

# Demófilo, Folklore and Contemporary Spanish Anthropology. Readings of Antonio Machado y Álvarez (1846–1893)

*Richard Pfeilstetter*

DOI: 10.21104/CL.2017.1.07

**Abstract** Antonio Machado y Álvarez (1846–1893), also known as Demófilo, was a pioneering collector and interpreter of folkloristic material from Andalusia and Spain. He wrote on popular dialects, literature, tales, sayings, music, flamenco and other expressions of popular culture. In this contribution I bring his writings of the end of the 19th century in conversation with debates at the end of the 20th century. At that moment, different readings of Demófilo, and of the Spanish folklore tradition in general, played a prominent role within an evolving anthropological discourse in and on Spain. In particular, I focus on the three related themes both in the writings of Demófilo and the commentators of the “folklore tradition” in more recent times. First, I look at the discussions over the “scientific quality” and the “subaltern” status of Spanish or otherwise regional or national anthropological traditions. Second, I discuss the relationship between cultural (identity) studies and the interplay between central and peripheral ethno-nationalisms in Spain. Finally, I reflect on the academic dispute over the differences between contributions of “foreign” and “local” scholars to the analysis of the Spanish cultural reality.

**Keywords** Demófilo, Antonio Machado y Álvarez, history of folklore, history of anthropology, Spain, nationalism.

This paper was first presented at the seminar series “Dissecting Society: Social Movement, Literature and Social Science” held at the Remarque Institute (New York University) during the 15th and the 16th of April 2016. I am grateful for all the comments I have received from both the organizers and participants.

**Contact** Richard Pfeilstetter, Departamento de Antropología Social, Universidad de Sevilla, C/ Doña María de Padilla s/n, 41004 Sevilla, Spain; e-mail: [rgp@us.es](mailto:rgp@us.es).

**Jak citovat / How to cite** Pfeilstetter, Richard. (2017). Demófilo, Folklore and Contemporary Spanish Anthropology. Readings of Antonio Machado y Álvarez (1846–1893). *Český lid* 104, 99–111. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.21104/CL.2017.1.07>

## Introduction<sup>1</sup>

The American Hispanic Society in Manhattan owns a portrait showing the famous Spanish poet Manuel Machado when he was four years old. It was painted by his grandmother Cipriana Alvarez Duran in 1879. Cipriana was an amateur painter, thus the painting was considered worth safeguarding because Manuel and his brother Antonio became world-famous poets. They are often (erroneously) portrayed as the personified symbols of the fierce ideological division in Spain during the twentieth century, Antonio representing the political left and Manuel representing the political right. This political stereotyping is today also applied to the grandfather of the Machado poets. Antonio Machado y Nuñez was an important politician (governor and mayor of Seville) and natural scientist (chancellor of the University) during the “sexenio revolucionario”, the revolutionary six-year period from 1868–1874. So for instance, the present-day main University library at the University of Seville was given the name of the poets’ grandfather, as he represents the early democratic and republican political tradition at this university.

A third Antonio Machado is missing from this picture. This Antonio, “the folklorist”, is often referred to as *Demófilo*, not only because he used this name as a pseudonym in his writings, but also because his sons (the poets) and his father (the natural scientist) transcended his prominence both in past and present. Cipriana, the author of our painting, is seen by some as the woman who introduced artistic sensibility into the family both to her son Demófilo and her grandsons, the Machado poets. This was because she engaged in collecting folkloristic material and read Demófilo’s collections of popular literature to her grandchildren. The uncle of Cipriana was Agustin Durán, author of important compilations of Spanish ballads. In the end, she was financing many of the folkloristic endeavours of her son Demófilo, who was never very successful in monetary terms. But her painting does not only allow me to speak of the inferior recognition of Demófilo and Cipriana within this family of distinguished Spanish intellectuals, but also of the literal absence of Antonio Machado y Álvarez. He died early aged 47 in 1893. His son Antonio was only 17 years old then.

After his death, his important folkloristic works were widely forgotten. His son Manuel complained in one of his texts about what he called “mediocre histories of our literature” which did not appreciate his father as the founder of the scientific and political folklore movement in Spain (Machado Ruiz 1946: 9–10). Nevertheless, in the post-Franco era of the 1980s, the work

---

1 If not indicated differently, this article relies on the introduction to Demófilo by Baltanás (2005a: xvii–xci) when presenting the family and the biographical background of the folklorist. It is one of the most recent, extensive and well-documented overviews on the work and life of Antonio Machado y Álvarez. Additional sources, such as Aguirre (1986), Aguilar (1990) and Steingress (1996), will be quoted throughout this text.

of Demófilo was increasingly re-appreciated by intellectuals both in Spanish anthropology and literature. In 2005, the completed works were published, what had previously been a huge amount of dispersed texts in a wide variety of newspapers, journals and books. In the following sections, I will rely mainly on this recent three-volume edition from Baltanás (2005b) to quote Demófilo's original texts. These quotes will be labelled with the original (but sometimes deliberately shortened) titles and the years of their original publication, followed by the page numbers in the "Baltanás edition". For the work "El folk-lore Andaluz" I will rely on the edition from Zoido (1986). If not indicated differently, literal quotes of Demófilo are my own translations of the Spanish source.

What I wish to argue in this contribution is that the time, the person and the family of Demófilo, but also his concept of folklore, perfectly lend themselves to discussions over some of the key controversies of Spanish Anthropology and the Anthropology of Spain witnessed since the 1980s. Since then in Spain, as in many other countries, there exists a discussion on the subaltern status of local anthropological traditions "from the global south" struggling with an economic, political and cultural "colonialism from anglo-saxon academia". Over recent decades this argument has been made in different guises, for instance by Roca and Martín-Díaz (2016), Narotzky (2002) or Aguirre (1986), as I will explore in more detail onwards. At the same time, Spanish anthropologists working abroad have argued that it is problematic to trace a sharp distinction between local and imported knowledge, and that the anthropology in Spain (with its colonial past and its integration in western Europe) is also part of the global north (Clua i Fainé 2016; Gay y Blasco 2016). Others have insinuated that the discreditation of any influences from outside as "colonization" aims to justify the micro-politics of local academic networks seeking to legitimize their own reproduction (Gay y Blasco 2016; Zamora 1993; Caro Baroja 1991). For Driessen, the whole debate is a result of the excessive introspection of many anthropologists in Spain, related to their regional-nationalistic agenda and he claims a "more differential treatment of the role of folklore studies and social anthropology" (Driessen 2016: 623).

In this contribution I want to explore some of the historical trajectories of this debate. I want to show different ways in which "local anthropology" has been compared with these of "outsiders" in Spanish folklore and anthropology. I will do so by situating this debate in the context of the work and life of Demófilo and how it has been interpreted since the 1980s. On the one hand, this allows me to display historically the beginnings of the special attention that the distinction between anglophone and local anthropology has received ever since. Already over one hundred years ago the folklorists were concerned with the quality of their science and compared themselves passionately with other European academics and traditions. On the other hand, looking at the more recent debates from the angle of one of the founding fathers

of Spanish folklore, allows me to distinguish three distinctive issues that are currently often reduced to just one opposition alone, namely the local intellectual traditions versus global anglo-saxon discourse.

In the first place, there is a recurrent dispute over the eventual historic specificity of a Spanish anthropological tradition, its peripheral nature when compared to other western countries. Thus, as either portrayed out-dated, unimportant, unscientific, “descriptive” or colonized and unjustly ignored. Secondly, there is a specific relation between cultural studies, identity politics and peripheral versus centralist nationalisms in Spain. Finally, there is a specific academic debate disputing the role, the consequences and the problem of ‘foreign(ers)’ accounts’ of Spanish culture as opposed to the ‘native accounts’. Each of the following sections is dedicated to one of these three issues. I will try to justify how they have been the concern of some important scholars in and of Spain, and how they are related, especially since the 1980s, to folklore as a discipline in general and in particular to the figure of Demófilo. I will show how different dimensions of the work and life of Demófilo replicate these discussions and how these different dimensions have been emphasized for diverse purposes. Among these dimensions are his roles as the “revolutionary” activist, as the “scientific” anthropologist and as the “local” (Andalusian, Spanish or otherwise regional or national) victim of “outsiders” (such as Spaniards, “foreigners” or the English). Therefore, as an overarching theme, I want to bring the Demófilo of the end of the nineteenth century in conversation with the Demófilo of the end of the twentieth century and onwards.

### **Quality, status and “Spanish” folklore**

A major preoccupation in the work of Demófilo and, in extension, within the more recent literature making reference to the Spanish folklore tradition, is the concern of what place the Spanish contribution to the academic study of culture plays in the concert of other European nations or the Americas. Of course similar disputes can be identified in other peripheral national traditions, but in this article, I would like to show that this debate has taken on a specific form in the case of Spain. Maybe this is because the Spanish nation or nations can be strategically situated both inside and outside the hegemonic north. This debate, as I will show, is often intimately intertwined with substitutive debates on the ‘scientific’ or ‘unscientific’ character or connotation of the term ‘folklore’.

Cristina Sánchez-Carretero working for the Spanish Research Council in Madrid (CSIC), writes in a contribution to the 50th anniversary of the International Society of Ethnology and Folklore (SIEF) in 2014 on what she calls the “f-word” in these terms:

*I am from a country where the term folklore has been largely abandoned and is often perceived as a term that describes an old fashioned, non-academic and amateurish approach.* (Sánchez-Carretero 2014: 101)

Along these same lines, Baltanás notes that the term folklore is somehow discredited as an academic concept for many Spanish scholars (2005a: xvii). This contemporary connotation of folklore in Spain is at least surprising as the folklore project, for the first time announced in Spain by Demófilo, had a decisively scientific-empiricist outlook. The folklore concept was introduced by Machado precisely to overcome an old fashioned, non-scientific, metaphysic or romantic approach to popular culture. Demófilo was inspired by Darwinism and by his translation of “Primitive Culture” by Edward Tylor, one of the eminent European intellectuals of that time. Different to Demófilo and his folklore concept, Tylor is today widely appreciated in Spanish academia as the author of the first definition of culture as an anthropological (therefore “scientific”) concept.

Let me illustrate this explicit mission of a “scientific” study of culture by Demófilo with reference to some of his original writings. Demófilo was convinced that popular culture was as underestimated by intellectuals as small organisms (such as worms), by scientists. Both small organisms and popular culture, he thought, were the building blocks explaining higher organisms and society (El Folk-Lore Andaluz 1881: 45–46). In a different moment he compares folklore for social sciences with fossils in natural sciences (El Folk-Lore Andaluz 1881: 65). Machado was also concerned about how climate had an important influence on culture. For instance, he thought about the influence of the natural environment on human phonetics. For instance, he was intrigued by the idea that the lips take a more active role in the pronunciation in idioms of the south versus the ones in the north (Fonética Andaluza 1870: 45). Machado saw the very evolution of his work as a process in which he was overcoming his initial literary outlook in favour of a more scientific-empiricist agenda. In the foreword of his first book, which was a compilation of articles from both periods (the “literary” and the “scientific”), he summarises this change as follows:

*It wasn't the ideological value [anymore], revealing the hidden meaning of its productions [of the people's literature] only to prove the importance of its truthful and exact collection for further scientific ends which worried me.* (Estudios sobre literatura popular 1884: 10)

Central for understanding Demófilo's attempt to scientifically validate his project of a science of popular culture was his concern to fill the gap between Spain and other European countries. Demófilo picked up the idea of folklore

both as a concept and an institutional endeavour when he read about the existence of the London Folk-lore Society. His folkloristic enterprise was also heavily influenced by the German-Austrian linguist Hugo Schuchardt, who was interested in flamenco and in the Basque language. Both maintained a prolonged correspondence (published and commented by Steingress 1996) and Hugo Schuchardt visited Demófilo in Sevilla. Consider the following excerpt from this correspondence where Demófilo lamented the political and cultural ignorance and the economic difficulties in Spain as opposed to those of Austria. He explicitly argues in the letter that these were leading to less serious scientific outcomes for academic work in Spain. “How bad we are, Mr. Schuchardt, how bad at science, at money, at politics, at everything” he writes (Steingress 1996: 71–73, 78, 80–81).

There is a curious continuity in this obsession on whether folklore has a sufficiently “scientific” character and consequently, on the overall value of the contribution or recognition of Spanish intellectuals in the wider field of anthropology beyond the national frontiers. Baltanás in his introduction to the recent edition of the complete works of Demófilo (2005b) is eager to show how the folklore concept of Demófilo was even more democratic than its European counterparts. He is concerned about showing how Demófilo was “in perfect synchrony” with Europe “different to what one might suspect” (Baltanás 2005a: xlv–xlvi; my translations). Along very similar lines, histories of Spanish (Aguirre 1986: 19) or Andalusian (Aguilar 1990) anthropology during the post-Franco era stressed that the Spanish folklore tradition had the same value compared to other countries.

This requirement to defend the quality and scope of Spanish anthropology and folklore can only be explained in relation to its real or perceived questioning or its invisibility abroad. The US anthropologist Stanley Brandes, in a keynote to the Spanish triennial anthropological societies congress in 2011, later published in a different guise in the influential journal *Anthropological Quarterly*, presented US informed anthropology during the Franco-era as opposed to the ethnographic-descriptive approach practiced by researchers working exclusively in Spain. For him this was due to the difficult legacy of the 19th century folklore tradition that still shaped Spanish scholarship of popular culture (Brandes 2011: 31, 33, 37). Here the ‘folklore tradition’ is clearly used to establish a qualitative difference between the high standard (comparative) anthropology practiced outside Spain and the low standard (‘merely descriptive’) folklore practiced inside Spain. More recently, Susana Narotzky was also concerned with the “re-folklorization of anthropology” (2002: 44) due to the proliferation of regional identity studies financed by the autonomous regions in Spain. She wrote that

*there is a danger that the indiscriminate proliferation of identity studies being sponsored by the regional autonomous governments in Spain and other local institutions will mean a re-folklorization of anthropology as it becomes ever more involved in the instrumental production of an ideology of 'local culture' emphasizing political homogeneity* (2002: 44, my emphasis).

Also Aceves, a colleague of Stanley Brandes, comments on this respect that Americans did not know very much about local anthropology and considered that Spaniards overemphasized the “folkloristic perspective” (Aceves 2011: 67–68; also Aceves 1987).

What already shines through in some of these quotes is that the concerns of Demófilo and of anthropologists in and of Spain, over the quality of Spanish “folklore”, is maybe more a political than a scientific dispute. Formulated differently, one could say that politically engaged scholarship was associated by some with Demófilo and the ‘local’ anthropologists from the 1980s, seen to contribute to overcoming authoritarian regimes. Others, as I will try to show in the next section, were suspicious of these arguments, as they suspected that these aimed to conceal the micro-politics and political-sectarian interests eventually dominating Spanish academia in past and present.

### **Anthropology, politicization, nationalism**

The “September revolution” that started in 1868 overthrew the absolutist monarchy in Spain and concluded in the declaration of the first Spanish republic, in place until 1874. These six years are generally held to figure among the most important moments of modern Spanish social history (Bernecker 2003: 69). It was also the time of Demófilo’s so called “literary period” (opposed to his later “folklore period”) and his years as a revolutionary minded student and doctoral candidate of law, philosophy and literature in Seville and Madrid (1870–1873). The revolution was also a moment of political and academic benefit for Demófilo and his father. The texts of his first period were mainly published in the new periodical at the University of Seville, the “monthly journal of philosophy, literature and science”, founded by his father, rector and governor of Seville, with a clear political agenda supporting the new republic.

The following example is from this journal and this period. In the text ‘Carceleras’ (1870) Demófilo tried to show how injustice and ‘absurd institutions’ of the state were challenged in the popular songs (‘coplas’) that he was collecting. These reflected the peoples’ common sense, which he claimed should guide politicians to reform the law (Carceleras 1870: 28). Demófilo wrote:



*We have nearly written a political article, aiming to write a literary one. The fault is ours not anyone else's, nevertheless we hope that the readers are indulgent, as for the critical epoch we pass through and the natural interest of every Spaniard in the fate of this unfortunate and dejected country. (Carceleras 1870: 33)*

The modern republic legalized the constitution of associations that benefited the constitution of an anarchist workers' movement in Spain in 1868. The opening to foreign investment led to the first industrial take off in the Basque country as concessions for the export of metals were granted (Bernecker 2003: 69, 71). When this first Spanish republic was overthrown by general Pavia and the control of king Alfonso XII was restored, the rise of modern peripheral political nationalisms in Spain could be seen as its direct reaction, quite analogous to developments during the Franco and post-Franco era. The Nationalist Basque Party (PNV) was founded in 1894 and the Catalanian independence movement took off in 1880 (Bernecker 2003: 71–73, 75).

This new political scenario in Spain correlated with what is known as the 'folkloristic period' of Demófilo and especially his endeavours to institutionalize folklore societies through a federal system of regional/national associations. In a circular note to the newly created members of the society of Andalusian folklore in December 1881, Machado called on 'all citizens of the eight provinces of Andalusia' (El folk-lore Andaluz 1881: 63) for

*work of real transcendental social importance, because it makes us recognize as brothers all humans without distinction of class, parties, opinions. All have their place and all we call for is their realization, from the poor farmer, to the most aristocratic lady, from the most modest artisan to the one who occupies the most elevated position in the social hierarchy. Everyone, by virtue of being Andalusian or of living under this beautiful sky, has the right to occupy a place in the society of Andalusian Folk-Lore (El folk-lore Andaluz 1881: 66).*

In the following, I would like to show different ways in which the historic moment, the biography and the label "Demófilo" were taken up during and after the Spanish transition at the end of the 20th century. At around this time, anthropology was institutionalized at Spanish universities, and this contributed to the proliferation of disciplinary histories, much of these designed as Spanish, Catalan, Basque, Andalusian or otherwise 'national' intellectual-anthropological traditions. In this context, Demófilo became a surface on which to project political agendas, social utopias and disciplinary paradigms of various kinds. Therefore, the background of this rereading of Demófilo was the progressive decentralization process of the new plural and democratic Spain, in contrast to the state-centralist model of the Franco dictatorship.



This increased the political accuracy of recalling regional cultural narratives and practices of ‘suppressed nations’.

In 1987, a journal with the name “Demófilo” was launched at the University of Seville as the official successor of the historic journal “Andalusian Folklore” once founded by Antonio Machado y Álvarez (see Rodríguez-Becerra and Medina 2002 on the genesis and history of the journal). In edition number eleven, Elías Zamora (1993) published a thoughtful piece on what he called the “origin myth of Andalusian anthropology”. Zamora identified a clear political agenda of those who situated themselves during the 1980s in a long-standing tradition reaching back to Demófilo. Borrowing the concepts of history from Cervantes and Jorge Luis Borges, he held that these evocations of the disciplinary past were not so much “the mother of truth” but more “what was judged by some of what had happened”.

Zamora was talking, among others, about a book from his colleague Encarnación Aguilar, on the origins of Andalusian anthropology, heavily relying on the analysis of Machado’s folklore movement. The main argument from Aguilar was that, in spite of some major problems in the works of Demófilo, such as the lack of the class-dimension and the mistake to believe in a unique Spanish national identity, it was the first empirical anthropological body of work in Spain. Aguilar held that his federalist concept of culture was a good start to demystify what she saw as an “artificial Spanish culture” (1990: 331–332). Against what could be

*considered the first anthropological work in our country, that from Luis Hoyos de Sainz and [Telesforo] de Aranzadi [...] fieldwork in an anthropological sense, the direct recompilation of data of cultural type, came from other kind of works, such as the ones which Machado y Álvarez began in Andalusia* (Aguilar 1990: 121, my translation).

The binary ‘fieldwork’ versus ‘armchair’ anthropology is employed here to justify the difference in quality of anthropological contributions of the past. Just a year later, in 1991, Julio Caro Baroja, maybe the most internationally known Spanish anthropologist of that time, wrote a bitter contribution on how the figure of Telesforo de Aranzadi, was ignored and silenced by younger Spanish anthropologists in favour of mediocre people or “personajillos” (1991: 29). He was already at the end of his career (he died in 1995) and lamented that since the Spanish civil war, there had been an ever repeating tradition in Spanish academia, namely that the political winners wiped the slate clean and condemned all research conducted before them (1991: 25–26). It is not the fact that Caro Baroja criticized an over-politicized Spanish university system that is worth mentioning here, since it may have existed anytime and anywhere. It is more the severe form of his criticism. He talks of ‘professional silencers’ interested only in ‘political power, economic power

[and] sex'. They would celebrate mediocre people ('personajillos') in encyclopaedias while not mentioning founding fathers of Spanish anthropology such as Telesforo de Aranzadi (1991: 29). Even if no names were mentioned, it is a plausible reading that he pointed towards regional nationalists within Catalanian, Andalusian or Basque academia and, eventually, to Demófilo.

This revisiting of Demófilo as either compatible with regional or centralist nationalisms, also becomes evident in the "History of Cultural Anthropology in Spain" from 1986, where Aguirre holds that

*the folklorist movement of Seville was more positivistic and scientific, more linked to the naturalists than to the poets. The folklorist movement of the [Spanish] Levante was poetic-romantic. The first ends up called the Spanish Folk-lore and the second is nationalistic. Between the two there was frequent communication but also suspicion, foremost in Galicia and Catalonia compared to the axis Seville-Madrid (Aguirre 1986: 19, my translation).*

It seems that Demófilo had come into the cross-fire of disputes over national belonging, regional intellectual histories and political projects of the future. Whether he was seen as successful or not, scientific or not, Andalusian or Spanish was maybe saying more about the academic Spanish anthropology at the end of the 20th century than about Demófilo's work and life.

These kinds of debates also expanded to speculations over the political nature of the "limited success" of Demófilo during his lifetime, not only during the Spanish transition period. The end of the republic and the restoration period was a biographical moment of difficulty for Demófilo. As his folklore movement was unsuccessful in raising money, he needed to engage in different economically and intellectually unsatisfying works as a lawyer, local magistrate, translator, law journalist, researcher, substitute professor, businessman and private teacher in order to sustain the ever growing number of children. In this respect, Baltanás speculated why Demófilo did not achieve a professorship in natural law for which he applied in 1887. For Baltanás and others it wasn't only the general political climate of the restoration period that did not favor dissident intellectuals, but it was also the micro political decisions of intellectuals within the University (2005a: xxxiv).

## **Conclusions: local culture and foreign scholars**

Let me summarize the argument up to this point. I have identified a persistent concern in the work and life of Demófilo and of those who picked up his work and life in their writings during the Spanish transition, of whether his folklore movement was ahead, behind or equal to other European societies. This observation was followed by the argument that discussions over the

quality and place of Spanish folklore and/or anthropology often had an important nationalistic-political undertone or motivation. This was because the revolutionary six-year period and the following monarchist restoration on the one hand, and the late Franco-dictatorship and the democratic-transition on the other hand, both fuelled a polarization between peripheral and centralist nationalism. Nationalism and counter-nationalism mutually depend on each other and the common ground for their dispute in Spain is “popular culture” that legitimizes belonging, nationhood and frontiers.

In this conclusion, I want to turn to a last, but related layer in this debate. This is the harsh distinction between contributions of foreigners and autochthonous scholars to the study of ‘popular culture’ in Spain. This “simple opposition pitting anthropologists ‘inside’ Spain against anthropologists ‘outside’ Spain” (Clua i Fainé 2016: 620), I want to argue, is a longstanding practice and fixation, which often condenses both the political-historical dispute over nationhood and the scientific-academic dispute on the nature of anthropology, in stereotypical personifications of awkward ‘outsiders’ and intimate ‘insiders’.

It seems that already Demófilo felt the need to justify his strong influence by foreign scholars, such as Darwin, Tylor, Schuchardt or British folklore. In “El folk-lore Andaluz” he held that the term folklore ‘did not have homeland (patria) anymore’ (1881: 42–43). During the Franco-era, in 1946, Joaquín María de Navascués, director of the archaeological museum in Madrid, talked deceptively of Demófilo because he was ‘introducing the English organization among us’ (see Baltanás 2005a: lxvii). For his part, the professor of sociology at the University of Seville, Gerhard Steingress, criticized that the figure of the Austrian Hugo Schuchardt wasn’t appreciated sufficiently in the Spanish literature as the most important initial impulse for Machado and his folklore movement in Andalusia (1996).

But similar discussions on the role of foreign versus autochthonous scholars of Spanish culture were picked up during the transition. Aguirre wrote that he has “not mentioned the, sometimes more than doubtful work of the foreigners which have studied Andalusia, driven by their picturesqueness” (Aguirre 1986: 60, my translation). He saw his history of Spanish anthropology as a contribution “to substitute the passive colonialism from those who, as Caro Baroja said, know the Nuer but do not know the Moriscos” (Aguirre 1986: 13). The opposition between the Nuer, an African ethnic group, and the Moriscos, the ethnic label for the former Muslim population in Spain after their systematic expulsions since the 16th century, was employed here in order to point towards two classic monographs, “The Nuer” (1940) by the British anthropologist Evans Pritchard, and “Los moriscos del reino de Granada” (1957) de Caro Baroja.

Narotzky, in similar terms as the paraphrasing of Caro Baroja by Aguirre, was offended by the fact that “The people of the Sierra” (1954), the classic monograph by British anthropologist Pitt-Rivers, was so popular, while the work of Peruvian anthropologist José María Argueda, was ignored (2002: 39). She

saw the recognition of only some selected Spanish anthropologists by foreign anthropologists as part of a 'political economy of negligence' and held that most Spanish anthropologists are actively silenced and ignored by the English speaking scientific community. While many local anthropologists were treated as folkloristic material (informants) themselves, a few 'conservative' figures, such as Carmelo Lisón Tolosana, were promoted as *the* Spanish anthropologists, she argued (2002: 42, 45). Meanwhile, Caro Baroja, also criticized passionately himself these 'Spanish anthropologists' who present the superiority of their work as linked to their training abroad (Caro Baroja 1991: 25–26).

In return, these 'outsiders' contributed in their own way to a neat and tidy inside-outside dichotomy obscuring the existence of more complex academic biographies. For instance, Stanley Brandes (2011) stresses this central distinction between foreigners and autochthonous anthropologists for the history of the discipline in Spain. He argues that modern social anthropology rose in Spain during the Franco dictatorship, introduced by US and UK scholars like him or by Spanish anthropologists trained abroad in Mexico within the US anthropological tradition (Brandes 2011: 28). His colleague Aceves picked up the comparison between the young Spanish anthropologists of the 1980s who saw the North American anthropologists as exploiters of their culture or as not getting the point of what they were observing (Aceves 2011: 67–68; also Aceves 1987). The clichéd picturing of the colleagues abroad often also shines through when names are misspelled, which indicates that people, as Aceves (2011) notes, basically often only do not really know each other's work.

This debate (now spanning over a hundred years) over the scientific or romantic, nationalistic or universalistic, autochthonous or imported character of folklore and anthropology in and of Spain, its practitioners and in particular of Demófilo's work and life, to some extent may be quite similar in many other places. Nevertheless, I have tried to show a particular disposition of many academics to reduce the grade of personal recognition, the value of scientific outcomes and the regional or foreign influences of scholarship to their either macro or micro political dimensions. From this angle, the life and work of Demófilo symbolize a very 'popular culture' in academic writing to which, of course, I also contribute with this text. It is a bit like in Cipriana's painting mentioned at the beginning of this article. Often some central figures of the family are missing to better understand the whole picture.

*February 2017*

## References

- Aceves, Joseph B. 1987. Fieldworker and Friend: Michael Kenny Remembered. *Anthropological Quarterly* 60: 4: 194–195.
- Aceves, Joseph B. 2011. Reflexiones de un pionero. In: Díaz Viana, Luis – Fernández Álvarez, Oscar – Tomé Martín, Pedro (eds.): *Lugares, Tiempos, Memorias. La antropología ibérica en el siglo XX*. León: Universidad de León: 65–73.
- Aguilar Criado, Encarnación. 1990. *Cultura Popular y Folklore en Andalucía. Los orígenes de la Antropología*. Sevilla: Diputación de Sevilla.
- Aguirre Baztan, Ángel. 1986. *La antropología cultural en España. Un siglo de antropología*. Barcelona: Promociones y Publicaciones Universitarias.
- Baltanás, Enrique. 2005a. Introducción. In: Baltanás, Enrique (ed.): *Obras completas. Antonio Machado y Álvarez "Demófilo"*. Sevilla: Diputación de Sevilla y Fundación Machado: xvii–xci.
- Baltanás, Enrique (ed.). 2005b. *Obras completas. Antonio Machado y Álvarez "Demófilo"*. Sevilla: Diputación de Sevilla y Fundación Machado.
- Bernecker, Walther L. 2003. *Spanische Geschichte. Vom 15. Jahrhundert bis zur Gegenwart*. Munich: Beck.
- Brandes, Stanley. 2011. El Nacimiento de la Antropología Social en España. In: Díaz Viana, Luis – Fernández Álvarez, Oscar – Tomé Martín, Pedro (eds.): *Lugares, Tiempos, Memorias. La antropología ibérica en el siglo XX*. León: Universidad de León: 27–51.
- Caro Baroja, Julio. 1957. *Los moriscos del reino de Granada*. Madrid: Instituto de Estudios Políticos.
- Caro Baroja, Julio. 1991. Don Telesforo de Aranzadi y su significado en la historia de la antropología de España. In: Cátedra, María (ed.): *Los Españoles vistos por los antropólogos*. Madrid: Júcar Universidad: 25–30.
- Clua i Fainé, Montserrat. 2016. A Necessary Review of the History of Spanish Anthropology. *American Anthropologist* 118: 620–622.
- Driessen, Henk. 2016. Patria Chica, Region, and the World: The Andalusian Case Revisited. *American Anthropologist* 118: 622–623.
- Evans-Pritchard, Edward E. 1940. *The Nuer: A Description of the Modes of Livelihood and Political Institutions of a Nilotic People*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Gay y Blasco, Paloma. 2016. Context and the Challenge to a “Decolonized Science”. *American Anthropologist* 118: 624–625.
- Machado Ruiz, Manuel. 1946. Acotación preliminar. In: *Antonio Machado y Álvarez: Cantes flamencos*. Madrid: Espasa Calpe.
- Narotzky, Susana. 2002. The political economy of political economy in Spanish anthropology. In: Lem, Winnie – Leach, Belinda (eds.): *Culture, Economy, Power. Anthropology as Critique, Anthropology as Praxis*. State University of New York Press: Albany: 33–46.
- Pitt-Rivers, Julian Alfred. 1954. *The people of the Sierra*. New York: Criterion Books.
- Roca, Beltrán – Martín-Díaz, Emma. 2016. The Institutionalization of Social Anthropology in Western Andalucía: A Struggle for a Decolonized Discipline. *American Anthropologist* 118: 614–620.
- Rodríguez Becerra, Salvador – Medina San Román, María del Carmen. 2002. La revista Demófilo y la antropología cultural en Andalucía. *Revista de Dialectología y tradiciones populares* (RDTP) LVII (1): 163–194.
- Sánchez-Carretero, Cristina. 2014. Feeling at Home: The Everyday Life of a Non-Discipline, or How to Celebrate Daily Routines of a Society. *Cultural Analysis* 13: 99–104.
- Steingress, Gerhard. 1996. *Cartas a Schuchardt*. Sevilla: Fundación Machado.
- Zamora, Elías. 1993. Mitos de origen, justificaciones académicas y desarrollo de la antropología andaluza. *Demófilo. Revista de cultura tradicional* 11: 41–55.
- Zoido, Antonio (ed.). 1986. *Antonio Machado y Álvarez (Demófilo). El folk-lore Andaluz*. Sevilla: Biblioteca de Cultural Andaluza.

Copyright of Cesky Lid: etnologicky casopis is the property of Akademie Ved Ceske Republiky, Etnologicky ustav, p.r.i. and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.