of Seville in 1959 to occupy the chair in "Pre-Hispanic America and American Archaeology," a "Seminar of Cultural Anthropology" was founded, following the example of Madrid. Cultural anthropology was the term used in the USA and in the whole of America, but in this case, the intention was to apply anthropological knowledge to both America and Europe. In this way, two projects were started up with the aim of studying northern Mexico and western Andalusia, comparatively and simultaneously. These would become further breeding grounds for Spanish social and cultural anthropology, which was developing despite still not being institutionalised academically.

3 Foreign and Spanish Anthropologists

This time of the slow development of sociocultural anthropology in the Spanish academic world, in

the 1950s, coincided with the publications of some foreign anthropologists who had chosen various regions of Spain as their object of study. After a first attempt by Oscar Lewis, it was George Foster, Michael Kenny, and above all, Julian Pitt-Rivers with his monograph “The People of the Sierra” (1954) about the Andalusian village of Grazalema who pioneered a long series of studies about Spanish rural communities. Their works were models for young Spanish university lecturers interested in sociocultural anthropology at that time, as well as the following generations of students. Caro Baroja published “Saharan Studies” in 1955, influenced by E. E. Evans-Pritchard as he researched one of the few enclaves of Spanish colonialism in Africa. He gradually published some important works at the same time as he became the host *par excellence* of foreign anthropologists visiting Spain like G. Foster and J. Pitt-Rivers. At a time when colonial empires began to be a thing of the past and primitive people were disappearing very quickly, thus causing a crisis in the object of sociocultural anthropology, Mediterranean countries began to attract the attention of many anthropologists who found the paradigm of the traditional societies they sought in their archaic economic and social structures.

In the 1940s, the only journal with an interest in ethnology that can be considered truly important was the *Revista de Dialectología y Tradiciones Populares*, founded in 1944 and which combined linguistic studies with others that can be barely classified as ethnographic ones, while anthropological articles were even rarer. Nonetheless, the situation of anthropology in Spain, as explained above, displayed clear signs of change. It was precisely in the 1950s that some of the anthropologists who had gone into exile after the Civil War started to return. One of them was the priest J. M. de Barandiarán, who had maintained his leadership in Basque studies while living in France. Initially in favour of diffusionism he was not well known outside the Basque Country, unlike his initial colleagues the naturalists Telesforo de Aranzadi and Enrique Eguren y Bengoa. Indeed, Barandiarán remained restricted to the Basque Country, constructing highly detailed surveys, which prevented him from playing an active part in the institutionalisation of Spanish sociocultural anthropology.

In the 1950s, numerous foreign anthropologists, mostly from the USA, carried out their doctoral theses in different regions of Spain with which they would maintain a special connection after finishing their research. In this way, they were a model and stimulus for young Spanish anthropologists. Together with O. Lewis, G. Foster (1953), J. Pitt-Rivers

(1954), J. B. Aceves (1971), and M. Kenny (1962) we can cite William A. Douglass (1969), D. J. Greenwood (1973), and later J. MacClancy (1993) in connection with the Basque Country; S. H. Brandes (1975) and R. Behar (1986) for Castile; S. Tax Freeman (1970) and W. A. Christian Jr. (1972) for Cantabria and Castile; J. W. Fernández for Asturias (1974); D. D. Gilmore (1980), I. Press (1979), S. H. Brandes (1975), D. D. Gregory (1976), and later M. D. Murphy (1983) for Andalusia; K. Moore (1976) for the Canary Islands; E. C. Hansen (1969) and K. A. Woolard (1985) for Catalonia; and R. A. Barret (1974), S. F. Harding (1984), and J. Fribourg (1980) for Aragon, just to give some examples. Many of these authors’ works were translated into Spanish, owing to the interest they aroused. These anthropologists often published articles in the new Spanish anthropological journals, thus feeding with their works the Spanish publishing market.

The prolonged stay of these English and American anthropologists after their initial visit was no different from what happened to other anthropologists in other Mediterranean countries. Some of their publications – first as articles in the 1960s and 70s and then as books – have become classics in research on Mediterranean societies,² in which the Mediterranean became a valued object of study, as Stanley H. Brandes (1991) showed with exceptional acumen. In reality, the Mediterranean is not a true cultural unit, but a cultural area in which several cultures are very closely related as a consequence of similar ecological conditions and the experience of a shared history. This explains not only the relationship between them all but also the existence of similar institutions and values (cf. Álvarez Munárriz y Antón 2001). The empirical understanding of the Mediterranean was a laboratory of experiences after the 1940s, when decolonisation and modernisation processes made exotic cultures lose importance and threatened the traditional object of social anthropology.

One special case is that of Claudio Esteva Fabregat, who entered the anthropological scene in Spain in the late 1950s. Born in Spain, he was trained in the National School of Anthropology and History in Mexico, which in those years was a point of reference, among other reasons because of its close relationship with American anthropology. Esteva Fabregat came to Spain in 1959 and joined the “History of America” section at the Complutense University of Madrid, where he taught “Ethnology of America,”

2 Pitt-Rivers (1954); Brandes (1975, 1980); Gilmore (1980); together with the collective works edited by Peristiany (1965, 1987).

which he complemented with working at the National Ethnology Museum. He came from a country where anthropological studies had grown powerfully and he soon had the opportunity to take part in the foundation of the School of Anthropological Studies in Madrid, whose main purpose was to train post-graduates and where he quickly was provided with the assistance of José Alcina Franch, who had just returned from the University of Seville, and the Americanist Manuel Ballesteros Gaibrois. Almost at the same time, in 1967, the History of America Section at the Complutense University founded two departments that continue to exist today: one devoted to the history of America and the other responsible for teaching American anthropology and ethnology as well as the archaeology of America. The fact is that the “School of Anthropological Studies” is definitely the most direct antecedent of the academic institutionalisation of sociocultural anthropology in Spain.

Indeed, although the life of this school was brief, as it only reached 1968, and even though it was not strictly within a university structure, it was a unique experience, as it helped to train young graduates who were attracted to anthropological studies and had not been able to acquire appropriate training in their undergraduate courses. Besides, its end was but the start of a new success, as Esteva Fabregat’s intense activity had persuaded academic authorities of the need to create a permanent post for a specialised anthropologist, for the first time in the history of Spanish universities. In this way, in 1969 Esteva Fabregat passed the examination to hold that post and joined the “Department of Prehistory and Ancient History” at the University of Barcelona as an associate lecturer in ethnology (Capel 2009). Hence, the teaching of the discipline was institutionalised academically with the name by which it was known in many European countries, as, e.g., in France.

A few years later, in 1971, Esteva Fabregat took up the chair at Barcelona University, whose title had been changed to cultural anthropology, which was the name of the department the professor was to run from that time on, independently from history studies. The new name also enabled the definitive break with an old tradition according to which, as explained above, ethnography and ethnology were taught by lecturers in prehistory, which has continued to the present time. Additionally, it allowed the subject that had officially been created to take a direction in accordance with the real perspective that Esteva Fabregat had adopted in his teaching, in line with his Mexican training. It should also be noted, that Esteva Fabregat’s activity outside university circles had led him to accept the directorship

of the Peninsular Ethnology Centre, dependent on the Higher Council of Scientific Research (CSIC) in the late 1970s. At the same time, he had taken part in the creation of the journal *Ethnica* in 1971. Throughout that decade and until it disappeared in 1984, the journal enjoyed an enormous prestige, as it became the true mouthpiece of the research Spanish anthropologists were carrying out in those years.

However, this was not the only new development in connection with anthropology at Spanish universities in the early 1970s. At that time, Carmelo Lisón Tolosana began his university activity in the Sociology Department at the Complutense University of Madrid within the Faculty of Political Sciences and Sociology, after obtaining a Ph.D. at the Institute of Anthropology at Oxford University, with a thesis supervised by E. E. Evans-Pritchard (Campo Urbano 1992: 189–209). In 1972, overcoming the restrictions in Spanish academic traditions, the Department of Sociology was created at the Complutense University of Madrid with a post ascribed to the area of sociology in order to teach a course of social anthropology. The post was filled by Lisón Tolosana himself, shortly after publishing a reference work titled “Antropología social en España” (1971). The social anthropology thus introduced in the Complutense University, with the characteristic English name, was a model that was very similar to but slightly different from the American cultural anthropology taught at Barcelona University. The most important point is, that from that time onwards the social anthropology Lisón Tolosana taught in Madrid was going to find an open road towards its own independence, before leading at the end of the decade to a new academic qualification, as a speciality of sociology, just as Radcliffe-Brown had conceived it in his time.

4 From the Emergence to the Consolidation of Social Anthropology in Spain

The slow emergence of sociocultural anthropology in Spain beginning in the 1960s is related to the stimulus produced by the publication of articles by foreign anthropologists, mainly from Britain and the USA, who carried out their research in different parts of Spain. When these types of studies first were carried out in the backwards and impoverished post-war Spain of the 1940s, pioneered by Pitt-Rivers (1954), English social anthropology already enjoyed a long history in the study of exotic societies and a shorter experience in the analysis of modern European societies. The persistence in the choice of Spanish culture as an object of study was because

of the clear preference of these foreign anthropologists for Mediterranean countries, where they found societies still following traditional ways of life and somewhat refractory towards modernisation. In these societies, institutions tied to the family and the local community acquired an unusual strength within a framework of profound inequality in access to the use and ownership of the land. This generated several forms of patronage and clientelism as ways of expressing the dominant powerful ranking, while the value structure was influenced by sharp differences in status, depending on sex, wealth, power, and prestige.

For Spanish anthropology in the 1960s and 70s, this presence of foreign anthropologists implied the reception of various influences from the theoretical and methodological points of view and helped the integration of Spanish anthropologists in the international scientific community (Prat i Carós 1989; Prat i Carós et Gisclard 2000). At the same time, the subject of anthropology was enriched because it empowered Spanish anthropologists' criticism of the research models followed by foreign anthropologists, in some cases owing to the inconsistency in the results obtained. Additionally, some Spanish anthropologists rebelled against a phenomenon that was called *scientific colonisation*, albeit without questioning the major contribution made by those foreign anthropologists in the development of social anthropology in Spain.

It should be stressed that one of the first studies rigorously carried out by a Spanish anthropologist with the premises of social anthropology was written by Lisón Tolosana (1966; published by Oxford University Press) under the supervision of Godfrey Lienhardt. In this book, Lisón Tolosana carries out an exemplary study of a town in Aragon whose anonymity was preserved under the name of Belmonte de los Caballeros. In this way, Lisón Tolosana, a researcher trained at Oxford, maintained the interest of English social anthropology in Spain and Mediterranean countries at that time, while he also became a worthy continuer of the tradition among Spanish anthropologists, who gave preference to research on Spanish culture. Lisón Tolosana's book "Belmonte de los Caballeros" (1966), which was published in a new edition in 1983 (by Princeton University Press), has never been published in Spanish. This was on the express wish of the author who, in this way, always attempted to respect the confidentiality of the social actors who appeared in the book.

However, in Spain in the late 1960s, the time when academic anthropology began to be institutionalised, there were many questions that received few answers at that time. The main question referred

to the delimitation of the units of analysis. Socio-cultural anthropology had changed a great deal during the twentieth century and it was necessary to inquire about the exact objects of study in a country like Spain, where the most important peculiarity was that research looked inwards and not towards a foreign otherness. Lisón Tolosana, author of the most emblematic book at that time, had chosen to produce a monograph which was not different from the preferences shown by other researchers in those years. It was accepted, that a monograph allowed a meticulous and profound analysis of a small human space (village, small town, valley, etc.), which was given the name of *community* in an attempt to demarcate a relatively separate and, if possible, relatively homogeneous human group, and in this way find the ideal conditions for the application of a methodology that in the past had been used to study exotic societies. An early study about this type of problem applied to Spain is found precisely in Esteva Fabregat (1969), and a slightly later one in Kenney (1971). Note that the former study did not even name the science it was cultivating as anthropology, even though it was written in the second half of the twentieth century.

This academic and scientific progress of socio-cultural anthropology, however, did not hide some more profound differences between the general and sociocultural approaches. This can be seen in the proceedings of the first and second meetings of Spanish anthropologists held in Seville and Segovia in 1973 and 1974, organised by the "Department of the History of America" in Seville University and the "Department of American Anthropology and Ethnology" at Complutense University, respectively. The first, which was organised within the field of a general anthropology led by cultural anthropology, was attended by specialists in physical anthropology, archaeology, social anthropology, etc., but with the discrepant absence of Caro Baroja, who did not find a place for his ethnological or ethnohistorical project in that meeting. At that time, Caro Baroja (1973) published the article "Mundos circundantes y contornos histórico-culturales," where he declared his faith in the ethnohistorical perspective. According to Caro Baroja, societies are subjected to change for historical reasons, which cannot be ignored in anthropological analysis, especially in Western societies with abundant written information about the passing of time in any cultural space. He gives the example of the Basque Country (Guipúzkoa, in particular), where he observed the combination of historical or diachronic elements with other synchronic ones, within a unit of research which can be approached using ethnohistorical methodology.

In the 1973 Seville meeting, Lisón Tolosana presented a study titled “Panorama of the Programme of Social Anthropology in Spain” (1975), in which he advocated the decisive emergence of an autonomous social anthropology, independent from general anthropology but in line with the predominant anthropology in Europe and especially in Britain. The debate was open, and had become extremely virulent, at a time that was to prove transcendental for Spanish anthropology. Lisón did not attend the second meeting in Segovia and, in view of the route that Spanish anthropology was taking, still in its formative phase, he opted to organise the first meeting of social anthropologists, which began with a symposium in Puerto Marín (Lugo) in 1974 (Lisón 1971), and which was attended by some American anthropologists who had carried out fieldwork in Spain (S. Tax Freeman, J. W. Fernández, and W. A. Christian Jr.) as well as a small group of anthropologists who had set out on their careers as teachers or researchers in Spain (T. San Román, R. Valdés del Toro, E. Luque Baena, M. Cátedra Tomás, and other scholars, including J. Mira).

During the 1970s, little by little anthropology, sometimes qualified as social (with its reference in the “Anthropology Department” at the Complutense University) and other times as cultural (according to the model at Barcelona University), was added to the curricula at Spanish universities in Madrid (Complutense University, Autonomous University, and the Distance University), in Catalonia (Barcelona University, Autonomous University, and the section of the Barcelona University in Tarragona), and at the Universities of Santiago de Compostela, Seville, and La Laguna (Tenerife). They forged a path which in the 1980s and 90s was to be followed by numerous Spanish universities. They fed an enthusiasm which had its repercussion in the unstoppable growth in the number of university lecturers teaching anthropology and the addition of a qualification in social and cultural anthropology at numerous universities, which were always the centres that had formed large groups of lecturers in the previous years. By the late 1990s, there were some twenty units – areas of knowledge (*campos de conocimiento* in Spanish terminology) – teaching social anthropology in Spain in the same number of universities. About 150 permanent lecturers were working there, which contrasts with the situation in the late 1960s, when sociocultural anthropology was a subject still absent from Spanish universities.

The “Anthropology in the Spanish State” congresses began in 1977 with the first congress in Barcelona. The second congress was in Madrid in

1980, and since then they have been held every three years, without a break, at different Spanish universities. The proceedings of these congresses reveal much of the intra-history of Spanish anthropology in the late 1970s, when acrimonious debates discussed the theoretical and methodological definition of sociocultural anthropology, which affected both the delimitation of the units of observation and analysis and the interpretation of new paradigms, to give two examples, always from critical standpoints. These questions and other similar ones were expressed in the journal *Ethnica*, for example, by Moreno Navarro (1972), and were raised, among others, by Lisón Tolosana (1975) and Frigolé (1975) in the “First Meeting of Spanish Anthropologists” in 1973 and, in fact, continued to be raised in later years, even until the Barcelona (1977) and Madrid (1980) congresses.³

5 The Conceptual Debate and the Means of Expression

What were the topics addressed by Spanish anthropology in the late 1970s and early 1980s? Naturally, as stated above, community studies were very common. The influence of functionalist anthropology and the British school in general, the models created by English and American anthropologists, at least since J. Pitt-Rivers carried out his fieldwork in Spain, and the limited funding for other kinds of studies encouraged the Spanish community studies. Although the first critical texts about this approach started to appear in those years, studies performed in country or rural environments continued as the result of a trend that had accompanied Anglo-American anthropology for decades, of which the interest in traditional societies in Mediterranean Europe was a good proof. Even the model developed by C. Lisón Tolosana (vide Sanmartín Arce 1994) in “Belmonte de los Caballeros” (1966) had encouraged this symbiosis of community with the rural context. However, another theme, although somewhat less common, as explained by J. Prat (1989) who has studied these types of observations, was that of marginal groups, beginning with gypsies who attracted Spanish anthropologists at the time, especially as they fulfilled the requirements of proximity and low financial cost (San Román 1976).

3 Congresses have been held in Barcelona (1977), Madrid (1980), San Sebastián (1984), Alicante (1987), Granada (1990), Tenerife (1993), Zaragoza (1996), Santiago de Compostela (1999), Barcelona (2002), Seville (2005), San Sebastián (2008), Leon (2011), and Tarragona (2014).

However, these topics were soon to undergo changes. In the late 1970s, Spain was in a political transition after the Francoist period which ended in 1975 and a new constitution was passed in 1978, leading to the decentralisation of the state and the creation of 17 autonomous regions, as well as the two autonomous cities in North Africa. This meant that the new autonomous communities took charge of the funding of research studying their identity. For this reason, many Spanish anthropologists at that time opted to return, with new premises, to the old nineteenth century–early twentieth century folklorism and regional ethnological studies. They were topics that guaranteed a connection with a tradition that was steadily disappearing. It can thus be understood how in those years, studies were carried out in all regions about the history or knowledge of folklore research and, complementarily, about the first ethnologists.

However, regional and local identity was expressed in anthropological studies in other ways, as, e.g., by studying regional festivals and rituals, which supposedly represented a kind of distillation of the purest attributes of the group personality (Velasco 1982). It may also be added, that together with traditional manifestations of culture, festivals and popular events are studied whenever they are representative of collective identities, even if they lack an inveterate tradition (Cucó y Pujadas 1990). In consequence, studies of territorial or regional identity were paradigmatic in Spain in the 1980s. It should be added that the studies published about regional identity generally concluded that it unarguably existed. The negation of identity or the demonstration that it was a diffuse or weak identity would not have received funding when regional authorities were anxious to justify themselves and find explanations to support the existence of multiple and often duplicated administrations.

Perhaps the most elaborate expressions of anthropology in that decade were studies on migration within Spain. The rapid development of Spain in the 1960s and 70s had produced a significant interior movement of people from rural areas, usually in the centre of the country and mainly in Andalusia, Extremadura, and Castile, towards the nearest cities and, particularly, to the largest Spanish cities and those favoured by economic growth. Thus, the young Spanish anthropology chose as one of its subjects the ethnicity produced by migration in areas of contrasting cultures, such as those by immigrants from Andalusia and Extremadura in Catalonia. Manifestations of identity, sociability, kinship networks, the strengthening of group personality, and other topics of that kind were researched by the

young anthropologists for their degree and doctorate studies and also by some academic anthropologists who needed to find topics with which to test their theoretical paradigm and their methodology.

Shortly before, a kind of revolt had taken place against foreign anthropology, when Ginés Serrán Pagán (1980) published “La fábula de Alcalá y la realidad histórica en Grazalema,” attacking Pitt-Rivers’s work and the studies of other English anthropologists who had carried out fieldwork in Spain. He considered that they had turned Andalusia into an enclave with a long series of clichés, whose common denominators were archaism and cultural exotism. In addition, this rebellion coincided with the crisis that was occurring in *community* studies within which Pitt-Rivers’ classic work on Grazalema was framed. This village in the Serranía de Ronda had been studied by the English anthropologist under the supervision of Evans-Pritchard. He not only studied the Andalusian world as a perfect example of a backwards Mediterranean society, but also because Grazalema was thought to represent the homogeneous and separate *community* Pitt-Rivers needed to construct his theory and to apply the methodology in accordance with it. Shortly afterwards, Serrán Pagán’s critique was supported and amplified in the same direction by Isidoro Moreno Navarro (1984a, 1984b).

Another very important event in connection with anthropologists’ object of study was the passing of Law 16/1985 of Spanish Historical Heritage. In the first place, the anthropological study of historical heritage or cultural heritage could represent a prolongation of studies on identity. This approach to heritage by Spanish anthropologists has been a characteristic of recent years, which explains why museums (the expression of collective identities and of their memory) have become an object of study with countless additional topics. However, in one of the countries in Europe and even in the world that receives largest numbers of foreign visitors, cultural heritage attracted special attention in anthropological approaches to tourism, in terms of cultural tourism. In consequence, studies on cultural heritage in general and on museums in particular, together with their management, became important objects of study for Spanish sociocultural anthropologists in the mid-1980s.

While the studies of collective identities and cultural heritage became very characteristic topics in Spanish anthropology, often but not only under the aegis of the political situation, other topics gradually consolidated as persistent objects of study within the thematic fields that were being defined. Some examples among these are: processes of change,

gender and feminine studies, the anthropology of health, social movements, and cultural sustainability of natural heritage. Furthermore in the course of social change, new topics were introduced, one of which was very typical of Spain in the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries: immigration from overseas. Spain, which until the early 1990s had been a country of emigrants, saw its role inverted when it began to receive immigrants who steadily increased in number and produced an image of Spain that was the opposite of the traditional situation, as they created a plural society. In other words, Spanish anthropologists could study other cultures inside their own country, where they could find alterity, and, therefore, it was possible to separate the groups they were studying a little more: the observer and the observed displayed cultural differences that had not always been present in the short history of Spanish anthropology.

The activity of publishing houses has been inseparable from research as regards the development of social anthropology. In addition to the powerful influence exercised by the largest publishers in the Hispanic world, like Siglo XXI, Fondo de Cultura Económica, Amorrortu, etc., which published the translations of many of the fundamental theoretical works from the 1960s onwards, other Spanish imprints like Akal, Anagrama, Tecnos, PPU, Adara, Alianza, Taururs, Península, Mitre, and Ariel have published works as well as some institutions, such as CIS and the publication services of the main universities. However, difficulties in the demand have often accompanied anthropology and led to some publishers losing interest. The number of publications increased as a result of the different journals edited by university departments, CSIC, and other institutions.⁴

4 The *Revista de Dialectología y Tradiciones Populares*, founded in 1944 and connected to the CSIC which channels ethnological studies is the longest running journal in Spanish anthropology. Another well-established journal is *Revista Española de Antropología Americana*, associated with the “History of America Section” at the Complutense University, which was created in 1955 and, like the previous journal, continues to be published. In 1971, a journal closely tied to the academic institutionalisation of social anthropology was founded with the name of *Éthnica*. Promoted by Esteva Fabregat, it published some major articles until it disappeared in 1984. A different example is the *Gaceta de Antropología* belonging to the “Department of Philosophy II” at the University of Granada; created at the same time as this emergence of anthropology and first published in 1982, it is still being produced. Equally, the “Institut Català d’Antropologia,” first brought out *Quaderns* in 1980 and its publication continues. The *Revista de Antropología Social* appeared in 1990, belonging to the “Social Anthropology Department” at the Complutense University of Madrid and promoted by the

6 On Teaching and Curricula

If anthropology has followed a path with certain peculiarities in its aspect of research, the same can be said of anthropology in the educational field. The number of lecturers increased slowly during the 1970s, mainly due to the inclusion of anthropology in the curricula of humanities and social sciences, which is to say, through the employment provided by the universities themselves. The growth was largest in the universities that made anthropology a speciality of other degrees. Thus, cultural anthropology became a speciality in history degrees at some universities (University of Barcelona, Autonomous of Barcelona, Seville, etc.) while social anthropology in some cases became a speciality of sociology, as at the Complutense University of Madrid.

Before the early 1990s, the number of anthropology students in Spain, as a speciality of history or sociology, was very small. However, in 1991, certain events marked a turning point in Spanish anthropology. The most important of these was the introduction of a licentiate⁵ in social and cultural anthropology. The originality of the new licentiate was that it became one of the few courses known as “Second Cycle” in Spain. This meant that the licentiate in social and cultural anthropology could be obtained by studying a single two-year-cycle, provided that the first-cycle-studies (which is to say, the first three years of university studies) had been completed as well as the complementary courses that each university considered necessary, depending on the previous studies. Later, in 1992, the Ministry of Education accepted another option, which allowed students who had carried out the first cycle in a long list of humanities and social sciences⁶ to pass directly to the second cycle in social anthropology, without any complementary courses. In addition, in the same announcement the ministry allowed access to an anthropology licentiate directly, again with no complementary courses, for all students with a qualification in primary education, nursing, social work, and social education.

director of the department at that time, Lisón Tolosana. This journal still is published as well as the *Revista de Antropología Experimental*, founded in 1990 by the anthropology section at the University of Jaén.

5 At that time, the typical university qualification in Spain was a five-year licentiate consisting of a three-year “First Cycle” and a two-year “Second Cycle.”

6 Students who in the first cycle had studied one of the following courses were exempted from the complementary studies: fine arts, philosophy, economics, business studies, law, sociology, political sciences, psychology, education, history, geography, humanities, journalism, audiovisual communication, and advertising, and public relations.

A new ministerial announcement in 1993, invoking “the multidisciplinary nature of the licentiate in social and cultural anthropology” enlarged the benefits of the previous ruling to include students who had taken the first cycle in history of art or any philology course. Because of all these changes in the early 1990s, the universities offering a licentiate in social anthropology saw an exponential growth in the number of students. It was a time in which several public and even private universities included social and cultural anthropology among the courses they offered. This route was particularly useful for students who had taken the first cycle of a course and who had been unable to continue in the second cycle that would give them access to a licentiate, as specifically mentioned in the ministerial announcement in 1992. However, some years later, a new measure was adopted in the Ministerial Announcement ECI/442/2005. This time, the right of access without taking the complementary courses was extended to “any official licentiate course and any first cycle of official university studies.” Curiously, the announcement explained the reason for this decision by invoking the “heterogeneity existing among the courses that currently allow access to this licentiate.” Notice the *Petitio principii* in the argument, as the 1993 announcement had precisely forced the heterogeneity of access by proclaiming the “multidisciplinary nature of anthropology.”

The advantages of the introduction of a qualification in anthropology with the characteristics described above have been clear because of the benefits of training, that anthropology has been able to give to students as well as the professional effects that a degree in anthropology may have represented, especially in those cases where the students’ career was obstructed as a consequence of lacking a licentiate or similar qualification. It is also possible that for many students it has provided a double benefit, both educational and professional. For university teaching staffs, the existence of a second-cycle-qualification has been beneficial as the growing number of students has led to a significant increase in the number of lecturers. Thus, university departments and units have consolidated in the attempt to achieve a place within university studies in Spain, which has been very positive for social and cultural anthropology. It can be said, that from this point of view the ministerial orders leading to the introduction of the new qualification allowed anthropology to strengthen its development that had begun forty years earlier and which has resulted in the consolidation of its academic space.

The number of students who have been awarded a licentiate in social and cultural anthropology in

Spain since the early 1990s, thanks to the administrative decisions described above, is very high.⁷ Indeed, the social demand has not matched the number of graduates in anthropology leaving Spanish universities. It is likely that most vacancies specifically requiring a qualification in anthropology have been in the universities themselves or very particular sectors of the administration. However, as many students were already in employment, thanks to a previous qualification, while they studied anthropology they have been able to improve their level of training in their original jobs, whereas in other cases the degree in anthropology has been an advantage in terms of promotion at work. In the latter cases, the qualification has often not been a licentiate in social anthropology but any other higher qualification. Indeed, there seems to have been a certain coincidence in the previous studies carried out by university departments that have developed a degree in anthropology in Spain, according to which 80% of the anthropology students, in the middle of the first decade in this century, were in employment when they started their courses. In most cases they were in permanent posts, which they maintained while studying, a situation which is completely different from that in other university courses. Consequently, the number of students in employment when finishing their courses is equally high and similar to the number at the beginning. However, in these cases it might be thought that anthropology graduates will become efficacious administrators of the subject in their jobs or in their relationships with other people.⁸

One of Lévi-Strauss’s texts (1954) may be recalled to show how he announced a future for anthropology involving an increasing social recognition and demand for professionals. In the 1950s, the French anthropologists envisaged two sociocultural spaces in which anthropology would play a significant role in sociocultural management. The

7 The creation of the European Higher Education Area, with the consequent uniformisation of university qualifications, has changed this scenario. As the Spanish “Second-Cycle” qualifications are not valid in this area, academic anthropology has become a four-year degree course, comparable from all points of view with other university qualifications of the same level. The number of universities teaching this course has decreased noticeably, owing to a reduced demand. A large number of Spanish universities offer Masters courses specialising in sociocultural anthropology.

8 Since 2009, social and cultural anthropology, which is the usual title of this qualification in Spain, has been included in the European Higher Education Area with significant changes. The course, which now leads to a degree, consists of a single four-year cycle, which is taught at a much smaller number of universities that offer licentiate courses and is followed by considerably fewer students.

first of these was co-existence with other cultures, not only abroad but also within one's own culture, where the problems inherent with immigration would arise. The second space would be that of social phenomena, typical of the anthropologist's society but equally characterised by "distancing," often due to their marginality but also rooted in the unconscious. Lévi-Strauss gave the examples of delinquency, prostitution, resistance to health and food changes, etc. It is clear that much has changed since then and new problems have arisen for which social and cultural anthropology in its practical or applied aspect now possesses long and well-tested experience. Although it is true that Lévi-Strauss fully identified the fields in which anthropology can act, it is no less true that since then specialities in social sciences have appeared oriented towards the solution of some of the problems noted by the French anthropologist: social workers, social educators, etc.

Conclusion

Anthropology, which is understood in different ways in Europe and in the rest of the world, and generally described as social, or cultural, or both, has followed a different route in each country towards its full institutionalisation. In the case of Spain, this route displays some unique characteristics, if it is borne in mind that its academic institutionalisation occurred in the late 1960s. The reasons for its particular route are various, but they are basically founded in the nineteenth century, in a national state like Spain, which was clearly opposed to the acknowledgement of an ethnic, religious, or cultural alterity in the country. Equally, in a country that after the loss of most of its colonial empire in the late nineteenth century and first third of the twentieth century lost the interest in other cultures. At the same time, the rigid and archaic structures of university life restricted the introduction of sciences that did not form part of the most traditional academic model.

In this way, the potential emergence of Spanish anthropology in the nineteenth century was replaced by a multitude of natural, medical, educational, legal, and philosophical anthropologies that did not succeed in identifying culture in general as the subject of an anthropology similar to that, which existed in surrounding countries. During the first half of the twentieth century, the contents of sociocultural anthropology were diluted in a series of subjects, like ethnography and ethnology, which in general are only an appendix of other sciences, like prehistory, which equally study "primitive" people.

Ethnology was also presented as part of American studies, together with the history and archaeology of America. Indeed, Spanish sociocultural anthropology emerged out of those two areas (prehistory and archaeology) in the 1960s, and also out of a third area created by the development of sociology which, although it was not very important in Spain at that time, produced a synergy that was beneficial for anthropology. However, the science would not have emerged without the stimulus of the studies of British and American anthropologists who carried out their fieldwork in Spain, with its traditional social and economic structures and without the direct impact their research models had on Spanish anthropologists.

The political transition towards democracy after 1975 and the passing of the Spanish Constitution in 1978 shaped a democratic and decentralised state and conditioned the interests of Spanish anthropology to unknown extremes. With the possibility of finding otherness in the exterior, weakened by the lack of funding, Spanish anthropology in accordance with its tradition opted to study its own interior cultures. It may be said, that Spanish anthropology, which until then had constructed its contents with *monographs on communities*, was to become increasingly complacent with the needs of a state that had to justify its territorial identities. The study of identities would later be enriched by the addition of new topics, increasingly alert to the study of the diversity that had historically been ignored by a State determined to make differences invisible, ever since its foundation in the late fifteenth century, as it gradually adopted the characteristic profile of a nation-State.

However, this positive view of anthropology in Spain would not be complete without some negative aspects. Many of the elements that hindered the institutionalisation of sociocultural anthropology before the late 1960s, and which later slowed its development, still persist. One of these, and perhaps the most important, is a notoriously low demand for anthropological knowledge in Spanish society, which is an insurmountable obstacle to the professionalisation of anthropologists.

References Cited

- Aceves, Joseph B.
1971 Social Change in a Spanish Village. Cambridge: Schenkman.
- Álvarez Munárriz, Luís, y Fina Antón Hurtado (eds.)
2001 Antropología del Mediterráneo. Murcia: Universidad del Mar.

Barret, Richard A.

1974 Benabarre. The Modernization of a Spanish Village. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Behar, Ruth

1986 Santa María del Monte. The Presence of the Past in a Spanish Village. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Brandes, Stanley H.

1975 Migration, Kinship, and Community. Tradition and Transition in a Spanish Village. New York: Academic Press.
 1980 Metaphors of Masculinity. Sex and Status in Andalusian Folklore. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. (Publications of the American Folklore Society, 1)
 1991 España como "objeto" de estudio. Reflexiones sobre el destino del antropólogo norteamericano en España. In: M. Cátedra (ed.), Los españoles vistos por los antropólogos; pp. 231–249. Gijón: Júcar.

Campo Urbano, Salustiano del

1992 Discurso de contestación con motivo del ingreso en la Real Academia de Ciencias Morales y Políticas de don Carmelo Lisón Tolosana. In: C. Lisón Tolosana, La imagen del rey. Monarquía, realeza y poder ritual en la casa de los Austrias; pp. 189–219. Madrid: Espasa-Calpe.

Capel Sáez, Horacio

2009 La antropología española y el magisterio de Claudio Esteva Fabregat. Estrategias institucionales y desarrollo intelectual en las disciplinas científicas. *Scripta Nova* 13: 281–309.

Caro Baroja, Julio

1943 Los pueblos del norte de la península ibérica [The Peoples in the North of the Peninsula]. Madrid: CSIC.
 1946 Los pueblos de España [The Peoples of Spain]. Barcelona: Barna.
 1955 Estudios saharianos [Saharan Studies]. Madrid: Instituto de Estudios Africanos.
 1973 Mundos circundantes y contornos histórico-culturales. *Revista de Dialectología y Tradiciones Populares* 29/1: 23–47. [Compiled in J. Caro Baroja, De la superstición al ateísmo (meditaciones antropológicas). Madrid: Taurus, 1974]

Christian Jr., William A.

1972 Person and God in a Spanish Valley. New York: Seminar Press.

Cucó, Josepa, y Juanjo Pujadas (eds.)

1990 Identidades colectivas. Etnicidad y sociabilidad en la Península Ibérica. Valencia: Generalitat Valenciana.

Douglass, William A.

1969 Death in Murelaga. Funerary Ritual in a Spanish Basque Village. Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Esteva Fabregat, Claudio

1969 La etnología española y sus problemas. Zaragoza: Institución "Fernando el Católico". (Actas del I Congreso Nacional de Artes y Costumbres Populares)

Fernández, James W.

1974 Persuasions and Performances. Of the Beast and Every Body ... and the Metaphors of Everyman. In: C. Geertz (ed.), Myth, Symbol, and Culture; pp. 39–60. New York: Norton.

Foster, George M.

1953 Cofradía and Compadrazgo in Spain and Spanish America. *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology* 9/1: 1–28.

Freeman, Susan Tax

1970 Neighbours. The Social Contract in a Castilian Hamlet. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Fribourg, Jeanine

1980 Fêtes à Saragosse. Paris: Institut d'Ethnologie. (Mémoires de l'Institut d'Ethnologie, 19)

Frigolé, Joan

1975 Algunas consideraciones sobre las unidades de análisis cultural. In: A. Jiménez Núñez (ed.), Primera Reunión de antropólogos españoles. Actas, comunicaciones, documentación; pp. 177–191. Sevilla: Universidad de Sevilla.

Gilmore, David D.

1980 The People of the Plain. Class and Community in Lower Andalusia. New York: Columbia University Press.

Gómez-Pellón, Eloy

1993 La contribución del krausismo al desarrollo de la antropología en España. El protagonismo de la Universidad de Oviedo. *Boletín del Real Instituto de Estudios Asturianos* 47/142: 497–510.
 1996 El discurso jurídico en los orígenes de la antropología social en España. In Encarnación Aguilar Criado (coord.), De la construcción de la historia a la práctica de la antropología; pp. 55–71. Zaragoza: Federación de Asociaciones de Antropología del Estado Español.
 1997 El krausismo y los orígenes de la antropología social en España: la influencia de Adolfo Posada. In: III Congreso de Historia de la Antropología y Antropología Aplicada; pp. 79–95. Santiago de Compostela: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas.
 1998 Unamuno y la antropología social. *Revista de Antropología Social* 7: 23–65.
 2000 La antropología española en las décadas finales del siglo XIX. In J. A. González Alcantud y A. Robles Egea (eds.), Intelectuales y ciencias sociales en la crisis de fin de siglo; pp. 259–289. Granada: Anthropos y Diputación Provincial de Granada, Anthropos.

Greenwood, Davydd J.

1973 The Political Economy of Peasant Family Farming. Some Anthropological Perspectives on Rationality and Adaptation. Ithaca: Cornell University, Center for International Studies, Rural Development Committee.

Gregory, David D.

1976 Rural Exodus and the Perpetuation of Andalusia. In: J. B. Aceves, E. C. Hansen, and G. Levitas (eds.), Economic Transformation and Steady-State Values. Essays in the Ethnography of Spain; pp. 69–76. Flushing: Queens College Press. (Queens College Publications in Anthropology, 2)

Hansen, Edward C.

1969 The State and Land Tenure Conflicts in Rural Catalonia. *Anthropological Quarterly* 42/3: 214–243.

Harding, Susan Friend

1984 Remaking Ibiaca. Rural Life in Aragon under Franco. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Kenny, Michael

1962 A Spanish Tapestry. Town and Country in Castile. Bloomington: Indiana University Press. [1st American Ed.]
 1971 El rol de la antropología social dentro de las ciencias sociales en España. *Ethnica – Revista de Antropología* 1: 91–105.

Krause, Karl Christian Friedrich

1811 Das Urbild der Menschheit, ein Versuch. Dresden: Arnold.

Lévi-Strauss, Claude

1954 Lugar de la antropología entre las ciencias sociales y problemas planteados por su enseñanza. In: C. Lévi-Strauss, *Antropología estructural*; pp. 310–344. Buenos Aires: Eudeba. [1980]

Lisón Tolosana, Carmelo

1966 Belmonte de los Caballeros. A Sociological Study of a Spanish Town. London: Oxford University Press.

1971 Una gran encuesta de 1901–1902 (Notas para la historia de la Antropología Social en España). In: Carmelo Lisón Tolosana, *Antropología Social en España*; pp. 97–171. Madrid: Siglo XXI.

1975 Panorama programático de la antropología social en España. In: A. Jiménez Núñez (ed.), *Primera Reunión de antropólogos españoles. Actas, comunicaciones, documentación*; pp. 149–168. Sevilla: Universidad de Sevilla.

1977a *Antropología social en España*. Madrid: Akal. [1971]

1977b Una gran encuesta de 1901–1902 (notas para la historia de la antropología social en España). In: C. Lisón Tolosana; pp. 105–179.

1983 Belmonte de los Caballeros. *Anthropology and History in an Aragonese Community*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

MacClancy, Jeremy

1993 At Play with Identity in the Basque Arena. In: S. Macdonald (ed.), *Inside European Identities. Ethnography in Western Europe*; pp. 84–97. Providence: Berg Publishers.

Moore, Kenneth

1976 Modernization in Canary Islands Village. In: J. B. Aceves and W. A. Douglass (eds.), *The Changing Faces of Rural Spain*; pp. 17–27. Cambridge: Schenkman.

Moreno Navarro, Isidoro

1972 El trabajo de campo etnológico en España y el problema de la elección de comunidad. *Ethnica – Revista de Antropología* 3: 163–180.

1984a La antropología cultural en Andalucía. Estado actual y perspectiva de futuro. In: S. Rodríguez Becerra (ed.), *Antropología cultural de Andalucía*; pp. 93–108. Sevilla: Instituto de Cultura Andaluza.

1984b La doble colonització de l'antropologia andalusa i perspectives de futur. *Quaderns de l'Institut Català d'Antropologia* 5: 69–84.

Murphy, Michael D.

1983 Coming of Age in Seville. The Structuring of a Riteless Passage to Manhood. *Journal of Anthropological Research* 39/4: 376–392.

Ortíz García, Carmen

1987 Luis de Hoyos Sáinz y la antropología española. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas.

1996 La antropología española en el primer tercio del siglo XX. Líneas de continuidad y ruptura. In: E. Aguilar Criado (coord.), *De la construcción de la historia a la práctica de la antropología en España*. (VII Congreso de Antropología Social, Zaragoza 16.–20.09.1996); pp. 121–130. Zaragoza: Federación de Asociaciones de Antropología del Estado Español.

Peristiany, John G. (ed.)

1965 Honour and Shame. The Values of Mediterranean Society. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.

1987 Dote y matrimonio en los países mediterráneos. Madrid: CIS.

Pitt-Rivers, Julian A.

1954 The People of the Sierra. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson. [Spanish Ed.: *Los hombres de la Sierra*. Madrid: Grijalbo. 1971; *Un pueblo de la Sierra*. Grazalema. Madrid: Alianza. 1987]

Prat i Carós, Joan

1981 El folklore i l'etnologia a la premsa catalana no diària. *Canya* 0: 7–15 (Barcelona).

1989 Nuevas tendencias en los principales países de Europa Occidental: España. *Anales de la Fundación Joaquín Costa* 6: 110–121.

1991 Historia y metodología. Estudio introductorio. In: J. Prat i Carós, U. Martínez, J. Contreras, e I. Moreno (eds.), *Antropología de los pueblos de España*; pp. 13–32, 113–140. Madrid: Taurus.

Prat i Carós, Joan, et Cybèle Gisclard

2000 Après “The People of the Sierra”. *Ethnologie Française* 30/2: 221–232.

Press, Irwin

1979 The City as Context. Urbanism and Behavioral Constraints in Seville. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Puig-Samper, Miguel Ángel, e Andrés Galera

1983 La antropología española del siglo XIX. Introducción a la historia de la antropología española del siglo XIX, Madrid: Inst. “Arnau de Vilanova”, Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas.

San Román, Teresa

1976 Vecinos gitanos. Madrid: Akal.

Sánchez Gómez, Luís Ángel

1992 La antropología al servicio del Estado. El Instituto “Bernardino de Sahagún” del CSIC (1941–1970). *Revista de Dialectología y Tradiciones Populares* 47: 22–44.

Sanmartín Arce, Ricardo

1994 La antropología de la experiencia. La obra de Carmelo Lisón Tolosana. In: R. Sanmartín Arce (ed.), *Antropología sin fronteras. Ensayos en honor a Carmelo Lisón*; pp. 13–17. Madrid: Centro de Investigaciones Sociológicas.

Serrán Pagán, Ginés

1980 La fábula de Alcalá y la realidad histórica en Grazalema. Replanteamiento del primer estudio de Antropología Social en España. *Revista Española de Investigaciones Sociológicas* 9: 81–115.

Velasco Mañillo, Honorio (ed.)

1982 Tiempo de fiesta. Ensayos antropológicos sobre las fiestas en España. Madrid: Trescautorcediecisieste.

Woolard, Kathryn A.

1985 Catalonia. The Dilemma of Language Rights. In: N. Wolfson, and J. Manes (eds.), *Language of Inequality*; pp. 91–109. Berlin: Mouton Publishers. (Contributions to the Sociology of Language, 36)

