

FERNANDO ESTÉVEZ GONZÁLEZ

INDIGENISM, RACE AND EVOLUTION

CANARY REFLECTIONS ON ANTHROPOLOGY
(1750-1900)



IDENTITARIA
CANARIAS

IDENTITARIA

Identitaria es un programa marco orientado a la reflexión sobre la identidad canaria. Su objetivo fundamental es investigar, analizar, fomentar y difundir el debate y la reflexión sobre el concepto de identidad en la sociedad canaria contemporánea.

Entre las diversas acciones que componen Identitaria (que se desarrollan desde 2023 hasta 2026) se incluye una línea de publicaciones, a cargo de profesionales en las materias que se abordan, donde el eje central es la identidad y el patrimonio cultural canario.

Estas obras se ponen en manos de la sociedad para su disfrute y conocimiento, con el fin de abordar un tema de tanta actualidad y relevancia, y cuyo debate se pretende trasladar más allá de la comunidad académica.

www.identitariacanarias.com

FERNANDO ESTÉVEZ GONZÁLEZ

INDIGENISM,
RACE AND EVOLUTION

CANARY REFLECTIONS ON ANTHROPOLOGY
(1750-1900)

PROLOGUE

GEORGE W. STOCKING Jr.
ROBERTO GIL HERNÁNDEZ



IDENTITARIA
CANARIAS



Instituto
Canario de
Desarrollo
Cultural



**Gobierno
de Canarias**

© **FIRST ENGLISH EDITION, 2024**

Instituto Canario de Desarrollo Cultural, S.A.
Gobierno de Canarias

<https://www.icdcultural.org/>
<https://www.identitariacanarias.com/>

©**ORIGINAL 1987 TEXT**

Heirs of Fernando Estévez González

©**ORIGINAL 1987 PROLOGUE**

Heirs of George W. Stocking, Jr.

©**THIS EDITION'S PROLOGUE**

Roberto Gil Hernández.

©**TRANSLATION**

Margaret Jean Hart Robertson (Tradunexia)

©**COVER IMAGE:**

Detail of “Indigenous people of La Gomera” by Leonardo Torriani in 1590

IDENTITARIA CANARIAS' EDITORIAL LINE
VALLADARES DISEÑO Y COMUNICACIÓN, S.L.U.

DESIGN AND LAYOUT

Alberto Bermúdez Ruano

PRINT

Grafo, S.A

ISBN 978-84-7947-867-4 (Print)

COPYRIGHT DEPOSIT TF 251-2024

The views expressed in this book are the sole responsibility of the authors.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, distributed, or transmitted in any form or by any means, including photocopying, recording, or other electronic or mechanical methods, without the prior written permission of the publisher, except in the case of brief quotations embodied in critical reviews and certain other non-commercial uses permitted by copyright law.

INDEX

PROLOGUE BY GEORGE W. STOCKING, JR.	P. 7
PROLOGUE BY ROBERTO GIL HERNÁNDEZ	P. 12
INTRODUCTION	P.18
1. ON THE HISTORY OF ANTHROPOLOGY	P.30
1.1 Importance of the history of anthropology	P.31
<i>The recent history of anthropology</i>	
<i>Decisive factors in the emergence of the history of anthropology in the 1960s</i>	
<i>The methodology of research programmes</i>	
1.2 The historiography of Canary anthropology	P.75
<i>Monographic studies: The "Notes" by Diego Cuscoy and "The Studies" by Pérez Vidal</i>	
<i>The "Notes towards a history of Canary anthropology"</i>	
<i>The Studies of Canary Folklore</i>	
<i>Biographies, correspondence and miscellaneous</i>	
2. BETWEEN INDIGENISM AND ETHNOCENTRISM: THE INDIGENOUS CANARY ISLANDER AS THE "NOBLE SAVAGE"	P.108
2.1. Back to the roots	P.110
2.2. Viera y Clavijo and the "noble savage" hypothesis	P.120
2.3. The indigenous Canary people in Romantic literature	P.146
2.4. S. Berthelot: a change of direction in the image of the original Canary islander	P.158

2.5. Indigenism versus positivism in late 19 th century Canary anthropology	P. 177
3. CANARY RACIOLOGY. THE CONSOLIDATION OF PHYSICAL ANTHROPOLOGY	P. 193
3.1. The concept of race as an epistemological obstacle	P.195
3.2. Race and racism in Canary anthropology of the 18 th century	P.214
3.3. One skull, two skulls... thousands of skulls. The Canary Islands, one big atavic necropolis	P.220
4. CULTURE AND EVOLUTION: A FRUSTRATED THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK FOR CANARY ANTHROPOLOGY	P.237
4.1. Condemnation and support for Chil y Naranjo's "Estudios"	P.246
4.2. Evolutionism in the "Estudios"	P.254
4.3. The controversy with respect to transformism	P.268
4.4. The eclectic defence of evolutionism	P.277
4.5. The obsession with roots	P.292
BIBLIOGRAPHY	P.300
BIBLIOGRAPHY ANNEX	P.373

PROLOGUE

BY GEORGE W. STOCKING, JR.¹

The historiography, or the history of the “history of anthropology” can be said to have begun in 1865 when Thomas Bendyshe, the then-Vice-President of the Anthropological Society of London, wrote an essay running under that precise title. At that time, the “anthropologists” were immersed in a heated debate with the “ethnologists” about which area of study was most suited to the study of humanity. The anthropologists contemplated human differences in somewhat static, physical and polygenetic terms whereas the ethnologists conceived of them in historical, linguistic and monogenetic terms. Bendyshe was highly interested in bestowing an honourable and more venerable lineage on his focal area, a motive that was to become, perhaps, the most dominant one behind the interest in the history of anthropological research in the following century, causing the subject to appear periodically in the academic literature in the field.

The beginnings of a more systematic historical interest, both on the part of the anthropologists and of the historians, can be traced back to the early 1960s when A.I. Hallowell wrote an extensive and carefully documented essay on *The Beginnings of Anthropology in America*, and the Social Science Research Council sponsored a

¹ Translator’s Note (TN from hereinafter): Neither of the two authors were still alive, regrettably, at the time of the translation. Therefore, this is a back-translation from the Spanish for want of the original document.

conference on the *History of Anthropology* in New York. As a disciple myself of Hallowell's, I am inclined to see his concern with history (and my own) more in terms of personal intellectual development than in any more general terms of larger intellectual historical processes. Yet the interest in the history of anthropology that grew rapidly and extensively in the 1960s can only be understood in the light of the broader developments described so pertinently by Dr. Estévez when he says (and I quote) that they were the result of *the internal development of theory within anthropology itself, the consolidation of the state of the art of the historiography of the science at the time and, lastly, the processes of liberation from colonisation in the Third World.*

That being said, there are still voices to be heard proclaiming a more traditional old-fashioned perspective, and more inclined to celebrate each and every ephemerides of the past. The research of our most recent period can, then, be discussed from two different perspectives, that can be termed respectively the "historicist" and the "critical" viewpoints. The former of these, mainly to be noted among professional historians, analyses the past "on its own terms", by the authors distancing themselves as much as possible from it and allowing no personal theoretic taint from the present to colour their vision. The latter, to be found mainly among anthropologists who are critical of the directions of theory in contemporary anthropology, is designed to attempt to upturn these theories and reveal their warped roots, to

clear the field for healthier growth in the future. Although I am of the former inclination, I have become aware over the years of the necessary and complex interplay between the past and the present in any historical research and that, therefore, more critically motivated histories are equally legitimate. In the best modern histories of anthropology, indeed, the two perspectives may be combined, as they are in the work of Dr. Estévez.

In that most of the world's anthropologists form part of the vast academic apparatus of specialist institutions in the USA, it is hardly surprising that the first developments within the modern history of anthropology should have taken place in the United States. However, and even as far back as the 1960s, other large centres of "international anthropology" had sprung up, first in Great Britain and then in France, where there has been a recent upsurge in the already more than lively interest in this field of history. Likewise, in the 1960s, the interest reached countries normally considered on the periphery of the most important traditions in anthropology, above all, Italy, home to a series of highly significant pieces of research. More recently, the expanded distribution of the *History of Anthropology Newsletter* and the annual volume of *History of Anthropology*, together with a substantial number of historical articles in the international journal, *Current Anthropology* indicate that interest has rippled outwards to anthropologists of traditionally marginal nations, or more on the periphery than those conventionally considered to be the mainstream in "international anthropology".

In this context, then, this book by Dr. Estévez is gratifying evidence of the constantly growing health and vitality of history within anthropology. It is all the more to be appreciated as it deals comprehensively with a topic intimately linked to a movement that, historically, is central to the anthropological tradition. In recent periods, that some have labelled "the crisis in anthropology", there have been notable attempts to broaden the focus of anthropological research to include a systematic reflection on the study of civilised cultures. However, for most of its history, anthropology has consisted in European research into the non-European "others". And among these "others", the first with whom they established context in the course of the expansion of Europe were precisely the inhabitants of the Canary Islands, the Guanches, whose anthropological history is the subject of this present work by Dr. Estévez.

Although known in the ancient past as "The Islands of the Blessed", the Guanches' fate in reality was far from blessed. Already by Columbus' times, in the Canary Archipelago, the launching site of his voyage to the New World, the Guanches were already well on their way to extinction, from the combined effects of war, slavery and imported illnesses. They were effectively wiped out from the human family over a century before serious anthropological speculation during The Enlightenment converted the Guanches into a kind of "blank slate" upon which the various anthropological speculative theorists of the times left their broad archetypical ideological

imprints. Dr. Estévez's analysis of these two centuries of imprints is a welcome contribution to the history of speculative anthropology in Europe and, it is my firmest hope, also to the attempt to redefine it with greater reflection and in broader human terms.

GEORGE W. STOCKING, Jr.
Professor of Anthropology and
Director of the Morris Fishbein Center
for the History of Science and Medicine.
University of Chicago.

PROLOGUE

BY ROBERTO GIL HERNÁNDEZ

One of the problems of the history of science is its tendency to convert documents into monuments. As a result of this, this sub-discipline has become trapped in an obsessive search for the ultimate Truth. It is for this reason also that it has become common practice in academic circles to overlook the fact that the past is always seen in retrospect, in the context of the present. Fortunately, there are other ways of “making” history.

Fernando Estévez González (1953-2016) is a prime example of the “other way” of making history. As opposed to the secular positivism, he stands out as one of the great modern thinkers on knowledge in the Canary Islands. This Archipelago off the North-East of Africa has been the outermost limit of the imperial project of Europe since the 15th century, allowing the Old Continent’s expansion through Africa, America and Asia. In the 21st century, the Canary Islands continue to form part of Spain and the European Union.

Estévez devoted his entire life as an intellectual to the study of the history of science. He threw light on the mechanisms uniting knowledge and power, underlining questions that escaped the boundaries of the compartmentalised silos of knowledge. Thus, although none of his work escapes the realms of cultural and social anthropology, the transdisciplinary scope of his reflections also took in history, philosophy, archaeology, sociology, literature and art.

Estévez produced countless articles, conference proceedings and chapters of books over three decades. Just lately, three anthologies have been published that reflect the most significant part of his work and thought. These materials allow us to classify the stages of his production into Marxism, post-Modernism and a final stage, no less radical but marked by theoretical ambivalence.

The early work of Estévez was marked by his involvement in island politics. In the tumultuous decade of the eighties in Spain, his work mainly revolved around ethnicity and nationalism. He played a prominent role as a militant left-wing intellectual in the period of transition. It was then that he presented his doctorate thesis in 1985 under the title *Indigenismo, raza y evolución en el pensamiento antropológico canario en los siglos XVIII y XIX* (Indigenism, Race and Evolution in Canary anthropological reflection in the 18th and 19th centuries), apart from publishing various articles, among which figure, *Etnicidad y nacionalismo en Canarias* (1985) (Ethnicity and Nationalism in the Canary Islands), *Guanchismo: la imagen cambiante del aborigen canario* (1986) ("Being a Guanche: the changing image of the original Canary islanders) and *Notas críticas sobre el concepto de "tradición antropológica"* (1989) (Critical Notes on the concept of "anthropological tradition"). In his work at that time, we can see the influence of intellectuals such as Ernest Gellner, Tim Ingold, George W. Stocking and Benedict Anderson.

The end of the 20th and beginning of the 21st marked a stage where anthropology left its mark on his work. His concerns focused on subjects that, again, escaped the limits of the

discipline, such as the misalignment of the subject or the discredit of the greats in history. This second phase reveals the fascination Fernando Estévez felt at the time for figures such as Jean-François Lyotard, Jean Baudrillard, David Lowenthal and Zygmunt Bauman, manifest in his publications such as *Patrimonio, saberes y artefactos de identidad* (1995) (Identity as expressed through Heritage, Know-how and artifacts), *El pasado en el presente* (2004) (The Past in the Present), *Redes de museos: conexiones y enredos* (2006) (Networks of Museums: connections and tangles), *Guardarlo todo, recordar nada* (2008) (Keep everything, remember nothing), among others.

In his last stage, Estévez became more radical. He began to include references from people such as Stuart Hall, Arjun Appadurai, Bruno Latour, David Harvey, Anthony Shelton, Dean MacCannell and Eduardo Viveiros de Castro, in a blend of post-colonialism with an ontological twist, and cultural studies based on the theories of active agents-networks. Dating from this time, we have his works of *Memorias y olvidos del archivo* (2010) (Memories and Oversights of the Archives), *Fetichismo, fantasmagoría, desechos y lo dado a ver en los museos* (2011) (Fetishism, Optical Illusions, Rejects and what we usually see in museums), *El turista: de flâneur a choraster* (2012) (The tourist: from "flâneur" to choraster) and *El guanche como fantasma moderno* (2015) (The Guanche as a modern ghost).

Nevertheless, the text that best represents the academic trajectory of the author is still, paradoxically, this, his first book: *Indigenismo, raza y evolución. El pensamiento antropológico canario (1750-1900)*. Originally published in 1987 and re-published in 2016, the book is based on his doctorate

thesis. In its pages, he proposes an original interpretation of the anthropology, ethnographic studies and folklore produced in the Canary Islands, with special emphasis placed on the pre-colonial populations, commonly known as Guanches.

Estévez told a new version of the history of the Archipelago, as had never been done before. He marked clearly the influence of the various predominant scientific paradigms on the island researchers such as Viera y Clavijo, Berthelot, Chil y Naranjo, Grau-Bassas and Millares Torres, among others, in the 18th and 19th centuries. He aimed to show how the ideas of the Enlightenment, above all, the ideas of raciology and evolutionism, had influenced reflection in the Canary Islands. He was thus able to pronounce upon the three major "*themas*" that guided the Canary anthropological reflection at the time, that is, indigenism, race and evolution.

Fernando Estévez identified the role played by physical anthropology in facilitating the colonial expansion of Europe. Raciology expressly pronounced that despite genocide and miscegenation, the physiognomy of any individual "people" could survive thus making it possible to identify features of the Guanche "race" in the contemporary Canary islanders.

As we now know, "race" is a social construct that hierarchises human groups to legitimise the place they occupy in the social structure. Therefore, it is racist to affirm that it is possible to detect archetypes that essentially distinguish one population from another. By calling this out as having existed in the history of science as produced in the Canary Islands, Estévez was underlining the links that exist between power and knowledge,

while also indicating how "race" was used as a mechanism of control in the advance towards global capitalism.

A clear example of this is to be seen in the research activity of Verneau in the Archipelago. The French Empire was anxious to consolidate its position in North Africa. Thus, Verneau's works insisted that original Canary islanders had the same "racial roots" as the Amazigh or Berbers (Mechta el Arbi), ultimately linking them back to the European ancestry *par excellence*, that is the Cro-Magnon, discovered in Dordogne.

Something similar was to occur with the physical anthropologists aligned with the German imperial interests. They also corroborated the survival of the Guanche race in the contemporary population of the Canary Islands at the time, but gave their origins as being Aryan. Meanwhile, Juan Bethencourt Alfonso was to reiterate the preservation of the "race" of the original Canary islanders, especially among the country folk, though in his case, he attributed their roots to the "Iberian Celt", thus affirming that the Spanish presence was atavic.

In brief, Fernando Estévez corroborated that it is not "race" that gave rise to racism but rather that racism instrumentalised "race" to justify the unfair social order that had reigned for centuries in the Canary Islands. The figure of the Guanche was used to speculate with respect to the origins of the islands' original populations, by way of a strategy to normalise the European presence in the Archipelago. Meanwhile, the irrefutable links to the Amazigh culture were instrumentalised to avoid direct assimilation into Europe while also limiting

relations with Africa, above all with Muslim Africa.

Since its first edition in 1987, *Indigenismo, raza y evolución* has always been immensely popular. It continues to be so. It overcomes the barriers between history and anthropology, and is essential reading when attempting to re-interpret the material registers with which archaeology works. It also spurred philosophical and sociological studies into identity, along with significant movement in literary and art circles, focused on pre-colonial questions.

For all these reasons, we can say that the book has become a classic, although it is only forty years since it was first published. It still moves researchers inside and outside the Archipelago to delve deeper into their studies. Perhaps its translation into English will finally help to answer questions such as to what extent the figure of the Guanche allows us to critically examine in depths questions of ethnicity, and what role should be played by the Canary Islands in research into racism at a global level.

The possibilities of divulging *Indigenismo, raza y evolución* to a wider audience through its translation is all of an event in itself. In a world plagued by inequality that restricts all life prospects for many, it is high time that we, like Fernando Estévez, begin to tackle the debates we have eluded in the past. After all, what greater legacy of his works exists than, like him, to re-write the history of history and to challenge its versions of the Truth.

Roberto Gil Hernández
Los Realejos, July 2024

INTRODUCTION

"Men make their own history, but they do not make it just as they please; they do not make it under circumstances chosen by themselves, but under circumstances directly encountered, given and transmitted from the past. The tradition of all dead generations weighs like a nightmare on the brains of the living (...)": K. Marx (1852)

For all native Canary islanders, the *Guanches* have always been, and will be, both “them” and “us”: at one and the same time, the “other” and “our other” selves.² The Guanches have constantly brought us together or torn us apart. Whatever they do or do not, they are a constant presence in our history and form an intrinsic part of our sense of who we are. Dead or alive, vilified or vaunted, they distil all the historic tensions of the Canary islanders. Time and time again, the question of our origins floats to the surface around these seven volcanic outcrops. So, who were our ancestors? Who were “we”? Or who were “they”? The truth is that, at any time in the present, the original Canary natives are who we want, or wanted, them to be, as we search in the past for ways to ratify our own ideas of who we are/they were. Through various negatives of different theories, we attempt to piece together a positive image of our identity, and our roots. Or at least, that is what we see when we review the history of the Islands and discover that the Guanches have never been a problem of the past, but are rather a problem of the present and future.

This recurring presence of the indigenous native people is just one expression of the peculiar character of the Canary identity, constantly tensed between autochthonous and acquired values, between what is homegrown and what is imported. Perhaps this is one of the reasons why there is such a longstanding tradition of anthropology on these islands. This book³ then is the result of a double concern. On the one

2 TN: “*Nosotros*” meaning “we” in Spanish is literally “*nos*”(we) and “*otros*” (others).

3 Many different people contributed in many different ways to my PhD (Universidad de La Laguna, 1985). However, this book, which is a modified

hand, it was born out of our interest in studying the causes that generated the phenomenon of the ethnic roots of the Canary islanders: and on the other, it is aimed at analysing the development of the research theories and strategies deployed in the past in Canary anthropology. Although the two concerns remit to problems of very different natures, they, nevertheless, bear a close historical relationship. The persistence of viewing the indigenous people as diacritical of the ethnic roots of the Canary identity leads us inevitably to the history of anthropology. Thus, the different images and views held with respect to the original inhabitants of the Canary Islands at various periods in history have been constructs pieced together largely on the basis of the theories and ideologies of the anthropological studies of the times.

This fact cannot be emphasised enough, as it underlines why it is a worthwhile endeavour to reconstruct the history of Canary anthropology, in the awareness that it is strongly mediated by problems in the present. Only the most persistently naïve among us would go so far as to claim that tracing the history of Canary anthropology is repayment for a debt long overdue to our “previous generations of intellectuals”. Up until just recently, anthropologists were of the belief that the continued research and practice of

version with some changes of no great substance, would never have seen the light had it not been for the unfailing support of Doctors Rafael González Antón and Alberto Galván Tudela. I am unsure as to how much I have been able to reflect herein everything I have learnt from Doctor Alberto Galván, but it most probably falls far short. If this book is in any way useful towards furthering knowledge with respect to the history of Canary anthropology, it is thanks to him and his constant mentoring and support over the past years - and for many more to come, I hope.

anthropology was sufficient repayment. However, the effect of the resulting histories, in general, has been none other than to raise "historic totem poles" for each of the schools, perspectives and "great men" of the past in anthropology. As of a few years back, nevertheless, a new type of historiography has begun to appear, a fact that is not, however, a mere reaction to the obsession with constructing "genealogies of respectable forefathers".

In the 1960s, a whole set of factors were responsible for the anthropologists beginning to ponder and analyse the various directions, strategies and dominant perspectives that, together, had marked the evolution of "anthropological thinking" up until then. These factors had their roots in three problematic areas that, although very different in nature, are nonetheless intricately interlinked: by which we mean, the internal development of theory within anthropology itself, the consolidation of the state of the art of the historiography of the science at the time and, last, the processes of liberation from colonisation in the Third World. The first of these factors indicated the critical attitude towards the marked idiographic trend that characterised early 20th century anthropological research, thereby producing top-level theories that were to restore, by way of result, comparative nomothetic generalisation. The second factor, with respect to displaying the historical nature of the scientific development in the field, alerted all the professionals within the academic field of anthropology to the reality that their work was mediatised, both by conditioning factors of an epistemological and theoretical

nature, and by the immersion of their scientific activity inside the social matrix of its research. The third and last factor was the challenge posed to the ethnocentric contents of classic anthropology by the processes of decolonisation in the 1950s that placed the academic field in the delicate situation of envisaging how to broach the object of its traditional research in the future, while imposing a radical transformation on its discourse. The context required urgent moves, as G.W. Stocking so clearly made manifest, to make the history of the academic field "historically sophisticated and anthropologically informed". The complete absence at the time of a unified macro-theory in no way exempted anthropologists from working with systematic and coherent methodologies.

In our case, there can be no need to highlight that anthropological, ethnographic and folklore studies are a longstanding tradition in the Canary Islands, as testified to by the substantial number of works accumulated over more than a century of research. Yet, in the same way as in the rest of anthropology, the past of these studies has never been the object of theoretical concern on the part of the professionals involved in the various fields. What scarce attempts exist in this sense, besides, are framed in a traditional type of historiography that allows for no comprehension whatsoever of the various different research strategies deployed in the study of Canary culture and society.

One of the basic aims of the present book, therefore, is precisely that: to show the relevance of the history of

Canary anthropology, together with the evolution in "anthropological thinking" in the Canary Islands from the late 18th century through to the end of the 19th century. From among all the theoretical problems touched upon, the most noteworthy aspects that sum up this broad period are the various different historical perspectives on the indigenous Canary people, the consolidation of raciology and the incorporation of evolutionism. Indigenism, Race and Evolution constitute the three main "thematic areas" around which all theoretical "reflection" and the work of the early Canary anthropologists was vertebrated. Their analysis here is viewed from a historiographic perspective that spotlights the main core of research strategies to which recourse was made in each case, together with the principal elements of their heuristics.

In Canary historiography, the history of Canary history, indigenism has always figured as a recurrent theme, usually presented in a discontinuous line, with no possibility of continuity, between the early chroniclers and the historians or anthropologists of the late 19th century. We have attempted to show that, although the theme itself is a continuum, the different perspectives on the theme in various different periods are not, responding as they do to the theoretical and epistemological hypotheses of their days. Thus it is, for example, that Viera y Clavijo, the maximum exponent of the Canary period of Enlightenment, offered a new vision of the original native population from that proportioned by the chroniclers and historians previous to 1750. However, it must be underlined likewise

that this new perspective, that incorporated some of the principal elements of 18th century French philosophical thinking, requires certain clarification of some nuances of important aspects. First and foremost, the defence of the "noble savage", that translated in Canary terms into the "noble Guanche", is not a response to a lament for a hypothetical lost state of nature. Viera's "noble Guanche" represents, as did the "noble savage" for the philosophers of the Enlightenment, the counterpart of the image of the society of their times. Any interest shown in the indigenous people of the Archipelago, therefore, is a direct remit to the moral lessons to be learnt from history with respect to the study of a culture considered to be "lamentably" lost. In this sense then, the discourse of this figure of the Canary Enlightenment with respect to the indigenous people is written from a perspective not so much about the Guanches as about the Canary society of Viera y Clavijo's days.

However, there have been attempts to pass off the thesis of Viera y Clavijo as a staunch defence of the "noble *Guanche*" in the purest Rousseauian style with no reference to the context in which the discourse was created, and that said thesis should pass the threshold of the 19th century intact, and enter Canary historiography practically without any substantial change. Notwithstanding, as of the study of the work of Sabino Berthelot, a significant modification of the subject can be observed. Berthelot introduced a new element that was to seriously affect the theoretical premise on which Viera based his perspective on the theme of indigenism, and that new element was none

other than race. As opposed to the Enlightenment belief in the unity of human nature, the firm conviction in the 19th century was that human societies differed as a result of the action of immutable biological laws. Berthelot, as opposed to Viera, indicated the survival of the indigenous race, basing his hypothesis on the raciology he embraced, as a theory to forward the view that “essential racial features” persisted, without any substantial modifications, even after crosses with various other populations. This allowed Berthelot to affirm, therefore, that the biological continuity of the indigenous population persisted after the conquest. Inasmuch as the basic characteristics had been preserved, Berthelot went on to reconstruct a psychological, philosophical and moral profile of the indigenous people of the Canary Islands, by extrapolating on the image he had formed of the common Canary country folk of the times.

This represented a radical shift in thinking among the Canary anthropologists, a change in direction that would consolidate over the 19th century, as testified to by the fact that it was fully assumed by the professionals at the close of the century. Chil y Naranjo and Bethencourt Alfonso, among others, were to embrace the theory first forwarded by Berthelot and include it in a revised history of the Canary Islands that manifested the continuity between the pre-colonial past and the present-day Canary society of their times. The resulting ideological derivations of this research strategy have been downplayed, in an attempt to claim that scientific classification of human populations into different races does not necessarily imply adopting racist

positions. However, the historical evolution of raciology studies has shown unequivocally that the concept of race is not only inadequate to explaining culture and human societies but that it can also lead, in the immense majority of cases where it has been applied, to so-called "scientific" justifications of the superiority of some "races" over others. The latest developments in population genetics and physical anthropology clearly indicate the need to abandon raciology as an heuristic principle. Population genetics picks out the similitudes in the genetic stocks of various different human populations, and within the species, with the differences registered at the level of populations. These populations do not correspond, in any way whatsoever, with the traditional classifications of the human species into different races. As a result, the conclusions reached by genetic studies alert all researchers to the uselessness of the concept of race, and suggest using "population" by way of substitute.

19th century Canary anthropology, in line with the methodology and theoretical principles of French physical anthropology, fully assumed raciology as the main way to research the original Canary native peoples. This resolute stance made it impossible to factor in the decisive significance of sociocultural aspects. As such, the Canary anthropology of said period contributed little towards an understanding of the culture and society of the indigenous Canary islanders. The cumulus of classifications and typologies did little less than nothing to throw light on the "enigmas" posed by the history of the Guanches. The

staunchly maintained belief that the degree of civilisation depended inexorably on the size of the skull made our early anthropologists forget the decisive role played by indoctrination and, in general, by economics, politics and religion on the peoples they were attempting to study. The discovery of the Cro-Magnon and their anatomical similarities to the first native Canary inhabitants meant that the Guanches were inserted by extrapolation into the historical evolution that was to become known as "the great European civilisation". This allowed for the material culture, morals and traditions of the Guanches to be overvalued, and for their dignity to be justified thereby which, in turn, merited their incorporation into the most "progressive" trends in the evolution of the human race.

In spite of the notorious evolution of raciology, the sub-field has continued to be used as the dominant research strategy in Canary physical anthropology through to the present day. There can be no doubt that its contributions are undeniable with respect to certain important aspects of the indigenous Canary populations. Albeit the case, however, "race" has become the major obstacle in the path to a general theory that explains the sociocultural system of our ancestors. Within this context, it is strikingly significant that, in the 20th century, there has been no critical study of any depth into raciology as a strategy. Quite the contrary, indeed, would seem to be the case, as physical anthropology continues enmeshed in the debate with respect to which typology is the best, without any consideration whatsoever of the operability of the concept and the main theoretical

premises upon which it is based.

Although the Canary anthropologists had no theory with respect to the sociocultural system of the Guanches in the last third of the 19th century, notwithstanding, they made an attempt to incorporate new scientific perspectives towards an interpretation of the history of the Archipelago. The most noteworthy of these was the criticism made of the old Essentialist concepts that were replaced by a Scientist perspective directed, basically, at inserting the history of the Canary Islands into a broader framework than that proportioned by evolutionist strategies. The absolute conviction that evolutionism, both biological and historical, could contribute efficiently towards an understanding of the indigenous past, was shared by researchers such as Chil, Bethencourt Alfonso, Millares Torres, R. García Ramos and Grau-Bassas, to name but a few. Nevertheless, those who defended the evolutionist perspective ran up against serious difficulties when attempting to apply the theory. On the one hand, and most decisively, they ran headfirst into the full resistance of ecclesiastic circles and their extra-scientific, ideological pressure. On the other hand, their eclectic defence of evolutionism impeded them from broadening the scope of the theory to the analysis of sociocultural phenomena. Finally, biological reductionism, above all of a racial nature, confounded their understanding of the decisive role of culture in historical development and evolution.

The fact that there were no coherent criteria available with which to explain sociocultural contexts and causes, is an

overall expression of the frustration felt by our early Canary anthropologists when attempting to bestow a scientific interpretation onto the anthropological research of the islands. And yet, seen within the perspective of the history of anthropology, this battle, somewhat paradoxically, actually represents their greatest and most valuable contribution. Their frustration was their greatest spur towards retrieving the nomothetic and generalising perspective that has been overlooked or even marginalised by so many of their successors in anthropological studies in the Archipelago.

Thus, it is more than evident just how important the history of anthropology is to the formulation of a general theory with respect to the Canary culture and society. However, there can be no doubt as to the need to overcome strict academic and collective departmental barriers, in that a significant number of the theoretical, methodological and epistemological problems are common to the archaeology, history and anthropology of the islands. In this measure, the present study can only be considered a contribution from the perspective of cultural anthropology to that overall project, in the firm conviction that, if the history of Canary anthropology deserves to be re-constructed, it is not merely because "it is there"⁴ but rather that, by knowing what was done and left undone, no doubt we will improve our overall scientific understanding of Canary society and culture, and of our roots.

4 TN: Reference to a famous quote from George W. Stocking Jr.

1. ON THE HISTORY OF ANTHROPOLOGY

"(...) the most beautiful, the most pleasant, and the most necessary of all our knowledge is, undoubtedly, the knowledge of ourselves. Of all the human sciences, the science of man is the most worthy. Yet this science is neither the most cultivated nor the most complete that we possess: ordinary men neglect it altogether."

Malebranche

1.1. Importance of the history of anthropology

Over the last twenty years previous to this publication, there has been growing interest shown in the history of anthropology both among historians and anthropologists. The cumulative bibliography from these past two decades shows just how significant the historical developments have been to how the academic field is structured in present times. Therefore, there is little need to underline this fact since it is more than amply demonstrated sociologically, at least in its academic and institutional aspects.

The history of anthropology is no longer an activity for those who treasure the ancient times, nostalgic for the past, nor is it a residual practice in anthropology, but now is rather a field with a significant trend towards specialisation. This has not only meant a critical analysis of the traditional ways of reconstructing history but also, and still more importantly, it has opened up debate with respect to the theoretical bases of various different methodologies and epistemologies. Practically no anthropologist nowadays would deny the interest of the history of the academic field. In fact, all the present textbooks and manuals tend to include historical aspects of anthropology by way of preface. Nevertheless, the absence of serious discussion with respect to the problems posed by said historiography is worth pause. The aim of this section of our work then is not to present an exhaustive balance sheet of the state of the art. There have been many others, certainly more qualified than the

present author, who have already carried out that analysis, with G.W. Stocking figuring importantly on that respect on two counts: first, for one of his early articles "On the Limits of "Presentism" and "Historicism" in the historiography of the behavioral sciences" in the *Journal of the History of Behavioral Sciences* (Stocking, Spanish translation, 1982: 1-12, original 1965: 211-218), and second, for his "Preface" to the 1982 edition of *Race, Culture and Evolution* (1982 [1968, first edition]:see Llobera 1980; Darnell 1974; Thorensen, ed. 1975). Our intention, on the contrary, is to trace a rough panorama of the recent evolution of this historiography that will serve us by way of theoretic and conceptual framework, and as a fixed reference for methodological guidelines towards elaborating a history of Canary anthropology. For that very reason, certain elements that are relevant in other contexts and to the purposes of other types of research are dealt with sparingly here or not at all.

When we look at the literature on the history of anthropology, the first question that springs to mind is why was there such great interest and so many books published in the last two decades? It is immediately surprising and somewhat of a paradox how, often while working simultaneously from totally antagonistic historical points of reference, the histories of anthropology still manage to bear some type of family resemblance. This question obliges us to remit, obviously, to the very development of this specialist field.

The recent history of anthropology

Some twenty years back, G.W. Stocking (1966) pointed

out that the work *The History of Ethnology* by R.H. Lowie (Spanish translation, 1974, original, 1937) had known no rival in the three decades of its existence. In the mid- sixties, on the contrary, there were some two thousand titles of a general and partially specialist nature registered in the bibliographical compendium of R. Kemper and J. Phinney (1977). Although this compendium was the most exhaustive, it was by no means the only existing inventory of use at the time. Thus, P. Erickson's *History of Anthropology Bibliography* (1982), for example, offered the advantage of focusing greater attention on physical anthropology, an aspect that Erickson himself had criticised in Kemper and Phinney's compendium, on account of the scarce reference made to the area in their work (Erickson, 1983). Likewise, the inventory of titles by J. Comas (1956) is particularly useful when following thematic movements in anthropology in the late 19th century. The history of anthropology bibliographies of D. Fowler (1975) and P. Menget (1983) are, however, excessively restrictive and show notable bias in their choice of titles listed. Notwithstanding all this, the scarcity of histories of the field previous to the article by Stocking is, however, relative.

In the 1930s, as indicated by R. Darnell (1977:401), there was a first crop of histories of anthropology. In 1934, the second edition of A. Haddon's 1910 volume on *History of Anthropology* (Spanish translation, 1979) was published and in 1935, T.K. Penniman brought out his work, *A Hundred Years of Anthropology*. Finally, in that same decade (1937), the aforementioned work by Lowie saw the light, the

first history that attempted to synthesize the unity of the academic field in best Boasian fashion. Boas himself had published a work at the turn of the century (1904) that offered a retrospective vision, wherein the importance of the German anthropological tradition was highlighted. Previous to this crop from the 30s, likewise, although of much less importance, mention must be made to the contribution of P. Radin (1929) that spotlights the conflicting views held in the late 19th and early 20th century. Still more work existed in the shape of countless articles of a historical nature scattered throughout general works written by the main anthropologists of the forties and fifties, together with the biographies of anthropologists and the institutional histories of establishments such as museums and the like, that were only recently taken into consideration as historiographical sources. Of these, the most significant are the compendia of the American Anthropological Association, as collected by F. de Laguna (1976) for the period 1888-1920 in the volume edited by G. W. Stocking with an introductory analysis of the anthropology in the inter-World War period; and R. Murphy's work (1976) on the most important developments as of the 40s. Yet, there can be no doubt that for systematic information on all the foci of interest and research in the history of anthropology, there is no substitute for *The History of Anthropology Newsletter* (Stocking, ed. 1973-).⁵

Despite this impressive weight of material, nevertheless, history was still held to be subsidiary to fieldwork, considered by the professional anthropologists to be practically the

⁵ TN. George W. Stocking Jr., died in 2013. The Newsletter went on line in 2016

all-exclusive activity. The situation changed radically as of the 60s, when a large number of anthropologists began to publish work where the focus, to a greater or lesser degree, was historical. It is certainly true that there is no one focal moment in time that can be marked as the date that the history of anthropology truly took on flesh as an academic field. Nevertheless, the Conference sponsored by the Social Science Research Council on History of Anthropology in 1962 was to be a decisive moment for the later development of the academic field (Hymes, 1962; Stocking, 1966; Darnell, 1977). Some articles by leading anthropologists would cause the research interest to grow and make the history of anthropology be approached by way of "an anthropological concern" (Hallowell, 1965). These times coincide with the publication too of some of the great historical volumes, some more monumental than others, where history was seen "from the beginning of time through to the present", among which we should highlight the works of T.M. Hodggen (1971, [1964]), P. Mercier (1969, [1966]), G. Gusdorf (1966, 1973), the collection of articles edited by J.O. Brew (1968) and J. Poirier (1968, 1969), among others.

1968 is another key date in the history of the studies into the history of anthropology. It was that very year that probably the two most influential volumes of the 60s were published. There was first *Race, Culture and Evolution* by G.W. Stocking (1982 [first edition, 1968]), in fact a re-publication in the shape of a book of some of his previous work plus

under a new editorial board and has now changed to History of Anthropology Review.

formerly unpublished pieces of research, and second, *The Development of Anthropological Theory* by M. Harris (Spanish Translation, 1978, original 1968). These represented two completely different theoretical perspectives which, in turn, constituted two radically different ways of understanding the past of the field and that were to polarise professionals for the following years, giving rise to vivid debate. The book by Harris was such a bombshell that it gave rise to comments and replies in *Current Anthropology* the very same year it was published (Harris et al. 1968; Stocking, 1968), and was referenced time and time again in historiographical texts in the 70s and 80s. Darnell (1977:406) even went so far as to say that two of the most important histories produced in the mid-70s, Voget (1975) and Honigmann (1976), actually constituted "*responses to Harris*". In Spain, its more widespread distribution was delayed until such time as a Spanish version appeared in the translation by R. Valdés from 1978 (Martínez Veiga 1980).

At the same time, a growing number of articles in specialist journals would contribute towards the consolidation of the history of anthropology as an area of research in its own right. Apart from the most influential academic journals of the time, such as *American Anthropologist*, *Current Anthropology* and the likes, other less-subscribed journals ensured systematic support for historiographical articles. *Isis*, and above all *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences* (where Stocking, among others, published regularly) would lay the bases for future publications, exclusively devoted to the history of anthropology. Such is

the case of the *History of Anthropology Newsletter*, a twice-yearly publication first launched in 1973 by Stocking, and the more recent annual volumes, likewise edited by Stocking, of the *History of Anthropology* (1983, 1984, 1985).

The works of Stocking and Harris were followed in successive years by others of a general nature that were produced either in response to one or other of these two works, or that represented new synthetic perspectives. In the early seventies, there were still works of a general nature being published, such as those by G. Broca (1973), E. Hatch (1973), A. de W. Malefijt (Spanish translation 1983, original 1974), F. Voget (1975) and J. Honigsmann (1976). In any case, and always attending the perspective of the sociology of the science, it should be highlighted that, with very few exceptions (for example, M.J. Leaf (1979)), rather than the past monumental volumes with one sole author, from then onwards the trend moved towards collective editions with varying historical themes, often combined with articles on anthropological theory : P. Bohannan and M. Glazer, eds. (1973), D. Hymes, ed. (1974), R. Darnell, ed. (1974), T. Thorensen, ed. (1975), S. Diamond, ed. (1980), E.A. Hoebel, R. Currier and S. Kaiser, eds. (1982) and B. RuppEisenreich (1984) together with the previously cited annual volumes of the *History of Anthropology* edited by Stocking. The ever-growing number of works devoted to specific aspects of sub-fields, moreover, such as national traditions and even more specific questions, to be addressed further in this and following chapters, constitute the more than abundant proof of the previously mentioned trend towards specialisation.

But let us return to the question we posed ourselves initially: that is, what factors intervened to produce such a proliferation of histories of anthropology? The “easy epistemological conscience” characterised the classic stage of anthropology while, in the functionalist model, fieldwork represented the greatest goal, the “*summum bonum*” of all research. In the sixties, on the other hand, the situation was completely different and the sensation of a theoretic crisis became gradually more evident in the various different academic circles and institutions. In Kuhnian terms, the state of the academic field could be labelled “polyparadigmatic”, in that various schools of thought, research strategies and perspectives fought among themselves for hegemony in the theoretical and epistemological terrain. The situation does not appear to be much different now from the “crisis of identity” suffered by his anthropologist friends, commented on by Stocking (1966) in one of his first articles, or from when Hymes (1974) a few years later called upon his colleagues to “reinvent” anthropology, or still more recently when Hoebel affirmed that many were still attempting to overcome the “crisis in anthropology”(Hoebel, et al. eds., 1982). It is in this context that the recent history of anthropology saw the light. It was precisely that lack of confidence and crisis of identity that allowed for the historical nature of the field to come to the fore and, as a result, for an attempt to be made to re-construct the different periods of scientific reasoning.

It is certainly complex to attempt to determine the weight of the different causal factors in the development of the historiography of anthropology over the last twenty

years. Methodological questions aside, there are a series of aspects of a more global nature that can be linked to the different historiographical perspectives, together with factors extraneous to the field of science itself. It is our opinion that there are three large blocks of factors that influenced the matter in hand. First, there was the very development of theory in anthropology itself. Second, there was the development of the modern historiographies of the sciences. And third, there was the new international context produced by way of result of the liberation of the so-called "third world" countries. As we have already pointed out, it is enormously complex to attempt to evaluate the weight of each of these factors individually, given that they are clearly interdependent. In any case, from an analytical viewpoint, there would appear to be a need to draw approximate dividing lines, albeit at the risk of losing many of the connections to some degree or other.

The relationship between the factors deriving from the evolution of theory within the field, and those caused by the new trends as of the 60s in the history of science, is clear and indicates, basically, internal problems of a theoretical, epistemological and methodological nature. The importance of the ideological and political contexts is more difficult to gauge in terms of direct cause-effect relationships, since these mainly remit to a framework external to the scientific activity. Obviously, we are facing the age-old problem of internalism versus externalism, the two extremes of one of the classic debates of historians of science. It is not within the scope of the present work to

delve deeply into the subject but it may be apt, nevertheless, to summarily outline some related considerations.

Llobera (1980) gave an extensive re-construction of the evolution of the two opposing poles of internalism vs. externalism in the historiography of the sciences. An internalist views all scientific activity as solely dependent, or at least basically dependent, upon the activity within the science itself, without any social circumstance bearing any decisive influence on what the developments are. An externalist, on the contrary, maintains that, together with the natural internal dynamics, external factors may exist that modulate and define scientific production. These are the two poles of the debate and it is clear that all historians of science situate themselves somewhere along the line between both. At the one extreme, there is the manic internalism of A. Koyré, and at the other, the radical externalism of J.D. Bernal, with many other authors firmly decanting in favour of one or the other. As Llobera himself points out (*ibid.*, 35), most of the articles considered to fall within the category of history of the sciences pertain to the internalist school of thought, while the externalist research tends to be grouped into what has evolved over time into a sub-field, the sociology of the sciences, where R. Merton must be considered to be one of the precursors or founders (Merton 1980[1949]). More recently, Y. Elkana made manifest the possibilities of an anthropology of science via a programmatic essay dealing with the study of scientific communities and institutions through participant observation and fieldwork (Mendelsohn and Elkana eds.,

1981). However that may be, the fact of the matter is that the question has not been solved satisfactorily and, in brief, we lack the clear methodological criteria as yet that would allow us to consider, on the one hand, the internal conditions affecting scientific developments and on the other, the specific external determining factors of an economic, political or ideological nature that have a bearing on scientific activity, together with their mechanisms of connection. In our case and with respect to this point, all we can do is to exert certain caution when approaching the history of anthropology. So, let us return to the core of our debate, to the three types of factors that we have considered to be of relevance in the appearance of present historiography of our academic field.

Decisive factors in the emergence of the history of anthropology in the sixties

The crisis in the field of anthropology due to the internal theoretical and conceptual metamorphoses was more than palpable in academic circles in the sixties. We have already touched upon the open manifestation of this situation when we alluded to the spectre of the disappearance of the "primitive world" as the factor most cited as the root-cause. However, not so manifest but nevertheless true, was that there was a whole process of theoretical and conceptual re-structuring going on at the same time. The importance of the changes in theoretical direction that took place as of the sixties is often played down, overshadowed as it was by the much more noteworthy lament for the disappearance of the "noble savages". So much so was this the case that,

to all effects and purposes, it became risky to establish mechanical links between colonialism and anthropology (Llobera, 1980:55) and, thus, the need to broach the internal dynamics of theory within anthropology became an imperative, not only to explain its historical development but, more importantly, to clarify what real anthropology was.

The fact that the importance of this theoretical regeneration has been ignored for the last two decades has done nothing towards elevating the scientific status of anthropology, but has rather reinforced the grasp of outdated humanism that is to be felt in many academic circles. It is clear that we cannot cover this matter here in the depth that is required but it is, nevertheless, important to state that many of the efforts to elevate the scientific status of anthropology were based, in the main, on previous studies of the past of the academic field. Historical reconstruction motivated by the imperative to consolidate a present theoretical perspective, it is true, is not exempt of dangerous pitfalls. There can be no need to insist in pointing out the mistakes that derive from "presentism" in the history of science. Stocking (1982) already detailed the results that this perspective caused in the case of the history of anthropology. However, we are of the conviction that some of the histories of the field published in the sixties, even when aimed at defending a specific theoretical stance, managed to convince many professionals in the field, notwithstanding, of the importance of a systematic history of anthropology, as well as the need to elevate it to the rank of a science.

The example of Harris, in this sense, is perhaps the most

illustrative. The fact that he was so meticulous in citing anthropologists and even professionals from other fields who had adopted positions with respect to the value of the history of anthropology, is nothing more than a clear expression of the confusion in which theory was mired in the sixties. With the benefit of hindsight, the adequacy and opportunity of a calculated dose of "presentism" no longer appears such a crazy idea. The fact in itself that Harris was to call his work "a" history and not "the" history, should have been understood within that context. And yet Stocking who is, if any, the historian least to ever be suspected of "presentism", after a decade of impassioned criticism and defence of traditional perspectives, had by 1982 come to say that,

But I am at the same time much more inclined today than when I first read Marvin Harris' Rise of Anthropological Theory to grant the historical utility of a strongly held present theoretical perspective. However one may feel about the readings of particular figures which seem to be required to align ancestors in the two moieties of "techno-environmental determinism" and "idealism,"(sic) it seems to me that Harris not only provided a provocative synthetic interpretation but in fact directed attention to problems which are historically significant but which were not likely to be raised so long as one tried to work from within the perspective of the historical actors (Prologue to 1982 edition, xviii).

The jettison of the theoretical and epistemological

theories that had characterised a large part of the past of anthropology obliterated, in the sixties too, the appreciation of the different phases of scientific logic. The importance of the changes that, truth be told, had begun previously but were to become consolidated in this stage after the decline of Boasian particularism and British functionalism, was eclipsed by the crisis that, apparently, only affected the traditional object of study in the field. It would be a gross mistake to say that all these changes obeyed the influence of one sole research trend. Good proof of this is the compendium compiled by R. Murphy (1976), although this, logically, only covers anthropology in the USA. However, the greater distance proportioned by time has led to a more paused evaluation of the relative importance of the various different strategies than they were given in their day. In any case, some of the trends that influenced decisively in the theoretical regeneration can be seen more clearly.

The disciples of J. Steward and L. White managed to consolidate the nomothetic perspectives in the framework of ecological-cultural studies, with greater or lesser degrees of success, but nevertheless decisively. The younger generation of French anthropologists, meanwhile, attempted to produce a synthesis between Marxism and the structuralism of Lévi-Strauss; and the ethno-semanticists and cognitivists, although maintaining their idiographic traditions, promoted a greater refinement of their methodological operationalisation. Feminism and Marxism and other "marginal" anthropologies moved mainstream, albeit not in all academic environments. Nevertheless, by

way of summary of the matter, Stocking recently stated that, at least from the results of the Spring Hill Conference (1980), "*this neoevolutionary viewpoint would have to be taken very seriously as a potential framework of theoretical reorientation in anthropology*" (1982: 416). Although this did not mean that this was the only alternative, as Stocking himself went on to say, the immediate future of the field would probably be divided between a symbolic type of anthropology with a humanist cut and neo-evolutionism. In any case, what would appear to be clear is the strict relationship of the historical developments of the sixties with the need to consolidate theoretical changes along one line or another. However, as we said before, that was likewise influenced by developments in the modern history of the sciences.

The history of science that had inaugurated the new trends in the forties and fifties underwent a serious programme of renovation in the sixties (see Quintanilla, 1972; Muguerza, 1977; Chalmers, 1982 [1976]). It was in that decade that new historiography trends would filter outside their traditional framework of influence and be assumed by the professionals in the various social sciences. The budding history of anthropology was not left untouched in the process. Proof of this were the many participants in the now famous Conference on the History of Anthropology sponsored by the Social Science Research Council in 1962 (Hymes, 1962, 1974), attended not only by anthropologists but also by sociologists and science historians. In the version of the proceedings as published in Darnell (Darnell, ed. 1974), Hymes supplied the references of who attended the

Conference and what they said. We can observe how "many leading lights" in anthropology were present. However, there were also noteworthy absences among the guests from other fields, such as is the case of the sociologist, R. Merton and the philosopher, E. Nagel (Hymes, 1974:303).

The work of T. Kuhn managed to rise intact out of the complex theoretical tangle resulting from the criticism of what Suppe (1979) titled the "inherited conception" or "received view", and was soon converted into one of the main poles of reference. In a relatively short period of time, his main work, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (Spanish translation, 1977, original 1962) occupied the centre of most debates on the new conceptions of history of science. However, Kuhn's ideas did not only attract the attention of philosophers and historians but also, and more interestingly for us, of the social scientists (Barnes, 1982). The importance of this phenomenon hardly needs to be underlined.

For many historians of anthropology, the intellectual osmosis with the new historiography of science converted *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* into a catechism. There is a need to produce a systematic study of how the "paradigm" filtered into the history of anthropology and what has been its usage, especially since the lack of research into this aspect impedes any acknowledgement of the sociological dimension of the recourse to the paradigms of Kuhn in our more recent histories. Albeit so, it is possible, nevertheless, to forward some of the characteristics of this process of assimilation. Among the works produced in the sixties, the use of the concept is relatively scarce, at least in the "great

histories". The reason for this may have been that they were published too close to the appearance of *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* or were already in the finishing stages before its publication. We are referring here to works such as that of Hodgen (1964) and Mercier (1969 [1966]), to name but two of the most relevant. Burrow (1966) and Harris (1968) used the thesis of Kuhn as a guide to their historical interpretations. In the seventies, however, Kuhn was widely cited but, and it is important to make mention of the fact, there was no real assimilation of his methodology. Almost everybody appeared to accept it and yet, in practice, they made recourse to other more traditional perspectives such as schools of thought, central foci and past directions when reconstructing the history of their field. What is significant, in any case, is that the awareness of the historical nature of anthropology would increase as some of the hypotheses of the new directions in the history of science were pressed into practice. The somewhat vague and indiscriminate use of the paradigms, in the long run, did not produce significant results. Yet there are, notwithstanding, some works where the paradigms were used as interpretative principles, and others where the validity of their use was debated.

Rondinelli (1974), for example, made an attempt to trace the history of race studies using Kuhn's perspective, although most of his text consists in a debate with respect to the advantages and disadvantages of its use. More recently, Kirsch attempted to apply Kuhn's thesis to the general evolution of anthropological theory. In his proposal, the development of the academic field can be contemplated as

falling into three different phases: the "pre-paradigmatic era" spanning no less than the impressive distance, in the words of Kirsch, from the initial stages of anthropology coincident, according to him, with the birth of human culture, through the philosophical speculations of the Greeks and Romans, the Renaissance, the age of discovery, the Enlightenment, and ending in the contributions of Post-Darwinian geology and biology; a tall order, all bundled together into the same sack as if it were of little consequence. The initial steps of anthropology coinciding with the birth of culture, that is, with the origin of "anthropological ideas", became a constant in extreme continuity perspectives within the history of science. Llobera (1980) showed definitively how this "continuism" or continuity was, in essence, little more than "sweetened humanism" (Llobera 1980:59; Estévez, 1984).

The pre-paradigmatic era was followed by another characterised as the "formative paradigm" phase, as of the intellectual ferment of the Enlightenment and the theories of Lyell and Darwin when "*a community of intellectuals seems to be addressing a whole set of distinctive questions anthropologically*" (see Kirsch 1982:98), the end result of which was little more than "sub-paradigms". At the beginning of the 20th century, however, "*a general consensus with respect to the problems to be researched and the modes of research*" was to constitute the "*classic paradigm*" that met the general conditions outlined in the thesis of Kuhn. Finally, Kirsch was left with the doubt as to a new paradigm having emerged after the II World War.

However, similar chronologies have, in effect, been traced without explicit recourse to the concept of paradigm and coincide overall in the content, at least if we refer to the last few periods. Stocking (1982), for example, divided the history of anthropology into five grand phases: the ethnological period (1800-1860), the evolutionist (1860-1895), the historical (1895-1925), the classical (1925-1960) and the post-classical. However, it would seem to be, at the least, "*a debatable point*" for it to be claimed that the anthropologists of each of these periods shared a common paradigm (1982:410). It was indeed Stocking himself that only some years before had been more than well-disposed to bestowing a more relevant role on the theses of Kuhn. Like Kuhn, and in the consideration of social sciences as pre-paradigmatic, he indicated that, for example, the concept of cultural evolution of the anthropologies of the 19th century "tended to operate by way of a type of paradigm", much the same as occurred with European physical anthropology. The anthropological concept of culture, in his opinion, could be considered of as a paradigm although he was quick to clarify that he felt inclined towards seeing Kuhn's framework "*not so much as a precise model for all scientific change but rather as a useful heuristic model that helps us to understand specific movements in the history of ideas*" (see 1982:302 [first edition, 1968])

From another perspective completely, P. Bonte proposed a chart of stages of "anthropological reflection", basing his proposal on the thesis of G. Bachelard or, to be more precise, on the Althusserian review of Bachelard. The

evolution of anthropology was contemplated as a series of "epistemological breaks" each of which proposed a specific relationship between science and ideology, therefore, with a special configuration of knowledge. Bonte (1975:11) observed four main "breaks": first, the criticism of slave systems through the noble savage-civilisation dichotomy (18th century); the second, the consolidation of the "ideology" of evolutionism (1850-1880); the third, the constitution of classic ethnology (1920-1930); and last, a fourth "break" (1950-1960) that involved the research into the bases of general anthropology and the "radical criticism" of modern anthropology. However, despite his different epistemological point of departure, the result is very much similar to that proposed by Stocking

We will finish by studying two analyses where the influence and importance of Kuhn's ideas in the history of anthropology are discussed in greater detail. We are referring, of course, to the analyses of O. Lynch (1982) and B. Scholte (1983). The former proposes analysing the sense of "crisis" in anthropology in the sixties, while the latter analyses, in the somewhat pedantic tone of dialectic-critical anthropology, the use of the concept of paradigms in the academic field, while proposing some suggestions as to how the definition of the concept could be enhanced using the same anthropological focus. According to Lynch, the crisis of the seventies was triggered by two factors. On the one hand, there was the change in the relationships with the societies of the Third World. On the other, there were the recent developments in the philosophy of

science that questioned the positivist perspectives of the science (of anthropology) and its interpretation as an accumulative process. Honigmann (1976) concurred with the idea that the development of anthropology could not be understood as an accumulative process, in the manner suggested by Kuhn for "normal science". In Honigmann's view, quite the contrary, anthropology would proceed rather by "*substitution*". However, Lynch was more concerned about the fact that "Kuhnism" was becoming the functional equivalent and substitute for philosophical positivism. No one studied the works of Nagel, Hempel or Popper any longer but rather *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. However, Lynch detected that there were two major lines of interpretation in the work of Kuhn. On the one hand, there was the cognitivist interpretation that underlined the irrational inter-generational psychological elements that Kuhn had made part of the theory of scientific revolutions. On the other hand, there was a rigorous logical-empiricist, pseudo-scientific interpretation. Those who embraced the latter of the interpretations, according to Lynch, considered that social phenomena were qualitatively of the same basic substance as natural phenomena and thus that the techniques of one were indistinctly applicable to the other and to other types of phenomena, leading them in the end, in his opinion, to attempts to develop high-flying nomothetic theories and laws.

Lynch did not see how either of these interpretations would manage to efficiently explain the true nature of the academic field or, to be more precise, he saw excessive

problems posed by both. In reality, neither the cognitivists contributed "*comprehension*" of who they were studying, nor did the positivists offer "*explanations*". What had happened, he seems to say, was that the spread of the Kuhnian model had contaminated anthropology, since people continued to try to justify the directions they took in terms of philosophy and the history of the natural sciences. In short, Lynch concluded, anthropology and the social sciences in general did not follow the model of Kuhn: anthropology was not a paradigmatic science. The solution here could not be anything else but eclectic. In the words of Lynch, "*we now need to reflect upon ourselves and what we do, how we think, to build a fitting epistemology and philosophy for the nature of our academic field of study*" (see 1982: 89). However, this proposal of anthropology as "*free and reflective*" left the epistemological and historical problems of the academic field unresolved. In our opinion, we continue to claim that our intellectual common sense, the "culture of anthropologists", is sufficient in itself to respond adequately to all the epistemological and methodological problems posed by the whole set of sociocultural studies. The type of "self-reflection" proposed by Lynch, on the part of academics probably leads to the adoption of openly idiographic stances, and to put off building a scientific "corpus" of theories to better days.

Similar perspectives were presented by Scholte in his history of the concept of the paradigm. Scholte was one of the first to introduce this concept into the literature of anthropology (Scholte, 1966) and, thus, produced a detailed analysis of

its vicissitudes, through its main dimensions, namely its existential, sociological, philosophical and historical facets. To be sure, the analysis offers many elements of information with respect to the impact of the thesis of Kuhn in the sixties and seventies. The thesis with respect to the change in paradigm, according to Scholte, closely corresponded to the institutional situation of anthropology in the sixties, and its use, among other things, legitimised the importance of external socio-political factors on the academic field. Over those two decades, the notion of the paradigm allowed a reorientation of the anthropological tradition of "self-reflective study". However, in spite of the fact that his study was more extensive than Lynch's, the conclusions reached were basically the same. Moreover, according to Scholte, the possibility of scientific anthropology and, as a result, of its history too, is a pure chimera, a goal destined to be unfulfilled: "*The social sciences replace theology to become converted into the new secular theology. Historically, the faith of the theologian became converted into the faith of the scientist in Reason... The Judaeo-Christian paradigm may have been transformed but it was never abandoned*" (see Scholte, 1983:262).

It is not our place to discuss here the contents of these affirmations of Scholte's that border on obscurantism. If we have mentioned them at all, it is only by way of highlighting the significant recourse made to Kuhn in our historiography. If we look back in detail at the literature on history of anthropology from the past two decades, the presence of Kuhn, whether it be throwaway, like the "cherry on the

top of the cake" to show that the author is updated on the subject, or in the more or less strict academic use of his historiographical theory, it is fairly conspicuous. He is the only "leading light" in the present history of science that our historians have taken into account. However, at the end of the day, what between those who considered anthropology to be pre-paradigmatic and did not see a model in reality envisioned for the natural sciences as feasible, and those who quite simply were not even prepared to try because they proposed other perspectives that were generally more traditional, or those who, having used it, concluded that it was impossible for anthropology to become a scientific field of study, the history of anthropology still seemed far from Stocking's goal of "*historically sophisticated and anthropologically informed*"(1982: xviii). But we will return to that question in due time First, we must take a look at the third factor that, in our opinion, decisively influenced the emergence of the history of the academic field in the sixties.

There is a powerful reason why the processes of theoretical renovation and the incorporation of new trends into the history of the science were, to a great extent, played down as of the sixties, even though they were prime factors of growing historical concern for the anthropologists. And that reason was the greater impact on the academic field of the processes of decolonisation after the II World War. The whole series of status of independence bestowed upon the countries of the Third World did not only modify the socio-political panorama in the world, upturning a large part of the traditional economic structures, but it also

inaugurated a new framework of relationships between the West and the rest, of "us" with "them". The immediate and real impact of the "crisis" made itself felt in anthropology through the more or less apocalyptic prediction that the "primitive world" was inevitably doomed to extinction. There is no need to go further into the exhaustive and repetitive debate that ensued with respect to the dubious future for an anthropology that had devoted itself entirely until then to the study of "primitive" societies. The combined effects of the "modernisation", transforming cultures that had been the focus of analysis of the academic field from its beginning, and the Western Eurocentric discourse of anthropology having its wings clipped by being challenged, constitute the third set of factors that spurred anthropologists to situate the development of anthropology in history. However, given that the debate has been a constant in all of the literature over the last two decades, it is of no interest that we follow the different perspectives from which it has been focused. Nevertheless, a brief summary will help to situate the orientations towards which most professionals decanted.

As Stocking indicated (1982), the "others" or the non-European "rest" were systematically expropriated and exploited for over four centuries, a fact that defined anthropological speculation as having always possessed a marked ideological nature. The change in the situation of the Colonies not only imposed a need to change the subject/object of traditional study within the field, but also demanded a modification of the previous discourse with respect to "the others". The ethnocentric contents of classic

anthropology constituted the main target of all criticism, both on the part of the anthropologists themselves and from all the other sectors of the social sciences, above all from those whose main fields of research had to do with the problems of under-development in the societies on the periphery. Much ink was spilt but to little effect it would seem, in retrospect, to judge by the scarce results. In the USA and, above all, in Europe, most of the pronouncements had to do with the end of anthropology, and anthropological activity was stigmatised in the Third World. To be brief, what was being debated in this "crisis of identity" was the need to choose between scientific anthropology and a committed, critical anthropology. Llobera (1975) systematised the main positions adopted by the anthropologists at the time, in their attempts to somehow square the dichotomy. What is to be highlighted in this context was the variety of positions and theoretical perspectives amongst those that inclined towards the need for radical and critical anthropology. Thus, for example, while P. Worsley (1970) predicted the beginning of the end of anthropology, Gunder Frank (1978) foresaw the future of anthropology as lying somewhere between standing as a defence-line for the mystification of neo-Colonialism and being used as a frontline weapon of attack by the Third World. Robert Jaulin (1973, 1976), meanwhile, seemed always to find it of greater urgency to criticise ethnic cleansing than to waste time on quibbling about theory. Finally, Stanley Diamond (1980), to cite one of the most qualified representatives of the dialectic-critical school of anthropology, saw the academic field as offering a means towards awakening humanity to new possibilities

and revolutionary imperatives.

P. Bonte (1975) insisted on that same point when he pondered whether anthropology truly had to be based on a radical ideology or should rather advance, combining its revolutionary commitments with developments in the science, at the same time as he criticised "*critical anthropology*" such as Jaulin's, calling it "*a right-wing criticism of ethnography*". He was of the opinion that only a "*criticism of anthropology*" could save the field from the theoretical and ideological limbo into which it had been thrown by the collapse of Colonialism. Whatever the way forward, either clinging onto the corpse of colonial anthropology or celebrating the demise of ethnocentric views, little time was left over to dedicate to the business of sorting out theoretical and methodological questions.

Nevertheless, in the seventies, some pieces of work appeared that attempted to establish the development of the field within broader historical processes, with special reference therein made to Colonialism. The most outstanding of these were, without a doubt, the work of Gérard Leclerc and of T. Asad. The former (Leclerc, 1973) presented the changes within the theory of anthropology, especially within British anthropology, as having been accommodated to the various phases of colonial expansion in Europe. In his opinion, there was a strict correlation between the imperatives of the colonial politics and the dominant schools within the field. Thus, the stage of Victorian Imperialism coincided with the consolidation of evolutionism, and the politics of "indirect

rule" with the predominant functionalist focus. The articles published with Talal Asad as an editor (1973) were, general introduction apart, devoted to the study of specific cases, and likewise abounded in remarks with respect to the intricate interplay of anthropology and colonialism. At the end of the day, however, this type of heavily biased externalist re-orientation could not explain the internal upheaval and schismatic processes within the theory of anthropology itself. Llobera (1980) criticised what he saw to be the mechanical establishment of "*connections between colonialism and anthropology*" to be observed in some of the positions taken by G. Leclerc and T. Asad. This, it should be noted, would appear to be a self-critique of the position he himself had defended only a few years previous (see Llobera 1975). There is an immense amount of literature on the subject, of which H. Alavi and T. Shanin offer a broad retrospective vision in their compendium of the main subjects that occupied social scientists in the seventies (Alavi & Shanin, eds., 1982).

Finally, there was a phenomenon that had run parallel to the lamentations on the end of anthropology that has not been treated or, at least, in any depth until very recently, that being the development or formation of "national anthropologies". As of several years back, there have been many pieces of work that have touched upon the problematic state of anthropology on the "periphery". In the collection of essays edited by Thorensen (1975), there were studies on anthropology in Hungary and India. The presence of national traditions in *Ancestors and Heirs*

(Diamond, ed. 1980), for example, a study devoted to "anthropological traditions", occupies a substantial part of the article. These "national anthropologies" were produced, together with works relating to different aspects of Anglo-American anthropology, with a marked number of them devoted to Germany, the Soviet Union, India, Italy and Latin America, to name only a few. The number multiplies considerably if we bear in mind the monographic books and articles devoted to one sole country or specific area.

In this context, we should highlight the fact of the significant absence of Spanish anthropology in all the texts devoted to analysing the development of national anthropologies in the seventies. There was only one short article by M. Cátedra (1978) in the *History of Anthropology Newsletter*, following closely what had been outlined by Lisón Tolosana (1971) with respect to the history of anthropology in Spain, that appeared in any international journal of the time. This reflects the scant development of the field and its late incorporation into "international anthropology". However, this does not mean that it was a barren field of study. J.R. Llobera contributed greatly towards promoting historical studies at the time, and collaborated closely with C. Bidón-Chanal (1982) and J. Bestard (1982, 1982a). In the Ethnological Museum in Madrid likewise, F. del Pino, P. Romero and A. Verde brought out significant studies in the history of anthropology, above all with respect to the 1901 Survey in the Athenaeum, (*Encuesta del Ateneo*) in Madrid. In the First Conference of Anthropology (Barcelona, 1977), the symposium on the history of anthropology revealed vivid

interest in the field that prospered, however, in a limited number of centres and, in most of the cases, by way of individual specialisation, failing to produce projects of systematic research. Here, we should point out that a large part of this work is devoted to various different national traditions, and that there are significant differences among the researchers, both in terms of bibliographical production and theoretical quality. It would be impossible to offer an exhaustive list of all of them, but there are some who must be mentioned by way of reference in these broad-ranging panoramas of national traditions, such as the pioneering work of J. Prat (1977) and its subsequent updates that constitute a vital guide.

In the same way, and in Andalusia, the works of greatest relevance are by I. Moreno (1971, 1984) and Rodríguez Becerra (1985). In Catalonia, where there was considerable production covering a broad range of theory, mention must be made to the studies of J. Prat (1980, 1985) and Ll. Prats (1981, 1982, 1985) and to a significant collective venture (Prats, Llopart, Prat, 1982). Del Valle (1981) and Azcona (1981, 1982) afforded an approach to the history of anthropology, meanwhile, in the Basque Country, Euskadi.

One of the main points of reference is the "Small History of the Birth of an Academic Discipline" (*Pequeña historia del nacimiento de una disciplina*) by Lisón Tolosana, in his Social Anthropology in Spain (*Antropología social en España*) (1971), albeit for want of its inclusion of the present-day methodology of the history of the science. And, last but not least, mention should be made to the work of the

anthropologists from the "older generation", in particular the History of Anthropology (*Historia de antropología*) by A. Palerm (1979), and The Dawn of Anthropological reflection (*La aurora del pensamiento antropológico*) by J. Caro Baroja (1983, 1985). The former is, in reality, a collection of comments on selected texts of precursors in the field and on anthropologists, with the treatment given to the evolutionists of particular value (Vol., II). The works of Caro Baroja, meanwhile, represent a re-encounter with the Greek and Latin "ancestors" (1983) and a programmatic panorama from the Enlightenment through to the classic schools in 20th century anthropology.

In spite of the evident diversity in the development of these national anthropologies, there are several elements they share, nevertheless. Gerholm and Hannerz (1982) suggested that the structure of the relationships between the centre and the periphery could be analysed sociologically. So, in the first place, the metropolitan anthropologists broadly focused their attention on what happened or was said "at home" in whatever metropolis was being studied. Meanwhile, the anthropologists on the periphery were concerned with what was occurring in their field in their own country, but also in developments in one or more of the metropolises. And, lastly, the anthropologists of different countries on the periphery were scarcely informed among themselves with respect to their colleagues' work, unless such had attracted attention from the metropolitan anthropologists (*ibid.*,7). One of the best ways to appreciate these phenomena consists in following publications and

their reception in various different countries. In this sense, the coverage of journals such as *American Anthropologist*, *American Ethnologist*, *Man*, *Ethnology*, *L'Homme*, among others, represented the main references for practising anthropologists internationally. The same criterion is applicable to the journals specialising in sub-fields, and to the publication of textbooks. Garfield's sociological analysis (1984) of the publication and citation of authors and specialist journals in anthropology, based on the Social Sciences Citation Index prepared by the publisher of *Current Contents*, shows clearly which were the leading journals in the field. Doubtless, the plurality of national points of view is evident and aligned to factors of a varying nature, from socio-political perspectives or reflecting pools of opinion, academic structures, "invisible schools" and many others. However, equally noteworthy is the preponderance of American, British and French journals, but above all of America, in the context of international anthropology.

In this context, the fact that "international anthropology" appeared in the fifties or sixties can be considered from two different viewpoints. On the one hand, it could be considered an expression of a kind of post-colonial or rather neo-colonial anthropology that would reproduce in old-new terms the historical dichotomy between being a means of control and dominating the "uneasy ill" conscience of neo-colonialism. On the other, it may be seen as an attempt to build scientific networks of intercultural theories, assuming the history of the field, and establishing a new framework of relationships between the mainstream

and peripheral anthropologies, between the centre and the periphery. Political and ideological elements apart, this dilemma was related to the tension that Stocking indicated between the two dominant types of research that have characterised modern anthropology. That is, basically, that there is, on the one hand, one that, among other distinctive characteristics, emphasised fieldwork via participant observation as the basic component of anthropological knowledge, prioritising empathy with the culture studied through "face to face" relationships and a certain holistic vision: and on the other, there was a more "scientist" perspective assumed from the evolutionist inheritance and based on comparative analysis (1982 :174). It is logically still too early to glimpse the future of international anthropology that arose from this complex process or to determine the development of the academic field towards multiple national anthropologies or rather towards a unified theory of sociocultural studies. In such time as it takes for the panorama to clear, meanwhile, this does not seem to be the best time to defer concerning ourselves with our pending historical, theoretical and methodological problems in the present.

The methodology of research programmes

We saw in previous sections the main factors that conditioned the appearance of history of anthropology. Likewise, we saw how some of the most recurrent themes and perspectives of that historiography arose in them. But we have yet to analyse the problems relating to methodological guidelines. In this section, it is our aim to outline the main

elements that, in our opinion, may contribute towards the elaboration of a methodological framework within which to analyse the history of Canary anthropology. However, we cannot repeat here the theoretical debate that we touched upon elsewhere in previous articles. In Estévez (1983,1984,1985), we have studied the theoretical structure of the history of anthropology more extensively, analysing the various different perspectives that concur therein together with the fundamental questions under debate. Therefore, here it is more a matter of forwarding a more positive proposal although we are aware that such does not constitute a closed formulation and that, as a consequence, the results it may give rise to will not be any more than provisional. However, this is, no doubt, also a reflection of the fact that we do not have at our disposal, as yet, a general high-level theory in the history of the science that is capable of accounting for all aspects of scientific activity nor, for that matter, that generally convinces most of the historians.

The strict relation between epistemology and the history of science is not something that has been of interest to the historians of anthropology, generally speaking. The negative repercussions of this attitude are evident in a large part of our literature that continued to find its inspiration in the mould of traditional historiography, in spite of the innovations of the sixties. The need for a sophisticated history of the academic field, from the epistemological viewpoint, has been made manifest in no uncertain terms by Stocking in a large number of articles, as well as by

other authors who have insisted on the point, working from other different perspectives. We have already seen how the Kuhnian paradigms have been used in the recent history of anthropology with varying degrees of fortune. However, we have also seen how most of our historians consider that the history of science ends in Kuhn. The theory of scientific revolutions has been assimilated, or rather uncritically assimilated, with the sole question being planted as to how it may be interpreted. There are, however, some other perspectives on the history of science that should be taken into account. Such is the case, for example, of the works of I.C. Jarvie, faithful to the thesis of Popper, with his latest research on the link between rationality and relativism as fundamental problems of anthropology based on Popper's teaching (Jarvie, 1984). Meanwhile, Llobera incorporated the formulations of the French epistemologists into his work and, among other things, produced a re-construction of the Marxist concept of social totality "*trying to apply some of the ideas of C. Canguilhem to the history of science*" (see Llobera, 1980:70).

As I. Lakatos so rightly declared, "*the history of science without the philosophy of science is blind. Philosophy of science without history of science is empty*" (Spanish translation, 1974: 456, original, see 1970). Lakatos' theory with respect to the methodology of scientific research programmes, along with recent developments, allow for some of the inconveniences of the formulations of Kuhn to be overcome, in our opinion. However, in order to be able to broach the theory, we need to trace some lines of

communication between Lakatos and Kuhn.

The philosophy of science developed in the twenty years previous to this publication was based largely on Popper's epistemology. The works of Kuhn, Lakatos and Feyerabend, to name only some of the leading lights, may be considered mostly to be a discussion with K. Popper. We coincide with many critics and comments with respect to the three aforementioned authors that a more satisfactory vision of their respective orientations is obtained if the evaluation of 'research programmes' is compared with Popper's falsification, since the programmes are the culmination of the falsifiability process, together with, as is only logical, the criticism of its limitations. The sociohistorical perspective of Kuhn and the heterodoxy exhibited by Feyerabend, can thus be presented with greater clarity, via a dialogue with Popper and Lakatos.

From the perspective of historiography of the sciences, and countering Popper's falsification, Kuhn highlighted the influence of psychosocial factors required to understand the genesis and evolution of scientific knowledge. It is, above all from Kuhn onwards that, as opposed to Popper, science began to no longer devote energy towards falsifying well-established hypotheses but that rather the irrational and metaphysical beliefs of the scientists were frequently to intervene in scientific discoveries and influence what the scientific community accepted and presupposed as a model of what the world was like. Kuhn's definition of paradigms is more than well-known: "*Universally recognized scientific achievements that, for a time, provide model problems and*

solutions for a community of researchers" (see Kuhn, 1962).

This was, in his opinion, the basis of ordinary behaviour in scientific activity, the "*normal science*". As opposed to what Popper believed, it was Kuhn's view that science did not risk its basic hypotheses in an unforeseeable battle that might end in them being falsified, but rather attempts to preserve them from any type of experiment that may even potentially jeopardise their validity with "*research based solidly on one or more past scientific event, events acknowledged by the community for a certain time as the basis for their subsequent practice*" (*ibid.*, 33).

Paradigms that provide a set of general theories, laws and techniques maintain a standard conduct in the course of research. This conduct can be characterised, according to Kuhn, as the resolution of "puzzles" or, in other words, as solving problems that have more than one assured solution. It is for this reason that the "puzzles" do not test the paradigm and the real world since there are always difficulties in achieving harmonisation between the two. At any moment in time, a problem arising from this lack of fit between the two, that cannot be resolved, becomes an "anomaly", the existence of which does not cause the immediate refutation of the paradigm in question. However, when an anomaly is of a persistently crucial nature, it generates a situation of "crisis". In the words of Kuhn, "(...) *this proliferation of competing articulations (makes the rules of science become increasingly blurred), the willingness to try anything, the expression of explicit discontent, the recourse to philosophy and to debate over fundamentals are symptoms of*

a transition from normal to non-ordinary research" (ibid.,148). That is, it gives rise to a crisis that is solved with the imposition of a new paradigm. The situation that produces the change from the old to the new paradigm may rightly be described as a "revolution".

Kuhn drew a parallel between political and scientific revolutions to develop his thesis with respect to scientific development. He considered that in the same way as in a political revolution, the aim was to substitute some institutions for others, using means that the existing establishments considered to be inadmissible. The opposition of rival paradigms was likewise the result of a choice between two incompatible modes of dealing with the contents of science and the processes used by the community of scientists. And that was so because, among other aspects, the change from the old to the new paradigm meant a re-definition of the concept of science and a re-structuring of the agreements and commitments of the community. These revolutionary processes occurred in such a way (*ibid.*, 165-) that there is no logical argument that can be offered to show the superiority of one paradigm over another. There is, in short, no "rational choice". In other words, according to Kuhn, two rival paradigms cannot be "*measured against one another*", they are "*incommensurable*"; or to say it more simply, there is no way of saying that one paradigm is better than another.

It is precisely on those passages in *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* that Kuhn based his relativist interpretation. In effect, the incommensurability of the paradigms advocates

for the idea that theories change, but not necessarily in the sense we could call "progress". Kuhn, nevertheless, when answering the critics of relativism, said that there was at least one way of affirming that science progressed, that basically consisted in its capacity to solve problems, although such progress could not be interpreted as ascending towards the "truth". One could only hope then for a gradual refinement of measurement and an evolution in explanatory formulae from qualitative to mechanical to mathematical. As is well known, Kuhn made some re-formulations of the concept of the paradigm, using a "*disciplinary matrix*" to refer to paradigms in the broadest sense, and "*exemplar*" when he was attempting to give more precision (Kuhn, Spanish translation 1979, original 1977). Nevertheless, that did not affect the original historiographical proposal in any substantial way. However, insomuch as these criteria of scientific advances are only applied to the theories and not to the paradigms as a whole, there are some problems encountered when attempting to explain changes in paradigms in a convincing manner.

Feyerabend, for example, saw the criterion for progress in science as the principle of "*anything goes*" (1981). He made manifest his opinion with respect to the insufficiency of Kuhn's criteria to detect when it might be considered that a paradigm or research programme had entered into a degenerative phase. Despite some important observations, Feyerabend's proposal of epistemological anarchism would seem to be more anarchic than epistemological, because there can be no doubt that, in the long run, the idea that

science is more than an "aesthetic judgement" is fairly useless and in no way clarifies the issue these problems pose. Chalmers (Spanish translation, 1982:207, original, see 1976) was to comment ironically "*should you be a reader that is particularly unnerved or alarmed by the humble position to which human efforts, aspirations and desires have been assigned, I believe that I can recommend you the right philosopher. His name is P. Feyerabend.*" Harris was to show no better humour in this case: "*(...) the epistemological anarchist, convinced that all knowledge is equally uncertain, faces the ludicrous task of trying to convince the others of the certainty (or probability) that all truths are equally false*"

Let us now continue with the focus of Lakatos'. In 1970, Lakatos presented two earlier pieces of work,⁶ where he attempted to formulate a conceptualisation of science that would represent an improvement on Poppers' falsification model. To a large extent, Lakatos' attempt covered some important aspects of those developed by Kuhn in 1962, and shone light overall on the complexity of scientific theories that meant, in his opinion, that they could not be understood from an inductivist focus; that the conjectures and falsification defended by Popper did not account for many of the features that define scientific knowledge and methodology. Leaving aside some necessary precisions for the moment, we can say that the ideas of Kuhn and Lakatos coincided in this, and that if we look more closely

⁶ TN The dates do not correspond to the original text as the latter appears to be based on the dates of the Spanish translations, since Lakatos' work on Falsification dates from 1970. The original read 1975, giving the dates of other earlier articles as 1970 and 1971.

at the history of science and accept the fact that concepts can only be understood within the framework of a theory, scientific theories must be considered to represent a certain type of complex, organised structure. In the words of Lakatos,

"(...) one of the crucial features of sophisticated falsificationism is that it replaces the concept of theory as the basic concept of series of theories. It is a succession of theories and not one given theory which is appraised as scientific or pseudo-scientific. But the members of such series of theories are usually connected by a remarkable continuity which welds them into research programmes." (Spanish translation, 1974:244, original, 1970:132)

For Lakatos, a "*research programme*" is made up of two types of methodological rules that conform to two types of heuristics. There is a negative heuristics that specifies the set of hypotheses or basic principles that form the "*hard core*" of the programme. Said "*hard core*" must be considered to be irrefutable with respect to the possible or real empirical anomalies "by methodological decision" of the scientists in the programme. The way of preserving the "*hard core*", that is, the hypotheses and basic principles, is by means of a "*protective belt*" of auxiliary refutable hypotheses. The positive heuristics, on the other hand, expresses "*a partially articulated set of suggestions or hints on how to change, develop the 'refutable variants' of the research programme, how to modify, sophisticate the 'refutable' protective belt*" (Spanish translation, 1974:257, original, 1970:135).

According to Lakatos, moreover, scientific development consists in the double attempt on the part of the various different programmes to explain phenomena that are already known and to predict new facts, following the rule of Popper in this process to "*devise conjectures which have more empirical content than their predecessors*" (Spanish translation, *ibid.*, 244, original, *ibid.*, 132). However, at the same time, a research programme can only be called scientific if it implies, on the one hand, an orientation of priorities for future research and, on the other, if it is capable, every certain time, of discovering new phenomena.

"(...) any scientific theory has to be appraised together with its auxiliary hypotheses, initial conditions etc., and, especially, together with its predecessors so that we may see by what sort of change it was brought about. Then, of course, what we appraise is a series of theories rather than isolated theories." (Spanish translation, *ibid.*, 231, original, *ibid.*, 117/118).

Unlike Kuhn, said evaluation is subject to being formulated in terms of progress or degeneration, so that a series of theories is "*theoretically progressive*" or "*degenerating*" according to whether or not it effectively discovers and explains novel facts. A fact can be said to be scientifically explained when the appearance of a new fact can be explained in its turn by it. Contrary to naïve falsificationism, therefore "*no experiment(...) or well-corroborated low-level falsifying hypothesis alone can lead to falsification. There is no falsification before the emergence of a better theory.*" (Spanish translation, *ibid.*, 232, original, *ibid.*, 119)

The importance of this hypothesis had immediate consequences for the history of science. According to Lakatos, science history had been or should have been a history that made manifest the struggle between rival research programmes as a suitable means towards discovering scientific developments. In this sense, the methodology of research programmes could be used not only to explain how science "works" but also towards re-constructing history. Science, Lakatos said in his *Rational Reconstructions* (1970: 456-) (*sic*) must be "*reconstructed rationally*", that is, via a history of what are considered the internal workings of science. When this "*internal history*" had been put together, he considered that we would be in a place to confront the "*real*" history of science. The problem, as most of Lakatos' critics were quick to indicate, was that nobody knows exactly what the "*real*" history is.

But even though we do not have at our disposal a general theory of history with which to contrast the rational reconstructions of science, the methodology of the research programmes, in our opinion, is a focus that offers a sufficiently versatile basis upon which to broach the historical problems of anthropology. Here we will not go into other recent elaborations in philosophy and the history of science, of which we should spotlight those of Stegmüller, Sneed and Moulines (see Moulines, 1982) that have been the object of our analysis in another place (Estévez, 1983). However, if paradigms and research programmes are to be applied with caution in the field of the social sciences, imagine what difficulties await us when we try to incorporate

methodologies that are still being tested preferentially in the field of natural science. Making recourse to these methodological criteria, therefore, we will attempt to broach the question of the history of Canary anthropology in the chapters and sections that follow. On these matters, we can observe coincidences with what was defended by Marvin Harris (Spanish translation, 1982, original, 1976) in his exhaustive approach and account of the epistemological and theoretical problems affecting anthropology in his present times. After an analysis of the various different currents in the philosophy of science, he proposed "research strategies" as the methodology to explain scientific activity and development. In fact, the term "strategy", that we have adopted in the title, is merely an improvement of his upon Lakatos' research programmes. We should indicate, likewise, that the core of the methodology suggested by Harris was solidly based on the theses of "Popper's hard core"(sic)⁷ to which some nuances had been incorporated, above all by N. Maxwell and L. Laudén (see Estévez, 1983).

We should insist, nevertheless, that a mechanical application of what has been explained in this section would not lead to anything more than a gross simplification, and perhaps even an upturning, of the historical processes we are attempting to study here. In our case, not only do we have to deal with the questioned scientific status of anthropology, but also with the added fact that a large part of the problems dealt with correspond to stages

7 TN. We believe that he intended to say "Lakatos' hard core " but have been unable to access the original article from which this idea is derived: Estévez on Harris (1983)

previous to the institutionalisation of the field of research, thus explaining the scarce consolidation of anthropological theories as full-blown scientific research strategies. However, if we are, at least, to advance in that direction, the conceptual and thematic analysis in the context of networks or sets of theories and not isolated theories, together with the more or less precise definition of the "universes of problems" of a theoretical nature, or other, that underpin a large part of the epistemological conceptualisation we have outlined herein, would appear to us to be of great use when analysing the development of Canary anthropology. But before tackling the question in hand, we need to examine what has been done in the islands in this terrain through to the present.

1.2. The historiography of Canary anthropology

In spite of the considerable accumulated volume of bibliography on the subject, Canary anthropology has not been the object of a systematic research project into its own history. The inexistence of such a project certainly affects not only the various different fields of anthropological research but is also extensive to closely linked academic fields, such as archaeology and even history. There are only some disperse and partial approximations of a history of Canary anthropology, generally produced to cover some important commemorative event that can be found over the long life of anthropology on these islands. The evident contrast of anthropological, folkloric and ethnographic

studies with analyses of a historical nature shows to what extent the history of anthropology has not been treated in the Archipelago as "an anthropological question".

In spite of research in this area being scant, we do have, however, significant source material in the form of documents, together with a large number of partial studies that, although disperse and difficult to trace, constitute sufficient basis for a systematic reconstruction of the history of anthropology in the Archipelago. These source materials and other documents can be classified under the following categories: monographs, biographical studies and historical profiles of institutions, and finally manuscripts, memoirs and correspondence. We will stick with this classification in order to facilitate the argument. Nevertheless, some general considerations are necessary insofar as it will be seen that most of the works on Canary anthropology share some important characteristics.

If we adhere to what was outlined in the previous section, the set of studies directly and indirectly related to the historical development of anthropology in the Canary Islands share, first and foremost, their traditional theoretical focus. Generally speaking, they are based on a type of historical reconstruction that bears the quasi-paradigmatic seal of approaching historical events "because they are there" (see Stocking, 1982). The history of the field was not conceived of as a scientific problem, the resolution of which, albeit obviously provisional, should depend upon the application of a likewise scientific methodology. The use, therefore, of the conceptual and methodological

apparatus of historiography of the sciences was practically non-existent and, as a result, the work is based on a naïve conceptualisation of historiography of scarce theoretic rigour. The requisites for the elaboration of the historical tale, along the same lines, only depended upon having done anthropological fieldwork or of being in possession of a greater or lesser knowledge of the field, and not on the use of a historiographical research programme. It would be a futile exercise to try to find here any references whatsoever to the ancient schools of history of the sciences that might have been used by way of theoretical guidelines. It would be equally futile to search for more recent theoretical perspectives. Names such as those of Kuhn, Lakatos and Feyerabend that are common currency among the tribes of anthropologists worldwide were complete unknowns for our ethnographers and chroniclers of folklore with historical inclinations.

A second shared characteristic, derived in great measure from this total lack of knowledge with respect to the history of the sciences, consists in the manner in which the history was written. The result is a continuous linear account where it is impossible to evaluate when research programmes or strategies signified advances or regressions in each disciplinary matrix. Moreover, and generally speaking, theoretical development was seen unilaterally as the result of an accumulation of pieces of work by certain individuals which gave sufficient grounds, besides, for them to be contemplated as "heroes" or "great men". Thus, the various different phases of evolution within the academic field

were not marked by their theories, directions, perspectives or research strategies, but rather by the turning points assigned to the authors considered to be relevant. And so, the history of Canary ethnography, folklore and anthropology is not even that of an anthropology of the Enlightenment, of Romanticism, of 19th century positivism or of diffusionism, but is almost exclusively the history of its foremost figures, namely Viera, Berthelot, Chil, Verneau and Serra Ràfols, among others.

Lastly, this type of historiographical process proved to be incapable of broaching the focal problems in the development of the academic field, that is, its genesis and conceptual evolution. Our understanding of the internal process of scientific activity in each one of the relatively autonomous fields of research, to a large extent, depends upon how these questions are resolved.

We shall attempt to show here how the work produced on Canary anthropology through to the present-day (of writing), and despite its importance in a practically barren terrain, only allows for a partial comprehension of its evolution. From our point of view, this is particularly evident at least in three relevant aspects. First, there is the question of intellectual affiliation; second, the aforementioned question of the genesis and conceptual evolution; and third and last, is the question of how and if the effects on and from the social matrix in which the island anthropological studies were carried out, have been dealt with, in any way.

Insofar as the first of these is concerned, there has been

insufficient study in many cases or none whatsoever into the intellectual and scientific training of the ethnographers, folklorists and anthropologists. Thus, as we will go on to see in the section devoted to biographies, there is a notorious imbalance in studies of the various different authors. Viera is, by far, the most widely studied in this sense, while the work devoted to Berthelot, Chil and Serra is much less, and scarcer still the studies referring to Bethencourt Alfonso and Grau-Bassas, to cite only some of the most representative figures. In the case of the researchers considered to be of secondary importance (but not for that reason any less relevant from the perspective of the history of the field), the total boils down to a handful at most of scattered and sporadically specific instances of reference.

The problem, of course, is not quantitative, although this does indicate a certain measure of importance. We are referring again here to the role assigned to intellectual influences in this type of historical analysis. Generally, the studies are limited to relating facts that the authors themselves have highlighted in their texts or correspondence. We know where they studied, what works they read, and even who their friends were. But the result tended to be descriptive when not merely anecdotal. From the perspective of traditional historiography, discovering to what extent the works, ideas, theories or concepts taken from others have played a relevant part in the theoretical orientations of the authors, depended almost exclusively on the affirmations of the authors themselves and not on a systematic reconstruction of the theories that, supposedly,

they were proclaiming.

That being said, the problems of intellectual affiliation can be solved with relatively few methodological tools. The conceptual genesis, on the contrary, demands a more sophisticated methodology in light of the evaluation of the heuristic power of each conceptual apparatus. In our case, the conceptual reconstruction is even more "elusive" than the intellectual affiliation. The "noble savage", race, species, evolution and diffusion, among other terms, were not only used without any degree of precision in their definition but, moreover, there was no consideration given to the possibility of the use of one same concept with different contents, or that different concepts in different terms could be applied to the same contents. This does not allow for any evaluation of the respective concepts while it reinforces a linear vision of the conceptual reconstruction, albeit with scattered "*coups de génie*" or master strokes on the part of the most relevant authors.

Finally, as far as the sociological aspects of the scientific activity of the researchers and institutions linked to anthropology are concerned, our historiography has proved to be more permeable in taking them into consideration. However, the importance given to the social contexts in which said Canary anthropology developed did not presuppose a setting for the sociological factors within a framework of overall interpretation. Through the literature available, we can trace many of the extra-scientific conditioning factors that were important as settings, influencing the Canary anthropology of the times. However,

these are more often to be found in works of economic or political history than in studies related to the history of anthropology. The latter studies show a greater trend towards more internalist perspectives without this implying, nevertheless, that they consciously assume any of the historical perspectives within the history of science; that is, they do not opt for any one internalist perspective over an externalist alternative for methodological reasons, but rather that they use the perspective as a default position, as pre-set by traditional historiography.

These considerations allow us to critically reassume the classification proposed at the beginning and to avoid repeating such elements as affect the same overall in each of the different sections.

Monographic studies: The "Notes" by Diego Cuscoy and "The Studies" by Pérez Vidal

The "*Notas para una historia de la antropología canaria*", (Notes for a History of Canary Anthropology, hereinafter referred to as "Notes") by Luis Diego Cuscoy (1975), and "*Los estudios del folklore canario*" (The Studies of Canary Folklore, hereinafter referred to as "The Studies") by José Pérez Vidal (1982) are the only published works that offer an overall vision of the Canary history of anthropology. More on account of their attempted synthesis than for the methodology used, these are the two most complete approaches to both of these traditionally popular fields of research in Canary anthropology, that is to say, physical anthropology and folklore.

However, as previously said, the contributions of Diego Cuscoy and Pérez Vidal are relevant in that they represent efforts at synthesis in a historiography where the common currency was usually anecdotal. Insofar as they are devoted to two different questions, each essay requires an individual analysis. Nevertheless, they share some common characteristics that should be highlighted.

Diego Cuscoy and Pérez Vidal were, at the time of writing this, two of the most outstanding representatives of the older generations of researchers in the fields of archaeology, ethnography and folklore. The two researchers in their extensive careers acquired an institutional status that allowed them to be present and exceptional protagonists in Canary anthropology as of the 1930s-40s. The documentary and information coverage that this fact proportioned made them more than authorised to pronounce on questions in history, not only in the fields where they were most active but in the whole of Canary sociocultural research (Galván, 1987). However, on the subject that here concerns us, the publications of both were significantly scarce, occupying a very secondary position in their broad-ranging and varied bibliographies. Moreover, their concern with the history of anthropology only gave rise to works in the later stages of both their careers as researchers. This fact, which is a constant in most anthropologists with leanings towards history, occurred in their cases when they could no longer be fully engaged in active fieldwork. Unfortunately, too, neither Diego Cuscoy nor Pérez Vidal was linked to a University or academic centre, a fact that has prevented

publication or reflection of much of their work and opinions on the history of the field, at least with respect to oral traditions.

Despite the shared elements, each work requires individual analysis to highlight the more specific questions of the subjects and fields with which they dealt.

The "Notes towards a history of Canary anthropology"

The "Notes" by Diego Cuscoy (1975) take the shape of a short but nevertheless dense essay where the main reference is Agustín Millares Torres. There can be no doubt that it was more truly motivated by the re-edition of the General History of the Canary Islands (*Historia general de las Islas Canarias*) by Millares (1975 [original, 1893]) than by the role played by Millares Torres in the theoretical context under analysis. Although it is indeed the case that Millares' work is relevant in more than one aspect in the Canary history of anthropology, he is not, truth be told, the most significant figure in this field. The title itself of the essay is the first item that requires analysis. Diego Cuscoy saw no need to use the term "anthropology" as an adjective despite the fact that the question being dealt with dwelt exclusively on one of the sub-disciplines within anthropology. The reasons for this were fairly simple: Canary anthropology was and has always been traditionally physical anthropology. Therefore, the stage has only ever admitted one version of the development of anthropology, that is, physical, from the times of Berthelot through to the 1970s. Bearing this fact in mind, then, there can be no faulting the

terminology. However, when looking at the reconstruction of anthropological studies in the Archipelago, there is a question that should have been and should still be posed. The question relates to the reasons that impeded the development of cultural anthropology in the Canary Islands or, in other words, what factors intervened to make physical anthropology the only possible variant of anthropology in the Archipelago. We will return to that question later.

In the "Notes", Diego Cuscoy traced the evolution of Canary anthropology as a circle. By using the figure of Millares Torres, he proposed that anthropological studies, at least once there was a certain institutionalisation of the academic field, opened and closed with the same theoretical questions. When analysing the concern of Millares with respect to the native culture of the Canary Islands, he stated that *"many of the subjects then intuitively felt to exist are still being posed and hypotheses, together with other aspects, continue to be used unquestioned, as they were at the original time of their authors (...)"* (Diego Cuscoy, 1975:267). These subjects, as so rightly pointed out by Diego Cuscoy, were none other than "What race was it?", "Where did they come from?" and "How did they get to the islands?"

However, it is patently easy to see how the role of Millares was gradually played out the further one advances into the reading, to allow other researchers to take the floor, others who, from then onwards, dominate the rest of the essay. First Berthelot and, above all, Chil y Naranjo were the most showcased figures in the first stages of Canary physical anthropology. Once Millares had been left behind as a

recourse, Diego Cuscoy went on to cite him, nevertheless, in various passages of the essay but always clearly identified as someone who borrowed hypotheses and theories to elaborate the part of the "General History of the Canary Islands" devoted to the indigenous people (Millares, 1975). These intellectual debts were fairly significant and reflected the role occupied by Millares in the theoretical context under analysis. He owed a debt not only to Chil from whom he borrowed "*some elements of information necessary for the completion of the design of the image of the pre-Hispanic native*" (*ibid.*, 268) but also with respect to the origin and distribution routes of the Cro-Magnon race, in this case as proposed by Chil, Quatrefages and Verneau. Lastly, he borrowed from Broca the elements he required for the racial characteristics, together with the cranial capacity and indices (*ibid.*, 277).

However, it is not how Millares was dealt with or what role he was given that is to be highlighted in the work of Diego Cuscoy. Doubtless, the interest of his work lies much more in the historiography used. The picture presented in the "Notes" is a continuous linear image of the development of physical anthropology: in the opinion of Diego Cuscoy, "*research into the Canary indigenous race has been constant, progressive and coherent*" (*ibid.*, 290). This conclusion is not due to his extensive repertoire of authors and bibliography, both of which are considerable given the dimensions of the work, but rather to the insufficiencies of the methodology adopted. Given that the questions posed in the late 19th century continued unanswered in the 20th century, the entire

intermediate period was reduced to a handful of innovations that, in Diego Cuscoy's opinion, basically affected the type of techniques used. Notwithstanding, in the first part, there is a greater concern shown for tracing the links of intellectual affiliation between the various different authors. In this sense, the combined influence of the theories of Boucher de Perthes, of Lyell and, especially in the case of Chil, of Broca y Mortillet on the Canary researchers in general, is a fact to be highlighted. Likewise, Cuscoy broached the question of evolution, if only to limit himself to indicating "*the ordered cultural evolutionism*" and polygenism assumed by Millares. The analysis of these questions, that would surely have thrown great light on the first stages of physical anthropology in the Canary Islands, was reduced, however, and almost completely, to the question of race.

A series of discoveries and scientific achievements were then to follow upon one another, linked together with no attempt whatsoever at continuity, around the racial characteristics of the original Canary natives. Berthelot was taken as the precursor, the man who "*sensed intuitively*" the first system of typologies, some thirty years before other researchers began their studies (*ibid.*,271), followed successively by the discovery of the Cro-Magnon in 1868, the similarities between the Canary skulls and the skull of the Cro-Magnon made manifest by Broca, the publication of the "Studies" by Chil (1876), which represented for Cuscoy "*the first systematic contributions to the palaeopathology and the anthropology of the original Canary indigenous people*" (*ibid.*,274) and the first system of types of Canary natives

as posited by Verneau. Thus, the initial stage of Canary anthropology was shaped and, as of then, one gets the impression from the "Notes" that all later developments were merely variations on the same theme. The references to Hooton, Fischer, Falkenburger, Pons, Balout and Camps among others are sparse and schematic. In Cuscoy's opinion, the only research that was valid consisted in the "*decisive research carried out by Schwidetzky and Fusté*" (Schwidetzky, 1963, 1970; Fusté, 195859).

In a text that was, in itself, synthetic, there was no leeway to deal with theoretical problems after the initial stage, nor to analyse the extra-scientific factors of bearing that had marked the various different phases of development of Canary physical anthropology. In such a context, evaluation of the various different theoretical and methodological orientations became practically impossible. However, there are various aspects of Diego Cuscoy's work that are more than a simple enumeration. Apart from the themes of evolutionism and race that are dealt with when describing Millares and Chil, the last few pages of "Notes" highlight the shift from physical anthropology to biodynamics.

For Diego Cuscoy, this was produced in the Canary Islands thanks to the previously mentioned contributions of Schwidetzky and Fusté. In brief, the perspectives and positions offered by this new biodynamic anthropology, both from the methodological point of view and the research perspectives, were to be the following: simplification of the typological systems, an attempt to solve the problem of the origins of the indigenous people via comparison between

them and the "*mechta-el Arbi*" Africans from the North, systematisation of an anthropo-geographical distribution by island and island regions, and a systematic use of statistical methods, both in determining racial characteristics and for the comparison between the indigenous populations and the present-day Canary islanders. Finally, there would be a greater evaluation of the bio-geographical factors and attention given to the palaeopathology and recovery of the mummy "*as proof indicating social stratification in the original native population.*"

None of these aspects, however, was developed upon by Diego Cuscoy. We cannot know from the "Notes" to what extent this biodynamic anthropology represented a qualitative advance over the old traditional physical anthropology. Neither do we know what advance it implied in the Canary Islands nor, far less, in the overall context of the academic field. That is, it is not possible to draw dividing lines between the classic focus and the apparently innovative perspectives of biodynamics, nor for that matter to establish specific links between Schwidetzky and Fusté and the various different strategies in physical anthropology as of the 1950s.

The general inevitable result of not accounting for the epistemological and theoretical questions when attempting historical reconstruction is a continuous presentation of the evolution of the field. So, for Diego Cuscoy, as we already commented "*the research into the Canary indigenous race has been constant, progressive and coherent*", a fact that stands in stark contrast to the affirmations scattered

throughout the essay with respect to the theoretical and methodological innovations assigned to the different authors and periods. Previously, Cuscoy (1963) had stated when referring to archaeology that it had developed in a "*fragmentary and confused fashion*" where the "*lack of continuity in the research and the absence of any method in the same*" were manifest. Moreover, but perhaps also the product of this focus, is the paradoxical association between an extreme continuity and a *de facto* presentism (see Llobera, 1983) when classifying the periods within the academic fields. Diego Cuscoy situated "positively" the beginnings of physical anthropology in the Archipelago in the "*animated and fertile environment in which A. Millares moved*". However, this did not stop him from characterising the studies of the "Canary native" into four stages, two of which are previous chronologically to the times of the Canary historian. The first dates back no less than to the 14th century finishing in the 16th which in the opinion of Diego Cuscoy (1975, 290) represented the "*literary-historical*" cycle, characterised by the use of descriptive techniques and "*observations without research*". The second, corresponding to the 18th century, could be summed up as the vision of the "*original natives as examples of the noble savage*", when experimentation began. The third that encompassed the whole of the 19th century and to which Millares' generation belonged, is the period named as that of physical anthropology "*an experimental phase based on the accumulation of data*" where the specialist was to appear, but also a period full of "*indigenism and the cult of the past*". Finally, the 20th century was divided

into two sub-periods. In the first, new typological systems were formulated and measurement techniques were to be perfected, while in the second, comparative statistics were to be introduced together with biodynamic perspectives. The picture managed in some way to "scientifically" value 19th century physical anthropology but without rejecting epistemologically the previous elaborations considered to be, in fact, non-scientific.

Finally, in our opinion, the "Notes" suffer from an excessively intra-disciplinary focus. By this, we refer not only to how sociological and extra-scientific factors are dealt with, but also to the omission of inter-disciplinary references. This is particularly noteworthy in the case of archaeology, the field to which Diego Cuscoy himself devoted most of his research work. Canary archaeology and physical anthropology have traditionally maintained countless points of contact and, in many aspects, have parallel lines of evolution. The fact that many researchers exercised indistinctly in the two fields, at least before the specialisation of anthropology consolidated as such, is not an irrelevant piece of information in this sense. Diego Cuscoy, however, presented no links between the two types of study in this essay, connections that, doubtless, would have contributed greatly towards revealing many key questions in the history of Canary anthropology. But here he preferred to ignore the links despite the fact that many authors, himself included, have covered the connections in their works in different periods (Diego Cuscoy, 1963, 1971; Pérez de Barradas, 1939; de las Barras Aragón, 1926).

It also contrasts, moreover, with questions defended by

Diego Cuscoy when he talked about the crucial turning points in the development of Canary physical anthropology. Apart from the previously mentioned parallel established by Broca between the skulls of the Cro-Magnon and the Canary mummies' which, in Cuscoy's opinion, merited "*the entry of the Canary Islands into the history of anthropology with a personality all of its own*" (*ibid.*, 275), there is another aspect of his work which is of interest to highlight. We are referring here to the shift from the central focus of anthropological research that produced the consolidation of the positivist period. According to Diego Cuscoy, the shift consisted in moving from the mummy to the skull as the empirical base to be researched. In his opinion, the Enlightenment researchers who contemplated the original natives through the ideological filter of the "noble savage" saw the mummy as "*the last relic of a population that was supposedly extinct*" while the positivist generation saw things from a completely different anthropological angle, in his words "*we could define it as that of skull first and then extra-cranial rest of skeleton*" (*ibid.*, 228). However, as Cuscoy also indicated, for the late 19th century anthropologists, mummification basically represented a process with a religious significance, preferring to ignore, it seemed, the sociological aspects of the procedure. It would not be until the 1960s that the study of mummification was to be approached more systematically, not only from the perspective of the techniques employed but, what is still more striking, as an indication of stratification within the indigenous peoples. This shift in orientation that occupied an important place in the "Notes" within the evolution of

Canary anthropology studies was, likewise, minimised in order to present the field as a "*constant and progressive*" academic discipline.

In short, the "Notes" by Diego Cuscoy, probably the researcher with the largest documentary base on Canary physical anthropology and an indispensable reference in the study of its evolution, was here limited, to a great extent, by the historiographical perspective he used. The perspective is not so much the author's particular viewpoint as the sub-conscious assumption of the traditional historiography used by most of the anthropologists when reconstructing the past of the academic field.

"Los Estudios del folklore canario" The Studies of Canary Folklore.

With Pérez Vidal's "*Los estudios del folklore canario*"⁸ (The Studies of Canary Folklore, hereinafter referred to as "The Studies", 1982), we find much the same in the way of problems as we did in Diego Cuscoy's "Notes". Like the "Notes", this is a piece of work produced in the mature stage of the author and did not respond to a specific theoretical concern for the subject, as can be observed from his prolific research bibliography (López Rodríguez, 1983). Considered overall, "The Studies" is an exhaustive description of research into Canary folklore over a century. It is, in this sense, the equivalent of Diego Cuscoy's "Notes", but in

⁸ TN To avoid all possible confusion where there are so many titles of a similar nature, Pérez Vidal's work is referred to as "The Studies" and Chil's as "*Estudios*".

another of the academic fields of longstanding tradition within our sociocultural studies. It is true that the work is broader than Cuscoy's, but the breadth is only registered in an extensive annotated bibliography and not in a greater coverage of the theoretical problems. In any case, "The Studies" is not only mandatory reading but also the work represents irreplaceable material furnished by one of the researchers with most knowledge of Canary folklore. Even though the theoretical content is scarce, Pérez Vidal sustains a series of theses in this work, some of which are stated with vehement certainty and others with certain reserves, that we should study in greater depth.

Pérez Vidal reconstructed the evolution of folklore studies in the Archipelago on two separate bases. On the one hand, there are the studies of the relevant folklorists in various different periods: on the other, there are the internal mechanisms of the institutions where the research took place. A. J. Bethencourt Alfonso, V. Grau Bassas, M. Picar and E. Serra Ràfols, among others, together with authors who, although not working in the Canary Islands themselves, maintained more or less direct links with the island folklore, such as is the case of Machado y Álvarez, M. Menéndez Pidal and J. Caro Baroja, to whom specific sections are devoted. However, other authors cited abundantly in "The Studies" whose contributions to folklore were considered relevant, only appear in sections and epigraphs of a more general nature. In any case, the first part of the essay is more devoted to highlighting the "*great men*" and their precursors, whereas the second gives greater relevance

to the institutions promoting folkloric research.

The institutional sections are, without any doubt, of greater interest and direct the train of thought of Pérez Vidal in this work. The history of Canary folklore is presented here in function of the role played by the various different institutions, academic or otherwise, that promoted studies related to folklore. Within this perspective, we can differentiate two types of institutional activity. On the one hand, there was the aspect of publications, referring mainly to the periodical journals and, on the other, there was the specific support of the institution. With respect to the publications, Pérez Vidal highlighted the importance of the The Canary Journal (*Revista de Canarias*), The Canary Museum (*El Museo Canario*) in its various different periods, the History Journal (*Revista de Historia*), The Compass Rose (*La Rosa de los Vientos*), the Canary Library (*Biblioteca Canaria*), "Tagoro", the Library of Popular Traditions (*Biblioteca de Tradiciones Populares*) and the Yearbook of Atlantic Studies (*Anuario de Estudios Atlánticos*) among others. With respect to the institutions offering positive support, he underlined the research promoted by, successively, the Canary Museum (*Museo Canario*), the Cosmological Society of La Palma (*la Sociedad Cosmológica de La Palma*), The Faculty of History at the University of La Laguna (*La Facultad de Historia de la Universidad de La Laguna*) and the Institute of Canary Studies (*Instituto de Estudios Canarios*). He added another group of institutions that were not in the Canary Islands to this list on account of their more or less noteworthy influences on the folklore in

the islands, such as is the case of *El Ateneo* in Madrid and its famous "Questionnaire" on births, marriages and deaths.

No matter how clearly important institutional factors were, their reliability in evaluating the internal problems of an academic field needed to be contrasted with other aspects of a theoretical and methodological order. In "The Studies", the theoretical debate was not treated with the same clarity as the institutional development, to such an extent that, in some sections, it is not even implicitly taken into account.

So, for example, with respect to Darwinism, Pérez Vidal limited himself to a brief bibliographic review of the main players in the controversy/debate in Gran Canaria (1982,13) and to the conference given by A. Rodríguez López (1981) in the *Ateneo de la Sociedad de Amigos del País* in La Palma (*ibid.*,16). There was no attempt made to broach the subject, that is, the debate aroused by the evolutionist theories in the Canary Islands, nor the positions adopted on an individual or institutional basis by the authors and institutions named. And this in spite of the fact that at the beginning of the first chapter, decisive importance was given to the "Darwinian revolution". For Pérez Vidal, the scientific origins of both ethnography and folklore were situated around the mid-19th century, although their intellectual roots differed: "*folklore, in romantic spheres devoted to the past; ethnography, although not exempt of romanticism, on the paths that lead to the Darwinian revolution*" (*ibid.*,9). In the Canary Islands, however, the development of these studies produced "*special adaptations*". He noted correctly that ethnographic studies of the original natives were preferred by both researchers

and voyagers in the Archipelago, to the detriment of folklore that did not have either the same exoticism or primitivism. Travel literature, the myth of the "noble savage" and romanticism were the main factors, in the opinion of Pérez Vidal, that stood in the way of a scientific approach to the society and culture of the indigenous people of the Canary Islands, in the early stages of research. To such an extent was this so, that the romantic island poets "*spent part of the century, alien to all progress, composing legends of Guanche chiefs (menceyes) and princesses (ibid.,11)*". From our viewpoint, this is an extrapolation on the ideological whims and assumptions of Pérez Vidal based on the documents available. There can be no doubt that there were "ascientific" components in the Canary anthropology of the late 19th century, but there were, nevertheless, attempts made to develop scientific sociocultural research based precisely upon what had been studied in the field of Canary ethnography, that would be taken up later by some of those who studied "folklore".

Another drawback presented by "The Studies" of Pérez Vidal consists in the fact that he did not give any attention to the various different research strategies used by the Canary folklorists, or by folklorists who worked in the Canary Islands. For example, he connected Bethencourt Alfonso with Machado y Álvarez and Guichot. Various aspects of these pioneers in Spanish folklore were given, but no hint of theoretical focus was ever mentioned for any of them. Particularly significant is also the case of E. Serra Ràfols with whom Pérez Vidal personally collaborated on

some publications. The relationship of Serra with Spanish anthropologists such as Aranzadi and Hoyos Sáinz is a matter of priority research when attempting to understand the evolution of sociocultural studies in the Canary Islands as of the 1930s (Galván, 1986). Successively, Pérez Vidal positioned authors and institutions as of importance but limited his comments on them to the works published and to the subjects to which they were devoted.

Finally, we would like to highlight an aspect that, from a present perspective of anthropology, would have been an important aid towards understanding the evolution of folklore studies in the Archipelago. Pérez Vidal devoted a large part of his essay to the various questionnaires that had been carried out in the Archipelago to collect information with respect to popular culture. Each of these is dealt with in a specific section: the questionnaire on Canary folklore carried out by Bethencourt Alfonso, the questionnaire of *El Ateneo de Madrid*, the survey by Serra, the linguistic and folkloric questionnaire prepared by Régulo Pérez together with the linguistic and ethnographic Atlas of the Canary Islands by M. Alvar, among other failed attempts (*sic*). However, the analysis is reduced to a mere description of each, with some reproduction of more important sections of the same, or some comment on the difficulties encountered in carrying them out. However, all the questionnaires are, in general, a chaotic mixed bag of various different cultural characteristics, modes of behaviour, traditions, proverbs, techniques, healing practices and prediction (clairvoyance), superstitions and festivities. The same level of importance is

attached to the making of the bride's dress as to the division of domestic tasks by gender, or the colour of the ribbons used to prevent "evil eyes" and curses being laid on milk production. Pérez Vidal did not see in these "*laundry lists*" (see Harris, 1976) many of the central epistemological and methodological problems of sociocultural studies; that is, the distinction between mental and behavioural aspects, or the contrast between emic and etic perspectives, to name only a few.

To sum up, although this history of Canary folklore studies is, without any doubt, indispensable as a collection of annotated bibliography, it suffers, nevertheless, from an excessively chronological and superficial analysis, insufficient to the theoretical developments it proposed to study. With these brief notes on the work of Diego Cuscoy and Pérez Vidal, we hereby end our study of general monographs to be found at present in the historiography of Canary anthropology.

However, there are many more essays that deal with the same problems from different angles. Although we cannot consider many of these to be historical studies of Canary anthropology, there is an important number of works related more or less directly to the theme. The enormous variety and uneven interest in the history of Canary anthropology make any classification of the same into a fairly complex business. We have no intention of carrying out an exhaustive analysis of all these works in successive sections. Although there can be no doubt that it is a task of great importance, it should be the object of specific research. The fact that the

study is long overdue has only made it seriously difficult to have easy and systematic access to the documents and source material. In this sense then, we will limit ourselves exclusively to the most relevant material relating to the subjects to be approached in the following sections and chapters.

Biographies, correspondence and miscellaneous

Aside from the works of Diego Cuscoy and Pérez Vidal, the works viewed from a strictly anthropological perspective are few and far between. There are, however, various monographs and essays as seen from other fields but that deal with recurrent themes in anthropology.

Such is the case, for example, of *The Canary Aborigines (Los aborígenes canarios)* by R. González Antón and A. Tejera Gaspar (1981) which, although it cannot be called a work of a historical nature, nevertheless is latently concerned with re-constructing the development of Canary archaeology, from present-day perspectives. Like anthropology, archaeology in the Canary Islands has been conditioned by serious theoretical and methodological deficiencies, in particular, by diffusionism, that "*constituted and constitutes a burden from which we have been unable to free ourselves*" (*ibid.*,23). This, together with the empiricist focus on the study of typologies (ceramics, engravings and the rest), plus the scarce attention paid to other fields outside the specialisation led, in the opinion of González Antón and Tejera Gaspar, to Canary pre-history being "*permanently installed in the present*". C. del Arco (1982)

criticised this interpretation of González Antón and Tejera Gaspar's from the perspective of fieldwork in archaeology, claiming that "*they have never been responsible for any fieldwork or archaeological excavation*". Laying aside the probability of this claim being true, there can be no doubt that the problem of the history of our sociocultural studies should indeed analyse both the perspective used and the "technical" development of the fieldwork. In the line of approaching the study of the indigenous people through broadening "*the narrow framework offered by Canary archaeology*", González Antón and Tejera Gaspar incorporated some innovative perspectives, among which we should highlight cultural ecology and cross-cultural analysis, to which they added contributions from the fields traditionally used in the Archipelago, such as ethno-history, linguistics and physical anthropology. All of this together may give the impression that they were attempting to give a new vision of the indigenous people from an eclectic perspective, that is, using "the best" of the various different orientations in archaeology and anthropology.

We are of the persuasion that scientific advance is not achieved in function of the more or less adequate use of the partial "truths" of each research strategy. The case is, in fact, quite the contrary. Only through the development of a corpus of interrelated theories guided by the same theoretical principles and epistemological assumptions can we offer a coherent vision of sociocultural phenomena. It is true that no strategy can presume to be in possession of the "whole truth", but equally so that "*the whole truth is never the result of the sum of*

partial truths" (see Harris, 1976). It is hard to obtain a network of interconnected theories when attempting to piece together the ethno-historical assumptions of Lévi-Strauss, the categories of Murdock, the evolution of an early Sahlins and the "ecology" of Barth. The case is that the authors of "*Los aborígenes*" do just that. They give the impression that the objective pursued, outlined in the introduction, is to throw new light and incorporate new perspectives into Canary archaeology, different from those traditionally deployed. What they do positively do is to work specifically with various different elements of the indigenous society and culture, using a more coherent set of theories, that privilege more closely assigned perspectives such as Sahlins' or Barth's. Besides that, and especially to be highlighted, is their criticism of the theory with respect to a "*pan-Canary culture*" or "*substrate*" (see Cuscoy, 1963), together with their proposal to incorporate the concept of "ethnic group" taken from Barth as opposed to the anachronic and scarcely operational term of "race". In any case, the work of González Anton and Tejera posed two questions of singular importance: on the one hand, they showed the urgent need to re-think theories in both Canary archaeology and anthropology and, on the other and parallel to the former, the need for their historical reconstruction. In this sense, R. González Antón has continued to work on problems of acculturation (1982) and on his criticism of the anthropological hypotheses on which the "Chronicles" and the "General Histories" of the Canary Archipelago were based (1982).

Although orientated differently and with other interests, we should also take the numerous works of A. Cioranescu into

consideration. His biographical studies of historians and voyagers, and most specifically his monographs on the Canary Enlightenment are of enormous utility. Cioranescu is, without doubt, the best specialist on this period from the perspective of history of ideas, although his tendency towards erudition in many of his texts lessens the possibility of a theoretical interpretation of any depth. As we will make reference to his writing hereinafter in various sections, we will omit any further description of his texts here.

By way of example of the "under-development" of the history of anthropology, the proliferation of biographies is a significant fact. Although the monographic studies are limited to those mentioned previously, biographical essays have been a constant and abundant genre in our historiography. The importance of biographies in the case of the history of anthropology has been evaluated by J. Gruber (1966,1975). In his opinion, "*the biography is one of the most deficient yet more usual ways of writing history. Often, the life of a man, too often only his name, is used as a pseudo-focus to establish a more traditional chronicle or to explain ideas*" (see 1975:9). Canary literature has an enormous number of biographical essays. It would be a gross error to attempt to assimilate the erudite studies of Cioranescu on Viera (1950,1967), Torriani (1978), Abreu Galindo (1977[1632]), Espinosa (1980) or Cioranescu (*sic*) (1960,1967) into a uniform whole with more belligerent perspectives such as Rodríguez Mouré (1913) and Dionisio Pérez (1971 [1920]) on Viera, or the almost excessively adulatory biographies of Bosch Millares (1971) on Chil, Alzola's (1980) on Grau-Bassas, or Régulo Pérez's (1971-2) on Serra Ràfols. Albeit so, all the biographies were

preferentially orientated, almost inevitably, towards positive distortion of the figure studied. In general, besides, there is a trend to highlight the anecdotal or anything of any relevance (in most cases) towards determining intellectual affiliation, a lamentably over-common characteristic of our biographers.

What should also be highlighted is the choice of the authors to be studied. Viera y Clavijo is the author that has been studied most and in greatest depth. Indeed, he has always been considered the historian of the Canary Islands and we are well familiar with his personal and intellectual vicissitudes and circumstances. The older historians have also been dealt with systematically. In general, there is fine documentation of their "*lives and works*". But, from the point of view of the history of anthropology, we have to point out, nevertheless, significant absences and omissions. Fairly conspicuous in this respect are the cases of Chil y Naranjo and Bethencourt y Alfonso, above all the latter, since they would seem to indicate something more weighty than a "*regrettable oversight*". As opposed to Berthelot and Verneau, to cite only two of the better known foreigners, the two most important anthropologists of the 19th century have only been the object of sparse biographical studies that were, moreover, late in appearing. A brief note in the *Museo Canario* journal lamented the death of Chil. F. Cabrera, who was the Museum's librarian at the time (*El Museo Canario* XI: 2-3, 1901) briefly underlined the importance of the work of the Director as an anthropologist, doctor and promoter of economic development in the island through the *Sociedad Económica de Las Palmas*. It was not until 1971, when Bosch Millares published an exhaustive biography of his person that any specific work

on the figure of the 19th century anthropologist was written.

Just as significant, or even more so, is the case of J. Bethencourt Alfonso. The work of the doctor from Tenerife who, together with Chil, marked a turning-point in the late 19th century Canary anthropology, has been scarcely valued as is his due. In the eighties, Diego Cuscoy was to say of the work of the Director of the *Gabinete Científico de Santa Cruz de Tenerife* that "he was a man of great scientific honesty but he produced or rather published little, although many aspects of his work are still valid to this day" (1928:9). But there can be no doubt that, thanks to the time and devotion of M. Fariña, much of his work has been retrieved, so that his biography and the unpublished works that were rescued are now being given systematic attention (Fariña, 1981, 1982, 1983).

S. Berthelot's fate has been kinder in spite of his being a foreign researcher, or perhaps precisely because of the fact. However, yet again in this case, and an indication that the history of our academic field was not "an epistemological question", many of the biographical studies of this French ethnographer and naturalist were produced only of late, with the publications mainly clustered around the time of the centenary of his death (Cioranescu *et al.* 1980, Berthelot, 1980). As in the case of S. Bello (1932) on R. Verneau, the cloying tone of the discourse and the exaltation of the fact that "*wise men of such importance should have studied on these volcanic outcrops*" eclipsed the comprehension of the research strategies used by the foreign anthropologists and, what is more important still, eliminated all possibility of critical analysis of their scientific practice. Our "adopted children" (*Hijos Adoptivos*), that is, the outsiders made

into Honorary Canary islanders on account of their contributions to society, were let off with much more here, perhaps logically, than the historians in their fields of research in their respective native countries have seen fit to forgive them. It is symptomatic in this sense that the first biography of Berthelot by his friend Elías Zerolo, originally published in *La Revista de Canarias* (1881) has never been substantially surpassed.

Meanwhile, the historiography of institutions, to some extent linked to Canary anthropology, is practically non-existent. Apart from scattered pieces of news, mainly produced in biographies, there are no monographs on the institutional context in which the academic field developed. Only Diego Cuscoy (1982) took it upon himself to analyse the conditioning factors that frustrated the continuity of the *Gabinete Científico de Santa Cruz de Tenerife* in a brief essay that also highlighted, on the other hand, the aspects that favoured the consolidation of the *Museo Canario* in Las Palmas. Even in this case, Diego Cuscoy contributed a greater abundance of elements for the biographies of Bethencourt Alfonso and Chil than for the history of the institutions themselves. Following in the line of Comas (1956), he compared the subject matter of the various International Conferences on Pre-Historic Anthropology and Archaeology with the research programme of Chil: his fieldwork, lab-work, use of historical, literary and ethnological texts to trace cases of ethnic and cultural survival, all represent just some of the aspects that Diego Cuscoy (*ibid.*,17) underlined in his identification of the “*unofficial erudite*” with the vanguard trends in late 19th century anthropology.

Finally, although we will only refer to it schematically, stock

must be taken of the material consisting in manuscripts and correspondence. According to J. Gruber, "*the study of private papers is one of the most suggestive ways of beginning to understand problems*" but these, nevertheless, "*contribute little towards solving intellectual problems (which) can only be done by looking at the published material*" (1966:31). The situation in this section of our historiography cannot be qualified as anything less than chaotic.

As we have already commented with respect to the biographies, the publication and, therefore, availability of the relevant writers' and researchers' correspondence in island anthropology has always been passed through a highly selective filter. In the case of Viera, for example, we have retrieved the main part of his extensive letter-writing. However, this is enormously widely scattered over countless publications. In accordance, likewise, with the biographical inclinations of our historiography, the correspondence of Berthelot can presently be studied (Berthelot, 1980; Cioranescu et al. 1980), whereas the correspondence of Chil y Naranjo and Bethencourt Alfonso "*have been left to their fate*". Both cases are all the more regrettable in that they are vital to a systematic analysis of the history of a large part of the Canary sociocultural research. The fact that the abundant handwritten documents and letters of Chil's kept in the *Museo Canario* have not been the object of publication speaks legions, and that, among other texts, the History of the Guanche People, "*Historia del pueblo Guanche*" by Bethencourt Alfonso was found inside a "potato sack" (Africo Amazik, 1985) would seem to indicate something more substantial than a "regrettable oversight". Meanwhile M. Fariña,

as we already mentioned, has rescued manuscripts and mislaid publications of Bethencourt Alfonso.

In short, all of a chronicle-tale that is not interested in the theoretical fabric or in epistemological questions, tending towards the search for ancestors (and mortals of lesser entity) and the chaotic scatter of most of the relevant materials could represent a faithful portrait of this field of anthropological research, still trapped within traditional historiography. In the following sections and chapters, we will look at some of the problems understood to be of relevance in the evolution of anthropological studies in the Canary Islands between 1750 and 1900. As we indicated in the introduction, we do not intend to touch upon each and every one of the subjects over this certainly very broad period. On the contrary, we will limit ourselves to the analysis of the problems with greater recurrence throughout anthropological speculation in its stages of formation and consolidation.

As Stocking so pertinently indicated (1983,ed.), the non-European "others" were what "*traditionally excited the anthropological imagination*". The indigenous peoples, the original natives, the autochthonous race, the first people: however we want to call them, the Guanches have always aroused the interest of those situated between "our old selves" and ourselves. However, the problem is rooted in knowing what they knew and not in saying what is in our interest that they did. And it is not a case either of exclusively revindicating what they did, but also being aware of what they did not. And not only what they did, either, but likewise how they did it, how they managed.

2. BETWEEN INDIGENISM AND ETHNOCENTRISM: THE INDIGENOUS CANARY ISLANDER AS THE NOBLE SAVAGE

"(...) and steeped in my Canary philosophy, I will only think of going later to our volcanic outcrops to sleep away my final days and unite my bones to those of the Guanches in their funeral caves". Viera y Clavijo (1776)

In the previous chapter, we discussed the most outstanding aspects that characterise the present state of the history of anthropology and evaluated Canary historiography within this terrain. We began by broaching some of the questions considered most relevant in the development of Canary anthropology. It is not our intention to present an exhaustive picture of this evolution. On the contrary, we think that, after seeing what has been done to present, the history of the island anthropology cannot be broached, in that there are no sufficiently refined methodological criteria available to do so, and more importantly, no monographs on authors, schools, periods or anything similar. However, that being said, we will try to show how indigenism, race and evolution have been the three basic coordinates of the formation and development of Canary anthropology through to the end of the 19th century.

We have tried to distance ourselves from traditional historiographical reconstructions and, thus, have avoided, wherever possible, an over-dependence on chronological details or personal anecdotes relating to the authors under analysis. We have opted rather, as opposed to this "chronicle-tale", to highlight the theoretical fabric of the development although we are aware that it is perhaps more uncomfortable to explain. However, we are convinced that if historiography is our field of study, it cannot continue to be a mere showcase of our ancestors, but rather an instrument towards advancing research and that we should not give in to the temptation, albeit highly rewarded both academically and institutionally, of adulating the heroic histories and

glories of the past. And so, before fully entering into the analysis of the three questions to which allusion was made before, we must pose a previous question: where do we begin?

2.1. Back to the roots

In light of the efforts made, it has been no simple question to determine the beginning of anthropological reflection. The more or less systematic tracking of "anthropological ideas" has been the means most often used by the historians to determine the beginnings of anthropology. In general, however, it continues to be a thorny issue to discriminate between anthropological ideas and scientific perspectives in the studies of humankind and society.

According to the authors, anthropology began back in Ancient Greece and Rome, or in the Renaissance, or in the Enlightenment, or with the Arab and Chinese historians. That is, the historians of the field, depending upon the national traditions they worked in and the intellectual ideologies they were defending, have shown a marked tendency towards laxity in questions of demarcating scientific boundaries. As Llobera so rightly affirmed, "one of the consequences of not concerning oneself with the epistemic status of anthropology is the incapacity to deal efficiently with the question of the beginnings of the academic field" (1980:56). We have examined (Estévez 1983,1984) the inconveniences of presenting history as a "chronicle" when defining the turning-points in the development of anthropology. We cannot go into a detailed explanation here but, suffice

it to say, the results obtained offer a situation of notable chaos. Schematically, to only mention a few of the most representative examples: Lowie (1974 [1937]) situated the start of anthropology with Meiners, Klemm and Waitz,⁹ among others; EvansPritchard (1975 [1944]), Harris (1976) and Voget (1975) situated it in the Enlightenment, as did LéviStrauss (1975) (especially in Rousseau who he considered to be "*the father of anthropology*"); Mercier (1969) went back in time with Hymes (1974) and Malefijt (1974) to the Greeks; and Hodgen (1964) and Rowe (1965) situated it in the Renaissance.

However, there have been serious attempts made to broach this question systematically in the understanding that the problem of the origins of the field is not something that depends on the greater or lesser erudition on the part of the historian but that it has serious implications when attempting to establish different ways of thinking within the academic field. According to Llobera (1980:60) in his "A History of Ethnology", Voget (see 1975) offered a series of methodological criteria with which to confront the problem of demarcation of the various anthropological ideologies and schools of knowledge from a scientific perspective. In the first place, "*the exponents of an academic field express a strong differential feeling by contrasting their special subject matter with that of other areas.*" Second, "*a 'special theory of reality' and causal explanation are pursued even when these*

9 TN. In other words, in the 18th century for Christoph Meiner's *Grundriss der Geschichte der Menschheit* (1785) and 19th century for Gustav Klemm's *Allgemeine Kulturgeschichte der Menschheit* (1843-52) and Waitz's *Anthropologie der Naturvölker*, (1870)

are not to be seen as totally explicit". Third, "*a distinctive methodology*" is used. And fourth, "*a 'special set of facts' is put together that is contrasted with those habitually used in similar academic fields*". Nevertheless, Llobera indicated when commenting Voget's criteria, that although these may be used to talk about the foundation of an academic field to the extent in which said discipline complies with the criteria outlined, they do not allow for understanding of whether or not the proposal is a generalising epistemology "*given that the epistemological weighting of each criteria is different from the rest*" (see Llobera, 1980: 60). In any case, as Llobera himself acknowledged, these criteria offer a sufficient basis upon which to examine the obstacles that impeded the emergence of anthropology in various different periods of time. Following through on this line of thinking, Voget himself showed how neither the Greek nor the Renaissance reflection could have constituted the beginning of anthropology.

In our case, all of these, the Greeks and the Romans, medieval voyagers and Renaissance historians occupied themselves with the Canary Islands on numerous occasions. But one of the most conspicuous problems in Canary archaeology and anthropology derives from the value assigned to the vast literature available with respect to the original natives, previous to the constitution of both fields as scientific disciplines. It still remains to be seen how reliable the information that the ample body of material may offer really is towards the re-construction of the sociocultural system of the indigenous Canary populations.

We are faced here with problems that, although inter-related, have different methodological and epistemological natures. In the first place, there is a purely historiographical question that consists fundamentally in reconstructing the way, and the context in which, these documentary sources were elaborated. In second place, their use from the ethno-historical perspective requires not only this previously-alluded-to verification but also the availability of criteria of empirical contrast that allow for the degree of their probability to be evaluated. Finally, their use poses complex issues with respect to the theoretical and ideological assumptions underpinning the texts, together with the no less delicate issue of the use of these sources as criteria with scientific authority. Precisely one of the most significant constants of Canary historiography has been the systematic use of the texts of the chroniclers of the Conquest and those of the first historians. That use, moreover, has consisted, generally speaking, in total plagiarism or acritical acceptance of the texts, a fact that does not lose its argumentative force no matter how often it is repeated. In the recovery and analysis of the "sources" of Canary history, we should highlight, nonetheless, the work undertaken by Elías Serra and his collaborators in the transcription of the agreements of the *Cabildo de Tenerife* and, most recently, the significant contribution made by Morales Padrón (1978) in transcribing and analysing the chronicles of the conquest of Gran Canaria. The acknowledgement of these efforts should not, however, detract from the fact that there is a need for the analysis of the methodological and, above all, ideological assumptions that motivated the texts (Galván, 1985).

Without a doubt, the questions that have been most and best studied refer to the processes of elaboration and to the biographies of the authors of the chronicles, general histories, travel tales and other miscellaneous texts. The Canary historians have devoted an important part of their research to this area and, in a broad sense, we can say that we now know our authors well and in what contexts they wrote their works. The study of these materials is of undoubted interest for the history of Canary anthropology, especially for rigorous research projects previously untouched by the Canary anthropologists, together with analysis of the society and culture of the indigenous people as seen from the perspective of cultural anthropology. The exegesis and the tracing of quotes from one author to another have always been the common denominators in the immense majority of the researchers who have tackled these materials. The practical result of the non-application (or rather of not applying) the current research strategies of cultural and physical anthropology has been that the theoretical distance between the chroniclers and the first historians is almost as short as the distance in time that separates the chroniclers from the original natives of the Canary Islands.

The objectives proposed in the present work do not allow us to broach this crucial part of our anthropology. In spite of the strong temptation to enter fully into the question, we have resisted and will not even deal with it in brief. But, to sum up, until such time as our archaeology and anthropology have at their disposal a rigorous, systematic

research project with updated methodological perspectives and theoretical directions, we will continue to repeat what was said in the records of Espinosa, Abreu, Viana and other ancestors that we have converted into "totem posts" of our intellectual genealogy.

Duchet showed decisively what anthropological ideologies represent in the process of formation of an academic discipline. Permit us the following long quote to clarify just how useless a large part of anthropological historiography is in this terrain.

"Nowadays, it is almost banal to talk about "pre-ethnology" when referring to the tales of voyages written by the historians of ancient times (...), by the Arab and Chinese chroniclers, or by the first observers of the savage world in Africa and the Americas. It is true, indeed, that we owe to them the first fieldwork, without which there would be no ethnology.(...) Ethno-history and the science of myths have revitalised this ethnographic literature. However, although it is true that fieldwork should be the obligatory prologue to all ethnological studies, it is not sufficient to stand as the foundation for a scientific method. Not one of the ancient historians, nor the first explorers of the interior of Africa nor of the American continent fixed as their ultimate objective anything other than the observation and description of the societies with which they entered into contact, making abstractions upon their societies themselves, their customs and their prejudices." (Spanish version

1975:14, see French original 1971:14)¹⁰

Although we may, with the best of intentions, strive to see "an anthropology" in consulting Bontier and Le Verrier's "*Le Canarien*" (1980), Espinosa (1980 [1594]), Abreu Galindo (1977 [1632]), Torriani (1978 [1592]) or Gómez Escudero (in Morales Padrón, 1978), the truth is that their discourse is on the margins of a scientific conception of sociocultural phenomena. That "sources" are a requirement for any re-construction of the indigenous culture does not imply in the slightest that they be revindicated as scientific knowledge. The ethno-historical work contained in them is noteworthy but that same judgement does not apply to the criticism of their ideological hypotheses. Nevertheless, an initial study along these lines can be appreciated in some of the work of R. González Antón (1982,1982a) on the bases of the comparison between the "general histories" produced in the Canaries in the late 16th century with their counterparts in the Americas. On the horizon traced, among others, by Abreu Galindo and Espinosa, "*the Canary islanders must surely have been relatives of one of the historical patriarchs, their families going back as far as the offspring of Adam. That way, the Christian religious tradition could act out in all of its broadest extension ... with evangelisation absolutely necessary and the priority objective of the colonisers*" (1982a:176). Along the same lines, Cioranescu, in his edition of the Description of the Canary Islands ("*Descripción de las Islas Canarias*") by Torriani, also denied the anthropological "legitimacy" of the

10 TN. As translated from the French original of Duchet, *Anthropologie et histoire au siècle des Lumières* by the present translator.

text when he said, "*the authority of Torriani on this matter cannot be seen as anything less than dubious*".

Therefore, for our first historians, the original natives did not represent an object of specific academic interest. The reality was quite the contrary, in fact, in that they only figured because their existence led to an obligatory process of colonisation. Thus, it is impossible to reject that their perspective was ethnocentric, from their condition as "civilised" people.

These so-called "sources" and "general histories" were followed chronologically by the work of the Canary enlightened in the 18th century. There can be no doubt that it is no easy matter to evaluate the significance of the work of the island intellectuals in this period within the total realm of the history of Canary anthropology. However, it must be done. We hope to be able to show how there was a shift, much in the manner of an "epistemological break", from previous conceptions of the indigenous Canary culture that occurred precisely in this period.

There are many anthropologists and historians of anthropology who considered the intellectuals of the Enlightenment to be the more or less immediate precursors of a science of humankind and society. When summing up everything touched upon in the previous section, we would highlight here the fact that Evans-Pritchard, Lévi-Strauss and Harris, authors that were broadly divergent in their theoretical perspectives, nevertheless coincided in signalling the Enlightenment as the historical period that

witnessed the birth of anthropology, a matter of no little consequence. Although there were clearly differences in how these authors approached and saw the figures and trends within Enlightenment thinking, the fact that they coincided on this point had more to do with the attempt to trace a respectable intellectual genealogy for the discipline than any effort to build a general framework within which to broach the problem of the origins of the academic field. Llobera (1980:61) underlined this point and, by way of counterpart, offered a proposal based on some ideas of R. Meek. His thesis, in brief, was that it was indeed in the Enlightenment that the bases for a science of humankind and society were to be found.

The question posed by Meek (1981) was with respect to what the Enlightenment allowed, which was to give unity to ideas with respect to the structure and development of society. In his opinion, there was a first factor that revealed "a common interest" shared by all the intellectuals within the Enlightenment, to apply the scientific methods used in natural sciences to the study of Man and society. Together with this, and with respect to history, another basic premise of the Enlightenment was the idea that history was the result of human actions, albeit not necessarily corresponding to a "conscious" plan. Last, as indicated by Meek, the intellectuals of the Enlightenment were convinced that institutions were, likewise, a product of the "action of men", and that both these and humankind itself were mediated by the "circumstances" in which they moved. In other words, and to say it in the unfortunate turn of phrase coined by

Harris (1976) to describe the reflection produced within the Enlightenment, the period could be seen in the light of these coordinates as one of "*radical ecology*" that succeeded in "*bringing to light the central questions of contemporary anthropology*".

In the Canary Islands, there can be no doubt that the incorporation of Enlightenment thinking completely shifted the bases of the conceptions of history and culture. A. Cioranescu (1950, 1977, 1982, 1984) clearly demonstrated this moment of rift, this "break" in the Canary historiography. Inasmuch as this is something completely taken for granted in the present perspectives of the academic field on the Islands, there is no need to insist further upon the subject here. However, it is true that Cioranescu himself changed his views from that period onwards, above all with respect to Viera. The magnificent contribution of Cioranescu, beyond all doubt, to the knowledge of the Canary Enlightenment, nevertheless represented a curious evolution. In his first works, the masters he assigned to Viera were to change, or their influences be modified, from Feijóo, Voltaire and Rousseau, to Raynal and finally to Fontanelle. The refinement of any analysis of historiographical questions should occur in the light of new information or as a result of the incorporation of new perspectives. We should, doubtless, insist at this point, yet again, upon the fact that scientific activity advances more positively with these changes in emphasis, and theoretical premises are made explicit. It would be extremely difficult for us to reconstruct the reflections of the Canary intellectuals in

the Enlightenment were it not for the work of Cioranescu. However, if the history of social sciences continues to tilt the balance towards volume of information and not towards systematic methodology, the results will tell us a great deal about what we are like as people, but will confuse us even further about what the people we want to study were like.

We are not going, therefore, to enter into the wide range of subjects suggested by the Canary intellectuals of the Enlightenment in their reflections. There are, however, several aspects, from the perspective of cultural anthropology, that should be reconsidered, most particularly, those that affect the conceptions with respect to the indigenous people and society. However, of all the authors the 18th century in the Canary Islands offered us, we feel no need either to justify that the intellectual who offered us the most elaborate production and reflection was, without a shadow of a doubt, Viera y Clavijo. On all the different levels, his presence eclipsed the rest of his contemporaries.

2.2. Viera y Clavijo and the “noble savage” hypothesis

The work of Viera y Clavijo represented a new way of approaching the history of the Canary Islands and the evolution of its cultural configuration, but it was to signify much more than that. It represented, moreover, a much more ambitious project with respect to the elaboration of an anthropology of the cultural space of the Archipelago.

In both these dimensions, the original Canary people played a pivotal role. In the first, obviously, because they were the very object of study or would definitely become so when archaeology and anthropology became specialist academic disciplines in their own rights. In the second, and occasionally more latent dimension, there can be no doubt that the Canary indigenous people were to become a permanent presence in any theoretical universe of those who devoted time to "reflecting" upon the Canary Islands.

It is precisely the presence of the indigenous Canary native as a recurrent element in the texts of the Canary authors that was to convert them into one of the traditional "*themas*" of Canary anthropology. It is difficult to assign a sufficiently precise term to define this systematic concern for the indigenous people. The "noble savage" or any of its versions translated into the Island "noble Guanche" and "*Guanchism*" or adaptations according to the periods or perspectives, are all terms that do not allow for the phenomenon to be broached in all of its theoretical and historical dimensions. We have opted, in the end, to refer to them with the noun "indigenism" and the adjective "indigenous", although we are fully aware of the semantic and historical scope of the term and its greater or lesser coined associations with some of the historical modalities of "defence" of the non-European "others" (see Group of Barbados, 1979; Morin et al. 1982). Indigenism, besides, has a very significant socio-political dimension that is to be seen clearly in the Canary literature on the subject, therefore making it more convenient to use here. By this we mean

that the defence of the autochthonous Canary islander not only represents a clear and explicit philosophical and moral stance but it also constitutes a basic ingredient in the historical processes of identity in the Archipelago, both from the ideological and the socio-political perspective. This present chapter is devoted precisely to that end, to tracing the conceptual evolution of the question through the most relevant literature of an anthropological nature from the second half of the 18th century through to the late 19th.

In all these subjects that occupied the preferential attention of the intellectuals of the Enlightenment, the barbarian, savage or aborigine is a figure that can offer valuable information. What did the figure represent for the Canary enlightened? What role was it assigned, above all by Viera y Clavijo, in the history of the Archipelago?

These and other similar questions have always had a categorical response in the Canary historiography. The native or "Guanche" in Viera is none other than the noble savage of his French masters. The history of Viera is riddled with examples in this sense. But what are those examples? The noble savage, for most of the biographers of the historian, and forming part of the "intellectual common sense" of those initiated in the history of the Islands, was none other than the figure that was proportioned by the stereotypical vision of the philosophy of the Enlightenment. This vision of the noble savage not only associates the term with one sole dimension but, moreover, it also adopts a monolithic conception of the thinking of the "philosophers".

That is to say, the noble savage in Viera, or rather the noble Guanche, is that majestic free figure of Atlantis who had his freedom and his land wrenched away from him by the ambition of the conquerors. But is that truly the indigenous people as portrayed by the Canary historian? If we work from this focus when reading the work of Viera, we can find countless corroborations of that vision. However, if we read between the lines and contextualise the "history" within the overall world vision of the Enlightenment in which it was shaped, we may find differences and even a shift from the standardised vision with which the concept is usually associated.

"The Canary islands, Sire, are those same Islands of the Blessed that began to emerge from their state of oblivion in the XIV century and when they were, as yet, in the possession of the indigenous barbarians..." (Viera 1967:4).

This was how Viera dedicated his News of the General History, "*Noticias de la Historia General (...)*" to the Emperor, Charles III. This dedication, as Cioranescu noted in his introduction to "*Noticias*" did not figure in the original version but was found in a handwritten copy (in Cioranescu on Viera 1967, 1:6) The "*oblivion*" that was referred to therein, most evidently, was the total lack of knowledge with respect to the Archipelago of the Europeans at that time. It implied the situation of "lost in time" of the Archipelago or, to put it in other words, of its being discovered for the first time by the Western World. Viera went on to give an assured description of the social state of the indigenous people of the Islands.

"It is easy to convince oneself that the ancient Canary islanders were an original nation with simple customs, similar to those of the heroes and patriarchs of old because anyone whosoever runs a conscious mental eye over their customs, ideas, ceremonies and traditions would be of that conclusion. Should their government and religion be examined, their tenor of life be compared with that of the first men, there can be no doubt that one will have the satisfaction and even the pleasure of finding nature in all of its simplicity and early infancy" (ibid., l:125).

Viera effectively went on to examine their traditions, customs and the rest. And he found in them the magic and delights of the "pastoral life" which are none other than those of "*nature in all its grace of the greatest simplicity*" (*ibid.*, l:147). This is followed by still more bucolic extolments and, above all, by a defence of the indigenous people's way of life. When he discovered that no money nor slavery existed on the Islands, Viera could not refrain from slipping in his praise for those people who, in his opinion, materialised the utopia of the civilised man. Therefore, we find here a first well-defined stance with respect to the indigenous people: they represent the negative of what it means to be civilised, that is, he offered a view of them that depicted them as what they were not, in this case, "civilised" (Clastres, 1978). Their lives, he said, were not lived under the tyranny of gold and jewels "*nor on other conventional goods depending on capricious whims*". Quite the contrary was the case, he went on to say, as their concerns had to do with "*timely rainfall*,

optimum seedbeds, abundant pastureland and happy children". "Our vanity", said Viera, did not allow him to cast discredit on their necessary, simple and innocent gifts, such as "a good sleep, sweet peace, fertile women, strong arms, blessings bestowed from the skies upon the herds and flocks, their granaries, their clothes" (*ibid.*, I:153). In short, "a barbarian people, but respectable and heroic". This was the first impression of Viera, an impression so surprising that it could not be true. So a significant nuance was imposed. The indigenous people were free of the "lively passions" of luxury, greed and ambition, not as the result of a choice between tyranny and freedom, but rather because their inclination towards equity, temperance and, in brief, all their moral virtues "were the fruit of constant occupation". They were indeed blessed. However, they were not aware of "the true source of their good fortune" (*ibid.*, I:154).

However, it is less in these passages where Viera exalts the virtues of the islanders than in the passages where he criticises the model of the Conquest that it has been claimed that the "noble savage" of Rousseau is seen to shine brightest, thus making him into the stereotypical Canary defender of the "noble Guanche". M^a R. Alonso (1952,1960,1982) maintained the same in her first approaches to the subject. Cioranescu (1950,1961) also supported this vision of Viera for many years, although in his later work he was to tone down the influence of the author of the "Contrat". "Viera could not have been a convinced disciple of the Rousseauian vision, because the doctrine of the natural goodness of Man is heterodox ... and because the Canary

historian was an adept of the idea of progress, that inspired no faith nor confidence in the Genevan philosopher" (1984:68).¹¹ Cioranescu, who had so clearly seen the "noble savage" in Viera, in other times, indicated here that "*the question is wrongly formulated because in his work he does not talk of any "noble savage" but rather of a "noble civilisation"*".

Conquerors and missionaries were to be the target of the criticism of Viera, criticism given by way of counterpart of his defence of the natives in the face of "*attacks on the freedom of that nation and denigration of their humanity*" as he commented with respect to the exploits of Maciot to obtain Guanche slaves (*ibid* I: 371). His comments in this sense are abundant: there is no conqueror or missionary free from the "*spirit of the century*", a century of abuse, treason and ambition, of the "*pathetic slave market*" and of the passion for gold. It could be no other way in Viera's view as "*the history of conquests is the history of the most monstrous crimes*" (*ibid.*, I: 296). This is particularly notable when the historian voiced his opinions on the right of conquest, to be commented on later when we talk about the possible influence of other authors on Viera. But, to conclude with this analysis of the vision he had of the indigenous Canary people, permit us to reproduce an extensive quote that sums up his position on that respect. For Viera, the state of natural happiness would be changed once and for all, for the worse, after the Canaries surrendered and, thus, were submitted to the conquerors.

11 TN In the original, this date was registered as 1948. Since it is in his later work, we consider this to be a typographical error that should have been 1984, and thus have adjusted to make the discourse congruent.

"This commendable nation of brave, generous natives, proud and zealous of their natural freedom and the independence of their native land: this lineage of Atlantic heroes that, for so many years had existed unbeknown to those who under the gilded name of conquerors changed the face of the world, that was hidden in the wings of the world theatre, saw itself in the ultimate need to give into brute force, to lose the simplicity of their ideas, to contract the vices and passions of Europe, and to disappear from the land, to become confused with the rest of the nations. The state of the original Canary islanders was the true youth of the human species: and while they were happy with their rustic life of goats, sheep and caves, content to adorn their goatskin garments with thorns and to deck themselves out in feathers and seashells, to painting their bodies with crude colours, and to defending themselves with stone slings and wooden darts, to cutting with obsidian "knives" and sharp stones, in short, while they were barbarians, they lived free, agile, healthy, strong and happy, in a way which is only allowed to mortal beings. But then came the Conquest and it took away this rhythm and regime of the simple life and degenerated the Canary islanders into a caste of dark men" (ibid., I: 538).

Perhaps these are the paragraphs that most revealed just how much Viera identified with those he had up until then called "*our ancients*". But was his stance unequivocal? Does this gushingly flattering discourse have only one

possible interpretation? This is, true to say, the orthodox "interpretation" of Viera, the conclusion of the analysis carried out by our traditional historiographers, which has been uncritically incorporated into the "common historical sense" of the Canary islanders as of the Enlightenment onwards. We believe, however, that other interpretations are possible. In the light not so much of the subsequent history of the Archipelago but rather of the broader context of the history of anthropology, Viera's vision of the "noble savage" must be toned down in various nuanced dimensions. What is curious, nevertheless, is that there is no need to recur to elements external to the work of the Archdeacon of Fuerteventura to find these turns, changes of emphasis or even the open counter positions to his first and most noble defence of the native people. In that we do not have a monographic study on the "evolution in the theory of Viera", it is enormously complex to compare this to the major evolutionary frameworks elaborated as of 1750 (Harris 1968, Bowler 1974). To be specific, the genesis of the "theory of the four stages", as R. Meek so rightly pointed out, requires something of greater substance than a mere comparison of quotes. For example, Viera situated the Guanches in the "age of youth", one imagines after infancy. Leclerc de Buffon, it is true, talked of "*infancy, the coming of age, old age and death*". The Guanches were barbarians and herdsman of livestock for Viera, the Canary writer of the Enlightenment. For Rousseau, there were three "states" of Man: "*The savage man is a hunter (chasseur), the barbarian is a herdsman (shepherd/berger) and civil man is a tiller of the soil (ploughmen/laboureur)*" (cited in Meek, Spanish edition,

1981:89).¹² Buffon was one of the masters of Viera. Viera's "Diccionario" (Cioranescu on Viera y Clavijo, 1982) owed a great debt to the author of the "Natural History". Rousseau was presumed to be another. Moreover, Viera had inherited "*the smile of Voltaire*" (Pérez, 1971[1920]). The problem is that neither Leclerc de Buffon was Rousseau, nor was the master from Geneva as "sardonic" as Voltaire, another of Viera's masters.

Viera first marked a distancing line constituted by what we could call "*the inevitability of progress*". Then, second, the very state of natural happiness depicted was seen to be less idyllic in reality, after a closer look at the day-to-day of the indigenous peoples. Finally, a categorical distancing aspect was constituted when one assumes, albeit critically, the continuity of historical developments in the Canary Archipelago.

According to Viera, the arrival of the Europeans completely upturned the "*simplicity of the nature and customs*" of the original Canary islanders, but since they themselves were unaware of the secret of their happiness, as we already saw was the opinion of Viera, logically they did not philosophise upon the subject. In reality "*they only appreciated the comforts that are usually furnished by the useful arts*" (*ibid.*,

12 We have found only references to Turgot and Montesquieu in the original works of Meek. As a result of what may be due to the Spanish translation of an original work with which we are not aware, we have opted to give an original Rousseau quote from *Essai sur l'Origine des Langues* (1781) that aligns totally with what Meek comments on Montesquieu. Translators: John A. Moran & Alexander Gode.

l:361) such as the ploughing of fields, construction of water deposits, houses and temples, all of which, according to Viera were "*an admirable sight*". These passages, wherein Viera commented upon the local life in Fuerteventura and Lanzarote in the early years after the Conquest, were times of "*peaceful, soft, laborious government*" where small bodies of society, Canary islanders and Europeans "*considered themselves happy*". And although nobody was immune to the "*general spirit of the century*", under the auspices of Alonso Fernández de Lugo, "*the arts of peace, by which I mean agriculture, manufactures, trade, shipping and police, began to establish themselves prosperously*" (*ibid.*, 704). However, this progress was not to be easily accepted by the islanders. The resistance to the Conquest would imply a first major obstacle to "*reducing them to reason and bringing them to live in society*"; a second was to be, according to Viera, the total incapacity on the part of the indigenous peoples to assimilate civilisation. With respect to native resistance, Viera continued to maintain what he considered to be the right of their keeping their natural state, thus making it comprehensible that they refused to submit. But once the Conquest had been consummated, the old social order was to be a backward element, thus causing Viera's discourse to swing substantially in another direction. Let us follow these aspects of the work of the historian since we believe that it is here where we can find the real basis of his image of the original Canary islanders.

"The war that was waged against the natural inhabitants of these islands, as occurred with the

"Indians", was strange, because they did not possess land in the Christian sense, nor did they disrespect their boundaries to occupy the land of others, and so, to say that they were bringing them the Word of God, had to be by preaching and admonition and not with drums and flags, to plead not oblige".

This was the opinion of Viera (*ibid.*, I: 625) when relating how Bencomo rejected the proposals of submission made by Lugo. In this and other passages, Viera continued to assume the stances held previous to the Conquest. As we shall see further on, Espinosa maintained (1980 [1594]) that some authors saw this as a unifying link between Viera and the philosophy of Las Casas. Likewise, when commenting on the Battle of Acentejo, Viera said *"in truth, these islands have never seen greater bloodshed or disaster, as it may be said that the Guanches set a high price on their freedom"*. And, effectively, on every occasion that he reconstructed episodes of surrender on the various different islands, through discourses of resignation at the loss of their freedom, Viera put in the mouths of the natives how inevitable their defeat had been. In the final attempts at resistance, Viera made Bencomo speak (through Viana 1968, see Alonso, 1952). Bencomo said that although infectious diseases, hunger, desertion and domestic dissent had been the true weapons the Spaniards counted on to reduce the islanders, there was no other option but to accept their fate and, breaking down into tears, and giving a great sigh, according to Viera, Bencomo went on to say,

"Forgive me, beloved land of mine, If I cannot defend you

against the foreigners who come to exert tyranny ... And you, my valiant leaders and trusty followers, who have shed your blood so bravely and with so much glory, in the service of our common cause, forgive the decision taken by this woeful descendent of the Great Tinerfe, and bear with me in asking for peace with your enemies, since it is fruitless to continue in war." (ibid ., 1 : 661).

This marked the end of an episode in the work of Viera but likewise revealed a change of discourse. What in appearance had been a historical tale told from the perspective of the conquered, supposedly the defence of the "noble savage" became a discourse told from the perspective of the Europeans, or to be more precise perhaps, from the perspective on an enlightened European. But are these effectively two different discourses? We believe not: in our opinion, it is one and the same discourse. Or rather, we would even go so far as to say that we cannot call it one and the "same" for it is contradictory, the historian debating between the defence of the native population, natural and free, and the world of the Europeans, civilised but corrupt. There is no tension between the two poles but rather, within the discourse of the Enlightenment: they coexist as two complementary elements within the same vision of the development of society and of historical dynamics. As we shall see, there is no theoretical break between Viera's view of the native people and the perspective from which he wrote his history.

Long before we get to the pages where he talked of the surrender of Bencomo, to which previous allusion has been

made, Viera had already assumed that the history of the Conquest was the result, in short, of the "*progress of our arms*". Openly, when relating various different passages, he made comments such as "*our troops advanced*", "*our troops attacked*" or also "*this sad reverse in fortune suffered by our conquerors*", "*a considerable group of islanders approached whistling and emitting terrifying screams ... they arrived in the sights of our army*". This siding with the conquerors' perspective can be traced even more clearly in his discourse of praise towards them. It is true, then, that Viera emitted severe criticism, at times virulent comments, when analysing what the conquerors had done. Practically all those who comment on his work, together with his biographers, indicate this as one of the systematic aspects of the "*Noticias de la Historia General*". However, just as evident are his declarations to the contrary. The atrocities, vile acts and vices of the conquerors were, in Viera's opinion, not only real but also necessarily to be decried: but, in any case, "*the signs of the times*" were ultimately responsible for their behaviour. If this is assumed, then notwithstanding, virtues can be found. In this way, Gadifer de la Salle would have received his just merits if he had not been "*one of the first heroes of our conquests*" (*ibid.*, 1.324). Juan de Bethencourt was seduced by the barbaric acts of his times and "*in spite of 'enslaving many of the natives'*", for which he was to receive due reproach from Viera, he nevertheless understood his plight and warned him that "*it was his mistake and a conqueror never does not commit mistakes and great ones at that*", considering that his actions revealed bravery and piety for which "*The Canary Islands may count themselves*

blessed to have been given a conqueror of so many brilliant qualities" (ibid., I: 354). And allow us one last illustrative quote in this respect, his praise of Fernández de Lugo, one of the central figures in the Conquest. Lugo, in Viera's opinion, might have failed in his honour as a gentleman by breaking his pact with the Guanches and causing them to "live in misery and die poor" but, when all is said and done, "his true reputation must mainly consist in his pacific dignity as the founder of our towns, our father and first legislator and cultivator of the best land of the Blessed" (ibid., I: 703). But, let us insist once more, the criticism of the barbaric acts on the part of the conquerors is just one side of the coin of Viera's Enlightenment morals. The other side is "the civilisation of the savages". As Duchet said (1975), the contribution of a large part of the reflection of the philosophers was the elaboration of a colonial ideology for bourgeois Humanism.

As of that moment, the indigenous people disappeared from the discourse of the historian. Before, however, another distancing factor from them had been produced, to which we made previous reference. In the end, for Viera, what determined the Conquest and all its trauma were not so much the military and political motives but rather religion. "*The sad fate of the Canary islanders*" says Viera, referring to the fact that they were almost to be wiped off the face of the Earth by their conquerors, was, without any doubt, "*more than justified by the knowledge that they had acquired the true religion and evangelical morals*" (ibid 1.539).

In Book II¹³ of "Las Noticias", devoted to a general

13 TN Despite saying that the quotes are from Book II, the author then goes on

description of the indigenous culture, we can find an important section devoted to religion. Viera contested those who considered that the islanders were worshippers of idols. In his opinion, they worshipped deities or "*had some obscure idea with respect to an all-powerful and eternal being*", but without these ideas being accompanied with a vision corresponding to the immortality of the soul. After citing Cadamosto, who considered that in Tenerife alone there were, at least, nine types of idol worship, Viera concluded that "*what cannot be denied is that, in the rest of the islands, more devoted to sensual pleasures, they look upon divinity in a more superstitious and fanatic way*" (*ibid.*, I: 163). The question of superstition was clearly not merely a personal concern of Viera's, but rather a recurring element in the Enlightenment thought, a confused sense of reality that presented an obstacle to the flowering of wisdom. For Voltaire, for example, it was what characterised the inferiority of the savages "*the lack of a religion founded in the distinct notion of one supreme God*" (quoted in Duchet, 1975:262 of the Spanish translation). This is one of the clearest aspects of the non-identification of Viera with the happiness of the natural state of the native islanders. In the same way, *Bontier* and *Le Verrier* found dullness of comprehension and obstinate adherence to superstitious rites in the native people of Fuerteventura. But the superstition of the people of El Hierro seemed to Viera to be "*even greater*". In any case, the religion of the islanders was, according to Viera, less dangerous than the errors

to give a long list of quotes reputedly from Book I. This may be a misprint but occurs in other parts of the text likewise.

of pagan mythology, the ceremonies of the incredulous Jews, or the sectarian dreams of Muhammad. The fact that the preaching of the first missionaries had had such swift success was attributed by the historian to the fact that the islanders, unlike others "*simply professed adoration of the laws of Nature and were little inclined to the superstition of worshipping idols... which is, perhaps, the best (religion) that any barbaric people without the gift of revelation could have*" (*ibid.*, II: 450). This is followed by some examples where Viera would seem to lose the critical sense he deployed on other subjects, on simplifying the world vision of the islanders. He talked of how they worshipped the sun, the moon and the stars and attributed this to the fact that the stars represented beneficence and majesty. The mountains were sacred because they were close to the sky and if oaths were sworn to the Teide, this was due to their fear of volcanic eruptions. This type of naïveté when explaining the religion of the natives made Viera think that their minds would be more predisposed towards accepting Christianity as was shown by all the references to episodes of appearances of the Virgin Mary and the enormous expansion of her cults.

There is yet one more aspect that diminished the idyllic image of the indigenous people. The valour and nobility of the islanders that Viera had portrayed, above all by attributing the eloquent discourses of surrender to the native leaders, *Menceyes* and *Guanartemes*, gave way to a more reflexive vision and a colder analysis of the political system. In reality, according to Viera, these men had always been the enemy of their peoples, and he resigned himself to

the thought that "war was a necessary calamity in the Canary Islands as it was in the rest of the regions" (*ibid.*, I: 180). The comforts of the "simple and philosophical life" seemed to be endangered when pastureland was usurped, livestock was robbed, there were revolutions of the "less content vassals", together with jealousy and resentment of these "would-be kings". At the end of the day, there was nothing to be done since all resistance was bound to fail, as he commented with respect to the rebellion in Fuerteventura: "the freedom of the men we call barbarians has some moments of convulsion, when they will rebel against their first oppressors, although always at their own expense" (*ibid.*, I: 409).

We have seen, thus, that there are elements in the historical discourse of Viera that oblige us to modify our ideas with respect to his presumed ideology of the "noble savage" which has traditionally been contemplated in its "positive" idyllic, utopian or nostalgic dimension. Using examples from Viera himself, we have attempted to show how that vision distorts the focus of the historian and has impeded us from observing any distancing of his from the indigenous world that is given in important sections of his work. However, these constitute profound reasons, in our opinion, for a reappraisal of Viera's position on this subject.

Two important factors incline us to think that the extensive treatment that the author of "Noticias" devoted to the Canary aborigines obeyed, on the one hand, his need to justify the continuity of the history of the Archipelago and, on the other, the special relationship that Enlightenment thought had established between the "enlightened" and the

"savage" societies. Insofar as the first factor is concerned, Viera found himself obliged to place the original natives of the Canary Islands in a privileged position that would fit into his historical framework. These were not just any barbarians, of the type that could be found in uncivilised regions. The criticism of Viera set him apart in this aspect from the historians that preceded him. When commenting upon the opinions of Nuñez de la Peña with respect to the origins and name of the Canary Islands, Viera is ironic:

"he believed ... he was in the obligation to illustrate the same. We can see that he preferred, unfortunately, to exert a most extraordinary feat of the imagination (...) he wanted to do no less than change Noah's place of residence, give him a daughter and a son called Crana and Crano, making them travel from the Continent to these islands (...) for which perhaps they had on hand the famous Ark of the flood, has them disembark in one of the islands, give it their names that gradually corrupted over time (...) from Cranaria to Canaria" (ibid., 54).¹⁴

This is the "smile of Voltaire" (Pérez, 1971 [1920]) that Viera almost incorporated as a characteristic of his physiognomy as a writer. A good proof of the satire and irony of Voltaire, the master, is given in the following passage:

"According to them, some descendent of Noah's had nothing better to do that to set up residence in the delicious country of

¹⁴ TN Again, there is no way of knowing whether he is referring to Book I or II.

Kamachatka (...) his family who had nothing to do went to visit Canada (...)they set to it and produced children non-stop (...) that were to populate Mexico and Peru (...) Noah's great-great grandchildren gave birth to giants in the Straits of Magallanes. The Manchu Tartars are undoubtedly the ancestors of the Peruvians since Minco Capak was the first Inca in Peru. Mango is similar to Manco: Manco to Manchu, and so we get to the Manchus in one foul swoop, all perfectly demonstrated."

Thus was Voltaire to dismiss the ideas of Father Lafitau (quoted in Duchet 1975: 248 in Spanish translation, see original French, 1975).

But, logically, this influence of Voltaire must be nuanced in more than one aspect. In the words of M. Verdugo: *"this curious courtesan clergyman/who translated Voltaire and prays to Christ/".* In any case, the Guanches, in Viera's opinion, descended from a noble lineage of the former Atlantes of heroic times, and their simple customs were similar to those of heroes and patriarchs. However, although this allowed Viera to dignify the incorporation of the original Canary islanders into history, giving continuity to the pre- and post-colonial periods, this represented but a secondary element to him, in our opinion, with the primary, and more decisive, factor of the ideological paradigm of the Enlightenment that, logically, Viera had adopted as his own, weighing much heavier.

Apart from happy beings installed in heroic times until the arrival of the Europeans, who were the indigenous peoples of the Canary Islands in reality? From the Renaissance

perspective, still surprised by the "discovery" of the savage world, this could not emerge as a specific field of research. However, the savages for the 18th century were no more than remains of nations disfigured by slavery, cast into the fire of Fate from which they had had no opportunity to escape. In the 18th century, the savages, then converts to Christianity, offered a mere blurry image of their past, that anthropological discourse would have to re-construct on the basis of imprecise witness accounts and biased or prejudiced stories that had to be purged of their tainted slants before use. The line had been traced, and the Earth had been divided up neatly into civilised and savages. Yet some of these savages were no longer savages, but could no longer return to their primitive state either. This was the dilemma that Enlightenment thought faced when it attempted to make them into the subjects of research. To put it in other words, the enlightened talked of the savages from the conviction that they had ceased to exist as such (Duchet, 1975). We believe that for the Canary Enlightenment, the question was also posed in these terms. Viera, in particular, was totally clear on the subject: and yet, this fact has been minimised if not completely ignored by Canary historiographers. Once more, Viera was merely reinstated to his role as the representative of, and ambassador for a native people pitilessly treated by their conquerors. But, who was Viera really defending?

"All who are interested in the indigenous nation of the Guanches and who would wish to see the lineage of these sovereign people subsisting with some glory

for monuments of noble, venerable and original manhood, will not be able to resist feeling that our first colonisers were, in that respect, very unjust in their ways of thinking. Far from offering their protection and showing respect towards these miserable families, as was their bound, following the precepts of their religion, honour and equity, they treated the nation with despicable disrespect; so much was this the case that their poverty, timidity, defeatism and, over all, their inclination towards a savage and errant life, were the causes that together caused the destruction of the remains of a people who had survived epidemics and war " (ibid., 1:677).

In this long paragraph, we can find the main keys to a more adequate perspective of the anthropological reasoning of Viera. First, he was talking as a European (*the unjust way of thinking of our first colonisers*). Second, his discourse was directed at the Europeans and Canary islanders of his times (since of the indigenous people of the Guanches there were only "remains"). And third, therefore, nothing that he reproached, criticised or manifested any longer concerned the Guanches themselves. And that for the most powerful reason, because "*These people have ceased to form part of the nation*" (ibid., 1:679). The extinction of the "Guanchinesque"¹⁵ nation is considered by Viera to be a "*lamentable*" fact. In the line of Espinosa, but one hundred years after the Conquest, he said that the few Guanches who had remained were entirely mixed with

15 TN An expression coined by Bethencourt Alfonso. See later in text.

European blood, and concluded that in Tenerife (and presumably extensive to all the other Canary Islands) "*No true Guanches remained with the exception of the mummies*". Clearly lamentable indeed, but above all, an undeniable fact in the opinion of Viera. So, what remained of the noble Guanche? By overlooking these elements upon which we have commented, there has been an attempt to cast Viera in a distorted light, in our opinion. And that, basically in two aspects, that we shall now go on to analyse further.

In the first place, many have wanted to see Viera's criticism of the conquerors and of the merciless treatment dispatched upon the indigenous people by them as being firmly rooted in the anti-colonialism of Bartolomé de Las Casas. The connection of discourse between the Bishop of Chiapas and Viera has been explored on multiple different occasions by Cioranescu and by González Antón (1982). The influence of the rationale of Las Casas was crystal clear in the opinion of Cioranescu (1961), and he suggested that they were linked via the work of Espinosa. We will not linger here on following the re-construction as per Cioranescu which, although not based on conclusive proof, is, nevertheless, basically plausible and coherent. It is of more interest to us to highlight here the theory he defended in his introduction to the History of Our Lady of Candlemas, "*Historia de Nuestra Señora de Candelaria*" (Espinosa, 1980). Cioranescu herein affirmed that Viera produced a synthesis, albeit not consciously but extremely useful in its results, of Las Casas' naturalism with Rousseau's. In our opinion, this requires further explanation on one or the other account, to know

the relative weight of each of these two influences. There is a vast amount of literature devoted to the interpretation of Las Casas' work, where the most relevant research perhaps has been done by M. Jiménez and L. Hanke (see Bataillon and Saint-Lú, 1976, Merle, translated into Spanish by Mesa, 1972). But it is of less interest here to delve deeper into the vicissitudes of said bibliography than to highlight that the "*chroniclers of the Indies*" and, of course, "*the defender of the Indians*", were used systematically in the Enlightenment as one of their main sources of information. This is all the more important because there may have been a double filter of Las Casas through to Viera, that is, not only from Espinosa but from the intellectuals of the French Enlightenment.

"In the Beginning of the world, there were Americans" as R. Meek pointed out (1978). After the impact caused by the European discovery of the "new Continent" on the mentality of the Western world (Elliot 1972; Lévi-Strauss 1975), the enlightened revealed the contradictions that the existence of the Indian caused with respect to biblical chronology and, in general, the whole text of Genesis. The "philosophers" made insistent recourse to Inca Garcilaso, Acosta, Lope de Gómara, Oviedo ...*(sic)* and Las Casas. M. Duchet broadly analysed how they were divided between "*unconditional praise and outright condemnation, which made it apparent that there were two bands, of friends and foes*"(see 1975:90 in Spanish translation). That the chroniclers were mostly "interested parties", that is to say "biased" is a generalised conviction among the philosophers. To be more exact, Las Casas was accused by both Robertson and De Pauw

of having introduced Negro slaves into America with the *"intention of converting himself into the sovereign in the Indies"*. Prévost and Voltaire recriminated him on his *"exaggerated zeal"* ("zeal" in the language of the philosophers was a synonym for *"fanaticism"*): and only Diderot, but much later in 1780, was to make a passionate defence of the *"defender of the Indians"* who he described as *"greater on account of his humanity than all of his compatriots together on account of their conquests"* (see Duchet, 1975:93 in Spanish translation).

The chroniclers, then, were to be taken into account because they might offer valuable information, but they were to be suspected of bias. It must be said that this criticism on the part of the figures of the Enlightenment was hardly objective either, but albeit so, it should be taken into account as a modulator of the views and most specifically with respect to the "savage world". The result, according to Meek, has been that the literature on this subject *"is so voluminous, so complex, so deformed by ideological considerations (...) that it is practically unmanageable"* (Spanish translation, 1981:41: original, 1978:82). This is another aspect that requires a major research effort with respect to the intellectual formation of the Canary historian. Viera handled a considerable knowledge of geography and literature of voyagers, above all, with respect to America and Africa, if he is to be compared with the "philosophers". Doubtless, research into his formation would offer more than one surprise with respect to the "paradigmatic" interpretation of his sources. It is significant that a large part of his bibliography was made up of publications in English.

For example, he used "The principal navigations; voyages, traffiques (*sic*) and discoveries of the English nation" by R. Hakluyt (a publication from 1599), and "Hakluytus posthumus, or Purchas, his pilgrimages, containing a history of the world in sea voyages and land travels by Englishmen and others" (published between 1625-1636). However, there is no record in his bibliography of the General History of Voyages, "*Histoire générale des voyages*(...)" that A. F. Prévost was to begin to publish in 1746 through to 1789, and that constituted one of the main sources used by the French Enlightenment, but whose first seven volumes, it must be noted, were, in part, a version of Hakluyt and Purchas.

With respect to Viera, his "Las Casas" influence (in such case as it could be demonstrated that this was the only thing that he took from the Chroniclers of the Indies) had to have passed through the powerful ideological and historical filter that was imposed upon it as a result of his "enlightenment". His condition as a historian that assumed the hypotheses of the dominant historical method in the "*Century of Lights*" is, quite clearly, more of a defining feature than his "veneration" of Las Casas. He was introduced to Las Casas by Espinosa but he was already "forewarned" of who all the pre-18th century historians had been.

These nuances with respect to the position of Viera towards the indigenous people do not imply, however, that the stereotype of the "noble savage" should have imposed itself on the historiography of the 19th century as a circumstantial element due to the author of "*Noticias*". At the beginning of the 19th century (as at the beginning of the

20th), it was crystal clear that Viera was also “ a defender of the Guanches”. However, in the light of what Canary anthropology produced after the criticism of Viera, the continuity of the indigenous “*themata*” was to remain, but likewise drastically changed in content.

2.3. The indigenous Canary people in the Romantic literature

The first half of the 19th century has been one of the most neglected periods in Canary historiography. This is probably the result of the lack of knowledge of the ideological hypotheses and theories that were produced in the Canary Islands at the turn of the century. In particular, we know little or less of what has become known as Canary Romanticism which, nevertheless, is named frequently in its various different perspectives in the social sciences. From the perspective of anthropology, the work of Berthelot represented the most noteworthy contribution in this period, which has led to distracting the anthropological interest from a large part of the contemporary Canary literature of the times towards the French naturalist and ethnographer.

The intellectual career of Berthelot was certainly complex. He was born in the 18th century and educated according to the models of the Enlightenment and Encyclopaedism, and yet his research activity was firmly entrenched in the Romantic age and still arrived in time to be incorporated into positivist anthropology. Berthelot, thus, is of first-order importance in analysing the road down which indigenism

travelled in the Canary Islands after the period of the Enlightenment. Most of the writers who comment on this coincide, in general terms, in assimilating his ideas with respect to the original Canary islanders on a continuum, that links immediately to Viera and, more remotely, to all the chroniclers and historians who defended the "noble Guanche" before the 18th century. There can be no doubts with respect to the continuity of the theme. The problem derives from whether this theme is seen in the same terms: that is, if there is real continuity or not in the ideological assumptions with respect to the "noble savage" among the enlightened and the Romantic generations. We shall only go briefly into the literary production on the Islands in the 19th century here, in order to return immediately thereafter to Berthelot, who is more relevant from the ethnographic and anthropological perspective.

The rise of Romanticism is closely connected to the processes of industrialisation in Europe. However, the movement was not the same in all of the countries. A. Gouldner underlined how some countries, for example, Germany, one of the main centres of the Romantic movement, when faced with the problems of industrialisation, felt the resulting need to formulate a stance on the same, with the ever more active social participation of the middle classes. Germany rejected the model of the French Revolution but was unable to continue in its old feudal system. According to Gouldner,

"Many educated Germans of that period turned therefore to the sphere of culture, to the achievements

of intellect and art that were more individually controllable: they fostered a movement for cultural revitalization instead of a political revolution. Unable to revolutionize society, German intellectuals sought to revolutionize culture." (Spanish translation, 1979:303: original, 1973:323).

Romanticism was to be distinguished not for its defence of science and rationalism, but on account of its innovations in the Arts and, above all, in literature, in clear opposition to the French for whom modern times centred on reason, science and technical skills. However, the religious crisis at the end of the 18th century was acute. It only seemed possible that Christianity be connected with the Middle Ages or with a modern eclectic sceptic. The Romantics sought a mode of existence and a world vision that did not have to reject religion. According to Gouldner, "*Romanticism was the substitute of aesthetics for politics, of cultural criticism for social criticism; and it was a demand for artistic freedom in place of political freedom*" (Spanish translation, 1979:308: original, 1973:327).

But the substitution of Romanticism for Neo-Classicism was a slow process, the origin of which would perhaps have to be situated in the writing of Rousseau and the "*Sturm und Drang*" movement that developed around 1800. Germany and Great Britain already had significant Romantic creations in the last decade of the 18th century and early 19th. In France, Italy and Spain, the movement was to be produced somewhat later. At the beginning of the century, however, the publication of Chateaubriand's

"*Génie du Christianisme*" (1802) was to contribute to the age with the exaltation of melancholy, pride and imagination. It would uncover the beauty of landscapes, civilisation and religion, and would base its inspiration on the "*feeling*" of nature. Thus began the splendour of Romanticism. This is important when explaining the processes of demarcation between the various different social sciences. Thus, with respect to anthropology, Gouldner was to distinguish the field from sociology in that it maintained a stronger link with the Humanities. "*The very activities of the anthropologist demand that he go to more exotic and romantic scenarios (...) and it is easier for him to see himself, in the words of J. Bennet, as a romantic hero*" (*ibid.*:354). The philosopher of the 18th century was to be replaced by the Romantic genius; the genius who lived intensely or disappeared, who rejected the rationalism of the bourgeoisie on account of its "vulgarity". This feeling of genius, of being different, would contribute most powerfully to the development of the idea of a "*national spirit*", the "*volksgeist*" of each people, the "*national guiding light*".

In the Archipelago, Romanticism was particularly marked in its way of contemplating indigenism. Its exaltation, framed within the "*patriotic sentiment*" was to be, among others, one of the main points of reference. Canary culture and, as a result, its literature, that was long characterised as a hybrid product, a dialogue tensed between isolation and the urgent needs to lay down roots on the one hand, and cosmopolitanism, the need to know the outside world that constantly visited its ports and coastlines on the other,

found a magnificent exponent and outlet in the Romantics. Nevertheless, it is important to highlight, as did M^a R. Alonso (1977) how late Romanticism arrived at the Canary Islands. This was also evident in the theatre at the beginning of the century. It was not until 1852 and Desiré Dugour who put on the play "Tenerife in 1492", and others such as Sansón y Grandy, that the theatre of the 19th century eventually broke away from the 18th (Alemany, 1981).

Sánchez Robayna highlighted, however, that we know nothing of these three chronological and aesthetic periods of pre-Romanticism, Romanticism and Post-Romanticism in the Archipelago. In any case, the late reception of Romanticism in the Islands as compared to Spain and Latin America is to be noted, together with its lingering clinging to neo-Classicism plus other additional difficulties, such as that presented by the premature death of some of its early promoters, such as M. Ossuna y Saviñón, R. Murphy y Meade and M. Marrero Torres (Sánchez Robayna, 1981).

In this context, an important role was to be played by the newspapers and magazines of the times. The weekly "*La Aurora*" (1847-1848) was to be the clearest exponent of Canary Island Romanticism, but there were others such as "*La imprenta isleña*", the newspaper "*El Guanche*", "*La Revista de Canarias*" (1878-1882), "*La Ilustración de Canarias*" (1882-1884) and the volume "*Poetas canarios*" by E. Mújica. According to M^a R. Alonso (1977), these contributed towards founding a firm "*regional awareness*" within a Romantic framework, although with highly accentuated idealism. We should, likewise, highlight the influence of cultural centres

such as the *Universidad de San Fernando* (1817/1823); the *Universidad de Canarias* (1825/1830), the *Instituto General y Técnico* (1845), the *Gabinete Literario* or *Casino de Las Palmas* (1844); plus the *Academia de Bellas Artes* (Fine Arts Academy) in Santa Cruz de Tenerife (1846).

But what were the main concerns of our Romantics? For Sánchez Robayna, following in the line of Valbuena Prat in his "*Historia de la literatura canaria*" (History of Canary literature), the Romantic variables formed a continuum that included intimacy, cosmopolitanism, the feeling of the sea and isolation. The "inward looking tradition" as defined by Sánchez Robayna, (1981:113) (that Unamuno defined as "*isletism*", the island within the island) was well expressed in the words of José Plácido Sansón y Grandy who in his "Literary essays" ("*Ensayos Literarios*") wrote: "*Trapped on an island in the Atlantic, far from the great artistic world, without masters with whom to consult, without any stimulation whatsoever, only totally concentrated on my own individual self*" (quoted in Sánchez Robayna, 1981:113).

Perhaps all the Romantic production should be viewed from this perspective of "introspective tradition" or at least a large part of it. The theme of the sea was to appear recurrently. Ignacio Negrín was the first to spotlight it and, just as Espronceda had asked the sun to stop in its path, Negrín asked the sea to calm and listen to his song. However, in this "introspective" literature, we should indicate a fact given as much in the theatre as in poetry, which was the return to landscape, above all, to El Teide, as scenery and nature, as a symbol of the "national spirit", advising the indigenous

peoples, "You are my children: I hear your laments/ and I see the misery on your faces/ and in your mourning, as a father, I come/ to dry the tears from your eyes" (Estévez, 1878).

M^a Rosa Alonso found three main thematic references in Canary Romanticism. In the first place, the 25th of July, with patriotic poetry to the nation cultivated, among others, by Viera y Clavijo in his "*Oda a la Victoria de Nelson*" (Ode to the Victory of Nelson), by his sister María Viera y Clavijo and even by Nicolás Estévez. The attack of Nelson was seen as that of an invader of the fatherland: "*a son of the sea and the war/who wanted to nail to your forehead one day/the red flag of England/had his impious pride more than humiliated*"(Estévez, 1900:18)

In the second place, "*El pleito insular*" (the traditional pique between the islands of Tenerife and Gran Canaria) was clearly reflected in Amaranto Martínez Escobar, who, while waxing lyrical on the sea and rejecting the invader, devoted the following to the "*envious island*" of Tenerife in his "*Soneto a Tenerife*", defining it as a "*false, corrupt sister*", and in his romance poem, "*Las dos islas enemigas*" (The two enemy islands) asked for the division of the provinces to avoid "*the Tenerife' ambition from milking it dry*"(quoted in Alonso, 1977:120)

Finally, the third theme was indigenism. As of the fifties onwards, the Romantic poets turned back to a more introspective poetry (although without abandoning their traditional models) where the subject of the Conquest and its negative interpretation were to be a constant feature. According to M^a Rosa Alonso,

It was the Romantic movement on the Islands that brought about the necessary re-evaluation of the role that the indigenous people and our origins played in shaping the Canary islanders' personality and culture, always according to their own spiritual and aesthetic creeds (...) our regional Romantics exalted the subject of the "natural man" as the Hispanic Americans did with the American Indians (1952: 417).

However, for other critics, indigenism was considered to be more of an aesthetic-literary motif or topic than a true response to a patriotic feeling and a rising national awareness that began by turning its gaze back upon the past and its roots (Sánchez Robayna, 1981).

Whether topic or not, there can be no doubt with respect to indigenism figuring as a constant in all of the Romantic poets and it was to be the theme that would give rise to the Regionalist school integrating fully into Romanticism at the end of the century. Both the first Romantic movement and the fully-fledged version in the fifties, or the Regionalist School in the late part of the century, would turn back to the Guanches. Faced with this climate of opinion, there was only one voice, that of the poet Desiré Dugour who would see the presence of the Conquerors to be positive, while the rest of his generation condemned it outright. The Regionalists, for their part, who were more influenced by what we could call "*neovianismo*", that is, a new wave influenced by Viana (Sánchez Robayna, 1981), would treat the Conquest as a fusion of the two "*races*".

One of the most recurrent elements in the indigenism of the Romantics was the figure of the "*Caudillos Guanches*" the "Guanche leaders". Tinguaro, Tanausú, Bencomo and Doramas, among others, were to appear systematically in their poetry. Nevertheless, there were noteworthy differences between the early and the late Romantics. The early Romantics highlighted the nobility of the Guanche people, their bravery in the face of invasion, and the promise-breaking of the invaders. Fernández de Lugo, naturally, was to be the most reviled. Ignacio Negrín in his "*Ensayo poético sobre la conquista de Tenerife*" (Poetic essay on the conquest of Tenerife) talks of the Castilian behaviour in the following terms: "*Those who came sowing blood and terror/and brought with them their thirst for robbery/stripping of all their possessions those that were their brothers and sisters/before their God, with their fratricidal hands/* (quoted in Alonso, 1977: 117). Something similar was to be said by Victoria Ventoso Cullén in her "*Dos Guanartemes*" (Two Canary chieftains). "*The Spanish chief swore/ on the Holy Bible/ what he was later to forget/the Guanche dreaming meanwhile./ trusted in the promise made/. An oath never honoured/virtue never given grace/and into the darkest slavery/he dragged his embittered life*" (quote from 1977:117). The figure of Manuel de Ossuna y Saviñón was relevant in this context. In "*Los Guanches o la destrucción de las monarquías de Tenerife*" (The Guanches or the destruction of the monarchies in Tenerife), he began by attacking the role of the invader, saying,

" (...)when the stupid, furious warriors of the 15th and

16th centuries returned from their Holy Crusades agitated by their spirit of fanaticism and conquest, the gates onto the non plus ultra were opened and they penetrated the West, throwing themselves ravenously on the Canary Islands and the Americas. In both parts, these fierce conquerors treated the inhabitants worse than the lowest of slaves (quoted in 1978:25, original 1877).

Another resource used frequently consisted in having the *Menceyes* speak the language of an "enlightened philosopher". M. Ossuna y Saviñón did this with certain elegance. When Lugo sent an emissary to Bencomo to communicate that he came to conquer the Islands in the name of God and the Catholic Monarchs, to propagate Christianity, the *Mencey*, according to Ossuna y Saviñón replied:

"(...) With respect to the invitation you make us with this religion you call Christian, I fear to say that I cannot accept it, because we live happily with the religion of our ancestors. And if you believe that our society could live in order and peace as we do without religion, you are mistaken. We have a religion based on Nature herself and beneficent towards our people, the Being we adore. She protects the peace and harmony among our nations, obliges us to love each other and to do good towards our fellows. In short, tell your chief that the princes of Tenerife have never obeyed others than themselves and that they will never submit to being made vassals" (Ossuna y Saviñón, 1978 [1877]:63).

All these texts show how the Romantics depicted the conqueror as a cruel exploiting tyrant. Estévez was to manifest this same attitude which likewise was shared within the Regionalist School. *"He was the omnipotent conqueror:/once the Guanches were submitted to Castile/ ruling over the Canary Islands, De Lugo/was the true monarch of the islands"*. The same disdain was shown in his description of the rebellion of Guayarmina faced by El Lugo: *"He intended to make her his slave as he could not/seduce her with love nor gold:/ for the islander despised the tyrant/ (...)/and on remembering her disastrous death/ that was typical vengeance on the part of De Lugo,/ they will forever curse the memory of De Lugo/ applauding the heroic Guayarmina"* (1878).

José Plácido Sansón was likewise to exalt the figure of the Guanche leader. In *"La Familia"* he included a sonnet to Tinguaro that shows his support for the Mencey. *"Tinguaro is dead! Mourning, agony/ the echo drags on still, from rock to rock:/ Nivaria stands immense, in solitude/ And further afield, beyond the Teide, along the gloomy trails/ we can hear 'The Island independence died!:/ and with him, Canary freedom died alike!"*(quoted in Alemany, 1981:153). The Guanches who had lived "in peace" and "dreamt of love" were to see their "Elysian Fields" stained with blood, but the leaders rose from their sleep to fight: *From sleep they awoke/ to die as titans! Bencomo the Great, Tanausú, Tinguaro,/ Doramas(...).Praise be to their illustrious valour. Heroes of my land!"*. Along the same lines, José Desiré Dugour was to inaugurate the indigenous theme in a first

in Canary Romantic theatre with his *"Tenerife en 1492"*, although his work inclined to reflecting the *"balance between victors and vanquished"* which was to continue into the Post-Romantic disciples of the Regionalist School. José Plácido Sansón, however, was outspoken in his criticism, leading the censors to forbid the enactment of his drama, *"Hernán Peraza"*. In his tragedy *"Anacaona"*, he staged in theatrical terms the Spanish violence on American soil, writing, *"If the Spanish were cruel in America, more cruelty still would be witnessed of them by the peaceful inhabitants of the Islands of the Blessed"* (quoted in Alemany, 1981: 153).

We can see, then, that not only in poetry but in the theatre also, there were re-creations of the subject of the Conquest: that in the last three decades of the century, dramas such as *"Tanausú"* by Pedro Tarquis Rodríguez and *"Guanchiada"* by Jesús Doreste Silva continued to be played.

Likewise, and as we indicated before, the theme was to continue through to the Regionalist School although within the *"Neo-Viana"* movement, that attempted to fuse "the races". So we can see one of its clearest exponents, Estévanez, exclaim, *"For the Fatherland you love as good children/ receive the Spanish among you./ and cross their blood with yours/ to give birth to a race of giants/"* (1878: 21).

In short, in spite of the evident importance that indigenism held for the Romantic poets, their typification around an idea of "national conscience" and the archetype of the fatherland was problematic. Although it is true, as Pedro García Cabrera so rightly

wrote in 1930, "*The 19th century in Tenerife failed to give an integral vision of our landscape*", a landscape understood as a "*spiritual whole*", insisting along these same lines, Sánchez Robayna was to indicate that, "*if, indeed, it is true that the Canary Romantics were prodigious in their use of landscape in their poetry, often related to historical introspection and the exaltation of the pre-Hispanic people, a position that would give rise to the "Neo-Viana" movement of the School of La Laguna, it is equally true that they lacked an "integral view" of free interpretation and personal expression*" (1981:151).

Towards the end of the century, the frustration for a national history and culture lost, was well expressed in the bittersweet testimony of Estévez: "*My land is not the world:/ my land is not Europe:/ my land is the sweet, fresh,/ unforgettable shade of an almond tree*" (1878).

2.4. S. Berthelot: a change of direction in the image of the original Canary islander

Berthelot was to be researching when all this literary output was being produced. He arrived for the first time in the Canary Islands in 1820 and his original activities made him into a collaborator of the Naturalist, Barker Webb, with whom he was to write, between 1836 and 1850, the monumental "*Histoire naturelle des Iles Canaries*" (Natural History of the Canary Islands). However, in spite

of his undertaking studies of very different types (botany, zoology, geology, geography), Berthelot always maintained a constant interest in ethnography and the history of the original inhabitants of the Canary Islands, from his "*Etnografía y Anales de la Conquista de las Islas Canarias*" (1978 [1836])(Ethnography and Annals of the Conquests of the Canary Islands) through to "*Antigüedades canarias*" (1980 [1879]) (Canary Antiquities). *Berthelot's* attitude was openly favourable to the Canary indigenous peoples, but we have to ask what his viewpoint was, and whether or not it was the same as was held by the intellectuals of the Enlightenment, in particular, the ideas of Viera. "*Free and happy*" the islanders may have lived on the Islands of the Blessed, and revel in their "*undiscovered*" status of oblivion in the world, until such time as the seafarers, adventurers and conquerors "*on the pretext of converting pagan idol worshippers*", *men driven by fanaticism and plunder, launched onto the ocean "seeking alerts to new countries", going on to embark on their Crusades in the West, merciless conquests where the vanquished had no other option but to submit to slavery or die*". These are just some of the first expressions of Berthelot with respect to the Conquest in his Ethnography, "*Etnografía*" (1978:14, original 1836). However, the goals that he set himself in his work illuminate even more clearly his concept of the native culture: "*To research the origins of the Guanches, make known their language, customs and religion, follow the tracks of that primitive society in the same land they occupied, question their traditions and compare them with the existing historical documents*" (*ibid.*,13).

The first step towards these ends was to review all the historical sources and texts from Pliny through to Viera. In this aspect, the analysis of Berthelot is more systematic than that of the enlightened Viera; whereas Viera offered his critical comments on the historians of the past in various different passages of the *"Noticias"*, Berthelot not only did the same but also wrote an exhaustive analysis of all the available documentation in an ample introductory chapter to his work. The results, nevertheless, do not differ globally from the conclusions reached by Viera. The previous accounts synchronic to the Conquest merited his opinion of being more trustworthy, precisely for that same reason, as those written two hundred years later. Between the 17th and the 18th century, many texts augmented upon the information with respect to the indigenous Canary islanders; however, *"only with the greatest of reservations can these be admitted as news, consisting in a motley collection of unpublished and unprinted works"* (*ibid.*..:49). Many of these were materials of dubious and obscure origins which led Berthelot to conclude that the only way to re-construct history had to be based on the proceedings of the first Town Councils and Cabildos, as well as on the ancient Chronicles. The chroniclers, he said, in this coinciding with Viera, *"all proceeded in the same way, copying successively and admitting everything without analysis, without criticism, and without the least indication of the original documents."* But, like Viera also, he did not always manage to escape the bonds of these texts, showing the same attitude as he criticised in others in many passages, copying without contrasting, or allowing himself to be led by his sympathies

towards certain authors. Of these authors, there are two cases that should be highlighted: Viera and Viana.

The dependence of "*Etnografía y Anales*" on Viera's "*Noticias*" is noteworthy on more than one account. We should, said Berthelot, pay homage to Viera who made no pretence when faced with history, who highlighted everything unjust in the Conquest and who, rising to the level of his century, did not hesitate in "*combatting the superstitions and popular folk tales told by others such as Espinosa, Viana and Núñez de la Peña, held to be true*" (*ibid.*,54). Even more explicitly, he commented "*we have found in the interesting 'Noticias' all the main elements of the history that we are writing*". In effect, the "*Etnografía*" is full of passages that are either a literal copy or a paraphrase of the text of the Archdeacon of Fuerteventura. It was not only Berthelot who copied many of the passages from Viera: many other foreign authors, such as Bory de St. Vincent and Humboldt also made profuse use of the "*Noticias*" in their texts on the Canary Islands. But to comment upon only two examples, we can see in two different contexts in Berthelot's text how he bowed to the theses of Viera. On analysing the conquest of Lanzarote, Fuerteventura and El Hierro by Bethencourt, he concluded that, insofar as the praise due to the conqueror, he could add nothing to what had been "*truly and ably traced by Viera*" (*ibid.*, 204, see Viera 1967:354). In another place, he also identified with the ideas of the Canary historian with respect to the similar luck experienced by the conquerors in the Canary Islands and the Americas, together with his considerations of the indigenous peoples. For Berthelot, the

native Indians of Mexico and Peru were conquered before combat on account of the fact that they were weak, indolent and superstitious. The Canary islanders, on the other hand, were made of another mettle, a proud race that despised the invader. With the exception of the "reward" that the knowledge of the Bible offered the Canary islanders in the opinion of Viera, Berthelot literally 'lifted' his version of the events (*ibid.*,:234; see Viera, 1967:234). Of course, there are some elements of difference but these only affect some of the contradictions of the story as told by Viera, such as, for example, his thesis that the Canary islanders worshipped a god of some sort, in that they had a vague idea of an all-powerful eternal Being but "*had no notions with respect to the immortality of the soul*" (Viera, *ibid.*,161). Berthelot on the other hand, reveals himself opposed to those who limit the religion of the Guanches to an elementary belief in a divinity. "*A people who left milk and sweet offerings for their dead must have believed in another life, and thought, doubtless, that something of the body survived when they conserved them with such care after death*" (*ibid.*,113). Thus, in his opinion, all the Canary theogony proved that adoration and offerings to the divinity had gone beyond the limits of spiritualism.

However, if he picked up on the critical discourse, contrasted news, and the "impartial" gaze in Viera's work, it was to be from Viana that he inherited the patriotism and the hymn to the Canary identity. This is a particularly important aspect in understanding how the image of the Guanche was shaped in Berthelot. Logically, like Núñez de la Peña, Espinosa,

Cairasco, Anchieta, del Castillo, and all who wrote on the subject of the indigenous Canary islanders, Viana was not exempt from incurring in errors. However, in Berthelot's opinion "*if it were not very dangerous for the historian to believe a poet on his word, the work of Viana would offer us the most varied news*" (*ibid.*,50). However, it is not in the *Etnografía* that Berthelot revindicated the importance of the poet from La Laguna. He devoted instead a monographic work to him, with which he began the age-old process of exegesis and interpretation that appears to be valid to this day. Apart from the errors, exaggeration and distortions that can be observed in *Los Cantos*, Berthelot defended an innovative interpretation that, in the long run, obliged all the biographers and commentators of Viana to concur with him: that is, the "Poem" as the epic and the nexus of union between the Guanches and the Creole people that were the result of the Conquest. Berthelot was to compare Viana first with Tasso and then to the "other great poets". With respect to the canto where Viana tells the account of what the messenger relayed to the Mencey Bencomo on the arrival of the conquerors, Berthelot formulated the question, "*Is there anything more beautiful or more nobly moving to be found, even among the heroes of Homer? Or Dante, or Camoes, or for that matter, Ercilla? Have they written anything more original or dramatic?*"(1880:104). Once Viana and his "Poem" had been elevated to the ranks of great epic poetry, the next step, more importantly, was to have it valued as a patriotic hymn. Viana was not only composing a canto to the tender sentiments but was also adding "*patriotic love to a sublime degree*". In perfect agreement with

the Guanche character, Berthelot went on to say, his style was rough, metaphorical, judgmental but turns arrogant, filled with emphatics and boasting, when the people who speak are the Castilians. So, before surrendering, Viana put in the mouth of Bencomo a "moving monologue" and, after reproducing the same, Berthelot asked, "*Is there any islander who does not feel moved while reading the reflections of the Guanche hero when surrendering his land?*"(ibid.,122). Therefore, Viana was to be forgiven for his lack of care, trivialities and even his errors, in benefit of the patriotic feelings and historical merit of his poem. After fifty years of residence in the Archipelago, his "second fatherland" where he was no longer looked upon as a foreigner, Viana was not only the poet of choice for Berthelot on account of having sung "*the last valiant battles of a people, of brave men who defended every inch of their native soil and who died as victims of the most noble heroism*", but also, since Berthelot was by then "*hijo adoptivo*", that is, the "honorary citizen" of the capital (then) of the Canary Islands, he could consider Viana, as indeed he did, to be "*our poet*".

The importance that Berthelot attached to the *Poema* by Viana was not limited to a mere revindication. In a letter to Miguel Maffiotte, as noted by L.de la Rosa, on the 23rd January 1840, he proposed that the work be reprinted with the costs paid by the towns in Tenerife. However, he immediately clarified that,

" (...) if, among the members of these town councils, there are no hearts sufficiently patriotic as to understand the importance of such a publication, if

the glory of the country, the noble national pride does not speak in favour of the island poet who told the tale of their fathers and forefathers and gave the land an epic poem much more dramatic than La Henriada (...) then I believe that any private individual (...) would make good business (from doing so) " (in Cioranescu et al., 1980: 181).

Immediately after, he gave a detailed analysis of expenses and possible profits. In spite of the proliferation of exegetic essays that have continued the interpretation of "*El Poema*" by Viana, the now classic study of M^a Rosa Alonso still stands alone (see Cioranescu 1967, 1970; Alonso 1978).

It is clear, therefore, that Berthelot's sympathies lay with the islanders but we should ask ourselves, what it was that allowed him, unlike Viera, for example, to keep his "indigenist" discourse intact, without watering it down with praise for the conquerors, nor recourse to justifications such as the "*guiding spirit of the century*" or the later benefits of religion. This is certainly a complex question to answer. Here, both ideological and political components intervened side-by-side with theoretical and scientific hypotheses. His anti-clericalism, as indicated by Cioranescu (1980:25), may have facilitated his avoiding any religious commitment while freeing him to criticise "*the pretext of going to convert idol-worshipping nations*". The political component, however, is more difficult to evaluate.

First and foremost, Berthelot was French and followed his home politics closely, keeping updated on Parisian affairs

and gossips even when in the Canary Islands, and who held a marked stance on France and its politics. Thus, his friend, Auguste Couder sent him a painting of "Republican France" that Berthelot hung in his office "*to have the image of France permanently before me, whether monarchy or Republic, but always with the same flag*" (quoted in 1980a:35). However, Berthelot was no "ordinary" French citizen, nor was he an educated traveller, grazing afield on mountains in an exotic country. In 1843, he was entrusted with continuing the vast project of Napoleon's to compile the *Histoire Générale des Pêches Anciennes et Modernes* (The General History of Ancient and Modern Fish). He was well aware of the potential for fishing in the Saharan bank as was confirmed by his broad-ranging bibliography on the subject. And, what is most significant, as of 1847 and as appointed by Guizot, the Minister for Foreign Affairs, he was to be the Consul for France in Santa Cruz de Tenerife. Berthelot was, in short, an "agent" of the French government, very much concerned with the problems and the future of his country. In 1871, in a letter to his friend, A.M. Ogier, anguished as he was on account of the events in his "Fatherland", he was not to be convinced that "*it will only take a few years before our France is once more fortune-bound and fertile, and for us to reconquer everything that constitutes our power and riches: enlightenment, indisputable superiority in the Arts and Sciences and, in a word, everything that has made our country the envy of its neighbours and, on account of its glory, of the whole world*" (1980 [1880]). As his biographers from Zerolo onwards (and through to the present day) have shown (1980 [1880]), he intervened decisively in key problems to

do with the Canary economy and politics. Among others, he intervened in promoting cochineal and its export (Cioranescu on Berthelot, 1980) plus in the movement that spurred the adoption of duty-free ports, a fact that figured in a report of his sent to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in France (Guimerá, 1980). If we add to this his criticism of the Spanish Conquest, A. Cioranescu will have been right when he said "*Had he written one hundred years later, Sabino Berthelot would have been considered an instigator*" (1980:26). But we should ask ourselves if he was not, indeed, just that, in his days. On this respect, his *Recuerdos y Epistolarios* (Memoirs and Letters) (1980) are highly illustrative. Howsoever, there was a clear difference between him and Viera, and also between Berthelot and many others who wrote before and after him. Berthelot did not suffer for Spain, he felt no "pain". Canary historiography and anthropology researchers have always been trapped by their "pain", a suffering that has caused them to incur in one of two poles of unresolved tension. Whether Frenchified or Anglophile, the discourse, poetry and Canary history have always been, and still are, caught between cutting and even derogatory, verging on "excessively nationalist '*chauviniste*'" attitudes towards the mainland or excessively obsequious towards Spain and everything Spanish. The significance of this is that there is no escaping it: we are trapped somewhere between the autochthonous and the acquired.

Another important element is yet to be analysed in the work of Berthelot that, together with what we have previously outlined, shaped his vision of the indigenous culture

and society. It is, moreover, what is of greatest interest in the present context since it remits to his ethnographic hypotheses. Unlike the enlightened intellectuals, Berthelot did not end his research into the original islanders with the destruction of the *Guanchesque* nation (see Viera). His research followed the tracks of the Guanches after the Conquest. Towards the end of the 18th century and beginning of the 19th, the great evolutionist frameworks had already been mounted by Millar, Robertson, Condorcet and Turgot. He was familiar with these and knew also of advances in geology and palaeontology, so he inserted the Guanche people into these frameworks. He was seeking the remains and survival of the "primitive people" (as would all 19th century anthropology) that would contribute towards a reconstruction of the past within an ample frame where the Guanches would be slotted according to their degree of progress. We shall return to this point later in greater detail. Even so, the destruction of the indigenous culture left Berthelot with the problem of determining which elements belonged to the original people and which did not, insofar as the documents that were available were obscure or contradictory. However, here again, another fine element in the training of Berthelot was to kick in as an heuristic principle, that principle being the study of race. Berthelot considered that the Guanche typology must have been reproduced in the alliances and, therefore, children of the soldiers and the women of the subjugated peoples, would have preserved all the features that were characteristic of their origins. *"Even in our present day, time has been unable to erase the characteristics of the two races"*. The

thesis was not his, but was taken rather from W. Edwards, one of the founders of the *Société d'Ethnologie* de Paris, a follower himself of the school of phrenology of J. Gall, and heavily influenced by the racism of the French Nationalist, A. Thierry (see Haddon 1979:120; Harris, 1968:85; Stocking 1984:422). Berthelot fully identified with the ideas of Edwards, citing him and his "*Des caractères physiologiques des races humains, considérés dans leur rapport avec l'histoire*" (Physiological characteristics of the human races, considered in their relationship with history):

"The main physical characteristics of a people may be preserved over a long series of centuries, in spite of the influence of the climate, of the mixing of races, of foreign invasions and the progress of civilisation. We should thus hope to find in the modern nations, with some variations, and in a greater or lesser proportion, the characteristics that distinguished them in the time when history first brought them to light" (1841).

And this was precisely the guide that Berthelot was to follow. The principles of Edwards were seen to be confirmed in the Archipelago because the European alliances, Berthelot said, had not made the characteristics of the Guancho race disappear. There had certainly been mixes of the two races but their different origins could be clearly established. In the following chapter, we shall see the dimension of these racial assumptions in greater detail, but in this section it is of interest to highlight how the racial focus intervened decisively in Berthelot's vision of the indigenous islander. Berthelot was convinced, then, of

the racial survival of the Guanche people. What is more, he affirmed that the African typology was dominant, and could easily be recognised in countryfolk and even city dwellers. After giving a morphological description, he correlated and extrapolated upon the physiognomic characteristics to piece together a psychological portrait of the islanders, that is worth reproducing here to fully capture also his undeniable adulation.

"The eyes of these islanders clearly reveal their natural goodwill. They are full of expression in the women, and almost provocatively so. They are humble and affable, in general, but extremely susceptible: their melancholic eyes light up at a gesture or word and reveal all the movement of their souls: their faces reveal all at the minimum sensation. Their joy shines everywhere: their laughter cannot be contained; all their limbs shake to accompany the joy of their hearts; and when they feel desperation, this is exhaled in sobs, seeking out who will sympathise with their plights and tormenting themselves in their delirium" (1978:174).

This was the islander that Berthelot saw in his time. However, insofar as the original race had not disappeared, we can observe in this stereotype the physiognomy, customs and traditions of the Guanches. Of course, Berthelot admitted that they no longer preserved their beliefs nor their language, but they did retain their habits and manners. *"Whether living in a hamlet, isolated in a cave or in the mountains"*, the Canary countryfolk were described as affable, obsequious, humble, astute,

reserved, hospitable towards strangers, respectful of old age (...) (*sic*) that he considered were just some of the many qualities that denoted their origins or, in other terms, the "*hereditary virtues' that the Guanches had passed on to their grandchildren*". But between this canto to the patriotism and freedom of the Guanches, and the condemnation of the fanaticism of their conquerors, there was an important clarification made, required to maintain the coherence of the discourse. The survival of the Guanche, as much moral, physical and psychological as the preservation of the original cultural features among the island folk three and a half centuries after the Conquest, was totally contradictory to the theory of genocide. This problem, the survival of the Guanches beyond the Conquest, was not only a problem for Berthelot. It has represented a real hobby horse not only in the anthropology, but also in the literature and historiography of the Canary Islands. The subject, in short, has only given rise to battles of figures, quotes and suppositions, and as long as it continues to be posed in ideological terms, little progress will be made towards finding a solution to it. The fact is that the demographic continuity of the native Canary population has been among the most recurrent ethnic diacritics in the history of the Archipelago. It makes a double effort of analysis necessary: on the one hand, it is a question that remits to the reconstruction of the ecology, demography and so many other aspects of the island populations before, and at the time of, the Conquest. The fact that many Canary and outside researchers have been unaware of this double ideological problem has confounded a large part of the

production in social sciences and represented one of its major handicaps and sources of frustration.

In effect, Berthelot realised that to take the ravage of the Conquest through to its ultimate consequences of physical destruction was totally incompatible with the idea of the survival of the race. As opposed to those who maintained that the indigenous people had been wiped out completely, therefore, Berthelot had first to offer some general aspects of the history of conquests that showed that, although barbaric destruction was wrought by the conquerors, none in history had been able to eliminate a whole nation, nor to dominate them completely immediately after the Conquest. Therefore, he reduced the effects of the Conquest to the disarticulation of the society and culture, which he did by indicating a change in the Castilian Monarchs' policies after the deed. To this, he added the particular development of the Conquest on the islands:

"If at the time of the Conquest, force of circumstances motivated the submission of the indigenous tribes and, although reproachable, barbaric acts were even committed on the unfortunate Guanches during the invasion, and on some of the islands, a part of the inhabitants were reduced to slavery, the orders of the Catholic Monarchs put an end at once thereafter to the hateful regime of injustice and cruelty" (1980:52).

According to Berthelot, the Spanish domination put an end to piracy, and the moderation of the newborn administration was a political feature to be highlighted. After this, he made

a rough calculation of the indigenous population lost in the Conquest, a figure he estimated at twenty per cent (20%) over an original total of one hundred thousand (100,000). The discourse was tempered, but such was necessary in order to maintain the coherence of his main thesis.

From the foregoing text, we can already extract some important conclusions. On the one hand, unlike Viera and other enlightened figures in the 18th and 19th centuries, Berthelot considered that the Guanche "*has not died*", had survived the Conquest and "*lives on*" in the present-day islanders. In the second place, this survival could be seen by studying the physiognomic features, habits and traditions of the population, especially among the contemporary countryfolk. In the third place, and what perhaps was most to be highlighted in the comparison of the different elements of his scientific logic, was that both the first and second conclusion depended on ascribing to a new research strategy whereby to re-read, re-interpret and reconstruct history. This perhaps requires more careful illustration. In Berthelot's text, the presentation of the thesis of racial survival and, as a result, the extrapolation on the portrait of the rural people who he observed as maintaining the "*ideal*" features of the Guanches, was produced after revision of the works of the historians of the past. That is, he took from the Chronicles and histories whatever passages referred to the continuity of the native people and their physical or psychological attributes, after which he explained these synchronic observations to be confirmation of what the first historians had said. This recourse is evident in his use

of Espinosa, but reaches its full expression in his recourse to Viana. "*The merry nuptials are celebrated ... Dácil with Don Gonzalo del Castillo/ a happy ending to his amorous trials/ And a joyful beginning of lineages!*" From Viera, the author of the "Noticias" he took "*the blood of Tinerfe was mixed with that of Castile*" (quoted in Cioranescu on Berthelot, 1978:173). The following step in the text of Berthelot was to confirm the historian's versions, since ethnographic science had proved the survival of the races (see W. Edwards). However, this is an image that is back to front, a negative. In reality, the text was a reverse construct of the intellectual process followed by Berthelot in order to affirm his thesis.

It was not Espinosa nor Viana who confirmed the ideas of Berthelot but rather he who validated their affirmations. Berthelot worked with the same materials as Viera: like him, he read Espinosa, Viana and other chroniclers and historians, to produce his own vision of the indigenous culture and society. But Viera "interpreted" that the Guanche "*has died*" and Berthelot that "*he lives on*". The difference established between both lies in their theoretical principles and their conceptual construct. Both see massacre and destruction in the Conquest, but Viera was interested in the indigenous people because they were also a manifestation of the universality of human nature, that he could use as such to extract moral doctrine, whereas Berthelot observed the same nature in its physical dimension. Viera was looking for insight and logic, Berthelot for morphology and race. When Berthelot assumed that the racial characteristics allowed for the cultural features of the indigenous peoples to be

reconstructed, he re-read the old chronicles to find support (which in fact was not essential) with which to sustain his hypotheses. Within his research strategy, whatever did not corroborate his initial assumptions was deemed to be an "anomaly" or errors on the part of those who compiled the chronicles. In a word, it is the vision of the present that he was validating by re-reading the past, not the past that was informing the perspectives adopted in the present.

This image that Berthelot obtained from his first stay in the Canary Islands (1980b [1820|1830], 1978 [1842], 1841) was to remain untouched throughout all his research. In 1879, and tucked between a description of the exuberant Canary vegetation and his fear for the systematic deforestation of the mountains on the islands, Berthelot, while talking about the famous dragon-tree in La Orotava, recalled that "*a race of innocent, simple people saw it first come to light*", and citing a poet from *El ramillete isleño* (1866) (The Island bouquet) said, "*Tell me your innocent laws/ that ruled over these men for a time:/ their rites, their justice, their Menceyes;/ repeat their names for me once more*" (1879a:258). However, a less idyllic vision would be imposed over the years. In "*Etnografía*", he felt satisfied to still encounter the patriarchal customs at the heart of modern society: "*such beautiful qualities have been propagated with the blood of a pure race*", for if it had not been so, they would have had the perverse passions of those "*fanatics that trampled over the rights of the nations*". Later, however, in his *Recuerdos*, he commented on his return to Tenerife in 1847, that "*the islander of the villages has transformed and is no longer to be recognised; they have*

integrated into the current fashion, thinking that by doing so they appear more civilised" (1980:28). He felt deceived, the "sweet quiet" life had been turned on its head. It was, he felt, another society where "each to his own" and the interests of party and politics prevailed. In his letters, where he described his concerns for France and the progress of his studies to his friends, he intermingles comments such as that he saw "lazy people" lacking in intellectual concerns, "only worried about rumours and trends: if such and such a person takes medicine, Mrs. Whats-her-name complains about her nerves, if so-and-so is prostrated, and if the other drinks donkey's milk. And, after the gossip, comes yet more gossip" (ibid.,71)

In short, Berthelot traced a new image of the native population in the first half of the 19th century. In many aspects, he used the same language as the enlightened, but framed within a discourse where the indigenous peoples did not represent the origins of the spirit and human reason, but were rather a link in the evolution of the human race. The continuity of the "*themata*" was maintained but interpreted from a different perspective, via a research strategy that defined new problems and brought new explanations, that made recourse to other methodological guidelines. The work of Berthelot was to offer a new vision of the indigenous people and a new way of contemplating them. As of his vision, Canary ethnography and anthropology would have a new research strategy at their disposal, that was to become consolidated in its various different dimensions in what remained of the 19th century, and continued to have the

support of most of the professionals working in the field of Canary physical anthropology through to the 20th century. However, before analysing the development of raciology on the islands, we should take a pause to observe the positions adopted by the Canary ethnographers and anthropologists with respect to the original Canary islanders, through to the end of the 19th century, since this is key to understanding the evolution of the theme of indigenism.

2.5. Indigenism versus positivism in late 19th century Canary anthropology

The romantic evocation of the native continued present in Canary literature and history throughout the whole of the 19th century. However, if attempts have been made to present this idyllic and bucolic image of indigenous life as the common denominator of Canary anthropological reflection in the last third of the 19th century, that would obscure some of the main components of the theoretical horizons of our researchers. There are at least two aspects that the anthropologists tried to overcome from the Romantic framework that had preceded them, by applying the positivist perspective to the same. So, on the one hand, there was the retrieval of the pre-Colonial past to build a general history of the Archipelago; on the other hand, there was the scientism they attempted to "imprint" on their "positive" version of said history. Certainly, both aspects overlapped and, more certainly still, neither is exempt of its incoherences and ambiguities.

The fascination with the indigenous peoples and the revindication of their culture and moral values, together with the highlighting of the dignity of all peoples and countries, no matter how small, was the heritage that the Canary positivist generation selected from the legacy left to them by Romanticism. But now the aim was not to be limited to a mere "love affair" or to "shedding a tear" on turning the page of history that ended in the Conquest. The aim was more ambitious, as Diego Cuscoy (1975) pointed out: to confer upon the islands "historical status". Although the degree of integration within the general history of the Islands admitted variants and nuances, Millares (1975, [1893]) in fact situated the "history" of the indigenous peoples as a preamble to his real history, whereas in Chil (1876) it was inserted into the process of construction of a people and culture: Man, race, territory and culture were all brought together to shape a nationality. According to Diego Cuscoy, this nationality was to respond to the Renaissance model (1975:270). We believe, on the contrary, that the construct of the nationality and culture responded to closer influences, among which, and certainly not the least important, were those deriving from the processes of the political ascent of the bourgeoisie, and the modern shaping of European States in the context of Western colonialism. The fact that the Canary bourgeoisie to which our Canary anthropologists and ethnographers belonged were to fail as a national class (Millares Cantero, 1975) did not diminish the importance of the attempt to develop historiography as an agglutinating element towards the elaboration of that national culture. The conditioning factors of the infrastructure, in the broadest possible sense,

at a political and social level, impeded the consolidation of a process of construction of a nation that clearly required another analytical framework, to which end the new Canary historiography has devoted significant energy over the last few years. If we position ourselves in this context, we can better comprehend the focus, and also the tensions, with which the Canary anthropologists broached the study of the indigenous culture and society.

Once the Europeans entered the Canary Islands, said Chil, the Archipelago embarked upon a new era of conquests and defeats, of victors and vanquished. Chil adopted the position of Viera and, thus, the conquests "*bore the mark of their times*", thereby confirming a historical law in consonance with the customs and religious beliefs of the peoples. "*Unjustified pillage, lawlessness of all types, heinous robberies, unheard of cruelty and slavery: all of these were carried out under the protective umbrella of the Popes and Monarchs*"(1876:311). Chil underlined the contradiction of a venture designed to convert a people to the "*true religion*" that used violence, murder and extermination. In the name of God, he insisted, up until a few centuries back, the deadly mission of the Christian conquerors was to wipe out or enslave men who had the misfortune to be in their path. These are some of the premises of Chil with which to justify his divorce from the "heritage" of the conquerors, thus freeing himself to write the history of "*innocent good people*" whose morality was not equalled even in small nations. The intention of Chil, clearer than in many of his contemporaries' work, was adamant:

"To position in my 'Estudios' the conquerors face to face with the conquered, to compare the ones with the others, and to corroborate what I have said and repeated from the very beginning, either in my own words or through transcripts of those who have preceded me in the history of the Guanches: that they were great though small, dignified in their isolation, wise in their obliged ignorance, and were models of morality, judgment and legality, without any knowledge of Christianity, without having possessed philosophers and without any written Codes" (1876:316).

However, unlike the Canary writers who assumed the small dimensions and isolation of the Guanches, regaling themselves in the topics of island literature, the pretension of Chil was that of a researcher who through palaeontology, geology, anthropology and sciences auxiliary to history (1882) aspired to understand *"the life of humanity in all countries, in all climates and in all situations"*. Although small, wrote Chil, the Guanches represented a section apart of that humanity that required to be studied in all of its different and unique characteristics, as a people that had a beginning, progress and an end that concluded their *"social autonomy"*, snatched from them, as they were absorbed by other populations. That is a position we can consider paradigmatic of the Canary anthropologists and historians at the end of the 19th century, with some rare and conspicuous exceptions. However, it was, likewise, an element of distortion of the scientific hypotheses they themselves assumed. In effect, the raciology and the

evolutionism they took from the European anthropologists had clear ethnocentric implications, and came to form part of the "intellectual common sense" of the West, especially to be noted in the history manuals (Perrot y Preiswerk 1979). The European peoples, nations and "races" were positioned at the head of all progress and civilisation while the other races and peoples occupied the lower rungs of a lofty ladder that reached its culmination in the Old Continent. To make the 19th century anthropological conclusions compatible with the criticism of colonisation, that, at least theoretically, were to link the Guanches into the chain of progress, and with the dignification of the history of a culture that "*had not yet abandoned the Stone Age*", were all characteristics of the internal tensions of an anthropological discourse caught somewhere between scientism and the intention to form a part of an incipient national culture. These tensions appear recurrently in the works of Chil, Millares, Bethencourt Alfonso and of all those who have tackled research into the ethnography and anthropology of the islands. The means and the procedures they used to resolve the contradictions between scientism with ethnocentric nuances and the awareness of "not being Europe", their desire to "be Europeans" without becoming lost in the cultural uniformity this implied, might seem invalid nowadays and even anachronic. However, this was something they were in no condition to overcome satisfactorily. In fact, the development of sociocultural studies even now show to what extent we have not been able to give an adequate response to this "intellectual torment" of our first anthropologists in the Canary Islands.

What has to be underlined, nevertheless, is that they tried to find solutions to that problem while remaining inside the scientism to which they had ascribed. The determination of the origins of the *Guanches* and raciology were to offer them two main footholds towards overcoming the lack of coherence between their theoretical hypotheses and their "patriotic" desires. In the following two chapters, we shall see more clearly these two poles of concern in the Canary anthropology during this period. However, some aspects relating to indigenism, should be pointed out here.

The application, without nuances, of the evolutionary theory as it had been framed in Europe and as learnt by the Canary anthropologists, placed non-Occidental countries outside of "history". Using these coordinates, only the "great civilisations" of the past could revindicate an honourable position in the history of humanity. The empirical evidence of the culture and society of the Canary aborigines did not offer, at least in a comparative context, sufficient elements to put it on a par with the Egyptians, Aztecs, Incas and others. Faced with the ethnocentric contents of the evolutionist frameworks that were translated at a higher moral level, more intelligent and more refined in customs and religious ideals the higher one advanced on the evolutionary scale, the island anthropologists did not opt towards criticism, but rather looked for the slightest opening that would admit the original islanders into the progressive currents of history. This they found by focusing upon the problem of the origins of the indigenous people in an ambiguous way. Significantly noteworthy in this sense is the treatment of the theory or

theories with respect to the Lost Continent of Atlantis. Like the phoenix, the sunken continent re-emerged recurrently in all of Canary historiography. As of the first formulations of Plato on this respect, the historians of the Canary Islands either categorically opposed the theory, defended it enthusiastically or adopted an eclectic stance. Viera y Clavijo defended it coherently from the methodological point of view, in line with the scientific models of his times. Years later, Bory de St. Vincent in his *"Essais sur les Îles fortunes et l'antique Atlantide"* would propose an elaborate theory with respect to the origins and destruction of the enigmatic continent. The Atlantes, said Bory de St. Vincent, preserved their lives miraculously around the destructive volcanic craters and believed they were the only survivors of a general disaster. The reminder of these misfortunes lived on for a long time and so, for example, the Guanches were convinced they were the only people in the world until the Europeans arrived (1804:459). Public establishments, monuments, cities that previously practised arts and science disappeared, indicated Bory de St. Vincent, after a violent physical revolution. But the Guanches did not seem to be a new population. Those *"who lived principally on these Archipelagos were, let us have no doubts, the descendants of these Atlantes who enlightened the world, both as conquerors and fugitives, that were rendered to nothing when the Europeans left no trace of them"* (1804:521).

There is no need to underline that the theories that finally were imposed with respect to the geological formation of the Canary Islands were those of Lyell, Fritsch and others,

who considered that they were the result of an upward thrust in the Earth's crust and volcanic activity. The Canary researchers, however, continued their criticism of the theory of Atlantis. Millares (1975[1893]), for example, understood that for a continent such as Atlantis to sink into the sea was "*inadmissible as a fact*". Chil was also of the opinion that the Islands "*had risen out of the deep*". However, it is significant that even if this were indeed so, Chil held highly ambiguous positions on the matter, on various different occasions. Years after the appearance of his "*Estudios*" (1876), he indicated that the scientists had not yet resolved the matter satisfactorily. And he asked whether the islands in this part of the Atlantic were not indeed the remains of that Continent, or if they had surged up from the bottom of the ocean. His interest was not geological because immediately afterwards he asked, "*and if these islands spontaneously emerged from the bottom of the sea, where did those aborigines come from?*" (1880: 229). In another article, a continuation of the first (1880), he gave abundant proof of people who defended the existence of a sunken continent, indicating palaeontological data on the similitude of flora and fauna from Europe and America in the Tertiary Era. He did not hold a steadfast position, but was attracted to Plato's tale of Timaeus on account of its beauty and, above all, was fascinated by the Atlantes' form of government, by their virtues, honour, the beauty of their cities and palaces, and the vast extension of their domains. Were the Guanches the remains of that great Nation wondered Chil? In the II Volume of his *Estudios*, Chil was to delve deeper into the same question, reproducing a long memory of E. Martínez Escobar (see Chapter 4).

Bethencourt Alfonso was even more explicit. In a short article, published in "*La Prensa*" in Santa Cruz de Tenerife (3151925), after giving a display of extreme diffusionism, he concluded that the Guanches

"(...) were not a primitive people but rather descendants of an extremely ancient, wise civilisation, and as Bory de St. Vincent says, the Guanches are the Atlantes people who sought refuge at the foot of the mountains; we also accept the sinking of the Atlantis and consider the Canary Islands, as did Sr. Fernández Navarro, to be pieces torn away from the African continent and "drifting towards America" (1985:56).

These digressions of Chil and Bethencourt had a powerful motive, therefore: to elevate the historical status of the native culture, and thereby justify the dignity of their history and role in the evolutionary process of the "*great cultures*". But the firmest footholds were not the hypothetical origins in Atlantis that most were to question, but rather the discovery of the Cro-Magnon and the subsequent favourable comparison with the Guanche skulls. This was to bolster the opinion of our anthropologists that the indigenous people had a place in history. That "family resemblance" with the Cro-Magnon lay down a bridge with a race whose historical destiny would be none other than to end up, after centuries, forming an integral part of the powerful European civilisation. "*The Canary civilisation bore the self-same features as distinguished the race of the Cro-Magnon, a highly advanced, moral race that must have been envied by many nations that strive to march at*

the head of civilisation nowadays", Chil was to say in 1890 in a commemorative discourse on the occasion of the tenth anniversary of the Canary Museum (*Museo Canario*, 1900:115). The reasons for which the Canary anthropologists had to make recourse, then, to the distortions of the frameworks of cultural evolution, already available at that time, can only be understood in two dimensions. First, there was the need to give value to the indigenous people to integrate them, to make this a diacritical element of the Canary identity: and second, on account of their adscription to the strategy of raciology, that obliged them to relegate the study of the processes of sociocultural evolution to a secondary level, outside the immediate picture. In effect, the cultural evolutionism of Morgan, Tylor, Frazer and McLennan,...(*sic*) was little known by our anthropologists. There is no explicit reference to cultural evolutionism in the works of Chil, although it is plausible that in the case of Bethencourt Alfonso, the work of Tylor was known through his relationship with A. Machado y Álvarez (Fariña, 1982; Galván, 1986). In general, the defence of the aborigine was supported by data offered by the physical anthropology of the times, and only an openly presentist attitude would disqualify its coherence with the epistemological assumptions and theoretical principles from which they worked.

Finally, there is another aspect that derives from the defence of the indigenous people, and which remits to the vision that they formed of Spain. This is, most certainly, a complex question where no clear position was

assumed by the anthropologists. On the contrary, and in consonance with the Canary political climate of the times, there were many contradictory responses. The criticism of the motivations of the Conquest and the actions of the Conquerors did not remit unequivocally to Spain. Like Viera and the Romantics, the anthropologists at the end of the 19th century identified the Conquest as "*the sign of the times*", an ambiguous formula that allowed the conquest to be identified as much with the practices of successive Spanish governments, as to also justify changes in the status of the Canary Islands with respect to Spain. In fact, as we have seen in the case of Viera, the condemnation of genocide stood side-by-side with the celebration of the successes of religion, and even with the virtues of some conquerors. The defence of the Guanches was always compatible with the glowingly ferocious praise for the "*Madre Patria*" that is, the "Mother Fatherland". Two examples from Chil and Bethencourt Alfonso may allow us to illustrate the tension that this problem produced for them.

Chil was a Canary doctor educated in Paris, who considered France to be "*our elder sister*". His relationship with Broca, Mortillet and other French anthropologists was so close that his attendance at conferences and exhibitions was always through their mediation. On the occasion of the Universal Exhibition in Paris in 1878, Chil had got in touch with his French friends with the intention of presenting various pieces and objects belonging to the original Canary culture. Once the Spanish Commission for the exhibition was informed of the fact, they called upon Chil on various

occasions to integrate the exhibits into the Spanish section, to which he replied evasively, alleging previous commitments with the French anthropologists. After making an appeal to his "*patriotic zeal*", the Governor of the Province asked Chil to attend the demands of the Spanish Commission. He replied again evasively, but justified his attitude, pointing out that "*Everything I have presented is as a Spaniard, for I will not deny my origins*" and that "*I have always been a firm supporter of the glories of my country*". Official copies of these requirements on the part of the Spanish Commission for the Universal Exhibition to Paris, sent by the Governor V. Clavijo to Chil, still exist, together with several others from Pedro González de Velasco. The response of Chil was highly detailed, a rough copy of which still exists and that we shall make reference to in Chapter 4. Whatever the circumstances, they show the scarce relationship of Chil with the Spanish anthropologists, and his direct connection with French anthropology.

Bethencourt Alfonso, for his part, in his response to Luis Rodríguez Figueroa in the "*Diario de Tenerife*" (Tenerife Daily) on the 8th March 1901 acknowledged "*the most sacred creed of my life, the love I feel for the fatherland, Spain*": to which he added immediately and categorically, although with a certain Romantic fascination, that,

"I do not know of a nation or race as worthy as mine, just as I cannot find a woman in the world to supplant my mother, on the altars of my veneration. Born in Las Bandas de Chasna, where there is no sign of progress, where we live as they do among tribes who follow the

herds of camels, I prefer that poverty and ignorance among my equals, breathing the air of freedom, to being led by foreign hands, like a bastard nobody, in the possession of modern advances. A vanquished population (which this will never be unless it so desires) has the right to revindication and the right to respect on the part of the conqueror. But a country where people turn their back on their own, who curse their own flesh and blood, for whatever pretext, in compliance with a historical law and an eternal principle of justice, is and always will be a vilified country that forges its own chains and seeks an owner" (1985:57).

But this declaration, together with "*our mother fatherland Spain*" made him reject his autonomy or regionalism as an "*insane act of fertility in small, isolated countries*". And what is even more relevant here, Bethencourt Alfonso considered the case closed on "*our 'Guanchesque' ancestors*" who, in the end, would turn out to be Iberian Celt, "*brothers of the 'population base' of Spain*".

F. Castañeyra, meanwhile, who collaborated with Bethencourt Alfonso on his studies in folklore, in his "*Antigüedades de Fuerteventura*", when describing the "*Sala del Consejo del Reino*" in Jandía, where the monarchs deliberated on peace and war, expressed that,

"(...)he cannot but experience [the explorer] a feeling of respect on seeing these venerable stones, silent but eloquent witnesses to a generation struck by the violent hurricane of the barbaric conquest. The brutal

empire of force robbed them of their independence and freedom (...) And let it not be said that the civilising light of the Conquest merits the annihilation of that race. Cursed be the light that burns the object it shines upon!" (1883:172)

However, in a "historical dissertation" of his that was published by *El Museo Canario* (Vol. 3, 35), after a long review of the "conquests" of science from Greece through to the 19th century, Livingstone and the Mungo-Parks do not appear as the ambassadors of colonialism (see Leclerc, 1973), but rather as "*scientific pilgrims*" to that unexplored part of the world to unveil it from mystery. "*This is how we advance towards perfectibility in all the branches of human knowledge,*" he concluded.

However, at the same time, there are more nuanced expressions with respect to the indigenous Canary islander. Thus, for example, in the almost forgotten "*Jardín Canario*" (Canary Garden) by D. Bello Espinosa, the Guanche was presented as far from belonging to the high cultures. However, that reality was experienced painfully:

"González wanted to show me his small museum of Canary antiquities, where I saw little else but poorly hewn stones together with pots and earthenware that made me cry, as I considered how difficult the life of our forefathers, the Guanches, must have been, and how much work they must have had to put into producing a simple garment out of pelts and hides" (1880:23).

But in our anthropological literature of the late 19th century, there was, at least, one openly dissonant element, C. Pizarroso Belmonte. As opposed to the model that guided Chil and Bethencourt Alfonso among others and, in general, contrary to those who studied the indigenous peoples, Pizarroso was more coherently aligned with the teachings of the Victorian Masters in Europe and declared, in no uncertain terms, after having studied their craniology, their rustic pens for their herds and their garments, "*How can anyone with any sense call a people who are ignorant of the joys of civilisation "happy", a people who do not experience the wellbeing proportioned through riches and whose hearts are not moved by a work of art?*" That was his reply to the optimism of Viera y Clavijo, who believed that the Guanches were the true youth of the human species, and that, although they were barbarians, they lived happily, as we have previously commented. "*No: the Guanches were not a happy people. In their faces there was the shadow of profound sadness that resided in their solitary souls that, at times, made them feel distaste for life*" (Pizarroso, 1880:98).

In spite of their not possessing the "*infantile admiration*" of the savage, their lethargy, their sad, painful ballads and rhymes of the "*endechas*", and the weak rhythm of the "Canary dances" suggested nothing but the deepest melancholy. Neither, suggested Pizarroso, "*should we let ourselves be deceived by the poets*" who were wrong to ponder and praise the strength of the Guanches. The meat, the toasted cornflour (*gofio*), the honey and the milk were only '*for the rich*', all their fruit was wild and tasteless, hunger often assumed epidemic proportions and, as they were not farmers, they lived in straitened

circumstances" (...) (*sic*) and when the rain did not fall "*there was no shortage of brave volunteers who offered to sacrifice themselves as victims*" by throwing themselves from the cliffs into the void. However, in all this discourse, there is an insistent echo.

"The true savage is neither free nor noble; he is a slave of his own needs and his own passions; (...) ignorant of agriculture, living from hunting, with no hope of success, staring hunger permanently in the face, and often moved towards recurring to the horrible alternative between cannibalism or death."

This last text, the "echo" was, of course, from Sir John Lubbock (quoted in Stocking, 1982) who Pizarroso knew well, at least his "Prehistoric Times".

The ideological derivations of these positions require systematic analysis, as elements of first order in the processes of formation of the Canary ethnic identity as of the end of the 19th century, an analysis, moreover, disregarded in the sociocultural research of the islands until well into the 1970s. Here, we have only touched upon some of the aspects that remit to the internal problems within anthropology but that, doubtless, formed the core of a large part of the problem. One in particular, as we shall attempt to show from here onwards, that is the racial focus adopted by our anthropologists, that was certainly not the factor with least weighting in this context.

3. CANARY RACIOLOGY. THE CONSOLIDATION OF PHYSICAL ANTHROPOLOGY

"In the prehistoric past as obviously today, culture was independent of physical race, was not a matter of biological heredity but of social tradition". Gordon Childe, 1933.

All through the 19th century, raciology was to become the dominant research strategy in Canary Anthropology. We can safely say there is not one single text in the ample anthropological literature of that time where race did not figure more or less explicitly. A retrospective glance at the history of Canary anthropology through to the most recent times shows us to what extent raciology had become the "deus ex machina" of our anthropologists. Although it was obviously significant from the viewpoint of the internal workings of anthropology, its importance, however, extended beyond the academic debates to reach the circles of intellectuals not linked directly to anthropology and, in a greater or lesser degree, to broad sectors of Canary society. The ideological and political dimension that race has had in the construction of the contemporary history of the Archipelago has not been the object of any analysis whatsoever, not even superficial. From the 19th century to the present, nobody in the Canary Islands has been able to escape from adopting a position on this respect. Obviously, it is not an abstract debate, nor have the controversies been over theoretical concepts. In the Islands, debates about race have had, and have, a recurrent central aim: that is, to settle the question of whether or not the Canary population is descended from the original indigenous people. In other words, it is the question of whether there are elements of the indigenous people that have persisted through to the present-day Canary islanders. For those who are not up-to-date on their information with respect to the contemporary history of the islands, this may seem like a hangover from the 19th century debates, but it

is, nevertheless, a subject that has remained very much in vogue almost two centuries after. Exploring the causes of the constant presence of the racial debate in the Canary Islands forms part of a broad research project, the main aim of which is to analyse the components and dynamics of the Canary ethnic identity. What we will show here, inside the historical framework we have traced, is a mere first contact with the question, from the focus of what was produced in anthropology on the subject in the 19th century.

In light of the vast amount of classifications and typologies elaborated to talk about the "races" of the indigenous Canary people in this period, it would be of scarce interest here to go into each of them in detail. Moreover, it would be nothing else but a tedious collection of "variations on the same theme". In its place, we have opted to analyse the main occurrences in this field. But it is only possible to understand the theoretical and methodological reach of raciology in the Archipelago within the greater global framework of physical anthropology.

3.1. The concept of race as an epistemological obstacle

To a great extent, racism was decisive in the 19th century anthropology in denying the crucial role of culture as an explanatory framework of sociocultural similarities and differences. As Harris so rightly pointed out, *"Before the 19th century, no nation had ever rewarded any of its experts for proving that the supremacy of one people over another was*

the inevitable result of the laws of the universe"(1968:69). At present, there are few anthropologists who would support openly racist attitudes. It would seem to be unnecessary, then, to insist upon the insufficiencies of racial perspectives to the task of resolving the set of problems that the academic field is currently facing. Likewise, as professionals, most anthropologists have condemned, or at least manifested against, the different ways that, even now, oppression and exploitation are justified on the basis of "racial" differences. If the results of the meetings called by UNESCO (1961, 1984) to debate the problems of racism are compared, the condemnation is unanimous. However, it is more than clear that the rejection of racism does not imply for many the criticism of the very concept of "race". It is usually said that the existence of human "races" is backed by "scientific evidence" which does not necessarily imply its warped application by governments or peoples. The idea that scientific work is protected against all ideological contamination is a belief that, in many academic circles, enjoys general acknowledgement. In other words, the idea is that scientists are not responsible for the social use of their work. But race and racism, even leaving aside the different varieties of popular racism, have a long parallel history.

In 1684, F. Bernier, a doctor in Montpellier, established the first truly anthropological racial classification when he established five races of humans (white, black, yellow, Lapps and blacks from the Cape also known as bushmen). It took almost half a century after for any serious attempt

to be made to classify the various different human groups according to certain differential morphological features. Linnaeus, in his work *Systema Naturae* (1758), and following the same framework that he had applied to other species in the animal kingdom, established the existence of four different types of races: *Homo americanus*, *homo europaeus*, *homo asiaticus* and *afēr*. He added another hypothetical *homo silvestris* and another race known as *monstruosa* who were not located geographically but rather by anomalies. Linnaeus suspected that the species of one same type had a common origin. Leclerc de Buffon, (also known as Buffon) who followed on with this idea, was to comment that "*there is a general prototype of each species in Nature according to which the individual is modelled, but that may be altered or perfected in the making*". Daubenton (1764) and Camper (1770) designed the method of angles and projections that allowed for exact measurements of the skull to be taken, a method that would later be used by doctors interested in comparative anatomy. In 1785 and 1799, Soemmering and White respectively measured skeletons and live subjects from different races. Blumenbach perfected the detailed report of the descriptive characteristics in a series of publications, the "*Decades craniorum*" (1790-1808) which he was to continue and improve upon until 1828. In 1806, he listed five races: Caucasian, Mongolian, Black (Ethiopian), American and Malayan. According to the author, the other four derived from the first by degeneration.

In the first half of the 19th century, works and publications proliferated with respect to the racial division of the human

race. For example, in 1825, Desmoulins defined 16 races while in 1839, Morton detailed 22 "families" as he called them, both using different morphological criteria. It was in the second half of the 19th century that Broca carried out the first methodological study of the various different races, publishing two reports in 1865 and 1875 where he collected his anthropometric techniques, making France thus into the obligatory gold standard reference for the anthropologists.

Parallel to this activity, the Evolutionist theories began to emerge in Europe. In 1809, Lamarck introduced both transformism and the biological concept of evolution in his "Scientific Philosophy" and Darwin published his "Origin of the Species by Natural Selection" in 1859. Although accepting, in fact, the idea of evolution, there were many anthropologists and intellectuals from other fields who tried to ascertain the origins of Man, with this question revolving around two different poles in the 18th century, both equally reactionary, and that ultimately defended the position of supremacy of some human groups over others. The first of these positions, the monogenist, inspired in the Book of Genesis, accepted the idea that the different groups or races had one common origin in Adam and Eve. The concept made implicit the idea of the determining influence of the medium, capable of transforming the hereditary material and that would shape, over not too long a time, the present characteristics of the different races. John Hunter, who supported this theory, indicated that "*since all blacks are born white and they are so for some time, it is clear that the sun and the air are necessary agents to make their skin*

black" (quoted in Harris, see 1968). The acceptance on the part of the monogenists of the Mosaic chronology, on the one hand, and of the influence of the environment on the hereditary characteristics on the other, led them to consider racial characteristics as relatively recent acquisitions. Thus, the origins of the human species was established around 3,700 BC, according to Rabbi sources, around 5,199 BC according to the Vulgata in the Pope Clement edition, and 4,004 BC, according to the notes of the Archbishop Usher to the authorised version of the King James Bible. In the "Seasons of Nature" by Leclerc de Buffon (1778), the proposal is 6,000 to 8,000 years old, extending geological time to 75,000 years. In the USA, this current was represented by the Reverend Dr. Samuel Stanhope Smith, a professor in Moral Philosophy at Princeton College who in his "Essay on the causes of the variety of complexion and figure in the human species", according to his own words, affirmed that he was "*establishing the unity of the human species*" (quoted in W. Stanton, 1982 [1960]). In England,¹⁶ the monogenist perspective defended previously in Europe by Linnaeus, Buffon and Blumenbach took a stronghold. The English society, with their own peculiar religious history, constituted an excellent breeding ground for these positions, with its most outstanding representatives as James Cowles Prichard and Sir William Lawrence. Prichard (1973 [1813]) in his "Researches into the Physical History of Man" defended that "*We can, with a high degree of probability, extract the inference that all the different races into which the human*

¹⁶ TN The Canary islanders to this day, regardless of the level of education, still tend to refer to the British people indiscriminately as English.

species is divided, originated from one family". And years later, Sir William Lawrence wrote "*the various races of human beings can be seen as varieties of one sole species*" (quoted in Stepan, 1984:2-3).

On the contrary, the polygenists rejected the veracity of Genesis and, in a context of rationalist criticism of the Bible, defended the multiple origins of the human species. However, some polygenists, such as Henry Home (Lord Kames) tried to strike a compromise with Genesis and, like Morton, contemplated the possibility of a divine intervention after Adam that conditioned the division of the races. Thus began a debate on the races that was to extend through to our days and that, according to Littlefield et al. (1982) falls into three phases. In the first, that began in the mid-18th century, the question focused on the sole or multiple origins of the races. In the second, the debate on racial equality replaced monogenism-polygenism. And in the third, finally, in the 20th century, it developed into a question of whether the different races of *Homo Sapiens* could really be identified or not.

The development of science and scientific methodology in the 18th century transformed systematics into one of the main objectives in European science, according to Shapiro (1959:372), favoured by the discovery of a new world with its different flora and fauna, and different human types, and relegating Man to a secondary level, moving him from the centre of Creation and the object of differential study from the rest of living beings, to being considered an integral part of the Animal Kingdom. Linnaeus had already produced a systematic classification of the animal

and vegetable kingdoms, placing Man on the level of the order of Primates. In the same sense, Johann Blumenbach in his "*Generis Humanae Varietate Nativa*" in 1795 (quoted in Herzstein, 1969:113) produced a re-classification of Man into five varieties, using morphological criteria, such as height, colour, hair, body structure and the shape of the skull. Nevertheless, after Leclerc de Buffon, it was still considered that Man was "*the most interesting being of creation*". Towards the end of the century came the first formulation of a theory of racial superiority, by way of response to the pre-revolutionary impulse towards equality in France, used by the nobility as a basis for differentiation between classes, and that, half a century later, would be taken up again by some anthropologists to thus justify their pretension of setting up a republic, led by aristocrats. It is plausible, as Stanton suggested (1960) that the idea of race arose as a defensive ideology when slavery and trade suffered serious attacks towards the end of the 18th century. As Stocking points out (1982), most of the histories of the idea of race have underlined its links to political currents, and to the search for the origins of the Europeans. According to him, "*race*" was the most extended expression with respect to dark-skinned populations, especially to people who were "*black-skinned*" (1982:36). In the 18th century, "*civilisation*" and "*progress*" were seen as parts of the capacity of all men, which led implicitly to everything from the recognition of the primitive peoples through to a positivist evolution. The concept of the "*noble savage*" and the notion of progress co-existed, whereas the idea of civilisation reached all humans and manifested itself in its most developed form in European society. Paraphrasing

Dégerando, Stocking expressly reproduced that idea in the following terms:

"Human nature was basically the same in all times and places and its development was governed by natural laws: Man developed from his first state in a slow, unilinear evolutionary progress, whose eventual aim was perfection, and whose highest manifestation in the present was Western European society" (1982:26).

However, the advances in the knowledge of the physical differences on the one hand, and the state of the post-revolutionary society in the France of the 18th century on the other, radically changed the concepts of human nature, which led Henri de Saint-Simon to write in 1803,

"He knows that the Europeans are sons of Abel; he knows that Asia and Africa are inhabited by the descendants of Cain. He observes how bloodthirsty the Africans are; he notes the violence of the Asians; these impure men have not managed in their first efforts to even come close to my divine forecast. The Europeans will join their forces and will free their Greek brothers and sisters from the domination of the Turks. The founder of the religion will be the Commander-in-Chief of the armies of the faithful. These armies will impose their religions on the descendants of Cain and will build all the necessary works on Earth for the safety of the members of the Counsel of Newton in all the voyages they deem opportune for the progress of the human spirit (1969[1803]).

Saint-Simon, consequent with this thesis, affirmed that the revolutionaries were mistaken in applying "*the principles of equality*" to the blacks since, in spite of receiving education, no black reached the same level as the Europeans (cited in Stocking, 1982:38). Years later, Gobineau would express his horror at the events of 1848 which, for him, represented an expression of the decline of civilisation, making it imperious to discover why a civilisation ever became decadent (quoted in Herzstein 1969:115).

In 1799, Louis François Jauffret founded *La Société des Observateurs de l'Homme* in Paris. Initially, this carried out wide-ranging anthropological studies, including observations on multiple aspects of the different societies (government, religion, customs, culture) that, in a certain way, were subordinated, in practice, to the study of the physical characteristics of Man (Copans et Jamin, 1978). Thus, in the second half of the 19th century, they began to lay the foundations for what was to be physical anthropology. In the long run, the concept of anthropology would end up being identified with the sub-section that was purely physical (Haller, 1971; Bender, 1965). The development of the same was intrinsically linked to the concept of race. In fact, some of the most renowned physical anthropologists of the times, such as P. Broca and A. Quatrefages, can be counted among the followers of Gobineau who identified racial superiority with social class. According to Gobineau, differences could be appreciated in the "*vitality of the peoples*" which led him to affirm that "*there are notable differences in the relative value of the human races*" (Kremer-Marietti, 1984).

His works present no evidence of systematic research, nor can they be placed strictly within the framework of anthropology. Nevertheless, he was to have an immense influence on the methodology of anthropological studies in the 19th century. In the same sense, among the precursors of physical anthropology in the second half of the 19th century, W.F. Edwards must be cited. He concluded that physical characteristics determined the moral nature of a race which, as we noted in the previous chapter, was also the opinion supported by Berthelot.

In 1842, Anders Retzius introduced the concept of the cephalic index and divided people into two groups, in accordance with the shape of their heads: the brachycephalic or short-headed, that would include the Asian peoples, and the dolichocephalic with large heads, where the peoples of Africa were included. However, years would have to pass before Broca systematised his work, and other measurements relating to morphological characteristics, thus giving more decisive impulse to physical anthropology.

In 1859, Broca founded the *Société d'Anthropologie* (Brabook 1980) which would be followed a few years later by other societies with the same name: in London in 1863; New York, St. Petersburg and Moscow in 1865; Manchester in 1866; Florence in 1868; Berlin in 1869; Vienna in 1870; Stockholm and Tbilisi in 1873. Broca's viewpoint was to give the broadest possible extension to the aims of the institution, under the umbrella term "anthropology", thereby studying not only the racial subdivisions of Humankind, but also

natural history. His ultimate aim was to describe the peoples in terms of their physical and cultural characteristics. The *Société* brought an important group of anthropologists together, among whom were Quatrefages, Mortillet, Topinard and others who expressed themselves via the *Bulletins de la Société d'Anthropologie*.

In this period, several journals appeared in France: In 1864, *Les Matériaux pour l'Histoire Primitive et Naturelle de l'Homme* (The Materials for the Primitive and Natural History of Humankind), devoted primarily to Pre-history; in 1872, the *Revue d'Anthropologie* (Anthropology Review) given over to physical anthropology; and, in 1882, *La Revue d' Ethnographie*, devoted to the study of the various different cultures. These three journals were fused in 1890, thus giving rise to *L'Anthropologie*. In 1891, finally, the *Revue Mensuelle de L'École d'Anthropologie* (Monthly Journal of the School of Anthropology), as founded by the School, was to appear. This interest in anthropology was made very clear in a letter from Mortillet in Paris to Chil, dated 20th January, 1876, where after commenting that he had been previously devoted to "medical studies", he said that he had moved on to "sciences in general, above all, anthropology". In that same letter, Mortillet communicated his intention of coming to the Canary Islands to study to his colleague, but his wish was never fulfilled.

Broca and Quatrefages maintained that the study of the races should include broader characteristics than the merely physical, at the same time as they declared that the distinction between two races could be established

from any characteristic, albeit of scant importance, that was heritable and sufficiently stable over various generations (Bender, 1965:142). The physical characteristics were considered to be of most importance since they remained relatively stable, while the cultural features were subject to modifications. In spite of the exhaustive study carried out by Broca, his definition of race was vague and inconclusive, "so that, although he proportioned the necessary elements towards racial definition, he was not sure how these defined it nor did he ever arrive at any conclusion" (Herzstein 1969:117).

Another aspect of great interest in understanding the development of the academic field in this period were the political positions adopted by the "leaders of the pack". Hammond (1980) and Harvey (1984) studied the political and ideological derivations of French anthropology in detail. *La Société d'Anthropologie* was identified with anti-authoritarian and anti-clerical positions that, in fact, were more clearly defended by the group of Mortillet than by the followers of Broca. Mortillet adopted a clearly argumentative attitude, attacking outright autocratic rules, the Jesuits, and the economic power of the bourgeoisie, all of which earned him his exile, to avoid prison. On his return, he entered the *Société d' Anthropologie*, where he defended an evolutionist concept of the cultural and physical development of Man, that was monogenist and unilinear.

As opposed to the French orthodox science represented by Cuvier, "Mortillet defended the mutable nature of the species, eliminated the Divine hand and invoked a clear evolutionary model for Man, stripped of extinctions, but rather through

evolutionary transformations covered with transitions without radical discontinuity" (Hammond, 1980:121). This monogenist and evolutionist concept of Mortillet was opposed to Broca's polygenist perspective. Initially, among the polygenists, there was open hostility towards evolutionism, mainly due to the association between evolution and the unity of Man. However, as Stepan pointed out, for Darwin "*the old debate between monogenism-polygenism is irrelevant to evolution*" (1984:104). So, the disciple of Broca, Paul Topinard fused the ideas of Darwin with Broca's understanding that competition was the law that ruled the universe, and conditioned the survival of the weak on the recognition of the strongest. The extension of this concept to the human species allowed him to establish a hierarchy of different races, equipped, according to him, with inheritable characteristics of a superior or inferior nature, among which cranial capacity was dominant (Herzstein, 1969). However, in spite of the fact that the concept of race, as defended by physical anthropology, lacked a solid scientific basis, its influence on 19th century and early 20th century thinking was to be decisive. Nevertheless, in a broad sense at least, physical anthropology managed to highlight, as H. Shapiro pointed out, that "*Man is an integral part of the animal kingdom, and that, in his organic aspects, is subject to the same laws as control the other forms of organic life*" (1959:371).

This influence would extend, moreover, in a lasting form throughout European thinking. The racist concept, used as part of physical anthropology, offered decisive ideological support for the legitimisation of colonialism. This situation

was to be prolonged through to the mid-20th century when, in the words of Ruffié,

"(...) the world was stupefied to discover to what extremes racist anthropology could go. A little after the conflict, the Second World War, the Old Empires crumbled and the former colonies, now independent, made their entry into the international world (...) human genetics progressed considerably. Racist anthropology, now repudiated on the philosophical level, sank on the scientific level" (Ruffié 1982:335).

In Germany, the idea of racial superiority reached extreme limits in the 1920s and 1940s. Basing themselves on the theories of the French G. Vechor de Lapouge, who had "established" the superiority of the endemic European race, blonde, with blue eyes and dolicocephalic, an ideological current arose that attempted to act out the confirmation of the hypothesis. A set of laws were promulgated in the thirties, ostensibly to protect the purity of the race, at the same time as they promoted the search for Aryan blood outside Germany. *"Truth be told, I intend to search for Germanic blood the world over, to extract it and rob it from wherever I can," said Himmler in 1938* (Ruffié 1982:357). To this very end, they made recourse to methods such as *"first glance racial diagnosis"*, one of whose most "celebrated" representatives was E. Fisher, who was to write in 1942 that *"the moral trends and all the activities of the Bolshevik Jews denote a mentality so monstrous that we can only speak of inferiority, and of beings of a different species to ours."* Some of the conferences given by German anthropologists in France during the Occupation

contained paragraphs of such significance as the following:

"The parallel evolution of political and scientific ideas is no coincidence. It proceeds from an inner need. Basic results for national health have been reached, thanks to the application of modern scientific knowledge. We pay homage here to the work of the French experts such as Broca, Gobineau, Lapouge, Montandon, Topinard and Vallois" (quoted in Ruffié, 1982:353).

However, as far as the scientific domain was concerned, racial theories, in spite of their consolidated acceptance, had at least one systematic opponent at the time. Already, in 1942, A. Montagu criticised the concept of race and, thus, sparked a debate that was to continue through to our days, and that pivoted on the scientific validity of the term. The reflection of this debate in the anthropological literature of our century, however, is not to be particularly noticeable until the 70s, although in the 60s there was already a more receptive attitude towards the criticism of racism (Littlefield et al. 1982). Good proof of this was the enormous controversy created by the article requested of Juan Comas (1961) for publication in *Current Anthropology* that ran under the significant title of "'Scientific racism' again?". Comas gave an exhaustive review of the various racial theories, above all from the 19th and 20th centuries, to conclude that the enormous danger was that "raciology" led almost inevitably to racism. Comas' essay did not go unheeded, especially on account of its criticism of many of the traditional bases of physical anthropology, provoking commentaries from people of such note as T.Dobzhansky, J.B.S. Haldane, Sir J. Huxley and A. Montagu.

However, the various different projects of Montagu in the 40s represented almost a solitary campaign. In 1944, Henri Vallois wrote in "*Les Races Humaines*" (The Human Races) that "...humanity is divided into a certain number of groups that are distinguished by their physical characteristics. These groups are called races (...). They can be defined as natural groups of men who present a set of common hereditary physical characteristics" (Vallois 1972:5). Notwithstanding, in the light of the development of human genetics, the defenders of race began to feel concern for the need to redefine the term. As we shall see, both the study of the polymorphic genes as determining factors in blood groups, and the genetics of the populations invalidated the traditional classification of human species into races on the basis of physical characteristics. This would mean, in the long term, its replacement with a new evolutionist biology of man (Washburn, 1963; Stepan, 1982).

In 1950, William C. Boyd was one of the first to apply the new genetics. He criticised the physical anthropologists for basing their racial classifications on characteristics of an unknown genetic definition. The discovery of the genetics of blood groups was used to define different human groups but Boyd (1951-4) failed in his attempt to make morphological and serological reasons coincide. According to Vallois (1951), this could have been due to the fact that the appearance and distribution of blood groups arose at different stages of human evolution. In this sense, Cavalli-Sforza (1974) used 58 genetic markers and 26 phenotypic measurements to build the diagrams of the

various different human groups. The conclusion seemed to be solid. The resulting phylogenetic trees did not coincide. Progressively, there have been more and more biologists who have indicated the impracticality of this type of study, both towards establishing differences between various human groups and towards determining their origins. Following the same drift, for T. Dobzhansky (1978:85) "*genetic differences between races are relatively secondary*", with social hierarchies independent of the genetic material of their subjects and, thus, not inheritable, only depending on sociocultural factors. Paul Weisz (1975:613) likewise discussed the validity of this type of study: "*Any 'description of race' is, therefore, completely arbitrary*". In spite of these apparently categorical affirmations, neither author ruled out the existence of races: in reality, their reasoning was directed in the sense of the search for criteria that were sufficiently clear to allow for an exact definition of the same. Thus, Dobzhansky was to define 14 human races in 1962 (quoted in Cavalli-Sforza 1981: 682) and, in his opinion,

"(...) humanity, along with many animal and vegetable species, perhaps most of them, are genetically defined into greater races (sub-species), lesser races and local populations of different categories". For Weisz, "some researchers have, in fact, adopted the position that there is no such thing as race (...) Such an extremist position is probably unjustified (...) considering that racial differences exist (...) but the question still remains unanswered of how many and what they are." (1975:613)

The necessary condition for the formation of a race is its

genetic isolation with respect to the other elements of its species. This isolation will favour the genetic divergence produced by derivations and natural selection, augmenting the genetic differences between groups. This difference in genetic frequencies has been used to characterise a race. But its applications to the human species turned out to be inoperative. As Cavalli-Sforza showed, "(...) *most of the human populations present a local variation sufficient for each city to be considered a race, if the previous definition is not modified.*" (1981:685).

That human populations are not very different from one another genetically, and that the differences between distinct populations are fundamentally sociocultural, is a position supported by human genetics. It would seem clear, in brief, that culture plays a much more efficient and rapid adaptative role than biological adaptation. In the words of Ruffié, "*the genetics of populations show that the structure of humanity is populational and not racial, and the origin of this present absence of racion is very clear: it corresponds to the non-specialisation of Man and obeys the same causes.*"(1982:315). In other words, the human species is the most ubiquitous and the least specialised. Or as E. Mayr wrote, "*to say it in other words, Man is specialised in lack of specialisation (...) in culture, which means the possibility of avoiding any organic specialisation.*" (Ruffié 1982:319).

At this level of the debate ,and once we have established the decisive role of sociocultural factors in human inequality, the concept of "race" loses all its meaning. However, in the last few years, the sociobiologists, who have made

this concept their own, have also indicated the possibility that the sociocultural characteristics of human groups are genetically defined. Wilson (1980), for example, drew attention to the environmentalist theory that maintained the inexistence of genetic variation in the transmission of culture, to suggest further on that "*the variation in rules between human cultures, in spite of being slight, could offer clues with respect to the basic genetic differences, particularly when correlated with the variation of physical features known to be inheritable*" (see Wilson, 1980: 567). From our point of view, the inheritability of cultural potential which is upheld by the sociobiologists, could offer a way out for a renewed biological reductionism.

The "*new synthesis*" of Wilson aspired to incorporate social sciences into Neo-Darwinist theory, structuring its fundamentals on biology. What sociobiology really tries to explain is social behaviour, and it attempts to foresee the characteristics of social organisation on the basis of the conditioning genetic factors of each species. Sociobiologists believe that "*scales of conduct*", selected genetically, define a hypothetical balance sheet of profit and loss, orientated towards reproductive success (Wilson, 1980; Van de Berghe, 1981). However, by postulating a hypothetical human biogram, this stands in the way of coherent explanation of changes in the sociocultural inventories and accounting for human social behaviour (see Harris, 1976). Then again, as the late great M. Sacristán would say, despite what this hypothetical genetic definition allows, such as, in fact, different and even incompatible

morals, sociobiology cannot explain "*these little differences that are precisely the ones that open up the field of categories in the social sciences.*" (1981:27).

In this context, we are in better conditions to analyse the development of raciology in the history of Canary anthropology. In attempting to shake free of a sterile descriptive framework, its analysis must be carried out within this evolution of the raciological and physical anthropological research strategy that has existed for almost two centuries, and of which we have only traced a brief synopsis here. In any case, we need to rewind to the period of the Enlightenment to find a basis from which to depart.

3.2. Race and racism in the Canary anthropology of the 18th century

The Canary researchers of the Enlightenment, following the theoretical concerns of their European Masters, had no special interest in race. That does not mean, however, that the subject did not figure on their intellectual horizon. The problem of human variability clearly occupies a central place in philosophical speculation and scientific activity throughout the 19th century. There was, nevertheless, a first-order qualitative difference between the way that the enlightened intellectuals tried to resolve said question, and the way in which the same was broached in the 19th century. In this kind of "radical ecology" as Harris (1968) called the period of the Enlightenment, sociocultural theories tended

to consider finite factors of similarities and differences in the various human societies as deriving from the environment. The conquests and advances of the Enlightenment, that characterised the progress of Humanity towards the empire of reason, in the opinion of the enlightened intellectuals, depended basically on acculturative processes. Their faith that, through education, any individual and, by extension, society could elevate itself progressively from misery and obscurantism made the scales of nature-culture always incline towards the latter.

Inevitably, we must refer again to Viera to find some of the keys to how the racial theme was treated in the Canary Enlightenment. It was not within the theoretical framework of Viera to explain sociocultural differences on the basis of racial characteristics. It is significant, in this sense, the rare number of occasions upon which he dealt with the subject. When he did so, it was highly summarily before moving on immediately to other aspects more related to "uses and customs". Thus, when broaching the subject of the origins of the indigenous Canary islanders in Book II of "*Noticias*", he limited himself to some brief comments with respect to what had been described by other historians before him, with respect to the islands. "*The early islanders, in general, were endowed with commendable physiognomies*" (Cioranescu on Viera, 1967, I: 126). This was followed by a quick portrait of the inhabitants of the different islands. "*The original inhabitants of Gran Canaria seemed to be handsome, full of noble spirit and solid warriors*"; in Lanzarote, however, Viera remarked in comments to Bontier and Le Verrier, the

women over time became ugly because of their engorged, sagging lower lips that were the result of their lacking "*milk in their breasts and (so they) fed the newborn milk from their lips, letting them suck upon them*". The natives of El Hierro and La Gomera were "*medium-build but strong, agile and lively*", whereas the inhabitants of Fuerteventura were "*tall and extremely courageous*". The inhabitants of La Palma "*although perhaps stronger are said to be less courageous*".

The critical attitude of Viera could also be seen here because although he admitted the descriptions of the previous historians, he countered the belief of the gigantic stature attributed to the Guanches, "*when talking about colossal men of this type, we can be sure there is a great deal of exaggeration*". In any case, Viera made recourse to Leclerc de Buffon to settle the question. He cited the General and Specific Natural History (*Histoire Naturelle Générale et Particulière*) and indicated that the indigenous people were not black, but that all the voyagers commended them as well-built, tall and strong, above all the women who were described as beautiful and with heads full of very fine hair (*ibid.*,127).

This is all that Viera highlighted with respect to the physical characteristics of the indigenous peoples of the Canary Islands. His interest was focused on other aspects of the Canary natives. He was more interested in their politics and religion, but also in their way of dressing, their food and their dwelling-places (...)(*sic*). In this context, his visions of the burials and mummification processes was equally significant. For Viera, "*there is nothing perhaps so interesting*

in the history of our indigenous peoples as the extraordinary care that they took in honouring the memory of their dead, and preserving their corpses from corruption" (ibid., 1:72). This was not a personal fascination on the part of Viera, as Diego Cuscoy (1975) has pointed out, but rather formed a constant in all the 18th century authors, much in line with the obsession with the skull that would characterise the following century. The mummy was not seen as a means whereby to determine the morphological characteristics of the indigenous peoples, but rather, and above all, as an expression of their religious beliefs and moral disposition. Then again, the historian seemed determined to attribute a decisive importance to the context and to the customs: "*the Canary islanders owed their strong constitutions and good health not only to the simple and natural way in which they lived, but also to their scarce use of medicines.*" (1967, 1:177).

Nevertheless, in spite of these scant references, there are passages in other works of Viera's that made explicit allusion to the subject of race, that are all the more interesting in that they were established in a comparative context. It is worth studying his perspective on the "Moors" and the American Indians. The images when compared with those of the indigenous Canary islanders, the latter of which coincide with the stereotyped perspective of Viera as the defender of the noble savage, paint a slightly less idyllic picture of Viera, in that they reveal blatant signs of racism. Not only did some of the conquerors pursue the islanders "*mercilessly as if they were Moors*" but from the Canary Islands, he commented, would set sail the worst enemies of the "*miserable nations*

established on this side of the Mount Atlantis" (ibid.,1: 599). On recognising the rights of the Crown of Castile over the coasts of West Africa (*Berberia*), Viera bestowed elaborate praise and showed admiration for the "*memorable attacks*" of Sancho de Herrero The Elder on these African regions. He was even more explicit when referring to the American Indians. To dignify the Canary history, Viera made recourse to the comparison between the Spanish conquests of Mexico and Peru with Gran Canaria. He found similitudes but, nevertheless, he said they were very different on account of "*the nature of the countries and the character of the nations*". Mexico and Peru, commented Viera, were two vast and opulent empires. Gran Canaria, on the contrary, was a small island. And yet, "*the Indians were a lineage of effeminate men, weak and lazy, who feared and adored the Europeans and their horses as if they were Gods: the Canary islanders were robust, hardened, courageous, incapable of fear, inclined to war and despised their enemies with all their might*" (*ibid.*:1:539). This categorical affirmation was not only a way of overvaluing the Canary islanders, but also remitted to theories defended by the French enlightened scholars to whom Viera owed a great deal. Cornelius de Paw, for example, defended in his "*Récherches sur les Américains*" (Research into the Americans) that,

"if we reflect upon the way in which the Spanish conquest of the Western Indies was carried out, we must agree that the American Indians, divided and forming factions, were not equipped to resist the Spaniards, with their wooden arms and undisciplined

armies; but it is no less certain that these armies were made up of extremely cowardly and incredibly indolent men, a fact that can only plausibly be attributed to the degeneration of the human species in that part of the world" (quoted in Duchet, 1975:176).

Moreover, the image of the American Indians as degenerate in stature and plagued with "*radical vice*" was also, as Duchet indicates, the opinion voiced by Leclerc de Buffon and Raynal, authors, above all the former, who had direct influence on the thinking of Viera. From this, we can deduce that the Canary islanders, according to Viera, were superior to the American Indians, and that the deeds of their conquerors were greater than those carried out by the troops that submitted the American Indians. But the "*sad fate*" of the Canary islanders was compensated by their assimilation into the "true religion". Therefore, Viera took from Buffon the idea that the kindness, good example, charity and exercise of virtue constantly practised by the missionaries, had formed more men in these savage nations than had the conquering armies: A world, the world of the savage, that the enlightened scholars saw as irretrievably lost (Viera, as we explained in the previous chapter, lamented the extinction of the Guanche nation) and that could only be retrieved in the memory of anthropological discourse. As far as the rest was concerned, the redemption of these peoples could only be accomplished if they entered into civilisation. However, as so rightly pointed out by Duchet, this was only a solution that signified a change to bourgeois humanism through the formation of a new colonial ideology.

In any case, the racism in the colonial ideology of the

enlightened was to persist throughout the century, always on a secondary level, with the forefront occupied by climatic and cultural factors. Another proof of this is to be found in George Glas. In his "Description of the Canary Islands" in 1764, and basing his opinions on Montesquieu, he wrote "*that he was very precise when he spoke of the effect that the air and climate have on the temperament and unique nature of the inhabitants of the different countries*" (Spanish translation 1976:117), and described the native islanders of the Canaries of his times as "*serious, extremely alert and sensitive, as is common in all the countries of North Africa and, in general, in places with temperate climates*".

3.3. One skull, two skulls...thousands of skulls. The Canary Islands, one big atavic necropolis

As opposed to this "radical ecology", the late 19th century Canary anthropologists developed a research strategy that ordered anthropological knowledge through raciation sequences. Insomuch as their work was inscribed within the coordinates traced by the French masters, the exact same story that G. Stocking (1982,1984) told with respect to Broca and the *Société d'Anthropologie de Paris* can be applied to the Canary researchers. "*For several decades, French anthropology became, in the first instance, physical anthropology and, archetypically, racial craniology*" (1982:40).

Although this was the case, some of the first works of Berthelot from the early 19th century marked a clear

precedent. Already in his "Ethnography", Berthelot carried out a first comparative examination of the skulls of the indigenous Canary islanders, found in funeral caves in Tenerife. The craniological study, although important, was not enough according to Berthelot to solve some of the pivotal questions for ethnology: it was only useful towards defining the typical "primordial" characteristics. In other words, *"the development, the prominence or the indentation of the surface of the skull, the protuberances and the relative distance between the facial bones, all of these could serve as little more than guides to us in distinguishing the race or the variety of race"* (1978:170). But Berthelot was also concerned with researching "national types", the "*facies*" or features that neither individual differences or foreign alliances could erase. For lack of Mendel's insight as yet, he felt fascinated. Nephews were seen to look similar to a great-uncle on the grandfather's side that did not even resemble his own brothers. Not only that but, frequently, features could be reproduced several generations later. There were no explanations to be found for this, and *"reason must confess its impotence when trying to explain the causes of these mysterious reproductions"*. As we know, the history of Mendelian theory is one of the most conspicuous in the history of the sciences. It was first proposed in the 1850s but went totally unperceived until the end of the century.

We analysed the complete turnaround and reverse of the indigenous peoples when Berthelot introduced the racial theory of Edwards. If, in the "Ethnography" the racial continuity was presupposed by extrapolating on the

basis of the portrait of the population at the time, some years later this hypothesis was to be taken to its ultimate consequences. After the Conquest, victors and vanquished formed a new people, but it was easy to determine their respective origins. One of Berthelot's works from 1879 on the physiology of the Guanches bore a bold subtitle: "*On the persistence of the characteristics that still distinguish between the present populations of the islands of the Canary Archipelago*".

"When we examine closely the present population of this Canary Archipelago that was inhabited in other times by African tribes, whose customs we have described on other occasions, we can see national characteristics in a large number of people that, in their features, essentially set them apart from the Spaniards." (1879:130).

In his famous "*Antigüedades Canarias*" (Canary Antiquities) (1980 [1879]), Berthelot was to broaden his data in support of this position, without substantial theoretical variations. His theory according to which the population of his times still maintained, under the substrate, native racial features, thus became the scientific "truth" most unanimously upheld by the Canary anthropologists. And, if for the enlightened researchers, "*in the beginning of the world, there were Americans*" (Meek, 1981), as of 1868 (after Lartet made the discovery in the Dordogne), the Cro-Magnon was to become our first main ancestor. The vast project of the French anthropologists, such as Quatrefages, Hamy and Broca, to study the scatter of distribution of the Cro-Magnon

"*in space and time*" had one immediate practical result. In 1871, Broca carried out a comparative examination of skulls from the Dordogne and the Canary Islands, and established significant similarities between the two. The first comparative studies were based on a significantly scant volume of material. It is worthwhile to reproduce the content of the crates that *Berthelot* sent to Quatrefages in 1877.

"One skull similar to those commonly found in the funeral caves...another with a large scar wound ... another partly mummified skull, two mummified legs...a skull extracted from a burial mound (Gran Canaria)...three skulls from the cave (Hierro)... and various other ancient objects" (1980:129).

In spite of this, as Diego Cuscoy has pointed out (1975), due to the fact that the skulls were taken from different islands, the coincidences with the Cro-Magnon did not seem so clear, thus triggering the "'Scientific Mission' of Verneau" to the Canary Islands. His results were published in an extensive number of works (1878, 1882a, 1882b, 1885, 1886, 1887, 1891, 1926). However, among these works, the "*Rapport*" (1885) and his "Five Years' Stay in the Canary Islands" (1981[1891]) are the most outstanding. This "evidence" and later research constituted, in the opinion of Diego Cuscoy, "*the entry of the Canary Islands into the history of anthropology with a personality all of their own*" (1975:275).

We owe to Diego Cuscoy himself (1975) the patient reconstruction of the tangled web of authors, dates,

classifications and typologies that, as of then, began to appear through to the present. Without any doubt, the systematic manner in which he explained the volume of material that the task entailed, constitutes one of the most important contributions of Diego Cuscoy to the history of Canary anthropology. It saves us, moreover, from reproducing here the "long and winding road" of Canary raciology. For our part, we also began that tedious task, attending to the type and provenance of the material studied, the anatomical description and racial typologies, but here we will not go into that subject. What is most important here is to highlight to what extent the raciology strategy was based on an empirical foundation of a very unequal nature, and how it extrapolated upon its results. This revision (that we do not recommend anyone approaching without a healthy dose of patience) reveals more than a little noteworthy chaos, but is a perfect illustration of the insufficiencies derived from using race as the most relevant heuristic principle. One only has to analyse some of these works, following type and provenance of the material studies, the anatomical description and the conclusions reached, to realise as much.

V. Grau-Bassas took 125 skulls, 26 of which were feminine, from the Museo Canario collection for his "Data for the study of the *Guanche*-Canary skulls" (1880:283-288). According to his observations, the skulls were either elongated dolichocephalic, less elongated subdolichocephalic, medium mesaticephalic, round brachycephalic or broad subbrachycephalic. The heads of the women were

particularly outstanding on account of their prognathism and elongation, as well as on account of their greater sphenoidal angle. Other aspects suggested to him that there was a great similarity between the female skull and the child's, a similarity of great "scientific" importance for Grau- Bassas, to the extent that in "*populations (that) are more civilised, the man has a larger skull capacity than the woman, whereas in less civilised peoples, the woman's skull is larger than the man's*". The conclusion, then, with respect to the indigenous Canary islanders would seem clear: "*the Guanche skulls show that women before the conquest must have occupied a distinguished place as endowed with greater intelligence than the men*".

The temporal styloid process was another relevant concern of the physical anthropologists. Chil was to talk about it when discussing a sample of skulls of the indigenous people of Gran Canaria (Chil, 1880) which is worth comparing with another study of his, referring to Tenerife (Chil, 1880). The sample he worked with for the Tenerife study was ample, over four hundred skulls, from the *Museo Antropológico de Santa Cruz de Tenerife*, but he did not offer data with respect to those of Gran Canaria. According to Chil, the skulls of the indigenous people of Tenerife were all dolichocephalic, which situated them among the "prehistoric races", the Neanderthals and the Cro-Magnon. Then again, the similitude between the skulls of Tenerife and those of the "Guanches" of Gran Canaria revealed a "*remote precedence*" of the Paleolithic and Neolithic periods. Finally, and as a result of what was outlined in the previous chapter for Chil,

the tall stature of the Guanches, their strong muscles and, in general, the whole of their anatomical characteristics "*offer a configuration found in a race that lived in Europe thousands of years ago*".

R. Verneau was the researcher that worked in greatest depth on the anthropological material available in his times. One of his most representative pieces of work, "Plurality of races in the Canary Archipelago" (1882) is significant, both on account of the establishment of a racial typology that would be amply accepted, although with variants (see Diego Cuscoy, 1975), and for its conclusions with respect to the settlement of the islands. The study was mainly carried out on over fifty skulls from the Barranco de Guayadeque in Santa Lucía and San Bartolomé de Tirajana in Gran Canaria, and forty from the island of El Hierro. Thus, after a detailed anatomical description, the most relevant conclusions that Verneau could reach consisted in the concomitance of the anatomical characteristics and the ethnographic features, which supported his hypothesis of the existence of different races in the Archipelago before the Conquest, at the same time as data suggesting a Semitic-based settlement. Schematically speaking, these races would be the Guanches, the Berbers and the Semites.

But, logically, the anatomical descriptions and typologies did not express, with sufficient clarity, the total lack of capacity on the part of our first anthropologists to explain the indigenous culture and society. The racial craniology, converted into the "*summum bonum*" of the research, also brought with it manifest racism. For Chil,

for example, the fact that Negroes had an "*extremely low level of civilisation*" was the inevitable result of their weak encephalic development in a skull of reduced dimensions. Then again, V. Grau-Bassas was firmly convinced that the skull of a woman was inferior in size to that of the man in civilised societies (similar to that of a child), whereas in the primitive societies, the skulls of the women were larger in dimension than their male counterparts. "*This is all the more noticeable the lower their position on the scale of perfection*". Likewise, Grau-Bassas considered that the cranial capacity increased with the perfection of the race, in such a way that it was evident that "*the European man is higher than his female counterpart or than that of the Negro with respect to his*" (1880:286).

However, together with the obsession with anatomical description and the elaboration of typologies, our anthropologists had, likewise, another potent reason for clinging to their raciological strategy. Insofar as one of the aims consisted in building a "*national history*" (for the Archipelago) that would show the continuity between the indigenous past and the present (then) European reality, and for lack of a sociocultural theory that would explain the acculturative processes after the Conquest, systematic recourse was made to "*racial survival*". To put it briefly, anatomy was the destiny and race its best definition.

We have followed the track of this "cranial obsession" of theirs, through the journal, *El Museo Canario*. Collection of bones became the principle goal of all the researchers in the Museum as is clearly shown in the countless articles

and reports, owed to, among others, Chil (1880, 1880, 1882, 1899), GrauBassas (1880, 1880a) and the myriad reports of the Secretary, Amaranto Martínez de Escobar on advances in research in the Museum. In this sense, we can say that "*the nostalgia for the past*" (Abeles, 1980) or the desire to fuse "*the past and present in the present*" (Bloch, 1981) was the fundamental basis on which the Museum was founded. But this, moreover, also meant the initiation of the first fieldwork carried out with a certain degree of systematics in the Canary Islands (Galván, 1987). Among the main initiators were Bethencourt Alfonso in Tenerife (Fariña, 1983) and GrauBassas (see Alzola, 1980) in Gran Canaria, and physical anthropology was mixed with archaeology, ethnography and folklore. The theoretical web that this produced obviously requires an analysis that can only be broached now from an interdisciplinary perspective

The Guanche that Viera had buried with a nostalgic epitaph came back to life thanks to anatomy. The island isolation had preserved the genuine characteristics of the indigenous peoples and these,

"...nowadays, four hundred years after the Conquest and in spite of mixes with European and African races, even now these show us the evidence that confirms the opinion voiced some time back by our respectable friend, the wise and venerable old Mr. Sabino Bertholet (sic), that the basis of our present population in Tenerife is Guanche, as opposed to general belief, and that this can be shown through comparative craniometric studies between the skulls in our cemeteries and

those found in the funeral caves of the Guanches
(Bethencourt Alfonso, 1880:68).

The cultural features that survived, as observed in our countryfolk, continued Bethencourt Alfonso, expressed, in spite of that "*type of absorption*" by the conquering race that, in Tenerife, there was "*more of the Guanche than of the Spaniard*". This, nevertheless, did not impede the Tenerife doctor from saying, years later, in 1901, as we previously mentioned, that he believed that the "*Guanchesque ancestry*" was, in the end, rather "Iberian Celt", that is, a member of the "*population base*" of Spain. But Bethencourt Alfonso acknowledged that "*it can almost be said, to date, that no important study has been published*" apart from by Hamy and Quatrefages where "*the ethnic element of the "Guanche" people can be shown to be (...) that of the Quaternary fossil race of Cro-Magnon*" (*ibid.*). All of the Tenerife doctor's published work, nevertheless, although primarily devoted to studies of folklore, was based on that fundamental premise. Inasmuch as it remains unpublished, it is worth reproducing some passages from a letter of Bethencourt Alfonso's, dated the 18th August 1879, in Santa Cruz de Tenerife.

"You ask me if I know the origin of the Guanches.

Nothing for me is so difficult as this part of speculative anthropology, since the antecedents that could be used as a basis for rational deductions, I hold to be commendable.

The Guanches of Tenerife, with their leather pouches for their "gofio" and their clay beads, identical to those found in the dolmen of l'Ardèche, to those of Lorraine and others; with their hand-mills, small obsidian knives, rough or refined garrots, and ceramic objects that are testimony to an almost nascent industry: troglodytes in natural caves, unmodified by the hand of man, and dressed in skins, tanned to a greater or lesser degree, fed with the milk and meat of goats and sheep, with the "gofio" of the corn and malt that they could grow by tilling their land with a stick and a horn, and on seafood and fish, acquired by poisoning the waters or with horn hooks; these Guanches, I repeat, would seem to reveal in their simple lives and their existence as shepherds and herdsmen, the life that undoubtedly must have been lived by the peoples of the most ancient of races.

These men with such primitive lifestyles had a kind of moral code, reflected in their customs, that implies an idea of great civilisation, such as is not to be found in any other society of such scant progress and little culture.

So, was Tenerife inhabited by one sole race in other times?

Hamy and Catrefages (sic) affirm that the Guanches have characteristics that correspond to the fossil race of the Cro-Magnon; and the truth is, apart from the exactitude of these two wise men, to date there is

nothing that justifies that Tenerife was populated by more than one race; almost the same could be said of La Gomera and Hierro.

With respect to Gran Canaria, although I have seen skulls identical to those in Tenerife, I have also seen skulls of the Semitic race (as they were classified, I think, for the first time by Berthelot), that were probably those taken from the burial mounds on La Isleta. I have had no luck in finding one sole example but you who will have, undoubtedly, been more favoured by fortune would do me a singular favour were you to tell me if, in said burial mounds, there were only skulls of pure Semitic race to be found; if it were not so, and if skulls the same as those of the Guanches were found, not only would this surprise me, but I would not know what to think. I believe it to be of so much more interest should we be able to compare them with the ones I am awaiting from the burial mounds that, according to what they tell me, exist in Fuerteventura and Gomera, news that if certain would discredit the idea of the unity of the race that, in my humble opinion, I believed to exist on the latter island, since to date I believed that the race that embalmed (the Guanches) was not the race that raised megalithic monuments in our Archipelago, nor was it the race that master crafted the openings of the caves of Cuevas de Constanzas, or the others that founded the city of the Majanos in Telde; that made the beautiful cloths woven with reeds and palms, that hewed stone artistically; the race that

raised the ceramic industry to a high level; the race that, in a word, gave impulse to the civilisation of Gran Canaria, unknown in Tenerife and La Gomera".

Chil y Naranjo likewise assumed this thesis in all of its dimensions: For Chil, anthropology, as an auxiliary science of history (1880a) led to results that totally dismantled the "sad role" of the genealogists.

"So it is that in spite of finding all the chroniclers affirming the destruction of this people by arms and other means employed by the conquerors, to the extent of the primitive race having disappeared, being removed from the face of the earth, in spite of this fact, anthropology, with the truth of its justifying evidence, has shown us¹⁷ the contrary; since it is a fact that the primitive race did not disappear entirely and still survives in the Canary Islands, as it still reigns in the countries of America where they went to set up residence and where the distinctive characteristics of the indigenous race of these islands are preserved" (1882:290).

Years later in 1890, Chil y Naranjo was to pronounce the following words on the occasion of the tenth anniversary of the *Museo Canario*:

"Anthropology has proven that the present population

17 TN. In the original, there was a "no" before the verb that, after consultation with expert colleagues in both anthropology and Spanish, has been left out of the translation in the sake of congruence, treated as a possible misprint, either already present in the original or in its transcription.

of the Canary Islands is made up, almost in its entirety, of indigenous elements, although those who practise genealogy believe the contrary. The war did not wipe them out entirely (...) and the race continued with these elements of their origins".

For the founder of the Canary Museum, transformation of the sociocultural system depended upon the evolution of the various different races. Thus, the difference between the colonialism as practised by the English, French and Spanish, was not to be explained in terms of different historical and economic conditioning factors`

"(...) but rather in function of how the dominating elements of their "guiding spirits" mixed with the populations they had vanquished. Thus, the English imposed their language and took their trading and industrial spirit and their pastors; the French took their science, their literature of good taste (...) and their priests; and the Spaniards imposed their language, took their priests, some literature, some science and a great deal of their "tempestuous temperament".

For Chil, then, these "*peculiar characteristics*" of each country could be deduced "*mathematically*" insomuch as the English, French and Spanish recurrently did the same things wherever they went. Manifestations in this sense were more than frequent among our first anthropologists and require no greater comment.

We have already seen that it was/is practically impossible

to use the concept of race without falling, almost inevitably, into formulations of racism. Chil, for example, was inclined, like Broca, towards the belief that "savage" populations had no history, but that it was possible to reconstruct their physical past thanks to anatomical study. If we went down the human scale, said Chil, we would even find some that *"to date, are not capable of recognising civilisation"* like the natives of Australia, the Tasmanians, some of the *"negroes in Africa"* and the *"redskins"* in America. And when asked about the disappearance of the native people in Cuba or Santo Domingo, the reply was precise:

"Races are more or less perfect, they show more or less aptitudes and those that possess less conditions to live in the presence of others that supplant them, disappear, since the new race is more suited to the conditions that surround them" (1880:247)

Insomuch as the Guanches survived the Conquest, it is to be supposed that they belonged to a race sufficiently vigorous and potentially capable of incorporating into civilisation. It is true that it was a commendable aim on the part of our first anthropologists to dignify the place of the Guanches in history, but the price they had to pay for it consisted in despising a large part of humanity.

Under this common denominator, all Canary anthropology juggled with its interpretation of the indigenous culture, trying to explain *"the ethnic complexity"* of the Islands. But, in light of what have been the results, and comparing them with the historical development of physical and

cultural anthropology, there is nothing left of the building they made but the ruins of a research strategy that was always incapable of explaining, explaining to us, that is, what we were like then and now. Perhaps what is most to be lamented, when looking back now on the history of Canary anthropology, would be that the raciology that was inaugurated in the 19th century has continued to be the dominant focus among us. In the Canary Islands, there was no Boas at that time to evidence the lack of viability of raciology to comprehend a culture, and who would recover the theoretical importance of the processes of acculturation. Although we had Malinowski in the 20s, he found no-one he could convince of the importance of systematic fieldwork in anthropological research. Diego Cuscoy (in press at the time of writing) carried out research on the time spent by Malinowski in Tenerife. As is well known, Malinowski resided in *El Boquín* (Icod de los Vinos) only for a time, to prepare his manuscript of "Argonauts of the Western Pacific". Probably, he found nobody to convince. Ten years later, Fischer (1926,1949) stopped off a while at the Canary Islands, still on the tracks of the Aryans. And, in the 50s, Schwidetzky followed them from a car (the speed of the buses, he claimed, was vertiginous), "*tallying counts along the way*".

"The Cromagnoid characteristics and physiognomies draw the attention of the anthropological observer, and Tenerife affords enthusiastic delights at each turn, with excellent representatives of this type" (1956:22).

It would have seemed to him a pity that, of the fifty owners

of stalls in the market in Santa Cruz de Tenerife, there was "*scarcely one Cromagnid*" but, of the twenty-one males he saw in Santiago de Teide, "*seven were very good Cromagnids*". But this "ancient European-like" fascination of raciology, and its racism, represents nothing more than the frustration of a science of human culture and society.

However, our anthropologists of the past century waged at least one battle to research the Islands' past within scientific coordinates. The fact that they did not fully succeed perhaps did not depend so much on themselves, as on the epistemological, social and historical obstacles of their times. The aspiration to an anthropology that would integrate culture into the broad framework of evolution, considering it in relation to the organic and inorganic world, and attempting to explain sociocultural phenomena without appealing to "metaphysical essences" was certainly not to be fulfilled. However, this failed attempt, seen from our present perspective, represents its greatest contribution. The fact that the history of Canary anthropology has paid no attention to this aspect of the work of the Canary anthropologists reveals both the insufficiencies of the methodology deployed to broach the problems of relevance to the academic field, and a substantially significant ideological bias. Let us see, then, the reasons for this failure which, at the end of the story, is also ours.

4. CULTURE AND EVOLUTION: A FRUSTRATED THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK FOR CANARY ANTHROPOLOGY

"The ecclesiastical circular announcing the censorship by the Church of the Historia de las Canarias by Dr. D. Gregorio Chil has been emitted, given that the first instalments of the work display the most absolute materialism, condensing all the aberrations currently in fashion with respect to the origins of Man, 'according to Science'" . El Gólgota (1876)

"I am firmly convinced that not only will the science of the 20th century accept in general lines our transformist doctrine, but that it will also consider it the most important conquest of the spirit of our times". E. Haeckel (1898)

In the Canary Islands, the reception of the evolutionist theories marked a turning-point of great significance in the consolidation of anthropological studies. Seen from the general perspective of the history of the academic field, this represented no novelty. As of 1860, evolutionism had become a dominant research strategy in all anthropological circles. However, it is noteworthy how fast evolutionist perspectives were assimilated in the Islands, and the circumstances surrounding that development. In this chapter, we shall try to show the relevance of evolutionism as one of the major "*themas*" of the Canary anthropology in the last third of the 19th century. As we shall see, this not only affected the anthropological problem, but also had social and ideological derivations, vital to a full understanding of the reach of scientifism during this period. Together with indigenism and race, evolution shared the major part of the theoretical concerns of our anthropologists. But, as opposed to indigenism and race, the subject of evolution, although explicit in the island anthropological literature, has been minimised in importance when not simply ignored, and whereas the problem of the indigenous peoples, in their more or less mystified dimensions as domestic representatives of the "noble savage" or as the incarnation of a "race" debating between extinction and survival, has filled the pages of discourse of Canary anthropology over the last two centuries, the evolutionist focus has remained in a closed theoretical parenthesis. We believe that this "oversight" of the evolutionist component in the Canary sociocultural studies obeyed extra-scientific reasons. The continued trend towards ideographic perspectives in the

present 20th century, together with political and ideological pressures in favour of a "non-materialist science" more in line with Christian precepts, frustrated the consolidation of a scientific focus in our anthropology.

Illustrative in this sense is the fact that there is no monographic work on the question in the Canary historiography. The period of the last third of the 19th century in island anthropology is associated with positivist anthropology but has avoided any deep analysis of what it meant to try to broach the indigenous and present-day Canary culture and society scientifically at that time. We saw in the first chapter, when we analysed the historiographical studies of Canary anthropology, how the two most relevant works, "Notes" by Diego Cuscoy (1975) and "The Studies" by Pérez Vidal dealt very superficially with the question of evolutionism. That is all the more significant in that both authors, ideologically, were associated with liberal stances (Galván, 1987). With respect to other matters, the controversy around Darwinism in the Canary Islands has usually been reduced to its most anecdotal components, such as the ecclesiastical condemnation of Chil y Naranjo and how it was impossible for him to get married in Las Palmas (Bosch Millares, 1971). We have found that Millares Cantero (1975) alone among the Canary researchers gave a more rigorous analysis, wherein he reviewed the sociopolitical context and its influence on the controversy, together with a study of the general island intellectual movements of the times. However, we continue to lack studies where the theoretical hypotheses under debate

were dealt with in depth. The work of a science historian, Th. Glick who specialised in the spread of Darwinism in Spain and Latin America, affords us, as far as we know, the only information with respect to the scarce attempts to follow Darwinism in the Canary Islands. His work, "Darwin in Spain" is especially relevant in this respect (1982).

In the previous passages, we have used the terms "evolutionism" and "Darwinism" indistinctly. Doubtless, this requires some clarification. In general, evolutionism is usually associated with the theories elaborated by Darwin. However, as various different historians have shown, the ingredients for the generalised acceptance of evolutionism had already been set in place before Darwin succeeded in offering an overall coherent synthesis of the same. In the case of anthropology, J.W. Burrow (1963, 1966) has shown how "*anthropology was evolutionist in its orientation even before the publication of "The Origin of the Species"*" (Burrow 1963:140), and signals that some of the main works on evolutionist anthropology were prepared before 1859, among others "Ancient Law" by H. Maine, published in 1861, but based on texts produced before 1850; or "Primitive Marriage" by J.F. McLennan that appeared in 1865 and was probably more influenced by "Ancient Law" than by the "Origin of the Species"; and besides, "*Das Mutterrecht*" from 1861, in fact a series of lectures by J. Bachofen that dated originally from 1856 (in Harris, see 1968). Even though, it is unquestionable that the contribution of Darwin represented the definite support for the evolutionist theories in the fields of biology and sociocultural development. We will

not attempt here to examine the conditions that allowed for the quick success of the Darwinian synthesis, but it would not be possible to study evolutionism in the Canary Islands without having some minimum general theoretical coordinates in place. We have opted, nevertheless, to use them within the context of Canary anthropology, avoiding all presentation of a general introduction that, moreover, can easily be found elsewhere. Thus, though evolutionism and Darwinism in the strictest senses should not be confused, at least insofar as the history of ideas is concerned, it is no less certain that, in many places, as of the publication of the work of Darwin, both terms were not only used indistinctly but also globally made reference to the same theoretical problem. We shall use these two terms always as synonyms whenever there is no need for greater precision or clarification of analysis.

The publication of the "*Estudios históricos, climatológicos y patológicos de la Islas Canarias*" (Historical, climatological and pathological studies of the Canary Islands) by Gregorio Chil y Naranjo in 1876, and the condemnation of the same by the Bishop José María de Urquinaona y Bidot, triggered a fierce controversy between those who supported and those who rejected evolutionism. However, to reduce this controversy to its mere journalistic dimension, or to limit oneself to describing it as a "*heroic battle of science against obscurantism*" would be equivalent to trivialising the true scope of the attempts on the part of the Canary anthropologists at the end of the 19th century to build a scientific foundation for our sociocultural studies. In reality,

the controversy sparked by the publication of Chil's work was no more than the tip of an iceberg made up of a vast intellectual movement, where the protagonists that were publicly implicated were but a minimum part of its component members. In fact, as we shall see, Chil was by no means the most belligerent figure in this confrontation. To be able to capture the full reach of the evolutionist studies on the Islands, we need to consider said intellectual movement in greater amplitude. However, there can be no doubt that the condemnation of the work of Chil marked a key moment with respect to the commitment of the island intellectuals towards the scientific proposals.

Glick (1982:32) indicated as proof of the rapid spread of Darwinism in Spain the fact that it reached the most distant of the provinces in less than a decade (Núñez, 1977; Puig-Samper y Galera 1983; Hormigón, ed. 1984; García Cué 1985). In the opinion of this historian, one of the examples of this was to be the controversy triggered by the publication of "*Los Estudios*" by Chil. We believe that this is a mistaken appreciation when referring to the introduction of evolutionist ideas into the Canary Islands. There were evident connections between many intellectuals in the Islands and the general scientific movement in Spain. There is even greater evidence of a more direct link of the Canary Islands with centres in Europe. If we merely restrict the search to the second half of the 19th century (it was more than notable too in earlier periods), suffice the reminder that the Canary enlightenment produced its own breeding ground in the Islands through its direct knowledge

of French culture (Cioranescu, 1977), and that the training of the intellectual elite of the Archipelago was not only through direct contact with the English (*sic*) and above all French authors, but also and still more illustrative, many were in fact educated in these same centres of learning in Europe. For the Canary bourgeoisie, who could access elite education, the centres in Spain were considered mere receptors of European scientific production. But we are convinced that, although this may have been a reason, it was not the decisive reason. The "tradition" of the aristocracy and the well-to-do islanders of studying in Europe had more powerful motives behind it: the close links and dependence of the Canary economy on the economic centres in Europe.

A clear example in this sense is the *Museo Canario*, the Canary Museum. An important number of those who founded the Society in 1879 in Las Palmas, or who were linked to it, were doctors. Chil and J. Padilla both studied Medicine in Paris, while the rest studied in Montpellier (Bosch Millares, 1971; Alzola, 1980). With respect to Grau-Bassas, who was also a doctor, no reliable data have been established. Inasmuch as his Gran Canaria colleagues studied in France, it is possible that he too studied in Paris. Alzola (1980:18) seems inclined to believe he studied in Barcelona, given his Catalanian descentance (see Rodríguez. et al. 1983). J. Bethencourt y Alfonso, meanwhile, graduated in Medicine at the University of Madrid (Fariña, 1983). Specifically, in the case of Chil, the most qualified of them all, his masters, colleagues from his studies and

friends included P. Broca, A. de Quatrefages, T. Hamy, G. de Mortillet, P. Topinard and R. Verneau, among others (Bosch Millares, 1971). The rough draft of a letter of Chil's, to which we have made previous reference, with respect to the demands made on him to send the objects he intended to present in the Exhibition of Paris through the Spanish delegation and not through the French, is a significant manifestation of the close link that bonded him to the French masters. There, in what we can consider to be a fragment of his intellectual memoirs, Chil said,

"From an early age, I felt a particular devotion for the study of History; for the need to devote myself to a faculty that made me who I am, never made me forget my early hobbies, though I had to abandon them for some time. During my long stay in the capital of France, I devoted my time entirely to my medical studies, and when I returned to the island of Gran Canaria, my profession occupied all my time. However, my visits to the countryside, to the places where I was called and the places I visited, with the many curious observations I made, awoke again my desire to study history, and I began to collect data, objects and take notes to help me understand the history of the Guanches, the former inhabitants of the Islands and, as a doctor, to study and separate the climates in order to characterise illnesses by places, seasons and the special conditions of the environments in the areas of the people who called me. I began to work along these lines and I have continued to work for over twenty years, making sacrifices of all kinds [...]"

But it was not enough in the end: historical studies have undergone a complete evolution as of a short time back, and I had hoped to carry out my work carefully to thus reclaim the knowledge of a people whose origins have divided all wise men from Plato through to our days. The Scientific Conferences held in Paris offered me an opportunity to enter practically a whole new field of knowledge, that I knew only from my reading of newspapers and scientific works. In a gift to the sciences and moved by my urge to do all things useful, I made two trips to that country. I attended the main scientific conferences on the invitation of my fellow students and wise professors, and I took part in them, showing various of the curious objects I possess, and presenting memories that my friends and masters in their kindness received with undeserved benevolence, thus tightening a bond of scientific confraternity among us, the value of which the distinguished intelligence of Your Grace will fully appreciate [...] The result of these trips and my reading is this humble work, that has cost me a fortune on account of the special circumstances of this country, and that I am publishing under the modest title of "Estudios históricos, climatológicos y patológicos de las Islas Canarias" (Historical, climatological and pathological studies of the Canary Islands), which I will have the honour of presenting personally to Your Grace in a copy of the first that have seen the light. The Anthropological Society of Paris has been kind enough to give their attention to the same and it was

due to the encouragement of its main members that I committed to do so and to attending the forthcoming Universal Exhibition, intervening with various objects from my small Museum [...]” (23-2-1878).

4.1. Condemnation of and support for Chil y Naranjo’s “Estudios”.

“It is with a heavy soul that we take up our pens to condemn a work that has recently begun to be published in this City.” Thus began the pastoral letter that the Bishop of Canarias, J.M. de Urquinaona sent to the “*venerable clergy and faithful*” in 1876, after having called a meeting of Theologists to analyse the content of the first instalments of “*Estudios históricos, climatológicos y patológicos*” by Chil (1876:1891). Urquinaona, who with “*so much pain for our soul to see you precipitated into such an error!*” (1876:5), saw Chil, a member as he commented of a highly honoured family, and born into the heart of the Catholic Church, as having drawn away from the school of divine revelation to study in that of senseless rationalism. All the indications were that Chil was a mason who belonged to “*La Afortunada*” Lodge (Millares Cantero, 1975). Alzola (1980:56) seemed to confirm this much, as he did for Grau-Bassas. It is true that the first wife of Chil, with the name of sister “*Lucrecia Borgia*” belonged to La Afortunada Lodge (see M. Paz 1983, for a global study of Canary masonry). But what was most alarming was that Dr. Chil had dared to say that proximity to God was greater the more a man became emancipated from religious slavery. The Synod of Theologists met and released a copious

report that they later distributed widely among the parish priests for them to inform their parishioners against "*the evil doctrine prevailing in some intelligences*".

In its first part, the report is a panegyric against those who wish to see the truth far from God, those "*Miserable beings who pay no heed, in their frenetic endeavour, to the germ of corruption hidden in these waters and who, like those who almost completely bury human lineage, leave nothing but ruin and desolation in their wake, spreading dark thoughts through the intellect, infecting the will, falsifying the principles of knowledge, and destroying the justice and morality of the people*" (*ibid.*, 9). For the Synod, the theories of Chil were "*rancid*", but he was insistent on taking things to ridiculous levels and in presenting the most degrading theories to humanity. The argumentation is based on sentences that range from quotes from "Genesis", Jeremiah and other biblical texts, through to the theses of Thomas Aquinas of the Lateran Council. However, in spite of what they affirmed (basing themselves on Ampère) that "*Moses had as great and deep an instruction in sciences as any scientist in our times*", the theologians made recourse, curiously enough, to authorities who had, in their time, been condemned by the Church. So successively they named Linnaeus, Rousseau and Leclerc de Buffon. The central problem was that of "*the creation of the human being*". After showing that the faith teaches the unquestionable intervention of the hand of God in the making of Man, the Synod asked itself how it was possible that Man could be the result of a modification from the "*ape*". Chil, they said,

"is proposing that the Son of God took the nature of a "humanised ape. What an affront! What blasphemy! Dr. Chil relegates Man to the life of beasts, flesh-eating nomads, when the Book of Genesis is perfectly clear that "in Paradise, not in caves, was where God placed Man, and there he had no need to eat roots of plants nor raw meat" (ibid.,16).

And they continued that if Chil maintained that the faculty of abstraction in humans depended upon the encephalic capacity,

"there can be no doubt that he is making gala of a materialism of the worst type, such as that exhibited by Hobbes, Diderot, Helvetius and La Mettrie whom Rousseau (argued the theologians) had called "false sophists". And, as if it were not enough, Buffon had shown that the rule of Man over the animal kingdom is not only legitimate but, besides, unalterable because it is, in the end, "the rule of the spirit over matter" (ibid.,17).

The Synod continued, saying that it would seem clear that Chil was unaware of the truths of the Church. But this lack of knowledge was not innocent; it leads us, says the Synod, to deny the fall of the first Man, the coming of the Messiah, the incarnation of the Eternal Word, redemption, and the existence of a future life. However, the theologians believed that they were warning about a danger of no lesser importance. By robbing Man of these beliefs,

"the materialists are only taking us to a situation where

the poor man curses his existence and guards in his rags "a dagger for the rich", since he has lost all hope of eternal rewards, and that the rich man would lose all his peace in the face of his fear of the "unhinged echo of the crowds" whose chant is none other than that of "property is robbery, usurpation a right".

The Synod quoted J. Virey, saying that they saw in materialism "a sad symptom of social disorganisation", read social justice (Glick 1982:112). As if it were not enough, they said, Dr. Chil in his frenzy as a free thinker and with "the madness and delirium of Darwinism" put the catholic priests on the same level as the priests of Buddha, Confucius and "other ministers of Paganism". In conclusion, in the opinion of the theologians called by Urquinaona, Dr. Chil not only ignored the truth of the Christian faith and incurred in flagrant contradictions, but he also seemed to parade "notorious ill faith" and his work was "false, unholy, scandalous and heresy" (Urquinaona, 1876:20). By way of final dispositions, the Bishop forbade its reading, and ordered whomsoever had received and kept the first instalments of Chil's "Estudios" that they remit them, unopened, to the Bishop or to their parish priests. "Since the work is condemned out of hand, no faithful Christian, whatever their instruction or category (should read it), unless empowered by the Holy See to read forbidden books" (*ibid.*, 21). The Bishop finished on a dark note, warning that failure to fulfil these dispositions would expose the person to "experience a painful destruction of their faith which will be the cause of eternal damnation".

The reactions for and against were not long in coming.

Immediately, "*El Gólgata*", a weekly paper linked to ecclesiastic circles, made echo of the pastoral letter warning that "*the true children of the Church know what to do*" and highlighting the charitable sentiments of the Bishop and the conclusions of the theological sentence. It insisted that the work of Chil preached "*the most absolute materialism, condensing all the aberrations currently in fashion with respect to the origins of Man, 'according to Science'.*" (1876:284). Between July and August that year, "*El Gólgata*" reproduced the whole Pastoral letter of Urquinaona. It was not the first time that the Bishop had used this type of measure. In 1874, he had condemned the "*Biografías de canarios célebres*" (Biographies of Famous Canary Islanders) by Millares Torres giving, among other reasons, "*its constant tendency to poke ridicule at, and criticise the holy tendencies of people*" (quoted in Millares Cantero, 1975).

Other newspapers in Las Palmas gave the prohibition wide newspaper coverage plus articles of opinion. The "*Prensa*" de Las Palmas, on the 26th May, criticised the Pastoral letter, using a healthy dose of sarcasm. "*If the news is confirmed and the condemnation is published, the interests of Dr. Chil would be favoured, because the curiosity aroused will, in itself, ensure that the edition of his historical-scientific work will be sold out*". Chil, as can be imagined, was not to be so lucky. The "*Estudios*" that, according to Q.T. Cook in a letter dated the 1st March 1897 were sold in the Casa Miller in Las Palmas at 40 pesetas, were left uncompleted. Chil could only publish the first three volumes, although a part in which he dealt with the island climatology was

to appear in fragments in the journal, *El Museo Canario*, under the title of "*Estudios climatológicos de la isla de Gran Canaria*". The rest are preserved in the archives of the Canary Museum together with another important collection of his manuscripts. The credits of the editions of Chil's "*Estudios*" were the following: 1876, Isidro Miranda, Printer-Editor, Las Palmas de Gran Canaria; 1880, Imprenta (Print) de La Atlántida, Las Palmas de Gran Canaria; 1891, Imprenta (Print) de La Atlántida, Las Palmas de Gran Canaria, for Volumes I, II and II, respectively. However, they were, in fact, edited in Paris by Ernest Leroux, as indicated by the several letters from the French editor on the progress of the works being published. Among others, in one dated 16th November 1875 from Paris, Leroux communicated that the publication was not yet ready. With respect to the public acceptance, distribution and conditions of sale, some of the letters of Chil's "representatives" are illustrative of the difficulties faced by Chil when attempting to publish his "*Estudios*". Juan de la Puerta Canseco wrote from Santa Cruz de Tenerife on the 23rd May 1876 to tell him that his "*Estudios*" "*are receiving few subscribers since the province, unfortunately, would appear not well-inclined towards literary studies*". From Havana, Alejandro Chaco commented much the same on the 3rd January 1882: that in spite of having published articles in "*El Triunfo*" and "*Diario de la Marina*" recommending the "*Estudios*", "*the response obtained is little less than nil since there is inconceivable indifference towards literature and science*".

The same newspaper, some months after the news, was to

make echo of the arrival of Chil in Madeira, where he went to get married since he could not do so in Las Palmas "*due to having meddled with religious matters*" (La Prensa 4-7-1876).

However, the pronouncements with respect to the condemnation of the Bishop were not limited to the confines of the Islands. In his ample correspondence, we have found numerous letters of support from scientists, politicians and writers for both Chil and his work. Among the most significant, from the 18th June 1876, J.M. Pulido, the director of "*El Memorandum*" in Santa Cruz de Tenerife commented to Chil that, in his opinion, the "*Estudios*" was well received among educated people. The Pastoral Letter by Urquinaona, he said, was "*what one would expect our clergy to engender*" and although he had thought of giving it light commentary to take away some of its importance, for "*a document that is ridiculous in nature and even more ridiculous in manner*", that a friend of his would rather take care of "*avenging this matter*". From the capital of Tenerife also, R. García Ramos, in a short but interesting letter dated the 16th July, let Chil know that he did not agree with the Catholic censorship of his work. From Santa Cruz de Tenerife, likewise, was to write M. Villalba Hervás on 23rd July. In a tone that is filled with joy, he wrote: *Dear Doctor from Gran Canaria, you are fulfilling yet again a historic law: "the priests of obscurantism excommunicate the priest of science"*, an honour on which he congratulated Chil effusively. In spite of all this support, the orders of Urquinaona were carried out. Proof of this was given by F. Ramos in a letter from Gáldar dated the 7th August,

where he confirmed that the Pastoral had been read in the Church. For Ramos, the theological condemnation was unreasonable, and he saw no other aim in the same but to "*hide the truth and stir up fanaticism*". L. Martinet's letter from La Roche dated 19th September that same year is likewise important since it reveals the extra-island transcendence of the ecclesiastic condemnation. For Martinet, each page of "*Los Estudios*" "*offers 'a breath of freedom'*" and if, at any time in the history, there is any note of infamy, "*the sacred fire of the progress of centuries was constantly burning*". It was Martinet himself who gave a review of "*Los Estudios*" in the *Revue d'Anthropologie* in Paris (1876, 5:696-698) and, two years later was to expressly criticise the attitude of the Bishop in the same journal (1878,7:181-4, quoted in Glick 1982). Berthelot was also to show his solidarity with Chil, but in a much less committed manner. He wrote to him, on the 10th August 1876, and after indicating his condition of "*Hijo adoptivo de la capital de Canarias*" (honorary citizen with the keys to the city of the Capital of the Canary Islands, then in Santa Cruz de Tenerife), he wrote a post-scriptum where he criticised those who wished to halt progress by making war against "*Los Estudios*" and placing it on the "*Index*" (of forbidden works), comparing the situation with the vicissitudes faced by Galileo. However, he said to Chil (in brackets), "*Keep this between the two of us*". On the 9th November and from Nancy, L. Adam, the Secretary of the *Congreso Internacional de Americanistas* sent congratulations to Chil on the independence with which he had dealt with the questions of the creation and the origins of Man, rejoicing in the fact that "*fortunately, for you,*

there is no longer a Holy Inquisition in Spain". Some years later, León y Castillo was to write to him from Paris (10th August 1888) lamenting that Chil was to leave incomplete the historical part of "*Estudios*", but acknowledging that "*the disgusts and sacrifices that have been caused to your person by what has already been published, will not have left you with any desire to continue*". This sample of Chil's correspondence makes manifest how much personal solidarity was shown to him, just as much, and more significantly from our present analytical perspective, as the declaration of rejection of the obscurantism shown by the Catholic Church, on the part of the Canary intellectual minority, together with their sympathies towards the new currents of scientific thinking. However, more interesting than that are the terms in which the theoretical debate was developed. Therefore, obviously, we will have to begin with an analysis of Chil's work itself.

4.2. Evolutionism in the "Estudios"

The number of articles in journals, leaflets and books, published in the Canary Islands between 1875 and 1900, is sufficiently large to require a monographic study. Nevertheless, the works of a scientific nature had greater distribution and reception in three journals in particular, published in this period: the "*Revista de Canarias*", "*El Museo Canario*" and "*La Ilustración Canaria*". In a broad sense, they can be considered the "voices" of a large part of the island scientific production, and practically all the intellectuals concerned with scientific development and, in particular, anthropological studies, collaborated in them. Of the broad

range of subjects that these three journals offered, it is of interest here to highlight only the works that, to a greater or lesser extent, were related to the questions of evolution, Darwinism, transformism and others of the same ilk. But let us view first the work of the anthropologist from Gran Canaria.

The works of Chil and, in particular, his "*Estudios*", constitute one of the most relevant parts of all the production in Canary anthropology in the 19th century. Its significance does not only consist in the volume of material collected and used but, retrospectively, it is also the most solid attempt to incorporate scientific methodology into the sociocultural studies of the Islands, frustrated, however, by later trends that appeared in the first few decades of the 20th century. The work of Chil, as we shall see, is clearly not an isolated phenomenon in the Archipelago, but it is, without any doubt, the greatest and most accomplished synthesis of what Canary anthropology had to offer in that period. Notwithstanding this, it does not oblige us to use the hackneyed scripts of traditional historiography with its ancestors, precursors, founding fathers and the rest of the heroes. Our field of history, infected by the virus of "*precursor-ism*" (Lecourt, 1973; Llobera, 1980) has already wasted too much time in determining human genealogies of famous ancestors, and paying intellectual debts, often assumed for the inadmissible reasons of obtaining good credentials and securing academic status. In our case, if we do not wish to convert Chil y Naranjo into another "*totem pole*" of Canary anthropology, of the kind erected

or being erected to others, the analysis of his work must offer not only what he did, but also what he did not do; not only what is useful at present, from the advantageous position afforded by retrospect, but also what is no longer valid. We shall try to show that the work of Chil, together with that of other Canary researchers, opened up the path towards a possible scientific anthropology in the Canary Islands, at the same time as the combined effects of some of its main theories and conditioning factors in the Canary society, impeded the later consolidation of the studies of the Canary cultural tissue of his times.

This possibility that was opened up by Chil was intimately linked to the incorporation of Evolutionist foci. However, to be able to analyse the particular way in which they were assimilated into the Canary Islands, we should proceed to trace, first, the objectives that were proposed in order to, in a second section, determine the components of their intellectual formation.

The author of "*Estudios*" in his dedication of the work to his uncle and godfather, G. Chil y Morales, considered that it was still possible to write the General History of the Canary Islands. And, in the Preface, after some general considerations on the object of history, he cited the Abbot Mably who, in his work "*Modo de escribir la historia*" (The Way of Writing History) expressed the desire that history be a manifestation of respect for customs, and a means to produce public well-being, love for the native country, and to unmask vice. Chil was convinced that history was not "*an isolated list of facts*" but rather a series of repeated

events, the comprehension of which allows us to avoid the errors of the past. History, likewise, was relentless, submitting all peoples, great and small, to the phases of "*infancy, manhood and decadence*". Although it might be true that the Canary Islands did not have the rich historical materials of France, said Chil, it did not mean that it did not have a history that was worthy of being studied. There was, however, a first obstacle: the lack of texts on the part of the primitive islanders, their scarce hieroglyphics and scantly popular traditions. The origins, laws, religion and customs could only be re-constructed on the basis of guesswork; not so, the history that "*has remained and will remain hidden forever*". Later, in the Introduction (1876, I: 10-11), he was to cite the discovery of the engravings in Belmaco in La Palma and in El Hierro ...(*sic*) in spite of which these materials would seem to him insufficient to this end. The indigenous peoples could not enter history, thus, not on account of voluntary exclusion, but rather because history requires documents. But this exclusion is more apparent than real. In fact, Chil would not only devote a large part of the efforts of his studies to the indigenous peoples but besides, he would try, as Diego Cuscoy pointed out, to incorporate them into the process of formation of a people and a culture (1975:268).

In Chil's opinions, apart from this first difficulty, there were others that were characteristic of various different periods in Canary history. There was a lack of a spirit of historical curiosity on the part of the first chroniclers, Bontier and Le Verrier "*write, it is true, a story of the expedition; but this was reduced to describing the piracy of those adventurers*";

there was the Inquisition that destroyed the few remaining elements with which to write the history of the Islands. The people who wrote on the Canary Islands during that period, in Chil's opinion, were influenced by the most gross concerns or by fear. Adulation, panegyrics and satire were the results of histories written without exactitude or impartiality. More serious still, if such were possible, was his criticism of foreigners' works that , in his words

"merit more the sad name of romance novelists since they believed themselves to have sufficient information to fill the role of historians, with nothing more than what they amassed from their arrival at the port, where they entered a bar and asked questions of the first workhand they met, who would answer them the first thing that came into their heads, all woven together with a couple more sentences" (1876, Preface: vi).

Only a few merited being taken into account, such as Humboldt, Sainte Claire Deville, Berthelot and D'Avezac. Chil was too severe with respect to the contribution of many other authors, but he did signal to the undeniable fact in Canary historiography, that is, the proliferation of amateurs. At the same time, Chil was trying to justify his own work, but also defending the need for systematic studies and coherent methodologies.

With these precedents, the author of "*Estudios*" undertook his research. Reading, collecting materials and following expert masters were the credentials he presented. Chil said that he could truly swear that "*I have read everything that has*

been written on the Canary Islands over the ages and in every language". In spite of his claim sounding exaggerated, there can be no doubt that he was one of the researchers with the widest-ranging information among his contemporaries. It is well-known how he rescued scattered and difficult-to-access material from the various libraries and archives in the Canary Islands, Spain and France (among others). Finally, he gave an account of those that, in some way or another, had contributed in searching for documents and towards training him as an intellectual. Without naming anyone, Chil highlighted, first and foremost, his excellent friends in the Islands. He made no insinuation whatsoever about the existence of exchange of ideas or projects, only that they supplied him with "*true treasures of antiquity*". It should be pointed out here that the leadership of Chil in the field of anthropology was amply acknowledged by his contemporaries. This is proven not only by his role as the Director of the Canary Museum, that can be followed through his speeches and publications in the journal of the institution, but also outside it, there are numerous data that confirm that this recognition was extended to his work as an agglutinating figure for all the researchers and students of anthropology in the Islands. By way of some examples, R. Gómez, who had a small museum of Canary antiques, did some paperwork for Chil for him to buy the famous, now lost, Museo Casilda in Tacoronte. Chil made strenuous attempts to buy it (Chil, 1880; see Alzola, 1980). More significant still was the letter from Bethencourt Alfonso, communicating his appointment as honorary member of the *Gabinete Científico de Santa Cruz de Tenerife*, wherein he

considered that they were mere "*amateurs*" ready to serve Chil "*in any such work as he should commission us to do*".

Among the leaders in Spain, Chil mentioned M. Rivadeneira, P. Velasco, J. Benavides and E. Hartzenbursch. But the scene was dominated by the French: D'Avezac, Gravier, Broca, Verneuil, but above all, Broca who was preparing works on the Canary Islands and who, as was acknowledged by Chil, "*has often traced for me the path I should follow in certain periods of my studies*". The Canary anthropologist was to offer still more credentials. He quoted his papers, presented in various conferences: "Origins of the primitive Canary islanders" (1874) in the Conference for the Advance of Sciences in Lille; "Plato's Atlantis" (1875) in the *Congreso de Americanistas* in Nancy; and in Nantes, "On the religion of the Canary islanders and their work in polished stone", plus the comments and observations made with respect to them by researchers such as C. Vogt, H. Haecquel, K. Von Fritsch. Last, Chil underlined his special relationship with J. Padilla Padilla and Emiliano and his brother Amaranto Martínez Escobar, whose collaboration with Chil was vital to his work. The aim that Chil was trying to achieve was to write, or more precisely begin to write, the history of the Canary Islands, surrounded by all the necessary material and with a methodology suited to the requirements of the science at the time. And it is precisely the focus from which he approached history that is of interest to us to analyse here.

For Chil, the work of creation was constant, without lulls or interruptions. In other words, the molecular and

microscopic worlds were united via a long chain with all the higher organised forms of existence. Moreover, the modifications of any one body imposed changes on the rest and *"this link constituted the harmony of Man with the Earth that he inhabits, and the Earth with the rest of the bodies that populate space"*. With the exception of slight variations, the form of humanity was unitary, in his opinion, and this could be shown by studying the laws that govern it. The unity of the organic and inorganic worlds and the existence of laws in human history were two basic theoretical premises in the perspective of Chil. After which, he clarified a first programmatic declaration.

"The disappearance of many types of vegetables and animals, whose existence is revealed to us in the layers of the earth found at respectable depths, is not an interruption in what has been created: neither the vegetation nor the animals that have grown to live in certain conditions have been able to subsist in others, and their organisation has modified, little by little, on passing from one means of existence to another different, at the same time as others have also completely disappeared now that they have completed the period of their evolution." (1876:2)

But these laws that science managed to discover, thanks to the development of the spirit of freedom, were being denied by obscurantism. And this obscurantism, according to Chil, was not only on the part of Christianity, that had tried to stop the civilising torrent, but also on the part of the followers of Buddha, Mohammed, Confucius, and

all those who believed in the supernatural. We already commented upon the virulent response this provoked on the part of the Synod that examined the work of Chil, who were not only indignant at this materialist declaration, but also, and more so, at his daring to place the priests of Christ on the same footing as those of Buddha and Mohammed. But Chil was quick to explain the nuances of what he had declared. He said that to assume the truths of science did not mean that one was an atheist, although it appeared to him to be totally unnecessary to have divinity intervene to explain the common events that are precisely the subject matter of history. But history, it is important to bear in mind, was for Chil an uninterrupted chain that linked Man to the Earth. Therefore, the first step in the "*Estudios*" consisted in showing the geological history of the Earth. Different theories were in play but, whatever, there was unquestionable evidence that the Earth had evolved and evolves passing through various different phases or periods, each with its own characteristics. In each one of these periods, beings and species appeared in a constant process of complexification of live matter. Chil used the geologists' descriptions to summarise the most outstanding features of the primary, secondary, tertiary and quaternary eras. The information came from two first-order sources. He quoted C. Vogt with respect to the geological formation of the Canary Islands, with whom he was in complete agreement. But it was noteworthy that his general argument was taken from Ch. Lyell (*sic*) and J. Boucher de Perthes, who he cited in the biography, from the "Antiquity of Man" and "*Antiquités celtiques et antédiluviennes*" respectively. The Quaternary

era was, without a doubt, the most attractive. Chil indicated how, in that period, the Earth was "*an immense meadow where herbivorous creatures of all types grazed*" and, above all, where Man appeared "*humanised*". By way of proof, he offered the discovery of fossil remains, as found by Boucher de Perthes, in Abbéville in 1863. The process of hominization was completed by modifying the "ape" into "man" and the latter, "*with the properties of his encephalon, allowing him thus the faculty of abstraction*" (judged a heretical affirmation by the theologians called by Urquinaona), putting him, as a result, on the highest rung of the animal ladder. Chil indicated that the faculty was more marvellous still since it had allowed Man to study the great book of creation and trace it back to its "*only supreme universal cause*". These were sufficient observations, Chil commented, as to no longer need to insist further upon the fact. In short, the results offered by geology and palaeontology allowed Darwin to produce his theories "*and, day by day, his way of thinking acquires certainty*". This legitimisation was due, in great measure, to the work of countless researchers, among whom the author of the "*Estudios*" highlighted Haeckel, who had proved "*the unity of organic and inorganic nature, the identity of the fundamental elements in one and the other, thus leading the genealogical doctrine to the viewpoint of the conception of everything created*" (quoted in Chil, 1876:15).

Chil hoped, with this materialist basis, to be able to answer the major questions of Canary history, such as how the Canary islands were geologically formed, and what was the origin of the indigenous peoples, together with what series

of events had occurred in their development. He had no desire to present himself as an expert, and although he was to reproduce what had been said before, he tried to express his own opinions. However, he tempered them with due caution, stating that, in case of error, "*in view of irrefutable proof and documents (...) I will be the first to proclaim the new doctrine*". Geology and palaeontology showing the uninterrupted chain between organic and inorganic were not the main concerns of Chil, however. In fact, these previous comments are taken from the Introduction to the "*Estudios*" and are mere general coordinates within which to be able to situate the questions that really interested him: Man and his evolution. He established a tripartite division, as was the model of the time, consisting in pre-history, proto-history and history itself. Using this framework, he situated materials and documents to answer the questions formulated in the Introduction. In the first place, Chil broached the periods of the "Stone Age". He accepted the three periods into which it had been fractioned (Eolithic, Palaeolithic and Neolithic) and applied them to the Canary Islands. But, apart from the cultural remains, the evolution of man was, for Chil, directly correlated to his cerebral development. During the Eolithic period, he considered that the intelligence of Man was "*infantile*"; he was convinced that there were populations in Africa that did not reach beyond elementary notions of survival. This degree of development was still lower in the more "*backward*" tribes in America, and for them to reach the degree of cultural evolution of the Africans, not only would they need to have "*the torch of civilisation*" lit for them but also, necessarily, there

would have to be modifications of their "*brain casement*". The perspective of raciology introduced here has already been the object of more detailed analysis in a previous chapter. In the present context, it is more relevant to follow the evolutionary framework proposed in the "*Estudios*". For Chil, it was difficult to determine whether there had been an Eolithic period in the Canary Islands. He criticised Viera, "*the most enlightened of our historians*" for having limited himself to informing about some burials, without concerning himself for the work of collection and the study of objects of the indigenous islanders. He added that most of the Naturalists who had researched in the Islands were geologists rather than palaeontologists. In short, these circumstances meant, for Chil, that there was an almost unbreachable gap in the pre-history of the Canary Islands. And, in spite of the fact that in the Stone Age "*roughly hewn flint*" existed, he found no proof of the tertiary fauna that corresponded to that time.

Following Mortillet, he divided the Palaeolithic period into four stages: Acheulean, Moustieran, Solutrean and Magdalenian. Chil indicated that, in the Archipelago, the evolution in the use of "hewn stone" could be appreciated but with one curious exception: there were no arrowheads, a fact that he tried to explain as related to the food base of the primitive islanders, obtained mainly from livestock. It was in the Neolithic period, however, that Chil fully situated the indigenous Canary islanders. The Neolithic period, in the denomination as accepted by J. Lubbock, was to be found "*aplenty*" in the Canary Islands, according to Chil. At that time, there was proof of fully fledged humanity. There were

dolmens, funeral mounds and burial caves, together with other evidence of cult towards the deceased and belief in the immortality of the soul. In short, the end result of a long process where it was shown that "*Man, in his beginnings as an ape has arrived via a series of transformations at the state in which he finds himself today*" (1876, 1:8). As of that moment, the evolution of Man faced a disjunctive: it was either to be elevated to a rational being or to see the power of its intelligence reduced to idiocy. Extrapolating on the basis of his own perspectives, Chil affirmed that the softening of the encephalic mass, after long and deep meditation (theological, we presume) on his part, "*produces imbecility or madness*". The plentiful manifestation of the Neolithic in the Canary Islands, according to Chil, was to be appreciated in the advanced nature of the society and the civilisation that the conquerors met on their arrival. However, in the islands, there was a confusing mixture of elements from various pre-historic eras; flint together with polished stone, different types of ceramics and earthenware, and "*magados*", that is maces together with "*tabonas*", that is obsidian knives. This was a serious problem for Chil for whom the Canary pre-history seemed to "*change all the rules*" with respect to the uninterrupted phases of evolution. Howsoever that might be, he was convinced that there was a continuity in all the pre-history of the Islands that, in spite of the scarcity of palaeontological studies to guide us through the "*darkness of those times*", could be re-constructed, if only through reasoned guesswork. The following was the evolutionary framework of the islands suggested by Chil at that time.

"I believe that there was a primitive race; that said race attained a rudimentary civilisation and that, thanks to that civilisation, we have the first arms, the roughest of clothing, the clumsiest utensils: that this generation was succeeded by another that inherited those first inventions, upon which they made great advances, without setting aside those that the previous generation had made, until such time, as occurs in any society, where the new generation still held on to the originals out of nostalgia, to the patrimony handed down by their forefathers, and the others, that is those people who through their efforts, prestige or descendance, find themselves in the higher ranks, are those who enjoy the advances produced by the industry of the rest" (1876, l:10).

We find here all the themes central to 19th century anthropology: evolution, civilisation, race and progress. There is no need to insist that here materialist and idealist theses are mixed. In other words, as suggested by Opler with respect to Morgan, this is the dualism that is manifest in being "*materialist with respect to material culture and idealist in everything else*". But, in accordance with Harris (1968), "*what was characteristic of the evolutionists was not their materialism nor their idealism but rather their confused eclecticism*".

Chil worked with considerable bibliographical information. The works of Darwin, Haeckel, Broca, Mortillet, Lyell, Boucher de Perthes, Thomas Huxley and Lubbock, among others, along with specialised journals, all formed part of

his library, now preserved in the Museo Canario. What did that large bibliography reveal? In the first place, what is evident, is that it updated him on the advances of the times, something all the more outstanding if we bear in mind the dates and the distance of the Canary Islands from the academic and intellectual centres in Europe. However, more significant still are the very authors he used. His incursions into various fields, derived to a great extent from the weak institutionalisation of some academic fields in the mid-19th century was reflected in his bibliography, where there was a marked presence of biologists (Darwin, Haeckel and Huxley, for example), geologists, palaeontologists and prehistorians (Lyell, Boucher de Perthes or Lubbock) and also physical anthropologists (Broca, Quatrefages and Mortillet).

4.3. The controversy with respect to transformism

However, as we already said, Chil's "*Estudios*" were not an isolated phenomenon. On the contrary, and even acknowledging the great impact of his work and the decisive influence of the author, it must, nevertheless, be said that the rest of the intellectual élite were receptive, from an early date, to the scientific innovations that were taking place in Europe. Darwinism, in particular, was assimilated or, at least, known enough to discuss, parallel to the publication of the "*Estudios*". This can be easily proved if we follow the course of the theological condemnation of the work of Chil. The work was, to all effects, practically excluded from open public debate after the censorship of Urquinaona.

There were other authors who assumed the roles either of defenders or critics of Darwinism through articles in the Press, leaflets and books. Disregarding all comments on incidents, skirmishes and anecdotes, what deserves to be highlighted is the wide and immediate echo that the condemnation achieved, and the decanting of opinions that it caused. Some newspapers not only picked up the news of the condemnation but also dedicated a good number of theoretical articles and opinions to the work, as we have already mentioned.

Three different stances emerged in the debate with respect to Darwinism. The first aligned with orthodox Catholicism, the second was anti-clergy but likewise opposed to Darwinism, and a third openly embraced Darwinism. The first had José Roca y Ponsa as its most qualified representative, the second, among others, had Rafael Lorenzo García and Pablo Romero, and the Darwinists, finally, were headed by Baltasar Champsaur Sicilia. Each of the different positions used newspapers and journals as their preferred means of expression: Roca y Ponsa published in "*El Gólgata*", an ecclesiastical weekly; Romero and Lorenzo both published in the anti-clergy liberal "*La Prensa*", and Champsaur in "*Las Palmas*" that was reformist Republican.

One of these in particular, Champsaur, offered us a portrait of the city of Las Palmas (de Gran Canaria) in the years when the controversy was at its most fierce, the decade of the 1870s, in the prologue to his book, "*Transformismo*" (1928). This work was, in fact, a collection of his articles at that time, to which he added an introduction that explained

the evolution of transformist theories through to the 20s. These articles appeared in Las Palmas on the 17-12-1876, 2211877, 221877, 1251877 and 721878. Champsaur published besides other books and leaflets in line with his Socialist ideology, and his faith in economic and scientific progress as decisive in securing social justice (1916, 1923, 1928a, 1929, 1934). Las Palmas (later, de Gran Canaria), commented Champsaur, was a small city of 20,000 inhabitants, lively and well-disposed towards debate, and where the September revolution had prepared a favourable environment for scientific, philosophical and political discussion. Liberal and Republican press, sent from Madrid, was read all over, and in the few bookshops that existed, it was easy to find works by Rousseau, Voltaire, Diderot, Condorcet and others, together with the discourses of Castelar, Salmeron and Pi y Margall. The streets were even often invaded by meetings, and "*new ideas*" circulated among young and old, workers and bourgeoisie. In this fertile climate, Millares, Chil and Lorenzo García worked and published. Scientific and philosophical concern stamped "*a liberal and rationalist orientation of a generalised nature nowadays, such as is the mark of a civilised country on the intellectual European path*" (1928:ix). A good measure of the intellectual temperature of the times was offered by the process of expulsion from their posts of the senior teachers, S. Milego and S. Calderón from the *Instituto de Segunda Enseñanza* (Secondary School), followed by the closing of the same in 1876. There can be no doubt that the "*penetration of Krausist rationalism in certain sectors of our intellectuals is a fact, as is the reception of evolutionism*" (Millares Cantero, 1975:124). Nevertheless,

the Canary anthropologists positioned themselves more decisively in the scientific perspective of evolutionism and positivism, that was less ambiguous than the stance of the Krausists (Millares Cantero, 1975; Noreña, 1977).

The prologue to "*Transformismo*" in 1928 had a clear objective for a militant socialist such as was Champsaur, that hailed back to a debate that had opened a period of "*healthy liberation of the spirit*" and a new horizon for individuals and peoples. His defence of transformism blended in with his faith in civilisation and progress as the means whereby to achieve a state of social justice.

"The new organisation of the European states and their openly rationalist tendencies clearly show the power of the flow of ideas and where it reaches (...) announcing perhaps, in our days, the dawn of a new society, in spite of the resistance of the privileged classes (...) the society to which we, the Socialists, reasonably and emotionally aspire for justice to be re-established for all the peoples we call civilised" (ibid., xvi)

Champsaur was, therefore, a socialist that studied and spread the ideas of transformism, like a weapon, to encourage civilisation among all the intelligentsia. Lorenzo y García, meanwhile, was also concerned with social problems but from the liberal perspective of his previous publications, years before the controversy, such as "*La esclavitud y el pauperismo en el siglo XIX*" (Slaves and paupers in the 19th century) (1863), where he affirmed that men had not been born predestined, some to work and others to

enjoy freedom, and that reason stood against anything that meant permanent privation of freedom and working for others. Lorenzo y García was anti-clergy and attacked most violently by the conservatives (Roca, 1878) with respect to the question of transformism, despite his positions contrary to the theories of Darwin. He did not limit his criticism of the clergy solely to the Press either. In a meeting celebrated in Las Palmas (de GC), Champsaur 1928) commented that many Liberals and Republicans had attended to listen to Urquinaona. When the Bishop had finished his intervention, Lorenzo y García stood up to answer him. It would seem, according to Champsaur, that the words of the author of "*Estudios filosóficos*" (Philosophical Studies) did not please the prelate and a bitter argument ensued between the two. Last but not least, Canon Roca y Ponsa launched his attacks on transformism from an exclusively religious perspective, more concerned with combatting heresy than about entering into a scientific debate and, in this context, as a result, is of no further interest to us. In the same year as the first instalments of the "*Estudios*" appeared, Lorenzo y García published Philosophical Studies on the Specification of Beings ("*Estudios filosóficos sobre la especificación de los seres*" (1876)). The work was broken up into four parts, where Lorenzo y García tried to show the invalidity of the transformation of species. For him, in the first place, there were two major trends into which to group those who attempted "*to dominate human reason*": theologians and free thinkers. The former defended the universe as dependent upon invariable laws dictated by "Supreme intelligence", and the latter aspired to understand the world through

reason and experience. Lorenzo y García defended that only free research could offer the truth and, in that measure, although contrary to Darwinism, he esteemed that evolution was not anti-spiritualist nor did it debate the dignity of Man. It was simply a theory, he said, based on science that could not be criticised from the perspective of the "*sole book*" of the theologians. The errors of Darwinism were not to be found in a hypothetical attack against religion, but rather in their scientific bases. Lorenzo y García proposed that palaeontological data merely showed the consolidation of the species, that is, the succession of similar individuals that reproduce indefinitely. He claimed, moreover, that there was no proof that the species had mixed in remote times to produce other new species. According to Lorenzo y García, this was the case of the ape and man, although Darwin was set on showing us the contrary. The theory of the author of "The Origin of the Species" was not based on the induction and deduction that characterised science, but rather on mere hypotheses. As such, he had to make recourse to fossils that, curiously enough, could not be found to prove, among other things, an extremely remote transformation of the monkey into man. In short, for Lorenzo y García, as much error was committed by the theologians who attempted to derive practical science from religious principles as by those who were set on explaining phenomena that could not be demonstrated scientifically.

Baltasar Champsaur was to answer this anti-Darwinist attack by Lorenzo y García from the pages of "*Las Palmas*". He felt satisfied that Lorenzo y García, "*one of the men who*

has most contributed to the intellectual movement of our country" had published a new work of a scientific nature. However, as he gave his comments, Champsaur tried to show the incongruence of his arguments. As opposed to the idea that the species existed in Nature regardless of the classifications established by Man, and that they were "*creations*" of the "*Divine Essence*", he asked how then to explain the appearance of new species in various different geological periods that replaced others that had disappeared after cataclysms and other geological phenomena. There were only two alternatives: either they were "*transformations*" of other previous species or, as Lorenzo y García believed, they were "*creations*" of the "*Divine Essence*", in which case one would have to think that He would have a multitude of species to replace when others disappeared. "*And would this not be to ridicule the Creative Force? This would be no more and no less than the "miraculous creations" of Agassiz (...) whose hypothesis nobody accepted in its day*"(1928:43). Lorenzo y García, meanwhile, only accepted that selection could form races but never vary the essence of the species. The objection to this thesis is interesting in that Champsaur picked up on the lack of unified criteria to define the "*essential qualities*" of the species, since "*on this matter of races and species, the naturalists have never been in agreement*" (*ibid.*,44).

In his counter-reply, Lorenzo y García (1877) defended himself from the accusation that he had never read Darwin, a fact that Champsaur had indicated in his article. He admitted that although he did not possess his works, he

was familiar with him through the Compendium by Omboni and the treatises of Haeckel and Büchner, the latter "a declared transformist". He expounded previous abundant arguments in the sense that there was no "replacement" in the species but that each occupied a precise place in the zoological chain. Besides, "since the power of God is infinite, the species are made manifest in an infinity of forms. Some of these specific forms have been destroyed, leaving behind many others that we know of nowadays". The tone of the controversy grew heated, with Lorenzo y García even proposing a public debate with the "petty article writer on *Las Palmas*" whensoever "his adversaries lent their true signature to what they wrote". Champsaur had not signed his articles all through the controversy. Answers and replicas flew back and forward throughout 1877 in the same terms as the original clash, with the sole addition of quotes from Lorenzo's works and a large list of "authorities". Lorenzo y García went on to publish his own articles in *La Prensa*, and specifically some of his essays were devoted to contesting the "ultramontanism" of Roca y Ponsa, in particular his "*Triunfos de la Ciencia*" (Triumphs of Science, 1879). We should also mention the comments (6-12-1876) of P. Romero in *La Prensa* with respect to the work of Lorenzo y García. He offered an "opinion on the philosophical studies", openly defending its author. However, later (30-11-1877) in a review of another essay by Lorenzo, "*Estudios filosóficos sobre el origen y formación de los seres vivientes*", he was to prove less enthusiastic.

"The work of Sr. Lorenzo that has irrefutable merits

when judged from a literary and scientific perspective lacks, nevertheless, originality and the boldness to broach certain questions linked to faith and the doctrine in the books of the Bible, from which he needs to separate himself completely when entering into the solid terrain of reason".

Likewise, Millares Torres would touch upon the confrontation between Lorenzo y García and Roca y Ponsa, congratulating the former on his "*new and elegant production*", *Triunfos de las Ciencias*, although he considered that the attack and repetition of his controversial style "*get in the way of the free expression of thought*" (Millares Torres, 1880:354). However, Champsaur was, by far, the person who possessed the greatest information. Apart from the classics of Darwin, Haeckel and Huxley, he also used Quatrefages' "*L'espèce humaine*" and "Darwin and his French Precursors"; "The Creation and Evolution of Scientific Ideas" by Spencer; Natural History by Vilanova; "*Leçons sur l'homme*" by Vogt; "*Oenothera Lamarckiana (...)*" by Vries¹⁸, and by Weissman, "Essays on Inheritance".

Champsaur made use of these and excellently showcased the bibliography, citing Darwin, Lamarck, Haeckel, Huxley, Vogt, Büchner and Spencer, among others, profusely whereas Lorenzo y García was shorter on quotes and

18 TN When referring to Champsaur's reading, the author makes reference to De Vries "Oenothera Lamarckiana". Although there is a lesser known article on this species discovered by De Vries, we believe that the author may be referring to Mutationstheorie, in other words, The Mutation Theory, already translated by 1904 (produced originally in 1901).

used, above all, Agassiz, Cuvier, Fleurens and Quatrefages. However, the three-sided controversy was practically restricted to the newspapers, and was full of generalities. Publications on evolutionism continued to proliferate meanwhile in the Canary Islands over the last third of the 19th century, although they were no longer within the controversial framework that had been produced by Champsaur, Lorenzo y García and Roca y Ponsa. Many of the most prestigious journals of the times in the Archipelago still showed interest in the subject. We shall comment upon some of these, therefore, in order to better trace the coordinated of Canary anthropology.

4.4. The eclectic defence of evolutionism

In general, the treatment of the transformist theses was to continue revolving around the same positions that the protagonists of the pages of *"El Gólgota"*, *"La Prensa"* and *"Las Palmas"* had adopted: that is, the stance of frontal attacks on the part of the religious spheres, an eclectic attitude maintained from the agnostics, and the open defence of Darwinism, with belligerence towards obscurantism, shown on the part of the "free thinkers". It is significant, in this context, that most of those who were active in or followed closely studies of anthropology and ethnography were doctors, (Chil, Bethencourt Alfonso, Grau-Bassas and Ripoche, to name but a few) and adopted evolutionism without hesitation as a theoretical and methodological guide for their research. This line was also followed by other professionals, interested in these studies, such as

Millares, Pizarroso and García Ramos, among others. With the exception of the works of Chil, who seemed to have a greater and better assimilation of the information, the work of the rest was limited either to specific and sporadic quotes or to describing the most relevant aspects of the ideas of the evolutionists.

What must be highlighted, then, is not so much the theoretical contributions as the sociological phenomenon that the dimension of the debate assumed among the island intellectuals. In this sense, one of the most significant aspects was the strong ideological pressure that obliged them to systematically tone down the scope of their transformist theses. This pressure came from two different sources. On the one hand, there was the pressure exerted by ecclesiastical ultramontaniam. On the other, there was the pressure that derived from the idealist focus that many of them adopted. With respect to the first, we have already seen the often passionate reaction against the condemnation of the "*Estudios*" by Chil and the criticism of the obscurantist postures on the part both of combative Darwinists such as Champsaur and by those more in the line of Lorenzo y García. In spite of the contrasts, anti-clericalism was a powerful nexus that united a large part of our intellectuals. However, obviously, this anti-clericalism did not imply that the defence of the "*truths of science*" had to follow down the same path as materialism. In reality, almost all our intellectuals insisted that science was not incompatible with religious beliefs, and tried to separate themselves from their pejorative tagging as "*materialists*".

The main escape route consisted in eclectic explanations of fixist and transformist theories. So, there was a recurrent journalistic style where, first, the arguments in favour of the immutability of the species were described with quotes from authors who had defended them, to thereafter proceed to forward the proof that supported mutation and changes in organic forms. The thread of the argument would generally follow a design that allowed for the conclusion that the transformist ideas were more credible, although the authors did not share, at any time, their personal opinions on the matter. Therefore, they would use recourse to types of phrases such as "*not my words, but those of the scientists*", in a discourse that seemed to follow the tactic of the imperative of an outside authority that, likewise, afforded them an opt-out from the need for any explicit commitment. That way, they took good care to clarify that the scientists were the maximum authorities on a subject that most confessed to not being experts on, but mere laymen. One example of such eclecticism is to be found in the work of R. Masferrer, "The species in organised beings" ("*La especie en los seres organizados*"). The ideas of the individual, species and gender, affirmed Masferrer, are a logical consequence of the generalising faculty of human intelligence. However, he was aware that there was no agreement among naturalists on the concept of species and, after a summary review of authors ranging from Tournefort and Fleurens through to Vogt, he advanced a definition of a synthesis: "*The set of animals and plants that form each one of these series that are constant, uninterrupted since the origin of organic bodies through to when all life fails*

on the planet we inhabit, is what we call an 'organic-species'" (1878-79:149). However, he went on to say, if we adhere to paleontological data, it is not possible to maintain an opinion on the fixed nature of species without admitting various successive and independent creations. Masferrer did not want to enter in depth into the transformist theory, but only touched upon those points that "some eclectic authors have admitted to be positive". These points were based on "irrefutable facts that give great value to this theory". In this sense, in spite of its being well founded that an organic form transmitted peculiar characteristics through reproduction on some of its descendants, there were still, Masferrer indicated, "great objections" to transformism. He hastened to say immediately afterwards that all the sciences tended "to accept, in their respective branches, analogous principles to what in Natural History is known of as the progressive evolution of organic forms" (187879:151). Howsoever that may be, Masferrer considered that deciding between fixism and transformism was "a purely scientific matter" where the clergy had nothing to say. With certain nuances, this is a standard stance among the collaborators on the "Revista de Canarias", "El Museo Canario" and "La Ilustración de Canarias". However, although he held a certain silence on the matter, S. Berthelot did not ever accept the transformist theories as they were formulated by Darwin, arguing from a scientist perspective. Millares Torres revealed as much when he showed the letter from the Hijo Adoptivo de Canarias sent to him on the 27th November that read:

"I do not believe in transformism; God did not create

genders, species nor varieties, he only created seeds that in different climates where they have been sown have developed according to the influence of the environment, with all of the typical characteristics that the law of heritage or ancestry has thereafter perpetuated. The world was created in a unity of composition, rather than a unity of creation. I am a polygenist" (Berthelot, quoted in Millares, 1880:195)

However, apart from the pressures specifically of a religious nature, the fact that evolutionism should have been limited among our anthropologists to a mere debate of principles was due, in great measure, to the lack of theoretical cohesion and the tensions at the heart of the institutions responsible for attempting to promote anthropological research. The most illustrative case in this sense is the Canary Museum. In August 1880, J. Padilla, one of *Chil's* closest collaborators, criticised the positivists and attempted to revindicate the unity of the sciences and the harmony of each of its branches. He claimed that Positivism,

"did not comprehend God the creator or rather did not wish to probe beyond what could be apprehended by the senses ... thereby signalling Man as the truly most perfect of all that surrounds us, the true king of creation and centre of all their aspirations on which to converge our scientific endeavours"(1880:390).

To clarify everything wrong about positivism, he recommended that the journal of the *Museo Canario* should reproduce a discourse of T. Martinez Escobar's where "he

vigorously refuted the basis and consequences of positivist doctrine". The editorial committee of "*El Museo Canario*" received the suggestion and, indeed, in Number 13 of that same year, began to publish the "Inaugural Speech" that Teófilo Martínez de Escobar, Professor in Metaphysics at the Universidad de La Habana, had given at the opening ceremony of the academic year, 1879-80. The positivism of Comte and Huxley were presented as the novelties of the century in a speech titled "No more God, nor the Soul, nor the Infinite, nor the Absolute". Martínez Escobar commented that there was nothing original about that arrogance, that was, in reality, little more than the synthesis of the theories of all those who, throughout history, have denied that God was the origin of all things. The relativism of Heraclites, the pantheism of Spinoza, the inductionism of Bacon, the sensualism of Hobbes or the empiricism of Locke had done nothing more than favour the fact that the sceptic Hume should "*awaken to the critique of Kant from the dogmatic slumber in which he had lived immersed*". That was, for him, the novelty of positivism. In other words, it was the negation of an ontological beginning, that is, atheism, and the reduction of science to the knowledge perceived by the senses, of contingent phenomena, sensualism, and consideration of matter as the only thing alive, that is, materialism.

"Atheism, Sensualism and Materialism, then, are the necessary consequences of these denials, exclusions and errors that reduce science to pure empiricism in its methods, and to a sum of phenomena whose bases

is unknown (...) they are born of the irrational denial of God, the primary cause and fundament of all science"
(1880:46)

According to Teófilo Martínez Escobar, as if it were not enough, positivism had ultimately been supplemented by transformism, making it useless, if one were to follow Spencer, to wonder about a concept of morality, or moral law, whose origin transcended human nature. Positivism, affirmed Martínez Escobar categorically, *"is, in all its variants, repulsive to transcendentalism, and has an irresistible horror of everything absolute and supra-sensitive"* (*ibid.*,120). Teófilo Martínez Escobar launched a true crusade against positivism and transformism in the pages of the journal, and in public sessions held in the Museo Canario. In the same meetings where Chil was to talk of the progress of palaeontological and anthropological sciences based on the *"firmly established theories of Darwin and Haeckel"*, the professor of metaphysics was to rail openly against those who had preceded him or who followed him in their interventions. It is, to say the least, illustrative that, in the same sessions, some explained the origins and evolution of the indigenous Canary races while others, such as Teófilo Martínez Escobar, in the meeting to commemorate the first anniversary of the installation of the Museum, on the 24th May, 1881, said in grave tones that *"anthropologists, geologists and palaeontologists directly attack the first of the sacred books, declared canonical as the very word of God"*. In short, *"anthropologists explain everything via the materialist system that we cannot admit"*. For that very reason, Martínez

Escobar found the theory of the transformists whereby Man descended from the apes, to be nothing short of hairbrained.

"Give me an anthropoid, the nearest dolichocephalic to man, in the least civilised family (...) and he will grow, get old and die without having been able to say a word, without expressing an idea. He is lacking, Gentlemen, in a soul, that will never be found in an irrational being because this divine principle is the exclusive property of man, whom God formed in his image and likeness (2151881).

In the same session, the professor spoke out against the school of Lamarck, propagated by Darwin, *"that, in our times, most unfortunately, has countless followers, some of whom are here among us."*

But it is true, nonetheless, that the main figures behind the Museum and its journal decanted towards evolutionism. We have already made reference to this here, and commented on the most significant interventions of those who, like Millares and Chil, most decidedly defended positivism and evolutionism as research strategies for history and anthropology.

Was the origin of the human species one or multiple? Millares Torres attempted to answer the question in a dense article in 1881, titled "Darwinism and Spiritualism". Many had researched the origins of Man, said Millares, but it was not until the early 19th century that Lamarck was to propose a

rational explanation to the question, in his work "Zoological Philosophy"(1809), thereby opening the doors for Darwinism. There can be no doubt that it was not only the wise Frenchman, Lamarck but also one of his disciples, Bory de St. Vicent, together with Geoffroy St. Hilaire and others who prepared the theory of Darwin. Millares was fascinated: "*the theory of Darwin is as simple as all revelation that contains in itself the seed of a great truth*" (1881:8). It is the law of natural selection as a striving towards adaptation to suit biological conditions and sexual choice as a battle between equals "*for the females in the seasons favourable to reproduction*". Millares took this synthesis from Tubino but, in his opinion, the person who best understood the theory of Darwin was Haeckel, "*the most illustrious of his commentators*". The theory of metamorphosis or transmutation, the other names by which evolution was known, affirmed Haeckel, proved how all organisms that have lived and live on this earth derive from one, at the most, of the few primordial forms that had evolved by "*gradual processes of metamorphoses*". Even Quatrefages, one of the fiercest adversaries of Darwin, had recognised in his "Human Species" that Darwinism had some irrefutable points, said Millares.

The Canary historian, nevertheless, wanted to go further. The inferior races of humanity "*that disappeared after contact with white men were either wiped out or fused with them*", he said, in some way verifying the first of the laws of Darwin. Few dared any longer to uphold objections when the mechanisms of inheritance and adaptation described by Darwin (bearing in mind the environment of the different

geographical regions) formed a system "*that admirably responds currently to all the questions posed by the biological sciences*" (*ibid.*, 42). Millares, however, was concerned by the thought that the "*defenders of evolutionism*" might associate with the materialist schools. He accused the materialists of lacking moral sense, but "*when there are so many among their adversaries that have none, we must allow, in our humble opinion, that in Darwinism, there is room for all the philosophical schools, both materialist and spiritualist*" (*ibid.*, 71).

Returning to the initial question, the conclusion of the author of the "General History of the Canary Islands" was final. The human species came from one sole seed, understanding by "*unit of origin*", that one of the elements that shaped its "*initial cell*". Materialists and spiritualists could, thus, on this basis, come to an understanding, as long as the former, with their positivism and empiricism, did not cast aside metaphysics as prejudicial to science, and the latter were to acknowledge the admirable conquests of the natural sciences. Millares revealed echoes of Hegel when he affirmed, convinced, that "*after thesis and antithesis will come the synthesis of human knowledge*" (*ibid.*, 72).

This contemporising stance did not impede Millares from writing "Darwin" praising his "*deep genius, the glory of your century/Star of grandiose magnitude/Brilliant beacon of the human sciences/ And thinking with deep logic/Laborious and sublime observer/ To prove to us in the infinite cosmos/what is the law of evolution*" (1882, in the journal of the Canary Museum, *El Museo Canario*) [12].

Last but not least, let us remember as one more proof of the tension caused by evolutionism among our intellectuals, some of the ideas that were expressed by R. García Ramos in his letters to Chil, cited previously. In the first, he affirmed that, basing himself on Lamarck, there was no need to deny the presence of the hand of God in the organisation of organic forms. However, one month later, he had decided to give the hypothesis of progressive evolution a clearly scientific sense. Referring to a work of his, García Ramos indicated that

"[...] There, it is more that of progressive creation; the edifice is raised on that basis, without divine intervention. In any case, this is little else but a paradox in Lamarck and in so many other philosophers (...). After all, or before all, I desire to know your opinion, not only on said first part of the Prolegomena which is a purely philosophical question but, in particular, with respect to the other great question that affects the body, in its orbit, that is, whether or not it is possible to vary the conditions of individual existence, to a certain extent, improve them and, in a word, prolong the life of the individual; something more than has been achieved to date thanks to human wisdom. Doubtless, this is a question of some magnitude and so, I hope you will consider this humble reasoning with the due indulgence [...]" (7-8-1876).

Chil, who preferred to assume prudence after the condemnation of Urquinaona was to prove more belligerent some years later in "*El Museo Canario*". In his article,

"Anthropology", although he indicated that "*anthropology is not a science that leads to atheism as many wretched spirits would have it*" (1880:39), he maintained that organic species and groups do not have eternal life, as was proved by the fact that millions of species had disappeared, and that many others had replaced them. From the simplest of things, step by step, through a general law of evolution, he said, one arrived at the "*age of the human being*". In short, for Chil, "*everything is explained in the genealogical theory that was evinced by Lamarck, that Darwin saw with greater clarity, and that Broca established by forming a body of doctrine around it*" (*ibid.*,40). Following Broca, he pointed out that man owed his place in Nature to the possession of two marvellous instruments, "*the brain that organises and the hand that executes*". Transformism, in the end, was nothing other than a movement of composition and decomposition, in the opinion of the Canary anthropologist. But with these hypotheses, as we have seen, likewise, in the case of raciology, Chil aimed the arrow of sociocultural causality in the direction of biological reductionism. "*The light penetrates even the most distant regions, and illuminates the peoples of inferior civilisation and race*", he was to say in a discourse in 1880 (El Museo Canario I:204). He found no other way to explain, for example, the fall of Rome if it were not for the vice and moral degeneration of the citizens of the Empire. In fact, Chil and the rest of the Canary anthropologists were not familiarised with the frameworks of the cultural evolutionists, and grouped around the research strategy of physical anthropology. However, although the cultural evolutionists had a more complex concept of the processes

of sociocultural transformation, this did not mean, as Harris indicated (1968) that Morgan, Tylor and Spencer (...) (*sic*) had a totally coherent theory in this area.

It is curious, however, that a collaboration of M. Sales y Ferré on the "*primitive state of Man*" that lent more attention to "*cultural evolution*" was to be published in "*El Museo Canario*". Sales Ferré showed how the course and development of the "*human spirit*' (*had begun*) *in the savage phase, elevating itself from this to the barbarian state to finally become civilised*" (1881:70). Sales y Ferré used Lyell, Lubbock and Tylor to develop the various different aspects that brought about the evolution of the earth, organic forms and Man. Insofar as the palaeontologist could reconstruct an animal from one sole bone, he said, or the geologist determine the previous composition of the Earth, one could determine "*the condition of savages of the first men*" by studying the historical evolution of societies, "*although considering no more than the part that has a sure chronology*" (*ibid.*, 169), that the founder of the Institute of Sociology in Madrid situated in 776BC in Olympia. If the Roman, Greek, Assyrian and Egyptian cultures were linked together, he said, it was clear that culture, in its most elevated form, was linked in an evolutionary chain to others that were lower.

Nevertheless, at the heart of the Museo Canario, under the direction of Chil, a solid line of research developed that, in spite of the internal differences and tensions, made progress by unifying criteria with respect to the development of the activities in the institution itself. The unifying criteria were to convert the Museum into the main centre of culture on the

Islands, to broaden its collections and also, doubtless ever present, to elevate the motivation, status and role of the island in the sociopolitical tissue in the Archipelago, factors that contributed greatly towards making the objectives of Chil a reality. His discourses transcribed in the Museum journal, allow us to see to what extent and to follow how the Museum was to become the scenario of the objectives of the bourgeoisie in Gran Canaria, in their struggle for the division of the provinces. In this scenario, two figures must be highlighted, that of the President D.J. Navarro and the Secretary, A. Martínez de Escobar. After the name of Gran Canaria was the one imposed generally on the islands (The Canary Islands), D. J. Navarro concluded his inaugural discourse on the occasion of the commemoration of the 13th anniversary of the foundation of the *Museo Canario*, by saying "*Also take note, Gentlemen, that as of this sovereign resolution, the confirmed and undebatable right of Canaria to be the only capital of the whole Archipelago has been set in motion.*"

In Tenerife, the founders of the "*Gabinete Científico*" which was, to a certain extent, the equivalent of the Museo Canario, would not have the same conditions to develop a systematic research programme. At least, they could not permanently group together as did, in effect, Chil, Grau-Bassas and other founder members of the Museum. Among other aspects, this perhaps explains why their manifestations were more sporadic on this subject. The reception of evolutionism in Tenerife was not to provoke any special public echo of the kind it did in Gran Canaria, where the controversy it stirred was virulent.

Nevertheless, there were impassioned defences of Darwinism that would seem to indicate, likewise, an auditorium that was not highly receptive to new theories. The identification with the nucleus of the evolutionist strategy was total, among others, in Bethencourt Alfonso. He understood that Darwinism was not only vital for anthropological research but that it should form part, in his opinion, of our common intellectual sense too. As M. Fariña has since pointed out, Bethencourt Alfonso, the doctor from Tenerife, indicated in his inaugural discourse to the academic course 1878-80 in the Secondary Education establishment in Santa Cruz:

"The knowledge of Darwinist theory imposes itself nowadays not only as an absolute necessity for all those who are dragged by their passions towards anthropological studies, but rather for all the people who desire to cultivate their intelligence in any branch of the natural sciences or whomsoever aspires towards having, even within a modest circle, a certain degree of culture and enlightenment (quoted in Fariña, 1983:30).

When dealing, among other things, with the problems of hygiene in Santa Cruz de Tenerife, he was equally final in his declarations when he said,

" (...) all of the existing systems being formed by chemical elements that pass incessantly from one entity to another, making up a temporary part of an individual, be it animal, vegetable or mineral, Nature not only avoided the annihilation of the material with the death or metamorphosis of the individual but also established

the formidable struggle for existence, the principle of "survival of the fittest" as formulated by Darwin" (1879:82).

Bethencourt Alfonso, still maintaining the 19th century faith in intellectual and moral progress, was to make recourse, likewise, to these general principles to denounce sociopolitical problems. Hunger, in his opinion, was the cause of two-thirds of the deaths in Santa Cruz. Poverty was that "*monument that neither the vicissitudes of time, nor the different civilisations, nor the very personifications of God on our planet, have been able to destroy*".

4.5. The obsession with roots

One of the main research foci derived from adopting the evolutionist strategy consisted in determining the origins of the indigenous island peoples. Together with race, the origins consumed a large portion of the efforts of the Canary anthropologists who attempted to reconstruct the past of the Islands. This concern was, of course, nothing new. It was already a matter of controversy in previous centuries. The recurrence and continuity of the subject needs no underlining as it is illustrative, in this sense, that from the first chroniclers through to the most recent publications, all the works are habitually prefaced by a more or less broad, more or less educated introduction highlighting the same, in an attempt to answer the question of where the Guanches came from. In general, we can affirm that all those who have written about the indigenous Canary islanders have been tempted or felt obliged to offer a solution to the question. The reconstruction of how the subject has been broached over these five

centuries of historiography would immediately give us a complex tangle of references and a mixed bag of authors, dates and genealogies. Tracing the "*enigma*" of the origins, therefore, in the whole literary and scientific production makes for a task for which nobody, at present, would appear to feel the necessity, unlike our historians of the past. Moreover, an exegetic work would have scarce interest, since what is important is not a matter of highlighting thematic continuity, which is obvious, but rather of determining the role that the concern for origins occupied in the scientific discourse and practices of the various different periods.

In the last third of the 19th century, the need to determine where the indigenous islanders had come from was something close to an obsession. The combination of evolutionist strategy together with the imperatives of raciology research to a large extent determined that this was to be one of the main questions under debate. There are various reasons of different natures that concurred to renew the interest for the subject in this period. We have already mentioned the importance for our anthropologists of linking the culture of the indigenous Canary islanders to the processes of formation of the "high civilisations". It was a matter, in synthesis, of justifying their incorporation into history, by means of an over-evaluation of their state of cultural development. To no small extent, the desire to lay down a bridge between the pre-Colonial past and the society that emerged from the Conquest was the motive, with the aim consisting in the elaboration of a "national history" that would account for the racial and cultural syncretism in the Canary society. It is not necessary to insist

upon the vacillations and contradictions into which this project became entangled but, in any case, we should highlight that the attitude with which they faced all controversy was based (or at least there was an attempt made to base it) on the application of empirical evidence contributed by archaeology, pre-history and the anthropology of the times. The scientism that they attempted to imprint on the resolution of the problem of origins was the other characteristic of this ambition.

If the publication of the "*Estudios*" of Chil gave reason for public debate on the validity of the evolutionist theories, the problem of the origins of the islanders also had its own controversial context. There was, however, a notable difference. While transformism affected the core of religious beliefs and threatened to cause the most firmly established dogma of the Church to tumble, the origins of the Guanches posed no such problem. It is easily understood, as a result, how virulently the controversy raged in the case of transformism as opposed to the strictly scientific framework within which research into origins was posed. In spite of this, the tension between scientism and Christian orthodoxy was also present in this field. Thus, for example, Chil was to insert a long "*Cartamemoria sobre el origen de los Guanches*" (Letter-Memoir on the origins of the *Guanches*) by Emiliano Martínez Escobar, one of his most direct collaborators, into the second volume of "*Estudios*", where it can be seen most clearly that there was an intellectual struggle between acceptance of geological, palaeontological and anthropological evidence ...(sic) and the criteria given through "revelation".

"I can say nothing of your Estudios with the exception

of what you feel with respect to the origins of Man and how long he has been in existence; of the beginnings that, in vain, have been searched for by geologists, palaeontologists and, most especially, anthropologists in their illusory "ideas of monism" (...) when we have a proof as simple as it is certain of its appearing in the world, as told by Moses in the Book of Genesis (E. Martínez Escobar, quoted in Chil, 1880:207).

Emiliano Martínez Escobar was to go on to lament that although, as he said,

"we have seen and studied together" everything written about the Canary Islands (...) the first attack launched by the anthropological and topographical theories is against the word of God, and that it be that sacred book against which the anthropologists have chosen to direct their energies".

However, the definition of the origins was the story of an important objective, far beyond theological dispute. The theoretical coordinates of 19th century anthropology led to the conviction that, by knowing where the Guanches were from, people would have the keys to understanding their own culture. From our present perspective, it is clear that our anthropologists did not come to any conclusive result by following that route. Most of their efforts remitted to the criticism of "fantastic genealogies" that linked the Guanches to some illustrious ascendancy and that entered into frank contradiction with the anthropological and archaeological data. Likewise, many of their arguments were based on mere

conjecture. However, the way in which this hypothesis was developed is a relevant question from the historiographical perspective. It should be indicated, at least, that this subject was directly related to the question of building a "general history" of the Canary Islands and to the strategy of raciology, to which the history of Canary anthropology should devote special attention in the future. Nevertheless, a brief synopsis of the controversy aroused by the publication of "The aborigines of the Canary islands" by C. Pizarroso Belmonte (1880) will stand us in good stead here to show in all its clarity that the question of the origins was something of greater weight than a mere pastime.

Pizarroso's work was met with several criticisms, above all in relation to his ideas about the origins of the Guanches. We have already seen, with respect to indigenism and race, that Pizarroso was one of the few authors who offered a discordant note with respect to what was the general reflexion within the Archipelago itself as to the original Canary islanders. Pizarroso did not believe in the majesty and virtues of aborigine life but was rather more coherent with the ethnocentric hypotheses of 19th century anthropology. He was convinced that their rudimentary material culture belied the possibility of the Guanches being "happy". As opposed to the exegetic obsessions of many of his contemporaries "*with the books written, tales of voyages, conquests and stories, we make no progress in Canary ethnography,*" (1880:8). For him, only anthropology and, specifically, scientific raciology could throw some light on the darkness surrounding the origins of the Canary islanders. Thus, "*from the rule of ethnography, it*

is easy to deduce: the more similar the intellectual aptitudes, the more similar the links of race, to the more similar the place of origin, to similar means of civilisation." (ibid., 11) From the craniometric studies of Broca, Quatrefages and Verneau, Pizarroso accepted that there were two different races among the indigenous islanders: The Cro-Magnon that was dominant on the islands of Tenerife and Gomera, and the Semitic type on the rest of the islands. Therefore, the conclusions are clear: the different riches of material culture, customs, art and religion between the different islands constituted proof for Pizarroso that they were, likewise, peoples of different racial genealogy. Moreover, they would have had different languages, being from different places, which, if one was to apply the principles of the times, "*one language, one nation*" impeded grouping the indigenous islanders into one and the same historical, cultural and racial model. The diverse degree of sociocultural evolution among the original islands was something detected by all the anthropologists, but this did not stop them from following first Berthelot, and then Chil, in talking indistinctly about "*indigenous Canary islanders or Guanches*" as if they were one sole historical and population unit.

The previous theses, together with Pizarroso's direct style of explanation, gave rise to significant debate on the matter that, again, has been ignored by the historiography of Canary anthropology. In their editions from the 7th June 1880, the journalists of the section, "*Revista Quincenal*" (Fortnightly Review) in the *Museo Canario* journal reflected the news of the publication of Pizarroso's book that, according to "*El Progreso*" was "*little more than the reproduction of a series of articles that,*

some time before, had been published in the newspaper "El Constitucional" signed by a "member of the Gabinete Científico". Pizarroso's research with respect to the racial origins of the original Canary islanders merited the evaluation of "curious" to the person writing in *El Museo Canario*. However, "El Progreso" went on to say, if what he wrote were to be true, "our deception would be complete". Days later, on the 23rd June, M. Maffiotte urged Pizarroso from the pages of the "Revista de Canarias" to continue his studies on the language aspect, although he proved to be in disagreement with respect to his opinions on the geological formation of the islands. Ireneo González, again from the "Revista de Canarias" was likewise to review "Los aborígenes" and, although he referred fundamentally to the style, he picked up on a "semantic" dispute (or perhaps something more than that) which has continued through to our days. According to I. González, in his review dated the 8th July 1880, this was,

"Beginning with the title of the work itself, we note that it is a contradiction of the same. Aborigines is a word made up of "ab" equivalent to "without" and "origo" (the origins) that is, the same as saying "without origin" and is applied to the natural race of a country by way of opposition to those who have come from some other place to settle in it. Therefore, if it is an attempt to prove that the Canary islanders had their origins in the Canaanites and Aryans, there is a clear contradiction; since, in such case, the first settlers would be "oriundos" or first peoples, from "oriori unde", origin in some other part) and their successors, indigenous ("inde genite",

engendered there) but never "aborigines".

Chil, equally, felt obliged to define himself on the matter although he used, like his contemporaries, the different denominations indistinctly.

"Autochthonous means from the land itself. Indigenous is the person born in the country; and aborigine is the person who has always been of the land (...) But nowadays, autochthonous has the spirit of the old idea, that the man was born in that land, while aborigine implies nothing with respect to the question of origin"
(1901:98).

Setting aside the problem of terminology, it was R. García Ramos who was to insistently counter the arguments of Pizarroso in a long series of articles (1880, 1880a, 1880b, 1881, among others) to which the author of "*Los aborígenes*" was to reply from the pages of "*El Memorandum*". In both cases, they repeated arguments and counter-arguments with respect to the place of origin and routes that the aborigines would have had to follow to reach the coasts of the Atlantic and, finally, the Islands. From a present perspective, the solution to the question does not consist, logically, in saying who made the "better" guess, but rather to determine the historical relevance of a question where "*Los Aborígenes*" and its critics merely represent the tip of the iceberg of the obsession with origins. This is an obsession in the history of the Canary islanders and one of the core points of their anthropology, whose history, to say it in the words of a famous historian, "*is now in the making*".

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ABELES, L.

1980 "Le musée du XIX siècle ou la nostalgie du présent". In *Dialectiques* 30:7176 (The 19th century museum or the nostalgia of the present).

ABREU GALINDO, J. de

1977[1632] *Historia de la conquista de las siete islas de Canaria. Introducción y notas, A. Cioranescu*. Santa Cruz de Tenerife. Goya Ediciones (History of the conquest of the seven Canary Islands. Introduction and notes by Cioranescu).

ACKERNECHT, E.H.

1955 "George Foster, Alexander von Humboldt and Ethnology". In *Isis* 46:8395.

ALONSO, M^a. R.

1952 *El poema de Viana*. Madrid. Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas (The poem by Viana).

1960 *Residente en Venezuela*. Mérida, Venezuela. Universidad de los Andes (Resident in Venezuela).

1970 "La literatura en Canarias (del siglo XVI al XIX)". In A. Millares Torres, *Historia General de las Islas Canarias*. IV. pp.282295 (Literature in the Canary Islands - from the 16th to the 19th century).

1977 "La literatura en Canarias durante el siglo XIX". In A. Millares Torres, *Historia General de las Islas Canarias*. V. pp.112131.

1978 "Estudios sobre Antonio de Viana". In Anuario de Estudios Atlánticos 24:475-523 (Studies on Antonio de Viana)

1982 " Entrevista con ...". *Gaceta de Canarias* 3:49-55 (An Interview with...).

ALEMANY, L.

1981 *El teatro en Canarias. Notas para una historia*. Santa Cruz de Tenerife: Ayuntamiento de Santa Cruz de Tenerife.

ALVAR, M.

1982 Prólogo al " *Diccionario de Historia Natural de las Islas Canarias*" de J. Viera y Clavijo. Las Palmas. Mancomunidad de Cabildos (Prologue to the Dictionary of the Natural History of the Canary Islands by J. Viera y Clavijo).

ALZOLA, J.M.

1980 Victor Grau Bassas, primer conservador de El Museo Canario. Las Palmas: El Museo Canario (Victor Grau-Bassas, the first curator of El Museo Canario).

ANDRIOLO, K.R.

1979 "Kulturkreislehre and the Austrian Mind". In *Man*, New Series. Vol.14, No. 1 (March 1979), pp.133-144. Published by Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland.

ARCO, C. DEL

1982 "Aproximación a la economía aborigen de Tenerife". In *50 Aniversario del Instituto de Estudios Canarios*, vol. II pp.51-87. Santa Cruz de Tenerife. Aula de Cultura/Inst. de Estudios Canarios (An approach to the aborigine economy in Tenerife. On the occasion of the 50th Anniversary of the Instituto de Estudios Canarios).

ARRIBAS Y SANCHEZ, C.

1900 *A través de las Islas Canarias*. Santa Cruz de Tenerife.
A. Delgado Yumar. (Throughout the Canary Islands).

ASAD, T., ed.

1973 *Anthropology and the Colonial Encounter*. London.
Ithaca Press.

AUGÉ, M.

1979 *Symbole, Fonction, Histoire. Les interrogations de l'anthropologie*. Paris: Hachette.

1982 *The Anthropological Circle: Symbol, Function, History*.
UK: Cambridge University Press.

AZCONA MAULEON, J.

1981 *Notas para una historia de la antropología vasca*:
Telesforo de Aranzadi y Jose Miguel de Barandiarán. In
Ethnica, N° 17, 63-84.

1982 *Antropología biosocial. Darwin y las bases modernas del comportamiento*. Barcelona: Anthropos (Bisocial anthropology. Darwin and the modern bases of behaviour).

1982 *La delimitación antropológica y etnológica de lo vasco y de los vascos*. In *Cuadernos de etnología y etnografía de Navarra*, Año N° 14, N° 40, 753-802.

BACHOFEN, J.J.

1861 *Das Mutterrecht: eine Untersuchung über die Gynaiokratie der alten Welt nach ihrer religiösen und rechtlichen Natur*. Stuttgart: Verlag Von Kraiss & Hoffmann.

BALOUT, L.

1964 *La Préhistoire*. Leçon inaugurale de la Chaire de Préhistoire prononcée le 14 avril 1964. Paris: Musée de l'Histoire Naturelle. (Prehistory: Inaugural speech on the creation of the Chair of Prehistory).

BARBADOS, GROUP OF

1979 *Indianidad y descolonización en América Latina*. México, D.F. Nueva Imagen (American Indian identity and decolonisation in Latin America).

BARKER WEBB, PHILIPPE & BERTHELOT, S.

1836 *Histoire Naturelle des Îles Canaries*. Paris: Béthune (Natural History of the Canary islands).

BARNES, B.

1982 T.S. Kuhn and the Social Science. London: MacMillan.

BARRAS ARAGON, F. DE LAS

1926 "Notas de una breve excursión a las Islas Canarias". In *Memorias de la S.E.A.P.* V:211239 (Notes from a brief excursion to the Canary Islands).

BARTH, F.ed.,

1969 *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries: The Social Organization of Cultural Difference*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.

BATAILLON, M. & SAINT-LU, A.

1971 *Las Casas dans l'histoire*. Paris: Juillard (Las Casas in history).

1974 Las Casas ¿un profeta? In *Revista de Occidente*, N° 141(Las Casas, a prophet?).

1976 *El Padre Las Casas y la Defensa de los Indios*, Barcelona: Ariel (Father Las Casas and the Defence of the Latin American Indians).

BATLLORI Y LORENZO, J.

1900 "La 'cueva pintada'". In *El Museo Canario* IX:117-123 (The "Painted Cave").

1901 "El cenobio de Valerón". In *El Museo Canario* X. 106:12 (The Granary of Valerón).

BELLO ESPINOSA, D.

1879 "Un jardín canario". In *Revista de Canarias* I. 21;22;23;24;25;26. Il. 27;28;29;30 (A Canary Garden).

BELLO, S.

1932 *Estudios biográficos de mi insigne maestro el Dr. René Verneau, presidente honorario de El Museo Canario*. Las Palmas: Tipografía La Provincia. (Biographical studies of my celebrated master Dr. René Verneau, Honorary President of the Museo Canario).

BENDER, D.

1965 "The Development of French Anthropology". In *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences* 1:139-151.

BENDYSHE, THOMAS

1865 *The Anthropological Treatises of Johann Friedrich Blumenbach*. London: Longman, Green, Longman, Roberts & Green.

1865 *Memoirs read before the Anthropological Society of London*. London: Trübner and Company.

BENITEZ PADILLA, S.

1950 "La obra científica de Viera y Clavijo". In *J. Viera y Clavijo, Historia de Canarias* (The scientific work of Viera y Clavijo).

BERNAL, J.D. & CORNFORTH, M.

1949 *Science for Peace and Socialism*. London: Birch Books Ltd.,

BERNAL, J.D. ed.,

1954 *Science in History*. New York: Cameron Associates, Inc.,

BERQUE, J.

1968 *La descolonización del mundo*. México: Fondo de Cultura Económica (The decolonisation of the world).

BERTHELOT, S.

1841 "*Mémoire sur les Guanches*". In *Memoires de la Société d'Ethnographie* 1:129-231 (Memoirs of the Guanches).

1879 "Prólogo para el Compendio de Geografía General, por D.J.P. Parrilla". In *Revista de Canarias* I. 3:333-4; 5:55-7 (Prologue to the general Compendium of Geography).

1879 "Estudios fisiológicos e históricos sobre la raza Guanche y sobre la persistencia de los caracteres que la distinguen aún entre las actuales poblaciones de las islas del Archipiélago Canario". In *Revista de Canarias* I. 9:130-133 (Physiological and historical studies on the Guanche race and on the persistence of features that can still be distinguished in the present populations of the Canary Archipelago).

1879 "Arboles y bosques". In *Revista de Canarias* I:15;16;17;19;20;21 (Trees and woods).

1880 "Necesidad de la conservación y repoblación de los bosques y de la plantación de arbolado en la cuenca de Santa Cruz de Tenerife". In *Revista de Canarias* II.29:3739; 30:4951 (Need for preservation and re-population of the woods and for trees to be planted in the basin of Santa Cruz de Tenerife).

1880 "Antonio Viana: PoetaHistoriador". In *Revista de Canarias* II. 32:33;34;35 (Antonio Viana: Poet-Historian).

1882 "El drago". In *La Ilustración de Canarias* I. 12:96 (The Dragon-Tree).

1977[1842] *Etnografía y Anales de la Conquista de las Islas Canarias*, 2 vol. Las Palmas: El Museo Canario (Ethnography and Annals of the Conquest of the Canary Islands).

1978[1842] *Etnografía y Anales de la Conquista de las Islas Canarias*. Santa Cruz de Tenerife: Goya Ediciones (Ethnography and Annals of the Conquest of the Canary Islands).

1980 *Recuerdos y Epistolario (1820-1880)*. La Laguna, Tenerife: Instituto de Estudios Canarios (Memories and correspondence).

1980 *Primera estancia en Tenerife*. (1820-1830). Santa Cruz de Tenerife: Aula de Cultura (First Stay in Tenerife).

1980[1879] *Antigüedades Canarias. Anotaciones sobre el origen de los pueblos que ocuparon las Islas Afortunadas desde los primeros tiempos hasta la época de su conquista*. Santa Cruz de Tenerife: Goya Ediciones (On Antiquities in the Canary Islands. Notes on the origins of the peoples that occupied the Islands of the Blessed from the early days through to the Conquest).

BESTARD, J.

1982 "*Viajar, observar, y comparar: de los textos de los antiguos a la naturaleza humana como texto*". La Laguna, Tenerife: Instituto de Ciencias de la Educación.(s.p.). (Unpublished. To travel, observe and compare: from the ancient texts to human nature as a text).

1982 "*El salvaje en el espacio cultural de la Ilustración*". La Laguna, Tenerife: Instituto de Ciencias de la Educación. (s.p.). (Unpublished. The savage in the cultural space of the Enlightenment).

BETHENCOURT ALFONSO, J.

1879 "La higiene en Santa Cruz de Tenerife". In *Revista de Canarias* I. 6:8182; 7:105106; 17:264267 (Hygiene in Santa Cruz de Tenerife).

1880 "Dos palabras con relación al estudio de los aborígenes de Canarias". In *Revista de Canarias* II. 31:6869 (A few words with relation to the study of the Canary natives).

1881 "Notas para los estudios prehistóricos de las islas de Gomera y Hierro. I.El silbo articulado en la Gomera". In *Revista de Canarias* III. 71:321322 (Notes towards the prehistoric studies of the islands of Gomera and Hierro. I.The whistle articulated in La Gomera).

1881 "Notas para los estudios prehistóricos de las islas de la Gomera y Hierro. II. Sistema religioso de los antiguos gomeros". In *Revista de Canarias* III. 73:355356 (Notes towards the prehistoric studies of the islands of Gomera and Hierro II. The religious system of the ancient inhabitants of Gomera).

1882 "Notas para los estudios prehistóricos de las islas de la Gomera y Hierro. III. Cuevas funerarias, kjökkenmoddinger y letreros en la Gomera". In *Revista de Canarias* V. 82:114115 (Notes towards the prehistoric studies of the islands of Gomera and Hierro III. Funeral caves, shell middens and signs).

1882 "Notas para los estudios prehistóricos de las islas de la Gomera y Hierro. IV. Palabras pertenecientes al idioma de los antiguos gomeros". In *Revista de Canarias* IV. 8384:131133 (Notes towards the prehistoric studies of the islands of Gomera and Hierro. IV. Words belonging to the language of the ancient Gomeros).

1985 *Los aborígenes canarios*. Edición de Africo Amasik y Hupalupa. Santa Cruz de Tenerife: Benchomo (The Canary aborigines).

BETHENCOURT MASSIEU, A.

1975 "Desarrollo de las investigaciones históricas canarias tras Millares Torres". In A. Millares Torres, *Historia General de las Islas Canarias* (Development of Canary research in history after Millares Torres).

BIDDIS, M.D.

1966 "Gobineau and the Origins of European Racism". *Race* 7:255270.

BIDON CHANAL, C.

1982 "Historia y naturaleza en los siglos XVIII y XIX". La Laguna, Tenerife. Instituto de Ciencias de la Educación. (s.p.). (Unpublished: History and nature in the 18th y 19th centuries).

BIDON CHANAL, C. & BESTARD CAMPS, J.

1979 Power and War in Primitive Societies: the Work of Pierre Clastres. In *Critique of Anthropology* 4 (13-14): pp. 221-227.

BITTERLI, U.

1982 *Los "salvajes" y los "civilizados". El encuentro de Europa y Ultramar*. México: Fondo de Cultura Económica (The "savages" and "civilised men". The encounter between Europe and Overseas).

BLANCO, J.

1950 "Biografía de Viera y Clavijo". In *J. Viera y Clavijo, Historia de Canarias*. (Biography of Viera y Clavijo).

BLOCH, M.

1977 "The Past and the Present in the Present". In *Man* 12:278-292.

BOAS, F.

1904 "The History of Anthropology". In *Science* 20:513-524.

BOHANNAN, P., & GLAZER, N.

1973 *High Points in Anthropology*. New York: Knopf.

BONTE, P.

1974-75 From ethnology to anthropology: on critical approaches in the human sciences. In *Critique of Anthropology*, no.2, 1974 (pp.36-67) and no.3, 1975 (pp. 1-26).

1975 *De la etnología a la antropología*. Barcelona: Anagrama.

BONTIER, PIERRE & LE VERRIER, JEAN

1874 [1629-30] *Le Canarien. Livre de La Conquête et Conversion des Canaries (1402-1422)*. Rouen: Imprimerie de E.Gagniard. (The Canary islander, Book of the Conquest and Conversion of the Canary Islands).

BOON, J.A.

1982 *Other Tribes, Other Scribes. Symbolic Anthropology in the Comparative Study of Cultures, Religions, and Texts*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

BORY DE ST. VINCENT, J.B.

1804 *Essais sur les Îles Fortunées et l'antique Atlantide*. Paris: Bandouin (Essays on the Islands of the Blessed and Ancient Atlantis).

BOSCH MILLARES, J.

1971 *Don Gregorio Chil y Naranjo. Su vida y su obra*. Las Palmas: Cabildo Insular. (Don Gregorio Chil y Naranjo. His life and works).

BOUCHER DE CRÈVECOEUR DE PERTHES, J.

1841 *De la Création, Essai sur l'Origine et la Progression des Êtres*. Paris: Treuttel et Wurtz Libraires (On Creation, an Essay on the Origin and Development of Beings).

1850-51 *Hommes et Choses; Alphabet des Passions et des Sensations*. Paris: Treuttel et Wurtz Libraires (Men and Things: Alphabet of th Passions and Sensations).

BOWLER, P.J.

1974 "Evolutionism in the Enlightenment". In *History of Science* 12:159-183.

BOWLER, P.J.

1983 *The Eclipse of Darwinism. Anti-Darwinian Evolution Theories in the Decades around 1900*, Baltimore & London: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

1985 *El eclipse del darwinismo. Teorías evolucionistas y antidarwinistas en las décadas en torno a 1900*. Barcelona: Labor.

BRABOOK, E.W.

1980 "Memoir of Paul Broca". In *Journal of Anthropology*. Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland 10:242261.

BREW, J.O., ed.

1968 *One Hundred Years of Anthropology*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

BROCE, G.

1973 *History of Anthropology*. Minneapolis: Burgess Publishing Co.

BURROW, J.W

1966 *Evolution and Society. A Study in Victorian Social Theory*. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.

1963 "Evolution and Anthropology in the 1860's: The Anthropological Society of London, 186371". In *Victorian Studies* 7:137154.

CAMPS, G.

1970 *L'Homme de Cro-Magnon. Anthropologie et Archéologie*. Paris: Arts et Métiers graphiques. (Cro-Magnon Man: Anthropology and Archaeology).

CARBALLO WANGUEMERT, B.

1862 *Las Afortunadas. Viaje descriptivo a las Islas Canarias*. Madrid: Imprenta M. Galiano. (The Islands of the Blessed. A descriptive voyage to the Canary Islands).

CARO BAROJA, J.

1983 *La aurora del pensamiento antropológico. La antropología de los clásicos griegos y latinos*. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas. (The dawn of anthropological reflection. The anthropology of the Greek and Latin Classics).

1985 *Los fundamentos del pensamiento antropológico moderno*. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas (The Fundamentals of Modern Anthropological reflection).

CASTAÑEIRA, R.F.

1883 "Antigüedades de Fuerteventura". In *La Ilustración de Canarias* I. 21:171172 (Antiquities of Fuerteventura).

CÁTEDRA, M.

1978 "Notes on the History of Spanish Anthropology". In *History of Anthropology Newsletter* 5:1015.

CAVALLI-SFORZA, L.L & FELDMAN, M.W.

(1981) *Cultural Transmission and Evolution*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

CAVANILLES, J.

1981 *Cartas a Viera y Clavijo*. Santa Cruz de Tenerife: Aula de Cultura (Letters to Viera y Clavijo).

CHALMERS, A.

1976 *What is this Thing called Science?* Queensland, Australia: University of Queensland Press.

1982 *¿Qué es esa cosa llamada ciencia?. Una valoración de la naturaleza y el estatuto de la ciencia y sus métodos.* Madrid: Siglo XXI.(What is this thing called Science?).

CHAMPSAUR SICILIA, B.

1916 *Hacia la cultura europea.* La Laguna, Tenerife: Imprenta Suc. de M. Curbelo.(Towards European Culture).

1923 *Por el ideal socialista.* La Laguna, Tenerife: Imprenta M. Curbelo (Towards Socialist ideals).

1928 *Transformismo.* Las Palmas: Imprenta Miranda. (Transformism).

1928 *Humanización del arte.* Las Palmas: Imprenta Miranda. (Humanisation of Art).

1929 *Anotaciones.* Las Palmas: Imprenta Miranda. (Annotations).

1934 *Adelante.* Palma de Mallorca: Tipografía J. Tons. (Forward).

CHATEAUBRIAND, F.A.

1802 *Génie de Christianisme ou Beautés de la Religion Chrétienne.* Paris: Mignoret.

CHILDE,V. GORDON

1925 *The Dawn of European Civilisation.* London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co.

1926 *The Aryans: A Study of Indo-European Origins.* London: Kegan Paul.

1933 Races, Peoples and Cultures in Prehistoric Europe. In *History*, Vol. XVIII, N° 71, 193-203.

1956 *Society and Knowledge: The Growth of Human Traditions*. New York: Harper.

1958 *The Prehistory of European Society*. Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin.

CHIL Y NARANJO, G.

1857 *Des differents moyens qui ont été employés dans le but de guérir les retrécissements de l'urethre*. Paris: Rignoux Imp.(The different means used in healing narrowing of the urether).

1876-80-91 *Estudios históricos, climatológicos y patológicos de las Islas Canarias*. Las Palmas: Imprenta Miranda. (Historical, climatological and pathological Studies of the Canary Islands).

1880 "Antropología". In *El Museo Canario* I. 1:48; 2:3741; 3:7174. (Anthropology).

1880 "Expedición a Guayadeque". In *El Museo Canario* I. 5:129133; 6:161166. II. 13:14. (Expedition to Guayadeque).

1880 "Apósisis estiloidea en el cráneo de los Guanches de Gran Canaria". In *El Museo Canario* II. 14:3840. (The styloid process in the skulls of the Guanches of Gran Canaria).

1880 "Estudios antropológicos en Tenerife". In *El Museo Canario* II. 16:103106. (Anthropological Studies in Tenerife).

1880 "La cerámica entre los Guanches de Gran Canaria". In *El Museo Canario* II. 18:160164. (Ceramics among the Guanches of Gran Canaria).

1880 "Platón y su Timeo". In *El Museo Canario* II. 20:224229.

(Plato and his Timaeus).

1880 "Platón y la Atlántida". In *El Museo Canario* II. 21:257261.

(Plato and the Atlantis).

1882 "Museos antropológicos y de Historia Natural en Europa". In *El Museo Canario* IV. 47:325328; 48:357360.

(Anthropological and Natural History Museums in Europe

1882 "Importancia de las exploraciones". In *El Museo Canario* V.57: 289292; 58:321326. VI. 58:59. (Importance of Digs and Explorations).

1882 "La antropología, auxiliar de la historia". In *El Museo Canario* VI:274276. (Anthropology, the auxiliary to History).

1899 "Discurso en el XIX aniversario de la fundación del Museo". In *El Museo Canario* VII:2021. (Discourse on the 19th anniversary of the founding of the Canary Museum).

1899 "El Museo en sus relaciones con la industria canaria". In *El Museo Canario* VII:138143. (The Museum and its links with Canary Industry).

1899 "Las exploraciones de 1886". In *El Museo Canario* VII:273279.(Explorations in 1886).

1900 "Anatomía patológica de los aborígenes canarios". In *El Museo Canario* VIII:4244; 7980; 111112; 139141. (Pathological Anatomy of the Canary aborigines).

1901"El dolmen de Tirajana". In *El Museo Canario* X. 114:9798 (The dolmen of Tirajana).

CIORANESCU, A.

1950 "Formación cultural de Viera y Clavijo". In *J. Viera y Clavijo, Historia de Canarias*. (The Cultural Formation of Viera y Clavijo).

1960 *Alejandro de Humboldt en Tenerife*. La Laguna, Tenerife: Instituto de Estudios Canarios. (Alejandro de Humboldt in Tenerife).

1967 "Biografía de Antonio de Viana". In *Anuario de Estudios Atlánticos* 13:117155 (The Biography of Antonio de Viana).

1970 "El Poema de Antonio de Viana". In *Anuario de Estudios Atlánticos* 16:67141.(The Poem of Antonio de Viana).

1977 "La Ilustración canaria". In A. Millares Torres, *Historia General de las Islas Canarias*. IV,pp.185193. (The Canary Enlightenment).

1980 "Un erudito en Canarias: Sabino Berthelot". In A. Cioranescu et al., *Homenaje a Sabino Berthelot*. (An educated expert in the Canary islands: Sabino Berthelot).

1982 "Don José de Viera y Clavijo o el precio de la insularidad". In *Gaceta de Canarias* 3:820.(Don José de Viera y Clavijo, or the price of insularity).

1984 "Viera y Clavijo y la filosofía de la historia". In *Syntaxis* 4:5774.(Viera y Clavijo and the philosophy of history).

CIORANESCU, A. et al.

1980 *Homenaje a Sabino Berthelot en el centenario de su fallecimiento (1880-1980)*. La Laguna, Tenerife. Instituto de Estudios Canarios.(Homage to Sabino Berthelot on the centenary of his death).

CLASTRES, P.

1978 "Salvajes y civilizados". In F. Chatelet, ed., *Historia de las Ideologías. II. Saber y Poder*. pp.177193. Madrid. ZYX.(Savages and Civilised Men).

COLEMAN, W.

1962 "Lyell and the 'Reality' of Species: 18301833". In *Isis* 53:325338.

COMAS, J.

1956 *Historia y bibliografía de los Congresos Internacionales de Ciencias Antropológicas. (1865-1954)*. Mexico: UNAM (History and Bibliography of the International Conferences of Anthropological Sciences).

1957 *Manual de Antropología Física*. México: Fondo de Cultura Económica.

1960 *Manual of Scientific Anthropology*, Illinois USA: Charles C. Thomas Publishers.

1961 "'Scientific' Racism Again?". In *Current Anthropology* 2:303340.

CONDORCET, JEAN-ANTOINE, MARQUIS DE

1804 *Oeuvres Complètes*. Paris: Henrichs (Complete Works)

COOK, A.C.

1900 "The aborigines of the Canary Islands". In *American Anthropologist* 2:451.

COPANS, J.

1971 "Pour une histoire et une sociologie des études Africaines". In *Cahiers d' Études Africaines* 11:422447.(For a history and sociology of African Studies).

COPANS, J. & JAMIN, J.

1978 *Aux origines de l'anthropologie française. Les Mémoires de la Société des Observateurs de l'Homme en l'an VIII*. Paris.

Le Sycomore.(On the origins of French Anthropology. Memoirs of the Société des Observateurs de l'Homme in year 8).

COQUET, A.

1982[1884] *Una excursión a las Islas Canarias*. La Orotava, Tenerife: J.A.D.L. Ediciones. (An excursion to the Canary Islands).

CUNNINGHAM, J.D.

1908 "Anthropology in the Eighteenth Century". In *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 38:1035.

DANIEL, G.

1972 "The origins of Boucher de Perthes' Archéologie". In *Antiquity* 46:317320.

DARIAS PADRON, D.

1929 *Costumbres e ideales de Santa Cruz de Tenerife en el siglo XVIII*. Santa Cruz de Tenerife: Imprenta Católica. (Customs and ideals in Santa Cruz de Tenerife in the 18th Century).

DARNELL, R.

1975 "The History of Cultural Anthropology: Two Views". In *Reviews in Anthropology* 2:118125.

1977 "History of Anthropology in Historical Perspective". In *Annual Review of Anthropology* 6:399417.

DARNELL, R. ed.

1974 *Readings in the History of Anthropology*. New York: Oxford University Press.

DARWIN, CHARLES

1859 *On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection, or the Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life*. London: John Murray.

DÉGERANDO, JOSEPH MARIE

1800 *Considérations sur les méthodes à suivre dans l'observation des Peuples Sauvages*. No information as to date or place of publication.

1969 *The Observation of Savage Peoples*. Translation F.C.T. Moore. London: Routledge.

DE LAGUNA, F.

1976 *Select Papers from the American Anthropology 1888-1920*. Washington: American Anthropological Association.

DELACAMPAGNE, Christian

1983 *Racismo y occidente*. Barcelona: Argos Vergara. (Racism and the West).

DE PAUW, CORNELIUS

1771 *Recherches philosophiques sur les Américains ou Mémoires intéressants pour servir à l'histoire de l'Espèce Humaine, avec une Dissertation sur l'Amérique & les Américains*. Berlin: No publisher found (Philosophical Research into the Americans or Interesting Memories at the service of the history of Humankind with a Dissertation on America and the Americans).

DEL PINO DÍAZ, FERMÍN

1975 Antropología y Colonialismo: Anotaciones para el caso español. In *Revista Española de opinión pública*, N° 42, 145-55.

DEL VALLE, TERESA

1981 Visión General de la Antropología Vasca. In *Ethnica*, N° 17, Barcelona.

DESMOULINS, Camille

1825 *Le Vieux Cordelier*. Paris: Baudouin Frères, Éditeurs (The Old Cordelier. Newspaper: 2 issues. Published by Desmoulins himself).

DIAMOND, S., ed.

1980 *Anthropology; Ancestors and Heirs*. The Hague: Mouton.

DÍAZ RODRIGUEZ, J.

1969 "Discurso del Presidente de EL Museo Canario". In *Anuario de Estudios Atlánticos* 15:16 20. (Discourse of the President of the Canary Museum).

DIEGO CUSCOY, L.

1963 *Paleontología de las Islas Canarias*. Santa Cruz de Tenerife: Museo Arqueológico (Paleontology of the Canary Islands).

1968 *Los Guanches. Vida y cultura del primitivo habitante de Tenerife*. Santa Cruz de Tenerife: Museo Arqueológico. (The Guanches. Life and Culture of the Primitive Inhabitants of Tenerife).

197172 "Don Elías Serra Ràfols y la época heroica de la arqueología canaria". In *Revista de Historia Canaria* 34:14.

(Don Elías Serra Ráfols and the heroic era of Canary archaeology).

1975 "Notas para una historia de la antropología canaria". In A. Millares, *Historia General de Canarias*, 1:267290. Las Palmas. Edirca.(Notes for a history of the Canary Anthropology).

1976 "Glosa a un fragmento de los 'Apuntes' de Don José de Anchieta y Alarcón, (Necrópolis y momias)". In *Anuario de Estudios Atlánticos* 22:233270.(Gloss to a fragment of the "Notes" by Don José de Anchieta y Alarcón).

1982 "El Museo Canario. Factores determinantes de su continuidad". In *El Museo Canario* 42:718.(The Canary Museum: Decisive Factors in its Continuity).

DISTON, A.

1829 *Costumes of the Canary Islands*. London: Elder Smith.

DOBZHANSKY, T. and MONTAGU, M.F.A.

1963 "Two views of Coon's Origin of Races". In *Current Anthropology* 4: 360368.

DUCHET, M.

1971 *Anthropologie et Histoire au siècle des Lumières*, Paris: Maspero.

1975 *Antropología e Historia en el siglo de las Luces*. México: Siglo XXI. (Anthropology and History in the Enlightenment)

1985 *Le partage des savoirs. Discours historique, discours ethnologique*. Paris: Éditions La Découverte. (Sharing Knowledge. Historical discourse, ethnological discourse).

EDWARDS, W.F.

1841 "Des caractères physiologiques des races humaines, considérées dans leur rapport avec l'histoire". In *Memoires de la Société d'Ethnologie de Paris* I: 1108.(On the physiological characteristics of the human races considered in their relation to history).

EDWARDES, C.

1888 *Rides and studies in the Canary Islands*. London: Fisher Unwin.

ERIKSON, P.

1982 *History of Anthropology Bibliography*. Halifax Saint Mary's University Occasional Papers in Anthropology, XI.

1983 "How Fares the History of Physical Anthropology". In *History of Anthropology Newsletter* X:1216.

ESPINOSA, A. de

1980[1594] *Del origen y milagros de la Santa Imagen de nuestra Señora de Candelaria, que apareció en la Isla de Tenerife, con la descripción de esta Isla*. Edition and Introduction by A. Cioranescu. Santa Cruz de Tenerife. Goya Ediciones. (On the origin and miracles of the Holy Image of Our Lady of Candelaria who appeared on the island of Tenerife, with the description of this island).

ESTÉVANEZ, N.

1878 "Canarias". In *Revista de Canarias*. I.2:1922.(The Canary Islands).

1900 *Musa canaria*. Tenerife: Imprenta Isleña.(Canary muse).

ESTÉVEZ, F.

1982 *Epistemología e historia de la antropología en el materialismo cultural*. Memoria de Licenciatura. La Laguna (Epistemology and History of Anthropology in Cultural Materialism) Dissertation.

1983 "Colonialismo e historia de la antropología en Africa". (Unpublished: Colonialism and History of Anthropology in Africa).

1983 "El materialismo cultural, de Marvin Harris." In *Revista Canaria de Filosofía y Ciencia Social*, num. 0 (pp.173-175).

1985 "Ancestros y precursores en la historia de la antropología". In *Revista Canaria de Filosofía y Ciencia Social* 1:78-93.(Ancestors and Precursors in the History of Anthropology).

1985 "Etnicidad y nacionalismo en Canarias". In ROA, *Revista del Oeste de África* 1/2: 6274.(Ethnicity and Nationalism in the Canary Islands).

EVANSPRITCHARD, E.E.

1951 *Social Anthropology*, London: Cohen & West

1975 *Antropología Social*. Buenos Aires: Nueva Visión.

1981 *A History of Anthropological Thought*. A. Singer, ed. Introduction, E. Gellner. New York: Basic Books.

FARIÑA, M.A.

1981 "La aportación de D. Juan Bethencourt Alfonso a los estudios arqueológicos y antropológicos en Canarias". *I Congreso Iberoamericano de Etnografía y Folklore*. Las Palmas. (The Contribution of D. Juan Bethencourt Alfonso

to archaeological and anthropological studies in the Canary Islands).

1982 "Introducción al estudio del 'mal de ojo' en la Islas Canarias". In *Arxiu d'Etnografia* 2:288-310. (Introduction to the study of the "evil eye" in the Canary Islands).

1983 "El Dr. Juan Bethencourt Alfonso". In *Gaceta de Canarias* 5:2639. (Dr. Juan Bethencourt Alfonso).

FERNÁNDEZ ARMESTO, F.

1982 *The Canary Islands after the Conquest. The Making of the Colonial Society in the Early Sixteenth Century*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

FEYERABEND, P.

1975 *Against Method: Outline of an Anarchistic Theory of Knowledge*. London: Verso Books.

1981 *Tratado contra el método*. Madrid: Tecnos.

FISCHER, E.

1926 "Estudios antropológicos sobre Tenerife". In *Butlletí de l'Associació Catalana d'Antropologia, Etnologia i Prehistòria*. IV: 226-230. (Anthropological studies on Tenerife).

1949 "Problemas antropológicos de las Islas Canarias". In *Homenaje a L. de Hoyo Sainz*. I. pp. 153-161. Madrid: Sociedad Española de Antropología, Etnografía y Prehistoria. (Anthropological Problems in the Canary Islands).

FISHER, Ronald

1953 Croonian Lecture- Population Genetics. In *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series B, Biological Sciences*. 141 (905): 510-523.

FOWLER, D.

1975 "Notes on Inquiries in Anthropology: A Bibliographic Essay. In T.H. Thorensen, ed., *Toward a Science of Man. Essays in the History of Anthropology*. The Hague: Mouton.

FRAZER, JAMES GEORGE

1890 *The Golden Bough: a study in comparative religion*. London: MacMillan.

1935 *Creation and Evolution in Primitive Cosmogonies and Other Pieces*. New York: Books for Libraries Press.

FUSTÉ M.

1958-9 "Algunas observaciones acerca de la antropología de las poblaciones prehistórica y actual de Gran Canaria". In *El Museo Canario* XIXXX: num. 65-72 pp.1279. (Some observations on the anthropology of the pre-historic and present populations of Gran Canaria).

GABINETE CIENTÍFICO DE SANTA CRUZ DE TENERIFE

1878 Reglamento. Santa Cruz de Tenerife: Imprenta M. Alvarez. (Rules and regulations).

GALVÁN TUDELA, A.

1987 *Islas Canarias: una aproximación antropológica*. Barcelona: Anthropos. (The Canary Islands: an anthropological approach).

GARCÍA CUÉ, J.R.

1985 *Aproximación al estudio del krausismo andaluz*. Madrid: Tecnos (Approach to the Study of Andalusian Kraussism).

GARCÍA DEL ROSARIO, C.

1981 *Historia de la Real Sociedad Económica de Amigos del País de Las Palmas, (1776-1900)*. Las Palmas: Mancomunidad de Cabildos. (History of the Royal Economic Society of Friends of the Country in Las Palmas).

GARCÍA RAMOS, R.

1880 "El mito de los Campos Elíseos". In *Revista de Canarias* II. 40:214216. (The Myth of the Elysian Fields).

1880 "Sobre el origen de los Guanches". In *Revista de Canarias* II. 43:267269; 44:281283. (On the origins of the Guanches)

1880 "Estudios etnográficos". In *Revista de Canarias* II.46:47;49. (Ethnographic Studies).

1881 "Dos palabras sobre los maxos y libifenicios". In *Revista de Canarias* III. 51:58. (A few words on the Maxos and Lybian-Phoenicians).

1883 "Sobre la antigüedad del hombre". In *La Ilustración de Canarias* I. 19:154155. (On the antiquity of Man).

1883 "La naturaleza". In *La Ilustración de Canarias* 1. 23:187-188; 24:195196. (Nature).

GARDFIELD, E.

1984 "Anthropology Journals what they cite and what cites them?". In *Current Anthropology* 25.

GERHOLM, T. and HANNERZ, U.

1983 "Introduction: The Shaping of National Anthropologies". In *Ethnos* 47:535.

GLAS, G

1764 *The history of the discovery and conquest of the Canary Islands translated from a Spanish manuscript lately found in the island of Palma, with an Inquiry into the origin of the ancient inhabitants to which is added a Description of the Canary Islands, including the modern history of the inhabitants, and an account of their manners, customs, trade, &..* London: R. & J. Dudley (Pall Mall) and T. Durham in the Strand

1976 *Descripción de las Islas Canarias, incluida la historia moderna de sus habitantes y una relación d sus usos y costumbres, comercio etc..* Translation and introduction, C. Aznar de Acevedo. La Laguna, Tenerife: Instituto de Estudios Canarios.

GLICK, T.

1982 *Darwin en España*. Barcelona: Península. (Darwin in Spain).

GOLDMAN, I.

1959 "Evolution and Anthropology". In *Victorian Studies* III:5575.

GÓMEZ DE LA SERNA, G.

1974 *Los viajeros de la Ilustración*. Madrid: Alianza. (The Voyagers of the Enlightenment).

GONZÁLEZ ANTON, R.

1982 "Conquista y aculturación de los aborígenes de Tenerife". In *Gaceta de Canarias* 3:3538. (Conquest and acculturation of the aborigines of Tenerife).

1982a "Introducción al estudio de las primeras Historias Generales de las Islas Canarias." In *50 Aniversario del Instituto de Estudios Canarios*. II.pp.17183 (Introduction to the first General Histories of the Canary Islands).

GONZÁLEZ ANTÓN, R. & TEJERA GASPAR, A.

1981 *Los aborígenes canarios. Gran Canaria y Tenerife*. La Laguna, Tenerife: Secretariado Publicaciones Universitarias, Universidad de La Laguna. (The Canary aborigines).

GONZÁLEZ ESPINOLA, E.

1880 "El Gabinete 'Casilda' en Tacoronte". In *El Museo Canario* I. 5:167170.(The Gabinete Casilda in Tacoronte.

1880 "Antonio Viana". In *El Museo Canario* II:33539.

GOSSIAUX, P.P.

1984 "Séquences de l'Histoire dans l'anthropologie des Lumières. Problèmes et mythes". In B. RuppEisenreich, *Histoire de l'anthropologie*. pp.6785. Paris. Klincksieck. (History Sequences in Enlightenment Anthropology. Problems and Myths).

GOULDNER, A.W.

1973 *For Sociology: Renewal and Critique in Sociology Today*, New York: Basic Books.

1979 *La sociología actual: renovación y crítica*. Madrid: Alianza.

GRAHAM, L.,LEPENIES,W. & WEINGERT, P.

1983 *Functions and Uses of Disciplinary Histories*. Dordrecht, Holland: D. Reidel Publishing Company.

GRAUBASSAS, V.

1880 "Una excursión por la Gran Canaria". In *El Museo Canario* I. 2:4853; 5:139141.(An excursion around Gran Canaria).

1880 "Las cuevas de Guayadeque". In *El Museo Canario* I. 3:6569.(The Caves at Guayadeque).

1880 "Datos para el estudio de los cráneos Guanche-canarios". In *El Museo Canario* I. 9:283288.(Data for the study of the Guanche-Canary skulls).

1881 "Nuevos objetos canarios". In *El Museo Canario* III. 36:357360.(New Canary objects).

1882 "Inscripciones numídicas de la isla del Hierro". In *El Museo Canario* IV. 46:47;48. V.56.(Numidian inscriptions on the island of El Hierro).

1980 *Usos y costumbres de la población campesina de Gran Canaria (1885-1888)*. Las Palmas: *El Museo Canario*. (Uses and Customs of the Countryfolk in Gran Canaria).

1980[1884] *Viajes de exploración a diversos sitios y localidades de la Gran Canaria*. Las Palmas: *El Museo Canario*. (Exploratory travel to different sites and places in Gran Canaria).

GRAYSON, D.K.

1983 *The Establishment of Human Antiquity*. New York. Academic Press.

GRUBER, J.

1966 "In Search of Experience: Biography as an Instrument for the History of Anthropology. In J. Helm, ed., *Pioneers of*

American Anthropology. Seattle: University of Washington Press.

1975 "Introduction". In T.H. Thorensen, ed., *Toward a Science of Man: Essays in the History of Anthropology*. The Hague: Mouton.

GUICHOT Y SIERRA, A.

1984[1922] *Noticia histórica del Folklore*. Sevilla: Junta de Andalucía.(Historical Folklore News).

GUIMERÁ PERAZA, M.

1973 *Estudio sobre el siglo XIX político canario*. Las Palmas: Cabildo Insular. (Study on the 19th century Canary politician).

1980 "Sabino Berthelot y los puertos francos". In A. Cioranescu *et al.*, *Homenaje a Sabino Berthelot en el centenario de su fallecimiento. 1880-1980*. La Laguna, Tenerife: Instituto de Estudios Canarios. (Sabino Berthelot and the Duty-Free Ports. In Homage to Sabino Berthelot on the Centenary of his Death, 1880-1980).

GUNDER FRANK, A.

1978 *Crítica y anticrítica. Ensayo sobre la Dependencia y el Reformismo*. Bilbao: Zero ZYX (Criticism and anti-criticism. Essay on Dependence and Reformism).

GUSDORF, G.

1966/1973 *L'Avènement des sciences humaines au siècle des lumières*. Paris: Payot. (The Future of Human Sciences in the Age of the Enlightenment)

HADDON, A.C.

1979[1910] *History of Anthropology*. New York: AMS Press.

HAECKEL, E.

1876[1868] *Natürliche Schöpfungsgeschichte*. Translated as *The History of Creation*. New York: D.Appleton & Co.

1894 [1892] *Monism as Connecting Religion and Science*. Translated from the German by J. Gilchrist. London: Adam & Charles Black.

HALDANE, J.B.S

1932 *The Causes of Evolution*. London: Longmans, Green.

HALLER, J.S.

1970 "The Species Problem: Nineteenth Century Concepts of Racial Inferiority in the Origin of Man Controversy". In *American Anthropologist* 72:1319-1329.

1971 "Race and the Concept of Progress in Nineteenth Century American Ethnology". In *American Anthropologist* 73:710-724.

HALLOWELL, A.I.

1965 "The History of Anthropology as an Anthropological Problem". In *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences* 1:24-28.

HAMMOND, M.

1980 "Anthropology as a Weapon of Social Combat in Late Nineteenth Century France". In *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences* 16: 118-132.

HANNERZ, U., ed.

1983 The Shaping of National Anthropologies. In *Ethnos* 47.

HARRIS, M.

1968 *The Rise of Anthropological Theory: a History of Theories of Culture*. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company.

1978 *El desarrollo de la teoría antropológica. Una historia de las teorías de la cultura*. Madrid: Siglo XXI.

1976 *Cultural Materialism: The Struggle for a Science of Culture*. California: Altamira Press.

1982 *El materialismo cultural*. Madrid: Alianza.

HARVEY, J.

1984 "L'Evolution transformée: Positivistes et matérialistes dans la Société d'Anthropologie de Paris du Second Empire à la Troisième République". In B. RuppEinsenreich, ed., *Histoires de l'anthropologie*. Paris: Klincksieck.

HATCH, E.

1973 *Theories of Man and Culture*. New York: Columbia University Press.

HEMPEL, C.G.

1965 *Aspects of scientific explanation and other essays in the philosophy of science*. New York: The Free Press.

HERNANDEZ RODRIGUEZ, C.M. et al.

1983 "La saga de los GrauBassas, boticarios y médico en la sanidad canaria". In G. Folch y S. Puerto, *Medicamento, Historia y Sociedad*. pp.225-254. Madrid: Universidad Complutense. (The saga of the Grau-Bassas, chemists and a doctor in Canary health circles.

HERRERA PIQUE, A. & ALONSO ANDRIO, P.

1981 "Las Islas Canarias en dos colecciones de historia inglesa del siglo XVIII". In *El Museo Canario* 38/40:235-271. (The Canary Islands in two collections of English History in the XVIII century).

HERSKOVITS, M.J.

1946 "Folklore after a Hundred Years: A Problem in Redefinition". In *Journal of American Folklore* 59. 232:89-100.

HERZSTEIN, D.

1969 "Anthropology and Racism in Nineteenth Century Europe". In *Sociological Abstracts* 14:112-126.

HODGEN, M.T.

1971[1964] *Early Anthropology in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

HOEBEL, E. et al., eds.

1982 *Crisis in Anthropology: View from Spring Hill, 1980*. New York: Garland.

HONIGMANN, J.

1976 *The Development of Anthropological Ideas*. Homewood, IL: The Dorsey Press.

HOOTON, E.A.

1916 "Preliminary Remarks on the Archaeology and Physical Anthropology of Tenerife". In *American Anthropology* 18:358-365.

HORMIGÓN, M. ed.

1984 *Actas del II Congreso de la Sociedad Española de Historia de las Ciencias*. Zaragoza. Proceedings of the II Conference of the Spanish Society for the History of the Sciences).

HOYME, L.E.

1953 "Physical Anthropology and its Instruments: A Historical Study". In *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology* 9:408-430.

HOWSON, C. (ed.)

1976 *Method and Appraisal in the Physical Sciences: the Critical Background to Modern Science, 1800-1905*. Cambridge, UK: CUP.

HOYOS SAÍNZ, L. de & ARANZADI, T.

1893 *Lecciones de Antropología ajustadas al programa y explicaciones del professor de la asignatura Don Manuel Antón*. Madrid: Imprenta y Litografía de los Huérfanos.

HUDSON, K.

1981 *A Social History of Archaeology. The British Experience*. London: MacMillan.

HUMBOLDT, A.

1814 *Personal Narrative of a Journey to the Equinoctial Regions of the New Continent* (Translation Helen Marie Williams). London: Longman *et al.*

1982 *Del Orinoco al Amazonas. Viaje a las regiones equinocciales del Nuevo Continente (1799-1804)*. Barcelona: Labor.

HUNT, J.

1864 "President's Address". In *Journal of the Anthropological Society* II: xxxxcv.

HUXLEY, Thomas Henry

1863 "On Species, and their origin". In *Proceedings of the Royal Institute of London, 1858-62*, (111):195.

1863 *Evidence as to Man's Place in Nature*. London: Williams & Norgate.

HYMES, D.

1962 "On studying the History of Anthropology". In *Items* 16:2527.

HYMES, D., ed.

1974 *Reinventing Anthropology*. New York: Vintage Books.

JARVIE, I.C.

1984 *Rationality and Relativism. In Search of a Philosophy and History of Anthropology*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

JAULIN, R., ed.

1976 *El etnocidio a través de las Américas*. México: Siglo XXI. (Ethnocide throughout the Americas).

KEMPER, R. & PHINNEY, J.

1977 *The History of Anthropology. A Research Bibliography*. New York: Garland.

KIRSCH, A.T.

1982 "Anthropology: Past, Present, Future. Toward an

Anthropology of Anthropology". In A. Hoebel et al., eds. *Crisis in Anthropology*. pp. 911-108.

KLEMM, G.

1843-52 *Allgemeine Kulturgeschichte der Menschheit*. Leipzig: Verlag von B.O.Teubner (General Cultural History of Mankind).

KOYRÉ, A.

1957 *From the Closed World to the Infinite Universe*. Baltimore: John Hopkins Press.

1968 *Metaphysics and Measurement. Essays in Scientific Revolution*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

KREMERMARETTI, A.

1984 "L'anthropologie physique et morale en France et ses implications idéologiques". In B. RuppEinsenreich, ed., *Histoires de l'Anthropologie*. Paris: Klincksieck. (Physical and moral anthropology in France and its ideological implications).

KUHN, T.S.

1962 *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. USA: University of Chicago Press.

1971 *La estructura de las revoluciones científicas*. México: Fondo de Cultura Económica.

1977 "Second Thoughts on Paradigms". In F. Suppe (ed.) *The Structure of Scientific Theories* (459-83). Illinois, USA: Illini Books Edition.

1979 "Segundas reflexiones acerca de los paradigmas". En F.

Suppe, comp., *La estructura de las teorías científicas*. Madrid. Editora Nacional.

KUPER, A.

1973 *Anthropology and Anthropologists: The Modern British School*. UK: Allen Lane. The Penguin Press

1973 *Antropología y antropólogos. La Escuela Británica: 1922-1972*. Barcelona: Anagrama.

LAKATOS, I.

1970 "Falsification and the Methodology of Scientific Research Programmes". In I. Lakatos and A. Musgrave (eds.) *Criticism and the Growth of Knowledge. Proceedings of the International Colloquium in the Philosophy of Science, London, 1965*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

1975 "La falsación y la metodología de los programas de investigación científica". En I. Lakatos y A. Musgrave, eds., *La crítica y el desarrollo del conocimiento*. Barcelona. Grijalbo.

1970 "History of Science and its Rational Reconstructions". In *PSA: Proceedings of the Biennial Meeting of the Philosophy of Science Association*, vol.1970. 91-136.

1976 "History of Science and its Rational Reconstructions." In C. Howson (ed.) *Method and Appraisal in the Physical Sciences: the critical background to modern science, 1800-1905*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press Studies.

1974 *La historia de la ciencia y sus reconstrucciones racionales*. Madrid: Editorial Tecnos (Translation by Diego Ribes).

LAMARCK, Jean-Baptiste

1809 *Philosophie zoologique, ou Exposition des considerations relatives à l'histoire naturelle des animaux*. Paris:Denton.

1914 *Zoological Philosophy*. Translated by Hugh S.R. Elliot. London: MacMillan and Co.,Ltd.

LAUDAN, L.

1977 *Progress and its Problems: Towards a theory of scientific growth*. Berkely: University of California Press.

LEAF, H.J.

1979 *Man, Mind and Science. A History of Anthropology*. New York. Columbia University Press.

LECLERC DE BUFFON, Georges-Luis (also referred to as BUFFON)

1749-1804 *L'Histoire naturelle, Générale et particulière avec la description du Cabinet du Roi (including Époques de Nature (1778))*. Paris: L'Imprimerie Royale.

LECLERC, Gérard.

1972 *Anthropologie et Colonialisme*.Paris: Fayard.

1973 *Antropología y colonialismo*. Madrid: Comunicación, Serie B. Alberto Corazón, ed. (Anthropology and Colonialism).

LECLERCQ, J.

1880 *Voyage aux Iles Fortunées. Le pic de Teneriffe et les Canaries*. Paris. Plon. (Voyage to the Islands of the Blessed. The Peak of Tenerife and the Canary Islands).

LECOURT, D.

1973 *Para una crítica de la epistemología*. Buenos Aires: Siglo XXI. (Towards a criticism of epistemology).

LEDRU, A.P.

1982[1810]. *Viaje a la isla de Tenerife, (1796)*. La Orotava, Tenerife. J.A.D.L. Ediciones. (A voyage to the island of Tenerife, 1796).

LESCO, Fray. (pseudonym for Doreste. D)

1901 "La sociología". In *El Museo Canario* X:6227; 4041. (Sociology).

LÉVISTRAUSS, CL.

1975 "Las tres fuentes de la reflexión etnológica". In J.R. Llobera, comp., *La antropología como ciencia*. Barcelona: Anagrama. (The Three Sources of Ethnological Reflection).

1963 "Rousseau, padre de la antropología". In *El Correo de la UNESCO*, March 6163. (Rousseau, the father of Anthropology).

LINNAEUS, CAROLUS

1735 *Systema Naturae, sive regna tria naturae systematica proposita per classes, ordines, genera & species*. Leiden: Haak.

LISÓN TOLOSANA, C.

1971 *Antropología social en España*. Madrid: Siglo XXI. (Social anthropology in Spain).

LITTLEFIELD, A. et al.

1982 "Redefining Race: The Potential Demise of a Concept in Physical Anthropology". In *Current Anthropology* 23:641655.

LLOBERA, J.R.

1974 Some provisional theses on the nature of Anthropology. In *Critique of Anthropology* 1, 3-25.

1975 "Algunas tesis provisionales sobre la naturaleza de la antropología". In J.R. Llobera, comp., *La antropología como ciencia*. Barcelona: Anagrama. (Some provisional theses on the nature of anthropology).

1976 The History of Anthropology as a problem. In *Critique of Anthropology*, Vol.2, Issue 7, 17-42.

1980 *Hacia una historia de las ciencias sociales*. Barcelona. Anagrama. (Towards a history of the social sciences).

LÓPEZ RODRÍGUEZ, A.E.

1983 *Biobibliografía de José Pérez Vidal*. Las Palmas: ICEF. Mancomunidad de Cabildos.(Bio-bibliography of José Pérez Vidal).

LORENZO Y GARCÍA, R.

1863 *La esclavitud y el pauperismo en el siglo XIX*. Las Palmas: Imprenta T.B. Matos. (Slavery and Paupers in the 19th century).

1876 *Estudios filosóficos sobre la especificación de los seres*. Las Palmas: Imprenta Vda. de Romero.(Philosophical Studies on the speciation of beings).

1877 *Estudios filosóficos sobre el origen y formación de los seres vivientes*. Las Palmas: Imprenta La Verdad. (Philosophical Studies on the origins and development of living beings)

1879 *Triunfos de las ciencias*. Las Palmas: El Independiente.
(Triumphs of the Sciences).

1881 "El porvenir del Africa y sus consecuencias para las
Islas Canarias". In *El Museo Canario* IV.41:12937; 42:16069;
43:193200.(The future of Africa and its consequences for
the Canary Islands).

LOWIE, R.H.

1937 *The History of Ethnological Theory*. New York: Farrer &
Rinehart.

1974 *Historia de la etnología*. México.: Fondo de Cultura
Económica.

LYELL, CHARLES

1830 *Principles of Geology*. London: John Murray.

1863 *Geological Evidences of the Antiquity of Man*. London:
John Murray.

LYNCH, O.M.

1982 "Kuhn and Crisis in Anthropology". In A. Hoebel et al.,
eds., *Crisis in Anthropology*. pp. 7990. New York: Garland.

MABLY, GABRIEL BONNOT (L'ABBÉ DE MABLY)

1783 *De la manière d'écrire l'histoire*. Paris: Alexandre Jombert
jeune, Libraire pour l'Artillerie & le Génie. (On the way to write
History).

MACHADO Y ÁLVAREZ, A.

1881 "Antonio Gianandrea". In *El Museo Canario* III. 27:814;
28:11115; 29:13842.

MAFESE, A.

1971 "The ideology of 'Tribalism'". In *Journal of Modern African Studies* 9:253261.

MAFFIOTTE Y LAROCHE, M.

1879 "Misión de las ciencias naturales". In *Revista de Canarias* I.4:5758; 6:9092. (Mission of the Natural Sciences).

1879 "Paleontología de Canarias". In *Revista de Canarias* I. 13:194195; 14:216218. (Canary Paleontology).

MALEFIJT, A.W.

1974 *Images of Man: A History of Anthropological Thought*. New York:Knopf.

1983 *Imágenes del hombre*. Buenos Aires. Amorrortu. (Images of Man).

MANRIQUE, A.M^a.

1880 "Antigüedades de Lanzarote". In *El Museo Canario* I. 10: 320328. (Antiquities of Lanzarote).

1881 "Estudios sobre el lenguaje de los primitivos canarios". In *Revista de Canarias* III. 70;71;73;74.(Study of the Language of the first Canary islanders).

1889 *Resumen de la historia de Lanzarote y Fuerteventura*. Arrecife, Lanzarote: Tipografía F. Martín.(Brief history of Lanzarote and Fuerteventura).

MARÍN Y CUBAS, T.

1984[1694] *Historia de las Siete Islas de Canaria. Origen, Descubrimiento y Conquista*. Santa Cruz de Tenerife: Tagala

Ediciones. (History of the Seven Islands of the Canary Islands. Origins, Discovery and Conquest).

MARTÍN DE GUZMÁN, C.

1977 "Bases objetivas para el estudio de la arqueología prehistórica de las Islas Canarias". En A. Millares, *Historia General de las Islas Canarias*. III: 1130. (Objective Bases for the Study of the Prehistoric Archaeology of the Canary Islands).

MARTÍNEZ DE LA PEÑA, D.

"El aborígen canario en la iconografía del 'hombre salvaje'". In *Rumbos* II. 9:1330. (The Canary Aborigine in the iconography of the "savage man").

MARTÍNEZ ESCOBAR, T.

1880 "El positivismo y lo absoluto". In *Revista de Canarias* II. 34:113115. (Positivism and the Absolute).

1880 "Oración inaugural, apertura del curso académico 187980, Universidad de La Habana". In *El Museo Canario* II.13:14;15;16;17. (Inaugural speech for the 1879-80 University of Havana Academic year).

MARTÍNEZ VEIGA, U.

1980 "Una historia de la antropología". Recensión a El desarrollo de la teoría antropológica, de M. Harris". Madrid: *El País*, 10th February. (A History of Anthropology, Review of The Development of Anthropological Theory by M. Harris).

MARX, K.

1897 [1852]. *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*.

Translated from the German *Der achtzente Brumaire der Louis Bonaparte* by Daniel de Leon. New York: Labor Books.

MASFERRER Y ARIMBAU, R.

1878 "La especie en los seres organizados". In *Revista de Canarias* I. 2:1719; 10:148151. (Species in Organised Beings).

MAXWELL, N.

1984 *From Knowledge to Wisdom: A revolution in the aims and methods of science*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

MAYR, E.

1943 *Systematics and the Origin of Species*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

1963 *Animal Species and Evolution*. Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

1970 *Populations, Species and Evolution*. Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Mc LENNAN, JOHN F.

1865 *Primitive Marriage*. Edinburgh: Adam & Charles Black.

MEEK, R.

1967 *Economics, Ideology and Other Essays*. London : Chapman & Hall.

1971 Smith, Turgot and the "Four Stages". In *History of Political Economy* 3, 9-27.

1973 *Turgot on Progress, Sociology and Economics*. Works of Turgot translated, edited and with introduction by R.Meek. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

1976 *Social Science and the Ignoble Savage*. Cambridge, UK: CUP.

1981 *Los orígenes de la ciencia social. El desarrollo de la teoría de los cuatro estadios*. Madrid: Siglo XXI.

MEINERS, C.

1785 *Grundriss der Geschichte der Menschheit*. Lomgo: Verlage der Meyerschen Buchhandlung. (Translated as *The Outline of History of Mankind* : 1793).

MENDELSON, E. & ELKANA, Y., eds.

1981 *Sciences and Cultures. Anthropological and Historical Studies of the Sciences*. *Sociology of the Sciences* 5.

MENGET, P.

1983 "Bibliographie élémentaire et critique de l'histoire de l'ethnologie". In *L'Ethnographie* 90/91:201207.(*Elementary Bibliography and Critique of the History of Ethnology*).

MERCIER, P.

1969 *Historia de la antropología*. Barcelona: Península. (*History of Anthropology*).

MERLE M. & MESA, R., comp.

1972 *El anticolonialismo europeo desde Las Casas a Marx*. Madrid: Alianza. (*European anti-Colonialism from Las Casas to Marx*).

MERTON, R.

1949 *Social Theory and Social Structure*. New York: The Free Press. Simon & Schuster.

1980 *Teorías y estructuras sociales*. México: Fondo de Cultura Económica.

METRAUX, A.

196263 "Les Précurseurs de l'ethnologie en France du XVI au XVIII siècle". In *Cahiers d'Histoire Mondiale* 7:721738. (The Precursors of Ethnology in France from the 16th to the 18th century).

MILLAR, John

1771 *Observations Concerning the Distinction of Ranks in Society*. London: John Murray.

MILLARES CANTERO, A.

1975 *Aproximación a una fenomenología de la Restauración en la isla de Gran Canaria*. Las Palmas: CIES. (Approach to a phenomenology of the Restoration on the Island of Gran Canaria).

MILLARES TORRES, A.

1879 "Excursión a la montaña de Umiaya". In *Revista de Canarias* I. 3:3637; 4:4951. (Excursion to the Mountain of Umiaya).

1879 "'Antigüedades canarias' por Mr. S. Berthelot". In *Revista de Canarias* I. 23:357358; 24:372373; 25:386388. (Canary Antiquities by Mr. S. Berthelot).

1880 "El cenobio de Valeron". In *El Museo Canario* I. 1:914. (The Granary of Valerón).

1880 "'Antigüedades Canarias' por Mr. S. Berthelot". In *El Museo Canario* I. 4:101105. (Canary Antiquities by Mr. S. Berthelot).

1880 "Triunfos de las ciencias' por el Sr. Lic. D. Rafael Lorenzo García". In *El Museo Canario* I:352354. (Triumphs of the Sciences by the Distinguished Don Rafael Lorenzo García).

1880 "Recuerdo a Berthelot". In *El Museo Canario* II. 19:193196. (Remembering Berthelot).

1881 "Darwinismo y espiritualismo". In *El Museo Canario* III. 36. IV. 37:38:39. (Darwinism and Spiritualism).

1882 "Del naturalismo en la novela". In *El Museo Canario* V. 54:166173. (On Naturalism in the Novel).

1882 "Viaje al Valle de Tirajana". In *El Museo Canario* V. 56:57:58. VI. 59. (Journey to the Valle de Tirajana).

1975[1893] *Historia General de Canarias*. Las Palmas: Edirca. (General History of the Canary Islands).

1976[1875]. *Benartemi o el último de los canarios*. Las Palmas: El Museo Canario. (Benartemi or the last of the Canary islanders).

1980[1852]. *Recuerdos históricos*. Las Palmas: El Museo Canario. (Historical Memories).

MILLARES CUBAS, L.

1900 "Una exploración a la Caldera de Bentaiga, por el Dr. GrauBassas". In *El Museo Canario* VIII:295299. (An exploration of the Caldera de Bentaiga (sic) by Dr. Grau-Bassas).

1903 "Estigmas de la raza semita en los cráneos canarios". In *El Museo Canario* XIV:203210. (Stigmas of the Semite race in the Canary skulls).

MONTAGU, A.

1962 The Concept of Race. In *American Anthropologist*, New Series, Vol. 64, No. 5, Part 1, 919-928.

MORALES LEZCANO, V.

1965 "La Ilustración en Canarias". In *Anuario de Estudios Atlánticos* 11:103127. (The Enlightenment in the Canary Islands).

MORALES PADRÓN, F.

1964 "Canarias en los cronistas de Indias". In *Anuario de Estudios Atlánticos* 10:179234. (The Canary islands in the Chroniclers of the Indies).

1978 *Canarias: crónicas de la conquista*. Las Palmas: El Museo Canario. (The Canary Islands: chronicles of the conquest).

MORAN, J.H. & GODE, A.

1986 Translation of Rousseau's *On the Origin of Language*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

MORAVIA, S.

1978 "From 'Homme Machine' to 'Homme Sensible': Changing Eighteenth Models of Man's Image". In *Journal of History of Ideas* 39:4560.

MORENO NAVARRO, ISIDORO

1971 La antropología en Andalucía: Desarrollo histórico y estado actual de las investigaciones. In *Ethnica*, N° 1, 107-144.

1984 La doble colonizació de l'antropolgia andalusa i perspectives de future. In *Quaderns de l'Institut Català d'Antropologia*, N°.5, 69-84.

MORGAN, LEWIS HENRY

1877 *Ancient Society*. New York: Henry Holt and Company

MORIN, F. *et al.*

1982 Indien, indigénisme, indianite, In Morin, F. *Fed Indianité, Ethnocide, Indigenisme en Amérique Latine*. Paris: CNRS. (Latin American Indian Identity, Ethnocide, Indigenism in Latin America).

MORTILLET, Gabriel de

1883 *Le préhistorique origine et antiquité de l'homme*. Paris:C. Reinwald, Libraire-Editeur (Pre-historic times: origin and antiquity of Man).

MORTON, SAMUEL GEORGE

1839 *Crania Americana* (...). Philadelphia: J.Dobson.

1844 *An Inquiry into the Distinctive Characteristics of the Aboriginal Race of America*. Philadelphia: John Penington.

1847 *Hybridity in Animals and Plants, Considered in Reference to the question of the Unity of the Human Species*. New Haven: B.L.Hamlen.

1850 "On the size of the Brain in the Various Races and Families of Man. In Nott, J & Giddon, G. eds., *Types of Mankind*. 8th edition, 298-327.

MOULINES, C.U.

1982 *Exploraciones metacientíficas. Estructuras, desarrollo y*

contenido de las ciencias. Madrid: Alianza. (Meta-scientific explorations. Structures, development and Content of the Sciences).

MUGUERZA, J.

1977 "La crisis de la filosofía analítica de la ciencia". In *Cuadernos Económicos de I.C.E.* 3/4:746. (The Crisis of Analytical Philosophy of Science).

MURPHY, R., ed.

1976 *Selected Papers from the American Anthropologist*. 1946-1970. Washington: American Anthropological Association.

MUSEO CANARIO, EL

1884 *Estatutos y Reglamento Interior de la Sociedad El Museo Canario*. Las Palmas: Imprenta La Atlántida. (Statutes and Internal Society Regulations: The Canary Museum).

NAGEL, E.

1961 *The Structure of Science*. New York: Harcourt Brace & World Inc.,

NAVARRO PÉREZ, L.

1879 "Vitalismo-Organicismo. Breves consideraciones acerca de estas dos escuelas médicas". In *Revista de Canarias* I. 19;20;21. (Vitalism-Organicism. Brief considerations with respect to two Medical Schools).

NAVARRO TORRENS, A.

1882 "Embalsamamiento de cadáveres, (momias canarias)".

In El Museo Canario IV. 45:268271; 46:301305. (Embalming Corpses, Canary Mummies).

NAVARRO, D.J.

1977 *Recuerdos de un noventón. Memorias de lo que fué la ciudad de Las Palmas a principios de siglo y de los usos y costumbres de sus habitantes*. Las Palmas: El Museo Canario. (Memories of a ninety-year old. Memories of what the city of Las Palmas was like at the beginning of the century and the habits and customs of the residents).

NOREÑA SALTO, M^aT.

1977 *Canarias: Política y sociedad durante la Restauración*. Las Palmas: Cabildo Insular. (The Canary Islands: Politics and Society during the Restoration).

NOUGES SECALL, M.

1858 *Cartas histórico-filosófico-administrativas sobre las Islas Canarias*. Santa Cruz: Imprenta S. Vidal. (Historical-philosophical-administrative letters on the Canary Islands).

NUEZ CABALLERO, S.

1957 "Menendez Pelayo y Canarias". In *Anuario de Estudios Atlánticos* 3:453489. (Menéndez Pelayo and the Canary Islands).

1980 "Sabino Berthelot, crítico de Viana". En A. Cioranescu et al., *Homenaje a Sabino Berthelot*. pp:6586. (Sabino Berthelot, the critic of Viana).

NÚÑEZ, D., ed.

1977 *El darwinismo en España*. Madrid: Castalia. (Darwinism

in Spain).

NÚÑEZ DE LA PEÑA, I.

1676 *Conquista y Antigüedades de las Islas Canarias*. Madrid: Imprenta Real.

OSSUNA Y SAVIÑÓN, M.

1978[1832]. *Los Guanches o la destrucción de las monarquías de Tenerife*. Madrid: Taller de Ediciones J.B. (The Guanches or the Destruction of the Monarchies in Tenerife).

OSSUNA Y VAN DENHEEDE, M.

1889 *La inscripción de Anaga*. Santa Cruz de Tenerife: Imprenta A. Benitez. (The inscription at Anaga).

1898 *Anaga y sus antigüedades*. Santa Cruz de Tenerife: Imprenta Isleña. (Anaga and its Antiquities).

1911 *El problema de Canarias*. Santa Cruz de Tenerife: Imprenta A.J. Benitez.(The Problem of the Canary Islands).

1912 *Isla de Tenerife. Impresiones de viajes e investigaciones científicas*. Santa Cruz de Tenerife: Imprenta A.J. Benitez.(The Island of Tenerife. Impressions of Voyages and Scientific Research).

1914 *Cultura social de Canarias en los reinados de Carlos III y Carlos IV*. Santa Cruz de Tenerife: Imprenta A.J. Benitez. (Social Culture in the Canary Islands in the reigns of Carlos III and Carlos IV).

PADILLA PADILLA, J.

1880 "El positivismo". In *El Museo Canario* I. 12:388390. (Positivism).

1881 "Los museos". In *El Museo Canario* II. 23:32734. (The

Museums).

PADRÓN, A.

1874 *Relación de unos letreros antiguos encontrados en la isla del Hierro*. Las Palmas: Imprenta A. Lopez Ramirez. (List of ancient signs found on the island of El Hierro).

PALERM, A.

1974/1982. *Historia de la etnología. I. Los Precursores. II. Los evolucionistas*. México: Alhambra. (History of Ethnology. 1. The Precursors II. The Evolutionists).

PARRILLA, J.P.

1879 "Las razas humanas". In *Revista de Canarias* I. 18:276-279. (The Human Races).

PAUL, D.

1981 "In the Interests of Civilization: Marxist Views of Race and Culture in the Nineteenth Century". In *Journal of History of Ideas* 42:115-138.

PAZ SANCHEZ, M.

1983 *Intelectuales, poetas e ideólogos en la francmasonería canaria del siglo XIX*. Santa Cruz de Tenerife: Ecotopia. (Intellectuals, Poets and ideologists in the Canary Freemasonry of the 19th century).

PENNIMAN, T.K.

1965[1935] *A Hundred Years of Anthropology*. London: Ducworth.

PÉREZ DE BARRADAS, J.

1939 *Estado actual de las investigaciones prehistóricas sobre Canarias*. Las Palmas: El Museo Canario. (Present State of Prehistoric Research on the Canary Islands).

PÉREZ VIDAL, J.

1982 *Los estudios del folklore canario*, (1880-1980). Las Palmas: ICEF. Mancomunidad de Cabildos. (The Studies of Canary Folklore).

PÉREZ, Dionisio

1971[1920] *El arcediano que tenía la sonrisa de Voltaire*. Santa Cruz de Tenerife. Lib. Valentín Sanz (The Archdeacon who had the smile of Voltaire).

PERIS FUENTES, M.

1879 "Estudios filosóficos-históricos". In *Revista de Canarias* I. 14:218-220. (Philosophical-Historical Studies).

PERROT, D. & PREISWERK, R.

1979 *Etnocentrismo e historia. América indígena, África y Asia en la visión distorsionada de la cultura occidental*. México: Nueva Imagen. (Ethnocentrism and history. Indigenous America, Africa and Asia in the Distorted View of the Western Culture).

PFLUG, G.

1971 "The Development of Historical Method in the Eighteenth Century". In *Hist. Theor., Beiheft* 11:123.

PIGGOTT, S.

1937 "Prehistory and the Romantic Movement". In *Antiquity*

11:3138.

PINO DIAZ, F.

1984 "Repercusiones de la nueva historiografía de de las ciencias en el caso de la etnología: el problema de la profesionalización". In *Alcaveras* 4:1922. (Repercussions of the new Historiography of the Sciences in the Case of Ethnology: the problem of professionalisation).

PIZARROSO BELMONTE, C.

1880 *Los aborígenes de Canarias*. Santa Cruz de Tenerife: Imprenta Isleña de F. Hernández. (The Aborigines of the Canary islands).

POIRIER, J.

1969 *Histoire de l'Ethnologie*. Paris. Presses Universitaires de France. (History of Ethnology).

PONS, J.

1969 "Algunas consideraciones sobre antropología canaria". In *Anuario de Estudios Atlánticos* 15:9196. (Some considerations on Canary Anthropology).

POPPER, KARL

1972 *The Logic of Scientific Discovery*. London:Hutchinson.

PRAT, J.

1977 "Una aproximación a la bibliografía antropológica sobre España". In *Ethnica* 13:129172. (An Approach to the anthropological bibliography on Spain).

1980 "Els estudis etnogràfics i etnològics a Catalunya". In

Quaderns de l'ICA 1:30-63. (Ethnographic and ethnological Studies in Catalonia).

PRATS, LL., LLOPART, D., & PRAT, J.

1982 *La cultura popular a Catalunya. Estudiosos i Institucions. (1853-1981)*. Barcelona: Berceus de Cultura Popular. (Popular Culture in Catalonia: researchers and institutions).

PRÉVOST, ANTOINE FRANÇOIS (ABBÉ PRÉVOST)

1746-89 *Histoire Générale des voyages ou nouvelle Collection de toutes les relations de voyages par mer et par terre jusqu'à present dans les différentes langues de tous les nations connues (...)*. Paris: Didot Rozan, Maradan.

PRICHARD, J.C.

1973[1826] *Researches into the Physical History of Mankind*. Edited by G.W. Stocking. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

PUIGSAMPER, M.A. & GALERA, A.

1983 *La antropología española del siglo XIX*. Madrid: Instituto Arnau de Vilanova. C.S.I.C. (Spanish Anthropology in the 19th century).

QUATREFAGES, Jean Louis Armand de

1887 *Histoire Générale des Races Humaines*. Paris: A. Heunnuyer. (General History of the Human Races).

1887 "Rapport sur les résultats anthropologiques de la Mission de M. le docteur Verneau dans l'Archipel des Canaries". In *Arch. des Missions Scien. et Litt.* 13:557-68. (Report on the Anthropological Results of the Mission of Dr. Verneau in the Archipelago of the Canary Islands).

QUINTANILLA, M.A.

1972 *Idealismo y filosofía de la ciencia. Introducción a la Epistemología de Karl R. Popper*. Madrid: Tecnos. (Idealism and Philosophy of Science. An Introduction to the Epistemology of Karl R. Popper)

RADIN, P.

1929 "History of Ethnological Theories". In *American Anthropologist* 31:933.

REGULO PÉREZ, J.

1970 "Curriculum vitae y bibliografía del Dr. Serra Ràfols". In Various Authors, *Homenaje a Elías Serra Ràfols*. I. pp.118. (CV and Bibliography of Dr. Serra Ràfols).

1971-72 "Don Elías Serra: el hombre y el maestro". In *Revista de Historia Canaria*, num.169, 6-13.

RÍO AYALA, J.

1944 "Los doctores Verneau y Fernandez Navarro y sus trabajos en el Museo Canario". In *El Museo Canario* 11:4756. (Drs. Verneau and Fernández Navarro and their Work in the Museo Canario).

RIPOCHE TORRENS, D.

1880 "Dos palabras sobre algunos puntos de la obra 'Antigüedades Canarias', por D. S. Berthelot". In *El Museo Canario* II. 15:7884; 23:340345. (Some words on a few points in the work "Canary Antiquities" by S.Berthelot).

1893 *Estudio de los bustos que posee este centro antropológico establecido en Las Palmas*. Las Palmas: Tipografía La Atlántida.(Study of the busts possessed by

this anthropological centre established in Las Palmas).

1902 *Les Pintaderas d'Europe, des Canaries et de l'Amérique*. Paris: E. Leroux. (The Seals of Europe, the Canary Islands and the Americas).

ROBERTSON, WILLIAM

1817 *Works*. Vol. II. London: Cadell and Davies et al.

ROCA Y PONSÁ, R.

1878 *El Sr. Lcdo. Lorenzo y García ante la fe y la razón*. Las Palmas: Víctor Doreste. (Distinguished Lorenzo y García on Faith and reason).

RODRÍGUEZ BECERRA, SALVADOR

1985 *Exvotos de Andalucía: perspectivas antropológicas*. In *Gazeta de Antropología*, N^o.4.

RODRÍGUEZ DORESTE, J.

1980 *El Museo Canario. Breve reseña histórica y descriptiva*. Las Palmas. El Museo Canario. (The Canary Museum. A Brief Historical and Descriptive Review).

1863 *Vacagüaré; Quiero morir. Leyenda palmera*. Santa Cruz de La Palma: Imprenta EL Time. (Vacagüaré: I want to die. A Legend of La Palma).

RODRÍGUEZ LÓPEZ, A.

1986[1863] *¡Vacaguaré!. Edición de Africo Amasik*. La Laguna-Las Palmas: Benchomo. (I want to die! Publication of Africo Amasik).

1881 *Consideraciones sobre el darwinismo*. Santa Cruz de La Palma: Imprenta EL Time. (Considerations on Darwinism).

RODRÍGUEZ MESA, M.

1980 "1820-1830. La primera época de Sabino Berthelot en Tenerife". In A. Cioranescu et al., *Homenaje a Sabino Berthelot*. pp.99-132. (The First Period of Sabino Berthelot in Tenerife).

RODRÍGUEZ MOURÉ, J.

1913 *Juicio crítico sobre el historiador de Canarias, Don José de Viera y Clavijo*. Santa Cruz de Tenerife: Imprenta A.J. Benitez. (A Critical Look at the Historian of the Canary Islands, Don José de Viera y Clavijo).

RONDINELLI, R.

1974 "An Historical Review of Racial Studies in Physical Anthropology from a ian Perspective". In *Journal of the Steward Anthropological Society* 6:49-69.

ROSA OLIVERA, L. de la

1980 "Correspondencia entre Sabino Berthelot y Miguel Maffiotte". En A. Cioranescu et al., *Homenaje a Sabino Berthelot*. pp.133-184. (Correspondence between Sabino Berthelot and Miguel Maffiotte).

ROSE, S.

1976 *Scientific Racism and Ideology: The IQ Racket from Galton to Jensen (112-141)*. In Rose, H., Rose, S. (eds.) *The Political Economy of Science. Critical Social Studies*. Palgrave, London.

1987 *No está en los genes: Racismo Genético e Ideología*. Barcelona: Crítica Grijalbo.

ROUSSEAU, JEAN-JACQUES

1781 *Essai sur l'origine des Langues*. Paris: A.G.Nizet.

ROWE, J.

1965 "The Renaissance Foundations of Anthropology". In *American Anthropologist* 67:120.

1965 "Diffusionism and Archaeology". In *American Antiquity* 31:334337.

RUFFIÉ, J.

1982 *De la biología a la cultura*. Barcelona: Muchnik. (From Biology to Culture).

RUMEU PALAZUELOS, E.

1977 *La Tertulia de Nava*. La Laguna, Tenerife: Ayuntamiento de La Laguna. (The Nava Reunions).

1981 *Biografía de Viera y Clavijo a través de sus obras*: Santa Cruz de Tenerife. Cabildo Insular.

RUPPEISENREICH, B., ed.

1984 *Histoires de l'Anthropologie*. XVIII-XIX Siècles. Paris: Klincksieck. (Histories of Anthropology).

SACRISTÁN, M.

1981 "La relación entre la sociedad y la naturaleza en la filosofía de las ciencias sociales". In *Mientras Tanto* 10:2334. (The Relationship between Society and Nature in the Philosophy of the Social Sciences).

SAINTE-CLAIRE DEVILLE, C.

1848-59 *Voyage géologique aux Antilles et aux îles de Ténériffe et de Fogo*. Paris: Gide et J.Baudry.(Geological

voyage to the Antilles and to the island of Tenerife and Fogo).

SAINTSIMON, H. de

1969[1803] "Todos los hombres trabajarán". En G. Bafeuf, H. de Saint Simon *et al.*, *El socialismo anterior a Marx*. México: Grijalbo. (All Men will work. In Socialism previous to Marx).

SALES Y FERRÉ, M.

1881 "Estado primitivo del hombre". In *El Museo Canario* III. 27;28;29;30;34;35. (The primitive State of Man).

SÁNCHEZ ROBAYNA, A.

1981 "Poetas canarios románticos". In S. de la Nuez, ed., *Noticias de la historia de Canarias*. Madrid: Planeta. (Canary Romantic poets).SARRAILH, J.

1979[1954]. *La España Ilustrada de la segunda mitad del siglo XVIII*. Madrid: Fondo de Cultura Económica. (The Enlightened Spain of the Late 18th century).

SCHOLTE, B.

1966 "Epistemic Paradigms: some Problems in CrossCultural Research on Social Anthropology". In *American Anthropologist* 68:11921201.

1983 "Cultural Anthropology and the Paradigm Concept: A Brief History of Their Recent Convergence". In L. Graham, W. Lepenies and P. Weingart, eds., *Functions and Uses of Disciplinary Histories: The Sociology of the Sciences Yearbook*. Vol., 7. 229281. Dordrecht, Holland: D. Reidel Publishing Company.

SCHWIDETZKY, I.

1956 "Observaciones antropológicas en Tenerife (relación de un viaje)". In *Revista de Historia* 115/116:1832. (Anthropological observations in Tenerife (story of a trip)).

1963 *La población prehispánica de las Islas Canarias*. Santa Cruz de Tenerife: Museo Arqueológico. (The Pre-Hispanic population of the Canary islands).

1975 *Estudio comparativo entre la población actual y prehispánica de las Islas Canarias*. Santa Cruz de Tenerife: Museo Arqueológico. (Comparative Study of the Present and Pre-Hispanic Populations of the Canary Islands).

SERRA RAFÒLS, E.

1950 "Viera y Clavijo, historiador". In J. Viera y Clavijo, *Historia de Canarias*. (Viera y Clavijo, historian).

SHAPIRO, H.L.

1959 "The History and Development of Physical Anthropology". In *American Anthropologist* 61:371379.

SKRUBSALL, F.C.

1896 "Crania from Teneriffe". In *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society* 9:154178.

SPENCER, Herbert

1864-98 *System of Synthetic Philosophy*. London: Williams & Norgate.

1892 *Essays: Scientific, Political, and Speculative*. New York: D. Appleton and Company.

STANTON, W.

1982[1960] *The Leopard's Spots. Scientific Attitudes Toward Race in America, 1815-1859*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. (Midway Reprint).

STEPAN, N.

1984 *The Idea of Race in Science: Great Britain, 1800-1960*. London: MacMillan.

STEWART, J.

1955 *Theory of Culture Change: The Methodology of Multilinear Evolution*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

STOCKING, G.W. Jr.

1965 "On the Limits of 'Presentism' and 'Historicism' in the historiography of the behavioral sciences". In *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences*, July 1965: 211-218.

1966 "The History of Anthropology: Where, Whence, Whither". In *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences* 2:281-290.

1982 "Afterword; A View from the Center". In *Ethnos* 47:172-186.

1982 "Anthropology in Crisis? A View from Between the Generations". In A. Hoebel et al., eds., *Crisis in Anthropology. View from Spring Hill, 1980*. New York: Garland.

1982[1968]. *Race, Culture and Evolution. Essays in the History of Anthropology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

1984 "Qu'est-ce qui est en jeu dans un nom?: La Société d'Ethnographie et l'historiographie de l'anthropologie en France". In B. RuppEinsenreich, ed., *Histoires de l'anthropologie*. Paris: Klincksiek.

STOCKING, G.W. Jr., ed.

19732013 *History of Anthropology Newsletter*. Department of Anthropology: University of Chicago.

1976 *Selected Papers from the American Anthropologist*.
19211945. Washington: American Anthropological Association.

1983 *Observers Observed. Essays on Ethnographic Field Work*.
History of Anthropology 1. Madison: Wisconsin University Press.

1984 *Functionalism Historicized: Essays in British Social Anthropology*. History of Anthropology 2. Madison: Wisconsin University Press.

STONE, O.M.

1887 *Tenerife and its six Satellites*. London: Marcus Ward & Co.

SUPPE, F., ed.

1977 *The Structure of Scientific Theories*. USA: University of Illinois Press, Illini.

1979 *La estructura de las teorías científicas*. Madrid: Editora Nacional. (The Structure of Scientific Theories).

TABARES Y BARTLETT, J.

1881 *Bosquejo sobre la conquista de Canarias y un romance*.
Santa Cruz de Tenerife: Imprenta A.J. Benitez.(An Outline of the Conquest of the Canary Islands and a Romance).

THEBUSSEN, Dr. (pseudonym for M. Pardo de Figueroa)

1881 "La biografía de Berthelot". In *Revista de Canarias* III.
62:177178.(The Biography of Berthelot).

THORENSEN, T.H., ed.

1975 *Toward a Science of Man. Essays in the History of Anthropology*. The Hague: Mouton.

TORRIANI, L.

1978[1592]. *Descripción e historia del reino de las Islas Canarias, antes Afortunadas, con el parecer de sus fortificaciones*. Introduction and notes, A. Cioranescu. Santa Cruz de Tenerife: Goya Ediciones. (Description and History of the Kingdom of the Canary Islands before known as the Islands of the Blessed, with some semblances of their fortifications).

TYLOR, EDWARD BURNETT

1861 *Anahuac: Of Mexico and the Mexicans, Ancient & Modern*. London: Longman, Green, Longman and Roberts

1865 On the Early History of Mankind. In *The Anthropological Review*, 3(11) 248-265.

1871 *Primitive Culture: Researches into the Development of Mythology, Philosophy, Religion, Language, Art, and Custom*. London: John Murray.

1881 *Anthropology: an introduction to the Study of Man & Civilization*. London: Richard Clay & Sons Limited.

UNESCO

1961 *El racismo ante la ciencia moderna*. Ondárroa, Vizcaya: Liber. (Racism and Modern Science).

1984 *Racismo, ciencia y pseudociencia*. Paris: UNESCO. (Racism, Science and Pseudo-Science).

URQUINAONA Y BIDOT, J.M^a

1876 *Carta Pastoral (...), con motivo de la obra que ha empezado a publicarse en esta ciudad con el título de 'Estudios históricos, climatológicos y patológicos de las Islas Canarias*. Las Palmas: Imprenta V. Doreste. (Pastoral Letter (...) with respect to the work recently begun to be published in this city under the title of "Historical, climatological and pathological Studies of the Canary Islands).

URRY, J.

1984 "Englishmen, Celts, and Iberians. The Ethnographic Survey of the United Kingdom, 1892-1899". In G.W. Stocking, ed., *Functionalism Historicized. Essays on British Social Anthropology*. 83105. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

URTUSAUSTEGUI, J.A.

1983 *Diario de viaje a la isla del Hierro en 1779*. La Laguna, Tenerife. Centro de Estudios Africanos/CCVT. (Diary of a voyage to the island of El Hierro in 1779).

VALLOIS, H.V.

1972 *Las razas humanas*. Buenos Aires: Universitaria. (The Human races).

VAN DEN BERGHE, P.

1981 *The Ethnic Phenomenon*. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

VERDE CASANOVA, A.M^a.

1980 "La primera sociedad antropológica de España". In *Actas del I Congreso Español de Antropología, 1977*. I:1738. Barcelona: Dpto. Antropología Cultural, Univ. Barcelona.

(The first anthropological society in Spain).

VERNEAU, R.

1878 "De la pluralité des races anciennes de l'Archipel Canarien". In *Bulletin de la Société d'Anthropologie de Paris* 21 Nov.(On the plurality of the ancient races in the Canary Archipelago).

1879 "Habitations et sepultures des anciens habitants des Iles Canaries". In *Revue d'Anthropologie*: 250264. (Dwellings and Tombs of the ancient inhabitants of the Canary Islands).

1882 "Pluralidad de razas en el archipiélago canario". In *El Museo Canario* IV. 45;46;47;48. (Plurality of Races in the Canary Archipelago).

1882 *Les Sémites aux Iles Canaries*. Paris: Typ. A. Henneuyer. (The Semites in the Canary Islands).

1882 *Sur les anciens habitants de la Isleta*. Paris: Typ. Henneuyer.(On the ancient inhabitants of La Isleta).

1883 *Las Pintaderas de Gran Canaria*. Madrid: Imprenta Fortanet. (The seals of Gran Canaria).

1885 Rapport sur une mission scientifique dans l'Archipel Canarien. In *Arch. des Missions Scien. et Litt.* 13:569617. (Report on a scientific mission in the Canary Archipelago).

1886 "La race CroMagnon. Ses migrations, ses descendents". In *Revue d'Anthropologie* 1:1024. (The Cro-Magnon race. Their migrations, their Descendants).

1887 "La taille des anciens habitants des Iles Canaries". In *Revue d'Anthropologie* II:64157. (The Stature of the ancient inhabitants of the Canary islands).

1889 "Habitations, sepultures et lieux sacrés des anciens

canariens". In *Revue d'Ethnographie* 8:221292. (Dwellings, tombs and scared places of the ancient Canary islanders).

1926 "La antigüedad de la humanidad y los fósiles ancestrales Guanches". In *Diario de Las Palmas* 1531926. (The Antiquity of Humanity and the ancestral fossils of the Guanches).

1981[1891]. *Cinco años de estancia en las Islas Canarias*. La Orotava, Tenerife. J.A.D.L. Ediciones. (Five years' stay in the Canary Islands).

VERNEAU, R. & RIPOCHE, D.

1881 "Razas antiguas del archipiélago canario". In *El Museo Canario* IV. 40:97105. (Ancient Races of the Canary Archipelago).

VERNEUIL, E. (DE) & LORIÈRE, (DE)

1854 Observations géologiques et tableaux d'altitudes observées en Espagne pendant l'année 1853. In *Bull. Soc. Géol de France*, deuxième série, t.XI, 661-711.

1869 Carte Géologique de l'Espagne et du Portugal.

VIERA Y CLAVIJO, J.

1950[1792] *Noticias de la Historia General de las Islas Canarias*. Edición de E. Serra. Santa Cruz de Tenerife: Goya Ediciones. (News of the General History of the Canary islands).

1967[1792] *Noticias de la Historia General de las Islas Canarias*. Edición de A. Cioranescu. Santa Cruz de Tenerife: Goya Ediciones. (News of the General History of the Canary Islands).

1976 *Viaje a la Mancha*. En J. Viera y Clavijo y T. Iriarte, *Dos viajes por España*. Santa Cruz de Tenerife: Aula de Cultura/Inst. de Estudios Canarios. (Voyage to La Mancha).

1981 *Extracto de las Actas de la Real Sociedad Económica de Amigos del País de Las Palmas (1777-1790)*. Las Palmas: Real Sociedad Económica de Amigos del País. (Extract from the Proceedings of the Royal Economic Society of the friends of the Country).

1982 *Diccionario de Historia Natural de las Islas Canarias*. Prologue by M. Alvar. Las Palmas: Mancomunidad de Cabildos. (Dictionary of Natural History of the Canary Islands).

1982[1807] *Librito de la Doctrina Rural, para que se aficionen los jóvenes al estudio de la agricultura, propio del hombre*. La Orotava, Tenerife: Colectivo Agujijón. (Book of Rural Doctrine for young people to become familiar with the study of agriculture, fit for Man).

1984 *Cartas a diversas personalidades*. Santa Cruz de Tenerife: Goya Ediciones. (Letters to various personalities).

VIERA Y CLAVIJO, J. & IRIARTE, T.

1976 *Dos viajes por España*. Santa Cruz de Tenerife: Cabildo Insular/Inst. de Estudios Canarios. (Two voyages through Spain).

VIERA Y CLAVIJO, I.

1916 *Costumbres canarias*. Santa Cruz de Tenerife: Imprenta y Litografía A.J. Benitez. (Canary Customs).

VOGET, F.W.

1965 "Progress, Science, History and Evolution in Eighteenth

and Nineteenth Century Anthropology". In *Journal of History of Behavioral Sciences* 3:132155.

1975 *A History of Anthropology*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

VRIES, Hugo de

1901 *Die Mutationstheorie*. Leipzig: Verlag Von Veit & Comp.

1904 *Species and varieties. Their Origin by Mutation*. Lectures Delivered at the University of California. Edited by De Vries, Hugo & MacDougal, D.T (1904) Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Company.

1910 *The Mutation Theory*. Translated by Professor J.B. Farmer and A. D. Darbishire. Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Company.

WAITZT.

1859 *Anthropologie der Naturvölker*. Leipzig: Fleischer.

WANGUEMERT Y POGGIO, J.

1900 *Consideraciones históricas acerca de las Islas Canarias*. Madrid: Imprenta Hijos de M. Hernández. (Historical considerations with respect to the Canary Islands).

WASHBURN, S.L.

1963 "The Study of Race". In *American Anthropologist* 65:521531.

WEISZ, P.B.

1975 *La ciencia de la Biología*. Barcelona: Omega. (The Science of Biology).

WERNHART, K.R.

1983 "L'École d'ethnologie de Vienne et la situation actuelle de l'ethnohistoire". In *L'Ethnographie* 90/91:6168. (The Ethology School of Vienna and the present Situation of Ethnohistory).

WHITE, L.

1949 *The Science of Culture: man and civilization*. New York: Farrar, Strauss and Giroux.

1959 *The Evolution of Culture: The Development of Civilization to the Fall of Rome*. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company.

WILSON, E.O.

1978 *On Human Nature*. Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

1980 *Sobre la naturaleza humana*. México: Fondo de Cultura Económica.

WILLIAMS, J.A.

1975 "Radicalism and Professionalism in Folklore Studies: A Comparative Perspective". *Indiana University Journal of the Folklore Institute* 11:211234.

WORSLEY, P.

1970 "The end of anthropology?". In *Trans. Sixth. World Congress of Sociology* 3:121129.

ZEROLO, A.

1881 *Ensayo poético sobre la conquista de Tenerife y la Palma*. Santa Cruz de Tenerife: Imprenta Isleña. (A poetic

essay on the Conquest of Tenerife and la Palma).

ZEROLO, E.

1880 "Un nuevo libro sobre Canarias: 'Viaje a las Islas Afortunadas', por Mr. J. Leclercq". In *Revista de Canarias* II. 48:346348. (A New Book on the Canary Islands: 'Voyage to the Islands of the Blessed).

1881 "Noticia biográfica de Mr. Sabino Berthelot". In *Revista de Canarias* III. 56:57;58;59. Red. Aula de Cultura. Tenerife. (Biographical Notes on Mr. Sabino Berthelot).

1897 *VLegajo de varios*. Paris: Garnier. (File of miscellaneous).

BIBLIOGRAPHY ANNEX

Bibliography annex prepared for this edition by Roberto Gil Hernández

ESTÉVEZ GONZÁLEZ, FERNANDO

(1980). Notas para un estudio del desarrollo capitalista y transformación de las relaciones sociales campesinas en La Orotava (Tenerife). En *Actas del I Congreso de Antropología*: 587-599.

(1982). Taganana. Un estudio antropológico-social, de Alberto Galván Tudela. *Ethnica*, 18: 141-143.

(1983). El materialismo cultural, de Marvin Harris. *Revista Canaria de Filosofía y Ciencia Social*, 0: 173-175.

(1984). Ancestros y precursores en las historias de la antropología. *Revista Canaria de Filosofía y Ciencia Social*, 1: 78-93.

(1985). Etnicidad y nacionalismo en Canarias: Algunos aspectos estructurales. *ROA. Revista del Oeste de África*, 1-2: 62-74.

(1985). *Indigenismo, raza y evolución en el pensamiento antropológico canario en los siglos XVIII y XIX*. Tesis doctoral dirigida por José Alberto Galván Tudela. Universidad de La Laguna.

(1986). Indigenismo, Raza y Evolución en el pensamiento antropológico canario en los siglos xviii y xix (Resumen). *ROA. Revista del Oeste de África*, 8: 91-105.

(1986). Costumbres populares canarias, de Juan Bethencourt Alfonso. *ROA. Revista del Oeste de África*, 8: 106-109.

- (1986). Guanchismo: la imagen cambiante del aborigen canario. *Banot*, 1 (2ª Época): 11-40.
- (1986). Historiografía de la antropología: en busca del paradigma perdido. *Gavagai. Revista Interdisciplinar*, 2 (Filosofía de los Lenguajes): 3-18.
- (1987). The History of Anthropology in Spain: Ruptures and Inheritances. *History of Anthropology Newsletter*, 14: 5-11.
- (1987). *Indigenismo, Raza y Evolución. El pensamiento antropológico canario, 1750-1900*. Santa Cruz de Tenerife: Aula de Cultura de Tenerife; Museo Etnográfico.
- (1989). Notas críticas sobre el concepto de "tradición antropológica". A propósito de las relaciones centro-periferia en la antropología canaria de finales del XIX. *Eres*, 1 (Serie de Antropología): 25-35.
- (1991). Gregorio Chil y Naranjo. En Christopher Winters (Ed.). *International Dictionary of Anthropologists* (p. 111). New York: Garland.
- (1992). Estado y estados de la antropología. *Antropología*, 3: 79-81.
- (1992). Canarians. En David Levinson (Ed.). *Encyclopedia of World Cultures*, (pp. 50-52). Boston: G.K. Hall & Co.
- (1992). Descubrir a los guanches, estudiar a los canarios. En José Ramón Santana Godoy (Comp.). *En el camino. Canarias entre Europa y América*, (pp. 127-150). Las Palmas de Gran Canaria: Edirca.
- (1993). El mundo aborigen en la construcción de la identidad canaria. En *Seminario Arte y Antropología*.
- (1993). La insularidad como reto teórico. *Disenso*, 1: 9.

(1994). Tipos y costumbres. En Ángel Alemán de Armas (Ed.). *Canarias*, (pp. 233-248). Madrid: Agedime/Mediterráneo.

(1994). Sabin Berthelot. En Carmen Ortiz García y Luis Ángel Sánchez Gómez (Eds.). *Diccionario Histórico de la Antropología Española*, (pp. 148-150). Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas; Departamento de Antropología de España y América.

(1994). Gregorio Chil y Naranjo. En Carmen Ortiz García y Luis Ángel Sánchez Gómez (Eds.). *Diccionario Histórico de la Antropología Española*, (pp. 245-246). Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas; Departamento de Antropología de España y América.

(1994). Gabinete científico de Santa Cruz de Tenerife. En Carmen Ortiz García y Luis Ángel Sánchez Gómez (Eds.). *Diccionario Histórico de la Antropología Española*, (p. 334). Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas; Departamento de Antropología de España y América.

(1994). Indigenismo canario. En Carmen Ortiz García y Luis Ángel Sánchez Gómez (Eds.). *Diccionario Histórico de la Antropología Española*, (pp. 399-400). Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas; Departamento de Antropología de España y América.

(1994). René Verneau. En Carmen Ortiz García y Luis Ángel Sánchez Gómez (Eds.). *Diccionario Histórico de la Antropología Española*, (pp. 682-683). Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas; Departamento de Antropología de España y América.

(1994). José de Viera y Clavijo. En Carmen Ortiz García y Luis Ángel Sánchez Gómez (Eds.). *Diccionario Histórico de la*

Antropología Española, (pp. 688-690). Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas; Departamento de Antropología de España y América.

(1994). Adaptación tecnológica y cambios socioeconómicos en la producción y comercialización de alimentos tradicionales en la comarca Tacoronte-Acentejo (Tenerife). *Guize*, 1: 99-105.

(1995) Patrimonio, saberes y artefactos de identidad. En *Antropología y Museología*. Museo de América.

(1995). Juan Bethencourt Alfonso. En Antonio M. Macías Hernández (Dir.). *Gran Enciclopedia Canaria*, (p. 604). La Laguna, Las Palmas de Gran Canaria: Ediciones Canarias.

(1995). *Informe de la situación y perspectivas del museo etnográfico de Tenerife. Febrero, 1995*. La Laguna: Cabildo Insular de Tenerife.

(1995). El estudio de las técnicas de momificación aborígenes en la historia de la antropología canaria. En *Actas del I Congreso Internacional de Estudios sobre Momias*, (pp. 59-64). Santa Cruz de Tenerife: Museo Arqueológico y Etnográfico de Tenerife, OACIMC, Cabildo de Tenerife.

(1995). Base de datos de las momias guanches. En *I Congreso Internacional de Estudios sobre Momias. Puerto de la Cruz, 3-6 febrero, 1992*, (pp. 163-166). Santa Cruz de Tenerife: Museo Arqueológico y Etnográfico de Tenerife, OACIMC, Cabildo de Tenerife.

(1996). Modernidad y racionalidad. Nuevos enfoques de la etnicidad y el nacionalismo. En José Antonio Younis (Ed.). *Después de la Modernidad. Cultura, Economía y Desarrollo en Canarias y en el Mundo*, (pp. 713-725). Las Palmas de Gran

Canaria: Universidad de Las Palmas de Gran Canaria; Fundación Maspalomas.

(1996). Etnia y nación, tradición y modernidad. *Disenso* 8-9.

(1996). Champsaur Sicilia, Baltasar Valentin. En Antonio M. Macías Hernández (Dir.) *Gran Enciclopedia Canaria*, (pp. 964-965). La Laguna, Las Palmas de Gran Canaria: Ediciones Canarias.

(1996). Evolucionismo. En Antonio M. Macías Hernández (Dir.) *Gran Enciclopedia Canaria*, (pp. 1456-1457). La Laguna, Las Palmas de Gran Canaria: Ediciones Canarias.

(1999). Descongelando cultura. Alimentación, museos y representación. En *Actas del Congreso Internacional Alimentación y Cultura*, (pp. 117-131). Madrid: La Val de Onsera; Ministerio de Cultura.

(Ed.) (2001). *Alimentación y Cultura. Catálogo de la exposición y materiales didácticos*. Santa Cruz de Tenerife: Museo de Antropología de Tenerife, Organismo Autónomo de Museos y Centros, Cabildo de Tenerife.

(2001). Determinar la raza, imaginar la nación. El paradigma raciológico en la obra de Chil y Naranjo. *El Museo Canario, LVI*: 329-346.

(2002). Nuevas identidades, viejas políticas. *Disenso*, 38: 6.

(2002). Inmigrantes o la identificación del Mal. *Disenso* 38: 13.

(Ed.) (2004). *El pasado en el presente*. Santa Cruz de Tenerife: Museo de Antropología de Tenerife, Organismo Autónomo de Museos y Centros, Cabildo de Tenerife.

(2005). *Área de Cultura, Patrimonio Histórico y Museos, Cabildo de Tenerife. Informes sobre publicaciones*. Santa Cruz de Tenerife.

(2006). Redes de museos: conexiones y enredos. *Museo. Revista de la Asociación Profesional de Museólogos de España*, 11: 151-157.

(2006) Vivienda arriba, salón abajo. Una maldición para el turismo rural. *BASA*, 29: 110-117.

(2006). *Cho Vito. Del sentido del lugar al sin sentido de su destrucción. Informe sobre el poblado marinero de Cho Vito, Candelaria, Tenerife*. La Laguna: Ayuntamiento de Candelaria; Universidad de La Laguna.

(2007). Millares o la excavación sin arqueología. En Orlando Franco (Ed.). *El artista como arqueólogo: Millares y El Museo Canario*, (pp. 53-55). Las Palmas de Gran Canaria: Centro de Iniciativas Culturales de La Caja de Canarias.

(2007). Curiosidades, especímenes, souvenirs: las momias como objetos-viajeros en el tráfico Canarias-Europa. En José M. Oliver y Alberto Relancio (Eds.). *El descubrimiento científico de las Islas Canarias*, (pp. 227-237). La Orotava, Tenerife: Fundación Canaria Orotava de Historia de las Ciencia.

(2007). *Política, historia del arte y museos. Una perspectiva anamórfica en 7.1 Distorsiones, Naderías y Relatos*. Centro Atlántico de Arte Moderno.

(2008). Narrativas de apropiación, seducción y muerte o el souvenir en la época de la reproductibilidad turística. *Acto. Revista de Pensamiento Artístico Contemporáneo*, 4: 35-49.

(2008). Guardarlo todo, recordar nada. Pasado, historia y amnesia bajo la memoria digital. En Antonio González González (Dir.). *Exceso y escasez en la era global. La nueva complejidad de la política, la economía, el sujeto, la ciudad*

y *el arte*, (pp. 184-203). Las Palmas de Gran Canaria: Obra Social de La Caja de Canarias.

(2008). En busca de los ancestros europeos. La dicotomía árabe bereber en la construcción de la identidad canaria. En Víctor Morales Lezcano y Francisco Javier Ponce Marrero (Coords.). *Una visión del Islam en África y desde Canarias. Historia de una frontera. Cuadernos de Estudios Canario-Africanos*, 2, (pp. 139-156). Las Palmas de Gran Canaria: Universidad de Las Palmas de Gran Canaria; Dirección General de Relaciones con África, Gobierno de Canarias; Casa África.

(2008). Lugares impuros, Ley de Costas y cirugía territorial. En Orlando Franco y Mariano de Santa Ana (Eds.). *Paisaje y esfera pública*, (pp. 77-78). Las Palmas de Gran Canaria: Centro Atlántico de Arte Moderno; Demarcación de Gran Canarias del Colegio Oficial de Arquitectos de Canarias.

(2009). Power Food (i). Exposición de Miralda en Artium (Vitoria, España). *Art.es. International Contemporary Art*, 29: 103-106.

(2009). Patrimonio cultural y proyección futura. En *Desafíos de la cultura en el siglo 21*, (pp. 345-361). Santa Cruz de Tenerife: Septenio, Viceconsejería de Cultura y Deportes, Gobierno de Canarias.

(2009). La mirada turística y lo dado a ver en los museos. *Revista bimestral de cultura y tendencias*, 63-67.

(2009). Pieles, pliegues paisajes. Un panorama desde el poblado marinero de Cho Vito, Candelaria, Tenerife. En Sergio Toledo Prats (Ed.). *Ecología y paisaje. Miradas desde Canarias*, (pp. 251-271). La Orotava, Tenerife: Fundación

Canaria Orotava de Historia de la Ciencia.

(2010). La singularidad del lugar. En *l Encuentro Europeo de Afectados por la Ley de Costas*. Candelaria, Tenerife: Asociación de Vecinos "Las Calas"; Asociación en Defensa de El Caletón; Plataforma en Defensa de los Ciudadanos de Candelaria; Asociación Europea de Perjudicados por la Ley de Costas.

(2011). Los sueños de presencia de Juan Gopar. En Juan Gopar (Ed.). *Era así, no era así*, (pp. 17-21). Santa Cruz de Tenerife: TEA Tenerife Espacio de las Artes.

(2011). Guanches, magos, turistas e inmigrantes: canarios en la jaula identitaria. *Atlántida. Revista Canaria de Ciencias Sociales*, 3: 145-172.

(2011). Fetichismo, fantasmagoría, desechos y lo dado a ver en los museos. *Museo y Territorio*, 4: 42-48.

(2012). El turista: *de flâneur a choraster*. *Fluor. Magazine on Contemporary Culture*, 3: 30-34.

(2012). Canary Island stew. En Anna Baldacchino (Ed.). *A taste of islands. 60 recipes and stories from our world of islands*, (pp. 110-113). Charlottetown, Canada: Islands Studies Press.

(2014). A la espera de un segundo y definitivo entierro. En Dailo Barco y Alexis W (Coords.). *Memorias de contrabando. Exposición en el Centro de Arte La Recova de Santa Cruz de Tenerife (19 de septiembre – 2 de noviembre de 2014)*, (pp. 182-187). Centro de Arte La Recova. Organismo Autónomo de Cultura. Ayuntamiento de Santa Cruz de Tenerife.

(2015). El guanche como fantasma moderno. O cómo la historia de los orígenes está siempre por escribir. En José Farrujia de la Rosa (Ed.). *Orígenes. Enfoques interdisciplinares*

sobre el poblamiento indígena de Canarias, (pp. 186-222). Santa Cruz de Tenerife: Ediciones Idea.

(2015). Conocimiento local, multiculturalismo y patrimonio cultural. *Jornadas sobre Patrimonio Cultural Inmaterial en Canarias, 8-9 de abril de 2015. En Entorno al Atlas del Patrimonio cultural Inmaterial de Canarias*. Viceconsejería de Cultura y Deportes. Dirección General de Cooperación y Patrimonio Cultural. Gobierno de Canarias. Santa Cruz de Tenerife.

(2016 [1987]). *Indigenismo, raza y evolución. El pensamiento antropológico canario (1750-1900)*. Prólogo de la segunda edición de José Alberto Galván Tudela. Prólogo de la primera edición George W. Stocking. Santa Cruz de Tenerife: Ediciones Idea.

(2019). *Museopatías*. Prólogo Anthony Alan Shelton. Editores Mayte Henríquez y Mariano de Santa Ana. Lanzarote: Fundación César Manrique.

(2019). *Souvenir, souvenir. Un antropólogo ante el turismo*. Prólogo de Dean MacCannell. Introducción y notas Pablo Estévez Hernández. Traductor del prólogo Carlos García. Coordinador José Díaz Cuyás. Madrid: Editorial Concreta.

(2019). *Canarios en la jaula identitaria*. Prólogo Pablo Estévez Hernández. Introducción Domingo Garí, Epílogo Pablo Ródenas Utray. Editores Mayte Henríquez y Mariano de Santa Ana. Las Palmas de Gran Canaria: Ediciones Mercurio.

(2022). Fetiches, fantasmas y caníbales: tres vengadores premodernos. En José Díaz Cuyás (Ed.). *Encuentros salvajes: arte, consumo y turismo canibal*, (pp. 23-52). Madrid: Editorial Concreta.

ESTÉVEZ GONZÁLEZ, FERNANDO; BETANCORT, LUISA Y HERNÁNDEZ ARMAS, RAMÓN

(1986). El impacto del turismo en la sociedad canaria: interacción social y cambio sociocultural en dos poblaciones canarias. En *Congreso de Cultura Canaria*. La Laguna.

ESTÉVEZ GONZÁLEZ, FERNANDO; GONZÁLEZ ANTÓN, RAFAEL Y RODRÍGUEZ MARTÍN, CONRADO

(1990). El Centro de Documentación Arqueológica y Antropológica de Canarias. En *Jornadas de Biblioteconomía en Humanidades*. Santa Cruz de Tenerife.

(1992). *Momias. Los Secretos del Pasado*. Catálogo de la Exposición. Santa Cruz de Tenerife: Museo Arqueológico y Etnográfico de Tenerife, OACIMC, Cabildo de Tenerife.

FERNANDO ESTÉVEZ GONZÁLEZ Y ANTONIO M. MACÍAS HERNÁNDEZ

(1994). Alimentación. En Antonio M. Macías Hernández (Dir.). *Gran Enciclopedia Canaria*, (pp. 195-197). La Laguna, Las Palmas de Gran Canaria: Ediciones Canarias.

ESTÉVEZ GONZÁLEZ, FERNANDO Y HENRÍQUEZ SÁNCHEZ, MARÍA TERESA

(1996). Cocina. En Antonio M. Macías Hernández (Dir.) *Gran Enciclopedia Canaria*, (p. 1032). La Laguna, Las Palmas de Gran Canaria: Ediciones Canarias.

ESTÉVEZ GONZÁLEZ, FERNANDO; HENRÍQUEZ SÁNCHEZ, MARÍA T. Y DÍAZ RODRÍGUEZ, PEDRO A.

(1996). *Bibliografía de Prehistoria y Antropología de Canarias*.

BPAC. Santa Cruz de Tenerife: Museo de Antropología de Tenerife, OAMC, Cabildo de Tenerife; Dirección General de Patrimonio Histórico del Gobierno de Canarias.

ESTÉVEZ GONZÁLEZ, FERNANDO; HENRÍQUEZ SÁNCHEZ, MARÍA T. Y DÍAZ RODRÍGUEZ, PEDRO A.

(2000 [1996]). *Bibliografía de Prehistoria y Antropología de Canarias. BPAC. Edición en CD-ROM*. Santa Cruz de Tenerife: Museo de Antropología de Tenerife, OAMC, Cabildo de Tenerife; Dirección General de Patrimonio Histórico del Gobierno de Canarias.

ESTÉVEZ GONZÁLEZ, FERNANDO Y HENRÍQUEZ SÁNCHEZ, MARÍA T.

(2007). *Mar de Arena de Mar*. Las Palmas de Gran Canaria: Viceconsejería de Cultura y Deportes del Gobierno de Canarias.

ESTÉVEZ GONZÁLEZ, FERNANDO Y SANTA ANA PULIDO, MARIANO

(Eds) (2010). *Memorias y olvidos del archivo*. Valencia: Museo de Historia y Antropología de Tenerife; Centro Atlántico de Arte Moderno; Lampreave Ediciones.

ESTÉVEZ GONZÁLEZ, FERNANDO Y HENRÍQUEZ SÁNCHEZ, MARÍA T.

(2012). El souvenir turístico. Banalidad, autenticidad y estética de la repetición. *Revista de Occidente*, 369: 39-52.

