

Medeiros, António: *Two Sides of One River. Nationalism and Ethnography in Galicia and Portugal.* New York: Berghahn Books, 2013. 382 pp. ISBN 978-0-85745-724-0. (European Anthropology in Translation, 5) Price: \$ 95.00

In “Two Sides of One River,” António Medeiros has offered both an ethnographic study full of astutely rendered detail and an ethnologic investigation spanning two countries and two languages, albeit related languages. How closely related Galician and Portuguese is key to Medeiros’s adroit argument. According to Galicians, from nationalists to the wider public, they are one in the same language. But to many Portuguese people, Galicians – living in a land just over their northern border, separated only the Minho River of the title – speak Spanish. The pride and joy of Galicians – their language – is rendered problematic by the Portuguese. This paradox is skillfully explained by Medeiros as a product of differing histories of both nationalism and ethnography in the two nations.

As Volume 5 in the series “European Anthropology in Translation” (translated by Martin Earl and published in association with the Society for the Anthropology of Europe of the American Anthropology Association), “Two Sides of One River” appeals to Europeanists and scholars of nationalisms alike. A respected ethnographer of Portugal (in the northern region of Minho), for the “Two Sides of One River” project, Medeiros crossed ethnographically over the northern border of Portugal into Galicia. He focused on the Galician capitol of Santiago de Compostela, befriending Galician nationalists and anthropologists and observing celebrations and everyday activities. Medeiros also mined the archives, in both Galicia and Portugal, as he embarked on a journey of imagining (his argument is influenced by Benedict Anderson and Richard Handler), retracing the steps of both Galician and Portuguese nationalists from the 19th century to the present day. As well, he cultivated contemporary popular culture sources, like the Televisión de Galicia (TVG): making incisive points about how “the official national Galician culture was represented in it” and “how new possibilities for thinking in the Galician language were nourished” by TVG – think John Wayne dubbed in Galician (219). But he also points to a friction between the official way that Galician culture has been represented by the right-wing Xunta (the autonomous government of Galicia) and the alternative portrayals current among the left-wing nationalists.

After an introductory chapter 1 “States in the Northwest” in which Medeiros elegantly lays out the terms of his argument, he turns his attention to Galicia in chapters 2 through 4, starting with the present day and then, retracing the steps of Galician nationalism from its inception in the late-19th century through its hiatus (at least, officially) in the years of Castilian hegemony of the Franco dictatorship (1939–1975) to new democratic Spain of the autonomies. The growth of Portuguese nationalism is covered in chapters 7, 8, and 9, and is presented comparatively to the Galician case. For instance, despite the desire of Galician nationalists to extend their culture over the southern border and into the Minho region of Portugal, Medeiros

ironically points out, there exists no equivalent idea of a shared Minho culture among its Portuguese inhabitants.

The role of ethnography – both Galician and Portuguese – has played in the developing nationalisms in both cases in another strand of Medeiros’s nimble argument throughout the book, but especially developed in chapters 5, 6, and 8. For instance, the “mutual lack of awareness between Portuguese and Spanish anthropologists” (173) is one theme established in chapter 5, “In the Skin of the Bull. State and Locations of Anthropology.” In respect to development of anthropology in Portugal, Medeiros argues that “the state and the nation seem to overlap perfectly in terms of the ethnological projects that were being proposed” (176). That was clearly not the case in Spain where since the end of the 19th century “peripheral” national cultures existed in tension with a “nationalizing discourse concerning the whole of the Spanish state” (175).

Finally, Medeiros powerfully illustrates the performative power of rituals (invoking Victor and Edith Turner, James Fernandez, and Paul Connerton) in imaging the nation in both Galicia and Portugal, in chapters 2, 6, 9, and 10. For example, Medeiros in chapter 2, artfully titled “On Galicia Day,” unpacks the many paradoxes of July 25. Santiago (Saint James) is the patron saint of Spain and July 25 is commemorated with a Mass with many Spanish state representatives in attendance, recognizing both national Catholicism and Santiago de Compostela as a site of international pilgrimage. But also July 25, since the 1920s, has been deemed to be the “*Día de Galiza*” (Galicia Day) and it is observed with counter-celebrations, still, since the inception of Galicia as an autonomous part of Spain in 1978, secondary to the official festivities.

An ethnographic example mid-way through the book (in chap. 6, “Portugal in Galicia”) is exemplary of Medeiros’s point about the mutual noncomprehension between Portuguese and Galicians. A group of Portuguese led by their parish priest is making their way through the streets of Santiago de Compostela on July 25. Suddenly, a Galician young man joins them, and starts singing along (in Portuguese), enthusiastically conducting the somewhat puzzled parishioners, and concludes with a rousing shout of “Long live free Galicia! Long live Portugal!” – “*Viva Galiza Ceibe! Viva Portugal!*” (201). But Medeiros notices that the Galician remains oblivious of the Portuguese’s group growing discomfort. They traveled to Santiago to observe the feast day of St. James and observe a culmination of the famous pilgrimage route. The Galician views that day – July 25 – not out of any religious zeal and certainty not as the feast day of the patron saint of Spain, but as Galicia Day. The Galician’s choice of words further perplexed the group of visiting Portuguese: to these rural persons the term *ceibe* connotes freedom of draft animals like “Free the Oxen, loosen them from the yoke” (223). That example and more throughout the book attest to Medeiros’s facility for matters of translation and the symbolic power of the quotidian.

Medeiros’s richly detailed account of the evolution of both Galician and Portuguese nationalisms could be made even more nuanced by the inclusion of Galician and Por-

tuguese local feminisms. For example, in a 1997 “Feminist Studies” article, the North American anthropologist Sharon Roseman contributes a close ethnographic read to the Galician feminist cultural review “Festa da Palabra Silenciada” (Celebration of Silenced Words), published since 1983 by the Feministas Independentes Galegas (Independent Galician Feminists) who, contrary to the dominant, androcentric portrayals of Galician nationalism, take the unrecognized voices of Galician women and make them visible and valuable additions to its continually changing story.

There are minor yet bothersome editorial mistakes like authors listed in the text and notes that fail to make into the “Bibliography.” The price is also prohibitive to add this fine book to private collections – and even – libraries.

“Two Sides of One River” is an important book and should have a wide audience outside of Iberian and European specialists. Paradoxically, in the end, despite the two nations being divided by a common river, if not a common language, Medeiros goes a long way in building an ethnographic bridge worthy of continued scholarly crossing.

Heidi Kelley

Milbrath, Susan: *Heaven and Earth in Ancient Mexico. Astronomy and Seasonal Cycles in the Codex Borgia.* Austin: University of Texas Press, 2013. 190 pp., photos. ISBN 978-0-292-74373-1. Price: \$ 60.00

Susan Milbrath’s recent volume provides a new interpretation of pages 29–46 of the pre-Hispanic Codex Borgia, placed within the context of central Mexican cosmology and astronomical studies. Its five chapters consider “Context and Calendars in the Codex Borgia”; “Seasonal *Veintena* Festivals in Central Mexico”; “The Sun, the Moon, and Eclipses in the Borgia Group”; “Planetary Events in the Codex Borgia”; and “Astronomy and Natural History in the Codex Borgia.” The text is supplemented by a preface, 18 “synoptic” plates detailing Milbrath’s interpretations of the iconography and calendrical significance of pages 29–46, a glossary, and a series of color plates at the end of the book that illustrate pages 29–54 of the codex. Readers will appreciate the generous use of illustrations as they make their way through what is, by virtue of the subject matter, a complex line of argumentation.

One of the strengths of Milbrath’s study is the contextualization she provides, in the form of discussions of highland Mexican calendars, the likely provenience of the codex, and a detailed examination of central Mexican deities that play celestial or astronomical roles. She presents persuasive evidence that the codex was painted in Tlaxcala, although I find her claim to have “proved” this connection based on a comparison to murals from the site of Ocotelolco in Tlaxcala (xii) a bit overstated.

Using data drawn from the fields of ethnohistory, anthropology, art history, and archaeoastronomy, Milbrath proposes that the events portrayed on Borgia pages 29–46 serve as “an astronomical narrative detailing noteworthy events over the course of a year in the context of the Central Mexican festival calendar” (xi). Despite the fact that this section of the codex lacks dates in either the year

or day count (and, like all of the codices in the Borgia Group, it contains no hieroglyphic texts), Milbrath nevertheless presents a well-reasoned case for interpreting the sequence of pictures as showing Venus’ transformation from an evening star to a morning star and back again. Based on what she determines to be eclipse iconography on page 40, she relates these events to the year 1496.

Milbrath’s repositioning of the ending date of the festival calendar, which she associates with the “month” *Izcalli*, in accordance with Nicholson’s proposal (in place of *Tititl*, as Caso proposed in the same volume), may give pause to some readers. She also notes that “[s]hifting the *veintena* festivals one day earlier than the arrangement proposed in the 1971 articles by both Caso and Nicholson would position the yearbearer as the first day of the last *veintena* festival” (6), which she argues could be accounted for if the *veintena* festivals began on a different time of day than the 260-day *tonalpohualli* cycle with which it was paired. By making these adjustments, Milbrath is able to tie each of the 18 pages of the Borgia pages 29–46 narrative to a particular 20-day *veintena* festival and to suggest associated astronomical events that correspond with dating them seasonally.

As Milbrath notes, Borgia pages 29–46 have received considerable attention in previous discussions of the codex. They are addressed extensively in Elizabeth Boone’s book “Cycles of Time and Meaning in the Mexican Divinatory Codices” (Austin 2007). The two authors approach this section from very different perspectives – Boone interprets it as a cosmogonic narrative, whereas Milbrath views these pages as an astronomical and seasonal narrative that “can be tested against real events” (17). It does not seem incongruous that these two scholars could have reached such different interpretations of the material, however, as the recording of astronomical events was often based on a mythological foundation. In the Dresden Venus table, for example, Venus’ heliacal rise is linked to one or more previous eras and to battles between underworld and celestial deities, as discussed by Gabrielle Vail and Christine Hernández in “Re-Creating Primordial Time” (Boulder 2013).

Milbrath’s dating of page 40 is based on her interpretation that the iconography depicts a solar eclipse visible in Central Mexico, similar to observed eclipses recorded in the Aztec historical annals. Based on other lines of evidence suggesting that Codex Borgia dates to the latter part of the 15th century, Milbrath correlates the proposed eclipse with a solar eclipse recorded for 1496 in the Aztec annals. The scene in question shows a black-painted deity in a squatting or birthing position with its head thrown back. Nine solar disks are arranged on its body – two on each arm, two on each leg, and a large one in the region of the torso. Each is shown being gouged or cut by various figures that Milbrath interprets as different manifestations of the Venus deity Quetzalcoatl. The black coloration of the central figure is interpreted as the darkened sun, whereas the eclipse glyphs with cuts are believed to depict the sun being eclipsed. Drawing comparisons with the iconographic program from the Aztec Bilimek vessel, which shows Venus gods attacking the eclipsed sun, Mil-