

## (Re)Telling History: Lília Jorge's *O Dia dos Prodígios*

Lília Silva

*To the memory of my friend Maria Luis*

All historical evidence is but the partial *visibilia*  
of an entire invisible world.<sup>1</sup>

*O Dia dos Prodígios*, written in 1980, was Lília Jorge's first novel and is a celebration of as well as an ironical perspective on the 25 April 1974 Revolution. Lília Jorge, who belongs to what Eduardo Lourenço called "a geração literária da revolução,"<sup>2</sup> did indeed write about the revolution and its consequences, but not from the point of view of "official discourses," that is, of those who write History, but rather from the point of view of those who in one way or another make up the unwritten reality of History. Through fiction, Lília Jorge recovers that "entire invisible world" mentioned above, the world of the oppressed and the silenced. *O Dia dos Prodígios*, according to Lourenço, is "exigência de 'fala,'"<sup>3</sup> (a demand to speak) in opposition to the silence imposed on Portuguese people for almost fifty years of Salazar's dictatorship. In this sense the novel can be read as a "metaphor for April 25," as Jorge herself remarked in a lecture at the Universidade de Lisboa in March 1986.<sup>4</sup> In *O Dia dos Prodígios* and in Lília Jorge's subsequent novels such as *O Cais das Merendas* (1982), *A Notícia da Cidade Silvestre* (1987), or *A Costa dos Murmúrios* (1988), the privileging of the word and the world of the dominated men and women suggests the possibility of multiple discourses that reflect the diversity of experiences where issues of class, gender, and race intermingle. It also opens up a space for a reading of the different experiences of women in a variety of social relations, contradicting the essentialized notion of women as a homogeneous entity.

In this paper I will attempt to show how Lídia Jorge brings to her text a diversity of languages or “world views” in a way which recalls Bakhtin’s conceptualization of each language as “a kind of ideology brought-into-speech.”<sup>5</sup> In this way, Lídia Jorge opens up possibilities to read *O Dia dos Prodígios* as a site of conflicting and possibly liberating “languages-in-use,”<sup>6</sup> which unsettles the patriarchal myth of one monologic language of truth.

### **Prodigious writing against silence**

Bakhtin, in his theory of the novel, contends that heteroglossia are an amalgam of socio-ideological languages, where

(...) all languages are specific points of view on the world, forms for conceptualising the world in words, specific world views, each characterised by its own objects, meanings and values. As such they all may be juxtaposed to one another, mutually supplement one another, contradict one another and be interrelated dialogically.<sup>7</sup>

This dialogical and dynamic conception of language implies a constant tension between two opposing sets of forces, which Bakhtin terms the centripetal and centrifugal forces of language. The centripetal forces work towards unification and stability of meaning, while the centrifugal forces introduce multiplicity and decentralization. This constant struggle defies “ideological unification and centralization,”<sup>8</sup> and as Herndl has suggested “is political and raises questions of power.”<sup>9</sup> Insofar as it acknowledges the existence of different experiences mirrored through different languages and transforms each and every speaking subject into an “ideologue,”<sup>10</sup> Bakhtin’s concept of the novel as a “social heteroglossia” offers the possibility for a better understanding of the different relations between the different social subjects in a particular society.

Lídia Jorge, in choosing to depict the rural, almost illiterate people of a small village in the Algarve, is deliberately constructing for us what I would call a “partial heteroglossia” as an act of resistance to centralizing tendencies and as a political accusation pointing to the marginalization of the rural poor. Lídia Jorge brings to her text the real atmosphere of the village with its smells, its habits, and especially the transcription of the oral speech of the villagers with their regional dialect, their jargon, and their swear words. Lídia Jorge also transcribes into the text the typical way they speak in the Algarve, where the vowels at the end of the words are closed: that in the text is transcribed

by the past tense of the verbs ending in “i,” such as “salti, pegui, di, atiri” (22). *O Dia dos Prodígios* conveys the idea that communication is impossible, not only between the urban and the rural world, but also between men and women, by drawing on specific techniques that remind us of oral discourse, with the continual shifting of narrative perspectives and points of view. I would suggest, then, that this struggle or dialogical relation between different discourses works as a reply to the homogenizing idea of the authoritarian discourse of Salazar’s dictatorship, where people had no voice at all. These voices can be considered as “centrifugal forces,” and what could be perceived as monologues are in fact dialogues in a Bakhtinian sense in that they resist and are acts of opposition to a monological discourse that wants to silence them. *O Dia dos Prodígios* starts with a brief introduction where we read, “E falamos todos ao mesmo tempo. (...) Seria bom para que ficasse bem claro o desentendimento.” Characters will all talk at the same time; that is, no one will have a dominant voice. Each of their discourses, as well as the discourse of the heterodiegetic narrator, will interpenetrate each other in a dialogic relationship. The third-person narrator, controlling the development of the story, gives insight into the lives and interior of the characters, assuming the position of different narrative voices, and so participates in the polyphony of the text.

According to Bakhtin,

(...) the word... exists in other people’s mouths, in other people’s contexts, serving other people’s intentions: it is from there that one must take the word, and make it one’s own.<sup>11</sup>

If, as Bakhtin claimed, one’s own discourse emerges from other discourses and eventually will be able to free itself, Lídia Jorge, by bringing to her text “o desentendimento” of all characters’ different ideas and intentions, is granting them the possibility of liberation through discourse. I will analyze *O Dia dos Prodígios*, arguing that in her construction of the novel as a “patchwork” of different discourses, or a “polyphony of voices,” Lídia Jorge adopts an aesthetic form that uses representations of language to explore and denounce different forms of oppression in terms of class and gender, and thus also constitutes a form of liberation.

*O Dia dos Prodígios* is set in Vilamaninhos, a small remote village in the Algarve, where nothing ever happens. As a result, “A povoação vai ficando um

ovo emurchecido. Que fede, gorado, e não gera” (21). Vilamaninhos does not produce anything anymore, and “nada avança” (139) because the young have been forced to leave, “Todos tinham abalado para as suas pátrias” (75), since there was no future for them in the village. Those who have stayed were tired of being voiceless, ignored by the politicians in the capital; the only way to survive was to seek refuge in their own dreams and hopes. These dreams and hopes, which are different for each of them, are reified in the sudden and mysterious appearance of a flying snake, which they see as “O pressentimento que antecede os grandes acontecimentos” (43). We are transported into an atmosphere of magic and fantasy to account for their daydreaming, their belief in the possibility that one day something would happen to change their lives, because although they feel powerless to change their own destiny, they see the snake as an omen, as a sign of “(...) crença (...). Não de surpresa (...) Antes de *inconfirmação*” (69). This resistance towards a fascist authoritarian politics that advised them to adopt “resignação” (81) and thus, silence, “(...) tão pequena é esta terra. E tão grande o seu silêncio” (170), is registered by bringing their voices to the text as a way of asserting themselves as autonomous subjects.

The leitmotiv of *O Dia dos Prodígios* is a need for change, but they have to wait, “Vão tão lentos os dias nesta espera” (150), a slow and painful expectation that is soon going to descend into disillusion and frustration. The news of a revolution that has taken place in the capital is brought by the only radio in the village, belonging to Pássaro Volante, and Maria Rebôla breaks the news saying, “(...) em Lisboa os soldados fizeram uma revolução para melhorarem a vida daquela gente? Uma re vo lu ção” (133).

Later on, Jesuína Palha also talks about the revolution as if it were happening far away and was going to have no consequences for them at all. Jesuína’s double-voiced discourse, because it expresses simultaneously two different intentions, that is, the direct intention of the character who is speaking and the refracted intention of the author, towards Carma and Carminha, not only stresses the gap between the rural people and those living in Lisbon, but also criticizes this situation. Jesuína with her strong voice says that in Lisbon there are

Gente que já tem luzes... Gente que basta fazer assim com o dedo mindinho, para que todos os instrumentos comecem a fazer o serviço... Gente. Gente que já tem sítio próprio onde dar de corpo sem ser preciso mostrar a vergonha a

ninguém. Gente que já tem tudo o que nem é possível a gente imaginar (...).  
E essa gente ainda não estava conformada com o destino. (141-42)

It is interesting to note that she answers herself with a bitter remark: “Aqui é uma tristeza” (143).

For these people the revolution is a mixture of fantasy and reality, because in the end they want to believe in something, as they believe that the soldiers are now visiting all the villages in Portugal in order to “ouvir todas as queixas” (134) and to free them of their misery. When the soldiers arrive, the people of Vilamaninhos scream and shout of joy “porque o espectáculo era o mais arrebatador das suas vidas” (155), but they soon find out “Que se tinham alvoroçado por um nada” (157) since “Esses que aí vieram mostrar-se nem chegaram a ouvir a voz da gente” (157). They did not visit Vilamaninhos to hear the people’s stories and complaints, but to bring their own empty discourses, full of ideals but devoid of meaning, for these people. In the end they came, “Mas ninguém compreendeu as palavras” (161), because although they came to speak about freedom, freedom of speech, and unity between all the people, they in fact did not allow the villagers to use their own words. Therefore, the realities of the two groups were too far apart for them to be able to communicate.

This miscommunication, or non-communication, is ironically depicted when one of the soldiers is addressing the community and says, “Oh amigos. Que aquela era a hora dos humilhados e dos oprimidos” (154), and one of the villagers, Manuel Gertrudes, showing his lack of political consciousness asks, “E quem são esses?” (154). The representation of these socially asymmetrical discourses has a strong satirical and political effect, especially if we take into account that the majority of these soldiers were coming from the lower strata of society. What could be understood as differently empowered discourses is in the end a kind of parody of the “official language,” because the soldiers are just appropriating another discourse, the discourse of the so-called truth, “Da pura verdade” (134), that in reality is not theirs.

Lídia Jorge seems to want to convey the idea that the revolution “for the people and with the people” was just “(...) ilusão dos sentidos” or “assombração” (162), and she points out the failure of the revolution to transform relations of power. Although these country people might be called “a alavanca dos prodígios” (154), in reality they were and remain impotent after the revolution, and their lives will have to go on as ever before. The title,

*O Dia dos Prodígios*, when “afinal nada aconteceu,” simply reinforces the satirical view of the revolution as a site for the liberation of the oppressed and the fulfilment of their dreams and wishes. The villagers soon find out that the change they were hoping for will not happen because of the snake or a revolution, but it is something that they have to look for inside themselves.

### The discursive construction of gender

Bakhtin’s sociolinguistic approach to the novel enables us to look into *O Dia dos Prodígios* as a discursive representation of the antagonism not only between the rural “margins” and the urban “center,” but also between women and the patriarchal cultural hegemony. Although Bakhtin has been accused of being gender blind and of neglecting the existence of female writers in his work, his theory provides some useful insights for feminist criticism.<sup>12</sup>

I would like to suggest that the struggle or dialogical relation between different voices or particular ways of viewing the world allows for the deconstruction and the undermining of discursive authoritarian practices, founded on binary oppositions, where the category “woman” is always grounded in an essential identity and takes the position of an alien “other.”

The narrative sequence built as an entanglement of different stories told by men and women who reveal different ways of perceiving the world shows Lídia Jorge’s insistence on the significance of gender. This is well expressed in the chatter between the old couple, Esperança and José Jorge Júnior, in which each of them goes on and on speaking without really listening to each other, “(...) os dois aqui de palestra sem se ouvirem” (33). It is important to remark that while Esperança talks about the thirteen children she had, remembering all the details of when they were born, José, standing on a bench, in a position of superiority as if giving a speech, talks about his ancestors and how brave they were.

Whereas José recalls images of a glorious past, as a form of asserting himself as a man, through the patriarchal history of the family, Esperança’s memory is firmly grounded in the materiality of the everyday and is etched in her consciousness as well as in her body, “porque afinal depois de tanta lágrima, nenhuma dor lhe atingia o corpo” (73). José’s words can be identified as what Bakhtin calls “the authoritative discourse,” because “it is connected with a past that is felt to be hierarchically higher. It is, so to speak, the word of the fathers.”<sup>13</sup> Esperança is the stereotyped image of the self-sacrificing, submissive mother and wife, the only role the patriarchal society envisaged

for her and to which she must conform. As Sadlier has pointed out, “Their speeches represent an archetypal male and female discourse aimed ‘outward,’ towards the reader.”<sup>14</sup> Therefore, Esperança’s double-voiced discourse towards herself and an “absent addressee,” or the reader, is subversive because it offers itself to be read in opposition to that official, masculine, phallogocentric discourse.

### Jesuína Palha: Parody through discourse

According to Holquist, “Heteroglossia is a plurality of relations, not just a cacophony of voices.”<sup>15</sup> Lídia Jorge illustrates this with the layout of her narrative, dividing the text into columns to represent unbalanced relations of power. There are two such moments in the narrative—when Jesuína Palha tells Carminha Rosa and her daughter about the snake, and later on about the revolution. Whereas Jesuína Palha’s words are on the left column, the column on the right presents gaps to express the silence, the ostracism enforced by the community on Carminha Rosa and Carminha, “(...) banida dentro dos muros da própria vizinhança” (56). The mother is depicted as a sinner and described in terms of moral evaluations, as Carminha is the daughter of a priest, an illegitimate child, “uma condenação” (17). By analogy with her mother, Carminha is also a sinner, expressed by the fact that they have the same name.

Jesuína functions here as the “spokeswoman” of the community and reinforces their marginalized position, calling them “Suas enteadas do diabo” (141) and “gente que sempre foi empedernida e consporcada” (145), supported by a first-person plural voice on the left, “a gente,” or the voice of the community, that works like a chorus. Jesuína, making them publicly responsible for the incident with the snake, is just a pretext for “Uma acusação pública e bem testemunhada contra as suas pessoas” (145). She speaks in the name of a community which needs a scapegoat in order to reinforce the cultural rules and the stability of the community.

Although Jesuína is not conscious of her alienated speech, she is a kind of leader of the community, and she identifies with those “virile” women that Kristeva in “The Terror of Power or the Power of Terrorism” identifies as the “guardians of the status quo, the most zealous protectors of the established order.”<sup>16</sup> Kristeva argues that even if some women are now in leadership positions in government and industry, the problem of the power structures remains the same. These women end up identifying with the power struc-

tures, and instead of a change towards democratization, there is conformism and stabilization.

Jesuína embodies the moral values of Vilamaninhos and by extension of a society that condemns women for threatening the imposed social codes and the stability of the “Law of the Father.” By discursively reinforcing the monologic, Jesuína undertakes the role of a centripetal figure in the novel.

Carminha Rosa is a double sinner, because she not only had a child out of wedlock, but also the child of a priest, thus challenging the values and morals of one of the ideological pillars of patriarchal society, the Catholic Church. Jesuína is depicted as a very strong woman: “Nem homem, nem mancebo conseguíu jamais fazer o que fez essa mulher valente.” However, she is empowered only by ventriloquizing that same discourse that oppresses her as a woman, the authoritative discourse of patriarchy. She assumes the attitudes usually attributed to men “cospe no chão” (145) and also their language when she incriminates Carminha with the question: “a quantos tu já deste a pinquina?” (144). Jesuína also accuses Carma and Carminha of opening their door to any man, implying that they are whores, and says, “Mas quem vem nem olha à cara. Nem sequer às pernas. Antes ao fundo delas, para se *aviar* depressa” (144).

Bakhtin relates parody to the tradition of carnival, which he sees as an occasion for temporary inversions of the power hierarchy and “the feast of becoming, change and renewal.”<sup>17</sup> The attitude of Jesuína “dez vezes mais varonil que um homem” (156) leading the mob, formed only by women and children, may be associated with carnival rituals. It may be read as a mockery, pointing to the parodic fiction of gender identity as immutable. Jesuína is a “mulher-homem,” and so she carnivalizes cultural idealizations of the feminine. Pointing to the fluidity of gender identity, where features of masculinity and femininity are not rigid, it questions the concept of a fixed gender identity. As Bakhtin argues about carnival, “It absolutises nothing, but rather proclaims the joyful relativity of everything.”<sup>18</sup> Although Jesuína assumes the dominant role in relation to Carminha Rosa and her daughter, reinforcing the culturally repressive rules defined by patriarchy for “unruly” women, she can only assert her position as a speaking subject by mimicking a masculine discourse. Having internalized a discourse that is not hers, the authoritative discourse of patriarchy, she unconsciously conforms to it as she embodies a masculine attitude and language. If on one hand Jesuína points to the possibility of “renewal” and “change” as she unconsciously debunks cultural



mystifications of women's identity, on the other hand she reinforces the established order. Her ambivalent figure points to the ambivalence of carnival itself as a form of liberation. As Herndl suggests when discussing the restricted space of carnival for a true subversion of the structures of power, "Carnival represents an event staged by those with power to subvert any potential power which might be developed by the oppressed."<sup>19</sup>

### **Branca: a textual strategy of liberation**

In her article "Irigarayan Dialogism: Play and Powerplay," Schwab defends Irigaray against accusations of being essentialist. She argues that Irigaray's identification of a certain textual praxis with the morphology of female sexuality has to be read metaphorically and as a dialogical textual strategy. She also contends that "the battle against women's oppression begins at the level of language, of textuality, and will be fought out there."<sup>20</sup> I suggest, then, that Lídia Jorge's writing practice can be identified with Schwab's concept of dialogical textual strategy, which by forcing a dialogue with monologic positions, attempts to disclose and shatter them.

Jorge in a recent interview with Stephanie d' Orey said that

(...) my novels describe Mediterranean women as powerful, but at the same time apparently submissive. The world of politics is not their concern—their natural arena is the family and the home—about which nonetheless they often complain.<sup>21</sup>

Although this naturalized point of view may be arguable, Lídia Jorge's writing shows what Spivak terms "a strategic use of positivist essentialism" framed "in a scrupulously visible political interest"<sup>22</sup> against patriarchy. Spivak identifies the "subaltern" with the female body, contending that the experience of the female body has to be examined in its cultural and economic context. This is the only way to recover the enormous gap in History concerning women, whose bodies were always taken for granted and exploited. I will argue that although Lídia Jorge in *O Dia dos Prodígios* conveys an essentialist conception of gender, identifying women as victims of patriarchy who conform to their fixed roles as wives and mothers, she introduces the possibility of liberation from the symbolic order through Branca.

Although she complies with sociocultural dictates by becoming a wife and a mother, she always remains skeptical of her role in society. Branca, always

“submissa e obediente” (88), is going to assert herself through speech and by the linguistic assimilation and consequent refusal of her role as wife, mother, and “mula.” Her husband, Pássaro Volante, always associates her with his lost mule “(...) contra a insolência de uma mula tão louca como a mulher, e como ela perversamente misteriosa e cínica.” Pássaro not only calls her a mule, but he also has sex with her as if she were a mule: “Pássaro cavalga. Branca é um dorso macio de aragem pelada” (48). Pássaro uses his wife “para se libertar das forças inúteis do seu corpo” (128), seeing her only as an object and depriving her of her own sexuality, because as “an angel woman,” she has no sexuality anyway. She is not only abused, but also deprived of her body and her own voice: “E eu mais do que submissa, acobardada. Caladinha” (88). In Pássaro’s mind she is a working-mule, someone who was born only to work for and serve her husband and children. But a mule may also mean someone false or deceitful. Pássaro is both aware and afraid of his wife’s subversive potential to deceive him. Ironically, it is through a traditional feminine task used by Branca’s husband “para controlar a minha pessoa no próprio espírito” (88), that Branca will start her process of breaking free, embroidering a flying dragon.

Turning her submissiveness and her silence into transgression, because “Um silêncio (...) nunca é bem um silêncio absoluto” (147), she starts what in Bakhtinian terms is a “re-socialization”<sup>23</sup> of an inner conflict.

As Emerson explains, Bakhtin

does not deny the reality of internal conflicts, but he does socialize them, thus exposing their mechanisms to the light of day. If enough individuals experience the same gap, it is re-socialized: there develops a political underground, and the potential for revolution.<sup>24</sup>

This gap may be understood as the lack of words women have to express their particular experiences within a patriarchal discourse. Branca, recognizing her inevitable place within the patriarchy, creates an alternative position to assert herself, seeing through people and reading their minds. Branca not only speaks out against her oppression, but her discourse, expressing her wishes and powers, can only be expressed in a language no longer defined by masculine meaning. Branca starts to sleep with her eyes open and to hear sounds at a distance, “havia tempo que ouvia os sons à distância” (46), like a premonition. To reinforce the recognition of her role as a woman, as biology is understood as destiny in a patriarchal society, she recalls the first time when

she had her period and “se rendera à evidência de uma preparação inexorável para um ciclo” (59). Although her first reaction was “Oh não” (59), Branca knew that after she had had her period, she was ready to accomplish her function as a woman, that is, to marry and have children, according to the same decree that rendered women blind to men’s sexual aggressions and that made them accept the authority of fathers and husbands.

Branca never stops thinking about her life: “Ardem-me os olhos dos pensamentos” (87). She dreams of the day when she will be able to free herself and when she will no longer need to “cortar as coleiras que me amarram a língua” (85). When she tells Pássaro about her powers, he says, “Ficou louca” (91) and he does not understand her anymore: “Esta fala latim (...)” (166). The fact that Branca starts to gain consciousness of herself and starts to speak confirms her position as a subject in discourse, in active dialogic relation to others. Branca, asserting herself as a subject, is denying her position as an object to be battered, possessed, silenced, and abused. For Pássaro, this can only mean that she is mad, because she is expressing a reality that is beyond his own discourse and understanding. According to Bakhtin, “The ideological becoming of a human being (...) is the process of selectively assimilating the words of others.”<sup>25</sup> Branca’s transformation, or “ideological becoming,” gradually happens inside herself, by absorbing and then opposing her husband’s words, as Pássaro stands for the discourse that she refuses and that oppresses her. Pássaro did not realize that “quanto mais a prendera mais a soltara para um recanto escondido da liberdade” (148). The change that she achieves is inside herself, “eu própria fiz mudança, porque nunca consegui dizer tantas palavras junto de ti (...). Ou seja da noite, da revolução ou de *mim mesma*” (148). But this change is expressed in words, and it occurs through the assimilation of the road sweeper’s words as well. The road sweeper states that “Ninguém se liberta se não quiser libertar-se. Empedernidas as pessoas criaram o jeito de olhar a pila como centro do mundo” (91).

Her transformation suggests, then, that identity, like discourse, is constructed in the relationship between speaker and addressee. Unlike Pássaro, who does not feel the need to change because he is “in the center of the world,” Branca is tired of being the “escravazinha” (66). Living in a house “onde apenas tinha feito de parideira de meninos machos. E servindo as coisas que serviam as bestas” (88), she realizes that even in a phallogocentric world there are ways of contradicting and subverting that same world. Her desire to break free, expressed through gaining powers to predict people’s future, is

the alternative she finds when she realizes that total freedom is forbidden to her, so she has to create for herself something else as a weapon of survival. Even if Branca is just producing a moment of utopian freedom, it relativizes the authoritative norm, contradicts the idea of the single subject-centered reason, pointing to the need for a reconception of the self. Through Branca, Lília Jorge found a way to underscore the idea that it is possible to escape the confining dichotomies that ground masculine representations of reality.

Ultimately by reaccentuating the dialects and discourses of the disenfranchised, be they a rural community or women, Lília Jorge is denouncing authoritarian power structures whether they are fascist, patriarchal, marxist, or Lisbon-centred, and she is making a stand against totalizing concepts of History. *O Dia dos Prodígios* is a struggle of words with words which represents the conditions of existence of those subjects, men and women, who are muted or absent in dominant discourses. Lília Jorge, in a “breve tempo de uma demonstração” (13), creates a style whereby the relationship between reality and mimesis is problematized, which calls into question the concepts of fiction and truth, and serves to demystify demagogic concepts of fictional truths, such as identity. Even if the acknowledgement of a proteiform concept of female identity is only possible in fiction and through anti-mimetic representations of language, it challenges the institutionalized norm. By defamiliarizing literary and social norms, Lília Jorge introduces the possibility for women like Branca, “autora de nada”(66), to be the authors of their multiple identity.

## Notes

All italicized quotations of *O Dia dos Prodígios* are my emphasis.

<sup>1</sup> Nancy Partner, unpublished paper presented at the 1984 American Historical Association, Chicago, cited in Caroll Smith Rosenberg, “Writing History: Language, Class and Gender,” *Feminist Studies/Critical Studies*, ed. Teresa de Lauretis (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1986) 31-52, citation from p. 31.

<sup>2</sup> Eduardo Lourenço, “Literatura e Revolução” 13.

<sup>3</sup> Lourenço 15.

<sup>4</sup> Sadlier, *The Question of How* 49.

<sup>5</sup> Wayne C. Booth, “Freedom of Interpretation: Bakhtin and the Challenge of Feminist Criticism,” *Bakhtin: Essays and Dialogues on His Work*, ed. Gary Saul Morson (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1986) 145-75, citation from p. 151.

<sup>6</sup> Diane Price Herndl, “The Dilemmas of a Feminine Dialogic,” *Feminism, Bakhtin and The Dialogic*, eds. Dale M. Bauer and Susan Mackinstry (Albany: State University of New York

Press, 1991) 7-24, citation from p. 9.

<sup>7</sup> M. Bakhtin, "Discourse in the Novel," *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M. M. Bakhtin*, ed. Michael Holquist, trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981) 262.

<sup>8</sup> Bakhtin, "Discourse in the Novel" 271.

<sup>9</sup> Herndl, "The Dilemmas of a Feminine Dialogic" 7.

<sup>10</sup> Bakhtin, "Discourse in the Novel" 333. Nancy Glazener argues that the importance Bakhtin gives to Dostoevsky is due to his depiction of characters as "ideologues" who "interact with each other, who attempt to persuade each other, who represent certain values for each other" (117). See her article "Dialogic Subversion," *Bakhtin and Cultural Theory*, eds. Ken Hirschkop and David Shepherd (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1989).

<sup>11</sup> Bakhtin, "Discourse in the Novel" 294.

<sup>12</sup> See Denise Heikinen, "Is Bakhtin a Feminist or Just Another Dead White Male? A Celebration of Possibilities in Manuel Puig's Kiss of the Spider Woman," *A Dialogue of Voices: Feminist Literary Theory and Bakhtin*, eds. Karen Hohne and Helen Wussow (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1994), 114-27, citation from p. 115. Mary Russo also claims that Bakhtin fails to acknowledge or incorporate the social relations of gender in his analysis. See her article "Female Grotesques: Carnival and Theory," *Feminist Studies/Cultural Studies*, ed. Teresa de Lauretis (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1986) 213-27.

<sup>13</sup> Bakhtin, "Discourse in the Novel" 342.

<sup>14</sup> Sadlier 65.

<sup>15</sup> Michael Holquist, *Dialogism* 89.

<sup>16</sup> Julia Kristeva, "Women's Time," *The Kristeva Reader*, ed. Toril Moi (Oxford: Blackwell, 1986) 201.

<sup>17</sup> Peter Stallybrass and Allon White, *The Politics and Poetics of Transgression* (London & Itaca, 1986) 17.

<sup>18</sup> Bakhtin, *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics* 125.

<sup>19</sup> Herndl, "The Dilemmas of a Feminine Dialogic" 20. According to Mary Russo, carnival has its limitations and is especially dangerous for women and marginalized groups precisely because of its complicity with the dominant culture. See Mary Russo, "Female Grotesques: Carnival and Theory" 213-27.

<sup>20</sup> Gail M. Swab, "Irigaryan Dialogism: Play and Powerplay," *Feminism, Bakhtin and the Dialogic*, eds. Dale M. Bauer and Susan Mackinstry (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1991) 57-69, citation from p. 67.

<sup>21</sup> Interview with Stephanie d'Orey, *Cultura* 12.

<sup>22</sup> See Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, *In Other Worlds* 205.

<sup>23</sup> This is a term used by Caryl Emerson in her article "Outer Word and Inner Speech," *Bakhtin: Essays and Dialogues on His Work*, ed. Gary Saul Morson (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1986).

<sup>24</sup> Emerson 33.

<sup>25</sup> Bakhtin, "Discourse in the Novel" 341.

## Works cited

- Bakhtin, M. *Esthétique du Roman*. Trans. Daria Olivier. Paris: Éditions Gallimard, 1978.
- . *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Ed. Michael Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981.
- . *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. Ed. and trans. Caryl Emerson. London and Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984.
- Bauer, Dale M. and Susan Mackinstry, eds. *Feminism, Bakhtin and the Dialogic*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1991.
- . *Feminist Dialogics: A Theory of Failed Community*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1988.
- De Lauretis, Teresa, ed. *Feminist Studies/Critical Studies*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1986.
- d'Orey, Stephanie, *Cultura* 16 (Spring 1998): 12-13
- Espírito Santo, Moisés. *A Religião Popular Portuguesa*. Lisboa: Assírio & Alvim, 1990.
- Graham, Lawrence and Douglas Wheeler, eds. *In Search of Modern Portugal: The Revolution and its Consequences*. Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1983.
- Hirschkop, Ken and David Shepherd, eds. *Bakhtin and Cultural Theory*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1989.
- Hohne, Karen and Helen Wussow, eds. *A Dialogue of Voices: Feminist Literary Theory and Bakhtin*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1994.
- Holquist, Michael. "Answering as Authoring." *Critical Inquiry* 10.2 (December 1983): 307-319.
- . *Dialogism: Bakhtin and his World*. London: Routledge, 1990.
- Jameson, Frederic. *The Political Unconscious: Narrative as a Socially Symbolic Act*. London: Methuen, 1981.
- Jorge, Lúcia, *A Costa dos Murmúrios*. Lisboa: Publicações D. Quixote, 1988.
- . *A Notícia da Cidade Silvestre*. Lisboa: Publicações D. Quixote, 1984.
- . "Escrita e Emancipação." *Revista Crítica de Ciências Sociais* 18/20 (Fevereiro 1986): 57-62.
- . *O Cais das Merendas*. Lisboa: Publicações Europa-América, 1982.
- . *O Dia dos Prodigios*. Lisboa: Publicações Europa-América, 1980.
- Lourenço, Eduardo. "Literatura e Revolução." *Colóquio/Letras* 78 (Março 84): 7-16
- McHale, Brian. *Postmodernist Fiction*. New York and London: Methuen, 1987.
- Medeiros, Paulo de. "Em Nome de Portugal." *Discursos: Estudos de Língua e Cultura Portuguesa* 13 (October 1996): 13-29.
- Moi, Toril, ed. *The Kristeva Reader*. Oxford UK and Cambridge USA: Blackwell, 1986.
- Morson, Gary Saul, ed. *Bakhtin: Essays and Dialogues on His Work*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1986.
- Sadlier, Darlene. *The Question of How. Women Writers and New Portuguese Literature*. New York and London: Greenwood Press, 1989.
- Seixo, Maria Alzira. *A Palavra do Romance: Ensaios de Genologia e Análise*. Lisboa: Livros Horizonte, 1986.
- Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. *In Other Worlds: Essays on Cultural Politics*. London and New York: Routledge, 1987.
- Stallybrass, Peter and Allon White. *The Politics and Poetics of Transgression*. London: Methuen, 1986.