

## Key considerations in the analysis of the development of social anthropology in Spain



Óscar Fernández-Álvarez<sup>1</sup> · Miguel González-González<sup>1</sup> · Sara Ouali-Fernández<sup>1</sup>

Received: 2 February 2023 / Revised: 26 March 2023 / Accepted: 28 March 2023 /  
Published online: 06 April 2023  
© The Author(s) 2023

### Abstract

The objective of this article is to present a brief overview of the long history of anthropology in Spain. Of primary importance is positioning this history both within Spain's wider social and political contexts, and also against the development of scientific research throughout the country. Methodologically, this study is based on extensive existing literature concerning the history of the discipline, from the start of the twentieth century to contemporary times, which informed the decision to structure this writing in four sections, segmenting the period of history covered. The first section considers the primary or formative development of a regionalist Spanish ethnography at the beginning of the twentieth century. Following this, in the second section, we explore the Francoist era when the twentieth century was well underway; this was a period marked by the strong influence of foreign research on the establishment of teaching methods and practical approaches to anthropology. In the third section, we observe how, as Spain transitioned from a dictatorship to a strong democratic state formed of autonomous regions, a uniquely Spanish anthropology emerged and, as we discuss in the fourth section, the country entered a time of consolidation and institutionalisation throughout the wider field of Spanish scientific endeavour. In this way, we examine Spanish anthropology from the context of intellectual development not dissimilar to that taking place on a global scale.

---

✉ Óscar Fernández-Álvarez  
oscar.fernandez@unileon.es  
Miguel González-González  
migog@unileon.es  
Sara Ouali-Fernández  
sara\_o\_f@hotmail.com

<sup>1</sup> Department of Social Anthropology, University of León, León, Spain

The article concludes with an exploration of the current challenges facing Spanish anthropology.

**Keywords** Spanish anthropology · Ethnography · Folklore · History · Heritage

## Introduction

The development of anthropology in Spain has been influenced by the country's history, its social and economic landscape, and indeed the country's specific path of scientific progress.

In its early stages, from the second half of the nineteenth century through to the middle of the twentieth century, that is, before the establishment of what might be considered academic anthropology, the field was fragmented and was characterised by a set of regionalist trends or movements which Prat-i-Carós et al. (1991) terms folkloric and anthropological discourses.

This was a time when Spanish ethnography was positioned outside of academia but was developing through the proliferation of scientific societies, museums, and other bodies promoting ethnographic research and the growth of Spanish ethnography. In this way, according to Prat-i-Carós et al. (1991), the establishment of ethnography in Spain at the end of the nineteenth century and start of the twentieth century was shaped by the co-existence of two contemporaneous yet poorly linked discourses. The first of these, the folkloric discourse, had a markedly provincial, regionalist nature and was interested primarily in man and his 'tribal' or 'ethnic' characteristics. This approach was rooted in other Romantic regionalist movements of the nineteenth century and gained its strongest footholds in Catalunya, the Basque Country, and Galicia. The second discourse, the anthropological discourse, was founded on 'enlightenment thought' which reflected on 'mankind in general'. From its roots in the Age of Enlightenment, the movement emerged from positivist evolutionism, which was spreading across Spain from its early strongholds in Madrid, Andalusia, and the Canary Islands.

Returning to the folkloric discourse, the principal characteristics of its development arise from its strong links to the Catholic Church—indeed many of its main proponents were part of the ecclesiastical establishment—and its reactionary, involuntarily tendencies. The movement devised a highly symbolic origin myth which highlighted its key values of nationalism, patriotism, race, the collective character of the people, Catholicism, language, and *fueros*.<sup>1</sup> The folkloric discourse gave rise to a number of similar movements in each one of Spain's regions, for example, Catalunya saw the *Renaixença*, of which the main exponent in ethnographic circles was Josep Maria Batista i Roca, secretary of the *Arxiu Etnogràfic de Catalunya* (Catalonian

---

<sup>1</sup> *Fueros* is a term given to certain sets of regional laws, or laws specific to certain class, for example, the *fuego militar* would be equivalent to a military code of justice. The term originates in medieval times but, in the Francoist era, the term was also applied to certain laws considered to be fundamental and thus beyond debate.

Ethnographic Archive); in Galicia, the *Rexurdimento* is represented by the work of Vicente Risco; and the *Fuerismo Vasco* of the Basque Country led by José Miguel de Barandiaran had notably strong links to the church.

In regard to anthropological discourse, its main supporters were free-thinkers with unorthodox views—often liberal professionals such as doctors and lawyers—who opposed the ‘truth’ of the Catholic Church because of its incompatibility with scientific methods. Many of these people, for example, Giner de los Ríos, were also linked to the *Institución Libre de Enseñanza* (Institution of Free Learning). This group maintained strong relationships with the international scientific community. Through the anthropological societies they founded, international ties were forged with similar societies of researchers across Europe, as well as publishing in international journals as a means of disseminating their work. The most striking results of their efforts are seen in the establishment of five great Spanish anthropological institutions between 1870 and 1880: the *Sociedad Antropológica Española*, the *Sociedad Antropológica Sevillana*, the *Museo Antropológico de Madrid*, the *Gabinete Científico de Tenerife*, and the *Museo Canario de Las Palmas* (respectively: the Spanish Anthropological Society; the Seville Anthropological Society; Madrid’s Anthropology Museum; Tenerife’s Scientific Bureau; and Las Palmas’ Canarian Museum). The premise behind this discourse emerged from general reflections concerning the nature of mankind that were informed by the liberal, progressive ideas of the Enlightenment, the Second English Civil War, and the French revolution, that is: ‘to enlighten humanity with the torch of reason’ and move away from the involutory ideas of traditional Catholicism.

It should be noted that these two discourses do, however, have certain things in common, primarily, the development of various criteria used to gain an understanding of anthropology in the context of the Spain in that era. In addition, both discourses share a methodological procedure that, with many nuances, is united in the aim of creating journals and other media (of an ever more specialist nature) for the diffusion of their findings. Each of these discourses, with their differing relationships to the state, and indeed to criticism, at different times has spurred the progress of the other and both have contributed to shaping the direction of later academic endeavour in the field. Bearing all of this in mind, the present work intends to analyse the development of Spanish anthropology and ethnographic studies undertaken in Spain within a framework that allows for trans-cultural comparison with that conducted in other countries. Furthermore, an attempt will be made throughout to maintain a focus on the links between the disciplines of anthropology and academia.

## Methodology

This article explores the construction of the field of Spanish anthropology and its recent development through an examination of bibliographic references. Analysis of sources has enabled the identification of a small selection of anthropologists and their works. These authors are well-known and recognised within the discipline as experts who have made key contributions to the construction of the theory, history, and methodology of anthropology in Spain.

In this way, the present work attempts a systematic classification of theory and practice in anthropology and ethnology during a period extending from the mid twentieth century to the present day. The time span considered encompasses the phase of development when Spanish anthropology began to strengthen its links with broader academia to the point where the discipline was able to make some of its greatest leaps forward. This period also coincides with increasingly rapid progress in technology and research in Spain, a process that is mirrored in social and scientific progress experienced within the field of anthropology, which was encouraged by the establishment of democracy and the devolved state.

Following the introduction in the previous section, we present our results and discuss them. These sections, organised in a consecutive, sequential, and successive manner, will focus on four key phases that correspond to principle areas of explanation and analysis regarding the growth of anthropology in Spain. Initially, we look at the foundations of academic anthropology in Spain and the influence of foreign contributions, which leads us to the second phase of development during which there is the gradual emergence of a uniquely Spanish anthropology. At this point, analysis centres on successive expansion in anthropology and ethnology and research results which become increasingly diverse as the discipline becomes more systematic. This form of institutionalisation opens the way for a third phase in which new objects of study appear, and we see the establishment of scientific societies, anthropology museums, independent associations of anthropologists, among others. This will enable an exploration of theoretical research and finally, brings us to a consideration of the present-day challenges in Spanish anthropology within the context of national development.

In the analysis of sources, we have focussed interest on well-known authors who are recognised as key experts in the fields considered in the present article. It is necessary, however, to highlight the novelty of this work and stress the opportunities it exposes in the discourses involved in the construction of Spanish anthropology, albeit from an identity-centred perspective, but also into the academic trajectory of social, cultural, and ethnographic studies, and into the construction of discourses and practices.

The bibliography is conceived as an addition to this work, fundamental as a resource in that it provides the references for this article, and because these references are themselves key to the construction of Spanish anthropology.

This article is a contribution to the project with reference PID2021-124970NB-100, funded by the Ministry of Science and Innovation of the Government of Spain.

## Results and discussion

### The beginnings of social anthropology in Spain

In Spain's recent history, little attention has been paid to the discipline of anthropology both in terms of its teaching and in the undertaking of research related to it. This is partly to do with Spain's unique history, particularly, the fact that the

Spanish Civil War was followed by Franco's dictatorship which together ushered in a period of paralysis in many academic fields, including that of anthropology. This meant that external influences have had a huge impact on the development of Spanish anthropology as a field of work such that, during the middle of the twentieth century, Spanish anthropology failed to evolve a distinctive personality of its own. In addition, and without underestimating the importance of foreign contributions, it also meant adopting alien perspectives often at odds to the Spanish context; alien perspectives that were shared by Spain's European neighbours at the inception, establishment, and consolidation of the discipline.

Some of these common European roots are collected in Castilla Urbano (1991) work from which we draw several sources, for example, Lowie's (1946) "History of Ethnology", which was considered one of the foremost authorities on the subject for many years. This work attempted to show the benefits of an institutionalised anthropology, presenting it within an international framework in order to guarantee its survival in individual countries. Taking a Boasian view (Boas 1911, 1940), that is being sceptical of the search for generalisable laws as an objective in the social sciences, Lowie's work contains many elements that modern historians of science would criticise. However, traditional historiography finds his work to be the best example of what anthropology is at its core: Lowie is a practitioner of his own discipline and his pedagogic intentions are evident.

Another author worthy of mention is Marvin Harris (1978) for his work "The rise of anthropological theory". At the time of writing, Harris had as many adherents as detractors, although, it must be said that a great number of students since have been attracted to anthropology on the basis of the explanations provided in his writings. The author expounds his point of view and uses history to support his methodological approach. The initial plaudits garnered by this work are perhaps difficult to understand today, but here, we must recognise their importance. Harris's main thesis is based on a form of presentism, in which the past is studied in the light of the present day. Perhaps the main merit of this author is his defence of the idea of social evolution against the rise of Darwinist biological evolutionism, although he did not always accept the primacy of social over scientific theories (Ronzón 1991).

The third key reference work from the early stages of academic anthropology in Spain is Mercier (1976) "Histoire de l'anthropologie" [History of anthropology]. This was one of the first major anthropology texts to be translated into Spanish and, although originally written in French, it makes ample use of Lowie's historical work. Written 30 years later, the texts provide updates on the problems and trends in ethnology. The allusion to classical French scholarship in Mercier's work and the North American focus of Lowie are both glorifications of their own traditions. The separation in time between the former and the latter enables Mercier to present an updated picture of the field. Complementing Mercier's historical account, we have both Poirier (1968, 1969) work and that of Duchet (1975) "Anthropologie et histoire au siècle des lumières" [Anthropology and History in the Century of the Enlightenment]. The latter is a fine example of how the history of the subject can be studied without focussing uniquely on the 19th and 20th centuries. Through a detailed analysis of the work of Buffon, Voltaire, Rousseau, Helvecio and Diderot, Duchet tries to dispel some of the myths about the Enlightenment, such as it being anti-colonialist.

Another important feature of Duchet's work is the knowledge of and time given to Spanish sources displayed by the author, which contrasts to the error-ridden efforts of other French historians of anthropology, like Rupp-Eisenreich (1984).

Here, we must also highlight the work of Duvignaud (1975), particularly, "Le Langage perdu, essai sur la différence anthropologique" (Lost language: an essay about anthropological difference). In this essay we find more than a practical history of anthropology. Rather, the text acts as an alternative source concerning other authors of interest in the field. It explores the work of Morgan (1877), Lévy-Bruhl (1922, 1927, 1935) Frobenius, Malinowski (1922, 1926, 1927, 1929, 1935, 1944, 1948) and Lévi-Strauss (1949, 1953, 1955, 1962, 1964, 1972, 1973, 1974, 1976a, b, 1979, 1981a, b, 1984, 1986, 1987, 1990, 1992), taking an idiosyncratic perspective according to Castilla Urbano (1991), which bears some comparison with the work of Geertz (1989), both in terms of its content and its structure. For Duvignaud, language loss is an object lesson for anthropology; it shows how certain groups are reduced to silence, an experience shared by primitive peoples and the proletariat alike.

Another work worthy of mention is that of "Anthropology and anthropologists" by Kuper (1973) which provides a Spanish translation of an important trend in English scholarship in its study of the British school of functionalism. It covers the ideology from its origins, situating its protagonists in context and, in some ways, demystifying them. It outlines British theories of social anthropology, identifying the formative environment of its major exponents and evaluating their theoretical influences and motivations. The most important contributions of this book are first, its detailed treatment of the work of Malinowski and Radcliffe-Brown and second, its exploration of the relationships between colonialism and anthropology. Perhaps its only fault is a failure to consider the repercussions for, and influence on this school of certain important characters, such as Tylor (1871, 1881), Frazer (1890), and Rivers (1914a, 1914b) among others.

Finally, we must consider Meek (1980) work concerning the origins of social science and his so-called "theory of four stages of universal history". The book entitled "The noble savage", constitutes a solid study of the contributions of the French and Scottish Enlightenment until 1800, albeit with a marked emphasis on economic issues, a tendency continued in the author's subsequent essays (Meek 1981).

## A uniquely Spanish anthropology

To understand Spanish anthropology in the time when it begins to develop its own distinctive character, we can look to a variety of sources. Apart from numerous specialist publications we have, for example, the respected "Boletines de historia de la antropología" [Bulletins of the history of anthropology], which had been published regularly for some years. In addition, we must also consider the role of the various anthropology conferences being organised in Spain by different organisations, principally the *Federación de asociaciones de Antropología del Estado Español* (FAAEE: the Spanish State Federation of Anthropology Associations). This organisation is today known as the *Asociación de Antropología del*

*Estado Español* (AAEE: Spanish State Anthropology Association), an association of associations taking a broader, more inclusive approach than its predecessor organisation. It has a number of dedicated committees: one for associations, another for professionals, and a third for academia, research groups, and private individuals. Reviewing some of the contributions of these various organisations and publications sheds light on the level of interaction between the history of archaeology as studied in Spain and that which was developing outside our frontiers (<https://asaee-antropologia.org/>).

Previously, one of the studies most cited by historians concerning the beginnings of Spanish anthropology is “Una gran encuesta de 1901- 1902: Notas para la Historia de la Antropología Social en España” [A major survey 1901–1902: Notes on the History of Spanish Social Anthropology] (Lisón-Tolosana 1977). However, the 16th and 17th centuries have been generally neglected in Spanish anthropological histories and there exists only a very small number of studies that address this period (Pagden 1982; Bestard and Contreras 1987). This issue is somewhat remedied in the work of Palerm (1974, 1976, 1977), in a series of texts published in three volumes entitled “Historia de la Etnología” [The History of Ethnology]. These lectures take the reader from Herodotus to Morgan, emphasising the importance of ethnological history as well as field work as fundamental learning and tools for the anthropologist. It cites Lowie (1920, 1924, 1937), Penninman, Hodgen (1964), Slotkin, Hallowell, Harris, and Manners, among others, as influences. The way in which Palerm selects his subjects makes it difficult to distinguish ethnologists who have made smaller contributions compared to those that are more influential, thus the pedagogic value of his work is questionable. Curiously, the author justifies the absence of Marx for two reasons: the contentious relationship between anthropology and evolutionism, and the fact that Marx’s influence on anthropology was felt only towards the middle of the twentieth century, not in the 19th when Marx was publishing.”

Another work worthy of mention in this section is that of Llobera (1980), “Hacia una historia de las ciencias sociales” [Towards a history of social sciences]. Here, we confront some of the problems encountered in anthropological history from the epistemological perspective of Althusserian Marxism. The book is composed of various analyses of Marx’s impact on social scientists, such as Weber, Durkheim 1893, 1895, 1912 and their followers, including an evaluation of their work from an anthropological perspective and their work on pre-capitalist societies. In addition, it also includes sections on Wittfogel’s critique of Marx and the Asian mode of production, and the influence of Marx on French anthropology.

Turning to the work of Isidoro Moreno (1979), specifically, his book: “Cultura y modos de producción: Una visión de la antropología desde el materialismo histórico” [Culture and means of production: A vision of Anthropology from the perspective of historical materialism]. The author aims to make a critical analysis of the development of the discipline, situating its diverse schools and trends in their specific contexts and, as such, deepening public understanding of their meaning within the historic construction of anthropology. The work presents anthropology as, partly, the child of colonialism and, thus, deeply entrenched in the ideas of that epoch. However, as Leclerc (1973) points out, the relationship between anthropology and colonialism is not as simple as first described, since it is impossible to

ignore other factors, such as the ideologies of individual, the use of anthropology in the metropolis, the relationship between anthropology and anti-slavery societies, and the value given to anthropology by colonial administrations, among many others.

An especially relevant figure in Spanish anthropology is Caro-Baroja (1983, 1985), who took a very distinctive approach to documenting the history of anthropology. This is apparent in the way in which he removed himself from many of the key debates of the discipline. As Castilla Urbano (1991) points out, Caro Baroja makes no comment on the origins of anthropology, the role of Marx in its development, presentism, or the study of the past. Caro Baroja's notion of anthropology's past owes almost everything to his vision of the subject as a pure form of humanist erudition. This view comes across most clearly when we consider his choice of Kant's philosophy as the origin for his book, "Los fundamentos del pensamiento antropológico moderno" [The foundations of modern anthropological thinking]. Although he makes use of Lowie's (1946) "History of ethnology", he has no hesitation in abandoning this model in order to consider the European folkloric movement and its many dimensions. The work of this author is characterised by an idiosyncratic understanding of the scientific method and a gaze that lingers too heavily on the present; however, every opinion is carefully weighed, and ideas are explained straightforwardly.

### **Towards institutionalisation and change: achievements of the 1960s and 1980s**

From 1960 onwards, Spain entered a new era of greater political openness and socio-economic transformation. At this time, Spanish anthropology starts to show visible signs of change. A series of events took place that are widely recognised within the academic landscape as key markers for the institutionalisation of anthropology. Among these, and by way of a summary, we would highlight the work of Esteva Fabregat at the National Ethnology Museum (Madrid), where the School of Anthropological Studies was founded. The museum produced many of the first cohort of Spanish anthropologists: the publication of Lisón-Tolosana's "Belmonte de los Caballeros. A Sociological Study of a Spanish Town" (1966); Pitt-River's work "The People of the Sierra" (1954); the emergence of Caro Baroja onto Spain's intellectual scene. The activities of the museum opened up a new intellectual horizon for Spanish anthropology, marking its departure from an era of academic dependency on other disciplines, from the use of conjectural, descriptive methodologies, autodidacticism and a lack of professionalism (Esteva Fabregat 1969).

Calvo (2002) comments that, at this time, the need to create an academic structure for Spanish anthropology was considered urgent. It was felt that the discipline needed to professionalise itself and take ownership of the key tools of anthropology: field work and comparative methodologies. The evolution of the discipline accelerated considerably when, in 1968, Esteva Fabregat left his post at the National Ethnology Museum in Madrid to take up a new role in the ethnology department at the University of Barcelona. Later, in 1971, as the director of the *Centro de Etnología Peninsular del CSIC* (CSIC Centre for Peninsular Ethnology), he founded the journal "Étnica" (Ethnics), the first cultural and sociological anthropology journal in



Spain. He also set up an association of leading anthropologists. From that point on, other universities formally began to consider anthropology as an academic discipline and in 1973, the first conference of Spanish anthropologists was convened in Seville—considered to be an historic event of considerable significance (Jiménez-Núñez 1975). This was followed by the Barcelona Congress in 1977, where a number of interdisciplinary symposia were held. Subsequently, there were a number of other conferences and meetings which gradually raised the profile of anthropology in Spain. At a time when Spain was teetering between the status quo and increasing openness, this new anthropology was in urgent need of trained professionals and teachers, recognition from universities, and a means of dissemination (journals, books, etc.). The progressive formalisation of the discipline made it necessary to abandon old concepts and integrate new ones that fell more in line with an increasingly dynamic wider society. Thus, social and cultural anthropology begins to substitute ethnology, a subject that had become more associated with prehistoric times and archaeology, than with the processes of social change, or ideas about, for example, identity and migration patterns.

Due to a growing interest in new themes such as immigration and ethnicity (Lisón-Tolosana 1975), Spanish anthropology experienced a significant increase in human resources and output, albeit from a very modest baseline. The new means of understanding and conceptualising anthropology are marked, firstly by anthropology from the English-speaking world, and secondly, by a move to a more empirical approach to the discipline. However, Spain continued to be the preferred region for fieldwork, largely due to a lack of resources and financial support. In Spanish universities, to cope with the upheaval of implementing new courses, social, scientific and economic changes, and the movement for greater democracy affirming the new anthropological paradigm, there became a need to distance from the historical legacy of this discipline—with the exception of the personal work of a few researchers. Universities also needed to separate themselves from the ethnology museums being established in autonomous regions across the country as independent instruments for the assertion of identity, political justification and affirmation. Consolidating the process of institutionalisation that began during the Francoist period—particularly between 1969 to 1975—was not easy (Alcina-Franch 1975; Kenny 1971; Moreno 1972a, 1972b). One particular difficulty was the changing way in which the discipline was being used to study various cultural practices in Spain, a tendency reinforced by the measures to decentralise politically and administratively. However, despite this and other problems, Spanish anthropological science had begun to develop strong foundations, reinforcing its international links and updating its focus (Calvo and Bidart 2000; Brandes 1991a, 1991b; Lisón-Tolosana 1966, Pitt-Rivers 1954).

### **New topics of study in Spanish anthropology**

A real change in direction for Spanish social anthropology begun between 1977 and 1980. Prat-i-Carós et al. (1991), whose analysis we draw on in this section, reflected upon the new topics of study in Spanish anthropology. These indicate that

the greatest transformation occurred as Franco's dictatorship ended and democracy arrived. With the establishment of the devolved state, we see the appearance of the first anthropology associations in the autonomous regions of Cataluña, Madrid, the Canarys, and Andalucía among others, who subsequently joined forces as the FAAEE.

Prat-i-Carós (1992) highlights the emergence of a series of new study topics that form the heart of a genuinely Spanish social anthropology. The first of these is a renewed interest in the history of folklore and of anthropology, a trend borne of the new political process taking place in Spain during the 1980's which encouraged a search for ancestral ethnic roots. However, we do see a move away from classic models, which were based on notions of exoticism and the study of so-called 'primitive peoples' towards approaches characterised by professionalism and corporatism, that were also political in nature. This turnaround was centred on society, or more properly, certain segments of the rural community, and caused a renaissance in the regional folkloric traditions that had developed in the latter half of the nineteenth century.

The second new topic to emerge was 'popular culture'. On the one hand, the motivations behind the increased number of studies on this topic can be found in purely theoretical and professional considerations. The concept of 'popular culture', for example, is essentially neutral compared to others, such as 'folklore', which were somewhat stigmatised in academic circles. In addition, there was country-wide growth of new disciplines interested in this same topic, including, for instance, the nascent fields of the history of attitudes, ethnographic museography, and the study of popular oral culture, among others. Thus, academics in these fields worked alongside anthropologists to create a rich interdisciplinary body of work concerning this topic. On the other hand, such interest had a distinctly political hue. In the sense that popular culture was co-opted as part of traditional culture, in order to support the regional identities of the newly created autonomous communities. This trend contributed to the foundation of numerous cultural centres funded by the autonomous communities, such as museums, research institutes and departments, as examples. These cultural centres prompted the proliferation of conferences and journals for the purpose of disseminating information about these organisations' activities. Thus, as Prat-i-Carós et al. (1991) notes, folklore, ethnography, ethnology, and anthropology became part of a political vision of providing, or being required to provide, scientific evidence (real or imagined) for the existence of specific regional identities. Identities that were often, in fact, non-existent due to the artificiality with which the territorial boundaries of newly created autonomous communities were drawn up or, indeed, simply because of the novelty of such demarcations, as was the case for Castilla and León and Castilla-la Mancha.

The third topic of interest concerns the study of festivals, rituals, and popular religiosity, fostered, in part, by the already well-established field of folklore-studies. According to Prat-i-Carós et al. (1991), the study of traditional folklore led directly to interest in festivals as an axis for defining the unique symbolic universes of specific communities. This author also notes that a contributing factor in this was the prestige acquired by traditional festivals in the latter stages of Franco's dictatorship and during the transition to democracy. Festivals had come to be synonymous with

freedom and spontaneity and, as such, regional councils, neighbourhood associations, political parties, and educational establishments, had a feverish commitment to reviving and reinforcing ancient festivals or, indeed, creating new ones. Another aspect of the phenomenon of festivals is the progressive assimilation of certain festivals into the national, regional, and local identities that had begun to develop quite prominently in the initial stages of Spain's post-dictatorship democratisation. The combination of interest from anthropologists and from social and political quarters (Prat-i-Carós et al. 1991) was key to triggering a massive increase in the number of talks, symposia, and publications about festivals, with carnival occupying a primary position in this output.

Studies concerning identity are the fourth area of new interest, as highlighted by Prat-i-Carós et al. (1991). In the vibrant, new Spain of autonomous communities, the study of local, regional, national, and ethnic identities was a central priority and, indeed, all of the topics mentioned above can be subsumed into this single most significant trend in anthropological scholarship.

The fifth topic concerns questions of marginalisation, specifically the study of groups that, while suffering some form of marginalisation, have managed to reserve a sense of ethnic cohesion. This might be by economic, cultural, social, or symbolic means, or more generally, requiring recourse to all four. In regard to this, we see a proliferation of studies focusing on marginalised ethnic groups or *pueblos malditos* (literally 'cursed peoples'), first in the rural context and later in urban settings. More specifically, there emerged a trend of studies of marginalised ethnic minorities, as well as numerous studies concerning immigration and processes of suburbanisation in some cities, often focussing on particular sections of marginalised communities, like, young people, adults, etc., or so-called 'high-risk' subcultures. Complementing this body of work, is the development of an anthropology of life-stages and studies specifically about youth, or old age. Furthermore, there emerged a wave of new specialisms: the anthropologies of gender, kinship, fishing, nutrition, tourism, as well as studies into associationism, among other related topics. In this way, it becomes clear that, during this phase of its development, Spanish social anthropology gains enormous complexity and diversity, and this trend continues to this day.

Evidence of the progress of Spanish anthropology can be found in "Antropología cultural de los pueblos de España" [A cultural anthropology of the peoples of Spain] (Prat-i-Carós et al. 1991), a collection of articles that complements the broad, introductory studies conducted by the editors themselves. The book expounds the theoretical perspectives of its editors, as such, the articles it references are chosen to support these. The early history of the discipline is presented by way of an analysis of the ideological tendencies that defined anthropological study from the middle of the nineteenth century into the 20th. In the second part of the book, the fundamental themes of anthropology are dealt with in sub-sections. These include, firstly, a section on "the organisation and perception of space", which contains various studies in ethnography that address this issue such as those dealing with smallholdings, landed estates, work, capitalism, and so on. The following section provides an introduction to relevant ecological factors and economic processes using key concepts such as strategy, flexibility, change, diversity, and risk. After which we find a compilation of work on the domestic sphere: strategies of production and reproduction.

The fourth section concerns “social stratification and power relationships” and, here, the authors examine several recurring concepts surrounding the key issues of patronage, despotism, and ideas about community. In addition, this section deals with other important questions of significance to Spanish anthropology, such as the impact of the Spanish Civil War, Francoism, and the transition to democracy. These socio-political contests are much larger scale manifestations of the other concepts studied in this section. The final section is dedicated to “identities and rituals” and offers a broad treatment of these concepts. In total, the book comprises 44 articles including the editors’ introductions, the majority of which, have considerable academic weight and, together, give a thoroughly representative sample of the types of studies and the authors working in anthropology contemporary to the time of publication.

Other important references are included in the various works paying homage to particular high-profile anthropologists of the time. The subjects of which include Caro Baroja” (Carreira et al. 1978), Claudio Esteva-Fabregat (Prat-i-Carós and Hernáez 1996), to Pitt-Rivers (Velasco-Maíllo 2005), and more recently, to Dr. Luis Munarriz (Antón-Hurtado and Tolosana 2018), Professor González Arpide (Fernández-Álvarez and Díaz-Viana (2020), and Professor Luis Díaz-Viana (Vicente-Blanco et al. 2022).

## **Conclusions: challenges for Spanish anthropology in the twenty-first century**

During the twentieth century, anthropology has undergone a notable transformation in terms of what, and how it should be studied, which has forced anthropologists to reconsider their methods and foci. As has been considered in previous work (Díaz-Viana and Fernández-Álvarez 2011), several authors have pointed out that anthropologists are: “the last to approach the urban environment in what might be called the third revolution in anthropology” (Cátedra 1997) and this is an idea we shall return to in this section. According to this point of view, there have been three principal ‘revolutions’ in anthropology during the twentieth century and all three have altered the discipline’s focus of study, moving it first away from ‘primitive’ peoples to rural communities, and finally, to urban dwellers. That is, anthropology has moved from studying what might be described as ‘exotic’ groups, or the ‘savages abroad’, to rural groups, the ‘savages at home’, to citizens *like us*.

The most recent area of study about which anthropology is becoming increasingly aware, and which could be seen to constitute a ‘fourth revolution’ in our discipline, concerns the ‘delocalization’ or ‘translocalisation’ of wisdom. New technologies have enabled the transmission of information and knowledge beyond anything possible by classical means, and thus these concepts can no longer be studied in relation to static communities or particular territories. This loss, or at least transformation of, the ‘sense of place’ (Appadurai 1996) is an overarching phenomenon in the modern world. The new shared spaces that technology creates, in turn, create new forms of documentation that can, and should be studied.

As such, at present, we stand before the dual challenges of ‘deterritorialisation’ and mobility. Large numbers of people now work in one place and live in another, people migrate to other countries to work, or return to the places they once left searching for new ways to subsist using skills and knowledge garnered in other places and from other occupations. This is not an entirely novel phenomenon, and, thus, perhaps it should make us reflect on the transcendence of mobility in the future of humanity. Modern human lifestyles often share more common features with those of the nomad than those of settled farmers. This observation may seem strange since the former has, until recently, been seen as something archaic and from our ancestral past, while the later might be considered modern and ‘civilized’. The challenge of understanding the often vertiginous mobility of today’s world has required anthropologists to revise their traditional approaches to ethnography and construct new strategies, seen in, for instance the development of so-called ‘multi-sited’ ethnography (Marcus 2001) or in calls for the establishment of a whole new area of study, designated as ‘the anthropology of movement’.

The phenomena of the study of mobility will now test the theoretical and methodological frameworks of ‘community studies’, a field which has principally focussed on rural communities. It will also test the suppositions and methodologies of ‘urban anthropology’, since the processes in question combines conventions of both the ‘rural’ and the ‘urban’. Another related area that should not be neglected is studies of popular culture (García-Canclini 1989) and ‘local knowledge’ (Geertz 1994) in the context of globalisation. Globalisation has profound consequences for our notions of culture. For example, how can we conceptualise ethnography beyond places and cultures that are spatially limited? Or, how do we untangle the relationships and dependencies between global and local levels, and their manifestations, in the process known as ‘glocalisation’? (Robertson 1995). Today, perhaps more than ever, it could be said that: “cultures are not walls and theoretically, frontiers are falling” (García 2001). This phrase succinctly expresses the idea that the lines separating ‘ethnographic space’ and ‘non-places’ (Augé 1998) are, in many cases, not as distinct as they might appear on paper. Indeed, this is never more the case than in ‘delocalised’ communities where the paradigms of city/countryside, urban/rural, local/global seem to be wrapped in a complex process of transformation that often irrevocably blurs their apparent characteristics.

In parallel, it can be appreciated that anthropology as a discipline of itself—which attempts to study all these processes—frequently gives the impression of questioning and reifying its profile as the objects of study broaden and increase in their complexity. The solution is probably not found in refusing to consider those processes and communities that present the most problems, quite the opposite. We need to address them based on real case studies that call into question the old paradigms, so enabling an assessment of how far anthropology’s current methods can take us in the analysis of such problematic instances. Furthermore, we must accept the challenge of evaluating what it is anthropology can bring to the table with respect to, and in collaboration with), other sciences by taking the holistic approach that has always characterised this discipline.

Through this, anthropology will continue to explore memory above all. Indeed, anthropologists have a somewhat subconscious awareness that this subject has

always been, in some way, part of our work. Anthropology, as neither pure history nor pure philosophy but amply reliant on both, deals in memory, both in terms of its content and its methodologies. On one hand, its core focus is humans, which are animals made of memory and this memory, as much individual as collective, gives humanity a consciousness of itself, knowledge inherited from others, and an identity. On the other hand, the ethnographer's methodologies are characterised by investigation into themes and problems identified and recounted by the peoples studied. Recounting is remembering; remembering just as much as forgetting.

However, records of the past—the ways in which we express narratives of time—have had to be standardised in recent years. Thus, across the planet, the spoken word, the primary way in which we communicate, is now recorded in written or technology-mediated forms. Paradoxically, many of the technological mediums by which ethnographers once captured particular instances have now come to be archive material or historical documents. The synchronous vision of things has become an evolution in instalments and ethnography, a form of 'serial history'.

Nevertheless, thanks in part to anthropology, we are of course aware that 'historical time' is not our only available vision of time. Since classical antiquity, we have been accustomed to combining this perspective with the notion of 'mythical' or 'ritual' time without too many problems. In other words, we could say that 'historical time' is the territory of history, while 'mythical time' belongs to anthropology. It is not a case of anthropologists denying history nor trying to dispense with it, but so-called 'ethno-history' has far more to do with history than ethnography. The small or modest history of normal people and everyday life, should not be confused with ethnography, since the latter involves the interaction with what a community remembers in the present. Ethnography is, then, what a group of people decide to remember or forget, and this selection of recollections is our most relevant material for study. In this way, anthropology has also taught us that time can be differentiated not only because of how it is understood, but also because of how it is recorded. It is not simply about how a story is told, but also how it is heard. Narration and listening form our collective memory. Without one or the other, there would be no point in remembering. This is the spectrum of challenges facing anthropology today. It is a field of ongoing transformation, no doubt irreversible, concerning notions of places, times, and memories.

**Acknowledgements** Not applicable.

**Authors' contributions** Óscar Fernández: Conceptualization, Methodology, Formal analysis and results, Discussion, and Conclusion. Writing. Miguel González-González: Conceptualization, Methodology, Formal analysis and results, Discussion. Sara Ouali-Fernández: Conceptualization, Methodology, formal analysis and results, Conclusion. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

**Funding** Not applicable.

**Availability of data and materials** Not applicable.

## Declarations

**Ethics approval and consent to participate** Not applicable.

**Consent for publication** Not applicable.

**Competing interests** We have no competing interests.

**Open Access** This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>.

## References

- Alcina-Franch, José. 1975. La antropología en España. *Revista de Antropología de la Universidad Complutense* XXIV: 97.
- Antón-Hurtado, Fina, and Carmelo Lisón Tolosana. 2018. *Antropología: Enfoque sociocultural: Homenaje al Dr. Luis Álvarez Munárriz*. Valencia: Tirant lo Blanch.
- Appadurai, Arjun. 1996. *Modernity at large: Cultural dimensions of globalization*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Augé, Marc. 1998. *Los 'no lugares'. Espacios del anonimato. Una antropología de la sobremodernidad*. Barcelona.
- Bestard, Joan, and Jesús Contreras. 1987. *Bárbaros, paganos, salvajes y primitivos. Una introducción a la Antropología*. Barcelona: Barcanova.
- Boas, F. 1911. 1964. *Cuestiones fundamentales de antropología cultural*. Buenos Aires: Solar-Hachette.
- Boas, F. 1940. 1966. *Race, Language and Culture*. New York: The Free Press.
- Brandes, Stanley. 1991a. España como "objeto" de estudio: reflexiones sobre el destino del antropólogo norteamericano en España. In *Los españoles vistos por los antropólogos*, ed. María Cátedra, 231–249. Madrid: Júcar.
- Brandes, Stanley. 1991b. *Metáforas de la masculinidad: Sexo y estatus en el folklore andaluz*. Barcelona: Taurus.
- Calvo, Luis. 2002. La Revista de Dialectología y Tradiciones Populares y sus aportaciones a la antropología española (1944–1996). *Revista de Dialectología y Tradiciones Populares* 57: 29–58.
- Calvo, Luis, and Pierre Bidart. 2000. L'épisode franquista. *Ethnologie française* XXX (2): 213–220.
- Caro Baroja, Julio. 1983. *La aurora del pensamiento antropológico. La antropología en los clásicos Griegos y latinos*. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas.
- Caro Baroja, Julio. 1985. *Los fundamentos del pensamiento antropológico moderno*. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas.
- Carreira, Antonio, Jesús A. Cid, Manuel Gutiérrez Estevez, and Rogelio Rubio. 1978. *Homenaje a Julio Caro Baroja*. Madrid: Centro de Investigaciones Sociológicas.
- Castilla Urbano, Francisco. 1991. *Historia de la Antropología en España: Textos clásicos y aportaciones nacionales*, 265–286. Revista de Dialectología y Tradiciones Populares, XLVI.
- Cátedra, María. 1997. *Un santo Para una ciudad. Ensayo de antropología Urbana*. Barcelona: Ariel.
- Díaz-Viana, Luis, and Óscar Fernández-Álvarez. 2011. Introducción. Los retos de la Antropología en la actualidad. In *Lugares, tiempos, memorias: la Antropología Ibérica en el siglo XXI*, ed. Óscar Fernández-Álvarez, Luis Díaz-Viana, and Pedro Tomé Martín, 17–22. León: Universidad de León.
- Duchet, Michele. 1975. *Antropología e historia en el siglo de las luces*. México: Siglo XXI.
- Durkheim, E. 1893. 1982. *La división del trabajo social*. Madrid: Akal.
- Durkheim, E. 1895. 1988. *Las reglas de método sociológico y otros escritos*. Madrid: Alianza.
- Durkheim, E. 1912. 1982. *Las formas elementales de la Vida religiosa. El sistema totémico en Australia*. Madrid: Akal.
- Duvignaud, Jean. 1975. *El lenguaje perdido. Ensayo sobre la diferencia antropológica*. México: Siglo XXI.

- Esteve Fabregat, Claudio. 1969. *La etnología española y sus problemas. Etnología y tradiciones populares*, 1–40. Zaragoza: Institución "Fernando el Católico.
- Fernández-Álvarez, Óscar, and Luis Díaz-Viana. 2020. In *La discreción del antropólogo, la antropología entre León y Tabarca: Homenaje al profesor J*, ed. L. González Arpide. León: Universidad de León.
- Fernández-Álvarez, Óscar, Luis Díaz Viana, and Pedro Tomé Martín. 2011. *Lugares, tiempos, memorias: la Antropología Ibérica en el siglo XXI*. León: Universidad de León.
- Frazier, J. 1890. 1965. *La rama dorada*. México: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- García, José Luis. 2001. Las fronteras administrativas y sociales: su influencia epistemológica en la antropología. In *La mirada cruzada en la Península Ibérica*, ed. María Cátedra, 21–56. Madrid: Perspectivas desde la antropología social en España y Portugal.
- García-Canclini, Néstor. 1989. *Culturas híbridas. Estrategias Para entrar y salir de la modernidad*. México, D. F.: Grijalbo.
- Geertz, Clifford. 1989. *El antropólogo Como autor*. Barcelona: Paidós.
- Geertz, Clifford. 1994. *Conocimiento local. Ensayos sobre la interpretación de las culturas*. Barcelona: Paidós.
- Harris, Marvin. 1978. *El desarrollo de la teoría antropológica. Una historia de las teorías de la cultura*. Madrid: Siglo XXI.
- Hodgen, M.T. 1964. *Early anthropology in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Jiménez-Núñez, Alfredo. 1975. *Primera Reunión de Antropólogos Españoles*. Sevilla: Universidad de Sevilla.
- Kenny, Michael. 1971. El rol de la antropología social dentro de las ciencias sociales en España. *Ethnica* 1: 91–105.
- Kuper, Adam. 1973. *Antropología y antropólogos. La escuela británica: 1922–1972*. Barcelona: Anagrama.
- Leclerc, Gérard. 1973. *Antropología y colonialismo*. Madrid: Alberto Corazón.
- Levy-Bruhl, L. [1922] 1957. *La mentalidad primitiva*. Buenos Aires: Leviatán.
- Levy-Bruhl, L. [1927] 1974. *El alma primitiva*. Barcelona: Península.
- Levy-Bruhl, L. [1935] 1978. *La mitología primitiva. El mundo mítico de los australianos y los papúes*. Barcelona: Península.
- Morgan, Lewis, H. [1877] 1971. *La Sociedad primitiva*. Madrid: Ayuso.
- Lévi-Strauss, C. 1949. *Las estructuras elementales del parentesco*. Barcelona: Paidós.
- Lévi-Strauss, C. 1953. *Antropología Estructural*. Eudeba: Buenos Aires.
- Lévi-Strauss, C. 1955. *Tristes Trópicos*. Barcelona: Paidós.
- Lévi-Strauss, C. 1962. *El pensamiento salvaje*. Fondo de Cultura Económica: México.
- Lévi-Strauss, C. 1964. *Mitológicas I. Lo crudo y lo cocido*. México: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Lévi-Strauss, C. 1972. *Mitológicas II. De la miel y las cenizas*. México: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Lévi-Strauss, C. 1973. *El futuro de los estudios del parentesco*. Barcelona: Anagrama.
- Lévi-Strauss, C. 1974. *Estructuralismo y ecología*. Barcelona: Anagrama.
- Lévi-Strauss, C. 1976a. *Mitológicas III. El origen de las maneras de la mesa*. México: Siglo XXI.
- Lévi-Strauss, C. 1976b. *Mitológicas IV. El hombre desnudo*. México: Siglo XXI.
- Lévi-Strauss, C. 1979. *Antropología estructural II. Mito, sociedad, humanidades*. Madrid: Siglo XXI.
- Lévi-Strauss, C. 1981a. *La identidad*. Barcelona: Petrel.
- Lévi-Strauss, C. 1981b. *La vía de las máscaras*. Madrid: Siglo XXI.
- Lévi-Strauss, C. 1984. *Palabra dada*. Madrid: Espasa Calpe.
- Lévi-Strauss, C. 1986. *La alfarera celosa*. Barcelona: Paidós.
- Lévi-Strauss, C. 1987. *Mito y significado*. Madrid: Alianza.
- Lévi-Strauss, C. 1990. *De cerca y de lejos*. Madrid: Alianza.
- Lévi-Strauss, C. 1992. *El totemismo en la actualidad*. México: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Lisón-Tolosana, C. 1977. *Una gran encuesta de 1901–1902 (Notas Para la historia de la Antropología social en España). Antropología Social en España*, 105–179. Madrid: Akal.
- Lisón-Tolosana, Carmelo. 1966. *Belmonte de los caballeros: A sociological study of a Spanish Town*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Lisón-Tolosana, Carmelo. 1975. Panorama programático de la antropología social en España. In *Primera reunión de antropólogos españoles*, ed. Alfredo Jiménez, 149–162. Sevilla: Universidad de Sevilla.
- Llobera, J.R. 1980. *Hacia una historia de las ciencias sociales. El Caso del materialismo histórico*. Barcelona: Anagrama.
- Lowie, R.H. 1920. 1972. *La sociedad primitiva*. Buenos Aires: Amorrortu.
- Lowie, R.H. 1924. 1972. *Religiones primitivas*. Madrid: Alianza.
- Lowie, R.H. 1937. 1946. *Historia de la etnología*. México: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Malinowski, B. 1922. 1985. *Los Argonautas del Pacífico Occidental*. Barcelona: Península.
- Malinowski, B. 1926. 1969. *Crimen y costumbre en la sociedad salvaje*. Barcelona: Ariel.



- Malinowski, B. 1927. 1974. *Sexo y represión en la sociedad primitiva*. Buenos Aires: Nueva Visión.
- Malinowski, B. 1929. 1971. *La vida sexual de los salvajes del noreste de Melanesia*. Madrid: Morata.
- Malinowski, B. 1935. 1977. *Jardines de coral y su magia. El cultivo de la tierra y los ritos agrícolas en las Islas Trobriand*. Barcelona: Labor.
- Malinowski, B. 1944. 1984. *Una teoría científica de la cultura*. Barcelona: Sarpe.
- Malinowski, B. 1948. 1955. *Magic, Science an Religion and Other Essays*. New York: Anchor.
- Marcus, George E. 2001. Etnografía en/del sistema mundo. El surgimiento de la etnografía multilocal. *Alteridades* 11 (22): 111–127.
- Meek, R.L. 1980. *Smith, Marx y después. Diez ensayos sobre el desarrollo del pensamiento económico*. Madrid: Siglo XXI.
- Meek, R.L. 1981. *Los orígenes de la ciencia social. El desarrollo de la teoría de los cuatro estadios*. Madrid: Siglo XXI.
- Mercier, Paul. 1976. *Historia de la antropología*. Barcelona: Península.
- Moreno, Isidoro. 1972a. El trabajo de campo etnológico en España y el problema de la elección de comunidad. *Ethnica* 3: 165–182.
- Moreno, Isidoro. 1972b. *Propiedad, clases sociales y hermandades en la Baja Andalucía. La estructura social de un pueblo del Aljarafe*. Madrid: Siglo XXI.
- Moreno, Isidoro. 1979. *Cultura y modos de producción. Una visión de la antropología desde el materialismo histórico*. Madrid: Nuestra Cultura.
- Pagden, A. 1982. *The fall of natural man. The American Indian and the Origins of the Comparative Ethnology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Palerm, A. 1974. *Historia de la etnología, I: los precursores*. México, D.F.: INAH-CIS.
- Palerm, A. 1976. *Historia de la etnología, II: los evolucionistas*. México, D.F.: INAH-CIS.
- Palerm, A. 1977. *Historia de la etnología, III: Tylor y los profesionales*. México, D.F.: INAH-CIS.
- Pitt-Rivers, Julián A. 1954. *The people of the sierra*. Nueva York: Criterion Books.
- Poirier, J. 1968. *Histoire de la pensée ethnologique, Ethnologie Générale*, 3–125. Paris: Gallimard. Encyclopedie de la Pleiade.
- Poirier, J. 1969. *Histoire de l'ethnologie*. Paris: P.U.F. (Trad. Esp. México: F.C.E., 1987).
- Prat-i-Carós, Joan. 1992. Antropología y etnología. In *Las ciencias sociales en España*. Madrid: Ed. Complutense.
- Prat-i-Carós, Joan, and Ángel Martínez Hernández, eds. 1996. *Ensayos de antropología cultural. Homenaje a Claudio Esteva-Fabregat*. Barcelona: Ariel.
- Prat-i-Carós, Joan, U. Martínez, J. Contreras, and I. Moreno, eds. 1991. *Antropología de los pueblos de España*. Madrid: Taurus.
- Rivers, W.H.R. 1914a. *Kinship and social organisation*. London: Constable.
- Rivers, W.J.R. 1914b. *Melanesian society. Vol. I*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Robertson, R. 1995. Glocalization: Time-space and homogeneity-heterogeneity. In *Global Modernities*, ed. M. Featherstone, S. Lash, and R. Robertson. Londres: Sage.
- Ronzón, E. 1991. *Antropología y antropologías. Ideas para una historia crítica de la antropología española. El siglo XIX*. Oviedo: Pentalfa Ediciones.
- Rupp-Eisenreich, Britta. 1984. *Histoires de l'anthropologie (XVI- XIX siecles)*. Paris: Klincksieck. (Trad. Esp. Madrid: Júcar, 1989).
- Tylor, E.B. 1871. 1977. *La Cultura Primitiva*. Madrid: Ayuso.
- Tylor, E.B. 1881. 1973. *Antropología*. Madrid: Ayuso.
- Velasco-Maíllo, Honorio. 2005. *La antropología Como pasión y Como práctica: Ensayos "in honorem" Julian Pitt-Rivers*. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, CSIC.
- Vicente-Blanco, Dámaso, Pedro Tomé Martín, Ignacio Fernández de Mata, and Susana Asensio Llamas. 2022. "Salvajes" de Aquí y de Allá: Memoria y Relato de Nos-Otros. *Liber Amicorum Luis Díaz Viana*. Valladolid: Universidad de Valladolid.

## Comments

**Publisher's Note** Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.