

INTRODUCTION

In the preceding section we discussed one of aims of this bibliographical project: the gathering and compiling of data provided directly by the authors themselves³. From the outset, however, this primary source of information was supplemented by through analysis of other sources of a more general nature which, for convenience, we have placed under several different headings: 1) general bibliographies; 2) partial bibliographies; 3) the acts of congresses (state-level congresses being distinguished from those held at regional level or devoted to a single topic); 4) publications resulting from seminars, cycles of lectures and collections of readings; and 5) specialized journals.

The exhaustive examination and transcription of these sources in card index form proved very useful since it enabled us to detect shortcomings, omissions and even errors which otherwise would have been difficult to remedy. Furthermore, as the list of headings itself reveals, all the chosen sources are of an eminently general and collective nature. Besides offsetting the strictly individual and personal nature of the data contributed by the authors themselves, this makes it possible to describe certain major trends in the scientific, institutional and research interests of groups of anthropologists - both Spaniards and foreigners - concerned with the anthropological study of Spain.

This often slow and arduous task of exhaustive analysis and card indexing was not conducted in a haphazard manner. From the very start we adopted criteria for the inclusion and exclusion of data and these criteria were applied very strictly to both written and printed materials in examining individual curricula and transferring the information onto cards.

In the first place, we omitted all articles of a journalistic nature that had appeared in newspapers or general news magazines. We similarly excluded the book reviews, commentaries and criticisms which were very abundant, especially in the curricula of the North American anthropologists. In the case of Spanish professionals, we also left out all references to translations of articles and books. Neither did we include data referring to prologues, preliminary notes and introductions of a technical or honorary nature which appeared at the beginning of some of the numerous books we handled and were signed by persons other than the author of the book itself.

The most important selection criteria we applied, however, are directly related to the title of our bibliography: *Thirty Years of Anthropological Literature about Spain*.

The "thirty years" span a period which runs approximately from the 1950s

(or, to be more precise, the second half of the 50s) up to the present day.

This is not an appropriate place for an account of the history of Spanish anthropology since the Civil War. It is relevant, though, to recall that during the 1950s a series of significant events occurred which enable one to refer to a type of anthropological activity that was altogether absent during the period immediately following the Civil War⁴. It should be remembered that it was in November 1949 that George Foster undertook his journey of ethnological reconnaissance (*Report on an Ethnological Reconnaissance of Spain*, 1951). Foster and his companion, Julio Caro Baroja⁵, visited Julian Pitt-Rivers⁶, who was living at the time in Grazalema, Andalusia, the locality which, a few years later, was to be the subject of the first modern anthropological monograph to be written about Spain (*The People of the Sierra*, 1954). In 1952 Caro Baroja travelled to England with Pitt-Rivers to study anthropology at Oxford and just one year later, in 1953, the mythical patriarch of Basque ethnology, José Miguel de Barandiarán⁷, returned from exile in Sara, France, to his native town of Ataun, from where he was to reorganize ethnographic research on the Basque Country. In 1956 Claudi Esteva Fabregat, who had received his anthropological training while in exile in Mexico, settled in Madrid with the clear intention of institutionalizing cultural anthropology in Spain⁸.

The signs of the revival which took place in the 50s were matched by developments in the academic field. Thus for example in the 1951-52 academic year, Julián San Valero began to teach a doctoral-level course at the University of Valencia under the title *Antropología Cultural*, and in 1959-60 in Seville, J. Alcina Franch founded the *Seminario de Antropología Americana* from which he subsequently launched an ambitious research project entitled *Etnología de Andalucía Occidental* (1960-63).

The return of a number of exiles, the interest of certain foreign anthropologists in doing research on Spain, and the first modest but significant academic and institutional initiatives are of course reflected in the realm of publications (cf. *Índex Cronològic*). We are therefore of the opinion that it is from the 1950s onwards that one can start to talk about modern anthropological literature on Spain, in the true meaning of the term⁹.

All the starting dates we have mentioned so far -1949, 1953, 1954, 1956 - are to some extent symbolic in character. On the other hand, the deadline we established for the inclusion of new references -July 1986- was dictated by strictly pragmatic, operational considerations. This brief digression on the thirty years of anthropological literature about Spain should be seen, therefore, as establishing the fact that we were interested exclusively in recent output. This implies the exclusion of authors (and works) which are usually deemed the ancestors or forerunners of cultural and social anthropology since the Civil War.

The term we have just used, "cultural and social anthropology", has not been chosen without forethought: it constitutes another of the selection criteria

we applied. In talking about anthropology, or rather **anthropological literature**, we are referring exclusively to the field of cultural and social anthropology, in the narrow sense. The application of this new restrictive criterion to the bibliographical corpus we present implied the systematic exclusion of references to disciplines like biological and physical anthropology, philosophical anthropology and the work of archeologists and prehistorians.

We found it more difficult to define frontiers, and thus to apply selection criteria, in the case of the very plentiful studies dealing with folklore, purely descriptive ethnography, and traditional and popular culture. Output on these subjects has been considerable in recent years. There are a fair number of journals which specialize in this traditional orientation, and, as we shall see, it has received considerable impetus during the last five or six years from the governments of the autonomous regions who have supported the organization of countless congresses, conferences, workshops and similar gatherings of an ethnological and/or folkloric bent.

Though the general criterion we initially adopted was to exclude all materials of this type, we are fully aware that it was applied somewhat laxly. In some cases what caused us to hesitate was the professional status of the authors involved, in others the quality of the materials already familiar to us. We were aware, furthermore, that certain professional cultural anthropologists had not scorned this type of approach, tending, in some of their studies, towards ethnographical perspectives... These, in short, were our main reasons for including, or rather, not excluding, titles and works which straddle the hazy borders of the above-mentioned disciplines, some of which may have a distinctly ambivalent flavour about them.

Our last major selection criterion was geographical and was related, like the others, to the overall title of the work *Thirty Years of Anthropological Literature about Spain*. The stress on the last two words is intended to indicate that our aim was not to produce a bibliographical inventory of works by Spanish anthropologists, but a bibliography for which Spain is the frame of reference. In applying this criterion to the curricula of some authors of American vocation -both Spanish and foreign -¹⁰, we obviously set off a chain reaction of exclusions. The damage was even greater in the case of the Africanists. From the output of the former we retained bibliographies and general surveys of Americanism as well as comparative studies which seek to establish the historical influences of Spanish culture on Latin American cultures. The remaining studies on America or Africa, some of which were the work of researchers of high professional standing, simply had no place in the bibliography we were compiling¹¹.

Having defined the basic criteria for inclusion and exclusion, we can proceed to comment upon the typology of the written sources referred to, as indicated at the beginning of this section. First mention will go to the general bibliographical articles on Spain, since these constitute the most direct precedents for our own work.