

SHAKESPEAREAN PERFORMANCE REVIEWING IN BRAZIL

This essay explores the ways in which the reception of Shakespearean drama in performance in Brazil is marked by purist stances during the late nineteenth century and the first part of the twentieth century, and reformist ones from the 1980s on. Purists are sceptical of productions that relocate “universal” and “timeless” contents of the canon. Reformists tend to appraise positively the updated productions that illuminate the social and political dimension of old themes, or radical approaches, which unsettle universals and deconstruct power relations. The choice of play-text was often crucial for critics who monumentalized the Bard. Since directors tended to use “True” versions in Portuguese written by translators who claimed to have recreated the verse, critics praised them for having articulated the “essence” (a term used to exhaustion) of the drama. With disregard for transmission history, great emphasis was placed on acting, costume and set design, often pointing out the coherence with the fictional historical period. Yet covering aspects of form without much regard to content was a distinguishing feature of reactionary positions in the context of dictatorships.

The emergence of counter-discourses that coexist with essentialism after the 1960s, and the current diversity of Internet relational modes, such as interactive sites and blogs of the theatre companies allowing for audiences to post comments, have also introduced changes in traditional theatre reviewing. However, there are no comprehensive works about Shakespearean theatre reviewing in Brazil, no extensive research informing, for instance, its availability in periodicals. The articles and other sources I have selected for this essay, therefore, are representative of the limited scholarship regarding the subject.

A much-discussed theme is the choice of translated play-text for production, as transmission through translation implies a never-ending process of rewriting. Marcia Martins, who has surveyed the translation history of Shakespeare’s works in Brazilian Portuguese, has generated a databank that currently covers 172 titles. She introduces this databank with a quotation by critic Eugênio Gomes, who “recommended that translations of Shakespeare’s works should be done from

time to time in Brazil as it happens in other countries [...] According to him, each generation must pay this tribute to the Bard” (my translation).¹

The first Shakespearean play translated into Brazilian Portuguese was *Hamlet*, in 1933. The earlier/colonial stagings of Shakespearean plays were performed by companies from Portugal that relied on continental Portuguese versions. João Caetano dos Santos (1835-1863), known as the first Brazilian actor to perform Shakespearean roles, also used editions by Portuguese translators. The works of Pascoal Carlos Magno in the 1940s and actor Sérgio Cardoso in the 1960s, who also are well known, could count by then on available versions in Brazilian Portuguese.²

In a previous survey, I pointed out that the earliest theatrical activity pertinent to Shakespearean drama in Brazil can be traced to the 1800s, even before independence from Portugal in 1822.³ José Roberto O’Shea has restated this position in his study of Caetano⁴ and argues that even our foremost theatre critic, Décio de Almeida Prado⁵, who

1. Citation in Portuguese: “O crítico e shakespeareanista brasileiro Eugênio Gomes tinha a mesma opinião, e chegou a recomendar que, no Brasil, as traduções da obra de Shakespeare fossem refeitas periodicamente, como sucede em outros países [...] Segundo ele, cada geração precisa prestar essa homenagem ao poeta inglês”. Available at <<http://www.lettras.puc-rio.br/shakespeare/default.php>>, accessed 23/10/2011.

2. *Hamlet* has been translated into Portuguese by 15 different translators since 1933, followed by *Macbeth* (13 versions), *Romeo and Juliet* (11), *King Lear* (10), and *Othello* (9), while the other works have received between 7 and 3 translations each. For a complete description of each entry, see <<http://www.lettras.puc-rio.br/shakespeare/database/>>. Charts are available at <http://www.lettras.puc-rio.br/shakespeare/pdfs/traducoes_publicadas_por_peca.pdf>, accessed 23/10/2011.

3. Margarida G. Rauen, “Brazil”, *The Oxford Companion to Shakespeare*, ed. Michael Dobson & Stanley Wells (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2001), 54.

4. José Roberto O’Shea, “Early Shakespearean Stars Performing in Brazilian Skies: João Caetano and National Theater”, *Latin American Shakespeares*, ed. Bernice W. Kliman & Rick J. Santos (Madison/Teaneck: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2005), 25-36.

5. Décio de Almeida Prado, *João Caetano: o ator, o*

considered Caetano a celebrity, was mistaken in assuming that he performed play-texts that were translated from English editions: "Under the influence of the Brazilian poet and dramatist Domingos José Gonçalves de Magalhães, Caetano, relatively early in his career, decided to meet the challenge of performing *Othello* and *Hamlet*, in translations done by Magalhães himself, not based on Shakespeare but on Ducis".⁶ O'Shea also adds that in 1900 "Artur Azevedo, perhaps, the most nationalistic of the Brazilian critics, turned out a condemnation"⁷ accusing Caetano of not having produced Brazilian plays despite being paid by the State to work preferably with national drama. O'Shea, nevertheless, mentions that Caetano did play numerous roles by Brazilian dramatists, in addition to many others by European playwrights. This scenario indicates the bias of a generation of critics who engaged in nationalistic politics in the beginning of the twentieth century, later aggravated during the Getúlio Vargas dictatorship, when an act banned foreign languages from the school curriculum.

In this Lusophone context with a mixed French and English influence, another shift of perspective occurs with Eugênio Gomes.⁸ He was writing in 1961 and is considered as the earliest historian of Shakespearean influence and transmission in Brazil, distinctive for his Anglophone background as he takes sides with John Dover Wilson and William Hazlitt, among others (New Critics included), to restate essentialist points of view, such as judging *King Lear* improper for performance and stressing the literary rather than the theatrical aspect of the plays. In the chapter "*Hamlet através do tempo*" [*Hamlet through the ages*], Gomes draws on a 1907 review by Pires de Almeida to comment on the appropriation and reception of a Shakespearean *Hamlet* and of the one by Ducis as translated into Portuguese by Oliveira Silva.⁹ According to Gomes, Shakespeare's *Hamlet* was unsuccessfully staged by actor João Caetano for the first time in Rio in 1835. Gomes's reasoning is worth citing fully as he goes on to compare this 1835 production with the Ducis version done in 1840, also by João Caetano:

empresário, o repertório (São Paulo: EDUSP/Perspectiva, 1972).

6. O'Shea, *Early Shakespearean...*, 29.

7. O'Shea, *Early Shakespearean...*, 35.

8. Eugênio Gomes, *Shakespeare no Brasil* (Ministério da Educação e Cultura. Departamento de Imprensa Nacional, 1961).

9. Pires de Almeida is cited by Eugênio Gomes, but the piece was not available.

Our audiences could not take Hamlet's rude treatment of Ophelia [...] nor the embarrassing situation between mother and son and not even the gloomy and jesting cemetery scene. Five years later, Ducis's *Hamlet* re-emerged on stage [...] and the same audience that had rejected the Shakespearean tragedy applauded this unfortunate imitation of a great play. In honour of our culture, one must say that the Brazilian actor could not accept this bad taste of our audiences and, at a certain point, he produced Ducis's and Shakespeare's *Hamlet* alternately. Facts such as this were not rare in performances of *Hamlet* in the Latin world, where theatre featured a strong predominance of the French spirit.¹⁰

This passage conveys Gomes's concern with the multiple ways a play can be staged, marking his Anglophone and purist stances. Nevertheless, he believes that "Hamlet is alas the chameleon protagonist who always takes the colour of the land where it passes",¹¹ ironically blaming Raymond Mander and Joe Mitchenson for not having included the productions featuring João Caetano and Sérgio Cardoso (São Paulo, 1957) in their anthology *Hamlet Through the Ages*.¹² Thus, Gomes's discourse is not consistently multicultural. He echoes the nationalism of his predecessors on a different note because he was not moved by xenophobia; rather he was seeking inclusion in the Anglophone academic setting.

The 1960s featured the emergence of Barbara Heliadora, whose purist point of view has provoked many a reaction amongst performance artists. Marcia Martins¹³ points out the historical value of Heliadora's brief history of translation and production of Shakespearean plays in Brazil.¹⁴

10. Gomes, *Shakespeare no Brasil...*, 238 (my translation).

11. Gomes, *Shakespeare no Brasil...*, 239 (my translation).

12. London: Rockliff, 1952 is the edition referenced by Gomes (p. 241), who also mentions Brazilian Theatre historian Múcio da Paixão writing about feminine Hamlets performed in Brazil by the Italian actress Jacintha Pezzara Gualtieri (São Pedro Theatre, 1882), by Sarah Bernhardt (Teatro Lírico, 1905) and by Portuguese actress Angela Pinto (Apolo Theatre, 1910).

13. Marcia Amaral Peixoto Martins, "Shakespeare em tradução no Brasil", *Shakespeare, sua época e sua obra*, ed. Marlene Soares dos Santos & Liana de Camargo Leão (Curitiba: Beatrice, 2008), 301-19. Another piece by Martins is "Shakespeare no Brasil: Fontes de Referência e Primeiras Traduções", available at <<http://www.maxwell.lambda.ele.puc-rio.br/12701/12701.PDF>>, accessed 23/10/2011.

14. Barbara Heliadora C. de M. F. De Almeida, "Shakespeare in Brazil", *Shakespeare Survey 20, Shakespearean and Other Tragedy*, ed. Kenneth Muir (1967). Available at <http://cco.cambridge.org/extract?id=ccol0521069009_CCOL0521069009A013>.

A bibliography in honour of Shakespeare's 400th anniversary, organized by Celuta Moreira Gomes and Thereza da Silva Aguiar in 1965, published by the Ministry of Education and Culture and the National Library (Rio de Janeiro, 1965), illustrates the enormous interest in Shakespeare in the context of the military dictatorship that swept to power in 1964.¹⁵ Given the focus of this essay upon theatre reviewing, I must claim that this volume deserves attention for listing the diverse use of Shakespearean works for official cultural production in the opening of the military regime. The entries include items published exclusively in 1964 in 39 periodicals from the states of Bahia, Minas Gerais, Rio de Janeiro, Rio Grande do Sul, Paraná, Pará, Pernambuco and São Paulo, which Gomes and Aguiar list in the volume (page 15), although most entries are from major newspapers from São Paulo city (*Folha de S. Paulo* and *O Estado de São Paulo*) and from Rio (*Correio da Manhã*, *Jornal do Brasil* and *O Globo*.) The volume features black and white photographs of productions, including several depicting actor Sergio Cardoso in nineteen different roles from *Hamlet* in the amusing piece "The rest is silence", described as a slide projection about Shakespeare (where he lived, important persons of the time, famous artists who played his characters, facsimiles of some early editions of his works), narrated by Sônia Oiticica. Sérgio Cardoso plays nineteen characters using fourteen different costumes, masks, wigs and other props.¹⁶

Three production accounts and one review are listed. The review by Décio de Almeida Prado¹⁷ (1964) is annotated as follows:

"The rest is Silence", if not the most exact, nor the deepest Shakespearean exegesis that we have heard during this year [...] perhaps it is the one that provides the greatest pleasure and amazement for the audience, given the aptly and carefully prepared juxtaposition of visual and audio elements. Published with the initials D.A.P.¹⁸

accessed 14/02/2012. Barbara Heliodora has translated the complete works of Shakespeare into Portuguese. She still writes reviews for *O Globo* newspaper in Rio de Janeiro.

15. Celuta Gomes & Thereza da Silva Aguiar, eds., *William Shakespeare no Brasil. Bibliografia das Comemorações do Quarto Centenário – 1964* (Rio de Janeiro: Divisão de Publicações e Divulgação da Biblioteca Nacional, Ministério da Educação e Cultura, 1965).

16. Gomes and Aguiar, *William Shakespeare...*, 101.

17. Prado. "O resto é silêncio", *O Estado de São Paulo* (13 Dec. 1964), 21.

18. Gomes and Aguiar, *William Shakespeare...*, 103.

Whatever a critic might say during the censorship years, this passage suggests Prado's irony regarding the actual productions connected with the anniversary celebrations. Various items covering 1964 stage productions both in Brazil and abroad, operas, ballets, cinema, radio, television and disc (vinyl) are listed in the bulk of the volume, in a section entitled "Representations".¹⁹

The line "The rest is silence" serves indeed as an epitaph for the various decades of censorship that marked both the Brazilian creative processes and theatre reviewing from 1964 to the 1990s. Augusto Boal's leadership regarding postcolonial performance is incontestable, as is his Theatre of the Oppressed aesthetics. Marlene Soares dos Santos has discussed his work with the Arena Theatre (São Paulo) from 1956 to 1964 (before the military coup) and from 1964 to 1971:

For eight years Boal and the Arena could try, develop, and actually realize their idea of a national theatre, with a popular voice, that aimed at making its audience politically aware and encouraged it to believe in its power to change the *status quo* [...] after the coup, the Arena had to find a way to evade censorship.²⁰

Santos goes on to consider the reception of Boal's *A Tempestade* (1981), a parody of Shakespeare's *Tempest*, also conveying the conflict between purist and reformist views. Whereas critic Flávio Marinho rejects the idea of parody, defining it as a poor storm (in comparison to Shakespeare's magic storm), critic Yan Michalsky advocates that the differences between Shakespeare and Boal must be noted.²¹ Boal had been John Gassner's student at Columbia University in New York and joined the Brooklyn Writer's Group in 1954, following an invitation by Langston Hughes, which he fondly mentions in his autobiography.²² Boal describes himself as a "Columbia man", wanting to think about great works, yet describes his own conflicted mission to take a position against cultural colonialism.²³ Such is the difference that must be

19. Gomes and Aguiar, *William Shakespeare...*, 53-172.

20. Marlene Soares dos Santos, "Theater for the Oppressed: Augusto Boal's *A Tempestade*", *Brazilian Readings of Shakespeare*, ed. Aimara da Cunha Resende (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2002), 42-54, 47-48.

21. dos Santos, "Theater for the Oppressed...", 52.

22. Augusto Boal, *Hamlet e o filho do padeiro* (Rio de Janeiro/São Paulo: Record, 2000).

23. Boal, *Hamlet...*, 176. Boal considers *Revolution in South America* (1960) his first "important play" in which he investigates Brechtian procedures, continually developed in Arena projects in the early 1960s. Boal and his group left Brazil after the promulgation of AI-5

accounted for in his *Tempest*, a play that, like most parodies, unsettles a cultural icon.

Roberto Rocha has written a remarkable essay about a production of *Coriolanus* in 1974, with the late actor Paulo Autran and directed by Celso Nunes, arguing that

... censorship, although not as rigid as in the period 1969-70, just after the promulgation of the AI-5 [Institutional Act number five] on 13 December 1968, was still very severe with regard to cultural production. [...] Any news that was prejudicial to the good image of the government could not be published or broadcast.²⁴

Director Nunes was technically committed to “the international theatrical avant-garde. He graduated as a director at the Sorbonne [and was] influenced by German expressionism, Antonin Artaud, and Jerzy Grotowski”.²⁵ Although Nunes experimented with these modernist aesthetic choices, the production did not feature a radical approach to content and “did not achieve its goal of criticizing the regime”.²⁶ This result was, perhaps, convenient to avoid censorship and granted him the authorization to open the box office.

It is worthy of note that before launching a play, companies had to perform it for a censorship committee. A censor might simply ban the play, or impose cuts and changes before issuing the permit for public viewing.²⁷ No entertainment event was launched without official clearing. Maria Cristina Costa offers a comprehensive discussion of this complex period in Brazilian history.²⁸ More than

[Institutional Act number five] in 1968. He came back to Brazil but was arrested in 1971 and went into exile, returning to Brazil only in 1984, when amnesty was granted. His plays were produced in Brazil but heavily censored until freedom of thought was established in the new Constitution of 1988.

24. Roberto Ferreira da Rocha, “Hero or Villain: a Brazilian *Coriolanus* during the Period of the Military Dictatorship”, *Latin American Shakespeares*, ed. Kliman and Santos, 37-53, 37.

25. da Rocha, “Hero or villain ...”, 44.

26. da Rocha, “Hero or villain...”, 50.

27. Permits were still needed in the 1980s and were issued for each play in certificate form, bearing the Ministry of Justice letterhead, the title “*Censura Federal – Teatro*” [Federal Censorship – Theatre] and a stamp of the regional censorship bureau. The certificates were numbered and mentioned the play title, its author, and the validity span of the authorization to perform.

28. Maria Cristina Costa, *Censura em Cena – Teatro e Censura no Brasil* (São Paulo: EDUSP/FAPESP, 2006). Censorship continues to be an important research topic and was the subject of many other books in the 2000s, covering not only the theatre, but also the media,

five hundred plays, six hundred films, and thousands of songs, books, and other cultural products were banned from 1968 to 1978, when AI-5 was in effect, but the practice of censorship continued throughout the 1980s until the promulgation of a new Constitution in 1988, with its symbolic fifth article granting freedom of thought and press. In short, when a play such as Nunes’s *Coriolanus* was cleared by a censorship agent, any contents related to Brazilian political history had been cut. In addition to this, with press censorship, whatever a critic might say was also limited by the action of the censorship agents who supervised newspapers, magazines and books, including translated ones. Evidence that would be priceless for reception studies, therefore, is not available.

Various theoretical positions regarding the explication of translation decisions and their political tensions appeared during the twentieth century. The subject has continued to receive scholarly attention in many languages. Additional and substantial Lusophone examples are the essays in the anthology edited by Homem and Hoenselaars.²⁹

The major issue that occupies the authors is related to the circumstances of reception in the field of translation, with a counterpart in theatre reviewing and involving two stances: on the one hand, there are advocates of the true Shakespeare, with their discourses of fidelity to the text both on the page and in performance; on the other hand, there are those who search for cultural correspondence, as do many theatre directors and critics. While the former illustrates a philological stance, the latter usually poses the logics of transposition into performance and focus upon audiences, even encompassing the collaborative work among directors and translators in order to cater to particular audiences. Analyses of this tension have emphasized dichotomies as purism versus reformism, essentialism versus revisionism. While some seek a “Platonic” staging – one which protests its fidelity to what Shakespeare might have written (ironically, mediated by a translator) – and others advocate the freedom of the director to transpose the plays by accentuating their universal and timeless themes, a third position has emerged in criticism and performance, with postcolonial attitudes of appropriation, production and reception. This stance also applies to Shakespearean studies and has been the object of scholarship in the Anglophone world.³⁰

cinema, music and the visual arts.

29. Rui Carvalho Homem and Ton Hoenselaars, eds., *Translating Shakespeare for the Twenty-First Century* (Amsterdam/New York: Editions Rodopi B.V., 2004).

30. See, for instance, Helen Gilbert and Joanne Tompkins, *Post-colonial Drama. Theory, practice, politics*

In my experience as a correspondent for the World Shakespeare Bibliography from 1988 through 1998, critical performance reviews are very rarely found in Brazilian periodicals, especially when compared to the frequency of postcolonial approaches. Reporters and critics, if these nouns can be used to define professions that were repressed for several decades, frequently use advance accounts based upon releases provided by production managers. Responding to an invitation to supply criticism, I contributed to the Curitiba newspaper *O Estado do Paraná*, maintaining a review column in the early 1990s, when the Curitiba Theatre Festival was established and prompted broad media coverage. Press freedom had just been established in the 1988 Constitution. A positive atmosphere arose with new subsidies for the performing arts. Since then, other critics have emerged, such as Valmir Santos, Luiz Fernando Ramos (a professor from the University of São Paulo) and Mariângela Alves de Lima. Their ability to analyze both form and content, and openness to appraise productions avoiding hierarchies, emphasizing technical and conceptual arguments rather than value judgment, certainly points to a reformist mentality.

Scholars who had earned their graduate degrees in Literature, Drama and Performance in the United States, the United Kingdom and Brazil in the late 1980s also added a new dimension to the field when they founded the Brazilian Centre of Shakespearean Studies (CESh – Centro de Estudos Shakespeareanos) in 1991. Since then, CESh's associates have produced critical works, be it about theatre as textual product or performance event.³¹

Theatre reviewing in the media has received little academic attention in Brazil; overall, the work of CESh colleagues reflects the range of approaches that is also familiar to our Anglophone peers in books such as *Approaching Theatre* by André Helbo et al.³² I single out this book, in the immense bibliography of performance studies published in the last twenty-five years, because it focuses on the interdisciplinary nature of theory and criticism, utilizing approaches as different as empirical research, historical studies, philosophy, interpretative criticism, dramaturgy, psychology, sociologi-

(London and New York: Routledge, 1996).

31. See, for instance, Aimara da Cunha Resende, ed., *Brazilian Readings of Shakespeare* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2002); Marlene Soares dos Santos & Liana de Camargo Leão, eds., *Shakespeare, sua época e sua obra*; Anna Stegh Camati & Célia Arns de Miranda, eds., *Shakespeare sob múltiplos olhares* (Curitiba: Ed. Solar do Rosário, 2009).

32. André Helbo, J. Dines Johansen, Patrice Pavis and Anne Ubersfeld, *Approaching Theatre* (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1987).

cal methods (especially interviews and surveys) and semiotics.

Reviews by Brazilian scholars currently reflect this diversity of critical approaches and convey their Anglophone background, testified to by their frequent echoes of Linda Hutcheon (2006), Margaret Kidnie (2009), Christy Desmet and Robert Sawyer (1999), Charles Marowitz (1991) and Helbo et al (1987).³³ A postcolonial stance marks my own work about *A-tor-men-tado Calibanus*, a radical appropriation of *The Tempest*.³⁴ Rocha's continued academic reviews of Shakespearean theatre have enhanced the state of the art for *Hamlet* reception since 1948, drawing on critics Aimar Labaki and Alberto Guzik.³⁵ Anna Stegh Camati's reviews and academic articles also have added substantially to discussions of radical appropriations of Shakespeare's plays in Brazil.³⁶

The subject of periodical reviews is likely to offer fascinating contents for those who are willing to search and discover microfilmed periodicals in various libraries. An obvious hypothesis is that reviewers did write for newspapers and magazines and had to deal with the harshness of censorship before scholarly works focused on Shakespeare began to appear in the 1960s, with the emergence of Eugênio Ramos and Barbara Heliodora. The impact of censorship and the cultural politics of the military regime have been covered by many historians, although they do not specifically write about the reviewing of Shakespearean productions. A sample of this rich field became available in the collection of 83 reviews by Décio de Almeida Prado, with a foreword by Prof. João Roberto Faria, of the University of São Paulo.³⁷ These reviews were originally published in the

33. Linda Hutcheon, *A Theory of Adaptation* (New York & London: Routledge, 2006); Margaret Jane Kidnie, *Shakespeare and the Problem of Adaptation* (London and New York: Routledge, 2009); Charles Marowitz, *Recycling Shakespeare* (London: Macmillan, 1991); Christy Desmet & Robert Sawyer, *Shakespeare and Appropriation* (London and New York: Routledge, 1999); Helbo et al., *Approaching...*

34. Rauen, "Guilherme Schiffer Durães Caliban: From Canonical Text to Resistance", *Latin American Shakespeares*, ed. Kliman & Santos, 130-42.

35. da Rocha, "Hamlet com Cara de Brasil: Reverenciado, Questionado, Carnavalizado e Deglutido", ed. A. S. Camati and C. A. de Miranda, *Shakespeare sob...*, 291-97.

36. Anna Stegh Camati, "Sonho de Uma Noite de Verão: o Erudito e o Circense em Cena", ed. A. S. Camati & C. A. de Miranda, *Shakespeare sob ...*, 269-90; Anna Stegh Camati, "Hamletrash: A Brazilian Hamlet Made of Scraps", A. da C. Resende, *Brazilian Readings...*, 62-75. She has produced many other articles and reviews.

37. Prado, *Teatro em Progresso* (São Paulo: Perspectiva, 2002).

newspaper *O Estado de São Paulo* (1955-1964) and only two are devoted to Shakespeare productions: Sérgio Cardoso's *Hamlet* (1956) and Adolfo Celi's *Otelo* (1956). Prado is not thrilled with the performances, but writes with respect and technical rigour. About *Hamlet*, he stresses that

It is the first professional attempt to stage Shakespeare in São Paulo; the cast is generally below 25 years old; it is, above all, an extraordinarily honest production [...] the worst flaw of the performance is not being audible enough and clearly understandable. Péricles Eugênio da Silva Ramos's translation is admirably faithful [...] but] not very theatrical.³⁸

In his review of Adolfo Celi's *Otelo*, Prado is enthusiastic about the fact that Shakespearean productions are being done in Brazil, but aptly observes the imbalance between Paulo Autran's great performance in the title role and the timid acting of the secondary characters.

Beyond the pages of criticism in hard copies is the universe of our Internet age. The breaking news, perhaps, is that the first Brazilian *Hamlet Q1*, translated into Portuguese by José Roberto O'Shea, has had a dramatic reading at an alternative space of a little church that became a theatre at the Federal University of Santa Catarina, in Florianópolis.³⁹

38. Prado, *Teatro em Progresso...*, 22.

39. William Shakespeare, *O primeiro "Hamlet" in Quarto de 1603*, transl. José Roberto O'Shea (Hedra, 2010).

An announcement online⁴⁰ remarked that audience participation would be pursued by the cast. Reviews and news about festivals, theatre seasons and performances all over Brazil can be explored on the World Wide Web. Although the usual content of Internet material is seldom critical, information is open and may feature statements by actors and directors who reflect upon their work, in addition to current international news, such as the continued success of Grupo Galpão's *Romeo & Juliet*, scheduled for performances at the Globe World Shakespeare Festival in May 2012.⁴¹

If Prado was pleased to realize that Shakespeare could be performed in Brazil as he reviewed Celi's *Otelo* over half a century ago, I am pleased to close this essay admitting that the amount of productions of Shakespeare's plays in Brazil is more than I could possibly deal with,⁴² as well as the fact that Brazilian artists have earned recognition in major international venues.

Margarida Gandara RAUEN

40. Available at <<http://noticias.ufsc.br/2011/12/09/grupo-pesquisa-teatro-novo-apresenta-%E2%80%99Chamlet-in-quarto%E2%80%9D-na-igrejinha-da-ufsc/>>, accessed 19/12/2011.

41. <<http://exame.abril.com.br/estilo-de-vida/arte/noticias/grupo-galpao-participara-no-festival-de-shakespeare-em-londres>> accessed 14/02/2012. The Complete Festival programme is available at <shakespeareglobe.com/globetoglobe>.

42. The many works cited offer further reading about this enormous topic, which unfortunately has not been covered in a book to this date.