

UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DE SANTA CATARINA
PÓS-GRADUAÇÃO EM LETRAS/INGLÊS E LITERATURA
CORRESPONDENTE

POLITICAL SHADOWS: TWO BRAZILIAN ADAPTATIONS OF
WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE'S *RICHARD III*

CAMILA PAULA CAMILOTTI

Dissertação submetida à Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina em
cumprimento parcial dos requisitos para obtenção do grau de

MESTRE EM LETRAS

FLORIANÓPOLIS

Abril 2010

To my mom and my dad, who are everything to me...

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to thank God for having given me the best gift ever, which is life and also for all the blessings that I receive from Him every day.

I am also thankful to my dear friend and colleague, Claudia Piaia, who was the first person to encourage me to start the Master's Program. I must acknowledge that, without Claudia's support, I would not have started Graduate School. I have no words to thank her for her endless support and friendship.

I am grateful to my adorable parents, who have always supported me and given me courage whenever I needed. Not even the geographical distance that separated us during these two years of research could prevent me from feeling their positive energy and encouragement.

I thank my dear grandma, Maria, who is so special for me and who has always been praying and cheering for me.

Special thanks to my advisors, professor José Roberto O'Shea and professor Daniela Lapoli Guimarães, who were not only professors and advisors to me, but models of professionalism, charisma, competence, and intelligence. Professor José Roberto is someone who has a positive energy and makes all the students feel competent and able to do their best.

Professor Daniela is someone whom I will always admire for her kindness, intelligence, capacity, and professionalism. I will never find words to thank her for all her support and attention for this research.

I am also grateful to my dear professor Sergio Romanelli for his encouragement and support in this research.

Special thanks to professor Roberto Ferreira da Rocha for his wonderful contribution in this research.

I also thank CAPES for the financial support I had to conclude this research.

Special thanks to my dear friend, Lola, who has helped me a lot with her brilliant ideas, especially in chapters II and III.

I am also grateful to professor Marlene Soares Santos for her brilliant suggestions and ideas for this research.

Thanks to Giuliano Ricca, from Ricca Produções, who has provided me with relevant information for the analysis of Soares' *Ricardo III*.

I also thank Teatro Ágora for providing me with the playtext by Celso Frateschi and Roberto Lage's *Ricardo III* and Teatro Faap, for sending the DVD of the making off of Jô Soares' production.

Special thanks to my "Shakespearean" friends and colleagues: Emiliano, Aline Maciel, Aline Sanfelice, and Meire, for the fun moments we spent together and for the moments when we shared ideas.

Finally, I thank all my professors and classmates, whom I have learned a lot with and whom I will never forget. It was wonderful to have met you.

ABSTRACT

POLITICAL SHADOWS: TWO BRAZILIAN ADAPTATIONS OF WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE'S *RICHARD III*

CAMILA PAULA CAMILOTTI

UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DE SANTA CATARINA

2010

Supervising Professor: José Roberto O'Shea, PhD

The aim of this research is to analyze how the character Ricardo is constructed in two Brazilian theatrical adaptations of William Shakespeare's *Richard III: Ricardo III*, directed and adapted by Jô Soares, and *Ricardo III*, directed by Roberto Lage and adapted by Celso Frateschi. Both productions were staged in São Paulo in 2006. From 2003 to 2006, Brazil went through a delicate time in terms of politics. Several scandals happened during President Lula's government, being *Escândalo do Mensalão*, *Escândalo dos Bingos*, and *Escândalo dos Correios* the ones which popped out in 2005 and 2006, causing great political instability. Therefore, taking into account that two productions of one of the most political plays of Shakespeare were staged in Brazil in the turmoils of political scandals, the analysis focuses on the character construction in each production in relation to the Brazilian political context of the time. The analysis demonstrates that the construction of the protagonists varies in each production. Whereas Soares' production seems to be making critical references to the political context of the time and to president Lula through the rendition of an ironic, almost comic Ricardo, Frateschi and Lage's production shows a certain neutrality in relation to the political moment and to the President, and through the depiction of a cruel, aggressive and violent protagonist, attempts to demonstrate, in general terms, other problems of Brazilian society, such as violence and the negative effects of capitalism.

Number of pages: 94

Number of words: 33.748

RESUMO

SOMBRAS POLÍTICAS: DUAS ADAPTAÇÕES BRASILEIRAS DE *RICARDO III* DE WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE

CAMILA PAULA CAMILOTTI

UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DE SANTA CATARINA

2010

Professor orientador: José Roberto O’Shea, PhD

O objetivo desta pesquisa é analisar como o personagem Ricardo é construído em duas adaptações teatrais brasileiras de *Ricardo III* de William Shakespeare: *Ricardo III*, dirigida e adaptada por Jô Soares, e *Ricardo III*, dirigida por Roberto Lage e adaptada por Celso Frateschi, ambas encenadas em São Paulo em 2006. De 2003 a 2006, o Brasil passou por um momento delicado em termos de política. Vários escândalos aconteceram durante o governo Lula, sendo Escândalo do Mensalão, Escândalo dos Correios e Escândalo dos Bingos os que vieram à tona nos anos 2005 e 2006 e que causaram grande instabilidade política. Levando em consideração o fato de que duas montagens de uma das peças mais políticas de Shakespeare foram encenadas no Brasil em meio a esse turbilhão de escândalos políticos, a análise tem como foco a construção do personagem Ricardo, em cada produção, em relação ao contexto político brasileiro da época. A análise mostra que a construção dos protagonistas difere em cada produção. Enquanto a produção de Soares parece fazer referências ao contexto político da época e ao presidente Lula por meio de um Ricardo irônico, quase cômico, a produção de Frateschi e de Lage demonstra certa neutralidade e procura mostrar, por meio de um Ricardo malvado, cruel e violento, outros problemas da sociedade brasileira, tais como violência e os efeitos negativos do capitalismo.

Número de páginas: 94

Número de palavras: 33.748

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Dedication Page	iii
Acknowledgments	iv
Abstract	vi
Resumo	vii
Chapter 1- Introduction	1
Chapter 2- Constructing Jô Soares' <i>Ricardo III</i>	15
2.1 Conception	17
2.2 Production	20
2.3 Reception	47
Chapter 3- Constructing Celso Frateschi and Roberto Lage's <i>Ricardo III</i> <i>III.</i>	51
3.1 Conception	51
3.2 Production	55
3.3 Reception	79
Chapter 4- Conclusion	84
References	88
Appendices	95

Chapter I

Introduction

“Richard III takes us into a theatre of showmanship and seduction, but that is Richard’s project.” (Jowett 3)

Richard III, the last playtext of William Shakespeare’s first historical tetralogy,¹ had a successful performance history, being performed by different cultures, at different places, from its first appearance until nowadays. To understand the reason of *Richard III*’s success, it is necessary to acknowledge the Wars of the Roses, which is portrayed in Shakespeare’s first historical tetralogy, especially in *Henry VI (Part III)* and *Richard III*. For this reason, I shall explain briefly the history of The Wars of the Roses before mentioning some of the most remarkable productions of *Richard III* throughout the years.

The Wars of the Roses was a long civil war between two branches of families, the Lancastrians and the Yorkists, both descendent from the same Plantagenet, Edward III. The conflicts between the House of Lancaster and the House of York started due to Henry V’s early death, leaving his only heir, Henry VI, to be crowned the King of England with only nine months of age. Because Henry VI was too young to reign, as Peter Saccio puts it, “he remained King of England for nearly forty years, but only nominally. The royal child became an adult saintly in character, incompetent in politics, and subject to occasional mental derangement” (8). Henry’s kingdom was ruled by his royal cousins and uncles, who in “concert and rivalry asserted themselves” (Saccio 8).

However, in 1450 the conflicts between Henry’s royal relatives resulted in armed fighting. In 1460, Richard, Duke of York, one of the Royal cousins, claimed to have the right to the English throne, because he was in fact descendent on both sides from sons of Edward III. According to Saccio, “since his mother was heiress of the Mortimer family, the line springing from John of Gaunt’s elder brother, Lionel, Richard did indeed have a powerful claim, although it depended upon the principle that the royal succession could pass through a female” (9). When the conflicts settled, Richard, Henry, and Henry’s son, Edward, were all dead, and the throne was being occupied by Richard’s eldest

¹ Shakespeare’s first historical tetralogy encompasses *Henry VI (parts 1, 2, and 3)* and *Richard III*.

son, Edward IV, from the House of York. The battle in which Richard, Henry and Edward were killed was known as the Battle of Tewksbury.² Edward IV reigned from 1461 until his death, in 1483. After Edward's death, his brother, Richard, duke of Gloucester, occupied the throne and became King Richard III.

Richard III's kingdom lasted only two years, from 1483 to 1485. In 1485, Henry of Richmond, who was exiled in Paris and claimed to have the right to the crown, prepared an army to defeat Richard III in England in the so called Battle of Bosworth. Richmond's victory over Richard III put an end to the Wars of the Roses. According to Roberto Ferreira da Rocha, "this victory also put an end to the political crises that surrounded the English aristocracy in the 15th century"³ (37). Richmond was crowned King Henry VII and married Elizabeth of York, Edward IV's eldest daughter, who belonged to the House of York. Since Henry VII was a Lancastrian, his union with Elizabeth resulted in a new monarchy: The Tudor Dynasty. Still according to Rocha,⁴ "the objective of this new monarch was not war, but the improvement of economic activities in order to guarantee the development of the country" (38).

As a historical playtext, *Richard III* cannot be read or staged without taking into account this historical background and the political intrigues that surround events portrayed in the play. According to Peter Saccio, "the social conditions, cultural habits, economic forces, justice and the lack of it, all that we mean by 'the times' must be translated into persons and passions if they were to hold the stage" (15). In other words, *Richard III* portrays the political context of the 15th century.

However, the fight for the crown, the political intrigues and the strategy of politicians to be the rulers of a city or a country have never stopped. It is still present in our times. John Jowett points out that *Richard III* "leaves to readers and performers the possibilities of constructing diverse *Richard III*s that reflect their tastes, their skills, their places in culture and history" (3). Therefore, when staging *Richard III*, it is important to establish a connection between the historical and

² In Shakespeare's *Richard III*, the battle of Tewksbury is mentioned in the famous scene in which Richard courts Lady Anne, wife of prince Edward, in front of King Henry's dead body (Act 1, Scene 2).

³ The original quotation is in Portuguese and it is the following: "essa vitória também poria fim à grave crise política vivida pela aristocracia inglesa durante o século XV" (37).

⁴The original quotation is also in Portuguese: "o objetivo principal deste novo monarca não era a Guerra, mas o desenvolvimento das atividades econômicas a fim de garantir o crescimento do país como um todo" (38).

social background that surrounds the play and the social and political contexts of our times.

It is interesting to observe that each production of *Richard III* staged along History has had its particularities. Jowett claims that the history of *Richard III* on stage “attempts to locate turning points in the representation of the play and its leading role, and to relate them, if only with brief touches, to the cultural context in which they appeared” (73). Jowett also claims that, besides the stage, *Richard III* has built its popularity into printed form: six quartos were printed before the first Folio. This was from 1597 (first quarto) until 1623 (first Folio). Jowett also mentions the appearance of two more quartos after the publication of the first Folio: Q7 (1629) and Q8 (1634). This large number of quartos reinforces the popularity of this playtext in early modern England. In the next paragraphs, in an attempt to contextualize the playtext in performance, I shall mention some important productions of *Richard III* staged in Europe and America.

According to John Jowett, who has competently chronicled the play in performance, the first successful adaptation of *Richard III* was Colley Cibber’s production, which was first seen at the Drury Lane in 1699 and published the following year. Cibber’s adaptation owes its success to radical changes in the text. He took out some lines from the text of *Richard III* and added lines from another historical tetralogy, by Shakespeare, especially from *Henry V* and *Henry VI*. In the first scene of Cibber’s production, King Henry VI appears mourning the death of his son, Edward, killed by Richard at the battle of Tewkesbury. Although Acts 4 and 5 correspond to the same Acts 4 and 5 of Shakespeare’s text, they are shortened in Cibber’s production. Jowett points out that Act 4 “omits the lamentation of the women in 4.4 [and] Act 5 is a shortened rewriting of Shakespeare’s Act 5, with the striking rationalization that the ghosts appear to Richard only, not to Richmond” (84-5). Also, in Act 5, there is the presence of lines from *Henry V*. As Jowett points out, “the lines of *Henry V* are spoken by Richard before seeing the ghosts. The ghosts appear as a single group to Richard, but Richmond is not on stage” (85). All these changes helped the audience of the time, who “were unfamiliar with *Henry VI* plays⁵” (Jowett 84) to understand the historical background of Shakespeare’s historical tetralogy. For this reason, Cibber’s adaption was considered an amazing production which, as Jowett points out, became “the basis for all the performances of

⁵ *Henry VI, Parts 1, 2, and 3.*

Richard III in the 18th century. Its hegemony was unchallenged until 1821” (83).

In 1877, Henry Irving directed, adapted and acted in his own production of *Richard III*. Such production was staged twice, in 1877 and 1896, “separated by almost twenty years”, and the same production portrayed two contrasting Richards: “the first was a man isolated by his deformity and the other was, more than an actor himself, an old figure that has outlived all pleasures, but the intellectual one of doing evil superbly” (Jowett 93). Such production was staged, both times, at the Lyceum Theatre in London.

During the Second World War, two productions of *Richard III* were staged as an attempt to relate the play with fascism: John Laurie’s production, staged in Stratford-Upon-Avon in 1939, and Donald Wolfitt’s production, staged in London Strand in 1942. Both productions exaggerated Richard’s cruelty in order to “respon[d] to the enormity of fascist political evil, as it was being revealed to the English public” (Jowett 98). Also with the intention of portraying the tension in politics during the Second World War, Ian McKellen and Richard Loncraine brought *Richard III* to the big screen in 1995. The movie is set in a scenario of the 1930s as an attempt to portray through the main character’s cruelty the political regimes of Nazism and Fascism that held sway in Europe at that time.

In 1961, another production of *Richard III* was staged at the Royal Shakespeare Theatre, in Stratford-Upon-Avon. This production was directed by Christopher Plummer, with Laurence Olivier as Richard. According to Jowett, “Plummer’s production was the most celebrated due to Olivier’s performance as Richard” (101). In 1996, Al Pacino produced a famous documentary on *Richard III*. According to Jowett, Pacino’s aim was “to wrest the play from academe and relate its vitality as theatre to the vibrant energies of contemporary life” (109). In the documentary Pacino and his co-producers walk around the streets of New York City asking people’s opinion about Shakespeare and informing them about the playtext *Richard III*.

Since *Richard III* is one of Shakespeare’s most political plays, the overall objective of the present research lays on the analysis of the construction of the character Ricardo in two Brazilian theatrical productions, focusing on certain political aspects of Brazil in 2006. One of the productions, namely *Ricardo III*, was directed and adapted by Jô Soares, whereas the other, *Ricardo III* as well, was adapted by Celso Frateschi and directed by Roberto Lage. Both productions were staged in São Paulo in 2006. Coincidentally, in 2006, Brazilian politics were

surrounded by a scenario of scandals and corruptions, which started around 2004 and peaked in 2006, with the discovery of *Mensalão* (big monthly allowance), in which representatives received an “allowance” of about R\$ 30.000,00 to vote in favor of President Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva’s projects of government. Together with *Mensalão*,⁶ other scandals, such as *Escândalo dos bingos*, and *Escândalo dos correios* occurred. Besides, 2006 was the year of presidential elections in Brazil, which made the situation even more delicate in terms of politics.

When comparing the Brazilian productions, it is interesting to realize that although Jô Soares’ production is different from Frateschi and Lage’s production, they still have remarkable similarities. One similarity between the two productions is the text. Both Soares and Frateschi used a rather colloquial language in their translation to facilitate the reception of the text by the Brazilian audience and to modernize the productions. Roberto Lage, the director of Frateschi’s production, observes that “*é preciso contar a história de forma a facilitar seu entendimento*” (Lima D6). Like Frateschi, Soares translated the text trying to modernize the production and to shape it into the Brazilian reality. According to Ubiratan Brasil, “*Jô reforçou a característica contemporânea do texto de Shakespeare*” (D5). Soares seems to have worked really hard in his translation. In fact, Brasil observes that Soares’s translation went through seven versions before reaching the stage (D5).

Another interesting similarity in the productions is the scenario. Soares insisted on constructing a sparse scenario, free from any elaborate details, so that the focus would be on the characters’ performances. Different from other directors, Soares intended to emphasize the importance of the female characters in his production. According to Soares himself, it would be irrelevant to take the strength of the female characters for granted (Néspoli D4). In relation to Soares’s intention with the characters, Brasil observes that “*Jô não só leva a sério a trama de Shakespeare, mas ressalta detalhes muitas vezes esquecidos por outros montadores como o humor (...) e a força das personagens femininas, também relegadas em segundo plano em outras versões*” (D5). Like Soares, Frateschi and Lage produced a sparse scenario. However, their intention was to emphasize the devilish performance of the main character, Ricardo. According to Néspoli,

⁶ The terms *Mensalão*, *Escândalo dos bingos* and *Escândalo dos correios* will be defined in Chapter II.

“[Lage] destaca a fluência como busca fundamental, ou seja, eliminar tudo o que é supérfluo e possa ‘interromper o fluxo das cenas’” (D4).

One important difference between the productions is the construction of the main character. Jô Soares portrayed a rather funny Richard, due to the fact that, according to Soares himself, the audience would not stand to see all Richard’s cruelties (Néspoli D4). Frateschi and Lage, on the other hand, constructed a devilish creature, emphasizing Richard’s cruelties in order to show the audience a constant quest for power. Frateschi’s Ricardo is so mean that in an interpolated stage direction, Ricardo appears on stage holding a white rose, which represents the House of York, “victors” in the Wars of the Roses. Later, in another interpolation, Ricardo eats the rose. Ricardo’s act of eating the white rose represents the act of killing the royal relatives, who might prevent him from becoming the next King of England. By using this interpolation, Frateschi warns the spectators that Ricardo’s ambition to conquer the throne leads him to commit the worst crimes against members of his own family. Like Frateschi, Soares’s intention when producing *Ricardo III* was also to depict a search for power in the political world. However, he insisted on constructing a funnier Ricardo to disguise Richard’s cruelty.⁷ Frateschi did exactly the opposite. He insisted on emphasizing Richard’s villainy to show the audience how corruptive the world of politics can be.

In my analysis, I shall attempt to answer questions such as how different the political aspects of Brazil portrayed in the rendition of the main character in both productions are and how the critical reception of the productions was. To answer such research questions, I shall draw critical concepts from Jay Halio’s study of adaptation of playtexts in performance. Such study has to do with alterations that occur when a playtext is adapted to be performed on stage. Halio argues that such alterations affect text, character, language, and set design (2).

As adaptation also involves translation, I shall use Patrice Pavis’ study of theatrical translation. According to Pavis, theatrical translation goes beyond the text, due to the fact that it involves not only language, but also culture. For Pavis, translation for the stage is concretized when the translated text reaches the audience by the actor’s performance on stage, in the situation of enunciation.

⁷ Throughout the research, I shall establish a connection between Frateschi’s Ricardo, who is so cruel, and the political aspects of Brazil in 2006. The same will happen with Soares’s Ricardo who, different from Frateschi’s Ricardo, seems to be extremely ironic and sarcastic.

The research is divided into four chapters. It begins with a brief historical introduction to *Richard III* as well as a brief account of the most remarkable productions of the playtext in Europe and America. This opening section also presents the objectives of the research and the critical and theoretical background, which includes scholars such as Jay Halio, Patrice Pavis, Barbara Heliadora, Susan Bennett, Marco de Marinis, and Alexander Leggatt. Chapter II presents analysis of character construction in Jô Soares' *Ricardo III*, contextualizing it with the political aspects of Brazil in 2006. Since it is a theatrical analysis, it will address aspects of conception, production, and reception. Chapter III presents an analysis of Frateschi and Lage's *Ricardo III* in comparison to Soares' production, and in relation to the political aspects of Brazil in 2006. Finally, chapter IV presents the final remarks, the general and specific conclusions of the present investigation, as well as the implications of the study for further research in the field of theatrical adaptation.

Theatrical adaptation, i.e., the adaptation from a playtext into performance, encompasses alterations in elements that compose the play. In *Understanding Shakespeare's Plays in Performance*, Jay Halio argues that such elements have to do with the text itself, set design, characters, and language. Although each of these elements is extremely important for a play as a whole, the text is the starting point of a play and, since I did not have access to any visual recordings of the two Brazilian productions of *Ricardo III*, the analysis will be focused on their respective playtexts, paying particular attention to the stage directions. As Halio points out, "the text, or script of the play is primary, the place where any production—and therefore any performance—begins" (5). Complementary to Halio's assumption, Pavis, in his article "From Page to Stage: A difficult Birth" argues that the audience "see[s] a performance which is more or less successful, more or less comprehensible, in which the text is only one of several components, others being the actors, the space, the tempo" (24). Laurie E. Osborne complements Halio's argument stating that "when actors and directors undertake to produce a Shakespearean play, they start from the text" (168). Since the text is so often the starting point for the performance to occur, the alterations in the text will be the focus here.

As already implied, when a text moves from page to stage, "there will always be a certain amount of change made by a theatrical editor, adaptor, or script 'doctor'" (Halio 4), and, still according to Halio, such alterations "can be helpful, but also counterproductive" (10). In other words, they can be helpful, because changes are made with the

intention of facilitating the audience's understanding and consequent enjoyment of a Shakespearean play, which was written for a certain audience and at a certain time. Changes in the text often have the objective of contextualizing and modernizing the play. Halio observes that "words, lines, perhaps whole speeches and, in some cases whole scenes will be deleted; sometimes a modern word will be substituted for a word that the editor considers archaic or otherwise undesirable" (4). The result of such process, as Halio points out, "affects the play's dramatic structure, the actor's performance, and the overall interpretation that the production exhibits" (12).

What can make the alterations in the text "counterproductive" is the idea of not only altering some aspects of the text, but changing its nature and transforming it in a different product. According to Halio, "the alterations in the text can be counterproductive when what a play meant for its author and its original audience may be quite different from what it signifies in contemporary production" (11). In other words, the farther the text is from its original, the bigger the difference between the original text and the produced text. However, Halio's argument can be refuted, because every theatrical production should be contextualized and related to its own times, so that the production will have a meaning for the audience at a specific time.

Altering the text for a certain audience is an important factor that affects the audience's understanding of the play, and consequently its critical reception. If the theatergoer sees a production and he/she finds it hard to understand it, or even worse, he/she cannot understand a single word of what he/she is watching, instead of being a pleasurable activity, the theatergoing experience becomes boring and unpleasant. Conversely, the more an audience understands the play, the more receptive the audience tends to become. Halio observes that "the impact [the impact the performance will have on the audience] will be greater partially because the more an audience understands, the more responsive it is likely to be, and the more responsive an audience is, the more fully realized the production is apt to become" (2).

Yet, altering a text to be performed is "no easy matter" (Pavis 24). According to Pavis, "what the first night audience sees is already an end-product, for it is too late to observe the preparatory work of the director" (24). Such end product has often gone through a difficult process of transformation. Aspects have been added, and aspects have been omitted in the process of adaptation. Osborne states that "whenever these texts are themselves taken up by the theatre, the blurring of the boundaries between performance and text becomes even more evident"

(176). In other words, when the playtext is performed, it becomes more than just a text. Halio observes that, “in performance, moreover, [Shakespeare’s plays] are much more accessible than they are when read from heavily annotated texts, for performances somehow provide all the annotation we need, or enough of it, they make the plays live” (2). That is, when a text goes to stage, it is no longer mere words written on a piece of paper, but it becomes an important part of the spectacle that is enunciated by the actors on stage.

Having discussed alterations in the text, I shall shift to another important issue in the study of theatrical adaptation: theatre translation. In “Toward Specifying Theatre Translation”, Pavis discusses the complexity involved in the process, since translation for the theatre represents more than just transposing one particular text into another language. To Pavis, translation is concretized in the “situation of enunciation”; that is, in “the situation of enunciation of a text presented by the actor in a specific time and place, to an audience receiving both text and *mise-en-scène*” (136).⁸

First and foremost, it is important to consider that theatre translation “goes beyond the rather limited phenomenon of the interlingual translation of the dramatic text” (Pavis 136). In other words, theatre translation is more than just linguistic translation, for it is concretized in the situation of enunciation, which is when the actors “enunciate” on stage the text that has been shaped by the translator, and it is in the situation of enunciation that both the original text (in translation) and its culture will be confronted by the target audience and its culture. According to Pavis, “we cannot simply translate a linguistic text into another, rather we confront and communicate heterogeneous cultures and situations of enunciation that are separated in space and time” (136).

Pavis describes the five steps which theatre translation goes through before it is completed. Such steps encompass T0, T1, T2, T3, and T4. T0, according to Pavis, is “the result of the author’s choices and formulations” (139). It is the original or source text. The source text, per se, is surrounded by the cultural background and the historical moment in which the text was produced. The process of theatre translation starts at the original text and is completed in T4, which is when the already

⁸ According to Patrice Pavis, “*mise-en-scène*, as we understand it, is the synchronic confrontation of signifying systems, and it is their interaction, not their history, that is offered to the spectator and that produces meaning” (24).

translated text reaches the audience through the voice and body language of the actors in the spectacle.

The following step is T1, the textual concretization. Pavis points out that “the text of the written translation depends (...) on the initial, virtual situation of enunciation of T0, as well as on the future audience who will receive the text in T3 and T4” (139). In other words, the translator in T1 does not have a real situation of enunciation, but a virtual one. According to José Roberto O’Shea, “*o tradutor deve estar ciente de que a tradução, de um lado, não tem como preservar a situação de enunciação original e, de outro, destina-se a uma situação de enunciação futura com a qual o tradutor tem pouca, ou nenhuma familiaridade*” (34). For this reason, textual concretization is more than just linguistic translation. In this step, the translator should not only translate the text, but also the play. O’Shea concludes that “*desde a primeira textualização, a tradução deve procurar ir além do lingüístico, em direção ao dramaturgico*” (34).

The next step encompasses T2, which is the dramaturgical concretization. According to Pavis, the translator as a dramaturge makes the necessary alterations in the original text (T0) or in the text that has already been translated linguistically (in T1). Pavis highlights that “when the commentary is too long or incomprehensible it is still possible for the dramaturge translator to make cuts in his version destined for the target audience” (141). By making the necessary alterations in the text that is aimed at a certain audience, the translator hopes to avoid the audience’s misunderstandings and incomprehension about the spectacle.

The next step, T3, has to do with the stage concretization. According to Pavis, this step is the “onstage testing of the text which was translated initially in T1 and T2: concretization by stage enunciation” (141). Now, the translated text with all its cuttings and interpolations is ready to be delivered by the actors on stage to an audience. Pavis argues that “the *mise-en-scène*, the confrontation of situations of enunciation, whether virtual (T0) or actual (T1), proposes a performance text, by suggesting the examination of all possible relationships between textual and theatrical signs” (142). That is to say that when the text is enunciated on stage, it becomes more than just the playtext. It is as important as the other elements that compose the spectacle. It becomes part of the *mise-en-scène*.

The last step, T4, encompasses the reception concretization. According to Pavis, this step is “where the source text finally arrives at its end point: the spectator” (142). The process of theatre translation

ends when the spectator receives T3, that is, the text announced by the actors in the situation of enunciation. As Pavis puts it, “the spectator appropriates the text only at the end of a torrent of concretizations, of intermediate translations that reduce or enlarge the source text at every step of the way” (142).

This highlights the importance of the situation of enunciation on stage. According to Pavis, “the actors have to be physically capable of pronouncing and performing their text” (143). Complementary to Pavis, Anthony B. Dawson claims that “the body signifies in the theatre as a crucial part of the performance, it establishes person” (37). In other words, besides pronouncing the words of a text in a competent way, actors have to be able to perform well physically using their body language the best way they can. Pavis argues that “what’s much more important than the simple criterion of the well spoken is the convincing adequacy of speech and gesture, which we may call the body language” (143). This means that part of the responsibility of the translation lies with the actors. If they fail in the situation of enunciation, the translated text and consequently the performance as a whole will be at risk.

The aforementioned elements, such as text alterations, and theatre translation, are essential for theatrical performance. However, a spectacle also involves the presence of the audience. Taking such issue in consideration, in the following paragraphs, I shall focus on the relationship between audience and theatre proposed by Susan Bennett, in *Theatre Audiences: A Theory of Production and Reception*, and by Marco de Marinis, in *The Semiotics of Performance*.

Edward L. Rocklin, in his article “Performance is more than an ‘approach’ to Shakespeare”, argues that “the performance ensemble is constituted by people in the roles or positions of the playwrights (directors), the players (actors), and the playgoers (audience)” (56). Such elements compose a triangle, and the audience is a fundamental part of this triangle, for without the audience, the performance would be incomplete and would be worthless staging. In *Theatre Audiences*, Susan Bennett defines audience as “subject of the drama, (who) can think and act” (1). Similar to Bennett’s definition of audience, Marco de Marinis points out that the spectator is “the subject of theatrical interaction, as co-producer of the performance, the active creator of its meaning; in short, as the only producer of the semantic and communicative potential of the performance text” (158). In other words, the audience interacts directly or indirectly with the play, be it through its expectations, through gestures of approval or disapproval, such as laughing, crying, screaming, whispering, and also through responding to

the actors. The playwright shapes the spectacle thinking about and taking into account audience reaction. According to Bennett, “in the theatre every reader is involved in the making of the play. Indeed, the audience of even the most ‘culinary’ theatre is involved in the success of the performance” (22).

According to De Marinis, the audience establishes a communication with the play. However, both sender (play) and receiver (audience) need to “know each other’s code” (140). In other words, the play needs to reach the understanding of the audience. This is crucial for the interaction between audience and play to take place. That is the reason why the play goes through several processes of adaptation before reaching the stage. De Marinis also points out that the communication between audience and play “seems fully carried out in the case of theatre by linguistic, paralinguistic, and kenesic signs which the audience generally transmits before, during, and after the performance: applause, whistling, laughter, whispers, expressions of disapproval, periods of silence, and so on” (140). Such reactions the play causes in the audience, for De Marinis, show how the audience responds to the spectacle.

To conclude this theoretical background, I present, in the following paragraphs, a succinct analysis of the construction of the character Richard in Shakespeare’s *Richard III*. For such discussion, I shall present the notion of character construction in Shakespeare’s History and Roman plays proposed by Barbara Heliodora and Alexander Leggatt.

In *Shakespeare’s Political Drama*, Alexander Leggatt explains how strategic Richard is to conquer the crown. One of his strategies is related to the complicity he establishes with the audience. According to Leggatt, Richard “allows the audience to hear his thoughts and the audience is aware of his strategies” (32). In other words, Richard confesses to the audience all he wants to do (and will do) to be the king. Such confessions make the audience Richard’s ally, that is, the spectators participate directly in the story. Leggatt points out that “sharing knowledge and insight with Richard, even sympathizing with him against our better judgment, we are not just detached spectators: Richard enlists us as his partisans” (32). The audience’s involvement with Richard is what makes him a kind character to the audience at first. Harold Bloom concludes that Richard’s power of seduction lies on his ability to establish this special relationship with the audience and with the other characters in the play: “that is the secret of his outrageous charm: his great power over the audience and the other figures in his

drama is a compound of charm and terror, hardly to be distinguished in his sadomasochistic seduction of the Lady Anne, whose husband and father in law alike he has slaughtered” (65). As the play develops, the audience realizes that Richard is a friend “not to be trusted” (Leggatt 32). However, Richard is still beloved by the audience.

Another strategy used by Richard involves the jokes he makes when talking to other characters in the play. According to Leggatt, “one of Richard’s favorite ways of playing with his victims is to jest with them and pretend to be serious. We know that the joke represents Richard’s true feelings, and the expression of serious concern is a trick” (33). Hence the validity of Shakespeare’s “comical” Richard. By delivering jokes from the beginning to the end of the play, Richard makes his victims all those who might prevent him from becoming king. According to Barbara Heliadora, in *Falando de Shakespeare*, the way Shakespeare portrays Richard, such a strategic character, has to do with his own view of political issues. Heliadora argues that Shakespeare uses *jogo do poder* [power struggle] as an ingredient to all his political dramas. According to Heliadora, “*Fala-se em jogo do poder nos casos de obras dramáticas que tratam de disputas políticas e, ele é visto, mais naturalmente, nas peças históricas, sejam elas inglesas ou romanas.*” (55). This *Jogo do Poder* can be observed in the characters’ behavior to conquer the crown and become kings or queens. Heliadora also points out that “*as convicções de Shakespeare a respeito do Estado e dos homens que disputam o jogo do poder foram definidas bastante cedo, produtos da própria conjuntura inglesa e, mais particularmente, da formação que o poeta recebeu em casa, na escola e na igreja*” (57).

Arguably, Shakespeare’s critical views in terms of politics were shaped especially at the church, through the sermons, which often had strong political content. In her discussion of the History Plays in *Reflexões Shakespeareanas*, Heliadora argues that “*é nas homilias que ele [Shakespeare] aprende a pensar na ordem do estado, na questão da responsabilidade dos governantes e na condição do cidadão comum*” (103). Heliadora proposes that Shakespeare understood the nature of the sermons and was the only writer to take them as a key to write about the order of the state and responsibility of the rulers. Leggatt agrees with Heliadora when he states that in his political dramas, Shakespeare’s view of politics is portrayed through the character’s action. The result is the construction of a character like Richard, whose “capacity of long-range planning and mastery of the political situation go along with extraordinary theatrical control” (32).

By constructing Richard, Shakespeare makes us conclude that political issues also pertain to the playgoers and this is the reason for Richard's engagement with the audience. Politicians cannot live without an audience. They need to develop strategies, so that they can conquer the "throne". Richard represents such view. Leggatt concludes that Richard gives us the responsibility of understanding his discourse between the lines: "Our involvement this time includes our responsibility to interpret his words and apply them to the present dangers of the state, whatever they may be" (53). By understanding Richard's discourse, Leggatt means bringing the fiction to reality; that is, contextualizing what Richard says to our time, to the moment we are living now.

As explained in the previous paragraphs, the discussions regarding the elements of theatrical adaptation, critical reception, and character construction are the scope for the proposed investigation. Such discussions, which I plan to expand in the present research, should be useful for verifying the tentative research questions. Having exposed a brief introduction of this research and the theoretical background which will be the scope of the work, I shall move to the analyses of the character construction of the two Brazilian productions and relate them with political aspects of Brazil in 2006.

Chapter II

Constructing Jô Soares' Ricardo

*“I am determined to prove a
villain / And hate the idle
pleasures of these days¹”*

(Richard III 1.1.30-1)

Along with *Coriolanus*, *Richard III* is the most political among Shakespeare's historical and Roman plays. The play is the epitome of the constant search for power that exists in the political world. Victor Kiernan observes this by pointing out that “in *Richard III* the whole play may be called a warning against the irremediable acts of violence that unfettered power seems doomed to give way to” (78). Beatriz Viégas-Faria summarizes in a few words the richness in political content in *Richard III*:

A leitura da peça oferece uma visão rica dos bastidores políticos (por extensão, de todos os tempos e de todas as culturas) naquilo que esses bastidores têm de mais corriqueiro: as alianças que se fazem e desfazem conforme os interesses mais prementes; as promessas e traições políticas; o ser político como um ator que se vale de objetos de cena e de personagens coadjuvantes para cativar o seu público; tudo isso e muito mais está em Ricardo III. (14)

Richard's ambition transforms him in the most devilish creature, who does not measure his actions when it comes to conquering the crown. José Renato Ferraz da Silveira agrees with Viégas-Faria in concluding that “em *Ricardo III*, poder político se apresenta sem disfarces. O bardo inglês realiza a teatralização da política expressando as tensões e paradoxos que atravessam a esfera do poder: o potencial com que a política pode contribuir ou impedir a melhoria da condição humana” (4). Certainly, Richard is a typical example of a corrupt politician. With his undeniable intelligence, Richard is able to seduce the audience and to dominate the other characters in the play, besides all the devilish plans and strategies he uses to conquer the crown. According to Kiernan,

¹ The edition used in this dissertation is the Riverside Shakespeare. USA: Houghton Mifflin, 1974. All Further reference refer to this edition.

“physically handicapped, [Richard] plumes himself on his intellectual superiority, the skill with which he can bend human beings to his will” (46). Throughout the play, Richard commits crimes, lies, provokes quarrels in the family, plans the bloodiest strategies ever to occupy the English throne, and when he is finally nominated to be the king, Richard “refuses” the crown. It may be argued that in refusing the crown, Richard reaches the limit of hypocrisy and sarcasm that a character could ever reach. Therefore, refusing the crown is another plan in Richard’s list of strategies. In order to be elected by the population, corrupt politicians simply act like Richard. They are keen on doing whatever they can to occupy a position and when they are officially nominated to it, sometimes they pretend not to deserve the job.

Throughout the play, some readers may come to the conclusion that Richard simply does not serve to be a politician. However, what Richard wants is to sit on the English throne and guarantee his crown for as long as he can. Richard is selfish and is only concerned about his own interests and social status. According to Leggatt, “it is appropriate for an intriguer to be a solitary, but a King, whatever final privacy he maintains, must be the centre of a whole network of social and political relationship, and Richard simply cannot function in that way” (36).

Due to the possibility of relating *Richard III* with the sociopolitical context of a certain time, the purpose of this chapter is to analyze Jô Soares’ production of *Ricardo III* in relation to the political context of Brazil in the years from 2003 to 2006. It is worth saying that during these years, Brazilian politics was going through one of its most delicate moments since President Fernando Collor de Mello’s government,² in 1992. This political instability happened due to several scandals that surrounded President Lula’s government.

In an attempt to assess the production as a whole, I have divided this chapter into three parts: conception, production, and reception. Because a production’s conception is often regulated by local context, in the first part, I comment on the sociopolitical context of Brazil from the years 2003 to 2006, being 2006 the year the production was staged. Part

²Fernando Collor de Mello’s government was considered one of the most corrupt governments from the 1990s. Due to scandals and corruptions that happened in his government, the population, especially the youngsters, made a manifesto in favor of the President’s impeachment. Because of the pressure of the population to take Collor away from the presidency, the congress voted the process that opened Collor’s possible impeachment. On December 28, 1992, President Collor renounced his mandate before the congress decided to approve his impeachment. Thus, the President lost his political rights and was replaced by Itamar Franco. Without this manifesto made by the population, the impeachment would not have existed and Collor would have finished his mandate.

two deals with the analysis of three scenes of said production, and their relation to Brazilian politics. Finally, the third part deals with the production's overall critical reception.

2.1 Conception

The years that go from 2003 to 2006 were surrounded by a delicate scenario in Brazilian politics. Ruled by President Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva, the political party from the left-wing, namely PT--*Partido dos Trabalhadores*--went through a polemic moment. The reason for this political instability had to do with scandals that occurred in President Lula's government, being *Escândalo dos Bingos*, *Escândalo dos Correios* and *Mensalão* the most remarkable ones. These scandals caused a negative impact in President Lula's government, harming his image as President and the image of PT.

The first scandal in Lula's government was *Escândalo dos Bingos*, also known as "*Caso Waldomiro Diniz*", which happened in February of 2004. On December 06, 2006, the newspaper *Folha Online* published an article, entitled "Entenda a CPI dos Bingos", defining *Escândalo dos Bingos* and explaining how it was discovered. According to *Folha Online*, "*Escândalo dos Bingos teve como característica principal a atuação do ex-assessor da casa civil, Waldomiro Diniz, flagrado em vídeo negociando dinheiro ilegal com um empresário do ramo de jogos*" (par.1). Due to the great impact caused by the discovery of this scandal, a CPI³ was settled in June of 2005 to investigate the case.

This CPI did not investigate only *Escândalo dos Bingos*, but it also started to investigate *Partido dos Trabalhadores*. The investigation resulted in the discovery of *Escândalo dos Correios*, which happened in May of 2005 and had to do with illegal actions committed by Mauricio Marinho, director of ECT--*Empresa de Correios e Telégrafos*--in Brazil. According to Policarpo Júnior, from *Veja*, "*Marinho foi flagrado em uma gravação de vídeo recebendo dinheiro e narrando em detalhes o funcionamento de uma estrutura clandestina de arrecadação de dinheiro ilegal*" (par.1). Júnior also observes that besides Marinho, other eight members of ECT were involved in the scandal: Antonio Osório, Fernando Godoy, Julio Imoto, Eduardo Coutinho, Roberto Jefferson,

³ In April 2006, *Veja* published an article, entitled "O Sujeito Oculto", and defined CPI (comissão Parlamentar de Inquérito) as "*um órgão do Congresso Nacional criado toda vez que deputados senadores entendem que seja necessário fazer uma investigação aprofundada. Uma CPI tem poderes de polícia, podendo pedir quebra de sigilo telefônico, bancário ou fiscal ou dar ordem de prisão.*" (52)

João Henrique Almeida, Roberto Garcia Salmeron, and Horácio Batista. According to Júnior, the images showed in the recording “*provocaram o maior escândalo político desde o impeachment do presidente Fernando Collor de Mello*” (par.1).

Unfortunately, the succession of scandals in President Lula’s government did not stop with *Escândalo dos Correios*. On June 06, 2005, the representative Roberto Jefferson, leader of PTB- RJ, confessed in an interview to *Folha de S. Paulo* the existence of an allowance of R\$30.000 paid for the representatives of PP (Partido Progressista) and PL (Partido Liberal) to vote in favor of President Lula’s projects. Such allowance was introduced to the Brazilian social and political vocabulary as *Mensalão*, and it was translated into English as “Big-monthly allowance” or “vote-buying” and to Spanish as “Mensalón”.

If *Escândalo dos Correios* caused great political instability, *Mensalão* was much more polemic. Diego Escostesguy, from *Veja*, concludes that the record of scandals was broken in Lula’s government. To Escostesguy, “*a atual safra de deputados e senadores que partem agora para tentar se reeleger (ou não) nas eleições de outubro próximo bateu todos os recordes e superou as piores expectativas*” (54). Escostesguy certainly refers to the forty politicians involved in the scandal of *Mensalão*. Thus, their involvement in the scandal might have been a strong factor to harm President Lula’s government. According to Jorge Almeida, “*foram caindo os principais dirigentes nacionais do PT, incluindo o Tesoureiro, o Secretário-geral e o Presidente. O processo atinge também uma série de deputados da base governista, inclusive do PT, sendo alguns forçados a renunciar para evitar cassação*” (132). This unfortunate event that Almeida refers to weakened President Lula’s government, because most of its participants were forced to renounce their political positions in the government.

The scandals in President Lula’s government served as a strong argument for the opposition to try to take Lula away from the presidency. In fact, every time that President Lula was a candidate, the opposition (right-wing parties) tried to prevent him from governing the country. In the elections of 1989, the opposition was trying to convince the population that there would be another dictatorship in Brazil if Lula became president. The same happened in the elections of 1994, 1998, and 2002. One typical example was the TV commercial starred by the actress Regina Duarte in 2002. In the commercial, Duarte pronounced the sentence: “*Eu tenho medo*” (I am afraid), which had to do with the fear of another dictatorship in Brazil if President Lula was elected.

Certainly, this commercial, produced by the opposition and broadcast by *Rede Globo*, was part of a political campaign against the candidate Lula to convince the population that he should not be elected.

Whereas the opposition was thinking of an impeachment for the President, the left-wing parties were fighting against the accusations of corruption. According to Almeida, “*toda a mídia deu ampla repercussão aos acontecimentos e à CPI que foi instalada no Congresso Nacional, contribuindo para um grande desgaste das forças políticas governistas em geral*” (132). Almeida observes that it is rather problematic to measure how much the media has used the scandals of Lula’s government to weaken PT and the President’s image (132). For instance, in the political debate that preceded the presidential elections of 2006, President Lula was absent, and *Rede Globo*, which broadcast the debate, took advantage of the President’s absence to promote the candidate from the opposition. According to Luciana Veiga et al, “*para alguns jornalistas e formadores de opinião, a onda anti-Lula teria sido impulsionada com a ausência do presidente no debate da Rede Globo*” (198). To Veiga et al, the President’s absence from the political debate was harmful, because the population, in general, considers the political debates to be more informative and more influential than electoral commercials.

In any event, the problematic scenario in Lula’s government and all the media’s struggle were not sufficient to take Lula away from the Presidency, since the president was reelected in 2006. The opposition expected that the population would make a manifesto, just like they had done in 1992 with President Collor, against the corruptions in President Lula’s government, but the population, in general, did not take the scandals into consideration in the elections of 2006. According to Almeida, only 26% of the population believed that Lula’s attitudes in relation to the scandals were deficient. Almeida concludes that no matter how corruptive Lula’s government was in the first years, the population still considered Lula’s mandate better than Fernando Henrique Cardoso’s government (132).

My hypothesis in analyzing Soares’ conception of *Ricardo III* in relation to the political context of Brazil in 2006 is that Soares, as an influential participant of the media, may have attempted to influence people’s minds, in particular the middle-class theatergoing audience, as regards the oncoming presidential elections. The hypothesis becomes even stronger considering the fact that the production was staged in May, 2006, some months before the presidential elections. In the next

part of this chapter, which concerns the production itself, I shall analyze three scenes in order to test my hypothesis.

2.2 Production

Soares' production counted on the presence of a famous, mainstream cast (appendix 1- picture 1). The leading roles were performed by Marco Ricca, as Ricardo, Gloria Menezes, as the Dutchess of York, and Denise Fraga, as Queen Elisabete. Marco Ricca had already interpreted the leading role in *Hamlet*, a spectacle directed by Ulysses Cruz, in 1996. However, Ricca's greatest ambition was to interpret Ricardo, whom Ricca himself defines as "one of Shakespeare's most fascinating characters to perform" (Brasil D5). Therefore, Ricca also recognizes the complexity in producing such a Shakespearean play like *Richard III* and interpreting Ricardo. According to him, "*Fazia três anos que eu planejava viver esse personagem nesse palco e, para isso, eu sabia que precisaria de um elenco vigoroso e uma direção que conhecesse com detalhes toda a riqueza do texto*" (Brasil D5).

Ricca, who is the co-producer of *Ricardo III*, counted on Jô Soares' participation to direct and to translate the text. Soares, who had also directed Shakespeare's *Romeo and Juliet* in 1969, accepted the task. Soares' translation was strongly praised by Ricca, who observes that, "*Jô não só leva a sério a trama de Shakespeare, mas ressalta alguns detalhes, muitas vezes esquecidos por outros diretores como o humor, que estabelece um canal com a platéia e a força das personagens femininas, também relegadas a segundo plano em outras versões*" (Brasil D5).

Soares' production took eight months of work and research. In his research, Soares discovered that Shakespeare's *Richard III* was never played entirely, due to the length of the play and the large number of characters; that is, a total of forty-eight. According to Soares, "*a primeira etapa foi excluir aqueles [personagens] que estavam ali apenas para marcar uma função de época, que deixava o texto datado*" (Brasil D5). The forty-eight characters in *Richard III* were reduced to fifteen in *Ricardo III*.

After translating the text, Soares started to prepare the production. The first step was the preparation of the actors to interpret their roles, a step that is "the most difficult problem an actor has to solve in approaching [an] important role" (Halio 31). Because of the complexity of the characters, the cast had a long process of preparation. First, they started preparing themselves by reading the text with the director, to work the best way to interpret their characters. The next step

concerned the stage rehearsals, which counted on the participation of Renata Mello to prepare the cast physically for the production. Due to the difficulty in performing Ricardo, Marco Ricca reveals that the body preparation with Mello was helpful to his interpretation: “*tive a preparação corporal da Renata Mello, que me ajudou muito e fui orientado pela própria peça e pelo Jô*” (screen 17).

In relation to the body preparation by Mello, Denise Fraga points out that the aim was to help the actors free their bodies from any tension, in order to facilitate interpretation. According to Fraga, “*é você deixar seu corpo disponível, quase vulnerável para a entrada daquele personagem*” (screen 19). Gloria Menezes also reveals her anxiety in interpreting the Dutchess of York, Ricardo’s mother. According to her, “*comecei a ler, a pensar, mas eu não tinha em que me basear, porque eu nunca, na minha vida, pude supor que uma mãe pudesse fazer uma maldição dessas. Nem existe*” (screen 16). Menezes refers to her role as Ricardo’s mother whose tragedy concerns the fact that she blames herself for giving birth to such a devilish creature.

Besides the preparation of the cast, it was also necessary to prepare the setting and the costumes for the production. The setting of *Ricardo III* was designed by Aby Cohen and Lee Dawkings. As an interesting fact, the setting of the spectacle is sparse, without any appealing detail, which according to Soares, helps the spectator focus their attention on the actors’ performance (D5). Also, the sparse setting, as the co-producer Giuliano Ricca observes, “*faz com que o expectador interaja com a peça, imaginando os lugares onde as intrigas aconteciam.*”

As for the costumes, they were designed by Cássio Brasil and Veronica Julian. According to Brasil, the material used to produce the costumes was taken from stores that sold equestrian goods. Ricardo’s crown, for instance, was made of horse’s spur. According to Denise Fraga, “*o figurino do Cássio tem uma cara especial. Não é de época nenhuma, mas tem uma linguagem que comunica. É uma escolha de um profissional, de um artista. O Cássio é muito criativo*” (screen 24). In relation to the music and lights, they were used to signal the changes of time and space, from one scene to another. The music, produced exclusively to *Ricardo III*, was composed by Eduardo Queiroz, and the lights were designed by Telma Fernandez.

As already implied, staging *Ricardo III* in the turmoil of corruptions and scandals in Brazil was at least revealing. Through the analysis of scenes from the production, it is possible to say that in an attempt to draw the audience’s attention to the political context of

Brazil, Soares criticizes the corrupt politicians who work for the government, as well as the president's attitudes in relation to the scandals that happened in Brazilian politics at the moment of the spectacle's conception. In what follows, I shall analyze the three scenes chosen: The analysis of scene 2 focuses on the construction of the character Ricardo, whereas scene 6 and scene 11 are related to the Brazilian sociopolitical context.

2.2.3 An Analysis of Scene 2

In the Battle of Tewksbury, one of the several armed conflicts between the Lancastrians and the Yorkists, the Lancastrian King Henry VI and his son, Edward, were killed by Richard of Gloucester. Thus, being the House of York⁴ victor in this battle, England started to be ruled by king Edward IV, the oldest son of Richard of York. Therefore, in this scene, which corresponds to 1.2 in Shakespeare's playtext, Richard courts Lady Anne in the presence of her father-in-law's dead body (King Henry VI).

The scene starts in an intense way. Lady Anne enters following Henry's dead body, which is carried by the guards and the halberds to be buried at the Monastery of Chertsey. After some moments of silence, Anne asks the guards to set the corpse down and then she mourns it for a moment. While she cries for Henry's and Edward's deaths over Henry's corpse, she expresses her misery by delivering a curse on the one who killed Henry and her husband, Edward. By watching lady Anne's misery toward her father-in-law's corpse, the spectators might sympathize with her condition as a young woman who has lost her husband and father-in-law at once and is about to be seduced by the devilish and fascinating Richard.

Right after Lady Anne's curse, the guards take the corpse again in order to take it to the monastery to be buried. However, at this moment, Richard enters and demands the guards to stop and set the corpse down. Richard's entrance allows a moment of tension to the scene. The spectators know that Richard is there to court Anne, since he confessed his plan of marrying her to conquer the crown in the end of 1.1, but they do not know how he will proceed. In addition, lady Anne, revolted with Richard's presence, starts to insult him with the worst adjectives. Some of the words she uses to describe him are "devil" (45),

⁴ When Richard delivers his famous opening soliloquy in act 1, scene 1, he mentions that the victory belongs to the House of York: "Now the winter of our discontent / Made glorious summer by this son of York." (1)

“minister of hell” (46), “villain” (70), “hedgehog” (102), “homicide” (125), “fouler toad” (147), and “dissembler” (184). Besides contributing to add intensity to the scene, Lady Anne’s insults reinforce Richard’s characterization as a villain. But Richard is so successful in his rhetoric, that he is able to use Anne’s insults in his favor. One example is when Anne says, “o wonderful, when devils tell the [troth]” (73) and Richard immediately answers, “more wonderful, when angels are so angry” (74). His strategic rhetoric is to compliment her whenever she insults him. Another remarkable passage is when Anne spits on Richard’s face and he says “why dost thou spit at me?”(144). She answers: “would it were mortal poison for thy sake” (145), and Richard takes advantage of Anne’s insults saying “never came poison from so sweet a place” (146).

Another passage that shows Richard’s powerful rhetoric is when he gives Anne his ring and says “look how my ring encompasseth thy finger, / Even so thy breast encloseth my poor heart: / Wear both of them, for both of them are thine” (203-5). When Richard says these lines, he acts as if he were completely in love with Anne. Hypocrite as he is, he is able to do so with undeniable perfection and, therefore, seduces her at this moment.

At the end of the scene, when Anne leaves, Richard delivers one of his famous soliloquies. In his words, he confesses to the audience that he has Lady Anne, but he will not keep her long. He takes off his mask of a virtuous man and confesses to the audience that his intention of marriage is only to guarantee the crown. According to Leggatt, “here we seem to be Richard’s accomplices: he tells us what he will do, and at the end shares with us his delight at having done it” (34). Richard’s last soliloquy in 1.1 and in 1.2 proves Leggatt’s words. At the end of 1.1 he confesses that he will marry lady Anne, because of the crown:

GLOU. For then I’ll marry Warwick’s youngest daughter. /
What though I kill’d her husband and her father? / The
readiest way to make the wench amend / Is to become her
husband and her father: / the which will I, not all so much for
love / As for another secret close intent / By marrying her
which I must reach unto. (153-59)

In the end of 1.2, he joyfully tells the spectators that he did what he promised: “Was ever a woman in this humor woo’d? / Was ever woman in this humor won? / I’ll have her, but I will not keep her long” (228-9).

Taking into consideration the circumstances in which Richard courts lady Anne and how he does it, I believe that this scene is

interesting to observe Richard's cruel, hypocritical, and at the same time fascinating personality. Certainly, Richard shows his devilish character in other scenes of the play, but it seems that it is in this particular one that all his villainy and cunning flourish. He is able to be so convincing in his discourse that Anne believes that Richard is being true to her and really thinks that she can read his mind and heart. Thus, she has quite the same destiny as Clarence and Hastings, who also believed for a moment that they could see Richard's heart. In Leggatt's words, "the illusion of complicity with Richard that Clarence, Anne, and Hastings have in their different ways may reinforce our sense of superiority over them, but it should also be a warning. The wooing of Anne is a case in point" (34).

In what follows, I analyze how Soares constructed this scene. He did not alter radically the textual translation,⁵ but made some necessary cuts to shorten the time of the performance. As for the main character, it seems that Soares constructed a more ironic Richard and consequently more humorous. It is possible to say that he took advantage of Richard's physical deformity and exaggerated it to construct a funny Richard. Besides being a hunchback, Soares' Ricardo is portrayed as a gangling man (appendix 1- picture 2). Therefore, my interest with this scene is not to analyze it entirely, but to observe the passages in which Ricardo's villainy, hypocrisy and irony are more evident.

The first moment that is worth observing in this scene is when Ricardo lies, saying that he did not kill Anna's husband, whereas the truth is that he was responsible for King Henry VI's and Prince Edward's deaths. The piece of dialogue that follows shows how Ricardo uses his powerful persuasion to seduce Anna, interpreted by Maria Manoella (appendix 1- picture 3):

RICARDO. *Eu não matei teu marido*

ANNA. *Ah é? Então ele está vivo?*

RICARDO. *Não. Ele foi morto pelos meus irmãos.*

ANNA. *Só sai mentira da tua garganta sórdida. Então
você também matou o pai dele? (Apontando o
corpo de Henrique)*

RICARDO. *(olhando para o corpo) esse eu matei.*

ANNA. *E você ainda confirma, porco imundo?*

Henrique era um rei bom e tolerante. Um

⁵ Soares' translation has been published in book form (see primary sources, under reference list).

homem santo!

RICARDO. *Por isso que o lugar dele é no céu.*

ANNA. *E o teu é no inferno!*

RICARDO. *Tem outro lugar onde eu ficaria melhor.*

ANNA. *Na cadeia?*

RICARDO. *Não. No teu quarto. (42-54)*

In *Richard III*, the respective dialogue is the following:

GLOU: I did not kill your husband

ANNE: Why then he is alive.

GLOU: Nay, he is dead, and slain by Edward's hands.

ANNE: In thy foul throat thou li'st!

Queen Margaret saw

The murd'rous falchion smoking in his blood;

The which thou once didst bend against her breast,

But that thy brothers beat aside the point.

GLOU: I was provoked by her sland'rous tongue,
That laid their guilt upon my guiltless shoulders.

ANNE: Thou wast provoked by thy bloody mind,
That never dream'st on aught but butcheries.

Didst thou not kill this king?

GLOU: I grant ye.

ANNE: Dost grant me, hedgehog? Then God grant
me too

Thou mayst be damned for that wicked deed!

O, he was gentle, mild, and virtuous!

GLOU: The better for the king of Heaven that hath
him.

ANNE: He is in heaven, where thou shalt never
come.

GLOU: Let him thank me that help to send him
thither;

For he was fitter for that place than earth.

ANNE: And thou unfit for any place, but hell.

GLOU: Yes, one place else, if you will hear me
Name it.

ANNE: Some dungeon.

GLOU: Your bedchamber. (92-111)

Besides affirming that he did not kill Edward, Ricardo blames his brothers for Edward's death. In the middle of this dialogue, Soares used an interesting visual interpolation, which seems to add a certain humor to this moment in the scene. When Anna says, "*então você também não*

matou o pai dele?” (46), the stage directions indicate that she points to Henry’s corpse. Then, Ricardo looks at the corpse and shamelessly answers, *“esse eu matei”* (47). It seems humorous to see Ricardo looking at Henry’s corpse and telling without any remorse that he killed the man. Moreover, by saying, *“esse eu matei”*, Ricardo seems to be proud of having killed Henry.

Another interesting visual interpolation added by Soares in this scene happens when Anna tells Ricardo that his presence caused Henry’s wounds to bleed. When she says, *“olha! As chagas do rei Henrique abrem de novo as bocas congeladas e voltam a sangrar!”* (29-30), Anna and the monks, interpreted by Jiddu Pinheiro and Rodrigo Lombardi, bless themselves. The fact that Henry’s wound started to bleed again implies that something supernatural was happening at that moment. Thus, they bless themselves as an act of protection. Soares probably added this visual interpolation to create humor in this tense moment of the scene.

Another passage that is worth observing is when Ricardo uses his rhetoric to justify Henry’s death. When Anna says, *“Henrique era um bom rei e tolerante. Um homem santo”* (49), Ricardo immediately answers, *“por isso que o lugar dele é o céu”* (50). By saying this line, Ricardo takes advantage of Anna’s definition, *“homem santo”* and attempts to convince her that, because Henry is a saint, Ricardo has sent him to heaven. According to Leggatt, by saying this line, Richard delivers “one of his most imprudent jokes” (34). It is not only in this scene that he delivers this imprudent joke, though. In scene 1, which corresponds to 1.1 in Shakespeare’s playtext, Ricardo uses quite the same argument by saying to the spectators that he loves Clarence so much that he will send him to heaven: *“coitado do Clarence... tão ingênuo... meu amor por ele é tão grande que, logo logo, vou enviar a alma dele ao céu”* (86-7). Besides scene 1, there is another example in scene 10, (3.5 in Shakespeare’s playtext). Ricardo holds a bag with Hastings’ head in it and confesses to the audience, *“eu amava tanto esse homem, que não consigo deixar de chorar.”* (1-2). Ricardo is extremely hypocritical and ironic when saying this line, because the spectators know that it was Ricardo himself who ordered Hastings’ execution. His hypocrisy and irony are visible in his facial expression (appendix 1-pictures 4 and 5).

Ricardo’s next argument to seduce Anna consists in convincing her that he is falling in love with her. Thus, he admits he killed Edward and explains that it was because of her beauty: *“a tua beleza, que afugenta o meu sono e molha os meus sonhos. Eu mataria o mundo*

inteiro em troca de uma hora entre a doçura dos teus seios” (60-2). In *Richard III*, the corresponding line is the following, “Your beauty was the cause of that effect / Your beauty, that did haunt me in my sleep / To undertake the death of all the world, / So I might live one hour in your sweet bosom” (121-4). By admitting that he killed Henry and Edward, Ricardo is, in a certain way, being true to Anne. However, he lies shamelessly in affirming that he killed her husband because of her beauty.

When Ricardo delivers these lines, Anna abhors his words by saying, “*Assassino! Se eu acreditasse nisso, arrancava com as unhas o desenho do meu rosto*” (63-4). However, Ricardo does not give up and goes even farther, saying, “*quem te privou do teu homem fez isso pra te dar um homem melhor*” (68). Naïve as Anna is, she asks Ricardo who this man is and Ricardo shamelessly answers, “*eu*” (72). Leggatt explains that “part of the excitement of the scene lies in watching the risks Richard takes in telling Anne the truth: that he feels no pity for having killed king Henry, that he killed Anne’s husband Edward. He twists the significance of the last fact in particular by claiming he did it for her love, but his openness with her is still extraordinary” (34).

Ricardo continues to play the devil by seducing Anna with his lies. In the following passage, Ricardo pretends to be regretful for having killed Henry and Edward and he pretends to be humiliating himself in Anna’s presence. His hypocrisy reaches its peak, when he says the following words:

RICARDO. (...) *O teu olhar arranca lágrimas desses olhos que nunca choraram antes. O que a tristeza não fez, a tua beleza conseguiu, afogando os meus olhos no meu próprio choro. Nunca pedi nada a amigo ou inimigo. Da minha boca nunca saiu uma palavra carinhosa, mas agora meu coração orgulhoso aprende a ser humilde e ensina a minha boca a suplicar. (Ela o olha com desprezo). Apaga esse desprezo que eu leio nos teus lábios. Tua boca nasceu para ser beijada e não para expressar tanto rancor. Se não te for possível perdoar, toma, pega esse punhal e liberta a minha alma que te adora. Eu entrego o peito nu à tua vingança e te imploro a morte de joelhos. (Ele se ajoelha, lhe entrega o punhal e descobre o peito se oferecendo à morte). Não, não vacila! Eu matei, sim, o rei Henrique, mas foi a tua beleza que obrigou. Vai rápido, fui eu que apunhalei o teu marido, mas foi teu rosto que me enfeitçou. (Ela deixa cair o punhal). Não! Pega*

*o punhal de novo. Pega o punhal... ou pega a minha mão.
(77-95)*

In Shakespeare's playtext, this passage is the following:

GLOU. (...) Those eyes of thine from mine have drawn salt tears, / Sham'd their aspects with store of childish drops: / These eyes, which never shed remorseful tear / No, when my father York and Edward wept / To hear the piteous moan that Rutland made / When Black-fac'd Clifford shook his sword at him; / Nor when thy warlike father, like a child, / Told the sad story of my father's death, / And twenty times made pause to sob and weep, / That all the standers-by had wet their cheeks / Like trees bedash'd with rain- in that sad time / My manly eyes did scorn an humble tear; / And what these sorrows could not thence exhale, / Thy beauty hath, and made them blind with weeping. / I never sued to friend nor enemy; / My tongue could never learn sweet smoothing word; / But now thy beauty is propos'd my fee, / My proud heart sues, and prompts my tongue to speak. /

She looks scornfully at him.

Teach not thy lip such scorn; for it was made / For kissing, lady, not for such contempt; / If thy revengeful heart cannot forgive, / Lo here I lend thee this sharp-pointed sword, / Which if thou please to hide in this true beast, / And let the soul forth that adareth thee, / I lay it naked to the deadly stroke, / And humbly beg the death upon my knee. /

He lays his breast open; she offers at [it] with his sword.

Nay, do not pause: for I did kill King Henry- / But 'twas thy beauty that provoked me. / Nay, now dispatch: 'twas I that stabb'd young Edward / But 'twas thy heavenly face that set me on

She falls the sword.

Take up the sword again, or take up me. (153-183)

Ricardo's words are accompanied with a dramatic show. He is really convincing in pretending to be sorry for Henry's and Edward's deaths and in pretending to be in love with Anna. According to Leggatt, "it

seems to Richard's victims that he is being frank with them--and he really is, up to a point, with Anne" (34). When Ricardo says, "*o teu olhar arranca lágrimas desses olhos que nunca choraram antes*" (78-9), he is being true in saying that he never cried before, but he lies when he argues that Anna's beauty is the cause of his tears. He also says the truth when he says "*da minha boca nunca saiu uma palavra carinhosa*" (81), but he lies when he justifies it by saying, "*mas agora meu coração orgulhoso aprende a ser humilde e ensina minha boca a suplicar*" (82-3).

Besides, Ricardo's devilish strategy goes beyond his words. At a certain point, he forces Anne to make a choice: pardon him and marry him or kill him. Needless to say, Ricardo knows that a fragile woman like Anna would never be able to kill him. According to Leggatt, "with her alternatives thus reduced, and finding herself unable to kill in cold blood, Anne surrenders" (34). Thus, when Ricardo says, "*se não te for possível perdoar, toma, pega esse punhal e liberta a minha alma que te adora. Eu entrego o peito nu à tua vingança e te imploro a morte de joelhos.*" (87-8), he plays the victim and begs his execution. At this moment, he gives Anna his sword, kneels in front of her and waits for her to kill him. When he does so, Anna believes that he is being sincere and feels sorry for him.

Observing that Anna does not have the courage to kill him, Ricardo obliges her to do so, almost forces her: "*Não, não vacila! Eu matei, sim, o rei Henrique, mas foi a tua beleza que obrigou. Vai, rápido, fui eu que apunhalei o teu marido, mas foi teu rosto que me enfeitiçou*" (92-3). But lady Anne drops the sword on the floor and does not kill Ricardo. From the beginning, Ricardo knew that Anna would proceed this way, because he knows that she is an innocent and fragile woman. Leggatt concludes that the spectators, like Anne, would choose not to kill Richard, because Richard established a special relationship with them in his soliloquies: "safe in the auditorium, we cannot be presented with this kind of challenge; but our alternatives too have been reduced. (...) faced with this choice, we naturally go with Richard, especially since he is so frank with us. But it seems to Richard's victims that he is being frank with them" (34). Like the spectators, Anna really feels that Ricardo is being sincere with her and, therefore, she chooses not to kill him.

Another passage that shows Ricardo's devilish personality is when he promises Anna that he will prepare Henry's funeral. His argument is that he feels so sorry for Henry's death that he will prepare the funeral that Henry deserves: "*deixa que eu trate desse funeral. Eu te*

encontro depois de enterrar o santo rei Henrique, com todas as pompas que ele merece e de regar o seu túmulo com as lágrimas do meu arrependimento. Deixa? Por favor...” (118-121). The corresponding comment in Shakespeare’s playtext is the following,

GLOU. That may please you leave these sad designs / To him that hath most cause to be a mourner, / And presently repair to Crosby House:/ Where (after I have solemnly interr’d/ At Chertsey monast’ry this noble king, and wet his grave with my repentant tears) / I will with all expedient duty see you, / For divers unknown reasons, I beseech you./ Grand me this boon. (210-18)

Ricardo’s irony and hypocrisy when he says, “(...) *regar o seu túmulo com as lágrimas do meu arrependimento*” (120) are so intense that it may sound funny, depending on how the actor delivers this line. In Shakespeare’s playtext, the corresponding line is not very different, though: “After I have solemnly interr’d / At Chertsey Monast’ry this noble king, / And wet his grave with my repentant tears” (213-15).

When Anna leaves with the guards and the monks, Ricardo takes off his mask of a good man and delightfully shares with the spectator his victory in having conquered her. Through his soliloquy, which is very famous in the playtext, it is possible to see how cold-hearted Richard is in confessing to the spectator his plans with Anna. When he says that he has her but will not keep her long, he means that as soon as he conquers the crown, he will get rid of Anna. He does not mention how, but the spectators imagine that he will kill her. And that is what he does. When he becomes king, he asks Stanley to spread rumours that Anne is sick: “Rumor it abroad that Anne, my wife, is very grievous sick” (2.4-50). The corresponding line in Soares’ translation is the following, “*espalha o boato de que a minha mulher Anna está morrendo*” (14.57). Ricardo gets rid of Anna when he becomes king because he needs to keep the crown. Thus, he has to marry his niece, Elizabeth, daughter to king Edward IV.

In Soares’ playtext, Ricardo’s soliloquy is loaded with irony and sarcasm, just like Richard’s soliloquy in Shakespeare’s playtext. However, Soares’ translation in some moments of the soliloquy seems quite humorous:

RICARDO. *Será que alguma mulher já foi conquistada assim? Será que alguma mulher já foi ganha desse jeito? O que? Depois de matar o sogro e o marido, seduzir a viúva? Quando ela tem o coração cheio de ódio por mim, com*

pragas na boca e lágrimas nos olhos? Eu, que fui o causador de sua miséria sangrenta e a razão da sua vingança, tendo, contra mim, Deus, a sua consciência e um morto no caixão? Mesmo assim ganhar, apostando tudo contra nada, contando só com a ajuda do diabo e do meu olhar enganador? Ha! Eu sou muito bom... ela é minha! Só que eu não vou ficar com ela muito tempo... Será que ela já se esqueceu do marido, que eu matei há menos de três meses de pura irritação, e se rebaixa olhando pra mim que sou manco e torto e que a deixei sozinha na tristeza dos lençóis? Ela acha que eu sou um homem atraente e elegante! Vou comprar um espelho grande e contratar uma dúzia de alfaiates para ver que roupas me caem melhor. Eu preciso investir nesse meu lado encantador. (para os monges e o lanceiro que ficaram mais afastados do corpo do caixão). Vocês! Tirem isso daqui (eles saem com o corpo). Bom: primeiro eu vou jogar o defunto na cova, depois vou suspirando encontrar o meu amor. Brilha sol, iluminando o espaço! Até que eu compre um espelho pra admirar minha sombra quando passo.(125-150)

In Shakespeare's playtext, Richard's soliloquy is as follows,

GLOU: Was ever a woman in this humor woo'd? / Was ever a woman in this humor won? / I'll have her, but I will not keep her long. / What? I, that kill'd her husband and his father, / To take her in her heart's extremest hate, / With curses in her mouth, tears in her eyes, / The bleeding witness of my hatred by, / Having God, her conscience, and these bars against me, / And I no friends to back my suit [at all] / But the plain devil and dissembling looks? / And yet to win her! All the world to nothing! / Ha! / Hath she forgot already that brave prince, / Edward, her lord, whom I, some three months since, / Stabb'd in my angry mood at Tewksbury? / A sweeter and a lovelier gentleman, / Fram'd in the prodigality of nature- / Young, valiant, wise, and (no doubt) right royal- / The spacious world cannot again afford. / And will she yet abase her eyes on me, / That cropp'd the golden prime of this sweet prince / And made her widow to a woeful bed? / On me, whose all not equals Edward's moi'ty? / On me, that halts and am misshapen thus? / My dukedom to a beggarly denier, / I do mistake my person all this while! / Upon my life, she finds (although I cannot) / Myself to be a marv'lous proper man. / I'll be at charge for a looking-glass, / And entertain a score or two of tailors / To study fashions to adorn my body: / Since I am crept in favor with myself, / I will

maintain it with some little cost. / But first I'll turn yon
fellow in his grave, / And then return lamenting to my love. /
Shine out, fair sun, till I have brought a glass, / That I may
see my shadow as I pass (228-63).

One interesting moment in Ricardo's soliloquy is when he celebrates his victory by saying, "*Ha! Eu sou muito bom...*" (135). In Shakespeare's playtext, Richard's corresponding line ends in "Ha!" (238). Thus, it is possible to say that this verbal interpolation used by Soares creates humor, since it might be comic for the spectators to see Ricardo praising himself for having conquered Anna saying "*eu sou muito bom*" (135).

Another passage that is worth observing in Ricardo's soliloquy is when he refers to his own physical deformity by saying, "*(...) e se rebaixa olhando pra mim que sou manco e torto e que a deixei sozinha na tristeza dos lençóis? Ela acha que sou um homem atraente e elegante!*"(138-9). As already mentioned, Ricardo's physical deformity was reinforced by Soares. Thus, Ricardo is extremely ironic when he delivers these lines concerning his own physical appearance. In Shakespeare's playtext, the corresponding words, "*(...) And made her widow to a woeful bed?/ On me, whose all not equals Edward's moi'ty/ On me, that halts and am misshapen thus?*" (248-50) are not very different from Soares' translation, but taking into consideration Soares' depiction of Ricardo, these lines might sound funny to the audience.

However, in spite of all his irony, Ricardo knows that he is physically deformed and this does not prevent him from seducing his victims. On the contrary, he uses his physical appearance⁶ in his favor to express his villainy. When he says "*ela acha que eu sou um homem atraente e elegante!*" (140), he seems to be celebrating with delight that his power of seduction has blinded Anna and she does not see how physically deformed and ugly he is. In Shakespeare's playtext, Richard even compares himself to Edward. He acknowledges that Edward is a better looking man and truly royal: "A

⁶ When Richard delivers his opening soliloquy in 1.1, he talks about his physical deformity and takes advantage of it to express his villainy: "Why, I, in this weak piping time of peace, / Have no delight to pass away the time, / Unless to see my shadow in the sun / And descant on mine own deformity. / And therefore, since I cannot prove a lover, / To entertain these fair well spoken days, / I am determined to prove a villain / And hate the idle pleasures of these days" (24-31). Soares translated this respective passage as follows, "*eu, que fui construído às pressas por uma natureza descuidada que se esqueceu de me completar; e me lançou no mundo disforme, mal-acabado, estranho e sem feitio, fico só observando entediado a minha sombra, perplexo com a minha deformidade. E, como eu não participo dessas diversões, me dedico a ser o mais canalha dos canalhas.*" (15-23)

sweeter and a lovelier gentleman, / Fram'd in the prodigality of nature- / Young, valiant, wise, and (no doubt) right royal” (142-44). Interestingly, Soares has opted to cut these lines and therefore, Ricardo does not refer to Edward in his soliloquy. Ricardo's sense of humor is also reinforced when he says, “*eu preciso investir nesse meu lado encantador*” (144). In Richard's soliloquy, the corresponding line is the following, “Since I am in crept in favor with myself, / I will maintain it with some little cost” (258-9).

The end of Ricardo's soliloquy is also worth observing. He is extremely hypocritical when he demands the guards to take Henry's corpse away. As aforementioned, he promised Anna that he would be responsible for Henry's funeral. However, this is not what he does when Anna leaves. He demands the guards to get rid of Henry's body: “*Vocês! Tirem isso daqui. Bom: primeiro eu vou jogar o defunto na cova, depois vou suspirando encontrar o meu amor*” (146-8). In Shakespeare's playtext, the corresponding passage is quite different. Richard demands the guards and the halberds to take Henry's corpse to White-friars, a Carmelite priority in London. Thus, the corresponding lines in *Richard III* are, “Sirs, take up the corpse (...) to White-Friars, there attend my coming.” (225-227). When the guards leave with the corpse, Richard delivers his soliloquy to the audience, alone on stage. In Soares' scene, Ricardo delivers the soliloquy to the audience in the presence of the monks and in the end of his soliloquy, he demands the monks to leave with the corpse.

Through this analysis, it is possible to infer that this scene is revealing to the Brazilian political reality of the time. Metaphorically speaking, Anna represents the Brazilian population: just as Anna feels impotent towards Ricardo's seduction, the Brazilian population felt impotent in relation to the corruption and to the scandals that happened in Brazilian politics at the time: just as Ricardo lies in saying that he does not kill Edward and Henry, some corrupt politicians have lied in saying they were innocent in the scandals. Some of them even appeared on television asking for votes in 2006 as if nothing had happened. Just as Ricardo seduces Anna with his rhetoric and his undelivered promises, some corrupt politicians seduce the population with their undelivered promises and their charisma. In short, just as Ricardo causes Anna's disgrace, the corruption that involved the Brazilian government at the time caused serious consequences to the Brazilian economy and to the population.

2.2.4 An Analysis of Scene 6

This scene, which corresponds to 2.3 in Shakespeare's *Richard III*, refers to the citizens' comments on the uncertain future of the country because of King Edward's sudden death. The citizens' concern lies on the fact that the King's eldest son and heir of the crown, Prince Edward, is only 12 years old and due to his underage, the prince counts on his royal uncles' protection. In comparing Soares' scene *vis-à-vis* its correspondent scene in *Richard III*, it is possible to say that Soares seems to express a strong criticism on Brazilian politics that cannot be ignored.

The citizens' comments, especially in the beginning and in the end of the scene, seem to address some corrupt politicians and the problematic scenario of Brazilian politics at the time. Soares has omitted the presence of the third citizen in the scene and consequently has cut some lines of the citizens' comments in *Richard III*. Thus, the conversation in *Ricardo III* happens between the first citizen, interpreted by Fábio Heford, and the second citizen, interpreted by Jiddu Pinheiro (appendix 1- picture 6). Taking into account that the textual analysis of Soares' scene is based on the comparison to its correspondent scene in *Richard III*, I shall transcribe below Soares' text and Shakespeare's text, being the latter transcribed first:

Act 2, Scene 3

Enter one CITIZEN at one door and another at the other.

1. CIT. Good morrow, neighbor, whither away so fast?

2. CIT. I promise you, I scarcely know myself.

Hear you the news abroad?

1. CIT. yes, that the King is dead.

2. CIT. Ill news, by'r lady – seldom comes the better.

I fear, I fear 'twill prove a giddy world.

Enter another CITIZEN

3. CIT. Neighbors, God speed!

1. CIT. Give you good morrow, sir.

3. CIT. Doth the news hold of good King Edward's death?

2. CIT. Ay, sir, it is too true, god help the while!

3. CIT. Then, masters, look to see a troublous world.

1. CIT. No, no, by God's good grace his son shall reign.

3. CIT. Woe to that land that's govern'd by a child!
 2. CIT. In him there is a hope of government,
 Which in his nonage, council under him,
 And in his full and ripened years, himself,
 No doubt shall then, and till then, govern well.

1. CIT. So stood the state when Henry the Sixt
 Was crown'd in Paris but at nine months old.

3. CIT. Stood the state so? No, no, good friends,
 God wot,
 For then this land was famously enrich'd
 With politic grave counsel; then the King
 Had virtuous uncles to protect his Grace.

1. CIT. Why, so hath this, both by his father and mother.

3. CIT. Better it were they all came by his father,
 Or by his father there were none at all;
 For emulation who shall now be nearest
 Will touch us all too near, if God prevent not.
 O, full of danger is the Duke of Gloucester,
 And the Queen's sons and brother haughty and proud!
 And were they to be rul'd, and not to rule,
 This sickly land might solace as before.

1. CIT. Come, come, we fear the worst; all will be well.

3. CIT. When clouds are seen, wise men put on their cloaks;
 When great leaves fall, then winter is at hand;
 When the sun sets, who doth not look for night?
 Untimely storms makes men expect a dearth.
 All may be well, but if God sort it so,
 'Tis more than we deserve or I expect.

2. CIT. Truly, the hearts of men are full of fear.
 You cannot reason (almost) with a man
 That looks not heavily and full of dread.

3. CIT. Before the day of change, still is it so.
 By a divine instinct men's minds mistrust
 Ensuing danger; as by proof we see
 The water swell before a boist'rous storm.
 But leave it all to God. Whither away?

2. CIT. Marry, we were sent for to the justices.

3. CIT. And so was I... I'll bear you company.

Exeunt (2.3.1-47)

Cena 6

SEGUNDO CIDADÃO- *Bom dia, vizinho*

PRIMEIRO CIDADÃO- *Bom dia, vizinho. Onde vai com tanta
 pressa?*

- SEGUNDO CIDADÃO- *Sabe que não sei? Ouviu as novidades?*
- PRIMEIRO CIDADÃO- *Ouvi. O rei morreu.*
- SEGUNDO CIDADÃO- *Má notícia. Quando um rei morre, o Próximo quase sempre é pior. Lá vem desgraça.*
- PRIMEIRO CIDADÃO- *Que desgraça nada, o filho dele vai ser coroado.*
- SEGUNDO CIDADÃO- *Eu só sei que, quando a chuva começa, os homens espertos já se cobrem. Uma tempestade fora de estação sempre traz miséria.*
- PRIMEIRO CIDADÃO- *É verdade que tá todo mundo assustado, mas sempre acontece isso quando muda o governo.*
- SEGUNDO CIDADÃO- *Coitado do país que é governado por uma criança.*
- PRIMEIRO CIDADÃO- *Também não é assim. É um conselho De ministros que governa enquanto o rei for menino. Além disso, ele conta com a proteção dos tios: pelo lado da mãe e pelo lado do pai.*
- SEGUNDO CIDADÃO- *Era melhor que os tios fossem todos do mesmo lado.*
Imagina só a briga que vai haver entre Eles para controlar o menino. O duque Ricardo é um homem perigoso e a família da rainha é muito ambiciosa.
- PRIMEIRO CIDADÃO- *Pára com isso. Vamos deixar tudo nas mãos de Deus.*
- SEGUNDO CIDADÃO- *E tem outro jeito? Antigamente tinha Políticos honestos, preparados, tinha bons administradores com vontade de trabalhar.*
- PRIMEIRO CIDADÃO- *Pode ser. Mas eu tenho esperança que as coisas vão melhorar. Vai ter mais comida na mesa. Adeus, vizinho.*
- SEGUNDO CIDADÃO- *Adeus, vizinho. (Para a platéia): É, Toda vez que muda o governo falam isso, mas para nós sempre acaba em sopa. (6.1-23)*

The first words that seem to refer to the Brazilian sociopolitical context are in the second citizen's answer in relation to the death of the

King. The following words, “*Má notícia. Quando um rei more, o próximo quase sempre é pior*” (5) corresponds to the second citizen’s words in *Richard III* “Ill news, by’r lady- seldom comes the better./ I fear, I fear ‘twill prove a giddy world” (4). The citizen in *Richard III* does not seem to mention explicitly the fact that the next ruler is often worse than the first, which is clear in Soares’ translation. Thus, it is possible to say that the second citizen’s words in *Ricardo III* seem to express a criticism on the fact that the political crisis in President Lula’s government has contributed to cause a feeling of disappointment in the population, who expected from President Lula, in general terms, a better political situation in Brazil. It seems that director Soares wanted to show that President Lula’s government kept having the same characteristics of the previous governments and was involved in a succession of scandalous corruptions. Indeed, According to Vânia Araújo Barreto, desde o começo, “*o governo Lula apresentou-se como expressão da ‘continuidade’ do legado neoliberal dos anos 90, dos governos de Fernando Collor de Melo e Fernando Henrique Cardoso*” (12).

Another strong critique on the Brazilian government is expressed in Soares’ translation of the next lines. The first citizen’s following words: “*eu só sei que quando a chuva começa, os homens espertos já se cobrem. Uma tempestade fora de estação sempre traz miséria*” (8-9), which correspond to “when clouds are seen, wise men put on their cloaks; (...) Untimely, storms makes men expect dearth” (32-5) in *Richard III*, seem to refer to the fact that the scandals that affected Lula’s government were not expected by the population. Thus, this “*tempestade fora de estação*” that the citizens talk about seems to refer to the fact that President Lula’s government probably disappointed the ones who expected from Lula a different government, that is, a less corrupt one.

As for the following line “*quando a chuva começa, os homens espertos já se cobrem*”(7) it might be referring to the attitude of corrupt politicians of protecting their image and the image of the government towards the problematic situation that surrounded their administration. The first citizen’s answer: “*é verdade que tá todo mundo assustado, mas sempre acontece isso quando muda o governo*” (9) seems to refer to the population’s insecurity and hopelessness in relation to the upcoming elections (2006) and a new government. New government, because with the election of President Lula in 2002, it was the first time that PT was governing the country. That is, in 2002 the government in Brazil changed indeed. Furthermore, in considering the fact that the production was conceived in a moment of a succession of scandals in the Brazilian

government, the citizen's words, "*é verdade que tá todo mundo assustado*", might refer to the way the population felt in relation to the political crisis and to the aforementioned commercial "*Eu tenho medo*" made by Duarte in 2002.

As for the second citizen's words: "*coitado do país que é governado por uma criança*" (10), which correspond to "woe to that land that is govern'd by a child" (11) in *Richard III*, they refer to the fact that the prince is too young and inexperienced to rule the country. However, if taken into the Brazilian reality, these words seem to have an intrinsic connection to the President's apparently naïve insistence that he did not know about the scandals. Furthermore, the years 2003-2006 were the first time that President Lula governed the country. For this reason, the word "*criança*" could also refer to the government as a young and inexperienced government with an inexperienced president.

Another interesting aspect of the scene seems to lay on the first citizen's answer: "*também não é assim. É um conselho de ministros que governa enquanto o rei for menino. Além disso, ele conta com a proteção dos tios: pelo lado da mãe e pelo lado do pai*" (11-12), which corresponds to the second citizen's words "In him there is a hope of government, which in his nonage, council under him, and in his full and ripened years, himself, no doubt shall then, and till then, govern well" (12-15) in *Richard III*. Certainly, these lines refer to the fact that, because of the boy's underage, the royal uncles and ministers would rule the country instead. In his translation, Soares cut the sentence that refers to the council as "hope of government", which possibly implies the idea that in Brazil, at least on that particularly delicate moment, there was no hope for a good government.

At the end of the scene, Soares used an interpolation that seems to reinforce the idea of criticism on Brazilian politicians. The first citizen answers: "*e tem outro jeito? Antigamente tinha políticos honestos, preparados, tinha bons administradores com vontade de trabalhar. Agora os tempos são outros*" (17-19). This seems to be not only criticizing the politicians of that time, but also comparing President Lula's PT in relation to previous governments, possibly affirming that President Lula's had broken the record of scandals and corruptions. Moreover, this line is not present in *Richard III*, which seems to confirm the hypothesis that Soares added this line in his textual translation to reinforce the criticism on President Lula's government.

The first citizen's answer: "*pode ser. Mas eu tenho esperança que as coisas vão melhorar. Vai ter mais comida na mesa. Adeus, vizinho*" (20-1) seems ironic, referring to those citizens who naively

believe that politicians will keep their promises of providing better life conditions for the population. Besides, the word “*esperança*” (hope) was the key-word in PT’s political campaign in 2002 and the sentence “*vai ter mais comida na mesa*” seems to be ironically referring to the project named *Fome Zero* developed by President Lula in the first year of his government. The aim of *Fome Zero* was to provide food for the lower classes.

Another passage that seems to be relevant is the second citizen’s following answer: “*Adeus, vizinho. (Para a platéia): É, toda vez que muda o governo falam isso, mas pra nós sempre acaba em sopa*” (22-3). This passage is possibly referring to the fact that promises made by some politicians have always been the same and have never been kept. Furthermore, The expression “*sempre acaba em sopa*” seems based on the Brazilian expression “*acabar em pizza*,”⁷ which gives the idea that there will never be punishment or solution to the scandals and corruptions.

In relation to President Lula’s government, this sentence sounds provocative, since it has been claimed by the opposition that President Lula acted passively in relation to the political crisis of PT. The expression also seems to refer to the fact that, although *Escândalo dos Bingos*, *Escândalo dos Correios*, and *Mensalão* were extremely polemic in the moment they happened, they ended up being forgotten. According to Almeida, “*os casos de corrupção envolvendo o PT não foram muito considerados pela maioria do povo. O Caso Waldomiro Diniz (Escândalo dos Bingos) e a relação de José Dirceu com ele acabaram sendo esquecidos*” (128). Besides, from the forty politicians who were involved in the scandal of *Mensalão*, only a few were prosecuted, including Roberto Jefferson. Thus, Soares might have changed the word “*pizza*” for “*sopa*” to reinforce the idea that after being elected, politicians simply forget about their duties with the population and end up by leaving the citizens in a rather precarious situation.

The interpolation used by Soares in the end of the scene in which the citizen talks directly to the audience seems to reinforce Soares’ intention of criticizing the attitudes of some politicians. The two

⁷ Thaís Nicoleti de Camargo, from *Folha Online*, claims that the expression “*acabar em pizza*” has been mostly used in the 1990s by the Brazilian population to refer to the scandals and corruptions that have been occurring in the Brazilian politics and that are never punished. According to Camargo, “*ao dizermos que algo vai ‘acabar em pizza’, pretendemos afirmar que, ao fim e ao cabo, todos confraternizarão, naturalmente devorando uma pizza. (...) Em tempos de ameaça de CPI e das tão conhecidas manobras que se fazem com intuito de ‘evitar o desgaste do governo’, usa-se a expressão ‘acabar em sopa’*” (1).

citizens seem to represent the Brazilian population, who, in a certain way, was feeling insecure and disappointed with the delicate scenario of the country. The actors' performances and possibly⁸ the visual signs used in the staging of this scene contribute to this hypothesis. The citizens stand on the corner of the stage and their presence seems to be rather intimate. Furthermore, the citizens wear dark clothes, which reinforce the idea of insecurity and anxiety in relation to the sociopolitical situation of the country.

2.2.4 An Analysis of Scene 11

In this scene, a scrivener appears on stage holding a document that he wrote about the indication against the Prime Minister, Hastings. Hastings might strongly prevent Richard from becoming the king, because he loved King Edward and wants Prince Edward to be crowned. Richard, knowing the fact that Hastings loves the king, establishes a special relationship of friendship with Hastings, in order to discover his opinion about Richard's own coronation.

The night before the council meeting, Hastings has a revealing dream in which Richard would kill him, but he decides to ignore the dream. Kiernan concludes that, "Hastings foolishly ignores a warning to escape, and in the council chamber remarks on how cheerful Richard is looking, and how his mood always shows in his face – a moment before Richard fiercely accuses him of conspiracy, and orders his execution" (47). The result is that Richard surprises everyone by killing Hastings on the day of the council meeting. Leggatt points out that "the council debate over the date of the coronation opens with a somewhat anxious discussion about the question: "who knows the Lord protector's mind herein?" the one character who claims he can read Richard's mind is Hastings, who is dead by nightfall" (34). Richard uses his strategy by mentioning that Joana Shores, Hastings' lover (and possibly the king's lover as well) has cursed him. The ones who followed Richard agreed on executing Hastings, who was accused after being dead. The document which the scrivener brings on stage reveals this treachery.

In Soares' production, the scrivener's document is read by the actor Edu Guimarães, and the document is a protest against the corruption that sometimes happens in politics, being Hastings' execution the pretext (appendix 1- picture 7). Soares uses an interpolation at the end of the scene which reinforces the idea of protest in relation to the

⁸ I use the word "possibly" to refer to the visual signs, because I had access to only one photograph of this scene.

sociopolitical context of Brazil at that time of political crisis. This scene in Soares' production corresponds to the following scene in Shakespeare's *Richard III*:

Act 3, Scene 6

Enter a SCRIVENER [with a paper in his hand]

SCRIV. Here is the indication of the good Lord Hastings,
Which in a set hand fairly is engross'd
That it may be to-day read o'er in Paul's
And mark how well the sequel hangs together:
Eleven hours I have spent to write it over,
For yesternight by Catesby was it sent me;
The precedent was full as long a-doing,
And yet within these five hours Hastings liv'd,
Untainted, unexamined, free, at liberty.
Here's a good world the while! Who is so gross
That cannot see this palpable device?
Yet who[s] so bold but says he sees it not?
Bad is the world, and all will come to nought,
When such ill dealing must be seen in thought. (3.6.1-14)

Cena 11

ESCRIVÃO – *Está aqui a indicação contra o primeiro-ministro Hastings, lavrada à mão livre com a minha bela caligrafia, pra ser lida daqui a pouco na Catedral. Olha como ficou bonitinho? Catesby me entregou o original ontem à noite e eu levei 11 horas para passar tudo a limpo. O curioso é que ele só foi acusado depois de morto. Que beleza, a nossa justiça! Até o mais completo idiota percebe que isso é uma fraude descarada. Mas quem é que vai ter coragem de protestar? (Para a platéia)*
O senhor?...
O senhor?... Ah, o mundo vai mal... e fica pior ainda, quando não se pode nem dizer o que pensa. (11.1-12)

The words spoken by the scrivener must give the impression that he is a proud and vain man, concerned only with praising his own job of writing the document that he will read at the Cathedral. In both Shakespeare's scene and Soares' translation, the scrivener spends half of his argument boasting about his job, "*Está aqui a indicação contra o primeiro-ministro, Hastings, lavrada à mão livre para ser lida daqui a*

pouco na Catedral. Olha como ficou bonitinho? Catesby me entregou a original ontem à noite e eu levei 11 horas pra passar tudo a limpo” (1-4). When the scrivener pronounces these words, he makes one wonder if a person like him, who only praises his job, really deserves respect from the audience. Whether what he wrote should be taken into account or not will be judged depending on how the director depicts the scrivener. If he is someone who is portrayed as ridiculous, probably what he says will be considered ridiculous by the audience. In Soares’ production, the scrivener is portrayed as someone disgusted with the political conditions of the country. Thus, what he said was probably received as a protest against corruption in politics.

The scrivener’s following words, “*o curioso é que ele só foi acusado depois de morto*” (5), which corresponds to “The precedent was full as long a-doing, / And yet within these five hours Hastings liv’d, / Untainted, unexamin’d, free, at liberty” (7-9) in *Richard III* possibly refer to the fact that Hastings should be accused before his death and with a palpable reason. In practice, this did not happen, as Hastings’ sudden execution was another illegal strategy used by Ricardo to conquer the crown.

When the scrivener pronounces the following words: “*que beleza nossa justiça! Até o mais completo idiota percebe que isso é uma fraude descarada*” (5-7), which corresponds to “Here’s a good world the while! Who is so gross that cannot see this palpable device?” (10-11), he also criticizes the political situation in Brazil at that time. In *Ricardo III*, the scrivener’s words seem to be much more explicit than in Shakespeare’s *Richard III*. Soares’ translation choice might be due to the fact that, as the production was staged before the presidential elections of 2006, this sentence was probably drawing the audience’s attention not to ignore the scandals in President Lula’s government in the context of the aforementioned presidential elections of 2006. For the opposition, the succession of scandals in President Lula’s government was the “*fraude descarada*” mentioned by the scrivener and that should not be ignored by the population. It is worth mentioning here that when the scandals in President Lula’s mandate popped out, the opposition started to repeat the sentence “*cada povo tem o governo que merece*” to provoke the left wing parties. In fact, this sentence has always been used by the opposition to attack the political party that is in power. What Soares probably attempts to show through the translation of this scene is that, from the point of view of the opposition, the population was having the government they deserved for acting passively in relation to the scandals.

At the end of the scene, Soares added an interpolation in which the scrivener points to the audience and says: “*mas quem vai ter coragem de protestar? (para a platéia): O senhor? O Senhor? É, o mundo vai mal e fica pior ainda quando não se pode dizer nem o que pensa*” (9-12). In *Richard III*, as soon as the scrivener says “Who is so gross / That cannot see this palpable device? / Yet who[s] so bold but says he sees it not? / Bad is the world and all will come to nought, / When such ill dealing must be seen in thought.” (10-14) he leaves the stage. He does not talk straightforwardly to the audience as the scrivener in *Ricardo III* does. The conversation between the scrivener and the audience in Soares’ scene was really a “call to arms” to draw the spectators’ attention to the fact that the future of the country depended on the population’s vote, thus they should not act passively in relation to the corruption that was happening in politics.

As for the protagonist, it is possible to say that as a corrupt politician and a villain, Ricardo is responsible for all the disgraces that happen in the kingdom. In scene 6, for instance, the citizens are worried about the political future of the country because of King Edward IV’s death. If Ricardo had not killed his brother Clarence, everything would have been under control, because Clarence would have become the princes’ protector and, unlike Richard, he is a peaceful character. So much so, that in scene 4, when one of the executioners mentions that Ricardo was involved in the execution, Clarence does not believe them and naively comments that Ricardo loves him: “*não, não é verdade. Ele me ama, ele vai chorar quando souber disso*” (96). In scene 6, the second citizen even comments that Ricardo is a dangerous man: “*O duque Ricardo é um homem perigoso e a família da rainha é muito ambiciosa*” (6.21).

In Scene 11, which refers to the document read by the scrivener, it is also possible to see Ricardo’s corrupt attitudes. As already mentioned, Ricardo ordered Hastings’ execution simply because the prime-minister might prevent him from conquering the crown. If Ricardo had not executed Hastings, the scrivener would not have read the document and would not have complained about the political situation of the kingdom. Moreover, if Hastings lived, he would probably prevent Ricardo from becoming king and, therefore, the political condition of the kingdom would not be in the hands of such a corrupt politician. Although the citizens and the scrivener are secondary characters, they are in the playtext to show that Ricardo’s government represents a risky and uncertain political future for the kingdom (appendix 1- picture 8).

Besides the three scenes analyzed above, there are further revealing passages in Soares's production. These passages also seem to express, in a way or another, a criticism on the President and on the sociopolitical context of Brazil at the time. The end of scene 3, which corresponds to 1.3 in *Richard III*, refers to the moment that Ricardo calls the murderers to execute Clarence in the tower (appendix 1- picture 9). In Shakespeare's play, the lines are the following: "But soft, here come my executioners./ How now, my hardy, stout resolved mates, / Are you now going to dispatch this thing?" (1.3.338-9). Ricardo's words in Soares' production are: "*Ah, meus carrascos! Amo vocês. Então, companheiros, estão prontos para resolver logo esse assunto?*" (181-3).

By calling the murderers "*companheiros*", Soares seems to establish a connection with President Lula, since one of the criticisms about the president is his custom of using the word "*companheiros*" in his speeches. The opposition simply hates this word, perhaps because it reminds them of the word "comrades" used by communists. Richard uses the word "mates", which could be translated in Portuguese as "*amigos, parceiros, colegas*". However, Soares chooses the word "*companheiros*", which, to my knowledge, was not by chance. In considering the fact that about forty politicians were involved in the scandal of *Mensalão*, about eight (or more) were involved in *Escândalo dos Correios*, the reference that Soares makes to the President in this scene makes sense.

The scene leading up to the moment of Clarence's execution is also provocative. One of the murderers thinks about the execution and starts to regret it. However, when the other murderer tells him to think about the money Ricardo will give to them, the first murderer changes his mind and decides to kill Clarence, without taking into consideration his conscience:

PRIMEIRO ASSASSINO- *E a consciência? Onde é que está?*

SEGUNDO ASSASSINO- *No bolso do Ricardo.*

PRIMEIRO ASSASSINO- *E quando ele abrir o bolso pra pagar a gente, a tua consciência vai embora?*

SEGUNDO ASSASSINO- *Vai, mas não faz mal. Deixa ela ir, ela é muito pouco usada hoje em dia. Só serve para atrapar. (4.52-56)*

This conversation in Soares' scene corresponds to 1.4 in Shakespeare's *Richard III*:

MURDERER 1. Where's thy conscience now?
MURDERER 2. O, in the Duke of Gloucester's purse.
MURDERER 1. When he opens his purse to give us
our reward, thy conscience flies out.
MURDERER 2. 'Tis no matter, let it go. There's few
of none will entertain it. (1.4.127-132)

The murderer's words about the conscience: "*deixa ela ir, ela é muito pouco usada hoje em dia. Só serve para atrapalhar*" (50) seem to express a criticism on the lack of responsibility and ethics on the part of some Brazilian politicians at the time. The message that these words seem to express to the Brazilian audience is that when acting illegally in politics becomes favorable, corrupt politicians do not use their conscience, no matter how illegal their attitudes might be. The scandals that happened in Lula's government, for instance, involved vote-buying with illegal money obtained by corrupt politicians, because this vote-buying would be favorable to promote the government and the President's projects. In the scene, the murderers execute Clarence thinking about "Ricardo's purse", that is, thinking about the financial reward they are going to receive from Ricardo after killing Clarence, the one who might strongly prevent Ricardo from occupying the throne. In sum, this passage is possibly depicting how selfish some corrupt politicians become when what is at stake is power.

In any event, the murderers' executing of Clarence was favorable to Ricardo, but harmful for other characters in the play and for the audience, who has witnessed Ricardo's devilish strategies. Inside the political world, corruption is also harmful for the population and for the political parties, especially for the former, who suffer the consequences of the illegal attitudes. According to Marcelo Araújo and Oscar Sanchez, "*a corrupção, em qualquer de suas manifestações, representa um ônus insustentável para qualquer sociedade, principalmente as que são permeadas por grande desigualdade social, como as latino americanas.*" (par. 50).

At the end of scene 5, which corresponds to 2.2 in *Richard III*, there is the announcement of the King's death. Thus, Buckingham, interpreted by Ary França, mentions that a committee should pick prince Edward up to be crowned as the King of England. As soon as Elisabete and the Duchess of York leave the stage, Buckingham and Ricardo start to plan their bloody strategy to prevent Prince Edward from being

crowned. The lines that correspond to Buckingham and Richard's conversation in *Richard III* are the following:

BUCK. My lord, whoever journeys to the Prince,
For God's sake let not us two Stay at home;
For by the way, I'll sort occasion,
As index to the story we talk'd of,
To part the Queen's proud kindred from the Prince.

GLOU. My other self, my counsel's consistency,
My Oracle, my prophet, my dear cousin,
I, as a child, will go by thy direction.
Toward [Ludlow] then, for we'll not stay behind

(2.2.146-154)

Buckingham acts as a typical corrupt politician, making plans which are favorable to Ricardo's conquest of the throne. Certainly, Buckingham helps Ricardo considering that he will receive a good reward after Ricardo's coronation. In relation to the translation in this passage, it is possible to say that Soares has altered some of Buckingham's lines, as follows:

BUCKINGHAM- *Seja quem for que vá buscar o príncipe, nós vamos também. Mas com a nossa tropa. Para que o nosso projeto funcione, é preciso que o príncipe seja afastado de qualquer parente da rainha. Quem ficar com o menino vai controlar o país.*

RICARDO- *Buckingham, meu primo tão amado! Eu me deixo conduzi por você como uma criança obediente. Vamos! (5.60-7).*

The line “*quem vai ficar com o menino vai controlar o país*” (64) is not present in *Richard III* and seems to express a criticism on President Lula's arguably passive attitudes toward the political crisis. The “boy” possibly refers to the President, whose supposed innocence in the scandals seems to be ironically compared to a child's innocence.

Through the analysis of the scenes and the passages above, it is possible to say that Soares' production seems to criticize, with irony and humor, corruptive politicians, attempting to raise a reflection upon our passive attitudes as Brazilian citizens in relation to the scandals and corruptions that happened in the first years of President Lula's government.

2.3 Reception

In this part of the chapter, I attempt to analyze the overall critical reception of Soares' production. *Ricardo III* was mostly praised due to Soares' translation, which modernized the text. The negative comments, on the other hand, were in relation to the hilarious and ironic aspects of the production, which seems to have weakened the tragic characteristic of the playtext.

To start with the positive comments, Ubiratan Brasil, from *O Estado de São Paulo* claims that “*antes de ser macabra ou pessimista, a peça permite--ao representar com imensa ironia a encarnação do mal--a possibilidade de se refletir sobre os tempos atuais*” (D5). Brasil praised Soares' translation, for its modern aspect: “*mesmo não sendo intencional, Jô reforçou a característica contemporânea do texto de Shakespeare*” (D5). To Mariângela Alves de Lima, also from *O Estado de São Paulo*, Soares' production was a carefully produced spectacle: “*Equilibrado, com um formato serenamente igualitário no que diz respeito à distribuição do foco sobre todas as personagens importantes da trama, o trato cuidadoso e bem acabado do espetáculo é sua maior virtude*” (D6). As for the actors' performances, Lima appreciated the partnership between Marco Ricca and Ary França on stage. As she observes:

Marco Ricca trabalha mais do que ninguém, e não poderia ser diferente em uma peça que o protagonista age só e narra seus feitos em um permanente diálogo com observadores situados fora do cenário. É um maquinador repulsivo e um histrião que assusta e faz rir ao mesmo tempo (...). Buckingham, interpretado por Ary França, é uma prova convincente de que não há pequenos papéis. Força, firmeza e serenidade emanam da atitude corporal do ator e da enunciação do texto. Em uma tonalidade que nos parece gelada. (D6)

Certainly, Lima refers to the impressing contrast between Ricardo's irony and humor and Buckingham's seriousness and coldness. In her opinion, Marco Ricca and Ary França performed well together. Ruy Filho, from *Gazeta do Ribeirão*, also appreciated the ironic characteristic of the actors. According to him,

Jô explora os momentos de cinismo e ironia do personagem- um misto de monstro e sedutor- determinando ao espetáculo maior leveza e dramaticidade, ao invés de intensificar a crueldade e o tom trágico com o qual o texto é normalmente explorado. (par.7)

As for the political content expressed in the production, Fernando Kinas, from *Bravo* magazine, points out that “*em época de Bush, CPIs, prefeitos assassinados, entre outros exemplos, o texto é arrasador*” (112). To Kinas, “*a peça é uma coleção não só de assassinatos bárbaros, mas de todo tipo de mentiras ardís, manipulações e cinismo*” (111). Professor José Roberto O’Shea, from Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina, who saw the play in performance, also relates Soares’ production to the political reality of Brazil. According to professor O’Shea,

Quando em alguma cena as personagens se referiam à mentira, à corrupção, falsidade, eu tinha impressão de estar ouvindo as notícias em um telejornal. Eu percebia que a platéia também reagia nestes momentos, como se estivesse reconhecendo que aqueles momentos estavam intimamente ligados à nossa realidade.

O’Shea also claims that Ricardo reaches the limit of hypocrisy in the scene in which he refuses the crown. To Professor O’Shea, Ricardo’s attitude is a typical attitude of a corrupt politician, who performs the worst actions and appears on television as if nothing has happened, pretending to be a “saint”, a word used by Richard himself at 3.1.337. According to him, “*foi muito engraçado ver o Ricardo no meio de dois monges muito mais altos que ele, fingindo ser santo, quando todo mundo sabia que ele era corrupto e sem caráter*” (personal interview).

Like Professor O’Shea, José Renato Ferreira da Silveira, from PUC, SP, claims that Shakespeare’s plays are intrinsically connected to the political world. According to Silveira, “*William Shakespeare nos revela, através da presente obra, o diálogo entre a política e arte e, consegue manter, evidentemente, a atualidade da peça para nossos dias*” (par. 1). To Silveira, the modern theatre represented through Shakespeare’s plays (in this case *Ricardo III*) should not be just entertainment, but a way to raise a reflection in the spectators, whose participation cannot be passive in the political world. To Ferreira, “*não se admite o desinteresse, a passividade e, fundamentalmente, a*

despolitização. No palco da política, sejamos atores e não espectadores, público da tragédia política” (par. 8).

As for the negative comments, Daniel Pizza, from *O Estado de São Paulo*, observes that “*a montagem perdeu força da tragédia, preocupada demais em entreter o espectador com recursos de movimentação, humor e atualização nem sempre justificáveis* (par.1). According to Pizza, moments that were supposed to be tragic in the production caused the opposite effect, and instead of shocking the audience, these moments made the spectators laugh. To Pizza,

Em algumas cenas de angústia, quando os monólogos femininos encadeavam metáforas, parte da platéia dava risadas, completamente desconectada do sentido dramático. É verdade que Shakespeare misturava o coloquial e o pomposo, mas cada coisa a seu momento. (par.1)

Also as a negative comment on *Ricardo III*, Ruy Filho criticizes the actors’ performances. According to him,

Falta melhor ajuste ao restante do elenco principal e apoio. E se por um lado Jô consegue primar pela qualidade da palavra, por outro a direção de cena se manifesta tímida e previsível, com certo ar de teatro repertório e academicismo de um suposto modernismo. (par.9)

Filho concludes that, in spite of these faults, Soares’s *Ricardo III* should not be considered entirely bad, for it brings Shakespeare close to the Brazilian audience: “*de qualquer maneira, mesmo não sendo excepcional, é uma ótima oportunidade para o público se encontrar com Shakespeare*” (par.10).

All in all, it seems that Soares’ *Ricardo III* was much more praised than criticized by the reviewers. To my knowledge, Soares’ undeniable sense of humor with which he conceived *Ricardo III*, as well as his effort in making an accessible textual translation and preparing the cast for the staging were important for the production’s success. But above all, *Ricardo III* owes its success to the possibility of relating the production to the highly delicate moment that Brazilian politics were going through. According to Giuliano Ricca, Marco Ricca’s brother and colleague, “*longe de ser uma peça pessimista, ela nos proporciona, ao ver tão ironicamente representada a encarnação do mal, a possibilidade de refletirmos sobre nossos tempos e a necessidade da transformação do homem e da sociedade*”. That is to say that with his

production of *Ricardo III*, fraught with irony and humor, Soares could enable the spectators to reflect not only on the Brazilian political reality, but on the Brazilian society as a whole.

Chapter III

Constructing Celso Frateschi and Roberto Lage's *Ricardo*

*"I clothe my naked villainy / With
Odd old ends stol'n forth of holy
writ, / And seem a Saint, when
most I play the devil"*
(*Richard III*. 1.3.335-7)

This chapter focuses on the other Brazilian production of Shakespeare's *Richard III*, staged in São Paulo in 2006: *Ricardo III*, adapted by Celso Frateschi and directed by Roberto Lage. Therefore, in 2006, Brazilian audiences had the opportunity to see two productions of *Ricardo III* in the same city, one production completely different from the other. In fact, Frateschi and Lage's production, unlike Soares', was not a mainstream one, with a famous cast. On the contrary, their production was small, relatively simple, and counted on the presence of a cast that was not popular and not from the mainstream. For this reason, in this chapter I attempt to compare and contrast these two Brazilian productions of *Richard III*.

The analysis of Frateschi and Lage's production will follow the same pattern as the analysis of Soares' in chapter II. Thus, this chapter will also be divided into three parts: conception, production, and reception. In the first part, I discuss Frateschi and Lage's apparent conception as well as the preparation of the theatrical company. The sociopolitical context of Frateschi and Lage's *Ricardo III* is the same as Soares' *Ricardo III*, and it has already been discussed in chapter II. In the second part, which concerns the production, I analyze three scenes and compare them with the corresponding scenes from Soares' production. Finally, in part three, I discuss the critical reception of the production.

3.1 Conception:

The idea of producing Shakespeare's *Richard III* seems to date back to 2000, but Frateschi's political commitments prevented him from continuing the project, as he was working as the secretary of culture for the city of São Paulo, in the mandate of mayor Marta Suplicy (Marcela Besson par.1). At the end of Suplicy's mandate, in 2004, Frateschi returned to the project of producing Shakespeare's *Richard III*. Besides

adapting the text, which was translated by Luciana Rossi and Jorge Barcat, Frateschi acted as the protagonist, Ricardo. The production was directed by Roberto Lage, who has been working with Frateschi since 1990. *Ricardo III* was not the first Shakespearean production that Frateschi worked with. In 1984, he was the protagonist in *Hamlet*, a production directed by Márcio Aurélio. Frateschi also adapted *The Tempest*, directed by José Rubens Siqueira in 1994.

Frateschi and Lage chose to produce and stage Shakespeare's *Richard III* because it would allow a reflection upon the Brazilian society at the time. To Frateschi, Brazilian capitalist society had turned the people into individualistic human beings. According to him, "*interessa-nos compreender o homem contemporâneo e suas relações e talvez Shakespeare seja o autor que nos proporciona, com maior clareza e profundidade, um questionamento das relações humanas na sociedade capitalista, onde a idéia do individualismo se fundou, se desenvolveu e se hipertrofiou*" ("program folder" par.3). In a certain way, Ricardo has the characteristics of the contemporary human being that Frateschi mentions. He is someone concerned with his own interest in conquering the crown and does not measure his actions to fulfill his ambition.

In an interview for Marcela Besson, from *Veja*, Frateschi observes that *Ricardo III* illustrates the violence and the aggression committed by the members of PCC (Primeiro Comando da Capital) in May 2006 (par.6). PCC is a movement organized by eight prisoners from Casa de Custódia de Taubaté, which is known as *Piranhão* and considered one of the safest prisons in the state of São Paulo. Nowadays, the PCC has become one of the strongest criminal movements in Brazil. *Folha de S. Paulo* has published an article online which defines the criminal movement: in order to give money to the cashier of the movement, the members of PCC are obliged to pay a monthly tax fee of R\$ 50, 00. The ones who are free must pay R\$ 500, 00 each month. The money is used to buy drugs, guns, and finance documents to free the prisoners who belong to the movement ("Facção Criminosa PCC" par.1).

According to Frateschi,

O PCC nada mais é do que Ricardo III em estágio anterior, não oficial. Toda a ofensiva da polícia e a barbárie provocada nessas últimas semanas são de uma gravidade sem tamanho. Lança-se mão de instintos baixos e tão pré-civilizados, que Ricardo faz, sim, refletirmos sobre tudo isso. (par.13)

Frateschi refers to the tense week of May in 2006, in which criminals attacked the city of São Paulo and threatened population. The attacks started on May 12 and continued the following week. During this time, members of the PCC shot police station and banks, killed police officers, set fire to several cars and buses, and invaded shopping centers, subway stations, and airports. The total number of attacks reached more than 251, with 115 prisoners. (“Salve Geral: O Código” pars. 1-2). In 2006, Sergio Rezende directed the Brazilian movie *Salve Geral*, which alludes to this week of attacks by PCC in São Paulo. The movie was nominated for the Oscar of foreign movie. The similarities between PCC and *Ricardo III*, as Frateschi points out, are the cruelty, the corruption, and the illegalities that the members of this movement committed against the authorities to conquer what they wanted, since Ricardo’s devilish plans and actions to conquer the crown are also corrupt and cruel.

To director Lage, *Ricardo III* is more intrinsically connected to the competition that has always existed in the political world. The director summarizes his conception:

Acho importante insistir nisso, porque nossa intenção, desde o início era sim falar do jogo político. O mote, digamos, a tese que se defende, é de âmbito político, mas sempre quisemos fugir de qualquer leitura restrita e imediatista sobre o comportamento ético deste ou aquele grupo. Queríamos falar de algo que é permanente: a disputa pelo poder a qualquer preço, a falta de escrúpulos na escalada ao poder inerente a um tipo de organização de governo.
(Néspoli D4)

As observed, Lage makes it clear that the intention of the production is not to refer to a particular group of politicians or a particular ruler, but to talk, in general terms, about the competitive behavior that has become natural among many politicians. By establishing a connection between the production and the political world, Lage agrees with Alexander Leggatt, who observes that “politics for [Shakespeare] is not a search for solutions to social and economic problems but a search for power and authority by the politicians themselves” (238).

As in Soares’ production, Frateschi and Lage’s playtext was modernized. Although the words are more formal and the text is longer than Soares’, it is accessible to the audience. Lage observes that the Brazilian audience has a certain prejudice in relation to Shakespeare’s productions because of the complexity of Shakespearean texts.

According to him,

Talvez porque os textos são escritos em um inglês da época, isso passa para a gente uma coisa sofisticada, erudita. Eu parto sempre de um Shakespeare em um sentido de fazer espetáculos que se comuniquem facilmente com a platéia, pois eu acho que a primeira preocupação do teatro é divertir e contar bem uma história. (par. 8)

Lage is correct when he alludes to the accessibility of the text, because among the various other elements in a performance, the text helps the spectator understand the spectacle.

The production included fourteen actors and actresses, such as Renata Zhaneta (as Lady Anne), Plínio Soares, Patricia Gaspar, Angelo Brandini, Ricardo Homuth, Paulo Vasconcelos, Isabel Teixeira, André Frateschi, Anahi Rubin (as Queen Elizabeth), Eduardo Gomes, Flavia Milioni, Hermes Baroli, Sheila Friedhofer, and Celso Frateschi. The cast had a long process of preparation, with play-readings, stage rehearsals, and body preparation by Vivien Backup. Working with Frateschi on the title role seems to have been a challenge for this group of actors and actresses. According to Mônica Santos, from *Veja*, “os treze atores precisam de muito empenho para não serem ofuscados pela presença cênica de Celso Frateschi” (“As diferenças entre as Montagens” par.2). As Santos claims, Frateschi is a brilliant and experienced actor, who has plenty of stage presence.

The next elements to be discussed encompass the setting and the costumes, both designed by Sylvia Moreira. The stage had three levels. On the top level, there was a dark window that was opened and closed by the actors. Beth Néspoli, from *O Estado de São Paulo*, reveals that when closed, this window became a dark dungeon installed on the top of the tower, where the victims of Ricardo were imprisoned. When opened, this window revealed a red throne that was installed on the highest place of the scenery (D4). The presence of this dark window on the stage gave more dynamics to the actions. Moreover, it seemed to increase the size of the stage of Teatro Ágora, which is 39 m². As for the costumes, they evoked Elizabethan times, but darkish colors and a gothic aspect. The lighting, designed by Wagner Freire, and the music, composed by Aline Meyer, were used mainly to mark the passage from one scene to the other.

Different from Soares' production, which reinforces the irony and the humor in certain scenes, Frateschi and Lage did not allow much humor in their *Ricardo III*. On the contrary, Frateschi cut or altered radically the passages or the scenes in the playtext that might sound funny. In the following part, which involves the production, I discuss the alterations and cuts made by Frateschi as well as compare and contrast the three chosen scenes with the corresponding scenes in Soares' production.

3.2 Production

Unlike Soares' ironic and sarcastic Ricardo, the protagonist in Frateschi and Lage's production is completely evil. Right in the beginning of the production, Ricardo appears alone on the stage holding the aforementioned white rose, symbol of the House of York (appendix 2- picture 1). The first impression he gives is that he is someone to sympathize with. As Néspoli observes, "*nos primeiros momentos, os desavisados podem até apiedar-se desse homem solitário, que com uma flor na mão parece invejar mansamente a alegria que toma conta do reino com o fim da Guerra das Rosas, entre as famílias Lancaster e York*" (D4). However, as already pointed out, as soon as Ricardo finishes his famous soliloquy, he eats the rose (appendix 2- picture 2). By doing so, he takes off his mask and shows the audience that he is not a lonely man not to be pitied. On the contrary, he is a devilish creature who will do whatever he can to become King. Since the white rose represents the House of York, by eating this rose, Ricardo shows that he will be able to kill, "devouring" the members of his own family to conquer the crown. The act of eating the rose in the beginning of the spectacle suggests cannibalism, that is, the idea of devouring the enemy to acquire his power. By devouring the ones who might prevent him from reaching the throne, Ricardo would acquire the power of his "enemies" and would be able to conquer the crown. In this case, of course, his enemies are his own relatives.

As already stated, the tragic characteristic is present in this production from its beginning to its end, and not only through the devilish rendition of the main character. For instance, Frateschi cut 3.7 of Shakespeare's *Richard III*, in which Richard refuses the crown. The moment Buckingham warns Richard about the major and the citizens' visit, Richard hides himself in his bedroom and Buckingham tells the major that Richard is praying. After some time, Richard appears, in the

middle of two bishops, holding a book of prayers. Needless to say, this can be seen as the funniest moment of the play, due to Richard's sarcasm in pretending to be a saint. As already argued, in Soares' production, the comic aspect of this scene was reinforced. Ricardo appears on the stage in the middle of two monks, holding a book of prayers. The monks are much taller than Ricardo. However, in Frateschi and Lage's *Ricardo III*, Buckingham only tells the people that Ricardo is in the presence of two monks praying. Certainly, hearing Buckingham's speech is not as funny for the audience as seeing the comic scene.

Another interesting alteration in Frateschi and Lage's production can be seen in the last scene. The importance of this scene lays on the fact that it refers to the moment when Richard is defeated by Richmond in the battle of Bosworth and is humiliated in the battle field, pronouncing the famous line: "A horse, my kingdom for a horse" (5.4.753). According to Leggatt, this line "is a joke against [Richard] himself, of whose irony he is quite unaware" (39). In Frateschi and Lage's *Ricardo III*, the battle of Bosworth was cut, and the spectacle ends with six citizens commenting on the battle on a London street. Through the conversation of these citizens, it is possible to understand that Ricardo was defeated and is dead. Therefore, it is possible to imagine that Frateschi cut this last scene because, if not well performed, it might become comic.

Frateschi also reinforced the presence of the female characters in his adaptation. So much so that he gave voice to some female characters who are only mentioned in Shakespeare's *Richard III*. For instance, in 3.2 of *Ricardo III*, Joana Shore knocks on Hastings' door in the middle of the night to warn Hastings of Stanley's dream, which was a premonition of Hastings' death. In the corresponding scene in *Richard III*, (3.2), "a messenger" is the one who knocks on Hastings' door and warns him. Like Joana Shore, Elizabeth, daughter to King Edward IV, who does not appear in Shakespeare's play, appears in two scenes of Frateschi's adaptation. The first time she appears is in 4.1, when Queen Elizabeth and Lady Anne go to the tower to visit the princes. In the corresponding scene in *Richard III*, which is 4.1, it is Dorset who accompanies Lady Anne and Queen Elizabeth to the tower. The second time Elizabeth appears is in the last scene of the production, for she marries Richmond before the battle of Bosworth and appears with him in his tent on their wedding night. By reinforcing the presence of the women in the production, Frateschi and Lage impart the female characters added strength, characters whose rendering seems so complex. After all, according to Harold Bloom,

Richard III is any actress's nightmare, for none of the women's parts are playable, whether poor Anne's, once Richard has seduced her through terror, or those of Elizabeth, Edward IV's Queen and widow, or the Duchess of York, Richard's mother. (68)

Besides the notable presence of the female characters, there is the presence of the people, represented by the citizens in Frateschi's adaptation. The citizens appear in three scenes and they are messengers of important happenings in the kingdom. The first scene in which they appear is 2.2, which corresponds to 2.3 in Shakespeare's playtext. However, in Frateschi's adaptation, this scene has the presence of seven citizens, not three as in *Richard III*. The scene is longer and the dialogues happen among several groups of citizens who are spread on the corners of a street in London. The other scene in which the citizens appear is 3.4. In this scene, the citizens talk about the murder of the princes in the tower. In the corresponding scene in *Richard III*, Tyrrel, the princes' murderer, appears on the stage alone and tells the audience his bloody act of killing the royal children. Once again, the citizens have the responsibility of telling the audience important happenings in the kingdom. Finally, the third scene with the citizens is 5.1, the last scene of the production. As already mentioned, this scene corresponds to the citizens' conversation about the battle of Bosworth, in which Ricardo is defeated by Richmond.

One of the hypotheses concerning Frateschi and Lage's *Ricardo III* is that although the production was also conceived in a delicate moment for Brazilian politics, it does not refer exclusively to the political crises mentioned in chapter II, but attempts to encompass other problems of Brazilian society at the time. In the analysis of the scenes that follow, I attempt to address the different ways in which the productions explore the political issues of the time. Therefore, in order to compare the two Brazilian productions, I have chosen the same scenes in both productions.

3.2.1 An analysis of Act 1, Scene 2

In the present production, this scene is textually quite similar to its corresponding scene in Shakespeare's playtext, 1.2. Frateschi and Lage have not made radical cuts and they have kept a formal translation, which seems to have contributed to reinforce the seriousness of the scene. In addition, they have not added any visual interpolations that

might lead to a comic interpretation. Thus, it is possible to say that Frateschi and Lage's scene, in comparison to Soares', is longer and more intense.

As for the main character, it was already mentioned in the beginning of this chapter that Frateschi and Lage depicted an extremely devilish Ricardo. Unlike Soares' Ricardo, whose main characteristics are irony and sarcasm, here the protagonist is rendered as an extremely cruel and violent man (appendix 2- picture 3). At the end of 1.3, also 1.3 in Shakespeare's playtext, Ricardo delivers a soliloquy before calling the murderers to kill Clarence in the tower, in which he summarizes his devilish personality:

RICARDO. *Cometo o crime e sou o primeiro a clamar por justiça. Assim os danos que causo em segredo, faço cair sobre os ombros dos outros. [...] e é desse jeito que encubro minha vilania despida. Uso os trapos dos livros sagrados e finjo-me de santo sempre que demonizo.* (160-1, 164-7)

Richard's corresponding words are similar,

GLOUCESTER. I do the wrong, and first begin to brawl. / The secret mischiefs that I set abroad / I lay unto the grievous charge of others. / [...] And thus I clothe my naked villainy / With odd old ends stol'n forth of holy writ, / And seem a saint, when most I play the devil (323-5, 335-7).

Ricardo shows his cruelty especially in the beginning of the scene, when he enters the stage and demands the guards to leave Henrique's corpse on the floor, and in the end, when he delivers his soliloquy. He also uses his best rhetoric; however, he seems less sarcastic and ironic in his discourse than Soares' Ricardo, because his words sound more serious and more intense.

In the beginning of the scene, when Ricardo demands the guards to leave Henrique's corpse on the floor, he shows to be really violent. He threatens one of the guards who disobeys his order by saying, "*cão malcriado, tire sua alabarda de cima do meu peito, ou por São Paulo, eu o jogo abaixo de meus pés e o esmago por seu atrevimento, mendigo!*" (22-3). In Shakespeare's playtext, Richard delivers the following lines, which are similar to Ricardo's: "Unmanner'd dog, [stand] thou when I command. / Advance thy halberd higher than my breast, / Or by Saint Paul, I'll strike thee to my foot, / And spurn upon thee, beggar, for thy boldness" (39-42). In Soares'

scene, the corresponding passage seems to be less intense, because Ricardo is not so violent. When he demands the monks to leave Henrique's corpse on the floor, he says "*Põe o morto no chão ou eu deixo morto quem não obedecer. Eu mandei parar! Afasta essa lança do meu peito ou eu te esmigalho embaixo do meu pé.*" In these lines, Ricardo does not address the monks in a negative way, like Frateschi's Ricardo does when he calls the guards, "*cão malcriado*" (22), and "*mendigo*" (23). These insults seem to make Ricardo's aggressiveness more evident.

In addition, to reinforce Ricardo's depiction as a villain and the intensity of the scene, Frateschi and Lage have kept the passages from Shakespeare's playtext in which Anne curses Richard. Therefore, their Ana seems to be much more revolted than Soares'. One interesting example is when Ana talks to Ricardo for the first time and says that he is responsible for the fact that Henry's wounds bleed again (appendix 2-picture 4):

ANA. Demônio imundo, em nome de Deus, não nos atormente mais! Dessa terra feliz você fez o seu inferno, enchendo-a com gemidos e gritos de maldição. Se sente prazer em contemplar a sua abominável obra, contempla aqui este exemplo de sua carnificina. Veja! As feridas do Henrique morto abrem as suas bocas congeladas e sangram mais uma vez! Envergonhe-se massa informe de mesquinha deformidade, envergonhe-se já que é a sua presença que faz jorrar o sangue das veias geladas e vazias onde nenhum sangue restava. É o seu feito monstruoso e desumano que provoca esse dilúvio contrário a toda a natureza.

Oh Deus, criador deste sangue, vinga a sua morte.

Oh terra, que bebe este sangue, vinga a sua morte.

Que o céu lance um raio de fogo sobre o assassino.

Ou então terra, abra a sua boca profunda e devore-o vivo assim como suga o sangue deste bondoso Rei morto cruelmente por um braço comandado pelo inferno. (28-40)

In Shakespeare's playtext, the corresponding passage, quite similar to Frateschi's, is the following:

ANNE. Foul devil, for God's sake hence, and trouble us not, / For thou hast made the happy earth thy hell, / Fill'd it with cursing cries and deep exclaims. / If thou delight to view thy heinous deeds, / Behold this pattern of thy butcheries. / O gentlemen, see, see, dead Henry's wounds / Open their congel'd mouths and bleed afresh! / Blush, blush thou lump of foul deformity, / For 'tis thy presence that exhales this

blood. / From cold and empty veins where no blood dwells. / Thy deeds inhuman and unnatural / Provokes this deluge most unnatural. / O God! Which this blood mad'st, revenge his death! / O earth! Which this blood drink'st, revenge his death! / Either heav'n with lightning strike the murth'rer dead, / Or earth gape open wide and eat him quick, / As thou dost swallow up this good king's blood / Which his hell-govern'd arm hath butchered! (50-67)

Besides the curse, Ana refers to Ricardo in a negative way. In this passage, she chooses adjectives such as “*demônio imundo*” (28), “*massa informe de mesquinha deformidade*” (32), and “*feito monstruoso e desumano*” (34). But not only in this passage does Ana use negative adjectives to describe Ricardo. Throughout the scene, she refers to Ricardo as “*ministro do inferno*” (25), “*vilão*” (42), “*grangrena pestilenta de homem*” (47), “*porco espinho*” (47), “*maldito*” (75), “*homicida*” (178), “*sapo nojento*” (93), and “*hipócrita*” (109). It is true that these adjectives are also present in Shakespeare’s corresponding scene, but it is not by chance that Frateschi and Lage have kept them in their playtext. Ana’s curses reinforce the violence of the scene and the negative words with which she addresses Ricardo reinforce his depiction as a cruel man.

Soares, on the other hand, has chosen to cut Anne’s curse in his playtext. Anna’s speech ends at the moment she mentions that Ricardo’s presence caused Henrique’s wound to bleed again, and, instead of the curse, Soares has added the visual interpolation of the monks blessing themselves, which possibly created humor. In addition, Soares’ Anna only uses the following negative words to describe Ricardo in the entire scene: “*demônio*,” “*sacerdote do inferno*,” “*porco imundo*,” “*assassino*,” and “*fingidor*”. As a consequence, Soares’ scene becomes less violent and less intense than Frateschi and Lage’s.

Another passage that is worth observing in Frateschi and Lage’s scene and that is also analyzed in Soares’ has to do with the moment Ricardo lies to Ana, saying that he did not kill Henrique or Eduardo. Due to the fact that this passage is also rather similar to Shakespeare’s playtext, it is consequently more intense than Soares’. The respective passage in Frateschi and Lage’s production is the following:

RICARDO. *Eu não matei o seu marido*

ANA. *Então ele está vivo?*

RICARDO. *Não, ele está morto. Assassinado pelas
mãos de Eduardo*

ANA. *Mentira, a rainha Margarida viu a sua espada*

*manchada com o sangue dele. A mesma espada
que apontou contra o peito dela e cuja ponta
seus irmãos desviaram a tempo.*

RICARDO. *Fui ofendido pela língua caluniosa de
Margarida que me acusou de uma culpa
que era deles.*

ANA. *Foi provocado pela sua alma sanguinária que só
deseja carnificinas. Você não matou esse rei?*

RICARDO. *Concordo (53-60)*

In Shakespeare's playtext, the corresponding passage is the following,

GLOUCESTER. I did not kill your husband.

ANNE. Why, then he is alive.

GLOUCESTER. Nay, he is dead, and slain by

Edward's hands.

ANNE In thy foul throat thou li'st!

Queen Margaret saw

Thy murd'rous falchion smoking in his blood;

The which thou once didst bend against her breast,

But that thy brothers beat aside the point.

GLOUCESTER. I was provok'd by her sland'rous tongue,
That laid their guilt upon my guiltless shoulders.

ANNE. Thou was provoked by thy bloody mind,
That never dream'st on aught but butcheries.

Didst thou not kill this king?

GLOUCESTER. I grant ye (91-101)

One difference between Soares' and Frateschi's scenes is that just like in Shakespeare's playtext, Frateschi has kept the passage which Ana mentions that Margaret saw Ricardo's sword stained with Henry's blood: "*A Rainha Margarida viu a sua espada manchada com o sangue dele. A mesma espada que apontou contra o peito dela e cuja ponta seus irmão desviaram a tempo*" (56-7). As we have seen, the corresponding passage in *Richard III* is the following, "Queen Margaret saw / Thy murd'rous falchion smoking in his blood. / The which thou once didst bend against her breast, / But that thy brothers beat aside the point" (93-6). The reason why Frateschi has kept this passage might be because it refers to a violent act committed by Ricardo. Thus, besides reinforcing Ricardo's aggressiveness, the passage includes the word "blood", which, in this particular case, alludes to tragedy, crime, and death.

The moment Frateschi and Lage's Ricardo admits to have killed Henry is also different from Soares'. Before asking Ricardo if he really

killed Henry, Ana refers to him in a rather violent way: “*Foi provocado pela sua alma sanguinária que só deseja carnificinas. Você não matou este rei?*” (59) and Ricardo simply answers, “*concordo*” (60). In Shakespeare’s playtext, before asking whether Ricardo killed Henry, Anne says “Thou wast provoked by thy bloody mind, / That never dream’st on aught but butcheries” (99-100), and Richard answers, “I grant ye.” (101). In Soares’ scene, however, before asking Ricardo about Henry’s death, Anna says “*só sai mentira da tua garganta sórdida*”, which in comparison to Frateschi’s and Shakespeare’s line is less cruel. Ana also asks Ricardo if he killed Henrique and points to the king’s dead body and Ricardo, looking at the corpse, says, “*esse eu matei*” (47). As aforementioned in chapter II, this visual interpolation and Ricardo’s words are much more informal and comic than “*concordo*”, said by Frateschi’s Ricardo or “*I grant ye*”, said by Shakespeare’s Richard.

The next passage that is interesting to observe has to do with the moment Ricardo explains to Ana why he killed Henry. In Frateschi’s scene, Ana mentions that Henrique is a virtuous and gentle man: “*Ele era gentil e virtuoso*” (62), just like in Shakespeare’s playtext, “o, he was gentle, mild, and virtuous” (103), and Ricardo answers, “*digno do Rei dos céus que o tem agora*” (63). In Soares’ rendering, on the other hand, Anna mentions that Henry was a holy man, “*Ele era um santo homem*” and Ricardo takes advantage of her words and answers, “*por isso que ele foi mandado para o céu*” (50). Certainly, this textual modification made by Soares reinforced Ricardo’s sarcasm.

The moment Ricardo lies to Ana, saying he killed Eduardo because of her beauty is also interesting to observe. In Frateschi and Lage’s production, Ricardo says, “*Sua beleza foi a causa desse efeito. Sua beleza me perseguia nos sonhos incitando-me enquanto dormia a destruir o gênero humano para que eu pudesse viver pelo menos uma hora aquecendo-me em seus doces seios*” (77-8) In Shakespeare’s playtext, Richard’s speech is the following: “your beauty was the cause of that effect-- / Your beauty that did haunt me in my sleep / To undertake the death of the entire world, / So I might live one hour in your sweet bosom” (121-4). By saying these words, Ricardo uses Ana’s beauty as a pretext for his crimes. His words, “*sua beleza me perseguia nos sonhos incitando-me enquanto dormia a destruir o gênero humano. [...]*” (78) are rather violent and show his characteristic as a cruel man, who is able to destroy humankind not for Ana’s love in return, but for the crown.

In answer to Ricardo's lie, Ana also uses violent words, "*Homicida! Acreditasse eu nisso e estas unhas arrancariam a beleza do meu rosto*" (79), or "If I thought that, I tell thee, homicide, / These nails should rent that beauty from my cheeks" (125-6) in Shakespeare's playtext. Although Ana is really angry with Ricardo and addresses him with such violent words, he does not feel discouraged and continues to seduce her. Then, in answer to her words, Ricardo says, "*meus olhos não aceitariam a destruição de sua beleza. Da mesma forma que o mundo inteiro se alegra com o sol, eu me alegro com sua formosura. Ela é o meu dia e a minha vida*" (80-1), or "These eyes could not endure that beauty's wrack, / You should not blemish it, if I stood by: / As all the world is cheered by the sun, / So I by that, it is my day, my life" (127-9) in *Richard III*. Ana abhors Ricardo's words saying, "*que a noite mais negra escureça o seu dia e a morte a sua vida*" (82), which corresponds to "Black night o'ershade thy day, and death thy life!"(131) in Shakespeare's playtext. Ricardo takes advantage of Ana's curse and simply answers, "*não se amaldiçoe! Você é o meu dia e a minha vida!*" (83). Cruel as he is, Ricardo says these words because he knows that he will be able to marry Ana and will make her life a tragedy, since his plan is not to "keep her long", as he says in the soliloquy, but to guarantee the crown.

In Soares' scene, on the other hand, this passage is less intense. When Anna says the corresponding line, "*assassino! Se eu acreditasse nisso, arrancava com as unhas o desenho do meu rosto*", the stage directions indicate that she raises her hands to her face and Ricardo holds them, preventing her from hurting herself. Then, he delivers the following lines, "*Pára, o resto do mundo se alegra com o nascer do sol, mas é a tua beleza que ilumina o meu dia*". Ricardo's attitude, holding Anna's hands and saying such words at this moment, seems to reinforce his hypocrisy and sarcasm. Then, instead of cursing him and saying violent words, Anna simply answers: "*E é a tua infâmia que escurece o meu*". In answer to Anna's words, Ricardo, with all his irony and hypocrisy, answers, "*quem matou seu marido fez isso para lhe dar um marido melhor*". Therefore, this passage in Soares' scene is definitely less intense than in Frateschi and Lage's.

As mentioned in the previous chapter, Ricardo's devilish and hypocritical personality becomes evident when he pretends to be sorry for Eduardo and Henrique's deaths and forces Ana to make one choice: kill him or stay with him. In this production, this passage is more formal:

RICARDO. [...] *esses olhos jamais haviam derramado uma única gota de arrependimento. O que nenhum sofrimento conseguiu sua beleza conquistou e meus olhos agora estão cegos de pranto. Jamais supliquei misericórdia a amigo ou inimigo. Minha língua nunca saboreou a lisonja, mas sua beleza é o reino que eu desejo e o meu coração cheio de orgulho suplica e obriga a minha língua a falar. Não mostre em seus lábios tanto escárnio, minha senhora, eles foram feitos para o beijo não para a amargura. Se o seu coração, grávido de vingança, não é capaz de perdoar, entrego-lhe o meu punhal para que o enterre se assim desejar neste sincero coração e deixe partir a minha alma que a adora. Entrego-me de peito aberto ao golpe mortal e ajoelhado, humilde, suplico que me mate. Não, não hesite, eu matei o Rei Henrique, mas foi a sua beleza que me provocou. Depressa! Apunhalei o jovem Eduardo, mas foi o seu rosto celestial que me guiou. (Ana deixa a espada cair). Fique com a espada ou fique comigo.*

In Shakespeare's playtext, Richard's words are the following:

GLOUCESTER. (...) *Those eyes of thine from mine have drawn salt tears, / Sham'd their aspects with store of childish drops: / These eyes, which never shed remorseful tear -- / No, when my father York and Edward wept / To hear the piteous moan that Rutland made / When Black-fac'd Clifford shook his sword at him; / Nor when thy warlike father, like a child, / Told the sad story of my father's death, / And twenty times made pause to sob and weep, / That all the standers-by had wet their cheeks / Like trees bedash'd with rain-- in that sad time / My manly eyes did scorn an humble tear; / And what these sorrows could not thence exhale, / Thy beauty hath, and made them blind with weeping. / I never sued to friend nor enemy; / My tongue could never learn sweet smoothing word; / But now thy beauty is propos'd my fee, / My proud heart sues, and prompts my tongue to speak.*

She looks scornfully at him.

Teach not thy lip such scorn; for it was made / For kissing, lady, not for such contempt; / If thy revengeful heart cannot forgive, / Lo here I lend thee this sharp-pointed sword, / Which if thou please to hide in this true beast, / And let the soul forth that adoreth thee, / I lay it naked to the deadly stroke, / And humbly beg the death upon my knee.

He lays his breast open; she offers at [it] with his sword.

Nay, do not pause: for I did kill King Henry-- / But 'twas thy beauty that provoked me. / Nay, now dispatch: 'twas I that stabb'd young Edward-- / But 'twas thy heavenly face that set me on

She falls the sword.

Take up the sword again, or take up me. (153-183)

The end of the scene is different in Frateschi's production. After giving Ana his two rings, Ricardo does not try to kiss Ana like Soares' Ricardo does. Possibly because she is colder and more aggressive than Soares' Anna. Right after Ricardo makes his promises of preparing Henrique's funeral, Ana answers, "*Alegra-me vê-lo assim tão arrependido*" (135). In reply to Ana's words, Ricardo asks her to bid him farewell, to which she coldly answers, "*eu já me despedi*" (137) and leaves the stage. In Shakespeare's scene, this ending is rather different. When Richard asks Anne for a farewell, "bid me farewell" (221), she kindly answers, "'Tis more than you deserve; / But since you teach me how to flatter you, / Imagine I have said farewell already" (222-4).

Right after Ana leaves, Ricardo delivers his last soliloquy in this scene (appendix 2- picture 5) and shows all his cruelty, celebrating his success in having seduced Ana and confessing his next plans to conquer the throne. In this production, Ricardo's famous soliloquy is formal, which reinforces his depiction as a villain:

RICARDO. *Alguma mulher já foi cortejada dessa maneira? Alguma mulher já foi conquistada em tais circunstâncias? Eu a tenho, mas não a guardarei por muito tempo. Não é incrível? Eu, que matei o seu marido e o seu sogro, consegui conquistá-la quando seu coração mais me odiava, quando ela tinha a maldição na sua boca e lágrimas nos olhos. Tinha contra mim a testemunha sangrenta da sua vingança, Deus, a sua consciência e este defunto. Não tinha amigos que me ajudassem, só o demônio e a minha hipocrisia. Mesmo assim eu a conquistei. Eu que ceifei a primavera dourada de seu doce príncipe e a deixei viúva num leito de dor. Eu, cujo todo não se compara à metade de seu Eduardo. Eu, coxo e disforme. Apostaria um ducado contra a moeda de um mendigo, sempre me enganei ao julgar minha pessoa. Por minha vida, embora não concorde com isso, ela me acha um homem bem proporcionado e maravilhosamente encantador. Comprarei um espelho e contratarei vinte ou trinta alfaiates para estudarem as roupas que adornarão o meu corpo. Já que estou*

reconciliado comigo mesmo, vale a pena investir um pouco para que isso perdure. Mas antes levarei aquele para a cova e depois irei chorá-lo diante de meu amor. E até que eu tenha comprado um espelho, que brilhe o sol, que brilhe muito para que eu possa admirar a minha sombra por onde eu passar. (97-109)

Richard's corresponding soliloquy in Shakespeare's playtext is the following:

GLOUCESTER: Was ever a woman in this humor woo'd? / Was ever a woman in this humor won? / I'll have her, but I will not keep her long. / What? I, that kill'd her husband and his father, / To take her in her heart's extremest hate, / With curses in her mouth, tears in her eyes, / The bleeding witness of my hatred by, / Having God, her conscience, and these bars against me, / And I no friends to back my suit [at all]. / But the plain devil and dissembling looks? / And yet to win her! / All the world to nothing! / Ha! / Hath she forgot already that brave prince, / Edward, her lord, whom I, some three months since, / Stabb'd in my angry mood at Tewksbury? / A sweeter and a lovelier gentleman, / Fram'd in the prodigality of nature-- / Young, valiant, wise, and (no doubt) right royal-- / The spacious world cannot again afford. / And will she yet abase her eyes on me, / That cropp'd the golden prime of this sweet prince / And made her widow to a woeful bed? / On me, whose all not equals Edward's moi'ty? / On me, that halts and am misshapen thus? / My dukedom to a beggarly denier, / I do mistake my person all this while! / Upon my life, she finds (although I cannot) / Myself to be a marv'lous proper man. / I'll be at charge for a looking-glass, / And entertain a score or two of tailors / To study fashions to adorn my body; / Since I am crept in favor with myself, / I will maintain it with some little cost. / But first I'll turn yon fellow in his grave, / And then return lamenting to my love. / Shine out, fair sun, till I have brought a glass, / That I may see my shadow as I pass. (228-63)

Ricardo's first words already show his cruelty. By saying, "*eu a tenho, mas não a guardarei por muito tempo*" (139), Ricardo makes us understand that he will get rid of Ana afterwards. At the end of 2.4, after asking Stanley to spread the word that Ana is sick, Ricardo says "*mas já fui tão longe e estou tão imerso em sangue que um crime me leva a outro crime. As lágrimas da piedade não habitam nestes olhos*" (42-3). His words are really violent and show how cruel and cold-hearted he is.

Ricardo's cruelty is also evident when he says, "*eu, que matei o seu marido e o seu sogro, consegui conquistá-la quando seu coração mais me odiava, quando ela tinha maldição em sua boca e lágrimas nos olhos*" (140-1). His villainy is visible in these lines especially because he is aware of the crimes he committed and still celebrates them, as if he were proud of having committed them.

In Soares' scene, on the other hand, this passage seems to be less aggressive. Ricardo, after celebrating his success in seducing Anna, says, "*Ha! Eu sou muito bom*" (135), which certainly reinforces his irony and sarcasm and not his aggressiveness. In Shakespeare's playtext, Richard simply delivers, "Ha!" (238) as an expression of delight for being successful in his plan. Frateschi and Lage have cut this expression from Ricardo's speech and have added, "*mesmo assim eu a conquistei*" (144) instead, which is definitely more upfront.

Ricardo is also aggressive when he mentions the fact that he was the one who caused Ana's suffering. His words--"*eu que ceifei a primavera dourada de seu doce príncipe e a deixei viúva num leito de dor*" (144-5)--are rather cruel. But what intensifies his cruelty is the fact that he seems to be proud of being the cause of Ana's tragic destiny. In Soares' scene, on the other hand, Ricardo's words are less intense and less formal: "*será que ela já se esqueceu do marido que eu matei há menos de três meses de pura irritação, e se rebaixa olhando pra mim que sou manco e torto e a deixei sozinha na tristeza dos lençóis?*".

Ricardo goes even further in his cruelty when he uses his physical deformity in his favor and says that even though he is ugly and deformed, he was able to seduce Ana. His words--"*Eu, cujo todo não se compara á metade de seu Eduardo. Eu, coxo e disforme.*" (145-6)--are very cruel, specially when he compares himself with Eduardo. His words become even more aggressive when he mentions, "*por minha vida, embora não concorde com isso, ela me acha um homem bem proporcionado e maravilhosamente encantador*" (147-8). These words are aggressive because Ricardo seems to be humiliating Ana for falling in love with such an ugly man, who even killed her husband and her father-in-law. In addition, he seems to feel proud of having conquered her in such circumstances.

In Soares' passage, Ricardo's irony is visible when he refers to his own physical deformity: "*[...] e se rebaixa olhando pra mim que sou manco e torto. Ela acha que sou um homem elegante*". As aforementioned, Soares reinforces Ricardo's physical deformity. Therefore, when Ricardo refers to himself as "*manco e torto*", his words seem to become rather comic. In addition, "*manco e torto*" are less

formal than “*coxo e disforme*”, uttered by Frateschi’s Ricardo.

At the end of his soliloquy, when Frateschi’s Ricardo mentions that he will get rid of Henrique’s corpse, he does not demand the guards to bury the corpse. After saying, “*Mas antes levarei aquela para a cova e depois irei chorá-lo diante do meu amor.*” (151), Ricardo leaves the stage. In Soares’ scene, on the other hand, Ricardo demands the guards to get rid of Henrique’s corpse in a rather humorous way: “*Vocês! Tirem isso daqui! Bom: Primeiro vou jogar o defunto na cova, depois vou suspirando encontrar o meu amor*”. Therefore, it is possible to say that whereas there is a comic moment in Soares’ production, in Frateschi and Lage’s *Ricardo III* the scene ends in a rather abrupt way.

As observed in the passages discussed above, Frateschi and Lage’s Ricardo is far more violent and cruel than Soares’ Ricardo. When other characters talk about Ricardo, they describe him as a violent man, whose existence means danger not only for the political future of the kingdom, but for the life of the population as well. The scenes that will be analyzed next are interesting examples of how Ricardo is described by other characters in the production. Furthermore, the scenes also allude, in a way or another, to the sociopolitical context of Brazil.

3.2.2 An analysis of Act 2, Scene 2

Like in *Richard III* and in Soares’ production, this scene refers to the conversation among the citizens in relation to the political future of the country after the death of the King. However, Frateschi’s scene counts on the presence of seven citizens, whereas in *Richard III* and in Soares’ production, the scene includes three and two citizens.

The seven citizens are divided into groups of three or two which are spread on three street corners in London. Citizen 4 and citizen 5 are on the first corner. Citizen 1, citizen 2, and citizen 3 are on the second corner. Citizen 6 and citizen 7 are on the third corner. Although these seven citizens comment on the troubled moment that the country is going through, due to the death of the king, the conversation seems to assume different tones on each corner. On the first corner, for instance, citizen 4 and citizen 5 seem to have the responsibility of letting the audience know of the latest happening of the kingdom. They inform the spectator about the death of the king as well as its consequences, such as the miserable condition of the royal women and of Prince Edward’s coronation. On the second corner, citizen 1, citizen 2, and citizen 3 express their worries, concerning the consequences of the death of the king. Apparently, the citizens’ conversation on the second corner

corresponds to the conversation of the three citizens in Shakespeare's *Richard III* and in Soares' scene 6. On the third corner, citizen 6 and citizen 7 also comment on the conditions of the women in the kingdom and on the ritual of Prince Edward's coronation. Frateschi's scene is the following:

Ato 2, Cena 2

Grupos se reúnem em várias esquinas de Londres.

Esquina 1

CIDADÃO 4: *Trágica violência! O Rei Eduardo está morto.*

Esquina 2

CIDADÃO 1: *Bom dia Vizinho! Aonde vai com tanta pressa?*

CIDADÃO 2: *Garanto que nem mesmo eu sei certo. Já soube das últimas notícias?*

CIDADÃO 1: *Sim, o Rei está morto!*

CIDADÃO 2: *Péssimas notícias. Virgem Santa! Raramente o sucessor é melhor. Receio que tudo piore ainda mais.*

CIDADÃO 3: *Bom dia, senhor.*

Esquina 1

CIDADÃO 4: *A rainha Elizabeth se afoga em lágrima que parecem ecoar todas as fontes do mundo. Ela chora a perda do marido e do poder de sua própria majestade.*

CIDADÃO 5: *A Duquesa de York, que ainda chorava a perda de seu próprio marido e de seu filho Clarence, assassinado na torre, soma agora a dor da perda de seu filho Eduardo, nosso Rei.*

CIDADÃO 4: *Resta-lhe apenas Ricardo de Gloucester de quem se envergonha de ter parido.*

CIDADÃO 5: *Entre os poderosos nunca houve mãe que Sofresse tamanha dor.*

CIDADÃO 4: *Ela é a mãe de todas as dores. As suas e as nossas.*

Esquina 3:

CIDADÃO 6: *A rainha chora por Eduardo, como a Duquesa que também chora por Clarence e por seu marido.*

CIDADÃO 7: *Por estes a Rainha não chora. Ela é Ainda mãe do jovem príncipe Eduardo, nele reside o seu consolo. Ele será coroado.*

CIDADÃO 7: *Ela que afogue a sua dor desesperada no túmulo do falecido Rei Eduardo e cultive a sua alegria no trono do Eduardo que vive.*

Esquina 2:

CIDADÃO 3: *É certa então a notícia que o nosso bom Rei Eduardo está morto?*

CIDADÃO 2: *Sim, é verdade. Deus nos guarde nesse momento.*

CIDADÃO 3: *Pois então, senhores é melhor se preparar para enfrentar novas desgraças.*

CIDADÃO 1: *Não, pela graça de Deus, o seu filho será Rei.*

Esquina 1:

CIDADÃO 4: *Já mandaram buscar o jovem príncipe Eduardo para a coroação. Um pequeno séquito comandado por Ricardo de Gloucester e Buckingham irão recepcioná-lo. Acompanham-no Lord Rivers e Lord Grey e também o irmão do novo rei, o pequeno príncipe de York.*

Esquina 2:

CIDADÃO 3: *Desafortunado o país que for governado por uma criança.*

CIDADÃO 2: *Não! Enquanto ele for criança, o país será governado por um conselho. Quando crescer, sem dúvida, reinará bem por ele mesmo.*

CIDADÃO 1: *Foi assim quando Henrique IV foi Coroado em Paris aos nove anos de*

idade.

CIDADÃO 3: *A diferença é que naquela época a Inglaterra contava com políticos e conselheiros sérios. O Rei contava com tio virtuosos para proteger sua pessoa.*

CIDADÃO 1: *Ora, este também tem tios, tanto maternos quanto paternos.*

CIDADÃO 3: *Aí é que está o problema. Seria melhor que tivesse um único tio. A disputa entre aqueles que estão mais próximos do futuro rei irá atingir a todos nós, se Deus não nos poupar. Ricardo de Gloucester representa grandes perigos e os parentes da rainha são soberbos e orgulhosos. Se eles fossem governados ao invés de governar, esse país enfermo poderia ter cura.*

Esquina 3:

CIDADÃO 6: *Isso ainda está bem longe do fim e pelo trotar dos cavalos, esta carruagem não chegará a um abrigo seguro.*

CIDADÃO 7: *Tudo caminha pela estrada segura das Tradições. Ricardo é o tutor e o Príncipe Regente. A ele devemos a paz na Inglaterra. Melhor ele que os parentes da Rainha.*

CIDADÃO 6: *A paz dos de cima nunca nos trouxe proveito algum. Assim como a guerra. Quando os que mandam brigam, tem que nos proteger. Quando estão em paz, devemos dobrar os nossos cuidados.*

Esquina 2:

CIDADÃO 1: *Estamos receando pelo pior, mas tudo acabará bem.*

CIDADÃO 3: *Quando aparecem as nuvens os sábios vestem os seus casacos. Quando as folhas caem, o inverno se aproxima. As tempestades fora de época fazem com que os homens esperem a penúria. Pode ser que tudo acabe bem. É mais do que merecemos, ou mais do que eu espero.*

CIDADÃO 2: *É verdade que os corações dos homens
estão repletos de
medo. Já é quase impossível conversar com
alguém que já
não esteja batido e com medo.*

CIDADÃO 3: *Assim são as coisas em período de
grandes mudanças. Por
um instinto divino os homens pressentem o
perigo assim
pressentimos o alagamento ante a
iminência da tempestade.
Para onde estão indo?*

CIDADÃO 2: *Pelos céus! Fomos chamados pelo juiz.*

CIDADÃO 3: *Eu também. Irei com vocês. (2.2.1-48)*

The scene starts with the fourth citizen, who appears alone on the first corner and enunciates, in a rather tragic way, the death of the king by saying: "*Trágica Violência! O Rei está morto!*" (1). Possibly, by saying these words, the citizen attempts to shock the spectators and indirectly warn them that the following comments and conversations will be in relation to the consequences of this sudden death. Besides, the expression "*trágica violência*" (1) has a strong meaning and hints that the consequences of the king's death will affect the kingdom, the country and the people. In addition, the shocking announcement of King Edward's death in the beginning of this scene is an interpolation used by Frateschi possibly to reinforce its tragic characteristic.

After the fourth citizen's announcement, the focus turns to the conversation among citizen 1, citizen 2, and citizen 3 on the second corner. In Frateschi's playtext, the conversation among the three citizens on this corner is similar to the scene in *Richard III*, but different from the corresponding scene in Soares' playtext. For instance, when told about the death of the king, the second citizen in Frateschi's playtext answers, "*Péssimas notícias. Virgem Santa! Raramente o sucessor é melhor. Receio que tudo piore ainda mais*" (5). The corresponding lines in Soares' text are said by the second citizen: "*Má notícia. Quando um rei more, o próximo quase sempre é pior. "Lá vem desgraça"*" (5). One difference between these lines is that Frateschi's citizen refers to the news of the death of the king in the plural, as he says: "*péssimas notícias*", whereas Soares' citizen refers to the news in the singular, by saying, "*má notícia*". Another difference is that the citizen's comment in Soares' scene, "*lá vem desgraça,*" seems to be more informal and brief than "*receio que tudo piore ainda mais*", said by Frateschi's citizen.

Moreover, depending on the way the citizen says “*la vem desgraça*”, it can possibly sound funny to the audience.

After the conversation among the three citizens on the second corner, the focus of the next conversation changes to the first corner. Thus, in this interpolation, citizen 4 and citizen 5 tell the spectators about the conditions of the women in the kingdom: Queen Elisabeth cries the loss of her husband, King Edward, and because she is aware that Ricardo is the only royal uncle left to be the protector of her eldest child, Prince Edward. Besides informing the audience of the condition of Queen Elizabeth, the citizen also mentions the selfishness of Queen Elizabeth in relation to power. In other words, the citizen assumes that Queen Elizabeth does not cry only because of the death of the king, but mainly because she has lost her place in the kingdom as queen.

The fifth citizen’s comments are related to the condition of the Duchess of York. Considering his words--“*A Duquesa de York que ainda chorava a perda de seu próprio marido e de seu filho Clarence, assassinado na Torre, soma agora a dor da perda de seu filho Eduardo, nosso rei*” (9-10)--it is possible to imagine how tragic is the Duchess’ destiny. In answer to the fifth citizen’s comment, the fourth citizen assumes that besides the death of the Duchess’ children, the main cause for her sorrowful destiny has to do with the fact that she is the mother to the evil Ricardo: “*Resta-lhe apenas Ricardo de Gloucester, a quem se envergonha de ter parido*” (11).

The following conversation, which is also an interpolation, happens on the third corner, between citizen 6 and citizen 7. These citizens also talk about Queen Elizabeth and the Duchess of York. Whereas the sixth citizen mentions the suffering of the Queen and the Duchess of York, the seventh citizen seems to feel optimistic in relation to the royal women, because of the coronation of Prince Edward: “*Por estes a rainha não chora. Ela é ainda mãe do jovem Príncipe Eduardo, nele reside seu consolo. Ele será coroado*” (15-16).

On the second corner, the comments on the death of the king end with the third citizen saying “*não, pela graça de Deus, o seu filho será Rei*” (21). Right after this comment, the conversation turns to the first corner, where the fourth citizen talks about the ritual of Prince Edward’s coronation. These words were added to inform the spectator of the ritual of the coronation, since the scene of the ritual, which corresponds to 3.1 in *Richard III*, was cut. Besides, the fourth citizen’s comment situates the audience for the following conversations on the other corners.

The conversation goes back to the second corner, among the three citizens, who comment on the insecurity they feel in relation to the Prince's underage to reign. Considering the first words said by the third citizen--"*Desafortunado o país que for governado por uma criança*" (24)--and the corresponding lines in Soares' text-- "*coitado do país que é governado por uma criança*" (10)--there is the difference between the words "*desafortunado*", said in Frateschi's production, and "*coitado*", in Soares' text. The word "*desafortunado*" evokes "unlucky" and is more formal and serious than the word "*coitado*." In addition, the word "*coitado*" seems to have a pejorative connotation in this sentence. Another difference is the verb *to be* in the sentences. In Frateschi's text, the verb *to be* is in the future tense, as in "*for*", which gives the idea that the country is not being ruled by an inexperienced ruler. In Soares' text, on the other hand, the verb *to be* is in the present tense, "*é*", which means that the country was being ruled by an inexperienced leader at the time.

Another interesting comparison can be made between the next words said by the citizen in both productions. In Frateschi's text, for instance, the citizen's answer--"*Não, enquanto ele for criança, o país será governado por um conselho. Quando crescer, sem dúvida reinará bem por ele mesmo*" (25)--corresponds to the second citizen's words in Soares' text--"*também não é assim. É um conselho de ministros que governa enquanto o rei for menino. Além disso, ele conta com a proteção dos tios: pelo lado da mãe e pelo lado do pai*" (11-12). One interesting difference between the two answers is that Soares' citizen uses the word "*conselho de ministros*", which can be seen as a reference to Brazilian politics, since the President counts on the contribution of ministers to rule the country. Frateschi's citizen simply omits the word "*ministros*". Moreover, the citizen in Frateschi's text seems much more optimistic in relation to the Prince's reign, since he hopes that the Prince will reign well in the future.

The answer to the second citizen's comment is given by the first citizen: "*Foi assim quando Henrique IV foi coroado em Paris aos nove anos de idade*" (26). This line was cut from Soares' text and is present in Shakespeare's *Richard III* as the following: "So stood the state when Henry the sixth was crown'd in Paris but at nine months old" (16-17). The answer to this comment is said by the third citizen: "*A diferença é que naquela época, a Inglaterra contava com políticos e conselheiros sérios. O rei contava com tios virtuosos para proteger a sua pessoa*" (27-8).

By saying “*a Inglaterra contava com políticos e conselheiros sérios*” (27), the citizen does not seem to be referring exclusively to the Brazilian political crises of the time. Soares’ citizen does not mention that England counted on serious politicians, but he uses the expression, “*antigamente tinha políticos honestos, com vontade de trabalhar*”, which gives the idea that Fernando Henrique Cardoso’s government, which was ruling the country before PT, was better than President Lula’s government. In addition, the citizen’s words-- “*vontade de trabalhar*”-- seem to allude to the popular complaint of many rightists. Since they defend the idea of *Estado Mínimo*,¹ they have a negative impression of politicians and public employees in general. They believe that public employees are not willing to work, and they do not like politicians, because they (rightists) are in favor of *Iniciativa Privada*, which defends the idea that the government and the politicians should not interfere in the state. It is interesting to observe that this idea is conspicuous in Soares’ text.

Due to the prince’s underage to reign, the kingdom is ruled by the royal uncles who protect the prince. By the third citizen’s comment-- “*Aí é que está o problema. Seria melhor que tivesse um único tio. A disputa entre aqueles que estão mais próximos do futuro rei, irá atingir a todos nós, se Deus não nos poupar*” (29-30)--it is possible to infer that the fight among the royal uncles alludes to the dispute among leaders to rule a country. In 2006, although PT was in power, members from the opposition were also ruling [and still rule] important states in the country. Since 2006 was the year of presidential elections, this political struggle became even stronger and affected the people and the country. In Soares’ text, the corresponding lines are said by the second citizen: “*Era melhor que os tios fossem todos do mesmo lado. Imagina só a briga que vai haver entre eles pra controlar o menino*” (14-15). These words give the idea that the Royal uncles will rule the boy and not the country. Since the boy seems to represent the President and a young and inexperienced government, the citizen’s words mean that the royal uncles, that is, “*conselho de ministros,*” will rule the president and not the country. In Frateschi’s text, on the other hand, the citizen’s lines seem to adopt a less critical position in relation to PT and to President Lula and attempt to portray, in more general terms, the fight among

¹ According to Lalo Minto, from Unicamp, *Estado Mínimo “pressupõe um deslocamento das atribuições do estado perante a economia e a sociedade. (...) Ao Estado Mínimo, cabe garantir a ordem, a legalidade e concentrar seu papel executivo naqueles serviços mínimos necessários para tanto: policiamento, forças armadas, poderes executivo, legislativo e judiciário.”* (par.1).

political parties to rule a country.

Another interesting difference between Soares' and Frateschi's scenes is when the citizens refer to the fear and insecurity of the population in relation to the political future of the country. In Frateschi's text, the third citizen comments: "*Assim são as coisas em período de grandes mudanças*" (44). Thus, he addresses the fear of the people on "*grandes mudanças*", which might refer, in general terms, to several changes in society rather than changes in the government. Soares's citizen, on the other hand, attributes the people's fear exclusively to the change in government by saying, "*sempre acontece isso quando muda o governo*" (9). Therefore, by comparing the citizens' comments, it is possible to infer that Frateschi's citizen does not seem to be referring to the Brazilian government, since he relates the insecurity of the people to great changes.

To conclude, the presence of seven citizens in this remarkable scene reinforces the importance of the people in the social and political life of the country. Different from Soares' text, the citizens in Frateschi's are depicted as active participants in the life of the kingdom, for they seem to be well informed, politicized, and able to express their opinions about the conditions of the country in a rather clever way. In Soares' text, conversely, the citizens limit their conversation to provocative and ironic comments on the political conditions of the country.

3.2.3 An Analysis of Act 3, Scene 6

This scene involves the presence of a scrivener, who comments on the document that he wrote concerning Hastings' sudden execution. As already stated in chapter II, Ricardo ordered Hastings' execution, for Hastings loved King Edward IV and might strongly prevent Ricardo from conquering the throne. The scene in Frateschi's adaptation is the following:

ESCRIVÃO

UMA RUA DE LONDRES

Eis aqui o ato de condenação do bom Lorde Hastings transcrito com a minha melhor letra para que possa ser lido hoje na igreja de São Paulo. Notem como os fatos estão bem ajustados: Eu levei onze horas para copiar esse libelo, porque ele me foi entregue apenas ontem à noite por Catesby! O original deve ter levado pelo menos outras onze

horas para ser redigido, entretanto, há cinco horas atrás Lorde Hastings estava vivo, gozando de plena liberdade, não estando nem acusado, nem interrogado, nem julgado... Livre. Ao ar livre! Que beleza de mundo! Quem será tão cretino que não consegue perceber essa manobra estúpida? Mas quem será tão corajoso para denunciar o que vê? O mundo não vai nada bem e só pode piorar quando a mentira se propaga descaradamente e já é quase impossível se reconhecer a verdade. (3.6.1-10)

As in Soares' text, the scrivener starts his discourse by mentioning his job of writing the document. However, Frateschi's scrivener does not sound boastful and proud. The formality of the words with which he refers to his job of writing the document shows that he takes the document seriously and that he is concerned about the illegal attitude of Hastings' execution. Soares' scrivener, on the other hand, seems to be concerned with praising himself.

The way the scribes express themselves in this scene also reveals their level of consideration for the spectators. Frateschi's scrivener seems to take the document more seriously than Soares' scrivener, although he also wants to be recognized for his hard work. Therefore, the image he possibly passes to the spectators is the one of a serious and politicized man, who is worried about the conditions of the country. Consequently, the audience tends to trust him and take his comments into consideration. The scrivener's comment in Soares' text, on the other hand, assumes a rather sarcastic and ironic tone. He seems to be more concerned with his handwriting than with the content of the document itself. By doing so, he possibly makes the audience believe that his words should not be taken into account, for he assumes a rather arrogant position in relation to his job of writing the document.

Another interesting difference concerning this scene is the scribes' reaction when referring to Hastings' accusation. In Soares' text, we may recall, the scrivener comments: "*Que beleza nossa justiça! Até o mais completo idiota percebe que isso é uma fraude descarada*" (5-7), blaming the failings of justice for the illegal attitude of accusing the prime minister. It is important to state here that, since Brazil has a democratic political system, the government is composed by three independent branches of power: executive, legislative, and judiciary. The justice that the scrivener mentions belongs to the judiciary branch. Strictly speaking, the President, who belongs to the executive branch, is not responsible for what happens in the judiciary or in the legislative branches. However, oddly enough, many Brazilians tend to believe that

the executive branch, that is, the President, is responsible for the three branches. Therefore, it is possible to assume that the scrivener is ironically alluding to the political conditions of Brazil at the time, for he uses the word "*nossa justiça*", which reinforces the idea of *our* political situation in Brazil.

The words said by Frateschi's scrivener--"*que beleza de mundo! quem é tão cretino que não consegue perceber essa manobra estúpida?*" (7-8)--which are similar to the words in *Richard III*--"here is a good world the while! Who's so Gross / That cannot see this palpable device" (10-11)--do not blame *our* justice for illegal attitudes, but the world. Thus, Frateschi's scrivener seems to adopt a less critical position in relation to the specific political condition in Brazil at the time.

In addition, Frateschi's scrivener defines Hastings' accusation as "*manobra estúpida*," whereas Soares' scrivener uses "*fraude descarada*." The words used by both Frateschi's and Soares' scribes to define Hastings' execution have disapproving meanings. However, the words said by Frateschi's scrivener seem to be more formal and less offensive.

The ends of the scenes in both productions are also worth comparing. In Soares' scene the scrivener finishes his speech by talking directly to the audience. His last words are: "*Mas quem vai ter coragem de protestar? (para a platéia). O senhor...? O Senhor...? Ah, o mundo vai mal... e fica pior ainda, quando não se pode nem dizer o que pensa*" (9-12). As already mentioned, this interpolation has the potential to draw the audience's attention to the political situation of Brazil at the time. It also attempts to encourage the spectators to think about the political future of the country, since, we recall, 2006 was the year of Presidential elections and another leader could be chosen. In Frateschi's lines, the scrivener does not talk directly to the audience and his last words, "*o mundo não vai nada bem e só pode piorar quando a mentira se propaga descaradamente e já é quase impossível se reconhecer a verdade*" (29-30), possibly refer, in more general terms, to hypocrisy and lies that existed [and still exist] in Brazilian society at large.

It is possible to conclude that in this scene Frateschi's and Soares' scribes assume different positions when they allude to politics. Frateschi's scrivener does not focus his discourse on political aspects, but attempts to go further and comment on the illegalities that happen in society as well. Soares' scrivener, on the other hand, attempts to focus on the political situation of the time, rather than comment on other aspects of society. In addition, he attempts to draw the spectators' attention to warn them not to close their eyes.

As for Ricardo, it is possible to say that he is responsible for all the disgraces that happen in the kingdom. He threatens the lives of other characters and, as already mentioned, is depicted as a true villain by them. In 2.2, (2.3 in *Richard III*) for instance, when the citizens talk about the future of the kingdom, they refer to Ricardo in a negative way. The third citizen, for instance, refers to Ricardo as a dangerous man: “*Ricardo de Gloucester representa grandes perigos (...)*” (31). Also, citizen 4 and citizen 5 on the first corner mention that the duchess of York’s disgrace is to have Ricardo as her son. Citizen 4 comments, “*resta-lhe apenas Ricardo de Gloucester, de quem se envergonha de ter parido*” (11). In answer to the fourth citizen’s comment, the fifth citizen says, “*entre os poderosos nunca houve mãe que sofresse tamanha dor*” (12), which also refers to the duchess as the most miserable woman for having Ricardo as her son.

In 3.6, when the scrivener complains about the corruption in the kingdom, he is indirectly blaming Ricardo, since all the crimes and illegalities happened because of his corrupt strategies to conquer the crown. Besides, Hastings’ execution was the scrivener’s pretext to complain about Ricardo’s crimes. In fact, Hastings himself also refers to Ricardo in a negative way. At the end of 3.4, when he is about to be killed, he describes Ricardo as a devilish creature: “*Oh, sanguinário Ricardo! Miserável Inglaterra! Profetizo os tempos mais terríveis que o século mais infeliz já viu*” (56-7).

3.3 Reception

Like Soares’ *Ricardo III*, Frateschi and Lage’s production received positive and negative comments. The negative comments were mainly in relation to the seriousness of the production, which reinforced its tragic aspect. Also, some critics claimed that some actors and actresses, especially actresses, were too young and too inexperienced to interpret their roles. Frateschi was also criticized for his performance as Ricardo. According to some critics, Frateschi’s performance was so exaggerated that it did not sound natural. Paradoxically, the positive comments were in relation to Frateschi’s performance as Ricardo and to the performance of the cast. The text, the costumes and the setting also received good reviews.

Monica Santos, from *Veja*, praises Frateschi’s performance as Ricardo. According to her, “*Celso Frateschi atinge a complexidade do personagem. Dissimula sem esforço, apenas com nuances de voz. Seu vilão é um guerreiro frio, desumano e, ainda assim, sedutor. A*

deformidade física brota do impecável gestual” (par.1). Frateschi’s performance as Ricardo was also praised by Nanda Rovere, from the newspaper *Spinner*. To Rovere, “*Celso está perfeito como Ricardo, conseguindo transmitir toda a falta de caráter do personagem. O ator possui uma força dramática ímpar e apresenta em cena um domínio corporal fantástico*” (par.2).

Aside from Frateschi’s performance, other actors and actresses received compliments. According to Adriana Zimburg, the actors and actresses’ performances were helpful to the spectators who were not familiar with the plot of Shakespeare’s *Richard III*. In an *Online Post*, Zimburg claimed that “*o elenco foi muito bem escolhido e dirigido, muito dedicado a expor com detalhes a história sobre a ascensão do Duque de Gloucester a Ricardo III de uma forma clara, usando menos poesia, favorecendo os expectadores [sic] mais leigos*” (par.19).² Like Zimburg, Beth Néspoli, from *O Estado de São Paulo*, claims that the presence of good actresses, such as Renata Zanetha, Bel Teixeira, and Patrícia Gaspar, was important to strengthen the cast: “*no elenco, atrizes de forte presença cênica, como Renata Zanetha, Bel Teixeira e Patrícia Gaspar reforçam a afinada equipe de 14 atores*” (D4).

As for the text, it was praised for the dynamism that gave movement to the scenes. According to Rovere, “*apesar de denso, o texto flui de uma maneira bastante interessante. São três horas de encenação, mas com um dinamismo que não nos permite sentir o tempo passar*” (par.8). Another interesting characteristic of the text, according to Santos, was its formality. Santos claims that the formality of the words establishes a relationship with the original text. Santos agrees with Rovere in the sense that the dynamism of the scenes prevented monotony: “*(...) cenas ágeis conferem a fluência à narrativa, facilitando o envolvimento com o expectador [sic]*” (par.3).

Frateschi’s text was also praised for its political content, which, despite its general characteristics, still can be related to the present times. According to Vanessa Medeiros, from the Theatrical Company Sagomadarrea, “*o texto de Ricardo III mostra que, assim como acontece em Macbeth, Shakespeare também tem para essa obra a política como centro, e não apenas como pano de fundo dos acontecimentos*” (par.3). According to Ruy Filho, from *Gazeta do Ribeirão*,

²I disagree with Zimburg’s statement. “Less Poetry”, as she puts it, does not help the spectators understand the spectacle. On the contrary, “less poetry” weakens the text of the performance and consequently the spectacle.

Ilustrar a construção do pensamento político enquanto metáfora de como a sociedade se organiza e consolida é uma das principais características responsáveis por fazer Ricardo III um personagem típico de nossos parlamentos, rosto semelhante a tantos diariamente estampados nos jornais.
(par.3)

To Filho, the similarity that Ricardo has with some politicians is that he is a character that performs illegal actions to acquire the throne.

In addition to the text, the visual elements of the production, such as setting and costumes, also received compliments. Although the stage of Teatro Ágora is small, designer Sylvia Moreira was able to take advantage of the lack of space. The costumes, also designed by Sylvia Moreira, received praise for their Elizabethan characteristics. According to Santos, “*A cenógrafa Sylvia Moreira faz mágica nos 39 metros quadrados do palco. As cenas são acomodadas em três níveis e portas de correr ajudam a multiplicar os ambientes. Ela também assina os figurinos, feitos com esmero*” (par. 5). Medeiros agrees with Santos in relation to the space of the stage and to the costumes. According to her, “*a peça conta com figurinos elogiáveis e um cenário muito inspirado que, com portas corrediças na parede ao fundo, revelando novos ambientes, soluciona um problema recorrente no Ágora- a falta de espaço*” (par. 6). Also, in relation to the space of the stage, Zimbarg affirms that “*o espaço foi brilhantemente aproveitado, painéis se movem, escadas levam e trazem personagens e a divisão frontal do cenário, que cria três áreas para a movimentação dos atores, acredite ou não, traz toda a dimensão física que essa peça precisava*” (par. 19).

As for the negative comments, Mariangela Alves de Lima, from *O Estado de São Paulo*, starts by criticizing Frateschi’s performance as Ricardo. According to her, Frateschi’s performance was so exaggerated that it became grotesque: “*Celso Frateschi contorce-se de modo mais exibido possível. É pesadamente grotesco e falso no seu duplo caráter de personagem embusteiro e ator que estabeleceu com seu público uma cumplicidade de narrador.*” (D6). Lima also complains that all the action in the production revolves around the protagonist. According to Lima,

todos os elementos revolteiam em torno do protagonista. Ele é um eixo histriônico forte e os elementos trágicos da peça são inteiramente absorvidos pelo personagem central. Sendo a um só tempo principal agente e narrador, a concepção do espetáculo assume que todos os episódios

devem ter a tonalidade que lhes atribui o protagonista. O efeito resultante dessa perspectiva é o mesmo de uma leitura apressada da peça em que o leitor só presta atenção no óbvio. (D6)

Besides Frateschi's performance, Lima criticized the performance of other actors and actresses. According to her, this production

conta com um elenco em parte integrado por atores inexperientes, que lutam com as palavras como se fossem inimigas e que, por isso mesmo, não definem bem os traços de cada personagem, a encenação se amolda a um velho modo de fazer teatro em que tudo depende do ator principal. Neste caso, até uma atriz excepcional como Renata Zanetha, que já provou seu talento e técnica em um repertório de estilo diversificado, parece carecer de imaginação para conferir à rainha de Eduardo IV o dom de despertar a simpatia dos espectadores. (D6)

In addition to the performance of the cast, De Lima criticizes director Lage, by assuming that he failed in his conception, because he did not present an original point of view on the playtext. According to De Lima, “*de um modo geral, além do despreparo do elenco, falta na concepção de Roberto Lage um ponto de vista nítido, alguma coisa que nos permita compreender por que esta e não outra peça atraiu o interesse desse coletivo*” (D6). Lima concludes her critique by observing that Frateschi and Lage's *Ricardo III* was not compatible with the project of Teatro Ágora. According to her,

O teatro Ágora tem se distinguido no panorama teatral paulistano exatamente pela firmeza do projeto artístico entusiástico, nada formalista e, embora centrado em boa dramaturgia, sem pretensões à distinção do repertório “clássico”. Seria coerente com esse programa um Shakespeare combativo, com um ponto de vista original, cheio de som e fúria, ainda que despenteado. Em lugar disso, uma apatia grupal envolve o desempenho de um protagonista, cuja única réplica de efeito é dada pelo espelho. (D6)

In spite of Lima's negative review, it is possible to conclude that, like Soares' production, Frateschi and Lage's *Ricardo III* received more positive than negative criticism by the professional reviewers. The

production was praised for the tragic rendition of Ricardo, the dynamism of the text, the setting, and the costumes. As for the content of the production, it is possible to affirm that Frateschi and Lage's *Ricardo III* attempts to explore social issues rather than only political ones. However, when it comes to political aspects, the production seems to be less provocative than Soares' *Ricardo III*. Soares' production, on the other hand, attempts to explore more overtly the political conditions of Brazil at the time, rather than other social issues.

In the next chapter, I present my conclusion about these two Brazilian productions of *Richard III* and suggest possibilities for further research.

Chapter IV

Conclusion

*“Minha consciência tem mil
línguas e cada língua conta uma
história diferente e cada história me
condena como um criminoso miserável”*
(Ricardo III 1.5.47-8)

In the final pages of my thesis, I acknowledge the importance of going back to its beginning and readdress the procedures involved in the research that have contributed to achieve the final results. The analysis of the character Ricardo in relation to Brazilian politics in the two Brazilian productions of William Shakespeare's *Richard III* was an attempt to demonstrate that the sociopolitical moment in a certain country, at a certain time, can be influential to a theatrical performance.

As theoretical background for this study, I have relied on theatrical adaptation (Jay Halio), theatre translation (Patrice Pavis), theatre audience (Susan Bennett, and Marco de Marinis), and character construction (Barbara Heliodora and Alexander Leggatt). Halio's notion of theatrical adaptation has demonstrated that each element that composes a performance, such as text, set design, characters, stage business, subtext, and language should be carefully prepared before reaching the stage. Thus, the process of theatrical adaptation is not an easy task, and it is the director's conception that leads him/her to make the necessary modifications in the playtext.

As the productions were staged in Brazil, for the Brazilian audience, Pavis' notion of theatre translation was crucial to understand the process of translation for the stage. Pavis' theory grants that theatre translation is a phenomenon that goes beyond linguistic translation. It is a complex task, because it involves cultural exchange as well. It is not only the playtext that should be transferred into the target culture, but all the other elements that compose a performance, in order to allow the target culture to construct meaning in the *mise-en-scène*.

Since I have also analyzed the critical reception of the two Brazilian productions, Bennett's and De Marinis' notions of theatrical audiences were crucial to understand the relationship between audience and performance. These scholars have demonstrated that the spectator is an active participant in the theatrical event. The director shapes the

spectacle taking into account its audience, for it is the audience who constructs meaning in the performance.

In order to analyze the character Ricardo in both productions, I have counted on Leggatt's and Heliadora's studies of character construction. Leggatt points out that Richard's excellent rhetoric and intelligence are typical characteristics of politicians. However, Richard uses all his intelligence, cunningness, and his power of persuasion in favor of his ambition for the crown. Therefore, he acts like a typically corrupt politician. Heliadora has showed that Shakespeare knows exactly the difference between a good politician and a bad politician and he brings this notion to his political playtexts: the good politician, for Shakespeare, is the one who is worried about the welfare of the population and not about his personal interests, whereas the bad politician is only concerned about his personal interests. Thus, Heliadora agrees with Leggatt in the sense that Richard is a typically bad politician. He is someone whose interest is only to grab the throne; therefore, he commits the worst crimes for the sake of this ambition.

The analysis of the two Brazilian productions of Shakespeare's *Richard III* has focused on the character construction in relation to the sociopolitical context of Brazil in the years 2003-2006. Although both productions were staged in a delicate moment for Brazilian politics, Jô Soares' *Ricardo III* seems to have been more critical in relation to the political crisis than Celso Frateschi and Roberto Lage's. I attempted to show that in Soares' *Ricardo III* some passages seem to be referring critically to the political context of the time, even making a critique of President Lula and his government.

To start with the protagonist, it is possible to say that Soares constructed his Ricardo as an ironic and sarcastic man, and reinforced his physical deformity. By depicting his protagonist with such characteristics, the message Soares seems to pass to the spectators is that the corruption and the illegalities that happened in Brazilian politics were not taken seriously enough by the population. He attempts to call the spectators' attention, so that they do not act passively toward the political turbulences of the government.

Furthermore, by reinforcing Ricardo's physical deformity, Soares seems to allude to the negative depiction that the media and the opposition have always made of President Lula. In the presidential elections of 2002, for instance, when President Lula was candidate to the Brazilian presidency, the rightists defended the idea that if Lula became president, the country would face another dictatorship, just like it happened back in 1964. The commercial starred by Regina Duarte,

“*Eu tenho medo*” (I am afraid), broadcast by *Rede Globo* in 2002, was an attempt to influence people’s mind not to vote on Lula, besides making a negative image of him. Ricardo’s physical deformity also alludes to the negative image that the opposition made of the president in the moment of the political crisis. The media and the right-wing parties were trying to take Lula away from the presidency and used the scandals as a fair reason.

Besides the protagonist’s depiction, I have observed that the characters talk directly to the audience. This characteristic added by Soares in scene 6 and in scene 11 is really a “call to arms” to call the spectators’ attention to the political moment Brazil was going through, so that they should wake up and try to change the political situation of the country by voting on another candidate in the elections of 2006.

As for the critical reception, Soares’ *Ricardo III* was praised because it was possible to relate the production with the sociopolitical context of Brazil, especially with the attitudes of corrupt politicians showed through Ricardo’s behavior. However, Soares’ *Ricardo III* was criticized because of its humor. According to some reviewers, Soares was overtly concerned about entertaining the audience with comic moments and weakened the tragic characteristic of the production.

As for Frateschi and Lage’s *Ricardo III*, it seems to have been less critical in relation to the political crisis of the time and to have attempted to show, in general terms, other aspects of Brazilian society, such as violence, the negative effects of capitalism, and the struggle for power among politicians in general. In relation to violence, Frateschi associated Ricardo’s aggressiveness with the cruelty of the criminal movement PCC, whose attacks in May, 2006 in São Paulo were very violent. As for capitalism, Frateschi associated Ricardo’s behavior with capitalist society: competition, selfishness, and excessive individualism. Finally, the production presented a perspective, which came from director Lage, who associated Ricardo with the competitive world in politics, without criticizing or alluding to the president or to a particular political party.

Ricardo was depicted as a true villain, extremely violent and aggressive, without any characteristics that would create humor. This serious depiction can be seen from the moment Ricardo first appears on stage holding the white rose to the end of the spectacle, when he is killed on the battlefield. Throughout the production, Ricardo’s violent personality is demonstrated by some of his soliloquies and by the negative description other characters make of him.

I have also observed that, besides from the protagonist, Frateschi and Lage's *Ricardo III* is entirely intense. The directors shaped their production to be tragic and serious from the beginning to the end. Therefore, they cut or altered scenes from *Richard III* that might lead to a comic interpretation.

As for the critical reception, the positive comments on the production were in relation to Frateschi's performance as Ricardo, which was considered excellent by most of the reviewers. However, the only negative comment was also in relation to Frateschi's performance. The comment was made by Mariangela Alves de Lima, from *O Estado de São Paulo*, who argued that Frateschi's performance as the devilish Ricardo was exaggerated.

In spite of the fact that I could not count on visual recordings of the productions, I believe that it was possible to have a clear idea--through the analysis of the playtexts and close attention to the stage directions--of how each director depicted their protagonists. Thus, the textual analysis of the playtexts was crucial to achieve the conclusions of this research. As a matter of fact, I must acknowledge that the study of character construction in the two Brazilian productions of Shakespeare's *Richard III* in terms of politics was extremely enriching. It was not a coincidence that two productions of one of Shakespeare's most political playtexts were staged in 2006, in the turmoils of a political crisis. There would not be a better moment for staging these shows.

Therefore, I would like to conclude by saying that there are many possibilities for further research in the analysis of Shakespeare's *Richard III* in performance. What if other Brazilian productions of Shakespeare's *Richard III* were staged in Brazil in the present context, 2010? What would be the implications of these shows? What about the protagonist, how would Ricardo be constructed in the present days? Certainly, there would be other interesting analyses, because the political and social scenarios in Brazil have changed and the productions would have their own particularities.

REFERENCE LIST:

Primary Sources

Frateschi, Celso and Roberto Lage. *Ricardo III*. Email to Camila Camilotti. 11. Dec 2008.

Shakespeare, William. *The Riverside Shakespeare*. USA: Houghton Mifflin, 1974.

Soares, Jô. *Ricardo III*. São Paulo: Imprensa Oficial, 2006

Secondary Sources

Almeida, Jorge. “Evolução da Imagem do Governo Lula e comportamento Eleitoral” *Política e Sociedade* 6.10 (2007), 118-152.

Araújo, Marcelo and Oscar Sanchez. “A Corrupção e os Controles Internos do Estado” *Lua Nova: Revista de Cultura e Política [online]*, 65 (2005) 137-173. 27 Mar. 2009 <<http://www.scielo.br/pdf/ln/n65/a06n65.pdf> >.

Barreto, Vânia Araújo. “A “Continuidade” Neoliberal do Governo Lula em Perspectiva
Macrosociológica: Uma análise Político- comparada em Florestan Fernandes e Immanuel Wallerstein”. Diss. *Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina*, 2006. Florianópolis, SC: 2006.

Bennett, Susan. *Theatre Audiences: A Theory of Production and Reception*. London and New York: Routledge, 1994.

Besson, Marcela. “Celso Frateschi: Sem patrocínio, ator protagoniza no palco do Teatro Ágora, montagem de Ricardo III”
Veja on-line. 27.jul.2006. 01. Oct.2009
< <http://vejaosaopaulo.abril.com.br/entrevistas/m0023935.html>>

Bloom, Harold. “*Shakespeare: A Invenção do Humano*”. Trans. José Roberto O’Shea. Rio de Janeiro: Objetiva, 2000.

- . *Shakespeare: The Invention of the Human*. New York: Riverhead Books, 1998.
- Brasil, Ubiratan. “Ricardo III e o egoísmo sem máscara.” *O Estado de São Paulo*. 27 mai. 2006, late ed.: D5.
- Bulman, James C. (editor). *Shakespeare, Theory, and Performance*. London, Routledge, 1996.
- Camargo, Thaís Nicoleti de. ““Vai acabar em Pizza?”” *Folha Online*. 20. May. 2005. 04. Jun. 2009
<<http://www1.folha.uol.com.br/folha/colunas/noutraspalavras/ult267u21.shtml>>
- Carreirão, Yan de Sousa. “A Eleição Presidencial Brasileira de 2006: Uma Análise Preliminar.” *Política e Sociedade*. 6.10 (2007), 92-116.
- Dawson, Anthony B. “Performance and Participation: Desdemona, Foucault, and The Actor’s Body”. In Bulman, James C. (ed.). *Shakespeare, Theory, and Performance*. London, Routledge, 1996. 29- 45.
- De Marinis, Marco. *The Semiotics of Performance*. Trans. Áine O’Hairy. USA: Indiana University Press, 1993.
- Escosteguy, Diego. “Museu Vivo do Código Penal”. *Veja*. 12. Jul. 2006: 54-65.
- “Entenda a CPI dos Bingos”. *Folha de São Paulo*, Dec.2005. 27 Mar.2009.<<http://www.folha.uol.com.br/folha/brasil/ult96u74415.shtml>>.
- “Facção Criminosa PCC foi criada em 1993”. *Folha Online*, May.2006 *Folha de São Paulo*, 01. Oct. 2009.
<<http://www1.folha.uol.com.br/folha/cotidiano/ult95u121460.shtml>>
- Ferreira, Aurélio Buarque de Holanda. *Novo Dicionário Aurélio de Língua Portuguesa*. 4th ed. 2009. Positivo: Curitiba, 2009.

- Filho, Ruy. “Ricardo III: A Face que Preferimos Ocultar”. *Gazeta do Rio de Janeiro* 08. Mar. 2007. 09 Apr. 2009
<<http://antroparticular.blogspot.com/2007/03/ricardo-iii-face-que-prefirimos-ocultar.html>>.
- Foakes, R. A. *Shakespeare and Violence*. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Frateschi, Celso. “Ricardo III”. *Program folder*. Ágora Teatro, São Paulo. May, 2006. Print.
- Granovetter, Mark. “A construção Social da Corrupção”. *Política e Sociedade*, 5.9 (2006): 12-36.
- Halio, Jay. *Understanding Shakespeare’s Plays in Performance*. USA: Scrivener Press, 1988.
- Heliadora, Bárbara. *A Expressão Dramática do Homem Político em Shakespeare*. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e terra, 1978.
- . *Falando de Shakespeare*. São Paulo: Perspectiva, 2001.
- . *Reflexões Shakespeareanas*. Rio de Janeiro: Lacerda, 2004.
- Jowett, John. Introduction. *The Tragedy of King Richard III*. By William Shakespeare. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000. 1-132.
- Júnior, Policarpo. “Autópsia da Corrupção”. *Veja Online*. 30. Jan. 2008. 30. May. 2009
<http://veja.abril.com.br/300108/p_046.shtml>
- Kennedy, Dennis. *Looking at Shakespeare: A Visual History of Twentieth-Century Performance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- . “Shakespeare Without his Language”. In Bulman, James C. (ed.). *Shakespeare, Theory, and Performance*. London and New York: Routledge, 1996. 133-147.

Kiernan, Victor. *Shakespeare, Poet and Citizen*, London, New York: Verso, 1993.

Kinas, Fernando. “Sobre Reinos e Cavalos”. *Bravo*. May 2006: 110-113

Lage, Roberto. Interview. *Minha Rua*. Jan. 2007. 01.Oct. 2009.
<http://www.minharia.com/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=141&Itemid=10082>

Leggatt, Alexander. *Shakespeare's Political Drama: The History Plays and the Roman Plays*. London and New York: Routledge, 1988.

Lima, Mariangela Alves de. “Ricardo III, a essência do mal em duas visões”. *O Estado de São Paulo* 16 jun. 2006, late ed.: D6.

Medeiros, Vanessa. “Meu Reino por um Clássico”. *Online Posting*. 01. Oct.2009
<<<http://www.facasper.com.br/cultura/site/critica.php?tabela=&id=69>>>

Melo, Edison Paes de. “Agora Teatro apresenta ‘Ricardo III’, de William Shakespeare, dirigido por Roberto Lage, a partir de 18/05” *Revista In*. 19. Apr. 2006.01.Oct. 2009

<http://www.revistainonline.com.br/ler_noticia_cultura.asp?secao=30¬icia=4547>

Minto, Lelo Watanabe. “Estado Mínimo”. *HISTEDBR: Navegando na História da Educação Brasileira*. Unicamp, n.d, 13.Oct.2009
<http://www.histedbr.fae.unicamp.br/navegando/glossario/verb_c_estado_minimo.htm

Néspoli, Beth: “O Tirano também afiado na sedução”. *O Estado de São Paulo* 18 mai. 2006, late Ed.: D4.

“O Sujeito Oculto”. *Veja* 19 Apr. 2006: 48-56.

Osborne, Laurie E. “Rethinking The Performance Editions: Theatrical and textual Productions of Shakespeare”. In Bulman, James C. (ed.). *Shakespeare, Theory And Performance*. London and New York: Routledge, 1996. 168-185.

O'Shea, José Roberto. Professor of Literature and Arts,
Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina. *Personal Interview*. 20
Apr. 2009

O'Shea, José Roberto "Performance e Inserção Cultural: Antony
and Cleópatra e Cymbeline, King of Britain em Português"
Cymbeline, Rei da Britânia. José Roberto O'Shea (trad.e notas).
São Paulo: Iluminuras, 2002, 31-43.

Pavan, Jussane Cristine. "JJ Entrevista Celso Frateschi que interpreta
Ricardo III". *Jornal Jovem*. Aug. 2006. 01. Oct. 2009
< <http://www.jornaljovem.com.br/edicao3/teatro05.php>>

Pavis, Patrice. *Theatre at the Crossroads of Culture*. Trans. Loren
Kruger. London and New York: Routledge, 1992.

---. "Toward Specifying Theatre Translation". *Theatre at the
Crossroads of Culture*. Patrice Pavis, London and New York:
Routledge, 1992. 136-157.

---. "Toward a Theory of Culture and *Mise-en-Scène*". *Theatre
at the Crossroads of Culture*. Patrice Pavis, London and New
York: Routledge, 1992. 1- 23.

---. "From Page to Stage: A Difficult Birth". *Theatre at the Crossroads
of Culture*. Patrice Pavis, London and New York: Routledge,
1992. 24- 47.

Pizza, Daniel. "Shakespeare Digestivo". *O Estado de São Paulo*.
18 Aug. 2006. 27 Mar.2009
<http://blog.estadao.com.br/blog/piza/?title=shakespeare_digestivo&more=1&c=1&tb=1&pb=1>.

"Procuradoria denuncia Jefferson e mais oito por Escândalo dos
Correios". *Folha Online*, Sep. 2008. *Folha de São Paulo*,
27mar.2009.
<<http://www1.folha.uol.com.br/folha/brasil/ult96u443813.shtml>>.

Ricca, Giulia. "Perguntas sobre a produção Ricardo III." E-mail to
Camila Paula Camilotti. 14 May. 2009.

Rocha, Roberto Ferreira da. “O Jogo Político na era dos Tudors: Absolutismo e Reforma”. In Leão, Liana Camargo and Marlene Soares dos Santos (org.). *Shakespeare: Sua Época e Sua Obra*. Curitiba: Beatrice, 2008. 35-64.

Rocklin, Edward L. “Performance is more than an “Approach” to Shakespeare”. In Riggio, Milla Cozart (ed.). *Teaching Shakespeare through Performance*. New York: Modern Language Association, 1999. 49- 62.

Rovere, Nanda. “Ricardo III interpretado por Celso Frateschi”. *Jornal Spinner*. 18. jul. 2007. 01. Oct. 2009
<http://www.spiner.com.br/JornalSpinner/noticias.php?subaction=showfull&id=1153211083&archive=&start_from=&ucat=33>

Saccio, Peter. *Shakespeare’s English Kings: History, Chronicle, and Drama*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1977.

“Salve Geral: O Código que parou São Paulo.” *Sony Pictures*. Oct. 2009. 18 Nov. 2009

<
<http://www.sonypictures.com.br/Sony/HotSites/Br/salvegeral>>

Santos, Rick J. dos. “Mestizo Shakespeare: A study of Cultural Exchange.” In Santos, Rick J. dos and Bernice W. Kliman (eds.). *Latin American Shakespeares*. New Jersey: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2005. 11-20.

Santos, Marlene Soares dos. “Dramaturgia Shakespeareana.” In Leão, Liana Camargo and Marlene Soares dos Santos. (org.). *Shakespeare: Sua Época e Sua Obra*. Curitiba: Beatrice, 2008. 165-206.

Santos, Monica. “Escolha seu Rei: Ricardo III, de Shakespeare, ganha duas boas Montagens na Cidade”. *Veja On-Line*. 7.jun.2006 01.Oct.2009

< <http://veja.abril.com.br/vejasp/070606/teatro.html>>

---. “As diferenças entre as Montagens”. *Veja On-Line*. 7.jun.2006 01.Oct.2009

<http://veja.abril.com.br/vejasp/070606/popup_teatro.html>

Silveira, José Renato Ferreira da. “A Sede de Poder: O Complexo Ricardo III”. *Online Posting*. 27 Mar. 2009 <http://www.pucsp.br/neamp/artigos/artigo_50.htm>.

Styan, J.L. *Perspectives on Shakespeare in Performance*. New York: Peterlang Publishing, 2000.

Shakespeare, William. *Cymbeline, King of Britain*.
Trans. José Roberto O’Shea. São Paulo: Iluminuras, 2002.

Teatro FAAP, Núcleo de Artes Cênicas. “Ricardo III: Making of”
DVD. São Paulo: 2006.

Veiga, Luciana Fernandes et al. “Debate Presidencial: As estratégias de Lula e Alckmin na TV Bandeirantes.” *Política e Sociedade*. 6.10 (2007), 196-217.

Viégas-Faria, Beatriz. Introdução. *Ricardo III*. By William Shakespeare.
Porto Alegre: L&PM, 2007. 13-20.

Worthen, W. B. “Staging ‘Shakespeare’: Acting, Authority, and the rhetoric of Performance”. In Bulman, James C. (ed.). *Shakespeare, Theory, and Performance*. London and New York: Routledge, 1996. 12-25.

Zimbarg, Adriana. “Ricardo III”. *Online Posting*. 22. Dec. 2006. 01.
Oct. 2009
<<http://www.artigos.com/artigos/humanas/artes-e-literatura/ricardo-iii-1183/artigo/>>