

Tessera: Garrett's *Travels in My Homeland* and a Tale of Four Fathers

Valéria M. Souza

Edmundo. Mother, at times I feel as if the world were empty, and no one else existed, except for us, meaning, you, Daddy, me, and my brothers and sisters. As though our family were the only and the first [. . .]. Love and hatred, then, must have been born among us. (102; trans. mine)

—Nelson Rodrigues

The Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do: for what things soever he doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise.

—John 5:19

The letter supposedly written by Carlos to his cousin, Joaquina, begins: “I am writing to you Joana, my sister, my cousin; to you alone” (223),¹ and it is this sentence that best encapsulates the central concern of *Travels in My Homeland*.² Scholars often deal with the famous letter, which comprises five chapters (XLIV–XLVIII) of the book, by emphasizing Carlos’s amorous encounters. There is, however, another facet of the epistle that deserves attention—namely, the complex web of familial connections it exposes. Existing readings are for the most part based on similar theoretical presuppositions. In his seminal article “*As Viagens na minha terra e a menina dos rouxinóis*” (1979), Helder Macedo observes:

Carlos' error was not only having been incapable of choosing but, as a consequence of that, not having been capable of transforming the love he felt abstractly into the concrete exercise of love. Effectively, his love was narcissistic: it was for his own sentiments and, therefore, finally for himself. Joaninha never existed for Carlos as an independent being[;] she remained for him until the very end an extension of childhood, and it was his own childhood that he continued to love in her. And the three English sisters [. . .] are interchangeable. [H]e fell in love with all of them in succession [and] Georgina ended up being chosen totally by accident. It was also not [Georgina] Carlos loved, but the well-being he felt next to her and her sisters. When Georgina and Joaninha became real, that is, when they began to exist on their own terms, Carlos renounced both—he grew fat, rich, became a baron. (20–21; trans. mine)

Macedo's reading can be compared with Helena Losada Soler's "A construção de Carlos como herói romântico em *Viagens na minha terra*," published in 2003:

I believe that Carlos-the-hero dies when he writes to Joaninha on that symbolic day from the armistice of Évora Monte, because that letter and its consequences signify the death of illusions, that weakness of *vintismo* that is one of the symbolic fulcrums of the novel. Carlos-the-baron is only the survival of the material. (n.p.; trans. mine)³

While the superficial details of Macedo's and Soler's arguments differ, their basic underlying structure is congruent. Macedo sees Carlos's love as "narcissistic" and declares as the character's primary error his incapacity "to transform the love that he felt abstractly into the concrete exercise of love" (20). Soler stresses the connection between the writing of the letter and the death of "Carlos-the-hero." In both cases, the consequence of the protagonist's amorous stagnation is determined to be his transformation into a baron.

The most salient aspect of the aforementioned analyses is the foundation of binary opposites upon which they are constructed. At the root of Macedo's argument lies the pair abstract/concrete; Carlos loves in the abstract, but is incapable of executing the conversion of this abstraction into any sort of tangible activity. Soler's reading analogously presupposes the existence of the dyad illusion/material. The "illusion" is maintained through the fiction of "Carlos-as-hero." When he pens the letter that ends up ensuring "the death of illusions," the resulting product, "Carlos-as-baron," represents the survival

of the mere material. These binaries point back to a set of principles from the second chapter of *Travels*, where “spiritualism, which marches on heedless of the material, earthy side of this life [. . .] can be suitably embodied, symbolized by the famous myth of the Knight of La Mancha, Don Quixote,” and contrasts with “materialism, which, taking not the slightest heed of these theories, in which it does not believe and whose impossible applications it declares to be Utopias each and every one, can be properly represented by the rotund and well-fed person of our old friend Sancho Panza” (27–28).⁴ The three pairs (abstract/concrete; illusion/material; spiritualism/materialism) may be read as equivalent variations on the master trope D. Quixote/Sancho Panza formulated by Garrett himself.

Victor K. Mendes's reading diverges substantially from Macedo's and Soler's. Mendes writes: “Carlos in his self-description loves metonymically, that is, his love does not proceed by radical substitution, but rather by spatial and familial contiguity” and “[a]bove all, Carlos' love is collective” (33; trans. mine). Mendes cites as evidence of this the passage of the letter in which Carlos proclaims: “And so I adored those three angels, all three, and I could not adore one without adoring the others” (Garrett, *Travels* 225). The critic continues, adding:

According to Carlos in the letter to Joaninha, “women do not understand men” (223). The opposition that the author creates between “the beauty of the human heart” (Joaninha and Georgina) and the “monster” (183), Carlos, can be read in the letter to Joaninha as the difference between monogamous love and polygamous love. (Mendes 39; trans. mine)

The type of love in question—“metonymic” but also polygamous—can be expressed via the dyad monogamy/polygamy and, as Mendes elaborates, women/men; in this manner, Mendes avoids replicating the pattern (spiritualism/materialism) established by Garrett and maintained in Macedo's and Soler's studies. At the same time, his reading is problematic, chiefly as a result of his assertion that Carlos's love “does not proceed by radical substitution”—which, as I intend to demonstrate, it in fact does—and because that love is described as “polygamous,” when a more appropriate term would be “adulterous.”

Before examining Carlos's letter, it is necessary to characterize the family unit. The letter deals with two families of which Carlos is a part, the first being the English one, consisting of the sisters Georgina, Júlia, and Laura, and the second biological and comprised of himself, Joaninha, Francisca, and Friar

Dinis. Within the biological family, there is substantial confusion regarding the roles of its various members. Joaninha and Carlos, for example, are simultaneously lovers, cousins, and siblings: Carlos, at various points in the letter and in *Travels* as a whole, addresses Joaninha as “my sister, my cousin” (223, 243), and “dear sister” (224). Francisca, meanwhile, is at once grandmother and mother to Carlos and Joaninha. Consider Joaninha’s admonition to Carlos: “When shall you go and see Grandmother? . . . Our mother, because she is our mother, Carlos, neither you nor I have ever known any other” (137). Friar Dinis, for his part, is progressively identified as a stranger who comes to visit the house each Friday, the murderer of Carlos’s father, and, finally, Carlos’s birth father: “He is your father, my boy. This man is your father, Carlos” (183), Francisca ultimately confesses.

Of all the family members, it is the sister who is most important. Joaninha is Carlos’s original love and his most enduring tie to his kin.⁵ He communicates with her even as he “cannot and dare not say anything to any other member of the family” (223). His letter begins and ends with Joaninha (and, to a lesser extent, with the family as a whole), and Carlos explains that its purpose is educational: “I want to tell you my story: from it you shall see what a man is worth” (223–24). He then weaves together the narrative of his own behavior with that of the family, associatively linking the two patterns of comportment. Carlos summarizes his general state of confusion when he writes: “In any case I no longer know who my family are; my head is bewildered and lost in the aberrations of my heart” (223). Why should Carlos’s perplexity about his family be connected to the “aberrations of his heart”? A reasonable answer is that the two stories somehow overlap.

One of the most significant features of the “collective” nature of Carlos’s love for the English sisters is that it allows him the ability to avoid distinguishing between the three. He loves them all and “[can] not adore one without adoring the others” (225). These “three sisters” exist as an *aggregate*; they are continually “mingled” (238) and “mixed together” (234) because it is not individually that they matter to Carlos but rather what they collectively represent to him that is crucial. Carlos selects sisters (rather than friends or acquaintances or mothers and daughters) because they embody—and, in their triplicate state, amplify—the image of his sister Joaninha. Their status as sisters is reinforced when Carlos is “received into the bosom of [the English] family” (225) and entrusted by the women’s father to keep them “company” (236) while he is away in London, placing Carlos in a fraternal role.⁶

The following passage, which details the carriage ride preceding Laura's departure to India, is illuminating:

I distinctly saw before my soul's eyes the only image that could call it back from the abyss: it was yours, Joana! It was my Joaninha, little and innocent; that little angel child, so fresh, so gay and sweet, whom I had left playing in our valley [. . .]. And you, Joana, you poor, innocent, hapless child, you appeared to me in the midst of all this, stretching out to me your sweet loving arms, as on the day when I said goodbye to you in that bitter-sweet vale of my tears and laughter, where I was to live the few moments of real happiness in my life [. . .].

Sitting there on the silk cushions of that splendid, comfortable carriage in the company of three divine women, who all cared for me and whom I mixed together in a mysterious, mystic adoration, blinded by passionate love for one of them, at the very moment when I was about to say farewell to her for ever . . . my thoughts were concentrated on a child who was still carried in people's arms! When I looked into the grey eyes of Laura, whom I adored, it was your green eyes I saw in my heart! (234–35)

First, there is the repetition—twice within the context of the departure—of “three” (233–34). In the midst of the collective, the image of Carlos's original sister reappears. Joaninha is referred to as an “angel child,” in an echo of Carlos's eulogy at the beginning of the letter to the “three angels from heaven” (225). In addition, Laura's departure for India serves to Carlos as a reminder of his own departure from the vale, during which he “said goodbye” to Joaninha. Carlos acknowledges that he “mixe[s]” the sisters “together,” underscoring the fact that separately they do not matter to him; rather, it is about what—or better, whom—they collectively *substitute*.

Carlos claims that he is “blinded by passionate love for one of them”—presumably Laura, since she is about to leave. Yet her departure is so conflated with Carlos's disappearance from the vale and from Joaninha as to permit the possibility that this “passionate love” belongs not to Laura, but rather, originally and always, to Joaninha. This becomes evident when Carlos admits that, looking into Laura's eyes, he sees Joaninha's. Finally, Laura's physical departure, once realized, corresponds to Joaninha's psychic departure from Carlos's mind: “I handed Laura out of the carriage and into the coach and we had time for only a nervous handshake and to say Goodbye! [. . .] And I no longer thought of you, I no longer saw you inside my heart” (236).

The interchangeability of all four “sisters” (Laura, Júlia, Georgina, Joaninha) is buttressed during an exchange that occurs between Carlos and Georgina, as the former lies convalescing in the hospital of Santarém. Georgina affirms: “you love your cousin, and [. . .] she adores you. And believe me, Carlos, I love her already *as if we were sisters*” (178; italics mine). Georgina recognizes Joaninha as her own sister, thus confirming the link between all four sororal figures. Joaninha is figuratively absorbed into the collective of Englishwomen who, up until now, had served as her substitute. Seen from this perspective, Carlos cannot properly be said to “love metonymically” in the sense that Mendes intends.⁷ The object of Carlos’s obsession is Joaninha, and the aggregate of English siblings constitute an attempt (albeit failed) on the part of the young man to “radical[ly] substitut[e]” (Mendes 33) one kind of sister for another.

The movement of substitution at work in the text is further underscored by Carlos’s involvement—following his chain of affairs with the British women—with Soledade, a woman described only in terms of her life’s vocation and attitude toward the protagonist: “One afternoon I was taken to the grille of a nuns’ convent there. My sad, absent, indifferent manner aroused the compassion of the good nuns. One of them, who was young, ardent, and passionate, decided to undertake the mission of comforting me” (242).⁸ Carlos states that “She did not succeed, poor girl!” and then elaborates, insisting:

The little nun’s name was Soledade and she stayed as solitary as her name. The gossips, who are never missing, said all they wanted, but they lied, as they nearly always do, and they were wrong, as they always are. I did not love Soledade.

Nevertheless I remember her with compassion and friendliness . . . I am made that way, my God, and I shall die the same! (242)

In the Portuguese text, “nun(s)” is written as “monja(s)” (*Viagens* 333) and “little nun”—used to identify Soledade—as “freirinha” (334). The word “freira” is, of course, the feminine form of “freire” (or “frei” as it appears throughout *Travels*); it is derived from the Latin *fratre*, meaning “brother.” In Soledade, then, we have yet another substitute sister. As for Carlos’s involvement with her, it remains ambiguous. Certainly he is drawn into the group of “sisters” and thereby to Soledade, and, despite his insistence that “she stayed as solitary as her name,” we cannot truly be sure, given the protagonist’s avowed predilection for lying (225). Carlos’s exclamation—“I am made that way, my God, and I shall die the same!” (242)—recalls a similar statement (“I

did not make myself what I am; I did not shape my destiny and the fate that pursues me is not of my making" [242–43]) in which he mentions his romantic behavior. Factors such as these contribute to the general aura of suspicion surrounding the nature of Carlos's relationship with the final "substitute."

The thesis of "metaphorical" (or "substitutive") love in *Travels* is supported by the fact that Carlos seems to view his own behavior as adulterous rather than polygamous. With his substitutes he betrays the original. In the midst of his tale regarding Laura's departure, the young man agonizes:

How shall I tell you, Joana, dearest Joaninha, how shall I tell you who love me and whom I love, because I do love you and, God punish me as he must, I love you blindly with this abominable, infamous heart He has given me—how shall I tell you, and for what purpose, the words we spoke, the pledges I made, the vows that were sworn, the promises that were exchanged? (233)

Carlos's preoccupation is with "words, pledges, vows, and promises"—all forms of verbal contract that seem traitorous to him because he has repeated them to multiple women.⁹ Carlos states in his letter that "I betrayed you when I loved you" (224). His concern with contracts emerges with respect to Joaninha, who is not only "of [Carlos's] blood" (178) but also ostensibly the only woman in reference to whom the subject of marriage arises: "I see in you, can only see in you, *the betrothed, the husband of* that innocent creature [Joaninha] I have taken under my protection and *to whom* I swear *you shall belong*" (178; italics mine), Georgina stresses. As Tony Tanner notes in *Adultery in the Novel: Contract and Transgression*: "The marriage bed is supposed to be the center point of converging and binding mutual obligations, reciprocal undertakings, and so on" (193).

The question is whether Carlos considers himself a "monster" and a "moral aberration" (235) because he loves his own sister or because he can only love her indirectly, through his entanglement with various substitutes, a pattern of comportment that to him feels adulterous.¹⁰ François Jacob observes that "Monsters always bear resemblances, but they are distorted resemblances which no longer correspond to the normal action of nature [. . .]. Each monster is the result of an iniquity and bears witness to a certain disorder: an act (or even an intention) not in conformity with the order of the world" (27). If Carlos is indeed the "result of an iniquity," a living "witness to a certain disorder," then perhaps the best approach is to examine his origins. He writes to Joaninha:

You are no longer ignorant of the reason why I fled my home: I knew that it was polluted by a great sin and I supposed it to be defiled by a terrible crime. That man, who is my father, I hated him. Now that I know just who he is—God forgive me!—I hate him even more!

As for my grandmother, I supposed her to be an accomplice to the crime; she only was to the sin. God forgive her, and well He might and should, since He made her so weak. My poor mother succumbed by her fault, because of her unpardonable complacency.

God can and should, I repeat . . . But what about me? How can I forgive her the colour I feel in my cheeks when I refer to my mother? She has suffered and gone through a great deal, poor creature! Her penance is a martyrdom, her old age a long passion and that man who made her sin a ruthless persecutor. But that is for God to deal with, it is nothing to do with me. (224; trans. altered)

Parker's translation of this excerpt is questionable because it alters key semantic and syntactical features of Garrett's work.¹¹ One of the defining characteristics of the Portuguese text is its ambiguity. The phrase, "My poor mother succumbed by *her* fault, by *her* unpardonable complacency" ("Minha pobre mãe sucumbiu por *sua* culpa, por *sua* irremissível complacência" [emphasis mine]), for example, leaves open the attribution of blame. The possessive "her" (*sua*) potentially belongs to the mother (i.e., "by *her own* fault") and/or to the grandmother, whom Carlos has just been discussing. By eliminating the element of uncertainty, Parker creates a bias against the grandmother that is reflected in other aspects of his translation: he changes "complacência" ("complacency," a word indicating passive unawareness) to the much more forceful "collusion," implying willful deceit. Prior to Parker's rewording, sections of the passage could have applied to *Francisca and her daughter*; hence, both possibilities must remain open for consideration. The uses of the word "sin" lend support to this theory, since they hint at a textual "intermixing" of grandmother and mother by a distraught Carlos: we have, for instance, an "accomplice [. . .] to the sin" ("cúmplice [. . .] no pecado")—a blatant reference to the grandmother—and "made her sin" ("a perdeu"—literally "lost her"), the meaning of which is unclear. The notion of an "accomplice [. . .] to the sin" suggests both the preexistence of a "sin" that has already been committed or is in the process of being committed by someone else and the act of witnessing, taking part in, or covering up that sin, whereas "made her sin" alludes to forced participation in an offense. Since these two uses of "sin" are distinct, they may each involve a different person.

Furthermore, the verb “lost” (*perder*) in the phrase “lost her” (“a perdeu”—translated by Parker as “made her sin”) can be construed as a euphemism for death, in which case “[h]er penance is a martyrdom, her old age a long passion and that man who made her sin a ruthless persecutor” conceivably refers to Carlos’ *mother* instead of his grandmother. The present perfect in Portuguese (“tem padecido muito”) is typically used to describe an action or state that began in the past and continues up until the present, and the present indicative verb that follows (“A sua penitência é um martírio”) appears to corroborate the rule, sustaining the view that the phrase is about Francisca rather than her daughter. However, given Carlos’s constant blending of familial roles as well as spatial and temporal planes throughout the letter, it is difficult to definitively exclude either of the women as the subject of the extracts. I have chosen to explore the idea that this last statement (“Her penance”) might pertain to Carlos’s mother.

At first glance, “sin” and “crime” seem to represent the same transgression, except that Carlos differentiates between them: “As for my grandmother, I supposed her to be an accomplice to the crime; she only was to the sin.” Logically, if the grandmother was an accomplice to the sin but not the crime, then the crime and the sin cannot be one and the same. The “crime” is probably the murder of Carlos’s father and uncle. Friar Dinis relates: “The two of them joined together to murder me and ambushed me on the heath. I defended myself not knowing against whom and had the misfortune to save my life at the cost of theirs” (185). The “sin,” on the other hand, might be the grandmother’s occultation of Friar Dinis’s crime. Or perhaps Carlos is referring to yet another sin? Before exploring this line of inquiry, it is imperative to take into account the following characterization of the friar:

He did live by something, then, this man, prayer and meditation were not enough for him, because he left his monastery and it was not to preach or to pray . . . Every Friday he was a certain visitor at the house in the valley, at the same hour, in the same manner . . .

There, then, was a part of the friar’s life, this monk who had not wholly cut himself off from the earth, a part which, say what he will, he had yet to *castrate* for the sake of heaven. (93)

The choice of the verb “to castrate” (*castrar*) is strange, since it is tied to “a part of the friar’s life” that exists “there”—that is, in the vale of Santarém. This

passage marks the only usage of “castrate” in *Travels*, and the verb comments on the friar’s virility.¹² Returning to the citation from page 224 of *Travels*, in which Carlos says, of his (grand)mother: “Her penance is a martyrdom, her old age a long passion, and the man who made her sin a ruthless persecutor” (224), the key term now becomes “passion.” Like “castrate,” it carries with it connotations of both sexuality and suffering (Rougemont 50). But if the statement is read as referring to Carlos’s mother, who died in early adulthood, how is it that she can experience any sort of “old age”? One hypothesis is that “old age” simply indicates the period preceding her death, consisting of the adultery with Friar Dinis, the resulting pregnancy, the murder of her husband, and at least part of the birth of her son Carlos, during which she ends up dying as “penance” for her “sin.” This sequence of events certainly entails a great deal of suffering, and its outcome (Carlos) serves as a permanent reminder of the adulterous relationship that took place. Additionally, the mother’s death, like the friar’s “castration,” is a bodily alteration that nullifies the possibility of future reproduction.

According to this scenario, Carlos’s mother’s “old age” begins with adultery, a prohibited expression of sexuality that “pollute[s]” and “defile[s]” (224) the home, even as it results in the creation of Carlos, a child condemned from the moment of his conception because of the “sin” committed by his parents. The “pollution” of which Carlos writes takes the form of a contamination of the blood, the family line: it is for this reason that he denies any culpability,¹³ while naming Friar Dinis, his father, as “the author of his and our misfortunes” (243)¹⁴ and blaming “the ardency of my Spanish blood” (226; trans. altered), for his adulterous love, with which he repeats the sin of his parents.

Carlos is presented as the living embodiment and corporeal expression of his parents’ sin. He is simultaneously the result of their adultery and the evidence of the deed; he is, as Jacobs might say, his parents’ monster.¹⁵ Tanner explains adultery as an act that “introduces a bad multiplicity within the requisite unities of social roles” (13). It is the infidelity of Carlos’s mother and Friar Dinis that acts as a catalyst for “bad multiplicity” in the lives of the family in the vale of Santarém. It single-handedly creates the conditions necessary for the murder of Carlos’s mother’s husband and Joanhina’s father (Carlos’s maternal uncle). In the aftermath of the murders, the entire family collapses inward, forcing surviving members to adopt double and even triple roles.¹⁶ Before the adultery, roles within the family were most likely static and well defined (mother, father, husband, wife, cousin, grandmother, etc.), but

the series of events that unfolds in its wake dismantles the familial structure, resulting in the conflation of nearly every existing role, so that a "cousin" also becomes a "sister," a "grandmother" also a "mother," and so on.¹⁷ In the "story of the maiden of the nightingales," the proliferation, in Carlos's life and in his language, of movements of substitution (metaphors) and the "bad multiplicity" they engender both fosters and reflects the familial and linguistic collapse manifested in his letter. Carlos is his parents' sin and its consequences run rampant. The issue of his love affairs, the aspect of the letter that has attracted the greatest amount of scholarly interest, should be regarded as a secondary concern; focusing solely on the affairs is tantamount to mistaking symptom for disease.¹⁸ Carlos's letter begins and ends with a central issue—family—and the story of his failed romances emerges first as a substitution for, and then ultimately as a means by which to tell an older, much more difficult tale: one, it might be said, of original sin.

Notes

¹ Regarding Carlos's tenuous status as the author of the letter, see pages 35–38 of Mendes.

² All English translations of Garrett's *Viagens na minha terra* are from John M. Parker's *Travels in My Homeland*. In some cases I have altered Parker's wording and, where applicable, this is noted.

³ While I am not in agreement with Soler's designation of *Travels* as a "novel" (*romance*), I have opted to retain her terminology in this quotation.

⁴ The English translation of the citation in its entirety is: "Some years ago there was a deep, abstruse philosopher from over the Rhine who wrote a work on the march of civilization, of the intellect—what we call, to be better understood, *Progress*. He discovered that there are two principles in all the world: spiritualism, which marches on heedless of the material, earthy side of this life, eyes fixed on its great, abstract theories, a stiff, spare, hard, inflexible belief which can be suitably embodied, symbolized by the famous myth of the Knight of La Mancha, Don Quixote; and *materialism*, which, taking not the slightest heed of these theories, in which it does not believe and whose impossible applications it declares to be Utopias each and every one, can be properly represented by the rotund and well-fed person of our old Sancho Panza (27–28).

⁵ "I became oblivious of all the past the moment I saw you. I fell in love with you . . . No, that is not true. I realized, the moment I saw you among those trees, in the starlight, I realized *that it was you I had always loved*, that *I was born to love you* and that I should be yours alone" (242; italics mine).

⁶ "Oh, what sadness and what everlasting regret when I remember those times of fraternal companionship!" (229).

⁷ By falling in love with a member of his own family, Carlos on one level obviously "proceeds by spatial and familial contiguity," but there is nothing remarkable about this fact; according to these criteria, all incest is "metonymic." A more thorough analysis of Carlos's affairs uncovers a process of substitution underpinning his involvement with women (one type of "sister" for

another; one pair of eyes for another; one temporal plane for another). If figural language is to be used in describing Carlos's relational style, then a more accurate assertion is that Carlos loves "metaphorically" (de Man, "Epistemology" 40; "Irony" 176). See also Roman Jakobson's "Two Aspects of Language and Two Types of Aphasic Disturbances," particularly 106–114.

⁸ This vignette of Soledade contrasts sharply with those of the other women, which feature intricate physical descriptions. The object of Carlos's final amorous or semi-amorous pursuit is reduced to little more than her title: "nun."

⁹ See pages 140–41 and 173–76 of *Travels*.

¹⁰ It is worth recalling again that Carlos intends with his letter to show Joanninha "what a man is worth" (223–24). He then proceeds, with this specific purpose in mind, to tell two interwoven stories—his own and that of his biological father, Friar Dinis. What the two men have in common is that they are adulterers.

¹¹ Unchanged, Parker's translation reads: "You are no longer ignorant of the reason why I fled my home: I knew that it was polluted by a great sin and I supposed it to be defiled by a terrible crime. That man, who is my father, I hated him. Now that I know just who he is—God forgive me!—I hate him even more! As for my grandmother, I supposed her to be an accomplice to the crime; she was only an accessory to the sin. God forgive her, and well He might and should, since He made her so weak. She was to blame for my poor mother's demise because of her unpardonable collusion. God can and should, I repeat . . . But what about me? How can I forgive her the colour I feel in my cheeks when I refer to my mother? She has suffered and gone through a great deal, poor creature! Her penance is a martyrdom, her old age a long Calvary and that man who made her sin a ruthless persecutor. But that is for God to deal with, it is nothing to do with me" (224). Compare to Garrett's: "Tu não ignoras já hoje porque fugi da casa materna: sabia-a manchada de um grande pecado, poluída de um enorme crime. Esse homem que é meu pai, não o podia ver; hoje que sei o que ele me é . . . Deus me perdoe, que ainda o posso ver menos! Minha avó, julguei-a cúmplice no crime; ela só o era no pecado. Perdoe-lhe Deus; e bem pode e bem deve, já que a fez tão fraca. Minha pobre mãe sucumbiu por sua culpa, por sua irremissível complacência . . . Deus pode e deve, repito . . . mas eu, como lhe hei-de perdoar eu este rubor que sinto nas faces ao nomear minha mãe? Tem padecido e sofrido muito . . . coitada! A sua penitência é um martírio, a sua velhice uma longa paixão, e esse homem que a perdeu um verdugo sem piedade. Mas tudo isso é com Deus, não é comigo" (313–14). Among other adjustments (see above, in the body of this article), I have translated Garrett's "paixão" as "passion" (Rougemont 15–53).

¹² See also Phillip Rothwell's remarks on "obverse castration" (61–64).

¹³ "I did not make myself what I am; I did not shape my destiny and the fate that pursues me is not of my making" (242–43).

¹⁴ The complete quotation in Portuguese in which the phrase "the author of his and our misfortunes" appears is: "Tu acompanha nossa avó, tu consola esse infeliz que é o autor da sua e das nossas desgraças" (335). Parker's translation reads: "Stay and look after our grandmother and comfort that poor wretch who is the author of his and our misfortunes" (243). In both instances, the structure consists of two imperatives with Joana understood as the subject, and two different direct objects separated either by a comma (Portuguese version) or the conjunction "and" (English version). In the letter, Carlos repeatedly places blame for his situation on two figures—one man and one woman (Friar Dinis and his grandmother)—starting as early as the second page of both the English and Portuguese versions (*Travels* 224; *Viagens* 313). Moreover, there are other utterances that appear similar to this one and which are clearly meant to include both Friar Dinis and Francisca. Consider Georgina's words as she instructs Joanninha: "Consola tua boa avó, e esse pobre velho. Ele não é tão criminoso, estou certa" (270; italics mine) ["Comfort your dear grandmother and this poor old man. He is not so guilty, I'm sure" (*Travels* 184; italics mine)]. More convincingly, many of the key terms contained within the quotation about the masculine "author" (*Viagens* 335; *Travels* 243) resurface in other contexts that help

shed light on his identity. On one occasion, Friar Dinis names himself as the agent of his own and the family's misfortune, admitting that he is "o réptil venenoso que mordeu na tua família e que fez a sua desgraça e a de quantos o amaram" (313; italics mine) ["the poisonous reptile which bit your family and caused his own misfortune and that of all who loved him" (*Travels* 181; italics mine, trans. altered)]. On page 270, Carlos's grandmother refers to the Friar as "este infeliz"—a choice of wording that cannot be overlooked given the parallel of "esse infeliz" featured in the passage above: "Não filho," exclamou a velha: "não meu filho; teu pai é *este infeliz*" (270; italics mine) ["No, my boy! the old woman cried out. 'No, my boy, *this unhappy man* is your father'" (*Travels* 184; italics mine)]. In Garrett's text, the gender of the noun "infeliz" is always expressed via a definite article or demonstrative preceding it. In Parker, the distinction is made by adding "man" or "woman," as in "unhappy man" or "unhappy woman." The term "a infeliz" (feminine singular definite article, in clear reference to a woman) appears three times: on page 208 (*Travels* 129), referring to Francisca; on page 258 (*Travels* 173), in reference to Georgina; and again on page 310 (*Travels* 221), in reference to Joaninha. In contrast, "infeliz" as a masculine noun appears only twice—both times coupled with a demonstrative rather than with a definite article. The first time is on page 270 ("teu pai é este infeliz") ["this unhappy man is your father" (*Travels* 184)]: "this man" is clearly the friar. The second time occurs on page 335 (243 of *Travels*): "esse infeliz que é o autor da sua e das nossas desgraças," ["that poor wretch who is the author of his and our misfortunes"]. Given the semantic parallels, it is clear that the "author" is Friar Dinis.

¹⁵ As an aside, it is interesting that Paré's *Des monstres et prodiges* lists as two possible causes of monstrosity "rotten or corrupted semen" and "compounding or mixing semens" (qtd. in Huet 129, italics mine).

¹⁶ The concern with family in *Travels* is not limited to the story of Carlos and Joaninha. Garrett writes: "How then, can I, who have to insert in this serious odyssey of my travels the most interesting and mysterious love story ever told, or sung—how am I to do it, who have nothing left to love in this world but a memory and a hope: a child in a cradle and a wife in the grave?" (70).

¹⁷ The whole family is a study of substitution gone awry, of too many substitutive movements and the resultant chaotic multiplicity that ensues. The eventual collapse of Carlos's family resembles the advanced stages of what Roman Jakobson calls "the contiguity disorder" (or "contexture-deficient aphasia")—a language disturbance characterized by the impairment of the capacity for "metonymical" linguistic operations (106–9). Jakobson writes: "This contexture-deficient aphasia [. . .] diminishes the extent and variety of sentences. The syntactical rules organizing words into higher units are lost; this loss, called *agrammatism*, causes the degeneration of the sentence into a mere 'word heap,' to use Jackson's image. Word order becomes chaotic; the ties of grammatical coordination and subordination, whether concord or government, are dissolved" (106). A "heap" featuring no clearly defined rules or roles, a nearly indecipherable entanglement of terms, and excessive reliance upon the process of substitution (metaphor) (Jakobson 106–7): this is a nearly perfect description of Carlos's family. "Bad multiplicity" and excessive substitution may also be said to account for much of the ambiguous language of Carlos's letter, as when certain passages could just as easily refer to one character as another, or when the protagonist combines his thoughts on several family members almost interchangeably within the space of a few sentences. In "The Epistemology of Metaphor," Paul de Man examines the manner in which "the abuse of language" (specifically the proliferation of tropes) is viewed as a kind of monstrosity, comparable to "manslaughter, incest, parricide, and adultery" (41). For both Jakobson and de Man, the proliferation of metaphor (substitution) inevitably leads to "collapse"—to monstrosity—in linguistic and social orders.

¹⁸ Macedo and Soler, for instance, examine Carlos's behavior as though it were only a cause, the effect or consequence of which is his transformation into a baron. Here it becomes possible to postulate the inverse—that is, that Carlos's comportment is an effect, the causes of which include the circumstances surrounding his birth and his familial situation, etc.

Works Cited

- De Man, Paul. "The Concept of Irony." *Aesthetic Ideology*. Ed. and intro. Andrzej Warminski. Minneapolis/London: U of Minnesota P, 2002. 163–84. Print.
- . "The Epistemology of Metaphor." *Aesthetic Ideology*. Ed. and intro. Andrzej Warminski. Minneapolis/London: U of Minnesota P, 2002. 34–50. Print.
- Garrett, Almeida. *Travels in My Homeland*. Trans. John M. Parker. London: Peter Owen / UNESCO, 1987. Print.
- . *Viagens na minha terra*. Org., preface, and notes Augusto da Costa Dias. Lisbon: Editorial Estampa, 1992. Print.
- Huet, Marie-Hélène. "Monstrous Medicine." *Monstrous Bodies/Political Monstrosities*. Ed. Laura Lunger Knoppers and Joan B. Landes. Ithaca and London: Cornell UP, 2004. 127–47. Print.
- Jacob, François. *The Logic of Life: A History of Heredity*. Trans. Betty E. Spillman. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1993. Print.
- Jakobson, Roman. "Two Aspects of Language and Two Types of Aphasic Disturbances." *Language in Literature*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap, 1987. 95–114. Print.
- Macedo, Helder. "As *Viagens na minha terra* e a menina dos rouxinóis." *Colóquio/Letras* 51 (1979): 15–24. Print.
- Mendes, Victor K. *Almeida Garrett: Crise na representação nas Viagens na minha terra*. Lisbon: Edições Cosmos, 1999. Print.
- Rodrigues, Nelson. "Álbum de família." *Peças míticas*. Org. and intro. Sábato Magaldi. Rio de Janeiro: Editora Nova Fronteira, 1981. 51–120. Print. Vol. 2 of *Teatro completo de Nelson Rodrigues*.
- Rothwell, Phillip. "Ethics, the Thing, and the Father: Almeida Garrett's Contribution to Empty Paternity." *A Canon of Empty Fathers: Paternity in Portuguese Narrative*. Lewisburg: Bucknell UP, 2007. 45–64. Print.
- Rougemont, Denis de. *Love in the Western World*. Trans. Montgomery Belgion. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1983. Print.
- Soler, Elena Losada. "A construção de Carlos como herói romântico em *Viagens na minha terra*." *Almeida Garrett, um romântico, um moderno: actas do Congresso Internacional Comemorativo do Bicentenário do Nascimento do Escritor*. [Coimbra, 3–5 Feb., 1999. Orgs. Ofélia Paiva Monteiro and Maria Helena Santana.] Vol. 1. Lisbon: Imprensa Nacional Casa da Moeda, 2003. n.p. Print.
- Tanner, Tony. *Adultery in the Novel: Contract and Transgression*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1979. Print.

Valéria M. Souza is a PhD candidate in Portuguese at the University of Massachusetts Dartmouth and a visiting instructor at Middlebury College.