

revista ANTHROPOLÓGICAS
Ano 19, 26(2):228-261, 2015

Roving the trail of Images: questioning heritage and a tradition of ethnographic writing in Portugal¹

António Medeiros^a

Taking the history of ethnographic interests in Portugal as my main frame of reference, I try to relate some present day perceptions of regional heritage and identity to its origins in late XIXth and early XXth century procedures of image making and the diffusion of nationalistic ideology.

Portugal; Minho; Images; Writing; Heritage.

One afternoon at the end of the summer of 1993, I decided to pose a question to one of my informants: I asked Manuel Azevedo where the Minho was². This was during *S. Miguel*, the traditional period of harvest, and it was hot, yet a large trellis covered the *eido* [patio or small yard]. Wasps hovered about the ripe grapes as we prepared the *dornas* [wine barrels] for the *vindima* [the grape harvest]. A large roof stood out in the distance where we had calibrated the press, burning sulfur fumigators in the casks – ‘men’s’ work. The women of the *casa* (household) had gone to work in the distant cornfields; every once in a while one of them would call out, sharply slicing the air. The cows ruminated in the *corte* [stable typically beneath the house on the ground floor], within our sight. They were my friend and informant’s passion, an old farmer in modest circumstances and also a livestock *contratador* [trader].

a Professor auxiliar do ISCTE-IUL, Investigador do CEI-IUL (Lisboa). E-mail: antonio.medeiros@iscte.pt.



Imagem 1 – Photomaton, young woman dressed Minho style, ca. 1940.

The bucolic notes were abundant that afternoon; that was how work went during the days of September in the Minho. This was a ‘minhoto’ ambiance. The use of this adjective could be justified by innumerable old citations, literary, pictorial and cinematographic. It was then that I asked my informant where the Minho was. We were drinking sparkling wine from a huge bowl, just as is described in the anthologies about the region (cf. Trigueiros 1967). The man, his hat on his head, white shirt, lowered his eyes and said: “Look, I don’t know how to answer that question, professor...” He insisted upon using such an academic title, much to my embarrassment. This extreme deference often made me think about ethnographic descriptions of Java and Bali (see Boon 1982 e 1990).



Imagem 2 - Visiting Manuel Azevedo (right) in the early 2000s. Photo by Sofia Marques, n.d.

My informant, wanting to clear up the unexpected question, suggested: “Perhaps Augusto would know...” Then he shouted out for his son: “Gusto, come over here, the professor wants to ask you a question.” Augusto arrived; he was friendly man in his forties, a salesman of agricultural chemicals who worked in a city in the District of Oporto, thirty kilometers to the south. Better educated than his father, he knew everything about the farmland to the north of the Douro river where he traveled by car to advise his clients. I decided to embellish the question I’d asked his father: “Gusto, are we in the *alto* or *baixo* [upper or lower] Minho?” He laughed and said: “That’s a difficult question, António, I don’t know, I think we’re in the upper Minho, the lower must be to the south, below Póvoa [de Varzim, the city where he worked]...” And the question that had seemed bizarre to my interlocutors died there. For my part, I already knew the official answers, not always clear, but described in books. We continued to

drink the wine from the enormous white bowl – afterwards it took the strength of all three of us to budge the huge *balseiro* [tank for crushing grapes].

Two decades ago Appadurai suggested a conceptualization of the term ‘locality’ which I believe to be suggestive for the analysis of the case we have in hand. Firstly, I would like to suggest that it might be suitable for considering the conversation about the Minho as a province and the fact that a portion of its inhabitants do not know it as one. Appadurai has the following to say: “I view locality as primarily relational and contextual rather than as scalar or spatial. I see it as a complex phenomenological quality, constituted by a series of links between the sense of social immediacy, the technologies of interactivity and the relativity of contexts” (1995:204). Following this, the author puts forth the idea that from the beginning of modern age the production of nation states as localities became favored. On the other hand it was necessary for states to produce ‘localities’ on a smaller scale in their hinterlands as an important part of the task of constantly updating this process of place-making. Appadurai, goes on, saying that

“The nation-state relies for its legitimacy in the intensity of its meaningful presence in a continuous body of bounded territory. It works by policing its borders, producing its ‘people’ [Balibar, 1991], constructing its citizens, defining its capitals, monuments, cities, waters and soils, and by constructing its locales of memory and commemoration...” (Appadurai 1995:213).

In that which has to do with the Minho – and the vast majority of Portuguese provinces – state interventions arrived late and have remained to this day only fragily connected and weakly pedagogical in what respect the teaching of provincial differentiation. On the contrary, the work of scientists, of artists and men of letters were all relevant in the articulation of the ways of naming that province. Marketplace phenomena that have sustained the spreading of products or the use of the Minho as a tourist destination likewise contributed in similar ways. These dimensions, which are inextricably interlinked, became significant facets in the process of nationalizing the references

of the middle classes in Portugal, or, in other words, their ‘*aportuguesamento*’ [Portugalization] (Ramos 1994).

Valorizing the interpretations of Appadurai and taking what happened in it is in the absence of interventions by the state that we are able to find explanations for the weaknesses in the recognition of the Minho among the less favored groups of its population. Appadurai also distinguishes ‘localities’ from ‘neighborhoods,’ defining the latter notion in the following fashion: “I use the term ‘neighborhood’ to refer to the existing social forms in which locality, as a dimension or value, is variably realized” (1995:204). Staying with the terms of Appadurai, there is still room for reflection on the stories of the ‘production of localities’ and their contemporary appropriation in ‘neighborhoods’. Let us follow this line a bit further.

An early and imaginative theory of the provinces

In the first pages of Oliveira Martins’s *History of Portugal* we see a new type of sensibility at work on the interpretation of the differences one finds in the territory of the Portuguese state. In this influential work of 1879, the so-called differences are referred to in an absolute fashion as provincial divisions, stressing, in the respective categorizations, ethnogenetic distinctions. Each province is considered individually in terms of its geographic characteristics and their dissimilarities are viewed in absolute terms: determinations imposed by very specific mesological conditions are discussed, a justifying factor in the great ethnic variety understood to exist between the respective populations. On the contrary, the author deemphasizes – firstly, and in a relative way – the role of ethnic and geographic determinations with respect to the national whole, the nation and its respective history.

I believe that it is in Oliveira Martins’s proposal that the earliest and most explicit formulation of the existence of a Portugal of differentiated provincial entities occurs – it is a theory of the nation which justifies such well-defined discriminations. To the provinces – which had been vague topographical divisions without any independent

power in the administrative context of the old regime, that is, the extensive period before the 1820 Liberal Revolution – the historian now attributes a ‘natural’ physiognomy. Almost a century later, an influent geographer, Ribeiro, would observe: “The reader will be perplexed [...] to see that there are natural borders to the provinces (older than the state itself) while the borders of the state are not natural” (Ribeiro 1977:36). It is worth comparing this with another more recent and significant opinion: “No one as much as Oliveira Martins has given us a ‘theory’ of Portugal in space and time, a theory which is certainly open to discussion, and really quite provocative, yet without a doubt rich in suggestions that still today are not fully explored” (Saraiva & Lopes 1989:922).

Oliveira Martins suggests a new reading of the countryside, where the presence of architectonic ruins of the Middle-Ages or of the different mountain ranges, valorized as referents of memory by the romantic authors, is erased in the conceptualization of the landscapes of the different parts of the country. Now it is the inhabitants of the provinces – inscribed in a natural space, ‘*Terra e Homem*’ [‘land and man’] – which have become the topic of reflection and documents/monuments of remote eras (cf. Le Goff 1984). It is they who are given the role of document of a very remote past, explaining the antecedents of the nation, and it is upon the representation of their static plurality that the nation might arise as a synthetic organism. As Handler (1988) would say we have a ‘being’ dynamically involved in the flux of its own history .

Oliveira Martins’s ideas are filled with anachronistic suggestions. For example he refers to a Minhotan peasant, one of his contemporaries, as a ‘galaico’ [a Galician], the beirão [someone from the center of Portugal] is a ‘lusitano’ [a Lusitanian], and the ‘algarvio’ [someone from the Algarve] a ‘turdetano’ [a Turdetani]. The author portrays these provincial types by postulating their invariability in an undifferentiated, timelessness, inside provincial spaces that are identified in a definitive manner. Characteristically, each of these provincial types is depicted in a rural context, in this way as De Certeau observed

thinking about France, the peasant is chosen to be the “savage of the countryside [...] the density of history here replaces geographical distance” (1993:48).

With his imaginative rationalizations, Martins tries to formulate a conceptual centralization for Portuguese history. He reconciles the political history of the construction of the state – in which he stresses a founding act, the process of ‘reconquest’ (*Reconquista*) from the north to the south bringing about the expulsion or submission of the so called ‘moors’ – as the definitive and incontestable justification for the ‘nation’. Lisbon as the political and symbolic capital becomes the reference for the resolution of this dilemma: “The taking of Lisbon gives form to the birth of the Portuguese nation, until then caught in the limbo of its genesis” (Oliveira Martins 1942:95). In this way, the central swathe of the territory can take on an anachronistic prominence in the identification of the ‘being’ of the nation; we can see a teleological resolution of the whole of the argument.

On the slopes of the Estrela mountain range, among the supposed descendents of the remote *Lusitanos*, Oliveira Martins recognizes a praiseworthy ethnic ‘heart’ as well as a more ‘virile’ landscape. With a convenient metaphor he reflects this centralization which the Tagus river defines: “via the Tagus maritime Portugal embraces agricultural Portugal fusing the two physiognomies typical of the nation.” (1942:58). The suggestion is implicit in these arguments that it is from the capital, from the exercise of powers concentrated therein, that the most effective organizing principles will emanate – that is those which allow for the act of imagining, in the broadest sense, the internal division of the country (cf. Bourdieu 1989). These are prerogatives that include, namely, the legitimacy to connect provincial peculiarities in a symbolic cartography. The moralizing landscape is justified through reference to the nation and centered upon a reference to its capital.

The work of Oliveira Martins should be considered a select reference for the task of identifying the country imposed in the ‘era of nationalism’. In his analysis of the Minho and the Minhotans, ‘*a Terra e o Homem*,’ are singularly disfavored, against the current of broad-

ly spread stereotypes, still at play, and which are eminently lovable. We can explain this discrepancy if we keep in mind the theses of the decadent movement (*decadentistas*), which Martins shared with other Iberian (and European) intellectuals.³ In the landscape allegory proposed by Martins, the most peripheral parts of the territory become polarized as images of the limits of the nation in space and time, touched by some essential ambiguity. In this way, the Minho is described negatively with adjectives more often used in the pejorative descriptions of Galicia and the Galicians, but also, more generally, in descriptions of the ‘*génio celta*’, in a curious amalgam of references of different provenance.

The metaphors used in order to characterize this province contain suggestions of germination and feminization, of excessive luxuriance, and also of death and corruption. In this imagistic argument the suggestion is of the recessive ethno-genetic characteristics of the nation: in its coming into being, Martins senses an unavoidable destiny of decadence and submission. This teleology would be inscribed in the ‘large dose of Celtic blood’ which would touch the nation as a whole, but principally the Minho. In the disproportionate parable that the historian draws, the Minho stands as a metaphor for the beginning and the end of the nation – the site of its remotest origins, and maintained as the a-temporal mirror of its predictable agony. In *Portugal Contemporâneo* (*Contemporary Portugal*), a later title by the same author (1881), we find even livelier illustrations of these teleological interpretations. There, ‘Maria da Fonte’ and ‘Patuleia’ occur as central episodes in the narrative structure. In the description of these *jacqueries* [peasant revolts], the attention to the ethnic stigmas of rural Minhotan plebeians confirms the historian’s pessimism vis-à-vis the future of the nation as a whole (cf. Oliveira Martins n. d.).

It is in the description by Oliveira Martins that we find the strongest of the deprecatory versions of the provincial image of the Minho. This same sensibility can be recognized among other authors who describe the province and its population and share the same decadent sensibility, like the novelist Fialho de Almeida (1857-1911) or the im-

portant ethnographer Rocha Peixoto. However, it is difficult to identify these same negative versions of the provincial image of the Minho in the more popularized texts and images that were produced starting at the end of the 19th century. This should be read in light of the affirmative nationalist discourse that began to circulate during this period due to the influx of various aesthetic currents that can be grouped under the rubric of a single adjective (which first appeared at the time): ‘neogarrettistas’ (cf. Coelho 1976:711-713; see later in this article).

The Minho had already been a ‘favored province’ in the imaginative world of the first nationalist romantic authors (cf. Medeiros 1995, 2003). However, it was with the spreading of an evolutionist ideology – of which Oliveira Martins was an influential proponent – that a lasting canon of description of the Minho (an amalgam of fin-de-siècle scientism and a romantic taste for the picturesque) began to hold sway. The mechanical reproduction of texts and works of art (see Benjamin 1992), intensified by enormous social and technological transformations during the final decades of the 19th century, helped the spread of a range of characteristic knowledge about the Minho. This, as we have already seen, was a period in which the invention of traditions was favored (Hobsbawm 1985).

O Minho Pitoresco, by José Augusto Vieira (1856-1890), is a curious document about the ways that people at the time came to know this province. The book brings together a sensibility for the picturesque with a vague ethnographicism tinged with evolutionist references. In this voluminous description, published in 1886-1887, with its profusion of illustrations, the author is attracted by ‘*os tipos*’ [characteristic types], the traditional clothing, the monuments, local practices, everything that is considered picturesque in this loveably exotic province, the “garden of Portugal”, where “men are carnations and women are roses” (Vieira 1887:769). *O Minho Pittoresco* was a work directed at the more well-to-do classes throughout the whole of Portugal. This is suggested by the text’s accessibility, by the variety of the images and by the resulting luxuriousness of the two large volumes. Vieira was born in the Minho; nevertheless, in his book’s opening he emphasizes that

a trip to this province is analogous to a trip through time, to coming face to face with the beginnings of the nation: “The Minho has been the sacred tabernacle of our ethnic traditions,” “there the spirits preserve the affective qualities of this Celtic temperament, which was our genetic fiat, and of that Greek spirit which was our artistic beginning” (Vieira 1886:III). Throughout the text, the author would cite some of the prestigious contemporary Portuguese authors, who considered themselves the pioneering ethnologists, to assert his identification of ‘archaisms’ or ‘surviving remnants’, because, as he assures us, “ages follow ages, traditions flow – light gondolas on the people’s soul.”

An improbable lineage

Years ago, Clifford questioned the terms of reference that form the professional identification of anthropologists at the present time, recognizing that their practices have become systematically diversified and that their objects of study have multiplied. The historian interrogated whether it is possible to recognize an open border between anthropology, cultural studies and other analogous traditions. His response: a rigorous “no” (1997:63). This response would be inconvenient for those who would like to consider, with a certain depth and latitude, the history of this interest in ‘describing the people’ in the Portuguese context, or in recognizing valuable antecedents in the works of nationalistic polymaths who produced these types of descriptions with a certain rigor and persistence.

According to Clifford, it is possible to say that an approach carried out according to the criteria used by Williams in *The Country and the City* – a key text in cultural studies – could clarify the situation in terms of our understanding the ethnographic practices generated from the nationalist discourses of the 19th century. On the contrary, absent here – or only sparsely detectable – are the observation of and record of the social practices of a ‘participant observer’ ethnographer, which are more similar to the academic practices on which we place a greater value. It would be easy to conclude that today’s anthropolo-

gists recognize themselves with greater facility in the writing and in the type of observations registered by the ‘naturalist’ novelists of the end of the 19th century, for example. These writers made field notes with great assiduity and had a decided interest in the detailed description of social contexts; the same could be said, from another perspective, of the reports of politicians and administrators.

Some of the representatives of the generation that was involved in the institutionalization of anthropology as an academic discipline in Portugal have tried to establish the most important coordinates in the history of ethnography as it was practiced in the country until the end of the 19th century. The most important texts in this endeavor are maybe those by Branco (1986), Pina-Cabral (1991) and Leal (2000). The differences in emphasis and relative depth that characterize each of these works are not discussed here; though I would like to point out a preoccupation that they all share: they all attempt to discern points of contact with older yet valued theories in the annals of academic anthropology in polymath authors recognized as ethnographers or ethnologists in the last decades of the 19th century. Their researches were mainly concerned with the degree of relevance in the work of these polymaths to the terms of debate that held sway at the beginning of the most notorious of the “anthropologies of the of empire building” (see Stocking 1982), English social anthropology. Special emphasis was given to the memory of figures like Consiglieri Pedroso (1851-1910), Adolfo Coelho (1847-1919), Teófilo Braga (1843-1924), Rocha Peixoto (1866-1909) and, more equivocally, the extensive activity of José Leite de Vasconcelos(1858-1941), which continued well into the 1930s.⁴

Those approaches to the history of works of ethnographic interest in Portugal suggest a hiatus that lasted for some decades, which is marked by the absence of proposals for work thought to be significant, aside from certain isolated contributions by Peixoto and Coelho that came about relatively late in the day. Starting in the 1910s, we would have observed a process of degeneration a ‘going’ progressively ‘native’, contextualized, from the beginning, by certain important works produced in the 19th century wherein some – though few – referenc-

es deriving from anthropological theories circulating abroad can be found. I believe that this process of ‘nativization’ was indeed an observable phenomenon, if we see it as a manifestation of the intense nationalizing process experienced during the first half of the 20th century, in which the uses of ethnography were particularly concentrated. Indeed, the disappointment over the quality of the ethnography conducted in Portugal in the beginning of the 20th century is longstanding.

As a comparative reference let us look at the perspective of Ernesto Veiga de Oliveira in a text from 1968. Here he wants to account for the first twenty years of the activities of the Centro de Estudos de Etnologia Peninsular, presented with the systematic intent to impose academic rigor on a corrupted field of study:

“Without even speaking of this irresponsible amateurism, the ethnographic research itself practiced by scholars with academic training (though not specialized), based on antiquated and out-of-date theories and molds, did not respond to the demands of a discipline that was in the vanguard of the social sciences, enriched with all of the discoveries that were emerging from this field. [...] And primarily not only in the old masters – and justifiably so – but also for those who follow them (and who never go beyond them), ethnography continued to be merely a descriptive activity whose object was the study of the “tradition” conceived statically and as an end in itself, and which depicted the culture of enclosed societies isolated in space, doing so under the influence of their localist conditioning” (Oliveira 1968:35).

At the head of the so-called movement of renovation was the figure of A. Jorge Dias (1907-1973), the director of the Centro de Estudos de Etnologia Peninsular, whose training was undertaken within the context of the anthropology of ‘nation-building’, *die Volkskunde*. Later, Dias attempted to bring his references up to date when confronted with the influential canon represented by the American tradition under the tutelage of Franz Boas. This *aggiornamento* – as proposed by Oliveira in the 1962 text – with the anthropology of ‘empire-building’ was marred by a range of equivocations, as Pina Cabral (1991) has so reasonably concluded.

A note by an influential geographer, Orlando Ribeiro (1911-1997), in the preface of one of Dias's first relevant works sheds some light on some of the questions at hand:

“The discontinuity of a university tradition, which was never able to organize itself, explains the appearance of a young ethnographer who owed nothing, in terms of his initial impulse, to the Portuguese school. Dr. António Jorge Dias, also a university professor, began his studies in ethnography at the University of Munich, where he received his doctorate in *Volkskunde*” (Ribeiro 1948:X).

The absence of academic institutionalization is noteworthy when it comes to its consequences for ethnographic research; notable as well is A. J. Dias's later commitment to the 'Portuguese School', a commitment which we see clearly expressed in a 1952 text, *Bosquejo Histórico de Etnografia Portuguesa*, where he presents a genealogical reading of ethnographic research in Portugal, recognizing the few 'masters' most deserving of praise.

At the end of the lineage, outlined as it is, Dias can present himself as a modernizer, resolving to embody the rupture himself. However, he is obliged - despite his criticism - to recognize the importance of the commitments to the history, the institutions and the institutional ethnographic practices indeed still then in existence in Portugal. The following phrase is significant: “The second Lisboan organ is the Secretariado Nacional de Informação, represented by the 'Museu de Arte Popular' which while without scientific intentions, constitutes a great event within Portuguese ethnography” (1952:36). For those who know the 'Museu de Arte Popular', untouched since its foundation, the meaning of this phrase can only be viewed as ambiguous. However, the more rigorous scientist in Dias brings him later to question the curious posture of Luís Chaves (1988-1975), an influential figure during those years:

“After this brief and generalized portrayal, it is important to understand what is happening in our country. Is the present phase simply using ethnography for exhibitions, concerts, competitions, etc., in order to maintain national characteristics and to recuperate [...] as

Luís Chaves intends. I do not believe so, it would be the negation of science itself" (Dias 1952:36).

By 1952, the practical uses of ethnography had been underway intensively for some decades and (relatively) successfully for the purposes of nationalization. It was late, under the authoritarian regime (on the 28th of May) that the state began to finance and support pedagogic events that had an ethnographic cast, now instrumentalized for political ends. As Rui Ramos amusingly said (1994) it was "a lack of money" that often hampered already clear nationalizing intentions in the final years of the Constitutional Monarchy and during the First Republic (1910-1926). The Estado Novo demonstrated itself to be more capable and ready to support these initiatives early on during the first stages of its institutionalization.

We can give examples of other versions of the lineage of ethnographic interests in addition to the proposals of A. J. Dias and Veiga de Oliveira, or those of contemporaneous academic anthropologists. Comparable, for example, is the approach of Vasconcelos – one of the recognized 'masters' of the 'Portuguese school' – who links the period of 'scientific' ethnography to the studies carried out by the Grimm brothers.⁵ With respect to Portugal, Vasconcelos brought attention to authors from a somewhat earlier period – who had little to do with ethnological specialization per se – like Almeida Garrett (1799-1854), João Pedro Ribeiro (1758-1839) and Alexandre Herculano (1810-1877). This is the period in which the author, quite familiarly, situates himself (1980:232 and 250). I believe that we should take this opinion into due account, since not only is this a register of the first romantic manifestations of nationalist sensibilities, but the career of Vasconcelos unfolds between 1870 and 1930, which coincides exactly with the 'age of nationalism' and its intensification.

The suggestion made by Vasconcelos at the end of his career will be taken up a bit later by a more recent figure – also surprisingly, hardly known today – who is unavoidable in the history of the practice of ethnology and ethnography of the first half of the 20th century, Antó-

nio Mendes Correia (1888-1960; see Matos 2011). Correia synthesized some of the most prominent characteristics of the studies that were inspired by nationalism soon after its first wave at the beginning of the 19th century. In 1933, the author has the following to say about Alexandre Herculano and his pioneering *História de Portugal*:

“The science of ethnic origins had already been born when in 1846 the first volume of the *História de Portugal* appears [...] This led to the first steps in the modern academic studies of Anthropology, Linguistics, Pre-History, Ethnology, etc. Partisan History (*História Militante*) was about to begin, an appropriate expression with which Henri Berr designated archeological excavations as understood in the broadest sense” (Herculano 1933:10).

In interpreting the phrase just cited we should take into account the periodization proposed and draw attention to the use of the adjective partisan (*militante*) as much as we do to the ‘archeological’ character attributed to the intertwined group of disciplines mentioned as having come out of the 19th century. The similarities recognized to exist between archeology, ethnology and linguistics were commonplaces. For example, in the phrase transcribed by Mendes Correia, various disciplines are linked in a way that would be perceived as obvious to any educated European of the 19th century and that in 1933 – an epoch of newly intensified nationalist activity – these disciplines could hardly be considered anachronistic.

The practice of a ‘partisan history’ imposes criteria of legitimization that are internal, non-universal and specific to each nation-state. It suggests terms of truths which only exist on ‘this side of the Pyrenees’, to paraphrase Pascal’s famous line. But we should also take into account the observations of Löfgren (1989) and of Thiesse (2000) on the international similarities that the *do-it-yourselfkit* of nationalism has imposed as a counterpoint to this ironic perspective. Here, what results – if we take into account simultaneously the plurality of the social uses of the term ‘ethnography’ throughout more than a century – is the imposition of very diffuse limits when it comes to the possibilities for working out its history,

which should be guided mainly by the attention to its uses as resources of nationalization.

The extent of ethnographic practices that are recognizable in the context of processes of the nationalization of cultures is extremely fluid: they extend even to the tradition of bucolic poetry, to novels and to painting, as well as to the ethno-mimetic practices of various social strata, to cinematic scripts and those used for ethnographic processions, etc. In general, it is necessary that analysts are familiar with the aesthetic criteria that predominate in a given epoch so that they can trace the manifestations of ethnographic dispositions and their consequences in the objectification of new national cultures.

The term '*neogarrettismo*' was employed by Jacinto Prado Coelho in order to classify all the most important aesthetic and intellectual works which appeared in Portugal starting at the end of the 19th century (cf. 1976); the author refers to the duration of this widespread ideological current with a neo-romantic character which lasted throughout the 20th century. Saraiva & Lopes, for their part, have noted the contours of a late-romantic revivalism at the end of the 19th century. The evolution of these sensibilities gave rise to various currents, the authors distinguishing between "*neogarrettismo*", "*nacionalismo*", "*integralismo*", the "*renascença portuguesa*" and "*saudosismo*" (1989:1013). José Augusto França (1993) corroborates these suggestions in a more ample record, documenting the persistence – which he refers to, in passing, as anachronistic – of expressions of a romantic character in Portugal up to the present.

Eduardo Lourenço has said that romanticism has introduced a dimension of 'interiority' (*interioridade*) into the collective reality of the country (Lourenço 1978). It is important to note – in addition to the possible detailed discriminations among different schools and ideological positions – that the intention to create a national culture was a commitment shared by these various groups of intellectuals. At the time similar dispositions existed across the whole of Europe and in different places around the world transforming each of its casuistical manifestations as the situated existence of a hege-

monic ‘international ideology’; as Löfgren said, when “the international thesaurus is transformed into a specific national lexicon, local forms of cultural expression, which tend to vary from nation to nation” (1989:22).

Among the pioneering *neogarrettistas*, J. Prado Coelho identifies Leite de Vasconcelos, Alberto Sampaio (1841-1908), Adolfo Coelho, Joaquim de Vasconcelos (1849-1938), Martins Sarmiento and Rocha Peixoto, for example. Among these names, it is Adolfo Coelho and Teófilo Braga who are pioneers in introducing an interest in ethnological questions in Portugal, and who are still acknowledged in the historiographic work of contemporary anthropologists (cf. Branco 1985, 1986; Leal 2000; and Pina Cabral 1991; cf. as well Ramos 1994). But, taking into account the thematic plurality of these authors’ studies – and still others of their contemporaries with assured places in the pantheon of the most recognized Portuguese ethnologists – they must really only be considered reluctant practitioners of ethnography, if we are to value ‘presentist’ criteria (Stocking 1968; Di Brizio 1995). At this stage, I take up the suggestion of that there was a very diverse idea of what constituted ethnography, that its practitioners were engaged in a process of apparent ‘nativization’ of the theoretical writings that they employed, which in turn led to a conspicuous use of such ideas in the nationalization of the masses. In connection with this point, it is worth citing at length an important remark by Rui Ramos on Portugal as it moved from the 19th into the 20th century:

“One of the most crass errors the historians have made has been to see these *‘reaportuguesadores’* as provincials or simply naïve. The most important of these writers, painters and architects have studied abroad – and what is more: their attempts at *‘reaportuguesamento’* correspond to what in the same period was happening in England, in France and in Germany, etc. [...] As such, it would be possible to understand that *‘aportuguesamento’* constituted one of the most radically cosmopolitan and modern intellectual movements. Also one of the most ‘democratic’ ones, in the sense that an art for the middle classes was defined, without the obscure Greco-Latin references of the *ancien régime*” (Ramos 1994:570-571).

Portugal, a state spoken of as a nation throughout the last century and a half, owes to its very specific anthropology of ‘nation-building’ many effective possibilities for being imagined that remain active and are manipulated to create new social facts even today. Thus, it would be naïve to think that it is possible to understand well a variety of very contemporary phenomena if we do not take into consideration the particularities of the ‘Portuguese School’ of ethnography, in spite of the fact that we do not recognize pertinent reasons for identifying ourselves with it professionally.

An argument about images

Examining the theoretical problems that emerged in his own texts on the history of Portuguese ethnography, Leal has described the ‘weakening’ of the theoretical concerns of Portuguese ethnography between the 1910s and the 1930s and 40s (1996:31), by the way, he also suggests the need of further analysis) . Leal argued that

“the non-institutionalization of ethnography and anthropology in Portugal until the 1940s [...] [and] a merging marked by a folklorizing nationalism lacking in theoretical ambitions are some of the endogenous factors at the base of my [earlier] observations. But it is also be important to see to what extent the Portuguese situation of this period does not form part of a wider pattern, which extends to a variety of national traditions of European anthropology of the same epoch” (Leal 1996:31).

He then remarks that the proximity with the privileged dominion “of this nationalist ethnography with a folklorist orientation – ‘popular art’” – is most salient in the work of José Leite de Vasconcelos during the 1920s; and that the important magazine, *Alma Nova*, in its 3rd series

“adopted the subtitle, *Revista de Ressurgimento Nacional*, creating a program which aimed to awaken ‘the cult of the virtues of the motherland and love of things Portuguese.’ It brought in ethnographers like Luís Chaves and Cláudio Basto (1886-1945), in the context of opting for a nationalistic ethnography which would pay special attention to the study of regional dress” (Leal 1996:32-33).

These remarks are geared to the characteristics of the ethnography of the early 1920s: we can note a 'theoretical weakening' and a lack of ambition, as well as an inflated attention being paid to folklore, 'popular art', dress and images in general. It is even suggested by Leal that this pattern would be replicated at an international level, a pertinent opinion which is conferred by consulting some of the comparative literature that is available. I believe Indeed that these kinds of concerns date to an even earlier period, with clear expressions already coming out of the end of the 19th century, also at an international level, and that these tendencies were only intensified from the 1910s to the 1920s.

The consolidation of the knowledge of nations was dependent upon a scientific discourse that developed in new academic disciplines – or in reformulated ones – in the last decades of the 19th century. Jacques Le Goff has said that a “new civilization of inscription” arose in mid-19th century Europe; he would refer to this as an epoch in which “the academic movement aimed at furnishing the monuments of remembrance to the collective memory of nations accelerated” (1984:38). ⁶If we take the example of what happened in Portugal it would be risky to view academic studies as central, or even as particularly important, to the definition of countries and their internal diversity. These studies were dependent upon previous proposals that while, not very rigorous, were nevertheless quite efficacious.

The total sum of available resources for describing a country's overall characteristics, and the distinctions between its different parts, reads like a palimpsest of literary, iconographic and academic representations that are inextricably superimposed. Here we should invoke Roncayolo, who has said the following about geographic readings of the French countryside at the end of the 19th century: “The wise reader is no stranger to the aesthetic, the stereotype of the journey and the discovery of the exotic, to the description of the countryside as a performance or an object of consumption” (1986:488). Roncayolo's characterization suggests important analogies for the intersection of references that marked the influential ways of speaking about Portu-

gal and its inhabitants in the 19th century, ways which also survived into the next century.

Recognition of the fecundity of these mixed processes of classification was accepted by the scholars of the day, such as Sampaio Bruno (1857-1915), when he refers to the efficaciousness of knowledge previously obtained through the “the suggestive intensity in literary works” (Bruno 1987:181), or even by Vasconcelos, who wrote with his characteristic solemnity at the end of his career: “Artists often anticipate what researchers of history discover at the cost of tiring mental labor” (1980a:246). In the imaginative theory of Oliveira Martins – the ‘historian-artist’ – we would find a good example of what Vasconcelos had in mind.

The definition of ethnography as “the art of painting the customs of nations” was contemporaneous with Almeida Garrett.⁷ Between 1870 and 1880 a new meaning was consolidated, summarized as the ‘description of traditions’ or, stronger in its insinuations, the ‘description of the Tradition’, which does not contradict the earlier definition; on the contrary, it strongly depends on it.⁸ In the second sense, that which will be retained by the romantic vision, the *hic et nunc* of the daily life of the subaltern classes of the rural world, recreated in physical images and allegorical texts – set forth in painting, in novels, in the first collections of traditional songs (even the ‘affected’ ones) – might now seem subject to being saved in the group of traditions, as part of the ‘Tradition.’ Soon there would be a multiplication of possibilities for increasing these assets, which increasingly included registers such as photographs, photogravures and postcards, as techniques of mechanical reproduction that expanded greatly during the last half of the 19th century.

Vasconcelos and certain of his contemporaries remained surprisingly attentive to these many different types of documents produced in the most diverse circumstances. As part of the great circuit of ‘sources of ethnographic investigation’ proposed by José Leite de Vasconcelos at the end of his career in 1933 he brought an array of definitively eclectic authors to our attention. Vasconcelos recalls sources as dispa-

rate as the *Promptuario Augustiniano das Indulgencias da Correa*, a work of the 17th century, or the literary works of the great Portuguese Romantic writers like Almeida Garrett, Alexandre Herculano, Camilo Castelo Branco and Júlio Dinis. But he also draws his sources from – even more unpredictably – the famous caricatures of Rafael Bordalo Pinheiro (1846-1905), or news items from the important daily newspaper, *O Século*. It is worth citing a suggestive passage from volume I Vasconcelos' 1986 (cf. Branco, 1985,d of Thyhstanding *Etnografia Portuguesa*:

“For this overflowing of a tendency toward ethnographic studies to have occurred, no one would deny the practices of specialized periodicals; and some will attribute it to the museums, ergological-industrial exhibitions, regionalist congresses and to the artists, due to the execution of works inspired by acts and objects of traditional life that are truly inspiring. Newspapers and magazines of various kinds compete to develop that which is being spoken about: they publish articles on ethnography and folklore; others sponsor, for example, song, proverb, or guessing ‘competitions’ and report on festivities, superstitions and customs. We owe as much equally to the illustrated magazines which create, graphically, an analogous species; the same could be said of postcards, so much in style today everywhere, and where we can see, for example, drawings of dress, of the instruments of transport, the ‘types’ of streets, the street peddlers, shepherds, entertainers, markets, houses, palaces and castles, a thousand things in the end, from the various areas of Portugal” (Vasconcelos 1980:323-324).

In 1933, the author could have also referred to the movie industry, its sets and costumes, the tradition of carnival processions in the large cities, the first attempts at ethnographic processions, at least one opera house, the operetta and local traditions off light theatre. Each of these visual and performative registers contained descriptions of the people. Each of them could be suggestive, register possibilities of verisimilitude and, thus, possibilities of being used as a ‘source’ for the establishment of representation of national traditions. I believe that nearly everything said by Leite de Vasconcelos in the passage cited above should be highlighted. I also believe that it suggests our thin knowledge of the ethnographic sensibilities predominant in the age of nationalism.



Imagem 3 – Leite de Vasconcelos doing fieldwork in another ‘remote’ Portuguese locality (Centro de Tradições Populares - Universidade de Lisboa).

As a matter of fact, Leite de Vasconcelos pointedly resented the ambiguities generated through the tremendous efforts the mainstream press spent in creating images of the country and the people of his period. For example, in volume III of *Etnografia Portuguesa*, the scholar lamented the contamination of his academic arguments by the contingencies generated through the strong market for images of Portuguese culture. At issue were the images of the Minho which he used to illustrate the pages of this part of his magnum opus:

“Fig. II, p. 42 – Minhotan from previous times. The same source as figs. 5-10. – Already after the printing of these figures, in the present work I found out that some of them had come out in *Lusa* and Dr. Cláudio Basto told me that part, or all, of them were being sold as postcards; and the illustrious researcher informed me as well that, according to Figueiredo da Guerra, not all of it is accurate. If I had known this would happen before the printing of the book, perhaps I would have abstained from its reproduction” (Vasconcelos 1980b:757).

As a key passage in the citations of Vasconcelos, it points to the existence at the time of an “overflowing of the taste for ethnographic studies” which was susceptible to being expressed by such a great variety of means. By following the trail of images, we will understand the importance the polymaths of the ‘Portuguese school of anthropology’ attribute to its production. In an undated and less well-known text, yet one that Flávio Gonçalves tells us was destined for the important magazine, *Portugália*, entitled ‘The Archeology and Ethnography of Postcards,’ Peixoto has the following to say about these mainstays of very widespread images:

“It is then an iconic document that rises up and triumphs, thanks to the accessible price, for their novelty and even that they are in style. Many of them are graphically excellent, especially the monochromes. We should distinguish, however, between those dealing with ethnographic subjects that faithfully reproduce scenes, customs and architecture from those that sacrifice reality in the name of some affected and puerile aesthetic.

[...] With the preoccupation for all that is new, the concurrence and the usefulness of the photograph and the engraving, the truth is that illustrative subjects are now sought out in remote places that were until now inaccessible even to the most zealous investigators. It is correct to presume that, some years from now, rare will be the monument or regional type that is not registered in this curious and inexpensive gallery of postcards” (Peixoto1975:401-402).

It is clear that the great haste to know the country registered above and the massive spread of these images produced serially, could only have multiplied the ‘overflow’ referred to by Leite de Vasconcelos.

Peixoto, considered the most rigorous of the ethnographers of the 'Portuguese school,' also confirms this. In this process of the imagination of the parts of the country and its inhabitants, the selective choice of icons susceptible to being manipulated to serve projects of collective identification also remains a possibility (cf. Chamboredon 1994).



Imagem 4 - Rocha Peixoto (on the right) at the Pelourinho de Rebordãos (Casa Museu Nogueira da Silva/ Universidade do Minho).

Peixoto's commentary is curious for yet another reason. We know that the author covered the mountains of the north of the country, firmly placing himself – as Gonçalves, his biographer, said – in the first group of interpreters of one of the most typical aspects of Portuguese *ethnosociologia* (Gonçalves 1968:XI). This author resented, as Leite de Vasconcelos did, the competition of other specialists, who were also the makers of images, namely of 'remote places' in the space of the nation-state. The possibilities for conceptualizing such places are enclosed in a space and a time of their own, due to the diversity of contributors: historians, archeologists and ethnologists, but also thanks to the dynamics of a robust market of images and texts which were anything but serious.

A consultation of the illustrated magazines of the last half of the 19th century would suggest that the trails over the northern mountains of the country began to serve those who made images of remote places, a movement that would intensify as the new century approached. Some of the ethnographers that we praise most are of this group. We will also see that a part of the symbols of the 'primitive' chosen during this period have lasted until today. Manuel Monteiro (1879-1952) – art historian, and also an important figure in the task of the *aportuguesamento* of the country – had the following to say: "Sr. Rocha Peixoto, a gifted man of science, who adds, to his singular erudition, the excellencies of an unmistakable plasticity, in a lucid précis, *kodakusou* [photographed] the *vivenda barrosã* [the typical house from Barroso], which he personally examined and thoroughly scrutinized" (in Biel 1902-1908, vol. VII, sp.).

It is clear that there is much to think about with respect to those places or objects that become iconic. (cf. Herzfeld 1997). Peixoto did not photograph *any* *vivenda barrosã*, but rather *the* 'vivenda barrosã,' as Monteiro suggests. This tendency toward typification was apparent in the Peixoto's earlier preoccupations; for example, in a 1904 text originally entitled 'A Casa Portuguesa (a propósito do novo prédio da Rua do Conde)' and later published under a more restrictive title, *A Casa Portuguesa (The Portuguese House)*. This curious text – collected by Gonçalves in *Estudos de Etnografia e Arqueologia* in the complete works

of Peixoto – was published in *Serões*, a widely distributed illustrated magazine from the beginning of the century. An article from another more lasting and influential illustrated magazine of the turn of the century, *A Ilustração Portuguesa*, documented the pedagogic potential of post-cards and the intensity of their use, preceding Rocha Peixoto's reflection noted above:

“They say that in Portugal nearly a million cards of this type are employed in illustrating our streets, our squares, portraits of our celebrated men, picturesque corners of our hamlets, the lovely customs of our provinces, the ruins of our centuries-old towers, our ancient churches and our grand houses where so many beautiful things have happened”.

He also refers to one of the possibilities of collective identification that postcards can provide:

[...] the most picturesque corners of our land, the most beautiful streets of our cities, the most singular aspects of our life, the faces of our peasants will show foreigners that we have beautiful places and beautiful faces, Negroes do not live on this side of the Pyrenees as some imagine” (*A Ilustração Portuguesa* no. 38, 1906).

This last question was not a minor one at the time. It worried Peixoto, leading him to write a newspaper article some years earlier, in which he also dealt with the manipulation of images and the possibility of their use in circulating depressing stereotypes of the nation among European academics. In the text entitled ‘O sangue do preto no povo português,’ [‘The black blood in the Portuguese people’] Peixoto discusses the fact that one of his countrymen had sent certain photographs to the “antropologist Zaborowski” [Sigismund Zaborowski-Moindron 1851-1928] and the hurried conclusions that those images allowed for.

“This singular puerility even explains the exhibition of seven representatives of the Portuguese people in the book already alluded to and entitled ‘Le Portugal’. They are: haberdashers, traveling merchants, a languid elegant clerk and, as an example of the Portuguese woman, a girl just released from an asylum!

The book, *Le Portugal*, which certainly must have had great success on the market, and now this presentation to the Anthropology Society of France, will do us that deplorable service..." (Peixoto 1975:268-270).

It was this circulation of faces representing the Portuguese nationality on the international market of the images of nations [cf. Thiesse 2000] which made Peixoto indignant. We can correctly deduce from his phrases the suggestion of a grave lack of confidence – the breaking of tacit principles of concealing that which belongs to the sphere of the nation's 'intimacy.' We have the unveiling – 'puerile,' it should be noted – of what happens behind the doors of the nation, where, in the end, there are haberdashers in the gallery of types normally recognized.⁹

None of the many photographs taken by Peixoto survive as identifying icons of the areas that he traveled through, such as the Minho, the Trás-os-Montes, the north of the country or even Portugal as a whole. In the context of what we understand ethnography to be today, with its origins in the 19th century, the documentary photographs taken by Peixoto are not, paradoxically, 'ethnographic.' The images of the mountain dwellers – of Gralheira, Arga, Montemuro, etc. – miserable and ungainly, captured by the naturalist sensibility of Peixoto were not used in the production of a nationalized culture of the masses, which took place in the following decades of the 20th century.

On the contrary, more fortunate were the representations of 'popular art' or 'typical dress' gathered around the *Terra Portuguesa* and other even older products, texts and images, dating back to the time in which ethnography was defined in the dictionary as the 'art of painting the customs of nations.' Thus, we can argue that anthropology, 'weakened theoretically' during the last years of the 19th century, was mainly capable of producing images and did so profusely; through making them, it was able to demonstrate its modernity and also contribute to the production of the nation-state and its monuments (cf. Appadurai 1986; Le Goff 1982; Herzfeld 1992).

Here, by way of the various references suggested – emphasizing first the recognized place of paintings, postcards and photographs in

the margins of the works of the great ethnographers, then the illustrators and illustrations between the lines of Leal's text (1996), or, more detailed yet, Ramos's calling our attention to the importance of a market of images and objects that symbolized the country and the distinguished parts of it, produced by 'naturalists', 'neo-romantics' and 'modernists' since the beginning of the 20th century - we can introduce a suggestion by J. Fernandez:

“Not only do the subtleties of consensus pose a challenge to the notion of ‘generalized belief’, there is also the problem of the process of collective mentation - the kind of information processing that goes on in the crowd. It is my view, and here I am in agreement with Le Bon, that the crowd's thinking mainly takes place through an argument ‘of images’” (Fernandez 1989:285).

The circulation of images of the Minho beginning at the end of the 19th century was a mass phenomenon which affected the growing middle classes, that by then were able to learn their nationhood in a variety of ways. The vehicles of this process were graphic representations and texts produced in series, tourism, parodic mimeses of the rural people in processions, Carnival dances, parties, student celebrations, etc. This learning process occurred with apparent freedom under the democratic regimes consisting of a constitutional monarchy and the 1st Republic, from 1910 onwards. But there were also dimensions of the process which were starkly imposed - along with certain strains of totalitarianism - under the Estado Novo (1933-1974), when the prominence of the Minho as the chosen province of the nationalizing discourse began to decline and images of the other provinces became abundant. It is worth citing a later formulation.

“[...] if the importance of ethnography and of Folklore is demonstrated and cannot be contested, it is urgent that its constitutive elements, which are many, be spread by all forms possible: by textbooks, literature, by public talks, by exhibitions, by processions, by the cinema and by the radio, especially the latter, which reaches all houses and all ears but without adulterations and obeying the highest principles of morality, composure and patriotism” (J. L. Dias 1956:22).

This sentence was written by Jaime Lopes Dias (1890-1977), a minor figure who was, notwithstanding one of the most prolific ethnographers of the mid-century period. What he has to say is chilling, and also surprisingly modern by being so completely conscious of the available technical resources and their capacity to create a totalitarian production of mass culture. Indeed, these types of preoccupations can be found in two very different European personalities from previous decades. There is Gramsci, who said:

“Folklore must not be considered an eccentricity, an oddity, or a picturesque element, but as something which is very serious and to be taken seriously. Only in this way will the teaching of folklore be more efficient and really bring about a new culture among the broad popular masses...” (Gramsci 1985:191).



Imagem 5 -Dressing up the nation, tentatively... Unknown photographer, n.d.

On the other hand we have António Ferro (1895-1956), a Portuguese intellectual who was in charge of propaganda for the authoritarian regime from 1933 to 1949) whose action can be understood in the context of complete political involvement with similar concerns

to those that are suggested in the extract from Gramsci above. Ferro said, for his part, appropriating the words of a French critic upon the premiere of the famous ballet, ‘Verde Gaio’, the choreography and costumes of which were clearly nationalized, full of ethnographic citations:

“Today we are entranced by the hastened rhythm of modern life and trained in the school of the rapid ideograms of the cinema, that make us used to thinking in images [...] the ‘screen’ and the choreographic lyricism blend elegantly in a civilization that has forgotten the luxurious cost of empty hours in favor of the problem of a collective and accelerated culture” (Ferro 1950:102).

Ferro exercised an enormous power in the spread of a new culture, one that is nationalized, from the beginnings of the 1930s; however, we already find similar metaphors in the texts of his younger years, when he was a young ‘modernist’ intellectual, during the 1910s (*cf.* Ramos 1994), texts contemporaneous with the moments in which ethnography had become ‘exclusively descriptive’ (*cf.* Oliveira 1968) or, formulated differently, had begun to experience a theoretical ‘weakness’...



Imagem 6 – Young women dressed in Minho style. Postcard, ca. 1910.

Notes

¹ This article is a version, shortened and updated, of chapter 7 of my book *Two Sides of One River. Nationalism and Ethnography in Galicia and Portugal*, Oxford & New York, Berghahn Books (translated by Martin Earl, with a foreword by James Fernandez), I'm grateful to Marion Berghahn's enduring generosity.

² Manuel Azevedo – my 'main informant' and host during my first fieldwork experience in the early 90's – passed away in May 2015. I want to dedicate this text to his unforgettable friendship. Minho is one of the eleven recognized Portuguese provinces (*provincias*), the one which provided for some of the more emblematic images of Portuguese rurality (see Medeiros 2013).

³ In Portugal, these theses were emblematically articulated in a famous lecture by Antero de Quental entitled 'Causes of Decadence in the Peninsular Peoples' (cf. Quental 1970; see also Pick 1989)

⁴ We should remind ourselves that the possibilities for recognizing such affinities are extremely scarce, affected they were most of the times by syncretism, irrelevant or only ephemerally expressed. This became gradually clearer after the initial enthusiasms. What is more, I believe that this research into antecedents was not enough justified and lasted too long. By consequence, the discernment of a rousing object of study – nationalism – and the relevant place of disseminated ethnographic practices which embodied it remained obscured. Indeed, we can say that contemporary Portuguese anthropology is not, in theoretical terms, nationally anchored: its most significant conceptual references are imported. The recognition of this fact should not be unduly exaggerated, and I believe, as a matter of fact, that no one in Portuguese universities is preoccupied today with doing so.

⁵ Compare affinities and particularisms in the European context in studies by Bendix (1997), Herzfeld (1986) and Aguilar Criado (1990), for example.

⁶ In Portugal, academic practices geared toward the creation of "monuments of memory" intensified beginning in the 1870s. Local practitioners of disciplines like geography, physical anthropology, ethnology, archeology and musicology began to appear; the writing of history was once again taken up and popularized (cf. Ribeiro 1977; Vasconcelos 1980; Catroga 1993).

⁷ This is the definition given in the 1831 edition of the *Dicionário de Moraes* (cf. Vasconcelos 1980a:18).

⁸ The apologetic definitions of this term in Vasconcelos' first important text from 1882 are suggestive. It is nationalized Portuguese 'Tradition' that he is trying to define (cf. Vasconcelos 1986, and also Guerreiro 1986).

⁹ I came to understand that in the locales of the rural Minho where I did my fieldwork, people were very careful to systematically keep hidden the internal dissension within 'casas' [households]. Children were understood to be the weak link, and were taught the arts of dissemblance early on. In the Minho even specific localities, parishes and municipalities are seen as being easily embarrassed or insulted, that is, capable of losing face in certain kinds of confrontations that involve homologous entities. (This doesn't, as far as I could tell, happen at the provincial level.) Citizens

of a country or members of a nation can also lose face. I am following Herzfeld's argument in these commentaries, who has the following to say with respect to contemporary Greece: "Hence cultural intimacy. It is no accident that the pat Greek phrase for the defense of that intimacy, often heard as a reason for not discussing admitted weaknesses of the nationalist argument before a foreign audience, should be: *ta en iko mi en dhimo* (matters of house [classical Greek *oikos*] [should] not [be exposed] in the public sphere)" (1997:95).

References

- AGUILAR CRIADO, Encarnación. 1990. *Cultura Popular y Folklore en Andalucía. Los Orígenes de la Antropología*. Sevilla: Deputación Provincial.
- APPADURAI, Arjun. 1995. "The Production of Locality". In FARDON R. (ed.): *Counterworks: Managing the Diversity of Knowledge*, pp.204-225. London/New York: Routledge.
- ARDENER, Edwin. 1987. "Remote Places- Some theoretical considerations". In JACKSON. A. (ed.): *Anthropology at Home*. Pp.38-54. London/New York: Tavistock.
- BENDIX, Regina. 1992. "National Sentiment in the Enactment and Discourse of Swiss Political Ritual". *American Ethnologist* 19(4):768-790.
- BIEL, Emílio. 1902-8. *A Arte e a Natureza em Portugal*. Porto: Emílio Biel e C^a.
- BOON, James. 1982. *Other Tribes, Other Scribes. Symbolic Anthropology in the Comparative Study of Cultures, Histories, Religions, and Texts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.
- _____. 1990. *Affinities and Extremes*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- BRANCO, Jorge F. 1985. "A Propósito da Presente Reedição,". Preface to T. BRAGA: *O Povo Português nos Seus Costumes, Crenças e Tradições*. Lisbon: Publicações Dom Quixote.
- _____. 1986. "Cultura como ciência? Da consolidação do discurso antropológico à institucionalização da disciplina". *Ler História* 8:75-101.
- BENJAMIN, Walter. 1992 [1973]. *Illuminations*. London. Fontana.
- BOURDIEU, Pierre. 1989. *O Poder Simbólico*. Lisbon: Difel.
- BRUNO, Sampaio. 1987. *Os Modernos Publicistas Portugueses*. Porto: Lello & Irmão.
- CERTEAU, Michel de. 1987. *La Culture au Pluriel*. Paris: Christian Bourgois.
- CLIFFORD, James. 1997. *Routes: Travel and Translation in the Late 20th Century*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- COELHO, Jacinto do P. 1976 [1960]. *Dicionário das Literaturas Portuguesa, Galega e Brasileira*. Porto: Figueirinhas.
- CORREIA, António M. 1933. *Martins Sarmiento e a Consciência Nacional*. Guimarães: Minerva Vimaranesense.
- CORTESÃO, Jaime. 1966. *Portugal. A Terra e o Homem*. Lisbon: Artis.

- DIAS, Jaime Lopes. 1956. *Problemas de Folclore*. Lisbon: Ferin.
- DIAS, A. Jorge. 1952. *Bosquejo Analítico de Etnografia Portuguesa*. Coimbra: Casa do Castelo.
- DI BRIZIO, Maria Beatrice. 1995. “‘Présentisme’ et ‘Historicisme’ dans l’Historiographie de G. W. Stocking”. *Gradhiva* 18:77-89.
- FERNANDEZ, James. 1986. *Persuasions and Performances: The play of tropes in culture*. Bloomington: University of Indiana Press.
- FERRO, António. 1950. *Verdo Gaio*. Lisboa: SNI.
- FRANÇA, José A. 1993. *O Romantismo em Portugal*. Lisbon: Livros Horizonte.
- GONÇALVES, Flávio. 1967. “Prefácio”. In PEIXOTO, A. R.: *Obras*. I, pp. ix-llii. Póvoa de Varzim: Câmara Municipal da Póvoa de Varzim.
- GRAMSCI, Antonio. 1985. *Selections from Cultural Writings*. London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- GUERREIRO, Manuel V. 1986. “Tradições Populares de Portugal. Génese de uma Obra”. In Vasconcelos, J. L. (ed.): *Tradições Populares de Portugal*, pp.7-28. Lisbon: Imprensa Nacional-Casa da Moeda.
- HANDLER, Richard. 1988. *Nationalism and the Politics of Culture in Quebec*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- HERZFELD, Michael. 1986. *Ours Once More: Folklore, Ideology and the Making of Modern Greece*. New York: Pella.
- _____. 1991. *A Place in History: Social and Monumental Time in a Cretan Town*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- _____. 1997. *Cultural Intimacy*. London/NewYork: Routledge.
- HOBSBAWM, Eric. 1985 [1983]. “Mass-Producing Tradition: Europe, 1870-1914”. In HOBSBAWM, E. & RANGER, T. (eds): *The Invention of Tradition*, pp. 263-307. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- LE GOFF, Jacques. 1984. “Memória” and “Documento/Monumento”. In *Enciclopédia Einaudi*, vol. 1, pp. 95-106. Lisbon: Imprensa Nacional-Casa da Moeda.
- LEAL, João. 1995. “Imagens Contrastadas do Povo: Cultura Popular e Identidade Nacional na Antropologia Portuguesa Oitocentista”. *Revista Lusitana* 13-14:125-44.
- _____. 2000. *Etnografias Portuguesas (1870-1970): Cultura Popular e Identidade Nacional*. Lisbon: D. Quixote.
- LÖFGREN, Orvar. 1989. “The Nationalization of Culture”. *Ethnologia Europaea*, 20:5-24.
- MATOS, Patrícia F. 2011. “A Vida e a Obra do Professor Mendes Correia: Articulações entre antropologia, nacionalismo e colonialismo em Portugal”. In MARTINS, A. C. (ed.): *Mendes Corrêa 1888-1960: Entre a ciência, docência e política*, pp.9-35. Lisboa: ACD Editores.
- MEDEIROS, António. 1995. “Minho: Retrato Oitocentista de uma Paisagem de Eleição,” *Revista Lusitana*, (NS) 13-14: 97-123.
- _____. 2003. *A Moda do Minho. Um Ensaio Antropológico*. Lisbon: Colibri.

- MEDEIROS, António. 2013. *Two Sides of One River. Nationalism and Ethnography in Portugal and Galicia*. Oxford and New York: Berghahn Books.
- MORAIS SILVA, A. 1831. *Diccionario da Lingua Portuguesa*. Lisbon: Imprensa Regia.
- OLIVEIRA, Ernesto V. 1968. *Vinte Anos de Investigação Etnológica do Centro de Estudos de Etnologia Peninsular. Porto 1947-Lisboa 1967*. Lisbon: IAC.
- OLIVEIRA MARTINS, J. P. 1942 [1879]. *História de Portugal*, 2 vols. Lisbon: Parceria A. M. Pereira.
- _____. n.d. [1881]. *Portugal Contemporâneo*. Lisbon: Europa América.
- PEIXOTO, A. R. 1967-1975. *Obras*, vol 3. Póvoa de Varzim: Câmara Municipal da Póvoa de Varzim.
- PICK, Daniel. 1996 [1989]. *Faces of Degeneration. A European Disorder, c. 1848-c. 1918*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- PINA-CABRAL, João. 1991. *Os Contextos da Antropologia*. Lisbon: Difel.
- QUENTAL, Antero de. 1970. *Causas da Decadência dos Povos Peninsulares*. Lisbon, Ulmeiro.
- RAMOS, Rui. 1994. *A Segunda Fundação (1890-1926)*. In MATTOSO, J. (ed.): *História de Portugal*, vol. 6. Lisbon: Círculo de Leitores.
- RIBEIRO, Orlando. 1977. *Introduções Geográficas à História de Portugal*. Lisbon: Imprensa Nacional-Casa da Moeda.
- RONCAYOLO, Michel. 1997. "Le Paysage du Savant". In NORA, P. (ed.): *Les Lieux de Mémoire 1*, pp.997-1033. Paris: Gallimard,.
- SARAIVA, A. J. & LOPES, O. 1989. *História da Literatura Portuguesa*. Porto: Porto
- STOCKING Jr., G. 1982. "Afterword: A View from the Center". *Ethnos*, 47:172-86.
- THIESSE, Anne-Marie. 2000. *A Criação das Identidades Nacionais. Europa-Séculos XVIII-XX*. Lisbon: Temas e Debates.
- TRIGUEIROS, Luís F. 1967. *O Minho*. Lisbon: Livraria Bertrand.
- VASCONCELOS, José L. 1980 [1933]. *Etnografia Portuguesa-Tentame de Sistematização*, vol. 1. Lisbon: Imprensa Nacional-Casa da Moeda.
- VIEIRA, José A. 1886-1887. *O Minho Pittoresco*, 2 vols. Lisbon: António Maria Pereira.
- WILLIAMS, Raymond. 1993 [1977]. *The Country and the City*. London: Hogarth Press.

Resumo: Tomando a história dos interesses etnográficos em Portugal como principal referência, tento relacionar algumas percepções contemporâneas do patrimônio e da identidade regional com a produção de imagens e a difusão do nacionalismo que tiveram lugar no final do século XIX e na primeira metade do século XX.

Palavras-chave: Portugal; Minho; Imagens; Escrita; Património.

Recebido em dezembro de 2015

Aprovado em janeiro de 2016