

# Ethnology, Folk Culture and Spanish Anthropology

*Claudio Esteva-Fabregat*

Esteva-Fabregat, Claudio 1996: Ethnology, Folk Culture and Spanish Anthropology. – *Ethnologia Europaea* 26: 111–122.

Although Spanish ethnology has a long tradition, associated with the ethnographic reports prepared by Catholic missionaries converting American Indians, today this tradition is based largely on the university and museums. Parallel to the evolution in ethnology, folklore, the study of rural cultural tradition, has followed its own historical development, though while it has attracted a wide audience, it has remained at the margins of the university.

Ethnology retained a place in university studies up to 1968 when it entered a period of transition in which it was incorporated within cultural anthropology (1971). Cultural anthropology subsequently became associated with social anthropology leaving ethnology as a variety of comparative ethnography. Today, cultural anthropology retains more elements of ethnology, while social anthropology retains more elements of folklore. However, there is a degree of interdisciplinary influence through ethnographically oriented fieldwork and the presence of researchers who adopt simply the name of anthropologists. There are more anthropologists working in academic institutions than physical anthropologists, the latter having become increasingly associated with the study of biology and genetics, than with culture, concerned more with laboratory studies than fieldwork.

European ethnology is facing a number of problems. One of them is the methods needed for an integrated study of ethnographic globalities and local ethnographies, while another is the analysis of cultural change and the consequences of modern technologies applied to the rapid transformation of culture in Europe. In addition, there are the problems we face in analysing ethnicity, nationalism, identity, migration, integration, mobility and social disorganization.

*Professor, Dr Claudio Esteva-Fabregat, Apartado de Correos 23. 325, ES-08080 Barcelona.*

This paper presents a historical review of ethnological studies in Spain. By providing a context in which we might view the academic evolution of Spanish ethnology, through its modern and contemporary history, we are able to identify its origins and describe the influences from the rest of Europe. These may be identified as having been the trends of diffusionism, historicism, evolutionism, pre-Roman tribalism, exotic primitivism and ethnographism. Ethnology in Spain, however, rapidly came to define itself as folk ethnography, as it was felt that the study of the archaic rural culture was most pertinent to the specific situation of Spanish culture.

These shifts between ethnology and folklore

emphasize both the historical and contemporary forms of the Spanish cultural past – the former in terms of time and the second in terms of archaisms present today. Ethnology, defined as the study of primitive cultures or tribal identities considered as non-civilized peoples, and folklore, the first modern variety of rural ethnography in Spain, came to be considered as interchangeable. However, the two could be distinguished by the division of tasks; so while the folklorists were dedicated to the study of Spanish folk culture, ethnologists, together with prehistorians and classical Mediterranean history scholars, centered their study on exotic primitive heathens and pre-Roman Spanish culture. Folklore and ethnology were joined by

the subsequent development of cultural anthropology and, later, by social anthropology. The four disciplines today do not exclude each other, though cultural anthropology and social anthropology are predominant in both the academic and professional worlds.

In this history the respective roles of the university and the museums have been instrumental in the development of both folklore and ethnology. Ethnologists have been active in both institutions, while folklorists have worked mainly in Museums. Cultural and social anthropologists work mostly at the universities and institutions devoted to field research. From the beginning folklore has been studied outside the university, since its main activities have been developed in folk museums founded on Spanish rural culture. In contrast, the academic system has provided the institutions in which ethnologists have worked on a professional basis, while folklorists have remained at the fringes of University departments. Consequently, folklore has been relegated to a secondary position in the academic system.

Museums of folklore and ethnology house material culture and have been responsible for most of the classification, restoration, study and exhibition of ethnographic material illustrative of ethnic traits. Members of these institutions have at times undertaken field work to obtain more ethnographic material, but in general terms museums have been mostly interested in contemporary primitive and exotic people, plus Spanish rural archaic culture. Archaeological remains have been housed in museums of archaeology, while early human remains are displayed at museums of natural science.

Historically speaking, ethnology has held only a minor status in university studies and in the filling of academic posts when compared with prehistory, archaeology and ancient history. This situation has arisen from its academic subordination to prehistory so that ethnology has been seen as a subsidiary discipline of prehistory. As a consequence, cultural primitivism has come to constitute the main concern of ethnology in Spain. Furthermore, as a result of this dependence on prehistory, Spanish ethnologists have focused their attention on primitive culture so that ethnology has become a comple-

mentary discipline of prehistory and ancient history. As a consequence, the theoretical approaches of ethnology have been borrowed from primitive anthropology.

Ethnological and folklore studies of Spanish culture coincide in their topics and themes of interest. This historical development is explained in greater detail below. The disciplines are then examined individually to examine the prevailing academic position.

## Folklore

In Spain the folklorists have been somewhat more prolific than ethnologists, generating more studies of Spanish folk culture than ethnologists. Popular folk expressionism, centered on traditionalism, has been the specific contribution of folklore. Indeed, initially, the fortunes of folklore in Spain were determined by the urban interest in understanding the meaning of their own traditions, whereby the latter are seen as a form of ethnic confirmation. In Spain folk studies have been conducted through the use of questionnaires sent to local informants. The main concern has been placed on ethnographic classification while folklorists in Spain have stressed the regional differences underlying ethnic identities via traditional cultures. Every region, every "inner nation", seeks ethnic identity through their folk culture.

Thus, the image of the folk culture defines one's ethnic or national personality. In Spain folklorists have emphasized those aspects of behaviour which are linked with the life cycle and linguistic differences. Festive traditions, oral literature, children's games, folk medicine, wedding dress, marriage and family life are all items of concern to the folklorist. Additionally, several prestigious folklorists have conducted a study of the internal logos lying in the depths of folk behaviour.

The questionnaire technique represents an indirect form of knowledge. The historical substitution of folklore by social anthropology has meant more field work and a more precise analytic approach to ethnographic materials. In fact, this professional and academic substitution of folklorists needs to be seen in terms of a need for greater insight on the same themes.

Methods of field work and analysis, academic institutionalization and intellectual prestige are the main features which distinguish social anthropology from folklore.

In 1901 the "Sección de Ciencias Políticas y Morales" of the "Ateneo de Madrid" undertook an extensive study of Spanish folk culture in rural Spain. What distinguished their work from ethnology was the approach rather than the subjects studied. Folklore relied on questionnaires sent by mail to hundreds of informants, while ethnology relied on personal observation through field work and ethnographic taxonomies and cultural reconstruction by historical methods. Thus at the turn of the century there was little to distinguish between ethnology and folklore in terms of information and contents collected. For example, in Catalonia folklorists of repute, such as V. Serra i Boldú, Joan Amades, and Aureli Capmany were also considered ethnologists and similarly Tomás Carreras-Artau, a philosopher, was conducting studies in folklore, using the sample and questionnaire techniques, though thematically he is often mistaken for an ethnologist. Luis de Hoyos Sainz, from Madrid, is another case in point though perhaps more of an ethnologist than a folklorist. Notwithstanding, folklore followed a phenomenological approach while ethnology was more holistic in its method.

Folklorists formed associations at a regional and state level, which in some cases also incorporated ethnologists, e.g. the "Arxiu d'Etnografia i Folklore de Catalunya" (Archive of Ethnography and Folklore of Catalonia). This Catalan association provided a professional forum for scientific debate. Yet, the academic standing of ethnologists placed them in positions of superiority, ratifying the different status given to ethnology. The result was that folklorists became self-trained in methods, techniques and intellectual orientation, while ethnologists were educated in academic and university institutions.

As a consequence, the academic influence from folklore was greatly limited and it came to be considered an amateur or part-time activity. In contrast the institutionalisation of ethnology conferred on it a certain academic respectability and opportunities for professionals to be

employed full time. Consequently, ethnology began to show a greater empirical concern, while folklore favoured a more interpretative approach. Much of the social importance of folklore can be ascribed to its growing popular concern and to politicians using folk heritage in the definition of ethnic or national identity.

In Spain regional and national movements, especially among intellectuals, have made greater use of folklore than ethnology due to a greater familiarity with folk culture than with exotic primitive or prehistoric cultures. Generally speaking, the impoverished intellectual standing of folklorists in Spain has meant the relinquishing of the scientific ground to ethnology. Notwithstanding, in this history ethnology has established only a weak foothold in the university. Folklorism has demonstrated that modern culture is too marginal to this kind of study. The fact that folklorists do not study folk culture within the wider global culture would seem to ignore the main trends of modern culture: diffusion and permanent acculturation, international interchange leading to cultural synthesis differentiated at the regional scale.

Critics claim that folklorism ignores the dynamics of culture if we consider the permanent addition and selective adaptations of human beings in societies. This is particularly significant if these are seen as open and scientific areas of social intercourse. In Spain, the standing of folklore is now weak and lacks the intellectual authority which might bestow on it a certain professional prestige.

## Ethnology

The demise of folklore as an academic activity in Spain began with the institutionalization of ethnology. Posts for ethnologists in the university have been scarce, but compared with folklorists they have found a space in the university.

We can trace the growth in academic prestige of ethnology in Spain to certain historical events, mainly the ethnographic contents of reports or "Relaciones" written by Spanish missionaries from the end of the 15th century to the present day, but in particular those written on the occasion of Columbus' discovery of the Antilles. One of these missionaries, the Catalan

Fr. Ramon Panó, in 1498 wrote a *Relación sobre Antigüedades de los Indios* (Report on Indian Antiquities), the first European ethnographic report on the American Indian customs of La Española.

These "Relaciones" were quickly established as a means of informing the Spanish authorities about the social habits of the Indians. They were based on field observation and social intercourse with the Indian people, using interpersonal communication in Indian languages previously learnt by a relatively long contact with natives. Indeed, since the missionaries learnt the Indian languages, the reports provide us with descriptions whose contents are basically of an ethnographic character. These "Relaciones" were complemented by "Visitas" made by official members of the Spanish Crown which also produced information on Indian people. These included descriptions of the geographical, political, economic, religious and social organization of Indians under Spanish rule.

These "Visitas" were conducted using questionnaires, a method quite distinct to that used in the "Relaciones", especially if we consider that the latter used more personal methods and involved a more qualitative approach. However, their contents constituted ethnographic material and represent the modern Spanish antecedents of ethnology.

Perhaps the most important ethnographic studies were written ca. 1560 by the Spanish Franciscan Fr. Bernardino de Sahagun. The title given by Sahagun to his work was, *Historia de las Cosas de la Nueva España* (History of the things of the New Spain). His exhaustive study describes Prehispanic Central Mexican culture. As Sahagun knew the Nahuatl language and spent 60 years in Mexico, his knowledge of the Mexican way of life was unrivalled. Sahagun can be considered as the main Spanish ethnographer of his time, and perhaps even to the end of the 19th century when contemporary European ethnology was introduced.

Sahagun worked with native informants, and was a close observer of the indigenous way of life. In some aspects, we may consider Sahagun as the first ethnohistorian of Spain. He gathered historical data from the oral stories told by elderly indigenous people and had ac-

cess to *Códices* or native stories written in the form of pictographs giving information on the origins and history of the Indians of central Mexico, plus their relations with other Indian peoples of Mesoamerica. Sahagun's ethnohistory was an original ethnographic treatment of historical materials, written both by Indians and Spaniards, and also transmitted by Indian scholars converted into informants of native cultural traditions. Although not as rich in terms of native writing, the Spanish approach to ethnohistory was similar in the rest of Mesoamerica and the Central Andes, particularly with regards to Mayan and Inca historical and contemporary culture.

Other missionaries wrote ethnographic studies of peoples from cultures at different stages of development. I refer to hunter-gatherer subsistence and nomadic or semi-nomadic peoples. Here the observation was distinct as these people lacked any kind of written history. In fact, their ethnographic reports were based on field work and long residences. This approach was imitated by other Spanish missionaries throughout Africa, Asia and Oceania during the Spanish colonial period.

Given its historical antecedents, contemporary Spanish ethnology is not unaccustomed to naturalistic approaches to the study of culture. Indeed there is a tradition for the study of primitive peoples through observation and the learning of their languages, the obtaining of information about a culture in an oral form, employing naturalistic and personal techniques, and in the combination of historical and contemporary cultures.

The main difference with the rest of Western European ethnologists has been in terms of economic resources available for field work, since the political decline of Spain interrupted the empirical and theoretical contribution of Spaniards to ethnology. This interruption coincided with the scientific naturalistic development of British, German and French ethnologists and more original production from these nations. In fact, the naturalistic approach in European ethnology makes theoretical and empirical sense in approaches to evolutionism, diffusionism and historicism. Furthermore, the questions raised by these movements coincided

with the imperialism and colonial expansion of Great Britain, France and Germany throughout Africa, Asia and Oceania. The ethnographic reports written by these ethnologists are coloured by cultural primitivism, as were the "Relaciones" conducted by Spanish missionaries in Indoamerica.

The difference consisted in the progressive substitution of missionaries by secular members of society, which led to the creation of professional associations which in their turn established a degree of critical control over ethnologists. As a consequence, ethnographic description became more precise being governed by taxonomic categories and theoretical concerns which represented the contribution of ethnologists to the explanation of human culture and diverse societies. The discussion and analysis of cultural meanings, their evolution and diffusion, and the historical behaviour of peoples are at the root of European ethnology from the second half of the 19th century.

Spanish ethnology had a poor academic standing in comparison to that of European ethnology, but was highly receptive to innovations in method and theory. This was no doubt the result of its own naturalistic tradition which meant that it was quick to adopt European influences. Spanish ethnologists tended towards exotically oriented studies and those of pre-Roman Hispanic cultures which have influenced the study of contemporary Spanish rural culture. Moreover, Spanish ethnologists have tended to work in the tradition of phenomenological folklorists.

It seems evident that contemporary Spanish ethnology shows important elements of both a historical and a field work/personal observation approach. The Catalan, Pere Bosch-Gimpera is representative of a prehistorian carrying out pre-Roman ethnology, while José Miguel de Barandiarán and Julio Caro Baroja applied both approaches, historical and contemporary, in studying the Basque people. Caro Baroja, moreover, maintained the early Spanish ethnological tradition when studying colonial Morocco (1955) and the peoples of the Sahara (1957) in studies which adopted the most advanced scientific requirements of his ethnological time. Moreover, until his death (1956) the Catalan

R. Violant-Simorra was the main exponent of empirical ethnological field work not only in Catalonia, but also in Spain.

Thus, Spanish ethnology has placed its focus on ethnoculturalism. Ethnographic field work and ethnocultural reconstruction through ethnohistory are complementary approaches to those of historicism and sociology, both alternating between cultural primitivism and rural folk expressionism.

Ethnology in the Spanish university has been poorly represented especially when compared with related disciplines and in terms of the number of academic posts established. For a long time, ethnology was merely a complement to prehistory which meant that the topics dealt with in ethnology were characterised by cultural primitivism. At that time, or before 1968, ethnologists were required to teach comparative regional ethnographies drawing on general anthropology and contemporary forms of primitive cultures. The concerns and theoretical problems of prehistorians dominated the ethnological studies of that time.

Outside academia, in the museums, ethnologists were principally engaged in the preparation of ethnographic exhibits, mostly material culture, although in some cases they remained interested in rural folk culture. Sometimes, ethnologists and folklorists were doing the same type of work distinguished only by the more academic approach of the former and the academic isolation of the latter. Indeed ethnologists were increasingly able to draw on the multidisciplinary sources available to them in the universities. Yet, historicism was the most important approach to ethnology in the framework of Spanish academic discourse.

The year of 1968 marked an important turning point in this short history. Ethnology was given a full-time academic post within the Spanish university with the appointment of C. Esteva-Fabregat to the permanent chair of Ethnology at the University of Barcelona. C. Esteva-Fabregat was also named Director of the "Centro de Etnología Peninsular", integrated in the "Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas" (Council of Superior Scientific Researches), also situated in Barcelona. At the same time August Panyella, the Director of the Museum of

Ethnology in Barcelona and part-time professor of ethnology at the City University, was appointed secretary of this institution. Thus, ethnology was formally established as an institutionalized discipline and achieved academic autonomy from prehistory.

However as a result of this historical and academic association with prehistory, ethnology acquired a certain familiarity with physical anthropology and the natural sciences. In that sense, ethnology maintained its relationship with the biological disciplines. Moreover, as ethnology is based on an interdisciplinary approach, and as it has tended to alternate synchronic and diachronic methods, it permitted ethnologists to concentrate on the study of past and present societies. Additionally, ethnology at the university sought to introduce studies in historical ethnography and rural culture. Holism and phenomenology were proposed as alternative methodologies, but in all cases ethnology was placed on a better academic standing than before. With the exception of museums of arts and popular customs, mainly dedicated to the study of Spanish rural folk culture, in line with traditional folkloristic, the museums of ethnology, principally those in Barcelona and Madrid, continued to take a primitivist and exotic approach to exhibits of ethnographic cultures. Frequently, both museums were interested in presenting rural folk culture together with primitive cultures. At the same time, in the university the structure of ethnological studies was widened. Also, it meant more students and increased requirements for the carrying out of research.

## Cultural anthropology

In 1971 C. Esteva-Fabregat was appointed to the chair of Cultural Anthropology in the Spanish Academy. A year later the Department of Cultural Anthropology was founded at the University of Barcelona. In addition, in 1971 the journal *Ethnica*, was founded, dedicated to expressing the interdisciplinary cooperation between the four branches of anthropology. This journal was based in the "Centro de Etnología Peninsular". In both activities, C. Esteva-Fabregat was the founder and director.

Ethnology was the central discipline of cultural anthropology. In fact, cultural anthropology was considered as being the main approach to the cultural explanation of human behaviour. Thus, culturalism constituted the main tradition at this time. In the process, cultural anthropology was considered by students and academia as a highly prestigious science integrating prehistory, archaeology and linguistics. The specific autonomous departmental structure of cultural anthropology permitted the analysis of past and present culture in terms of theoretical generalizations when studying the anthropology of behaviour.

The sources or hermeneutic information were regional ethnographies, archaeological descriptions and linguistic materials. This kind of integration gave rise to a more holistic and less phenomenological approach. Morphological and qualitative contents were considered quite differently, one historic and the other contemporary in functional observation. The model for this kind of conceptual integration was provided by the American conception of anthropological or Boasian holism which permits the four branches (ethnology, archaeology, linguistics and physical/biological anthropology) to be brought together in one discipline, as integrated in the study of human behaviour.

The influence of the Mexican "Escuela Nacional de Antropología e Historia" (National School of Anthropology and History) had a great influence in general and particularly on the author of this paper, who was a student and professor there between 1947 and 1956. Later he was to become a professor of Ethnology and Cultural Anthropology in Madrid where in 1965 he founded the "Escuela de Estudios Antropológicos" (School of Anthropological Studies). C. Esteva-Fabregat was simultaneously Director of this "Escuela" and of the "Museo Nacional de Etnología" (National Museum of Ethnology) in Madrid. At that time, the "Escuela" had a curricula of studies based on the four branches outlined above. In 1968 the author obtained the status of full professor of Ethnology at the University of Barcelona.

The international student movement of 1968 was of considerable strategic importance for the reception of ethnology as a discipline within

cultural anthropology. This movement created a more open mentality in the Spanish university permitting the creation of new disciplines. Cultural anthropology was particularly well received within Spanish academia, and the subject acquired a certain prestige in the rooting of cultural holism in the University of Barcelona.

Rural themes came to be emphasised within ethnology. The ethnology of the Iberian peninsula gained more importance than primitive culture, and the same was true of field work conducted in the Central Andes and Hispanic Southwest of the USA. The new blood among anthropologists gradually led to the subdivision of cultural anthropology into several areas: Culture and personality, economic-anthropology, cognitive anthropology, history of anthropology, and so on. It might be said that we witnessed the ramification of ethnology into ethnologies, and anthropology into anthropologies. All these extensions have contributed to the enrichment of the content and epistemological structure of ethnology and cultural anthropology. At the same time, the teaching of anthropology and field research became more intense. Today, ethnography remains at the core of cultural studies. Epistemologically, ethnology has been oriented in two directions: Ethnohistory and functional or codeterministic factorial relationships of cultural elements in social communication.

## Social anthropology

The formal initiation of social anthropology in Spain began with the field work conducted by Julian A. Pitt-Rivers (1954), Michael Kenny (1961) and Carmelo Lison Tolosana (1966). The common denominator to their field work was the study of contemporary rural culture. These scholars reintroduced the same sociological topics which had been the concern of former folklorists, but a more detailed and refined analysis was applied to cultural materials. The most obvious influence came from British anthropology. In 1979, when C. Lison obtained the chair of social anthropology at the Faculty of Political Sciences and Sociology, at the University of Madrid, the academic institutionalization of

this discipline in Spain began.

As sociology was the dominant approach of social anthropology, and while the method was based on personal field work and self-sufficiency, there is no doubt that the analysis was also monographic. This is a major distinction with ethnologists, since the latter are more interdisciplinary in their academic tradition, especially when seen in terms of the anthropological sciences. Furthermore, we should consider the fact that social anthropologists are mainly concerned with synchronic and contemporary studies and that they have been seen to rebuff historical materials. In that sense, they are in agreement with Radcliffe-Brown when this author claimed that the synchronic approach was the truly objective method – the authentic natural science of culture. Thus, social anthropology has become a branch of comparative sociology.

The main contribution of social anthropologists to sociology in Spain has been the symbolic interpretation and critical analysis of rural folk culture and, additionally, the qualitative approach to sociology. In addition, ethnography when given a cultural explanation is also of some academic importance. The analysis of traditional culture represents a major contribution, especially when thought of as a substitution to folklorism in the same themes. Both disciplines study similar items, and in that sense the differences with folklorism are mainly in terms of quality and academic standing. In some aspects social anthropologists could be said to have adopted a functionalist approach to the study of cultural behaviour. Thus, synchronism and functionalism are predominant in this view of culture. At the core of the explanation lies culturology, and meanwhile their adherents are certainly resistant to any merger with ethnologists.

In comparison with ethnology there have been certain losses, e.g. historical data, biological aspects of behaviour and linguistic concerns, in other words features of classical anthropological reference and studies related to the study of borrowed culture and acculturation.

In fact, certain ethnographic weaknesses can be observed while at the same time there

has been an increase in the semantic and symbolic internal analysis of materials gathered in the field. A thematic preference for sectorial or phenomenological studies has been expressed and there has been a tendency to transform isolated cultural manifestations into systems. The individualistic or solipsistic approach prevails in research. In the meantime, the influence of the social anthropologists with respect to sociologists is increasing, and situational analysis tends to singularize the personal interpretation of the emic version. In fact, other losses can be identified in terms of less ethnographic formalization. As a consequence, we witness a certain aesthetic tendency which while producing a better literary style, makes social anthropology appear more as a kind of literature than a class of science.

## Anthropologist

At present in Spain one is more likely to be considered an anthropologist than an ethnologist. The title is commonly ascribed to academics engaged in ethnology and social anthropology as well as physical anthropology. This is evidence of an epistemological weakness, indicating the confusing of a branch of anthropology, ethnology, with the anthropological tree itself.

It would seem that this perception could be attributed to the fact that the branches in themselves are mutually assimilative. This kind of mutual assimilation seems to me to be the consequence of a historical phase into which the initial separation of the branches is not sufficiently defined to justify the fact that the contents of each differ.

This situation reflects two influences, one from the USA by which any scholar working in one of the four branches is called an anthropologist, and the other which expresses the anthropological dedication identified with social anthropology. The latter represents an influence from the United Kingdom. Ethnology would not therefore have to renounce the name ethnologist, given to the researcher engaged in comparative ethnography. Anthropology, at the same time, would be the measurement of physical man. Both disciplines are in the European

continental academic tradition. In Spain the physical anthropologist is increasingly a biologist or a geneticist already disconnected from the academic discourse of general anthropology, while increasingly separated from ethnology and social anthropology.

Thus, the concept of the anthropologist rooted in the European anthropological tradition will not persist much longer. Scholars devoted to the physical study of man are disappearing from this interdisciplinary approach, preferring to be called biologists or geneticists.

It would seem that American anthropology has had an indirect influence on young Spanish ethnologists and social anthropologists as American anthropologists call themselves anthropologists even if they are studying archaeology, ethnology, physical anthropology or linguistics. Moreover, in the USA the name Anthropology is given to a general view of fieldwork in which the laboratory is less important than the attention given to the landscape/environmental perception of man in culture. At present, the biological study of man in the physical tradition receives more emphasis in terms of empirical manipulations conducted in the laboratory than in terms of naturalistic fieldwork data observation.

Without any doubt the number of physical anthropologists conducting metrical and morphological measurements is now in a state of academic regression. Meanwhile, biological anthropologists working in laboratories and conducting genetic studies are increasing in number. From this perspective, the name anthropologist is increasingly being applied only to the cultural and social anthropologist and not to his biological counterpart. Indeed, the mass media are more familiar with this concept as applied to this approach, than applied to biologists occupied in the study of organic man.

The evolution of physical anthropology intensifies the work being undertaken in the laboratory, placing this kind of anthropology more firmly within the pre-phenomenological problems of genetics and biology than those of ethnology and social anthropology. Ultimately, the concept of culture and its dynamic implications are considerably weakened within studies of physical/biological anthropology. The state of knowledge in these disciplines is more organi-



cally oriented than the superorganic idea of culture, as viewed by ethnologists and social anthropologists.

The separation between the study of the organic and the study of the superorganic is a highly academic division, but as a result the emphasis can be clearly differentiated. So, if the naturalistic approach to cultural fieldwork is now more prevalent in ethnography than biology, and if the laboratory analysis is more frequent than fieldwork, then there is a progressive conceptual and academic separation between the study of culture and the study of the organic. Paradoxically, now and in the future, the name anthropologist is becoming more closely associated with culture than with the organic.

When an ethnologist or social anthropologist writes about topics of ethnographic transformation within analytical categories of culture, people outside the academic world identify these studies as anthropological. In fact, the greater number of cultural anthropologists compared to that of biological anthropologists in the university and conducting field research means a stronger identification of biology with physical or organic human items, in laboratory terms, and a greater cultural orientation from ethnologists and social anthropologists.

Thus in Spain, today, anthropology coincides closely with ethnology and social anthropology, and is clearly differentiated from archaeology and linguistics. The situation reflects the historical conditions of academic dispersion suffered by these disciplines. Probably, in the near future, in spite of the increasing specialization of sciences, it will be necessary to recombine interpretations and analyses, not so much in phenomenological terms, but in providing holistic and interdisciplinary explanations. This will depend on the extent to which we need to study the codeterminative contents of causes and processes, interpreted as a synchronic empirical model, complemented with the knowledge we possess of the historical or dynamic transformation of culture in man and by man in both local and global environments.

## Present horizon and into the future

What can we learn from this brief history of Spanish ethnology? And how decisive has the academic structure been in its development? To my mind, the main question is: Can ethnology integrate the cultural phenomenon of globality by moving its focus from local folk culture to a national and international ethnography? These questions have a certain definitive character, especially when we think in terms of a globality which is more dynamic than the local or regional adaptation of culture.

However, we must recognize the difficulty in applying an ethnographic approach to the joint social-ethnic situation of culture in contemporary metropolitan societies. The ethnic and national groups perceived by the individuals who form them, are ethnographically scattered in terms of urban cultural organization. This has come about as ethnic identities do not interfere with the powerful global culture. In the social process this globality is functionally interethnic and the phenomenon of interchangeability in international culture introduces a compelling factor namely that of scientific and technological productions and adaptations to them.

Sociologically speaking, it is clear that technology gives rise to a similar social organization of economic production, as we can see when we observe multinational enterprises, banking, transportation, hotel services, political ideologies, trade unions, parliaments, fashion, sport, and the orientation of personal objectives. Consumption modes are now universal in our European societies. In the light of this, how can ethnology through ethnography provide an adequate description of the metropolitan culture in which we live today? Could the universal meaning of the global culture be interpreted in ethnography? Is it possible to identify particular features within the globality using an ethnographic approach? And moreover: is globality an ethnographic category? In this context, could we ignore the concept of ethnicity? These are important questions since reference to identity refers also to cultural identity.

Another question we need to answer: Are the big cities unique ethnic cultures suitable for

ethnographic description? Or: How culturally different are two men employed in two banking organizations when both are ethnically different? Where is the core of the ethnographic approach? Our understanding of this question is that as ethnics of national entities we retain more than an ethnic culture, we have ethnic identity. So, in spite of culture globality, we expect to remain ethnics, bearers of a national identity, individuals genealogically integrated in families, specific or individualized socializations, and members of local or regional cultures. Because this is the way we are and the way we recognize ourselves as individuals, we can also be recognized as a historical combination of a global culture with an ethnic, local, regional or national culture.

If this were the case where would the European ethnologist work to explain the ethnography – in the local, regional, national or global culture? In our societies today it is accepted that we are European, at the same time as we are identified by a local, regional or national culture. Languages and folk culture are the main ingredients in the images we have of our personalities. Historical roots are ethnic at the very least, and national in their widest extent. We have our own ethnographic production sources. That means ethnology studies the application of the concepts with great tradition (Europe and globality) as well as those of a lesser tradition, that is the local or traditional integration of culture, which has to combine permanently the form of specific adaptations to local, regional or national cultures. The cultural combination resulting from the permanent interchange and diffusion of the large-scale European tradition and its contemporary dynamics within each local culture is the perspective European ethnologists must give to the study of European societies submitted to a global cultural interchange and geographical expansion. In fact, we can observe the product of this interchange between global and national, regional or local cultures as ethnography in action.

Thus this ethnographic approach could be seen as a form of existence, but also as a form of social discourse of the cultural situation. This ethnic and national identity of culture is worthy

of our attention. Besides, as we can observe the need to be different, the conclusion might be drawn that differentiation lies at the heart of folk culture. Such a study of the effects of combining folk culture with globality gives sense to ethnography and in turn to ethnology. The very proof of ethnic consciousness is ethnography, and hence the only way to give continuity to ethnology.

Another question needs to be answered at this point. I refer to the migratory movements entering Europe from Africa and also from Latin America. Immigration leads to cultural reorganization and to readaptations and culture synthesis. The question is: to what extent will this situation increase the difficulty of carrying out ethnography? And to what extent this ethnography should be a descriptive form of an homogeneous cultural status quo?

The number of people coming from Africa to Europe is set to increase, which might result in clashes, social troubles and aggressive reactions between persons of different ethnic and racial origins. In that sense, when we can identify initial cultural differences, we also know we are submitted to the dynamic effects of globality. And as we also know, if the globality is more European than African, then, what kind of cultural transformation occurs which leads to a change of the ethnic or national identity of the original immigrants? Indeed, the remaining differences are more a question of race and color than cultural identity? Here, does ethnology have sufficient epistemological capacity to tackle these problems? In the near future can ethnology cope with the complexity of causes which are unique to anthropology? Probably it is at this point that we need to reconsider our views and approaches.

## References

- Actas 1980: I Congreso Español de Antropología. 2 volúmenes. Barcelona, Departamento de Antropología Cultural, Universidad de Barcelona.
- Amades, Joan 1979: *Folklore de Catalunya*. 3 volúmenes. Barcelona: Editorial Selecta.
- Apalategi Begiristain, Joxemartin 1981: Introducción a la historia crítica de la producción oral vasca. *Ethnica* 17: 7–47. Barcelona.

- Aranzadi, Telesforo de 1917: *Etnografía*. Madrid: Biblioteca Corona.
- Barandiaran, José Miguel de 1972: *Obras Completas*. Bilbao: Editorial La Gran Enciclopedia Vasca.
- Bosch-Gimpera, Pere 1932: *Etnología de la Península Ibérica*. Barcelona: Editorial Alpha.
- Capmany, Aureli 1978: *Calendari de Llegendes, costums, i festes tradicionals catalanes*. Barcelona: Editorial Laia.
- Caro Baroja, Julio 1946: *Los pueblos de España. Ensayo de Etnología*. Barcelona: Editorial Barna.
- Caro Baroja, Julio 1949: *Los Vascos. Etnología*. San Sebastián: Biblioteca Vascongada de los Amigos del País.
- Caro Baroja, Julio 1955: *Estudios Saharianos*. Madrid: Instituto de Estudios Africanos, CSIC.
- Caro Baroja, Julio 1957: *Estudios Magrebíes*. Madrid: Instituto de Estudios Africanos, CSIC.
- Esteva-Fabregat, Claudio 1957: Sobre la teoría y los métodos de la Antropología Social. *Revista Internacional De Sociología* 59: 411–436. Madrid.
- Esteva-Fabregat, Claudio 1969a: La Etnología española y sus problemas. *Actas del i congreso nacional de artes y costumbres populares*, pp. 1–40. Zaragoza, Institución “Fernando el Católico”.
- Esteva-Fabregat, Claudio 1969b: El etnólogo como conservador de Museo. *Pirenae* 5: 159–184. Barcelona, Instituto de Arqueología y Prehistoria, Universidad de Barcelona.
- Esteva-Fabregat, Claudio 1972: L'Étude du Village en Espagne. *Ethnologia Europaea* vi, 1: 74–85. Göttingen.
- Esteva-Fabregat, Claudio 1981: El Folklore en el contexto de la Antropología Cultural. In: *Cultura tradicional y folklore*, pp. 35–68. Murcia, Editora Regional, S.A.
- Esteva-Fabregat, Claudio 1982: Autobiografía intelectual de Claudio Esteva Fabregat. *Anthropos*, Boletín de Información y Documentación, 10, pp. 4–25. Barcelona.
- Esteva-Fabregat, Claudio 1984: *Estado, etnicidad y biculturalismo*. Barcelona: Ediciones Península.
- Esteva-Fabregat, Claudio 1988: *El mestizaje en Iberoamérica*. Madrid: Editorial Alhambra-Longman.
- Esteva-Fabregat, Claudio 1989: Antropología, Folklore e Identidad. In: *Antropología cultural en extremadura*, pp. 15–33. Mérida, Editora Regional de Extremadura.
- Esteva-Fabregat, Claudio 1994a: El mundo folk en los estudios antropológicos. In: *Actas do simposio internacional de antropologia*: 125–149. Santiago de Compostela, Consello da Cultura Galega.
- Esteva-Fabregat, Claudio 1994b: Antropología, ¿Per a Què? In: *Les relacions entre ciència i societat a catalunya*, a la fi del segle XX, pp. 159–223. Barcelona: Fundació Catalana per a la Recerca.
- Esteva-Fabregat, Claudio 1994: *Mestizaje in Iberoamerica*. Tucson, Arizona: The University of Arizona Press.
- Esteva-Fabregat, Claudio 1995: *Introducción a las fuentes etnográficas y la América indígena*. Madrid: Fundación Mapfre América.
- Esteva-Fabregat, Claudio 1995: Interview with the Doyen of Catalan Anthropology. *Easa Newsletter*, 16: 6–9.
- Guichot y Sierra, A. 1922: *Noticia histórica del Folklore. Origenes en todos los países hasta 1890. Desarrollo en España hasta 1921*. Sevilla.
- Hoyos Sainz, Luis de; y ARANZADI, Telesforo de 1893: *Lecciones de Antropología*.
- Hoyos Sainz, Luis de; y Hoyos Sancho, Nicues de 1947: *Manual de Folklore*. Madrid: Manuales de la Revista de Occidente.
- Kenny, Michael 1962: *A Spanish Tapestry*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Lison, Carmelo 1966: *Belmonte de los Caballeros*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Lison, Carmelo 1971: *Antropología Social en España*. Madrid: Siglo Veintiuno de España Editores, S.A.
- Pitt-Rivers, Julian A. 1954: *The People of the Sierra*. London & Chicago, Ill.: The University of Chicago Press.
- Prat Carós, Joan 1985–86: Trenta anys de literatura antropológica sobre Espanya. Tarragona, *Arxiu d'etnografia de Catalunya*, 4–5.
- Radcliffe-Brown, A.R. 1958: *Method in Social Anthropology*. Edited by M. N. Srinivas. Chicago: The University Press.
- Redfield, Robert 1960: *The Little Community. Peasant Society and Culture*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Serra-Boldú (director), Valeri 1980: *Arxiu de Tradicions Populars*. Foreword by Josefina Roma-Riu. Barcelona: José J. de Olañeta Editor.
- Serra-Boldú, Valeri 1981: *Calendari Folkloric d'Urgell*. Barcelona: Publicacions de l'Abadia de Montserrat.
- Violant I Simorra, Ramón 1949: *El Pirineo Español*. Madrid: Editorial Plus Ultra.
- Violant-Simorra, Ramón 1955: *Etnografía de Reus i la seva comarca*. 5 volumes. Reus: Asociación de Estudios Reusenses.
- Violant-Simorra, Ramón 1979: *Obra Oberta*. 4 Volumes. Barcelona: Editorial Alta Fulla.