

## Giving Voice to the Silenced: Teolinda Gersão on Martha Freud and the Power of Fiction

---

**SANDRA SOUSA**  
UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL FLORIDA

With enthusiasm and good spirits, Teolinda Gersão and I spoke for an hour about literature, storytelling, and the power of giving voice to those often left out of dominant historical narratives. Our conversation touched on the role of fiction in shaping social change, the ability of stories to heal and challenge perspectives, and the urgent need to revisit history through a more inclusive lens.

Within this broader discussion, we delved into her latest book, *Autobiografia Não Escrita de Martha Freud* [Martha Freud's Unwritten Autobiography] (2024), which I consider not only essential but urgent—especially in a time when women's rights are being questioned or even revoked. In this novel, as in much of her vast body of work, Teolinda Gersão continues to examine the complexities of power relations, the marginalization of women, and the voices that history has silenced.

With a literary career spanning decades and numerous prestigious awards, Teolinda Gersão has firmly established herself as one of the most influential voices in contemporary Portuguese literature. In 2023, she was honored with the DST Literature Grand Prize, one of Portugal's most esteemed accolades. Gersão's extensive body of work is profoundly committed to addressing social and political issues, with a particular focus on the struggle for women's rights. Her work encompasses themes such as loneliness, family relationships, identity tensions, and gender oppression, always with refined prose and a unique sensitivity to the complexities of human experience. Author of novels such as *A Árvore das Palavras* [The Word Tree] (1997), *A Cidade de Ulisses* [The City of Ulysses] (2011), and *O Regresso de Júlia Mann a Paraty* [The Return of Júlia Mann to Paraty] (2021), Gersão has built a career marked by deep explorations of complex female characters, often focusing on women who lived on the margins of dominant historical figures.

In *Autobiografia Não Escrita de Martha Freud*, Teolinda gives voice to the woman silenced by Freud, who not only lived in the shadow of her husband's name but also bore the weight of a patriarchal society that prevented her from fully expressing herself. This female figure, often ignored or misinterpreted, now emerges with renewed strength and a humanity that transcends the boundaries of her time. The book, with its blend of historical rigor and literary sensitivity, not only challenges Freud's legacy but also invites us to reflect on the persistence of gender inequalities today. With her

keen insight and courage, Teolinda Gersão continues to affirm her relevance in literature, creating a work that, as always, serves as a beacon of critique and resistance.

Sandra Sousa (S.S.): *Teolinda, your literary career spans several decades and has explored a variety of themes and settings. What initially inspired you to become a writer, and how has your creative journey evolved over time?*

Teolinda Gersão (T.G.): I have been writing since childhood—I have always loved stories and always knew I wanted to be a writer. Writing felt as natural as breathing or walking; not writing never seemed like an option. Studying also came easily to me—I am curious and enjoy research.

I realized that making a living from writing in Portugal was not feasible, so I pursued a master's and a PhD and became a university professor. I loved teaching, especially the connection with students, particularly in PhD seminars where I had the privilege of working with brilliant minds. However, I retired early, even though it was financially challenging. By then, I had already published a few books, but I could only write during summer breaks. From that moment on, I was finally able to dedicate myself fully to writing. I believe I am a writer of the unconscious, of what is difficult to put into words. I write about what I do not know, and it is precisely this “not knowing” that drives me forward.

I have no pre-established format and never plan my next book—it simply happens. My books are always very different from one another, each venturing into uncharted territory.

S.S.: *Your work often engages with feminist themes. How has your understanding and approach to feminism influenced your writing?*

T.G.: I believe the opposite happened: it was through writing that I realized the extent to which feminine/feminist themes interested me. But I don't concern myself with theories, definitions, classifications, or labels—I leave that work to researchers. Likewise, everything I know about literature and literary theory is swept away and disappears when I write. Writing is a way of “unlearning” and rethinking what has been passed down to us.

S.S.: *Female characters play a central role in many of your stories. How do you go about developing these characters, and what do you hope readers take away from their experiences?*

It's easy for me to step into the shoes of female characters—they come from a reality I know well and am a part of. But I have also placed myself in the skin of male characters—after all, we are all in the same boat. In *A Cidade de Ulisses*, for example (published in the U.S. by Dalkey Archive), the narrator and central character is a man. Seeing human relationships through his eyes was a fascinating experience, one that allowed me to better understand “the other side.”

I would like to lead my readers to reflect and gain a deeper understanding of the world and life—starting with their own. In the end, the great question is: Who are we? What is the human being, in their inner and outer reality? How do we relate to one another? This question belongs to both literature and philosophy—their paths are simply different.

S.S.: *In your view, how has the role of women in society changed over the years, both in Portugal and in the Lusophone world or, if you want, globally?*

T.G.: It has progressed enormously in recent years, but there is still much to be done. We are still far from gender equality, even in basic aspects such as equal pay and status. For any job or task, we have to prove our competence far more than men do.

S.S.: *Looking at the current landscape of gender equality, do you feel that younger generations of women are facing different challenges than previous ones? How do you think literature can contribute to these ongoing conversations?*

T.G.: In some aspects, the struggle of women is now more widely accepted, but there is still a great deal of machismo in institutions and society. Literature can and should facilitate dialogue between the sexes, yes. But it cannot be a pamphlet or serve an ideology—literature is a work of art, which is why it touches us so deeply. The world is too dangerous and dark. We need beauty to survive. A world without art would be uninhabitable.

S.S.: *You have lived in both Portugal and Germany. How would you compare the roles and perceptions of women in these two countries, both in literature and in society?*

T.G.: I lived in Germany in my early twenties, as a student and as a Lecturer for Portuguese language and literature. At the time, the difference was enormous; Portugal was under a dictatorship until April 1974. Now there are no remarkable differences.

Sandra Sousa (S.S.): *Teolinda, thank you so much for your generosity in providing me with *Autobiografia Não Escrita de Martha Freud*. This book deeply moved me and, I must confess, left me feeling angry and frustrated with Freud. What kind of reactions have you received from readers regarding the book?*

Teolinda Gersão (T.G.): It has been going well; I have received very positive feedback. The Portuguese Society of Psychoanalysis invited me to speak about the book in March, which is a good sign. There will certainly be those who won't like it, especially orthodox Freudians, but the president is a young and open-minded person, and she was the one who invited me. Besides, it has been more than a hundred years since Freud's death – the world has changed, and many things have evolved.

S.S.: *I hope so. I was unsettled for a whole month...*

T.G.: Yes, it anguished me too. He was terrible...

S.S.: *What inspired you to write this book? How did the idea of giving a voice to Martha Freud, a historically silenced figure, come about?*

T.G.: As I previously mentioned, I studied in Germany for three years, received a scholarship, and in my third year, I worked as a Portuguese lecturer at the Technical University of Berlin. My thesis advisor, Walter Höllerer, was also a professor there and a well-known writer. I had read a lot of Freud and Jung; deep psychology is interesting and sometimes useful in interpreting texts.

But I hadn't read Freud for years – I didn't follow that path, nor was I particularly drawn to his work. However, I do recognize that he had a strong command of language and wrote very compelling essays, such as *The Uncanny (Das Unheimliche)*. He had a close connection with literature and envied writers. The theme of “psychoanalysis and literature” fascinated him – he was always an avid reader and aspired to be a writer and an artist.

About four and a half years ago, I came across an online announcement for the first volume of Sigmund and Martha's letters, which stated that their entire correspondence during their four-year engagement would be published. I ordered the first volume and found it so intriguing that I immediately purchased the others. They were published at intervals: 2011, 2013, 2015, and then the fourth volume only in 2019, with a four-year gap. The fifth volume has yet to be released, and we don't even know if it ever will be, as it covers the most turbulent period of their engagement. Just a few weeks before their already scheduled wedding, Freud decided he would end everything unless Martha cut ties with her brother and family. I don't know if the fifth volume will be published – the editors were meticulous and rigorous, filling the books with footnotes and detailed lists of all the names mentioned. However, there is always a structural issue: they strive at all costs to absolve Freud of any flaws, faults, or blemishes.

In the preface to the first volume, they claim that, during the period when Freud and Martha exchanged letters but barely saw each other, they both underwent a “sentimental education” that led to a perfect and harmonious marriage. Yet the first book is titled *Be Mine, As I Imagine You* (he repeatedly writes “*as I want*”), because he intended to shape her into his ideal woman – an obviously impossible task. For the last volume, they chose as a title a phrase taken from a letter sent from Paris: “*To accept you as you are.*” But in reality, Freud did the exact opposite – he tried to end the engagement over an irrational demand. The so-called “sentimental education” never actually happened.

S.S.: *Are these editions in German?*

T.G.: Yes, they are in German. I read them attentively over the years, and I also read other articles related to some of the issues addressed in them. I also went back to reading the letters to Fliess, which

Freud absolutely did not want to be published. However, they have been published in various languages and recount his self-analysis.

The letters he exchanged with his daughter Anna are also translated, and I read them as well. Anna dedicated/sacrificed herself to her father's work, as is evident in that correspondence. She was the ideal woman he had always desired: completely devoted to him, a virgin, with no other man in her life. In fact, all those who tried to get close to her were driven away by Freud... The Freud-Anna relationship was strange and complex. As we know, he was not an easy person.

When I read the correspondence between Sigmund and Martha, I said to myself: "I cannot remain silent; this is so intense and violent that people need to be informed, through the direct source, about what they wrote to each other. And Martha's figure cannot remain unknown."

Her letters are calm and sensible, revealing great empathy. She was a woman capable of putting herself in someone else's place, which was not the case with Freud. She tried to help him, accepted his flaws, and sought to correct them.

But he says in one of the letters: "I have within me all the demons that torment me, and they also turn against you. So, if despite everything you still want to love me, the responsibility is yours." He felt or knew himself to be incapable of change – it always had to be her changing according to his wishes.

Martha obviously could not cure him. He himself tried to heal but failed. In the letters to Fliess, he often refers to "my neurosis," "my hysteria," "my illness." He would easily fall into depression and was never able to overcome that tendency.

S.S.: *The themes of gender roles and power dynamics that you address in the book remain highly relevant today. Was it the persistence of inequality and violence against women that motivated you to write about Martha Freud? What led you to bring this issue to light from this perspective?*

T.G.: It is a topic that, unfortunately, remains relevant. In Portugal, we still see women being murdered by their partners – almost every week, there is a case in the news. And domestic violence also profoundly affects children, who witness the abuse or even the death of their mothers at the hands of a deranged husband.

Today, domestic violence is considered a public crime. In the past, it was mistakenly said to be a family issue when, in reality, it is a public matter. I have always defended the cause of women because we are still the weaker link. The world was built by men and for their convenience. They have always delegated child-rearing, household care, and everything else to women. They were absent, busy with work – which was a convenient excuse to choose the more comfortable role.

Now that we also work, have careers, and hold responsibilities equal to men in society, we realize that we still face inequalities. Often, we earn less – this is strikingly evident in Portugal. We have fewer rights, we are less frequently chosen for important positions because we get pregnant, and employers do not want to grant maternity leave. Society still does not make things easier for us – there are no incentives for part-time work, and there are no adequate support networks. And there is a feeling of guilt that follows us. When we leave a small child at home, crying in the arms of a nanny we do not fully trust – because she is always a stranger – we feel guilty. And children feel our absence too. But men do not carry that burden.

S.S.: *Are you a mother?*

T.G.: Yes. I have two daughters and two grandchildren, and fortunately, everything turned out well. But it was often tough – I was left without any domestic support, had classes to prepare, and it was very complicated.

S.S.: *We are talking about progress and the achievements of women, and we are in the 21st century, yet, due to certain political measures, I often feel that we are regressing and that everything we have fought for is being taken away. What is your perspective on this?*

T.G.: Yes, we are all very concerned about what will happen in the United States, which has been the greatest global power. We are seeing that there will be states where voluntary abortion will be prohibited. There are many areas where we are regressing, and that is very worrying. We fought so hard for this in Portugal and in Europe... In France, for example, it is already part of the Constitution. It is a woman's right, the right to have control over their own body.

S.S.: *I didn't want to stray too far from the book...*

T.G.: But the book came about because I have always been on the side of women. There was a review that just came out in *Jornal de Letras*, by Miguel Real, where he says that, after April 25, 1974, no other Portuguese writer has dedicated herself as much as I have to women's and feminist issues. It's true that this is a central theme in my books: the situation of women.

S.S.: *Both *Autobiografia Não Escrita de Martha Freud* and *O Regresso de Júlia Mann a Paraty* [The Return of Julia Mann to Paraty] explore the lives of women who lived in the shadow of famous men and whose voices were historically silenced. What draws you to these figures? Do you see parallels between Martha Freud and Julia Mann in terms of how they were marginalized, or do they represent entirely different narrative challenges for you?*

T.G.: They are very different. Julia Mann was an artist, and it was through her that art entered the Mann family, but she was also accused of bringing emotional instability to the family, which is

absolutely false. There were psychologically troubled people among the Manns, and there is even a possibility that Julia Mann's husband may have committed suicide. But if that was the case, the blame wasn't on her; the husband was a depressive person, and one of his brothers was a very disturbed figure. So, the emotional imbalances didn't come from Julia, but because she was mixed-race, foreign, and from a country considered to be part of the Third World, it was assumed that she was the cause of everything wrong or bad that happened. Even Thomas Mann himself said that, since his father was German and his grandfather was too, only a quarter of his and his siblings' blood was Latin. He tried to push as far away as possible the genetic heritage from his mother. That's why, in the book, I wrote a chapter imagining Thomas Mann conversing with Freud, where he admits that, in his books, there is often a foreign mother, different from the German mothers, whom the children are ashamed of. Which is very significant. This is not the case with Martha Freud, who lived in the same country and came from a Jewish family, just like Freud. Jung was the first non-Jewish person in the Freudian circle and in his psychoanalytic group. Freud considered him indispensable so that people wouldn't think of psychoanalysis as a Jewish theory that only applied to some. But, of course, later on, Freud broke with Jung when they began to disagree on certain aspects.

S.S.: *He cut ties with everyone who disagreed with him.*

T.G.: Exactly! Jung did not accept that sexuality was the root of all evils and believed that the human psyche was much more complex. He disagreed with many aspects of Freud's theory, as well as Freud's imposition that his authority could not be questioned.

S.S.: *That's one of the most fascinating aspects – how someone who pioneered psychoanalysis seemed to understand so little about the complexity of the human being. Freud is a contradiction in himself.*

T.G.: It's a total contradiction. In fact, Jung recounts that in 1909, they traveled together to the United States to present psychoanalysis to the American Medical Society. Jung had married a wealthy woman and traveled first class, while Freud traveled in a much cheaper class. During the trip, they agreed to share and analyze each other's dreams. At one point, Freud shared a dream, but Jung said to him, "There are many details missing here; you need to tell me the circumstances." Freud replied, "No, I refuse to do that, because it would undermine my authority." Jung found this attitude unacceptable.

S.S.: *The title *Unwritten Autobiography* is fascinating – almost a paradox. Could you explain its meaning and how it reflects the essence of the book? Do you see the title as a form of symbolic justice, an opportunity for Martha to finally tell her story?*

T.G.: In part, yes. But, getting to know Martha through the letters, I realized she was a very dedicated person, especially to her children, and she didn't want them or her grandchildren to know what she

had gone through. She believed – and was completely right – that their lives would be very hard, and she didn't want to take away their good childhood memories.

On the other hand, she feared that her daughter Anna would destroy any manuscript of hers, or that an editor wouldn't trust her or, worse, would emphasize the negative aspects of Freud to make more money from it. She feared that her manuscript would be altered and used for various interests. She knew Anna would destroy it and saw no way to preserve it safely for later publication. That's why she renounced the pages she had already written. She had started writing with great enthusiasm, trying to answer the question: "What was my place in all of this? Who was I? I was forced to remain silent, to be a housewife, a mother of children, never having a voice or public appearances." But my portrayal isn't just that.

S.S.: *Is all of this in the letters?*

T.G.: Yes, everything is in the letters. She had a very dim role, imposed by Freud, who wanted all the space for himself; she existed to serve him. In fact, she would put his briefcase next to his toothbrush so that he wouldn't lose a few seconds and could devote himself entirely to his work.

She fulfilled the role of mother, protector, and pillar of the family – everything Freud demanded – but she was much more than that. She understood, but rejected, psychoanalysis. She thought it was sickly, morbid, doing more harm than good. In fact, she believed it mostly did harm and absolutely didn't want Freud to conduct observation experiments with the children. For her, psychoanalysis stopped at their bedroom door. She managed to impose that – but not with Anna. Anyway, she wanted to know: "After all, what was my role in this family?" Rereading the letters, she realized that from the beginning, Freud needed her support. She was the sensible, realistic, down-to-earth person who listened to his complaints, his depressions, his lack of self-confidence, and tried to help him – but she couldn't.

Martha was, in a way, his first psychoanalyst. She listened to him for years, and he told her everything, even things that were unnecessary and cruel, like when he wrote to her from Paris about how he imagined his life would be if he married Charcot's daughter, which would guarantee him success and a career, etc. Why would he say that to her? But her response letter was destroyed. In fact, of the letters that were published, many disappeared, and others exist only in fragments.

S.S.: *Teolinda, did you have to imagine some of these letters?*

T.G.: No, I based everything purely on what is written. But there are letters that respond to others that no longer exist, and you can tell. Some appear only as fragments, as the editor points out.

I have always considered that the authors of the letters are responsible for what they wrote. Martha remains sensible and coherent. She was emotionally stable and incredibly strong; she endured things

that many other women wouldn't have been able to, they would have broken down, fallen ill – she herself, at certain moments, also got sick and depressed – but in the end, she survived. And, above all, she detached herself from Freud. At a certain point, he became indifferent to her. She even somewhat accepted that he had an affair with her sister, Minna, who lived with them. Recently, I found an essay that mentioned something I didn't know: there wasn't even a door between Martha and Freud's room and Minna's – just a screen. In the book, I mentioned a door because I thought it was impossible that there wasn't some sort of separation, but apparently, there wasn't even that. The three of them always had to enter and exit through the same door. When I visited the Freud Museum in Vienna, that intimate part of the house was never shown to us – only a few rooms.

S.S.: *I find it interesting that, in the end, Martha questions herself: "Who was I? What was my role?" Does this appear explicitly in any letter?*

T.G.: It doesn't appear literally, but it's implied. She detached herself. She started traveling alone, went to Hamburg with her daughter Sophie when she got married, helped organize the house, and left Freud to Minna. She finally created her own life. Over time, Minna also aged, gained weight, and became an aunt with back pain. And Freud, always needing a beautiful feminine figure to project his fantasies, fell in love with his own daughter, Anna.

S.S.: *Do you believe Minna had an abortion?*

T.G.: Definitely. And it's a profoundly perverse fact. In an article written by a critic, published in the United States, this hypothesis is confirmed: he researched and found, on a particular day, a guestbook entry from a hotel in Switzerland where it was noted: "Prof. Dr. Freud and Madam." Now, that "madam" Freud was with on that date was not Martha, but Minna.

Orthodox Freudians quickly came up with excuses: "There were no other hotels available," "They could have stayed in one room, but surely in separate beds," "Nothing happened between them." In the book, I sarcastically comment on these arguments because I have read numerous texts with similar justifications, including one claiming that Freud's sexual history was "pure as a lily."

S.S.: *Do you think orthodox Freudians struggle to face certain realities?*

T.G.: Definitely. For many, Freud's doctrine became almost like a religion. When the Society of Psychoanalysis invited me to speak about the book, I gladly accepted, but I made my position clear: in the 21st century, there are no taboos, no untouchable figures. Free examination of texts is allowed. Even the sacred books of religions are critically analyzed – so why should Freud's letters be any different? The letters reveal things that can no longer be ignored. But there are those who have built their entire careers on the premise that Freudian theory is a universal, timeless truth, applicable to all

people forever, and then, suddenly, they see their foundation crumble, as if the rug were pulled out from under their feet. On the other hand, if one is open to evolution and critical thinking, I believe that a psychologist or psychiatrist can play a very positive role. The “cure by word” – a term coined by Bertha Pappenheim, a patient of Breuer – is a valuable concept. Breuer, who was Freud’s mentor and a second father to him, used this approach with empathy and respect for the patient. Freud cut ties with Breuer, despite owing him so much. But Breuer never abandoned Bertha, even when she developed an imaginary pregnancy, convinced that she was giving birth to his child. Breuer’s wife was initially jealous, but later understood the situation, and Breuer continued to support the patient. Bertha, who many considered a “hysterical madwoman,” eventually healed and became an active advocate for women’s rights. She created a support network for single mothers and poor Jewish women who were often forced into prostitution. She organized free food programs for needy families and translated the first diary ever written in German by a woman, one of her ancestors. She saw psychoanalysis as equivalent to confession for Catholics: everything depended on the listener and how they advised and welcomed the person. Essentially, the effectiveness of the process depended as much on the character of the therapist as on the abilities of the person seeking help. I believe that empathetic listening can save lives. During a phase in my life, I felt that the university was too much of a closed, intellectual bubble, so I decided to dive into concrete reality. I worked for several years at SOS Voz Amiga, an emotional support helpline. We received training with psychiatrists for six months, and then we took calls from people in despair, many with suicidal thoughts. We had weekly meetings to discuss the most difficult cases and tried to provide ongoing support by telling people when we would next be available. It was a fascinating job. If I hadn’t been a teacher, I might have pursued clinical psychology – I think I could have helped many people. And yes, I believe a conversation can prevent suicide. Understanding and listening to someone, and speaking with them, can make all the difference.

S.S.: *Beyond literature as a form of expression, do you feel that your books serve a therapeutic role, both for you and for your readers?*

T.G.: Yes, I believe so. I receive many letters from readers telling me just that.

S.S.: *During the writing process, what was the biggest challenge you faced in giving voice to Martha Freud?*

T.G.: I don’t know how to answer in detail. I didn’t set goals or objectives; I just wanted to do my best to bring attention to a forgotten or never truly known female character. That was all. Of course, I knew the book would likely have an impact.

S.S.: *When delving into the letters, was it challenging to balance Martha’s voice between what she felt at the moment and what she might have reflected on years later?*

T.G.: Yes, it's evident that, in her seventies, she wouldn't read the letters with the same eyes as she did when she wrote them at twenty. She learned a lot from life, from Freud, and from herself. She went through a wide range of experiences and couldn't see things in the same way. She had critical thinking and the capacity for evolution and transformation. For example, when she wrote to her fiancé saying she was cold in negative temperatures, and he authorized her to buy a blanket for twenty-eight marks but never sent it, while buying a gold watch for himself, she could have responded more firmly. Loving someone means wanting that person to live better, not just living for oneself without caring about the other. He even wrote: "I pity that my parents live so poorly, but I am selfish or self-centered enough to refuse anything to myself." Martha realized who he truly was. In the beginning, she was convinced he was different, or capable of change, and started with a great passion for him. Some critics say that she took too long to love him and that he insisted so much that he eventually won her over, but that's a completely incorrect reading of the facts. Two plus two is four, and we can't choose to be willfully blind and say it's five. Of course, those people are intelligent and cultured, but they refuse to acknowledge Freud's mistakes to such an extent that they end up writing absurdities. This made me want to bring the real facts (written by them themselves) to people's attention.

S.S.: *Beyond revealing a new perspective on Freud, what reflections do you hope to provoke in readers regarding the role of women in history and psychoanalysis?*

T.G.: I hope readers grasp what life was like in 19th-century Germany and how similar it was elsewhere. Being in a Jewish milieu may have made things harder for women, but the reality wasn't so different from non-Jewish women's lives. I want readers to reflect on the past, appreciate the freedoms we've fought for, and never take them for granted. We must defend democracy, free speech, and our rights. I also want them to see the quiet but persistent struggle of women. Martha was a fighter—she had moments of weakness but always found herself again.

S.S.: *After such a significant work as this, are there any new literary projects you can share with us? Do you consider *Autobiografia Não Escrita de Martha Freud* and *O Regresso de Júlia Mann a Paraty* to be the culmination of this theme, or are there still other voices to rescue in your creative journey?*

T.G.: I have projects, but for now, I'm focused on getting the book translated. I receive many invitations for launches and library events, so I'm quite busy. At the moment, I'm not writing. Usually, after six months, sometimes a year, after releasing a book, I'm absorbed by the work of making it known. Especially this time, because it's probably my strongest book, and I have invested the most in it, as if I had a moral obligation to share information that has been withheld from people.

S.S.: *Teolinda, thank you so much for granting me this opportunity to exchange some ideas with you.*

### **Selected Works**

Gersão, Teolinda. *Autobiografia não escrita de Martha Freud*. Porto Editora, 2024.

Gersão, Teolinda. *O Regresso de Julia Mann a Paraty*. Porto Editora, 2021.

Gersão, Teolinda. *Passagens*. Sextante, 2014.

Gersão, Teolinda. *As Águas Livres*. Sextante, 2013.

Gersão, Teolinda. *A Cidade de Ulisses*. Porto Editora, 2011.

Gersão, Teolinda. *O Silêncio*. Porto Editora, 2007.

Gersão, Teolinda. *A Mulher que Prendeu a Chuva*. Porto Editora, 2007.

Gersão, Teolinda. *A Árvore das Palavras*. Porto Editora, 1997.