



# From the Regime Ethnologists to the Democratic Generation: Histories of Portuguese Anthropology

*Clara Saraiva, Giacomo Pozzi, and Chiara Pussetti*

## ANTHROPOLOGIES IN PORTUGAL: POINTS OF CONTACT AND TRANSITION

Ephemeral soprano voices—sampled and arranged by Philip Glass—floated in the balmy air of a late Portuguese summer in the courtyard of the Ethnographic Museum in Coimbra during the opening of the first Congress of the European Association of Social Anthropologists (EASA), taking place between 31 August and 3 September 1990 (Eriksen, 1991, pp. 75–76).

---

In the original version of this book, published by Palgrave Macmillan in 2023, Maria Clara Ferreira De Almeida Saraiva was omitted from the authorship of this chapter in error. Some of the data has also been revised.

---

C. Saraiva (✉) • C. Pussetti  
Institute of Social Sciences, University of Lisbon, Lisbon, Portugal  
e-mail: [maria-saraiva@edu.ulisboa.pt](mailto:maria-saraiva@edu.ulisboa.pt)

G. Pozzi  
Dipartimento di Studi Umanistici, Università IULM, Milan, Italy

© The Author(s), under exclusive license to Springer Nature  
Switzerland AG 2025

G. D'Agostino, V. Matera (eds.), *Histories of Anthropology*,  
[https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-75052-6\\_7](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-75052-6_7)

Approximately 450 anthropologists from all over Europe came together in response to the invitation launched by a small group of 19 anthropologists. They discussed Europe (the title of the congress was “Anthropology and Europe”), anthropological theory and the future of the discipline in the lecture halls of a university that was celebrating its 700th anniversary at the time. Three decades later, in a sunny July in Lisbon, the 16th EASA Congress was held: in this case, the sounds that surrounded the participants were those of computer keyboards, digital platforms and intermittent Internet connections. In a Europe sadly devastated by the Covid-19 epidemic, the 30th anniversary celebration of the Association’s first Congress took place entirely online. By 2020, the number of participants had grown to around 1900, but the central topic of discussion remained the same: dialogue within and beyond Europe, inspired by the motto “New anthropological horizons in and beyond Europe”.

Portugal is considered a marginal and peripheral country in relation to the larger European area. This is due in part to the small size of its national territory (just over 92,000 km<sup>2</sup>, less than one-fifth of neighbouring Spain) and small population (10.28 million people). Socially, economically and politically, but also culturally, the Portuguese-speaking country belongs to Southern Europe and the even smaller circle of Mediterranean countries (Portugal, Italy, Greece and Spain, a grouping economic journalists refer to as PIGS without much irony—or at least with an irony that is largely misunderstood). As a member of PIGS, the country has long been considered less than virtuous and tending to financial mismanagement. Like its Mediterranean peers, Portugal’s public finances are precarious, its economic competitiveness is low, its government bond yields are minimal and its productivity is limited, all of which result in a reduced ability to repay public debt. However, in recent years—or at least until the crisis caused by the Covid-19 pandemic—the country has been able to deconstruct this image of being located at the bottom of the European ladder thanks mainly to the income generated by tourism along with a few other sectors. It has demonstrated—albeit admittedly in a way that has drawn some criticism—that it is possible to throw off the yoke of economic crisis and the even more violent and ferocious yoke of the “cure” imposed by Troika.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>From the Russian word *тройка*, (“trio”), in the framework of European Union policy Troika represents the set of official creditors who act during negotiations with the various member countries. It consists of representatives of the European Commission, the European Central Bank and the International Monetary Fund.

There are historical causes for all of this. In general, and very briefly, the events characterising Portugal's history are inextricably linked to its particular geographical position. With its approximately 800 km of coasts facing the Atlantic Ocean, the country represents the extreme western offshoot of the Old World. It is a strip of land with its gaze turned always towards the sea, a position that has made it a seafaring nation par excellence. Portugal represents one of the oldest political organisations in Europe and has maintained roughly the same borders since the twelfth century. In this sense, the country has maintained an enviable and unusual stability over the centuries due to its relations with the rest of Europe. The vast Spanish territory represents a presence against which Portugal has always had to be on guard, due to the risk of absorption, and for a long time Spain acted less as a bridge and more as a wall dividing Portugal from the rest of Europe. This is part of what makes its history so unique as compared to the other European powers. This uniqueness is most evident in the role that the ocean has played in the construction of the world of Portuguese influence: rather than entertaining relations with other European nations, the country has preferred to surf the waves. This allowed it not only to build one of the greatest colonial empires of the modern era (and the last to fall), but also to develop—in almost total isolation from the rest of Europe—its economy, politics and “culture”, in relation to the ocean. The isolation resulting from its Atlantic and imperial vocation had as an extreme consequence the establishment of a fascist dictatorial regime that lasted half a century, a regime that played on the country's history of separateness to further isolate it and anchor it to political, social and economic positions that distanced it from the rest of Europe. It was not until the mid-1970s with the African wars of liberation, ensuing national independence and the fall of the centuries-old Lusophone Empire that the socio-political transformations took place leading first to the EEC and then the European Union.

It was in the country marked by all these vicissitudes, however, that European anthropology decided 30 years ago to begin to think of and construct itself as such: in a certain sense, to use a de Martinian myth, Portugal was the first place chosen to plant the *kaupwa-auwa* pole (i.e. the EASA Congress) of the Old World anthropologists (the Achilpas) in order to redeem the European branch of the discipline from an epistemological and geographical distress that threatened to undermine its possibilities for existence. In this sense, returning recently to the same spaces where the myth was first created has meant renewing a founding act carried out in the past, the celebration of a restless trajectory that, thanks to the pole, nevertheless manages to remain connected to the “centre”.

The marginality of Portuguese history, including the history of the discipline, has undoubtedly played a paradigmatic role in this trajectory. As the feminist writer bell hooks repeatedly reminded us, “marginality is a place of radical possibility [...]. A place capable of offering us the possibility of a radical perspective from which to look, create, imagine alternatives and new worlds” (bell hooks, 1998, p. 68). Can Portugal adequately represent this place? In a way, the 19 founders of the European Association of Social Anthropologists believed it could.

In 1990, Portuguese anthropology was experiencing a moment of particular vitality in what are known as the “years of internationalization” (Bastos, 2014; Pina Cabral, 1989, 1991). The generation of anthropologists trained in the first-degree courses after 25 April 1974—the year of the famous Carnation Revolution (*Revolução dos Cravos*) that brought down the pro-fascist dictatorship, one of the last great European dictatorships to persist after the Second World War—became responsible for the new anthropology courses. Some had completed their training abroad, returning to Portugal in the 1990s with a wealth of knowledge and experience acquired over the course of long periods spent in English or American departments and research centres. In an interview we conducted with him, Miguel Vale de Almeida uses the term “democratic generation” to define the anthropologists who emerged after 25 April, bringing with them baggage accumulated elsewhere. A dynamic and international panorama was created in those years, a landscape Vale de Almeida defines as “peripheral or marginal cosmopolitanism”. This effervescence effectively represented the restlessness and prolificacy of European anthropology at the time: a discipline that was attempting to redefine its ethical, methodological, theoretical and epistemological premises from a post-modern perspective and in a context of increasing mobility.

Although it now operates in a different framework, this dynamism has not been lost: Portugal today represents a politically progressive vanguard in Europe and, notwithstanding its limits and issues, from the point of view of anthropology it acts as a reservoir of experimentation, exchange and contact growing out of a patchwork of “histories”, traditions and schools of thought.

The “histories”, traditions and schools of thought comprising Portuguese anthropology have been recounted by several authors, from different perspectives and with distinct narratives. Jorge Dias provides an initial summary of these accounts in *Bosquejo*, going back as far as the sixteenth century with its transoceanic voyages and related chronicles (Dias,

1952). Ernesto Veiga de Oliveira devoted a great deal of energy to restoring—often partially—the life of the research centres (and their researchers) created by Jorge Dias himself (Oliveira, 1968, 1984). Between the end of the 1980s and the beginning of the 1990s, João de Pina Cabral (Pina Cabral, 1989) outlined the main stages in the history of Portuguese anthropology. Pina Cabral likewise began his account at the end of the nineteenth century, reflecting subsequently on the figure of Jorge Dias and his team in the 1950s and 1960s and went on to discuss the historical, epistemological, methodological and theoretical current surfacing in the discipline until its “rebirth” at the end of the 1980s (Pina Cabral, 1991).

If we had to identify a single person who has contributed the most to the study of the history of anthropology in Portugal, it would undoubtedly be João Leal (Saraiva, 2023). Investigating the period between 1870 and 1970, Leal has focused on popular culture, its impact in the construction of national identity, and the social, political and cultural landscape of the periods in which the discipline took hold (Leal, 2000, 2006).

Another point of reference for our reflections here is the work of José Sobral. Sobral devoted an essay to the figure of Jorge Dias, significantly titled *O outro aqui tão próximo* (“The Other Here So Close”). Sobral analyzes Dias’s role in the history of Portuguese anthropology and his studies on rural communities, highlighting the way he organized the team responsible for the largest and most important ethnographic research ever conducted in the country. He also looks at the research Dias carried out among the Macondes in Mozambique, together with his wife, Margot Dias, at the end of the 1950s, during Portuguese rule (Sobral, 2007).

More than 20 years after his first historical overview, Pina Cabral has returned to reflect, together with Susana Matos Viegas, on anthropology’s relationship during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, with the two main poles of the broader political axis that determined the construction of the Portuguese state: the pole of the nation and that of the empire. This analysis of what the two authors have called *A encruzilhada portuguesa* (“The Portuguese Crossroads”) (Viegas & Pina Cabral, 2014, p. 316) reaches up to the present day, providing a broad overview of the consolidation of research and university teaching in anthropology. This text is part of a wider series of reflections—some offering accounts of lived experiences, others historical-analytical in character—written by 30 anthropologists who participated in 2012 in the Conference organised by Marina Pignatelli (Pignatelli, 2014) celebrating the 50th anniversary of the creation of the Centre for the Study of Cultural Anthropology (CEAC).

In 2018, the above-mentioned José Sobral co-wrote with Cristiana Bastos a timely and effective entry for the International Encyclopedia of Anthropology (Bastos & Sobral, 2018) dedicated to the anthropology of Portugal. The two scholars highlight in particular how it was only after the 1974 revolution that Portuguese anthropology began to flourish and become consolidated, thanks to a renewed climate of the kind of intellectual freedom essential for the development of critical thinking.

A year later, following the interpretative line proposed by Bastos and Sobral, Paula Godinho published her own reading of the history of Portuguese anthropology between 25 April 1974 and 2018. While acknowledging the importance of the studies carried out between the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth and particularly those linked to the “School of Jorge Dias”, Godinho focuses on the period from the late 1970s to the present, providing an exhaustive description of the work of the main Portuguese anthropologists and the cycles of expansion and contraction the discipline has undergone in recent years (Godinho, 2019).

In the following pages, these “histories”—or rather “histories of histories”—constitute points of reference leading us down a path of reflection aimed at providing the reader with a synthesis on the trajectory of a marginal, paradigmatic and revelatory anthropology. Before proceeding with our reconstruction,<sup>2</sup> a note on our methods is in order: this essay is the result of collaboration between a Portuguese and two Italian anthropologists who, at different times and in different ways, have built their careers in dialogue with Portuguese anthropology.<sup>3</sup> The diversity of their personal

<sup>2</sup>The authors recognise the necessarily incomplete nature of their choices in terms of enumeration, description and analysis. As it could not be otherwise, a complete history of Portuguese anthropology would require a long list of authors and many volumes to be exhaustive. Therefore, we apologise to the colleagues omitted from this overview, as everyone is important in this discipline with its aspirations of being humane and interventionist.

<sup>3</sup>Clara Saraiva (PhD 1999), a Portuguese anthropologist, has been, for the past nine years, the President of the Portuguese Anthropological Association. She was part of the group that finished their BAs at the Department of Anthropology at Nova-FCSH in the 1980s and went on to pursue a master's degree as a Fulbright fellow in the United States. She returned to Lisbon in 1988, to work as a researcher at the Instituto de Investigação Científica Tropical and as a professor at the Department of Anthropology at Nova-FCSH, where, for over 20 years, she was responsible for the course in History of Portuguese Anthropology. She is currently a senior researcher at the Instituto de Ciências Sociais, Universidade de Lisboa. Giacomo Pozzi began visiting Portugal in 2010 thanks to an Erasmus grant. From that experience, he collaborated with ISCTE-IUL and the *Universidade Nova de Lisboa*. He then

biographies enables different views on the history of the discipline to emerge, and the following pages represent an attempt to synthesise this heterogeneity into a single account.

NATIONAL IDENTITY, REGIME ETHNOLOGISTS AND JORGE  
DIAS: FROM THE END OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY  
TO THE FALL OF THE *ESTADO NOVO*

João Leal is the anthropologist who has contributed most to mapping the history of the discipline in Portugal. In his *Etnografias Portuguesas (1870–1970): Cultura Popular e Identidade Nacional* (2000), Leal outlined the history of Portuguese anthropology according to two fundamental themes: on the one hand, rural popular culture understood as the primary object of research; on the other, the interpretation of this sphere of culture as a strategic terrain for constructing national identity and the nation as an “imagined community” (Anderson, 1991). According to Leal, the beginnings of nineteenth-century anthropology were characterised by an “ethnogenealogical” discourse on national identity that framed the nation as a community of descent in which vernacular culture, language, oral literature and popular customs complement each other to embody an identity based on ethnogenesis and the richness of popular culture (Leal, 2000, pp. 17–18).

In another fundamental volume, *Antropologia em Portugal: Mestres, Percursos e Tradições* (2006), Leal presented four great masters of Portuguese anthropology:<sup>4</sup> Consiglieri Pedroso, Adolfo Coelho, Teófilo Braga and Leite de Vasconcelos. Their importance can be grasped from the historical context in which they operated, a context marked by the transformation—part of a wider European shift—of a vague and effervescent romantic interest in popular culture into a systematic and scientifically

obtained a PhD in Urban Studies in Portugal in co-tutorship with a PhD in Cultural and Social Anthropology at the University of Milano-Bicocca. Since 2020, he has been conducting fieldwork in Cape Verde. Chiara Pussetti’s link with Portugal began in the 1990s, following fieldwork among the Bijagó of Guinea-Bissau. Chiara Pussetti and Lorenzo Bordonaro were among the first Italian anthropologists to start a career in Lisbon, opening a path that ended up being heavily trodden in the following years. She is currently a researcher with the *Instituto de Ciências Sociais* at *Universidade de Lisboa*.

<sup>4</sup>The following reflections on the book *Antropologia em Portugal: Mestres, Percursos e Tradições* are a re-elaboration of a text by Clara Saraiva published in the journal *Etnográfica* (Saraiva, 2008).

oriented effort to collect data.<sup>5</sup> These four scholars were particularly attentive to this process: Coelho, in particular, was enormously interested in fieldwork and “modern” methodologies of investigation as well as in certain emerging theories such as diffusionism, comparative mythology and evolutionism.<sup>6</sup>

If we were to look for a fundamental theme characterising Portuguese ethnographic production between the end of the nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth centuries on the basis of these four *mestres*' work, it certainly lies in the investigation of the construction of national identity and ethnogeny<sup>7</sup> as analysed through literature and popular mythologies. The ultimate example of this moment is the research career of José Leite de Vasconcelos, an intellectual history marked by “a back-and-forth between ethnography and archaeology” (Leal, 2006, p. 36). Through the publication of his *Etnografia Portuguesa* (Vasconcelos, 1933, 1936, 1941), the anthropologist constructed a compendium of ethnographic synthesis—based in part on a comparative perspective—of Portuguese popular culture. In this constant dialectic between past and present, the key point that emerges is the importance of popular culture understood as the “Lusitanian” foundations that accompanied the Portuguese people from prehistory to the foundation of an idea of nationhood.

Amidst theoretical influences and concerns poised between defending national identity and systematically cataloguing the country's diversity and cultural richness, Portuguese anthropology reflects both anthropological traditions of the Western world of the time: the “anthropology of colonial empire-building” and the “anthropology of nation-building” (Stocking, 1982). In spite of the importance of the colonial empire, the development of Portuguese anthropology was focused mainly on the question of national identity.<sup>8</sup> According to Leal, this orientation was determined by the weakness of Portuguese colonialism and, at the same time, the centrality of national identity issues in Portuguese intellectual life: quoting Eduardo Lourenço (2007), Leal defines this situation “as the ontological fragility of

<sup>5</sup>Analysing, for example, Consiglieri Pedroso's compilations of folk tales and myths published in English as *Portuguese Folk Tales* (Consiglieri Pedroso, 1882).

<sup>6</sup>Such as Max Muller, Foustel de Coulanges, Spencer, Renan, Mommsem, Benfey, James Frazer and E.B. Tylor (Leal, 2001, pp. 31–33).

<sup>7</sup>This argument is confirmed in the writings of Teófilo Braga. See, for example, Braga (1867).

<sup>8</sup>Other authors, such as Viegas and Pina Cabral (2014), consider that the two aspects, nation and empire, were always intertwined.

the nation”.<sup>9</sup> It is important to note that this interpretation is not intended to reproduce a conciliatory view of Portuguese colonialism. Portugal has often thought of itself as “the matrix of a society capable of integrating, through *mestizaje*,<sup>10</sup> groups of different origins and for this reason of being free from racial discrimination” (Ribeiro-Corossacz, 2016, p. 137). However, this celebratory vision—culminating in Freyre’s (1940) theories of lusotropicalism—has been widely critiqued by various components of civil society and the intellectual community, including Leal himself.

Despite its fragile national identity, Portugal is well known to have been a colonial empire, and this fact inevitably determined the development of “its” anthropology to a large extent. After the proclamation of the Republic in 1910, a development in which several ethnographers took on politically key roles (such as Teófilo Braga, president of the Republic in 1915), the expansion of the discipline was inextricably linked to the ideology of the regime. The period of military dictatorship beginning with the 1926 military coup put an end to the first Portuguese Republic by establishing a *Ditadura Nacional* that lasted until 1932. Both this period and the authoritarian regime established in 1933, called the *Estado Novo*, brought down by the Carnation Revolution of 1974, bore a clear colonial imprint. This colonial stamp can be seen, for example, in the public exhibitions organised to give visibility to Portuguese imperialism (Godinho, 2019, p. 6; Bastos & Sobral, 2018). During the years of *Estado Novo*, the work related to anthropology was essentially undertaken by individuals that Leal (2000) divides into three groups: “regime ethnologists”, the school of Jorge Dias and intellectuals who opposed the *Estado Novo* (art critics, filmmakers, ethnomusicologists, architects).

<sup>9</sup>Leal analyses four fundamental stages of Portuguese anthropology between 1870 and 1970 (1870–1880; 1890–1900; 1910–1920; 1930–1970). In the first, he identifies the study of Portuguese ethnic originality; in the second, an interest in the country’s internal diversity emerges (some journals, such as *Portugália* and the *Revista Lusitana*, had a national scope while others such as *A Tradição*, *A Ilustração Transmontana*, *Revista do Minho and Lusa* had a more local scope and regional circulation (Leal, 2000, pp. 32–35); in the third, the republic and optimism about national destiny gave rise to nationalist ethnography with a folkloristic character; in the fourth, Jorge Dias and his team, coining the concept of “ethnography of urgency”, are concerned with preserving the material and immaterial heritage of different local communities.

<sup>10</sup>The term *mestiçagem* generally refers to the process of mixing between groups considered distinct, particularly in the colonial and postcolonial context. Far from being a neutral category, the term denotes a space of identity negotiations, often marked by ambiguities and tensions, and carries the imprint of the historical and political conditions that produced it.

The first grouping included ethnologists such as Luís Chaves, Fernando Castro Pires de Lima and others who, although not openly embracing the dictatorship, continued to practise their profession. It also comprised figures directly linked to the regime such as António Ferro, a great supporter of the *Estado Novo's* cultural policy. The Salazarist euphoria of the time, conveyed by most of the regime ethnologists, celebrated rural Portugal alongside a fierce imperialism narrating the nation as an “immense colonial empire” by virtue of the African, Asian and Eastern territories under its domination.

In these years, the intellectual vigour of the late nineteenth to early twentieth-century ethnographers waned (Bastos & Sobral, 2018, p. 3), and ethnography placed itself at the service of the *Estado Novo*. In the last decades of the nineteenth century physical anthropology was established as a discipline in Portugal, as elsewhere in Europe. Oliveira Martins, a historian and economist, was one of the first to support not only this field of study but also one of its main outcomes, the hierarchisation of “races”.

Imperialist ideas influenced research in the field of physical anthropology, and this was particularly so within the so-called *Escola do Porto* led by Professor of Medicine António Augusto Mendes Corrêa, coordinator of all the “anthropological missions” carried out in the colonies (Pereira, 2005). Mendes Correia founded the Portuguese Society of Anthropology and Ethnology in 1918,<sup>11</sup> and in 1943 he published a text that became highly popular, *As Raças do Império* (Matos, 2006).<sup>12</sup> The book was based on a simple assumption: *mestiçagem* represented a risk and “the race had to remain pure”. Following this racist logic, his disciples (including Santos Júnior) used a Lombrosian approach to measure skulls<sup>13</sup> and presented theses on the “Negroes of the colonies”.

During the *Estado Novo* years, the figure of Jorge Dias emerged, and played a particular important role in the development of the discipline. Jorge Dias was born into a wealthy middle-class family in Porto. After graduating in Germanic Philology and working in Germany, he developed a passion for anthropology and went on to earn a PhD in anthropology

<sup>11</sup> The Society still exists today and publishes the journal *Trabalhos de Etnologia e Ethnologia*.

<sup>12</sup> Mendes Correia (from the University of Porto) and Eusébio Tamagnini (from the University of Coimbra) were part of the political elite of the time: the former became President of the Lisbon Geography Society and the Colonial School; the latter was a Minister in the Salazar regime (Bastos & Sobral, 2018, pp. 4–5).

<sup>13</sup> Rui Pereira recounts how, in November 1945, Santos Júnior gave a speech to the settlers of Beira (Mozambique) entitled “How to study a Negro: a lesson on how to observe the descriptive characteristics of an indigenous person, identify and take the body measurements of greatest anthropological interest” (Pereira, 2005).

from the University of Munich in 1944 with his thesis *Vilarinho da Furna: Um Povo Autárquico da Serra Amarela* (Sobral, 2015).

His official career as an ethnologist in Portugal began in 1947 when he was invited by Mendes Correia to direct the *Secção de Etnografia do Centro de Estudos de Etnologia Peninsular* (CEEP), established in 1945 at the University of Porto (Oliveira, 1974, p. 12). In this period Dias formally created his school consisting of his wife, Margot Dias, as well as friends and long-time companions, Fernando Galhano and Ernesto Veiga de Oliveira who were joined in 1959 by Benjamin Enes Pereira (Leal, 2007).

The work of Jorge Dias and his team followed the established pathways of Portuguese ethnography at the beginning of the century by focusing on three essential themes. The first concerned the rural world and rural technologies, investigated through a sort of “emergency” ethnography approach based on the premise that this world was at risk of disappearing from one moment to the next (Oliveira e Galhano, 1964; Oliveira, Galhano e Pereira, 1969; Oliveira, Galhano e Pereira, 1975; Oliveira, Galhano e Pereira, 1976). The second theme, the characterisation of Portuguese culture and ethnic psychology, was represented by three texts by Dias himself: *Elementos fundamentais da Cultura Portuguesa* (1953b); *Algumas considerações acerca da estrutura social do povo português* (1955); and *Tentâmen de Fixação das Grandes Áreas Culturais Portuguesas* (1960). On the one hand, these volumes reflect the significant influence of Human Geography—represented in Portugal by Orlando Ribeiro—on the research group and, on the other, the influence of Dias’s romanticism and idealism that led to framing peasants as beings of superior quality and purity and outlining representative democracy as an exemplary model of autarchic government. The third thematic area was related to the 1950s’ establishment of the Missions for the Study of Ethnic Minorities in Overseas Portuguese Territories (MEMEUP), a research series that marked a new interest in the anthropology of “empire-building”.

Methodologically, the intensive Malinowski-style fieldwork was reflected in Jorge Dias’s two monographs (see note below).<sup>14</sup> Otherwise, the team pursued extensive work throughout the whole country (often including the islands of Madeira and Azores), mapping the regional and local variety of technologies, material culture and ways of living of peasants. While collecting objects which later on became part of the collections of the Museum

<sup>14</sup>Such as those of Jorge Dias on two mountain communities and the phenomenon of agro-pastoral communitarianism: *Vilarinho da Furna* (Dias, 1948) and *Rio de Onor* (Dias, 1953a).

of Ethnology, they also gave vivid accounts of the everyday life of the individuals who used them. Furthermore, beyond material culture, some of the best pieces of Portuguese ethnography on popular feasts and musical instruments were also part of the team's research (Oliveira, 1966; Oliveira 1984). In the Jorge Dias's team, Benjamim Pereira, coming out of a north-western peasant family, was an influential and crucial element in the studies on material culture (Saraiva et al., 2014). As Leal points out, "the anthropological project of Benjamim Pereira and of the whole Jorge Dias' team (...) "anticipated to a large extent the renewed contemporary interest in material culture, or in the 'social life of things', to quote Appadurai's (1986) felicitous formulation" (Leal, 2010, p. 187).<sup>15</sup>

Such extensive work was also a means of highlighting the nation's cultural wealth and thus contributing to the preservation of heritage. The school's theoretical influences mirrored Dias's international academic training, the diffusionism he encountered in Germany on the one hand and the American culturalism he absorbed during a series of trips to the United States on the other.

As mentioned above, the Dias school did not coincide with what we have called "regime ethnologists". However, the link between the school's founder and the dictatorship is sometimes seen as controversial (Pina Cabral, 1991). Dias began his academic career with the support of Mendes Correia, a figure linked to the colonial and racist policies of the *Estado Novo*. Nevertheless, Dias never adhered to eugenic theses, and always took a stand against racism. Jorge Dias's work was based on an idealized vision of the rural world. He did not like the urban and capitalist life and had a romantic nostalgia for a communal world founded on Christian and solidarity-based values (Sobral, 2007, pp. 510–512). At the same time, however, he did defend colonisation as a fundamental part of the Portuguese national character (Sobral, 2007) and support the lusotropicalist theses of Gilberto Freyre, the Brazilian sociologist who portrayed the Portuguese as ideal colonisers—not racists—who would use *mestiçagem* to construct a harmoniously multiracial Brazil (Castelo, 1998) (Saraiva, 2010).

The late 1960s and 1970s were also decades when anthropologists from abroad became interested in Portugal. Colette Callier-Boisvert, from France, and Caroline Brettell, from Canada and the United States, came to the north to study the effect of emigration on families' structure. Joyce

<sup>15</sup> Leal wrote this in a text that is a tribute to Benjamim Pereira, which was presented as a keynote speech at the IV Congress of the Portuguese Anthropological Association in September 2009, and later published in the journal *Etnográfica* (Leal: 2010: 187).

Riegelhaupt researched the folk-urban continuum and anticlericalism in a village of the *saloia* region, close to the capital. José Cutileiro, although Portuguese, was trained at Oxford, and wrote a monograph about Alentejo and the relationships, tensions and conflicts between peasants and landlords. They brought, as Leal puts it, “an approach from the outside” (Leal, 2006, p. 158), and a breath of fresh air into Portuguese anthropology. Nevertheless, their influence was at the time short lived and not profound. The attempts to renew both Portuguese anthropology and sociology<sup>16</sup> had to wait for 1974 for new approaches to effectively develop (Leal, 2006).

### BUILDING A DIFFERENT COUNTRY, IMAGINING A DIFFERENT ANTHROPOLOGY<sup>17</sup>

The events of 25 April 1974 radically changed the situation of anthropology in Portugal. The Carnation Revolution<sup>18</sup> inaugurated a historical moment of social, political and cultural transformation and renewal. Portugal and the revolution attracted not only social scientists, but also photographers and filmmakers, all looking to experience and document the *Revolução dos Cravos*. Some of the intellectuals, artists and art critics (such as Ernesto de Sousa), ethnomusicologists (such as Michel Giacometti) and filmmakers (such as Manuel de Oliveira and Álvaro Campos) who had produced ethnographic work “against the grain” of the *Estado Novo*’s celebratory logic—and who therefore constituted one of Leal’s abovementioned three groups working on anthropology under the *Estado Novo* (in addition to the regime ethnologists and the Dias school)<sup>19</sup>—were finally able to express themselves freely. In addition to the

<sup>16</sup>As Adérito Sedas Nunes was also, at the time, trying to implement, with the creation of the Gabinete de Investigações Sociais (GIS), in 1962, which became in 1982 the Instituto de Social Sciences.

<sup>17</sup>The title of this section is inspired in Sérgio Tréfaut’s excellent documentary *Outro País* (Tréfaut, 1999) which portrays the photographers and filmmakers who documented the events of the 1974 revolution.

<sup>18</sup>Through which the dictatorial regime of the *Estado Novo*, in force since 1933, was deposed and a process began that would end with the establishment of a democratic regime and the establishment of a new Constitution (on 25 April 1976) marked by a strong socialist orientation

<sup>19</sup>The same thing happened with the architects who, on the basis of Ribeiro’s tripartite division (Ribeiro, 1963), examined popular architecture in the country from the end of the 1950s until the beginning of the 1960s (Associação de Arquitectos, 1988). The second part of *Etnografias Portuguesas* deals with this topic in a masterful way (Leal, 2000, pp. 145–223).

agrarian reform process in Alentejo, the *Plano de Trabalho e Cultura* was launched in 1975 as part of the *Serviço Cívico Estudantil*. Coordinated by Michel Giacometti, this project brought young university students throughout the country to ethnographic inquiry focused on collecting data about literature, music, folk medicine, tools and material culture (Godinho, 2019, p. 11). These investigations left behind the nineteenth-century preoccupation with looking for the nation's founding identity among rural populations and were instead guided by a strong focus on class struggle, characteristic of that revolutionary moment and the PREC (*Processo Revolucionário Em Curso*), the period of Portugal's transition to democracy. As Branco points out, "The anthropology of those years is not dedicated to nation-building, it does not evoke it in its essence, but rather interrogates the country with a question, sometimes contemplative, sometimes non-conformist (echoing the spirit of revolution and decolonisation)" (Branco, 2014, p. 376).

A period of expansion in research and teaching began, a time of change and hope aimed at achieving a better and more democratic future. The former colonies gained their independence in 1975. The *Instituto Superior de Ciências Sociais e Política Ultramarina* (ISCSPU)—an institution created at the beginning of the twentieth century<sup>20</sup> to meet the needs of governing and administration colonial possessions—was shut down: the professors who taught there were fired, as they were considered to be linked to the regime. An internal and generational disciplinary war broke out. Young anthropologists and students took sides against the circle of anthropologists who, despite having collaborated with the regime, had managed to maintain their academic positions after the fall of the dictatorship. As a result, the anthropological current linked to the regime was dismantled during the years of the revolution. In order to imagine a new course for the discipline, between 1974 and 1976 no anthropology classes were held in Portugal.

With the contribution of the geographer Raquel Soeiro de Brito, José Carlos Gomes da Silva, who trained in France with Luc de Heusch, and, later on, Augusto Mesquitela Lima,<sup>21</sup> a Cape Verdian anthropologist from

<sup>20</sup>The ISCSPU was an heir to the old Colonial School, established in 1906 in the Lisbon Geographical Society, which had been founded in 1875 (Bastos e Sobral: 3–5).

<sup>21</sup>Initially with José Carlos Gomes da Silva, a scholar who graduated in Belgium but shortly afterwards founded the Anthropology course at ISCTE and later encouraged the transfer of young teachers from FCSH to ISCTE.

Cape Verde, the Department of Anthropology at the *Universidade Nova* was created, and managed to attract young professors trained at the former ISCSPU, in other Portuguese institutions, or abroad (such as João Leal, Rosa Perez, José Gabriel Pereira Bastos, Jorge Crespo and Yáñez Casal).

The opening of the anthropology programme at FCSH was followed, some years later, by the inauguration of another course at the *Instituto Superior da Ciência do Trabalho e da Empresa*, and some of the anthropologists who had begun working as professors at the *Universidade Nova*, such as Gomes da Silva, João Leal and Rosa Perez, decided to move to the ISCTE. While both institutions presented an international offering with professors from abroad—some Portuguese self-exiles, others professors “from the outside”—FCSH was shaped by the tradition of French anthropology and structuralism while ISCTE was distinguished by the Anglo-Saxon influence (Almeida, 2014; Branco, 2014; O’Neill, 2014; Pignatelli, 2014; Godinho, 2019). Between 1982 and 1984, a strong Department of Anthropology was created at the ISCTE with a contemporary and critical character that distinguished it at the national level from the discipline’s overall colonial heritage.

In a text dealing with the discipline’s expansion and dynamism, Godinho (2019) points out that the anthropologists who began their careers in the 1980s carried forward the rural studies of Jorge Dias, partially reflecting Robert Redfield’s theoretical influence. In general, therefore, Portuguese scholarship was characterised by an intense continuing interest in the rural world undergoing profound transformation. Examples of this approach included, for example, Brian O’Neill’s study of landowners and peasants in Trás-os-Montes, the vision of the Minho peasant world described by João Pina Cabral, and the continuation of Dias’s study in the village of Rio de Onor by Pais de Brito (Godinho, 2019, pp. 12–15). Others focused instead on the theme of celebrations, taking up Benjamin Pereira’s work on the masks of the *Ciclo dos Doze Dias* (“Cycle of Twelve Days”) (Pereira, 1973), and Noémia Delgado’s film on the same topic. In addition to Ernesto Veiga de Oliveira’s collection of texts on cyclical festivals (Oliveira, 1984), Pierre Sanchis carried out research on pilgrimages (Sanchis, 1983). In the early 1980s, FCSH’s programme entailed not only a four-year course of study but also an obligatory few months (or even year) of fieldwork and a written dissertation. This requirement kindled young people’s interest in research at an early stage: some students, fascinated by the earlier work of the National Museum of Ethnology team, were committed to the rural

studies characteristic of Portuguese anthropology. João Leal and Rosa Perez, teaching at the Universidade NOVA de Lisboa Anthropology Department (FCSH), encouraged students to carry out fieldwork revisiting the *Ciclo dos Doze Dias* festivities. Other students followed research paths on diverse, more topical and socially critical themes such as whaling in the Azores, a practice that was about to be banned in 1982. Many FCSH graduates were later placed as professors in the same department, or in the new course created at the ISCTE.

### THE DEMOCRATIC GENERATION AND ANTHROPOLOGIES OF THE CONTEMPORARY

Many of the young anthropologists who trained in the 1980s and 1990s were born before 25 April, a time when anthropology was intimately linked to its colonial vertex. Rejecting the legacy of the dictatorship, during the 1980s and the 1990s the democratic generation diversified its research foci, working with innovative approaches, methodologies, theoretical frameworks and themes. Miguel Vale de Almeida<sup>22</sup> called this new wave “the democratic generation”. Topics included urban neighbourhoods (Graça Cordeiro), the use of psychotropic substances in raves (Luís Vasconcelos), the phenomenon of hip-hop (Teresa Fradique), elite families in Lisbon (Antónia Lima), medical anthropology (Cristiana Bastos), and gender identity (Miguel Vale de Almeida). These research paths often focused on previously less-investigated geographical settings, both inside the national territory (e.g., Cristiana Bastos and Clara Saraiva worked in the northeast of the Algarve) and the international context. In the latter case, new research areas included Morocco (Maria Cardeira da Silva), Guinea-Bissau (Clara Carvalho; Clara Saraiva), Mozambique (Rui Pereira), Brazil (Cristina Bastos, Miguel Vale de Almeida, Susana Viegas), Angola (Nuno Porto) and Cape Verde (João Vasconcelos). It is worth noting that, in most cases, research abroad took place (and still takes place) in areas that had been part of the Portuguese empire until a few decades earlier. Scholars have chosen and continue to choose these sites because of the opportunities by a common language and, secondly, because of the ramifications of post-colonial policies and ties, thus demonstrating the deep (and sometimes unconscious) roots of colonial webs.

<sup>22</sup>In an interview conducted on 23 November 2022.

A fundamental arena for sharing research results, developing the discipline and building of the scientific community, was represented by the anthropological journals associated with the country's various departments and research centres. *Ethnologia*, the journal of the FCSH Department of Anthropology published between 1983 and 2003, played a prominent role in these processes.<sup>23</sup> *Etnográfica*, published by the *Centro em Rede de Investigação em Antropologia* (CRIA), still today stands out as the main Portuguese journal of anthropology with international standing. It was first directed by João Leal (Universidade NOVA), then Miguel Vale de Almeida (ISCTE), Manuela Ivone Cunha (Universidade do Minho), and now Humberto Martins (Universidade de Trás-os-Montes). To mark the years of internationalisation, the journal accepts publications in four languages (Portuguese, English, French and Spanish) and has become a pole of attraction for Brazilian colleagues looking to disseminate their work in Europe.<sup>24</sup>

The anthropological community was strengthened not only by the originality of the topics and working methods and the chance to share these through journals, but also and probably above all by the nationwide growth of anthropology degree programmes and research centres. Thanks to the contribution of lecturers recruited after 25 April as well as young doctoral students and researchers, various research institutions were founded. At the ISCTE, the *Centro de Estudos de Antropologia Social* (CEAS, 1986–2009) was created in 1986 and the *Centro de Estudos Africanos* (CEA) in 1981, later renamed *Centro de Estudos Internacionais* in 2013. At FCSH, the *Centro de Estudos de Etnologia Portuguesa* (CEEP, 1994–2007) was opened, followed shortly afterwards by the *Centro de Estudos das Migrações e Minorias Étnicas* (CEMME, 2000–2009). In Coimbra, physical and biological anthropology continued to play a

<sup>23</sup> In one of its special issues (Cardeira da Silva, 1997), the journal featured a portrait of the vitality of the department headed by Jill Dias. A specialist in ethnohistory, Dias combined deep historical knowledge with remarkable ethnographic sensitivity, and in addition to numerous publications on Africa, she also curated one of the most important exhibitions at the National Museum of Ethnology, *África and Brazil, Nas Vésperas do Mundo Moderno* (Dias, 1992).

<sup>24</sup> Other significant scientific journals include *Antropologia Portuguesa* by the University of Coimbra (founded in 1983); *Trabalhos de Antropologia e Etnologia*, a journal founded in 1918 and published by the *Sociedade Portuguesa de Antropologia e Etnologia* (SPA); *Arquivos da Memória*, created by CEEP in 1994; *Análise Social: Revista do Instituto de Ciências Sociais da Universidade de Lisboa*, founded in 1963 by the Institute of Social Sciences.

leading role in the work conducted at the *Centro de Investigação em Antropologia e Saúde* (CIAS, since 1994), heir to the forensic tradition developed at that university.

The 1997 creation of the *Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia* (FCT)<sup>25</sup>—Portugal’s national public funding agency for science, research and technology—resulted in the restructuring of research centres alongside a considerable increase in research funding. In terms of restructuring, in 2009 the CEAS joined with the CEMME and other centres to form the *Centro em Rede de Investigação em Antropologia* (CRIA) bringing together anthropologists and universities from all over the country (Trás-os-Montes, Minho, Coimbra, Lisbon and Algarve). Alongside the *Instituto de Ciências Sociais* of Lisbon University, CRIA constitutes the largest centre of anthropological research in the country.

In terms of funding, the creation of the FCT inaugurated a period of abundance in doctoral and post-doctoral fellowships. These were open to students and researchers of all nationalities, but attracted, in particular, candidates from Italy, France, Belgium and Germany. These were the years of internationalisation. The contribution of anthropologists trained abroad greatly enriched the Portuguese scientific community, making it one of the most lively and fertile in Europe.

A very international environment was created in this period with a strong preponderance of intellectuals belonging to what we might define as the “Lusophone axis” (using the Portuguese language as an instrument of scientific work and strengthening relations with Brazil<sup>26</sup> and the former Portuguese colonies in Africa) and the “Anglophone axis” (using English as a *lingua franca* for connecting Europe and the United States, creating dialogue between multiple disciplinary traditions and attracting researchers of different nationalities). Teachers, researchers and students circulated between countries and institutions, moving between different universes, feeding on multiple stimuli and expanding their research horizons. This was an effervescent environment, with “sandwich” grants (to support the movement of Brazilian students); PALOP grants (to enable students from African countries with Portuguese as their official language to study in

<sup>25</sup>This replaced the former *Junta Nacional para a Investigação Científica* (JNICT).

<sup>26</sup>It was mainly after the 1990s that Portugal and Brazil developed very close relations, thanks to the research work of Portuguese anthropologists in Brazil (Cristiana Bastos, Miguel Vale de Almeida, Susana Viegas, João de Pina Cabral, and later on, João Leal, amongst others) and of Brazilian anthropologists in Portugal (e.g. Feldman-Branco, 2001).

Portugal); ERASMUS (European Region Action Scheme for the Mobility of University Students) grants; and specialist, master's, doctoral and post-doctoral grants.

Institutes, departments and research centres proved ready to welcome new researchers and projects with national or European funding. Portuguese anthropologists were particularly receptive to the foreign researchers who arrived in these years, bringing new synergies: these included, among others, Ramon Sarró, Ruy Llena Blanes, Lorenzo Bordonaro, Frédéric Vidal and Iñigo Sánchez. Unfortunately, the economic crisis of 2008 and the subsequent and inevitable fleeing of many researchers abruptly interrupted this process (Godinho, 2019).

Between the late 1990s and the first decade of the 21st century, the diversity of anthropological production highlights the changes that occurred, as demonstrated by Cristiana Bastos and José Sobral detailed contribution, published in the *International Encyclopedia of Anthropology*, which we quote here in full:

The scope of research topics and contexts expanded outside the national borders and improved in diversity and sophistication within. To outline a sample, necessarily incomplete and counting only works published until 2010, there had been research outside Portugal on Gujarat villages (Rosa Perez), Moroccan cities (Maria Cardeira da Silva), sub-Saharan African settings (Manuel Areia, A. Yanez Casal, J. Fialho Feliciano, Clara Carvalho, Manuel J. Ramos, Fernando Florêncio, Manuela Palmeirim, Amélia Frazão-Moreira, Nuno Porto, F. Ribeiro), ethnicities and kinship in China (João de Pina-Cabral, Gonçalo D. Santos), Azorean diaspora in the Americas (João Leal), Brazilian indigenous groups (Susana Matos Viegas), transnational identities and practices (Susana T. P. Bastos and José G. P. Bastos, Luís Batalha, João Vasconcelos, José Mapril, Marta Rosales), science networks (Cristiana Bastos, Nélia Dias), death rituals (Clara Saraiva), and, with a renewed approach to Portuguese issues, there were works on national identity (Luís Cunha, José Sobral, António Medeiros), borders (Fátima Amante, Paula Godinho, Humberto Martins), memory and heritage (Paula Godinho, José Sobral, Elsa Peralta), cultural policies (Vera Marques Alves), religious communities (Marina Pignatelli, Pedro Pereira, Ramon Sarró and Ruy Blanes, Clara Saraiva), labor (Paulo Granjo, Emília M. Marques), financial elites (Antonia P Lima), prisons and confinement (Susana T. P. Bastos, Manuela I. Cunha), soccer (Daniel Seabra), tourism (Paula Mota Santos, Luís Silva, Xerardo Pereiro), critical museum studies (Nuno Porto, Nélia Dias), fairy tales (Francisco Vaz da Silva), the history of anthropology (Frederico Rosa), and Portuguese anthropology (Rui Pereira, Jorge Freitas

Branco, João Leal, Gonaçalo D. Santos), epistemology (Filipe Verde, Luís Quintais), environment (Ana Isabel Afonso, Jean-Yves Durand, Pedro Prista), surveillance (Susana Durão, Catarina Fróis), land reform and revolution (Margarida Fernandes, Sónia Vespeira de Almeida), fishing communities (Inês Meneses and Paulo Mendes, Francisco Oneto Nunes), spatial patterns and culture (Shawn Parkhurst), ritual and performance (Paulo Raposo), visual anthropology (Catarina Alves Costa), urbanities (Filomena Silvano, Teresa Fradique, Daniel Seabra Lopes, Paulo C. Seixas), health and illness (Cristiana Bastos, M Manuel Quintela, Elsa Lechner, Chiara Pussetti, Luís Silva Pereira), food and cuisine (Daniela Araújo, Vasco V. Teixeira, José Sobral, Nuno Domingos, Marta Rosales), ethnomusicology (Susana Sardo), and many other topics. [...] [W]hile the study of colonial issues was avoided for a long period in the new Portuguese anthropology, it would come back as a prime field, often in convergence with history, cultural, and postcolonial studies. Biological anthropology also renewed itself dramatically in the post-dictatorship decades, opening up to important research on primatology in Lisbon (Claudia de Sousa and Catarina Casanova). Yet Coimbra remains the benchmark in the teaching and research of biological anthropology and also in connection with archaeology and forensic medicine (Augusto Abade, Eugénia Cunha, Cristina Padez, among others). (Bastos & Sobral, 2018, pp. 11–12)

A new anthropological community was formed without dissolving individual specificities, creating networks, nuclei and centres that facilitated the dynamic international circulation of knowledge, practices and theoretical developments. The Portuguese model involves two parallel career paths, one based mainly on teaching and the other on research. The mission of the *Instituto de Ciências Sociais da Universidade de Lisboa*, for example, is essentially centred on research and innovation, preparing competitive research projects in international arenas, teaching at the doctoral level and coordinating post-doctoral students.

A further sign of disciplinary strengthening and institutionalisation was the 1989 founding of the Portuguese Anthropology Association (APA). The association aims to represent all the anthropologists who speak Portuguese or who work and train in Portugal. The APA counts among its members several scholars from abroad, mainly Brazil and Spain, as these are the countries with which the APA has established close, collaborative relations.

The Brazilian anthropologist Carla Costa Teixeira recently wrote a very detailed history of the APA, tracing the relationship between the

strengthening of the Association and the consolidation of discipline in Portugal (Teixeira, 2021). Her exhaustive analysis maps the main stages of the establishment of the Association in an effort to understand the place held by the social sciences and anthropology in science policies in Portugal, considering the tensions that have marked the modernisation of scientific and technological knowledge production in the country since the early 1990s.

But many aspects of the social sciences scholarship have not managed to retain the vitality of those years, as the history of the discipline is inevitably related to the social and economic history of the country. Godinho (2019) has suggested that the half century separating us from the changes brought around by the 1974 revolution should be divided into two main cycles. These cycles are defined by “waves” oscillating between phases of disciplinary expansion and contraction determined by social, political and economic fluctuations not only in the country, but also in Europe and the global panorama. She thus identifies a first phase of openness and dynamism following the *revolução dos cravos* (1974), Portugal’s entry into the European Union (1986), and the creation of FCT, a phase that lasted until approximately the beginning of the twenty-first century. A second phase, however, began with the 2008 economic recession:<sup>27</sup> this represented a moment of crisis for Portuguese anthropology, the effects of which began to be severely felt between 2012 and 2013. Specifically, the funds available for teaching and research decreased drastically with dramatic consequences for students, researchers, universities and research centres, as well as for doctoral and post-doctoral fellowships. As funding for research projects declined, there were fewer and fewer opportunities to offer fellowships. An entire generation of scholars suddenly found itself unemployed, and, as referred above, many bright young people left the country.

## CONCLUSION

According to Pina Cabral (1989), Portuguese anthropology is heir to circumstances that intimately tie the history of the country to that of the discipline. As we have tried to highlight in this essay, each phase of the discipline has been accompanied by a significant historical transition. This was true of the discipline’s romantic period in the nineteenth century,

<sup>27</sup>Also Bastos e Sobral (2018) and Viegas and Pina Cabral (2014) reflect upon this situation.

the work of the first ethnographers in the gestation period of the Republic, the work of Jorge Dias and his group in the 1950s and 1960s and, finally, the period at the end of the 1980s when Pina Cabral wrote his essay, considered the period of disciplinary development. In addition to these phases, we must certainly add the phases of disciplinary internationalisation and crisis. Pina Cabral, highlighting the ever-lively dialogue with the international currents dominating scholarship in different eras, pointed out that, in the Portuguese case, moments of vitality were always followed by “long periods of paralysis, isolation from the international dialogue and inability to produce internally innovative young scientists” (Pina Cabral, 1989, pp. 34–35). Writing at the end of the twentieth century, with the democratic transition completed, Pina Cabral explains that although it is no longer necessary to fight against the ideological, cultural and social isolation of the period of Salazar’s dictatorship, Portugal’s position remains peripheral and therefore requires a strengthening of international relations. The 1990s and beginning of the twenty-first century have witnessed the realisation of this need, with anthropology courses spread widely, research centres founded and restructured, foreign students and researchers integrated into the national system and scientific cooperation networks created at the European and world levels.

In the introduction, we asked if Portugal—in its marginality—might represent a space of synthesis and original creativity in the context of European anthropology more broadly. In the past we have tried to reconstruct here, such innovation has proven possible in some phases but not in others. We must now look to the future, a future that will be achievable if the new generations are able to project themselves into the time to come and seize the momentum of the debates, struggles and schools that have characterised the history of Portuguese anthropology. In this way, the discipline will remain strong and lively, contributing more and more to the creation of a just, democratic and inclusive society.

## REFERENCES

- Almeida, M. V. (2014). Com um pé dentro e outro fora: reflexões pessoais sobre a geração dos eighties. *Etnográfica*, 18(2), 379–384.
- Anderson, Benedict (1991) [1983]. *Imagined Communities. Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. Verso.
- Appadurai, A. (1986). *The Social Life of Things: Commodities in Cultural Perspective*. Cambridge University Press.

- Associação Dos Arquitectos Portugueses. (1988). *Arquitectura Popular em Portugal*. Associação dos Arquitectos Portugueses.
- Bastos, C. (2014). A década de 1990: Os anos da internacionalização. *Etnográfica*, 18(2), 385–401.
- Bastos, C., & Sobral, J. (2018). Portugal, Anthropology. In H. Callan (Ed.), *International Encyclopedia of Anthropology*. John Wiley and Sons Ltd.
- bell hooks. (1998). *Elogio del margine. Razza, sesso e mercato culturale*. Feltrinelli.
- Braga, T. (1867). *Antologias: Cancioneiro Popular Coimbra*. Imprensa da Universidade.
- Branco, J. F. (2014). Sentidos da antropologia em Portugal na década de 1970. *Etnográfica*, 18(2), 365–378.
- Cardeira Da Silva, M. (Ed.). (1997). *Trabalho de Campo*. Cosmos.
- Castelo, C. (1998). *O Modo Português de Estar no Mundo: O Luso-Tropicalismo e a Ideologia Colonial Portuguesa: 1933–1961*. Edições Afrontamento.
- Consiglieri Pedroso, Z. (1882). *Portuguese Folk-tales*. Folklore Society.
- Dias, J. (1948). *Vilarinho da Furna: Uma Aldeia Comunitária*. Imprensa Nacional Casa da Moeda.
- Dias, J. (1952). Bosquejo histórico da etnografia portuguesa. *Revista Portuguesa de Filologia*, II, 1–64.
- Dias, J. (1953a). *Rio de Onor: Comunitarismo Agro-Pastoril*. Editorial Presença.
- Dias, J. (1953b). Os elementos fundamentais da cultura portuguesa. *Estudos de Antropologia*, I, 135–157.
- Dias, J. (1955). Algumas considerações acerca da estrutura social do povoportuguês. *Estudos de Antropologia*, I, 159–181.
- Dias, J. (1960). Tentamen de fixação das grandes áreas culturais portuguesas. *Estudos de Antropologia*, I, 183–206.
- Dias, J. (1992). *África e Brasil. Nas Vésperas do Mundo Moderno*. CNCDP.
- Eriksen, T. H. (1991). A Community of European Social Anthropologists. *Current Anthropology*, 32(1), 75–78.
- Feldman-Branco, B. (2001). Brazilians in Portugal, Portuguese in Brazil: construction of sameness and difference. *Identities*, 8, 607–650.
- Freyre, G. (1940). *O Mundo que o Português Criou: Aspectos das Relações Sociais e de Cultura do Brasil com Portugal e as Colónias Portuguesas*. Livros do Brasil.
- Godinho, P. (2019). Antropologia Portuguesa contemporânea, casi medio siglo desde Abril. *Disparidades. Revista de Antropologia*, 74(2), 1–30.
- Leal, J. (2000). *Etnografias Portuguesas (1870–1970): Cultura Popular e Identidade Nacional*. Publicações Dom Quixote.
- Leal, J. (2001). Orlando Ribeiro, Jorge Dias e J. Cutileiro: imagens do Portugal mediterrânico. «*Ler História*», 40, 141–163.
- Leal, J. (2006). *Antropologia em Portugal: Mestres, Percursos, Transições*. Livros Horizonte.
- Leal, J. (2007). *Cultura e Identidade Açoriana. O Movimento Açorianista em Santa Catarina*. Editora Insular.

- Leal, J. (2007). “Nos 100 anos do nascimento de João Dias”, texto dactilografado. Colóquio de Homenagem nos 100 anos do nascimento de Jorge Dias, “Leituras Etnográficas”, Sociedade de Geografia, Lisboa.
- Leal, J. (2010). Os dois países de Benjamim Pereira: uma homenagem. *Etnográfica*, 14(1), 185–195.
- Lourenço, E. (2007). *O Labirinto da saudade. Psicanálise Mítica do Destino Português*. Gradiva.
- Matos, P. F. (2006). *As côres do império: Representações raciais no império colonial português*. Imprensa de Ciências Sociais.
- O’Neill, B. J. (2014). Os anos 70 em 3D: reflexões pessoais. *Etnográfica*, 18(2), 333–340.
- Oliveira, E. V. (1966). *Instrumentos Musicais Populares Portugueses*. Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian.
- Oliveira, E. V. d. (1974). António Jorge Dias. In AA.VV (Ed.), *In Memoriam António Jorge Dias, vol. I*. Instituto de Alta Cultura-Junta de Investigações do Ultramar.
- Oliveira, E. V. d. (1984). *Festividades Cíclicas em Portugal*. Publicações Dom Quixote.
- Oliveira, E. V. d. (1968). *Vinte Anos de Investigação Etnológica do Centro de Estudos de Etnologia Peninsular*. Instituto de Alta Cultura.
- Oliveira E. V e Galhano. (1964). F. PALHEIROS do Litoral Central Português. Instituto de Alta Cultura.
- Oliveira E. V., Galhano F., & Pereira, A. B. (1969). Construções Primitivas em Portugal, Centro de Estudos de Etnologia-Instituto de Alta Cultura, Lisboa.
- Oliveira E. V., Galhano F., & Pereira, A. B. (1975). Actividades Agro-Marítimas em Portugal, Instituto de Alta Cultura, Lisboa.
- Oliveira E.V., Galhano F., & Pereira, A. B. (1976). Alfaia Agrícola Portuguesa, Instituto de Alta Cultura, Lisboa.
- Pereira, B. E. (1973). *Máscaras Portuguesas*. Junta de Investigações do Ultramar.
- Pereira, R. (2005). Raça, sangue e robustez: Os paradigmas da antropologia física colonial portuguesa. *Cadernos de Estudos Africanos*, 7(8), 209–241.
- Pignatelli, M. (2014). Antropologia em Portugal nos últimos 50 anos: Introdução. *Etnográfica*, 18(2), 301–305.
- Pina-Cabral, J. (1989). Breves considerações sobre o estado da antropologia em Portugal. *Antropologia Portuguesa*, 7, 29–36.
- Pina-Cabral, J. (1991). A antropologia em Portugal hoje. In J. Pina-Cabral (Ed.), *Os Contextos da Antropologia* (pp. 11–41). Difel.
- Ribeiro, Orlando (1963) [1945]. *Portugal, o Mediterrâneo e o Atlântico*. Sá da Costa.
- Ribeiro-Corossacz, V. (2016). Una decolonizzazione mai terminata. Il modello portoghese di colonizzazione in Brasile e la costruzione dell’Altro/a africano/a nell’immaginario razzista. *Altre modernità*, 16(11), 134–147.

- Sanchis, P. (1983). *Arraial: Festa de um povo*. Publicações Dom Quixote.
- Saraiva, C. (2008). João Leal, Antropologia em Portugal: Mestres, Percursos, Tradições. *Etnográfica [Online]*, 12(1).
- Saraiva, C. (2010). *Os caminhos do Benjamim*. *Etnográfica*, 13(1), 161–163.
- Saraiva, C. (2023). Histórias e Memórias da Antropologia Portuguesa”, in Bérose- Encyclopédie internationale des histoires de l’anthropologie, Paris. URL Bérose: article 2906.html.
- Saraiva, C., Durand, J.-Y., & Alpuim, J. (Eds.). (2014). *Caminhos e Diálogos da Antropologia Portuguesa, Homenagem a Benjamim Pereira*. Câmara Municipal de Viana do Castelo.
- Sobral, J. M. (2007). O Outro aqui tão próximo: Jorge Dias e a Redescoberta de Portugal pela Antropologia Portuguesa (anos 70–80). *Revista de História das Ideias*, 28, 139–187.
- Sobral, José Manuel (2015). Dias, António Jorge. In *Dicionário de Historiadores Portugueses. Da Academia Real das Ciências ao Final do Estado Novo*. Retrieved January 17, 2022, from <http://dichp.bnportugal.pt/projecto.html>.
- Stocking, G., Jr. (1982). Afterword: a view from the center. *Ethnos*, 47, 172–186.
- Teixeira, C. (2021). “Da desconstrução da dualidade nação-império à reafirmação da antropologia em Portugal: história e desafios contemporâneos da Associação Portuguesa de Antropologia (APA)” in Bérose- Encyclopédie internationale des histoires de l’anthropologie, Paris. URL Bérose: article 2484.html.
- Tréfaut, S. (1999). *Outro País. 70’*. Prod. SP FILMES, distribuição FAUX.
- Vasconcelos, J. L. d. (1933). *Etnografia Portuguesa I*. Imprensa Nacional.
- Vasconcelos, J. L. d. (1936). *Etnografia Portuguesa II*. Imprensa Nacional.
- Vasconcelos, J. L. d. (1941). *Etnografia Portuguesa III*. Imprensa Nacional.
- Viegas, S. M., & Pina-Cabral, J. (2014). Na encruzilhada Portuguesa: A antropologia contemporânea e a sua história. *Etnográfica*, 18(2), 311–332.