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The myth of Echo reveals that the worst prison existed is the one in which human beings cannot express what they think or what they feel; it is the torture of living with their thoughts and feelings imprisoned by fear or by threatening conventions (unidentified author, apud PRADO, 2015, p. 19).

Virginia Woolf (2019) created Judith, a fictional character, sister of the British author William Shakespeare, as a representative of what would happen if a woman had the same brilliance as him. Prevented from going to school and embargoed by domestic care demands, she would be constantly distanced from the possibility of learning how to read and write. Before turning 17 years old, she would be engaged and once opposing the marriage, her father would beat her or beg her not to sully the family name. Deciding to pursue her dream of working in Theater, she would run away from home and try to enter a theater, only to be repelled by a man. With no possibilities in the city, she would become involved with a manager who would get her pregnant. Then, hopelessly, she takes her own life, being buried in a crossroads that would eventually become a bus stop in the city.

A Room of One’s Own (WOOLF, 2019) was one of the extra readings recommended in the study group about gender and Analytical Psychology, created by Gimenez (2018) and Tancetti (2018). The group, started in 2019, was created on the felt need to deepen and expand the review of gender in Analytical Psychology, especially after the turbulence of the Brazilian presidential elections in 2018 with a series of misogynist, racist and fascist speeches from the elected candidate. In discussion of the selected articles, chapters and books, many common discomforts were mobilized in the group, guided by the prism of gender and personal experiences.

Reading about Judith raised the question of how enforced silencing permeates human development. By asking this question, we looked for mythological references about silencing and, since the origin of the question was a literary one, we also looked for references about Literary Studies that would establish relations with Psychology and silencing. Hence, this present article aims, through the mythological figure of Echo and Literary Studies of Magnabosco (1999) and Saçço (2016), to better understand the context of silenced voices, some consequences of such silencing, possible means to break imposed silencing and the transformations that can derive from this breaking.

Echo is a mythological reference about enforced silence, since her ability to speak was reduced to repeating the last words she hears after angering Hera. Berry (2014) seems to be the first specific reference to Echo that was not secondary to Narcissus, with the whole focus on Echo. The author emphasizes a creative aspect of the nymph that, although mentioned in several other studies (CAVALCANTI, 2003; PRADO, 2015; ALVARENGA, 2011; MONTELLANO, 1996; 2006; RUBIN, 2020) seems to weaken before the echoic perspective of repetition as empty of meaning and the nymph as strictly other-centered rather than herself.

We present Echo divided in six themes: her identity, her relationship with Pan, the punishment suffered by Hera, her encounter with Narcissus, her death and her presence at Narcissus’ death. We found two Literary Studies that converge on silencing and that relate, in different ways,
to Psychology, which seems to favor an interdisciplinary dialogue on the subject. Magnabosco (1999) studies justifications that maintain the silencing of the discourse of resistance regarding the insertion of women in Literature and Psychology, and Sacço (2016, p. 130) investigates how testimonial narratives can rescue “silenced voices and stories” in order to reconstruct the truth of what happened during the years of the military dictatorship in Brazil (1964-1985).

We understand the subject as relevant in the face of social movements that claim to be heard, such as – with no implications on diversity reduction of these movements – feminisms, anti-racism, the fight against LGBT phobia¹ and the Brazilian indigenous issues. Although groups different from the hegemonic have always existed, it seems that only recently their voices have been louder (or started to be heard) and thereby caught our attention, which has turned to realities different from the “standard”. This seems even more intense after the Brazilian presidential election, in 2018, with the rise of far-right government based on a morally conservative perspective that has been threatening liberties, that were, if any, recently conquered – if it is possible to speak of “liberties being conquered” when facing the daily violence that women, people of color, LGBTQIA+ people, indigenous people and other groups suffer. In line with this, we understand that there is a possible amplification of individual and collective consciousness in listening to silenced voices.

Reading the content about Echo, in Analytical Psychology, brings forth an understanding of the nymph as an important aspect in the formation of the relationship with the Other, but always at service of the Other, denoting a tendency to understand her as a figure with a somewhat disregarded identity and an intense need for positive reflection (Montellano, 1996; 2006; Alvarenga, 2011; Rubini, 2020). Even when pointed out in her individuation, (Cavalcanti, 2003) or as a reference in stories of suffering (Prado, 2015), for example, the focus on Echo still seems to be stuck in an understanding that seems to forget or ignore her creative capacity, intensifying what Prado (2015, p. 14) pointed out as a “petrified image of Echo”. The story of Echo is also related to frustrated passions, masochism, and restriction to repetition without creative possibilities, pointing to what seems to be a one-sided comprehension of her (Berry, 2014).

In searching for references of Echo outside Psychology, Prado (2015) found several references that agree with the hegemonic understanding of Echo in Analytical Psychology, but also found other references that were dissonant, which emphasize a more complex aspect of the nymph as a mythical representation of the female figure. We chose to highlight the work of Santos and Zolettato (apud Prado, 2015, p. 20) for whom Echo “exemplifies the female trajectory that acquires voice and presence by marking her space and building her story” and express herself using linguistic resources in their totality. This perspective in Law, found by Prado (2015), also reinforces the importance of a dialogue between Psychology and other fields of study, in search for an amplified perspective of any subject of interest.

Echo is a nymph, daughter of the earth and the air, who serves in rites and ceremonies concerning conjugality and fertility. The etymology of the word nymph, from the Greek “nymphe” meaning “bride”, seems to highlight her potential absolute involvement with everything, which, associated with the capacity for mystical participation that Cavalcanti (2003) inculcates in her for being a nymph, connects her to creativity. Part of Hera’s retinue, Echo was the one who distracted the goddess while Zeus had sexual relations with other nymphs and mortals. This relates her to both creative conjunction, to what she serves, as to her relationship to origin and creativity, since she helps Zeus in his populating settlement of

¹ LGBTQIA+ refers to the group of lesbians, gays, bi and pansexual, transvestites and transgender, queer, intersexual and other groups of nonconformative sexuality. LGBT phobia is the term used to refer to the prejudice that individuals, parts of the group, or the whole group, suffer from.
the Greek pantheon (BERRY, 2014). Her connection to creation is also related to her pre-Hellenic past, in which she would have been the goddess Acco, known as “voice of creation” (CAVALCANTI, 2003, p. 139).

As for Echo’s identity, Cavalcanti (2003, p. 145) presents her as a figure who needs to be seen and recognized, who demands space to build her positive self-esteem and who has, in repetition, the means to seek recognition. Her lack of positive reflection would leave her excessively available to reflect the other rather than herself, which relates her to empathy. Hence, Echo would see herself as “destitute of worth and resources” and from this would derive a dependent and symbiotic stance in search for a sense of self-worth. Berry (2014, p. 140), in contrast, understands Echo not as an entity on her own or even separated from her environment, since she needs it to communicate herself. The author also states that, once Echo presents herself in unoccupied spaces, “what is missing in a manifestation [...] is what shapes Echo”.

Berry (2014, p. 138) mentions the romantic relationship of Echo and Pan, another mythological figure who also relates to Everything, which would have been broken by Echo. The rejection of Pan by Echo is understood by the author as a refusal of Everything’s desire to resonate, by which she means that Echo draws a line for what can be echoed: “part of this involvement [with Everything, Echo’s potential] is also resistance, an escape from answering to everything and everyone”. Cavalcanti (2003) understands this rejection as an indicator of a better development of object choice in Echo, who refuses an equal, even though she still seeks in Narcissus a complement of herself.

Realizing that she was fooled by Echo’s talkativeness, Hera punishes her by refraining her ability to speak, restraining Echo only to repeat the last words she hears, which seems to be Echo’s best-known characteristic: repeating what she hears, as an empty repetition or being at the service of others. Hera’s punishment seems to be Echo’s identity reference, on which the authors support themselves when talking about her identity. Hera punishes Echo by removing what gives her identity and the possibility to exist autonomously and independently (CAVALCANTI, 2003; MONTELLANO, 1996; ALVARENGA, 2011; PRADO, 2015).

However, Cavalcanti (2003) states that Hera’s punishment is ambiguous: while it accentuates Echo’s alleged lack of identity, it points out a path of development: should the nymph unravel herself from the indiscriminate service of the other, finding other ways to accomplish her own creativity. Thus, the lack of possibility of spontaneous self-expression would lead Echo to seek other forms of self-expression, using repetition as a way to heal. Here, repetition can be positive since it can lead to elaboration; it also gives a sense of continuity and pertinence and allows the development of identity through creative repetition when Echo gives new meanings to what she echoes, in her “covered fertility”, associated with her covering for Zeus; and, repetition also allows for highlighting what is repeated, for elaboration and resolution of the need to repeat (BERRY, 2014, p. 141; CAVALCANTI, 2003).

According to Berry (2014, p. 140) Hera represents, in myth, the regent aspect of consciousness, being a “literalizer” who takes care of and serves the establishment, especially in its external and social aspects. In this way, the relationship that Hera and Echo establish with words seems to be the opposite, that is, while the former relates words to facts, the latter relates them to their creative potential. The author also highlights the importance of Hera’s ignorance about the tension with the arrival of something new: “Maybe it is important that the established does not understand the informed and the non-established. In this way, the tension remains – the tension between [...] tradition on the one hand [...] and the new on the other” (ibid, p. 141, her highlight). This tension, according to her, is important because it gives to the new a strange and original characteris-
tic, and would also need to negotiate its place in what is already established. Thus, the echo from the void, the empty, in the talkativeness of Echo, seems threatening to Hera because it shows Hera’s own emptiness, who is tricked in her own established and defined reality.

From Echo and Narcissus’ encounter, Berry (2014, p. 145) points to Echo’s ability to reorganize the meaning of words, shaping “words into her echo” in a way that “the literal meaning was transformed by her echo”. By stating that the echo is also a form of responding and that makes it possible for Echo to express herself, the author seems to understand that Echo expresses herself through the other’s speech, reorganizing the meaning of the words so the other can serve her as a way of expression. That was already affirmed by Ovid (1983, p. 90, our highlight), when the author states the following about Echo, on her desire to declare her love for Narcissus: “Echo’s nature prevents her from speaking first. It allows her, however, and she is willing to do so, to wait for the sounds and return her own words”. By echoing Narcissus’ speech, Echo also seems to create the possibility of self-listening, in her and in the other (CAVALCANTI, 2003). She echoes Narcissus’ invitation to her, making it her own way to express herself. Thus, Hera’s punishment seems to fulfill her healing function mentioned by Cavalcanti (2003), as she seems to find ways to express herself in a way that is not spontaneous, but creative, through the echo of the words that she hears to talk about herself. This seems to allow another identity of Echo, one that is “really more specific and articulate, like the corners and cracks of a cave, the ripples of a valley, the precise cuts where the rock emerges and recedes. These details, these precisions, refer to Echo” (BERRY, 2014, p. 146), in a way that establishes her identity, but not by what the consciousness represented by Hera, related to the establishment, assumes as form, but as something more subtle.

Rejected by Narcissus, Echo was fueled by the pain of the rejection; her body dries up and only her bones, which turned into stone, and her voice, remained. Berry (2014) asserts that Echo’s beauty is in her pathos, her suffering-passion, once she seems to acquire a body through the pain, despite losing her concrete body. It is through the embodiment of pain that Cavalcanti (2003) understands that Echo went through her individuation process, obtaining recognition of herself and understanding where and how she can act both as nymph (the one who animates, who gives soul) and as a bride (who seeks creativity through conjugality), always being recognized when we are in her presence, since the echo is easily recognized. Echo would have such an appropriation of herself that she would be free to choose intentional behaviors, developing what Tannen (2007, p. 6) calls “bodily autonomy”.

Narcissus, before his own image, notices that it responds soundlessly: “and, as much as I can guess by the movements of your beautiful mouth, you tell me words that do not reach my ears” (OVID, 1983, p. 60), appearing to be himself echoing Echo’s silence in his own words. According to Ovid (1983, p. 61), Echo echoed wails of regret. Narcissus laments, briefly before he dies: “Oh, cherished in vain”, and has his words echoed. He says “Goodbye!” and Echo replies to him “Goodbye!”

It is impressive that no researched material on Echo, in Analytical Psychology, has mentioned this last scene, except for Prado (2015) who associates the echo of Echo with her empathy to Narcissus’s suffering. However, Ovid (1983, p. 61) states that she is there and “still resentful of the grievance, she felt pity”. Although in the version we used she shows him pity, in the version used by Prado (2015, p. 93), she would be “still angry and unwilling to forgive him”, quite a big difference in terms of how we can understand Echo’s position towards Narcissus, at this point.

In the bibliographic research on Literary Studies, Psychology and silencing, we were able to find two relevant studies. Magnabosco (1999) questions what sustains the unworthiness of wo-
men’s speech in literary and psychological scopes. The author questions what makes women a speechless figure, identifying that they would have their speech represented by a male figure who speaks for them. She questions whether women have no words, or whether it is the disallowance of male speech that has made them develop other ways to express themselves. Finally, she poses the question: “Would literary and psychological canonical theories have had (or do they have) the structural, linguistic and lexical support that could connote (or that do connote) other meanings to the speech developed by women?” Saçço (2016. p. 10) in contrast, has as a scope of study “listening to silenced stories” and investigating the consequences of the violence suffered by militants who opposed the military dictatorship in Brazil. According to her, “Fiction and oral narratives complement each other in the search for truth, in the rescue of silenced voices and stories”, with Literature being a possible representation of catastrophes “once it acts on the social imaginary”, since its function is “to express what cannot be expressed, without losing the testimonial function of writings” (ibid, p.11).

Magnabosco (1999, p.52) understands the difference in the portrayal of women as a consequence of the definition of gender through the bias of physiological and biological differences, in a way that makes identity associated with individuality, as opposed to the notions of difference and coexistence. Such definition of the individual “affirms the impossibility of being the Other, of identifying with other social roles, of transforming space, time, and memory and of using different perspectives to organize and conceive the world”. This would be one of the reasons for the unworthiness given to the participation and recognition of women in both Literature and Psychology.

In understanding male supremacy over women through the differentiation of bodily difference as identity, Magnabosco (1999, p. 53) states that it is given to women to be “echo of the voices that told them what the world was, what they were allowed and forbidden, what were their duties and rights and, in the end, with what literary and psychological bodies they could identify with”. She insists that “I identified, named and put down through the male speech, women were dumbfounded, only being able to know themselves as a reflection of men”. She states as an example of these dynamics, in Psychology, the search for words and structures that are not those dictated by men in terms such as hysteria and male or penis envy. In Literature, the author states that every written expression of women was considered “foolishness, of impure desires, a misunderstood dissatisfaction or were about transgressive ideas to the imposed order of the feminine” (ibid, p. 53).

By this context, the author denominates the female testimonial narrative as a form of discourse of resistance because it represents a “political denouncement of oppression, marginalization, and discrimination practiced on those who are considered language subalterns, that is, those who do not enunciate themselves under the possibilities of the official language of a given culture” (p.54, her highlight).

Saçço (2016, p.38) instills the Brazilian Armed Forces, besides the crimes of torture and persecution, the crime of silencing the survivors, not allowing them to participate in writing Brazilian history when it comes to the 21 violent years of military dictatorship: “The scars of repression are still glued to their bodies and minds because they suffered, right after the amnesty, the moment of imposed silence”. As such, the testimonial narrative, fictitious or real, is pointed out as a way to elaborate the trauma experienced, both individually and collectively, relying on Kehl (apud SAÇÇO, 2016), who states that not naming the traumatic violence can be a greater pain than living it. The testimony as a “narrative [that]
gives voice to the silenced voices” (ibid, p. 36) would be fundamental for the elaboration of this historical period, especially given the value that Seligmann (apud SAÇÇO, 2016, p.15) attributes to it, which can “serve as a way to construct a new post-disaster identity”.

Kehl (apud SAÇÇO, 2016) brings the silencing of the suffering resulting from the Brazilian military dictatorship close to the silencing imposed by the slave regime, and Saçço (2016) brings it closer to silencing in the face of the violence that happens in many Brazilian suburbs. The silence, combined with the lack of social refuge to witness, enhances the pain. The testimony, as a potential to work with and in the social imaginary, when absent, corroborates the repetition of the trauma.

Testimony, according to Saçço (2016), is a way of gathering fragments of the past. The author points out two critical theories of testimony: the European and North-American, which have as example the II World War and the Nazi Holocaust, and the Latin-American, represented by dictatorships and the oppression of minorities. Regarding the Nazi Holocaust, it is understood as search for justice and historical documentation and, therefore, it has relevance. However, in Latin America, testimony is understood as a denunciation in which the whistleblower must prove to be a victim.

Magnabosco (1999, p. 54, her emphasis) highlights, among critical literary theories, the one that criticizes the hegemony of Western literary canon, marked by the notion that language and identity are made in their social-political context. This model is opposed to canonical criticism based on objectivity and universality, which is guided by the “literalization of meaning, that is, the resistance to the new meanings of the word”, comprehending the discourse of resistance as an “outrage and devaluation of the Western-cultured work and language ”. Thus, the author claims, there would be in the literalization of words the maximum literary value. This need to literalize and to appreciate what is literalized is close to what Berry (2014) presents of Hera, as a representative of the consciousness of and by the established.

The criticism of the discourse of resistance, as opposition to the new, is another notation made by Magnabosco (1999, p. 54), who understands that “to oppose means not to submit, not to passively accept a definition [...] as ‘the’ truth”. For her, opposing brings forth the possibility of other meanings and opens up to knowledge and apprehension of different ways of organizing thoughts and languages. The author also explains the mechanism of expropriation of meaning in the discourse of resistance which attempts to place this discourse inside boxes known by the hegemonic discourse; if it does not fit, it becomes marginalized, a prejudice term, as “one of the movements expected by those who feel threatened and uncomfortable in their mental, psychological and literary habits” (p. 55). The author also cites the term marginalized, the one from the margins, as the “representation of the Other from a point of view of world and language that does not correspond to itself” (ibid, p. 55), indicating a subjugation of otherness.

When talking about the redemocratization process, occurred in Brazil, Saçço (2016, p.50) points out the marginalization of the testimony of militancy against the military dictatorship, being replaced by a hegemonic discourse, leaving the testimony to the “politics of forgetting”. The justification given to this silencing, according to her, is to reduce the possible desire for revenge of the survivors and relatives of those who did not survive, as if the search for justice were a mere retaliation.

Magnabosco (1999, p. 55, her emphasis) connects the criticism of the discourse of resistance to an imbalance in the “narcissistic economy, that is, the affective investment upon the chosen and valued subject-object”; this imbalance would cause discomfort as it would show “the frailty of the rules and meanings of language and identity (once they are not ontological, but human and social-cultural productions)”, and this calls into question their identifying models, that
is, it questions the hegemonic unity of identity. “In other words, through the denunciation word of the witness, the reader is confronted with experiences and perceptions of intense human suffering and misery, which are preferably denied or repressed” (ibid, p. 56). This reaction could be justified by the difficulty in identifying oneself with experiences narrated as a human and political problem, not as a matter of identity. Thus, by diminishing the value of a discourse that is different from the hegemonic, one is exempting oneself from looking at problems exposed by silenced voices and “answering them by building new consciousness of re-signifying the democratic value of the word” (ibid, p. 56).

Thus, explains the author, by reducing the relevance and the consequent exclusion from the hegemonic point of view, the new becomes impossible, in order to “maintain and reaffirm only the structures and meanings of language and behavior consented and reaffirmed by the dominant discourse, in the face of certain political and social interests” (MAGNABOSCO, 1999, p. 56), which ends up making the idea and coexistence with difference and otherness unfeasible. It may be due to ponder if the notation also serves for the little attention given to Echo, pointed out by Berry (2014), Cavalcanti (2003) and Prado (2015). It seems possible to establish a connection between the silences of Echo as representative of the Other (CAVALCANTI, 2003), of women in literature and of opponents and victims of Brazilian military dictatorship, since Magnabosco (1999) points to women (and any other form of identity that is not considered hegemonic) as the Other, and Saçço (2016) points out throughout her essay a series of speeches that marginalize opponents, who are usually called “terrorists”. In all three cases, the denial of the other resembles what Cavalcanti (2003, p.208) defines as “defensive denial of the object’s autonomy” in narcissist individuals. According to her, there is a perception of the other’s independence, but narcissists deny this perception due to feelings of insecurity, which have been shown as difficulty in dealing with more complex perceptions of the other and with the fear of being abandoned and/or rejected and their feelings of fragility, inferiority, and vulnerability. Thus, the “relationship with the other is hampered by persecutory feelings regarding the invalidation and autonomy of the self” (ibid, p. 209), something that also appears in Magnabosco (1999) when she mentions the impossibility of the Other existing in face of what is hegemonically given as identity and discourse. Saçço (2016) points to the act of silencing as a denial of persecution and torture as a means of oppression and repression of those who opposed the military dictatorship in Brazil. The narcissistic negation of the Other does not seem to find space for Echo’s rejection of Pan, as if there could be no resistance.

Echo uses words she hears to express herself (BERRY, 2014; OVÍDIO, 1983). When we ignore Echo’s transformation through her pain we still see her as a maintainer of narcissistic grandeur and omnipotence (CAVALCANTI, 2003). The empty and meaningless echo seems to be echo of the emptiness of the hegemonic, literalizing, oppressive discourse, silencing voices that oppose it, that do not passively submit.

Echo, because of her relationship with Narcissus, is understood as a possibility of connection and relationship with herself and the other; she represents the Other in the development of relationships, in the process of identity formation and in the development of sense of self (CAVALCANTI, 2003). But Narcissus rejects her. This rejection is associated with the narcissistic refusal to perceive the autonomy of the Other (KOHUT apud CAVALCANTI, 2003), which is consistent with what Magnabosco (1999) pointed out as the difficulty of representing the Other as a different identity and discourse that

---

1 Tiburi (2018, p. 37) presents as hegemonic identity the image of the “white man”, a focus of social favoring, as a representative of power. For her, the “white man” is “a metaphor of power, of the subject of privilege, of the authoritarian figure grounded in the coverage of relationships that involve aspects of gender and race, sex and social class, age, and corporeality.”
ends up being marginalized. “For the narcissistic personality, the existence of its individuality is only possible by denying the other’s individuality. Their strength and value only can be asserted through the invalidation of Other’s strength and value” (p. 210). There is a devaluation of the object to determine one’s own superiority because the other’s existence is felt as a threat to one’s own existence, as Cavalcanti (2003, p. 210) explains: “The devaluation of the other is also used as a means of having the object under one’s own control and possession and, therefore, guarantee exclusive satisfaction of one’s needs”. In this sense, it is possible to connect the attitude of those who silence, whether they are the hegemonic discourse, as pointed out by Magnabosco (1999), whether they are the persecution and especially tortures by the Brazilian military dictatorship pointed out by Saçço (2016), to a narcissistic attitude.

Cavalcanti (2003, p. 211) explains the position given to Echo of serving Narcissus as a way to seek self-esteem once devalued in favor of Narcissus’ self-esteem: “Echo is only important to Narcissus insofar as she functions within his expectations. For Narcissus, Echo cannot have an identity because she threatens to destroy the structure that he built to maintain his own autonomy”, in such a way that “Narcissus perceives in Echo his own lack, which is denied”. The explanation given by the author correlates directly to what Magnabosco (1999) explained about the necessity to silence those who are different. A correlation between this same dynamic with the Brazilian military dictatorship requires further studies, although at first sight it also seems possible to identify narcissistic aspects in the discourse of its supporters.

Echo as the Other, as a figure with identity, independence and bodily autonomy, seems impossible to the narcissistic view, as this would make her leave the servitude and submissive position in which she was placed by the narcissistic dynamic. Echo’s identity and speech, expressed by her reorganization of meanings in her echo, are rejected by the narcissistic view because she must be kept submissive and passive, responding to the narcissistic need and desire for mirroring and positive echo; however, Cavalcanti (2003, p. 214) states that Echo must be kept at a certain distance because, otherwise, she represents a reminder of Narcissus’ vulnerability and fragile identity, which demonstrates the impossibility of his independence from Echo, since he needs to feel loved in order to feel worthy, and this leads to an intolerance to be criticized. A real relationship between Narcissus and Echo can only exist when “she acquires for him the function of an independent and autonomous object. The development of the ego’s autonomy is linked to the perception of the other’s autonomy”.

The same difficulty in dealing with the existence of the Other is pointed out by Magnabosco (1999) when she talks about the discourse of resistance and also seems to establish a connection with what Saçço (2016) points out about the intensity of violence exerted by the Brazilian military dictatorship: the strength needed to maintain the silence imposed on voices that do not echo voices of the hegemonic discourse, whether the patriarchal/androcentric discourse (MAGNABOSCO, 1999), the discourse of the Brazilian military dictatorship (SAÇÇO, 2016) or the narcissistic discourse (CAVALCANTI, 2003), is measured by the need to overcome, oppress and marginalize difference, otherness, the Other.

Narcissus was condemned to see himself (CAVALCANTI, 2003), but does not seem to be able to listen to himself or to the Other. He can perceive his own image talking to him, but he does not listen to his voice because Echo does not echo it. It is interesting to notice what Ovid (1983) says about Echo’s affectation of her appearance in Narcissus’ death: she is angry, resentful. Cavalcanti (2003, p. 146) points out that Echo would be afraid of her own anger and, fearing her own anger, she would use it as a restorative impulse. Echo denies her anger and mobilizes Eros against the pain on frustration and depression. In this sense, the impossibi-
lity to access anger seems close to what Saçço (2016) says about the resistance to speak openly and socially about the damage left by the Brazilian military dictatorship, under the justification of a desire for retaliation. The anger felt by those who are silenced must be kept silent.

However, by getting angry, it seemed possible for Echo to give up her submission to Narcissus’ voice in such a way that we might wonder if Eros did not mobilize her out of frustration, a perspective closer to Berry’s (2014) perspective about the importance of Echo’s experience of her own suffering.

At this point, it seems important to say something about anger. Rubini (2020) points to Eros as the potential for connection, a bond, whereby consummation becomes possible. At first glance, it seems possible to approximate the affectation by fear and anger of a “communist threat” in the 1960’s - revived in 2018 Brazilian presidential elections - to the silencing of those associated with this threat, promoting a connection of a large part of Brazilian society to the military dictatorship and to the current Brazilian government, especially during the elections, as a way of trying to prevent such a threat from being consummated. This also seems to have been - and continues to be - the justification of many supporters, both of the military dictatorship from 1964 to 1985 and of the current Brazilian government, which reinforced, during the military dictatorship, and seems to be trying to reinforce the silencing of opposers. On the other hand, the affectation of fear and anger towards the current Brazilian government, shared several times in the study group created by Gimenez (2018) and Tancetti (2018), allowed members to connect, make new friendships and build a joint review of the world, aiming the amplification and expansion of perspectives that were learned and socially reinforced. This is exemplified by the article of Tancetti and Esteves (2020) on the importance of decolonial black feminism to Analytical Psychology. The article, written by two of the group’s participants, aims to provide space for voices from decolonial and black feminist thoughts to be heard and incorporated into traditional Junguian thought.

What Echo echoes in Narcissus’ final laments may be his pain or her own pain, when she sees in him someone who was “cherished in vain”, the one to whom she bids farewell, also bidding farewell to the servitude provided by her and to the identity given to her, fulfilling the potential transformation of the punishment given by Hera, when she develops an identity that incorporates her previous one, as the goddess Acco, the voice of creation, and the nymph Echo, the voice of repetition, who becomes expressive of herself. This notion seems very relevant when we consider the importance of creating the National Truth Commission and the process of listening to victims who survived the Brazilian military dictatorship. Among the various excerpts that Saçço (2016) uses, we highlight the following:

If I was inclined to speak? […] I taught for many years, I spoke about this period. I have always been extremely critical, consciously critical, I formed critical students and I made all the critiques, I still do, but I was a person that hovered in the air, right?! So, I think this must be said (p.120).

What can be noted in the bibliographic research carried out in this essay is that there is little positive reflection on Echo as herself, by and for herself, as pointed by Soares (apud PRADO, 2015, p. 25), who states that “there will never be a representation of Echo made by herself”, which seems to reinforce the imprisonment to silencing and empty repetition from the narcissistic gaze that contemplates her. Echo’s characteristic emptiness (CAVALCANTI, 2003) seems to be due both to the relationship that Narcissus establishes with her, and to the lack of positive reflection that we give to her, in a way that they seem to give a reciprocal feedback, on a perpetual motion of submission and passivity in the understanding identity and listening to the narrative of
the Other. This idea is close to Magnabosco’s (1999) understanding of the marginalization of the discourse of resistance, which is not restricted to women, but to any group that is identified as Other by the hegemonic culture, so that can also encompass the silence experienced since the Brazilian military dictatorship and the silence imposed by the amnesty law, as pointed out by Sacço (2016).

What is given to Echo as a limitrophe identity, not autonomous, dependent on the renunciation of herself in order to search for herself seems to have been surpassed by her, but not by us, who, in our own narcissism, do not give her the opportunity for autonomy because that would hurt us, while keeping her imprisoned in a useless posture of worthless echo so that we are not touched in our own narcissistic wounds. This seems to be reinforced by Berry (2014) who states that by focusing on Narcissus, we chose the easy way out because Echo’s passion is much more complex, as her precision is like the shape of caves and valleys:

Like all of us, Narcissus would like to keep things simple. And it is much simpler to think of your self, identity and subjectivity as separated from a world of echoes – our shape and our experiences as different from what surrounds us (p. 148).

As Berry (2014, p. 150) explains, Echo’s passion is more complex because it cannot happen, and her suffering is something that must be preserved: “This sensible cultivation of suffering is an art form that has more to do with tones and moods that echo inside the psyche rather than with rules of magnitude or analytical prescriptions”.

In this essay, we could realize that Echo is an image that can help us to hear silenced voices with a worthy connotation different from that given by the hegemonic culture, supposedly universal and objective, the one that establishes what is valid and what is not valuable. With the support of studies from different fields, it seems possible to go even further than with just the psychological lens, which has its own strains, limits and narcissistic wounds. Echo, with a rediscovered self-worth, even if not recognized by the other, finds ways to express herself and seems to establish an important relationship with so many other silenced voices. As Ovid (1983) indicated, Echo uses what the other says to speak for herself, she serves the creative conjugation (CAVALCANTI, 2003), but is placed at the service of the narcissistic view in order to sustain the narcissism of the so-called “dominant”. Echo seems to relate much more to the re-inauguration of “value of the word by listening to the discourse of other people” (MAGNABOSCO, 1999, p.56), so it can transform “voices silenced by a hegemonic discourse into other discourses” (ibid, p.57).

Berry (2014) argues that Echo’s beauty is in her inflamed pathos and also in her frustration, suffering and sadness, which can echo our own feelings alike. Perhaps this is why it seemed necessary to silence Echo. Perhaps this is why it still seems necessary to silence so many voices that echo sadness and suffering in their experiences of oppression and marginalization.

The ending of Judith, Shakespeare’s sister created by Woolf (2019), is not a happy one, like so many other endings that her story can represent; just as the ending of Echo is not understood to be happy. Because of our need to avoid the suffering identified in Echo, we avoid echoing her otherness, creativity, and expression. The need to materialize and for the physicality of our desires seems to relate more to Hera’s formality than to Echo’s subtlety, who, even without her physical body, can exist, occupy spaces and create. Berry (2014) reminds us that, in the myth, there is no consummation but self-consumption, the transformation of life into death; but because they are symbolic deaths, they talk about transformation. Echo transforms herself through rejection; while we reject her creative potential, that is all she will echo back to us: the emptiness of our understanding. Once given space to be heard,
she can echo creativity, transformation, and otherness. And that is why it seems so important that we must listen to silenced voices.

However, it is essential to highlight that Echo alone did not support the suffering felt when reading the excerpts of testimonies given to the National Truth Commission (apud SAÇÇO, 2016). We need to go far beyond hegemonic cultural references to better understand silenced voices; it is necessary to listen to references of those who were silenced, whose echoes we still refuse to listen to (BREWSTER, 2020). In the myth of Echo, there are many gaps, especially regarding her pre-Hellenic past. This erasure also seems to be related to the silencing of people, cultures, nations, differences.

The identity given to Echo does not belong to her; it is something she seems to keep to herself while she plays around with us, when we call to her in an empty space and she answers us with our own voice. Hiding may have been her way to resist and face adversities, but we are living a very critical moment in our country when those silenced voices should not continue to hide, but emerge and present themselves so that we can find the Other and start functioning with otherness, where differences can exist, and they do not need to be fought against because they are seen as a threat to a fragile and narcissistic sense of integrity. Rescuing and listening to the history, discourse, and identity of those who were and still are silenced is crucial if we intend to have real otherness and autonomy. ■
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Resumo

Chamado de Eco: a escuta de vozes silenciadas

O presente trabalho tem por objetivo dar atenção a vozes silenciadas. Pelo levantamento de estudos em Psicologia Analítica sobre a figura mitológica de Eco e de Estudos Literários que correlacionam silenciamento e psicologia, buscou-se compreender o que leva ao silenciamento imposto. Foi possível compreender que o olhar hegemônico para Eco e para o Outro os coloca numa posição de pouco valor, algo também encontrado em discursos de resistência e narrativas testemunhais na área da Literatura, especialmente quando o encontro com o Outro parece ser ameaçador.
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Abstract

Llamada del Eco: la escuta de voces silenciadas

Este artículo tiene como objetivo prestar atención a las voces silenciadas. Al relevar estudios en Psicología Analítica sobre la figura mitológica de Eco y Estudios Literarios que correlacionan el silenciamiento y la psicología, buscamos comprender qué lleva al silenciamiento impuesto. Se pudo entender que la mirada hegemónica a Eco y al Otro los coloca en una posición de poco valor, algo que también se encuentra en los discursos de resistencia y las narrativas testimoniales en el campo de la literatura, especialmente cuando el encuentro con el Otro parece amenazador.

Palabras clave: Eco, voces silenciadas, psicología, literatura.
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