

Frederico van Erven Cabala

Figures of the Modern in Brazilian Theater

Abstract: This article investigates the different nuances of the term *modern* in Brazilian theater criticism, seeking to map the main variations and their implications for the analysis of the drama in Brazil. Through examination of materials from press pages and books of the 19th and 20th centuries, studies dedicated to the history of Brazilian theater, and remarks on the concept of the *modern* made by researchers like Hans Robert Jauss, this text seeks to present the widespread use of the term, applied to different productions in the Brazilian theatrical context. Consequently, we propose to reflect on the *modern* in Brazilian theater as a fruitful inquiry into the various aesthetic influences that transformed the country's stage and dramaturgy.

Keywords: Brazilian Theater; Brazilian Dramaturgy; Modern; World Literature.

FREDERICO VAN ERVEN CABALA

Universidade Federal Fluminense, Brazil
fredericocabala@gmail.com

DOI: 10.24193/cechinox.2024.47.16

Histories and Disagreements

If we take a look at some of the best-known studies on the history of Brazilian theater, we will notice how much the word *modern* shines through as a central category, sometimes as part of the book titles, and other times as a determining point in historiographical narratives. Let's take, for example, some works by Décio de Almeida Prado, such as *O teatro brasileiro moderno*, from 1988¹, and *Apresentação do teatro brasileiro*, from 1955; or *Moderno teatro brasileiro*, by Gustavo Dória, published in 1975; as well as books such as *Panorama do teatro brasileiro*, from 1962, and *Moderna dramaturgia brasileira*, from 1998, written by Sábato Magaldi. More recently published, the two-volume work *História do teatro brasileiro* (2012), by Joao Roberto Faria, tackles the topic in its own editorial structure: it is the irruption of the *modern* that draws the dividing line between the subjects of the first and second volumes.

All the studies mentioned above announce the emergence of the *modern* in Brazilian theater around the first half of the 20th century. The predominant view points to *ground zero*, on December 28, 1943, as the play *Vestido de noiva*, written by Nelson Rodrigues. This event is often referred to

as a kind of *advent of the modern* in Brazilian theater. Another point of similarity between these studies, it must be stressed, lies in the fact that, despite discussing the presence of modern theatrical art in Brazil, the texts do not specify from which understanding of *modern* or *modernism* they operate. The impression is given that the term has a consensual meaning, as if its use generically and spontaneously encompassed all the possible important innovations that touched Brazilian theater exclusively throughout the 20th century, as if no alternative interpretation could envisage the existence of the modern in the preceding century of the theatrical art in Brazil.

It is thus somewhat unexpected to encounter references to a modern theater in Brazil from periods earlier than those typically considered by 20th and 21st-century critics and historians. The term *modern*, in reference to Brazilian theater, appeared in periodicals, magazines and books in Brazil before the first decades of the 20th century: newspaper collections and editions of books from the 1800s indicate that we need to go back to the mid-19th century, when the expression began to be used with more frequency. In what follows, I will take a chronological look at the appearance of the word, indicating, whenever it's possible, the sense of modern given by those who used it in relation to the Brazilian theater, in order to demonstrate the variations of the meaning across different time periods.

The Perspective of Novelty in José de Alencar and Machado de Assis

In 1857, José de Alencar penned his considerations about “A comédia brasileira” in the newspaper *Diário do Rio de Janeiro*.

The text is a kind of ideology from the author of *O Guarani* about which paths Brazilian theater should follow. Alencar notes that the only institution worthy of his praise was the Teatro Gymnásio Dramático, a place that brought some of the writer's plays to the fore. The newspaper article says that the Teatro Gymnásio Dramático tended to “introduce the *true modern school* to this court”². This *true modern school* referred to French realist theater, especially the dramaturgy written by Alexandre Dumas Filho, an author expressly mentioned as a model to be followed.

The same treatment of the Gymnásio Dramático is repeated in a note in the *Jornal do Commercio*, from Rio de Janeiro, in 1859. The short article mentions with regret the death of an actor from this institution and says that the legacy of the artist from the Gymnásio Dramático would be eternal for the memory of “the modern Brazilian theater”³. Also in 1859, Machado de Assis published a theatrical chronicle in which he harshly criticized the Brazilian stage productions of that period. According to the young Machado de Assis, then in his twenties, the theater should be an instrument of moralization for the country that had obtained its political independence just a few decades before: “The theater is for the people what the Chorus was for the ancient Greek theater: an initiative of morality and civilization”⁴, and, for the future author of *Dom Casmurro*, “Thus the deviations of a transitional society are passing away and modern art has to correct them altogether”⁵. The expression *modern art*, which Machado didn't clarify in this first chronicle, would be used again seven years later to refer to the theater, in a series of texts from 1866 about the dramaturgy

of José de Alencar. *Modern* [theatrical] *art*, according to Machado de Assis, was associated with the so-called high comedy school of French theatrical realism, just as José de Alencar himself understood it. In these articles from 1866, Machado de Assis argued that Alencar was “the head of our dramatic literature”⁶, whose creations for the theater brought hope for changes in direction on the Brazilian stage: “when the reality of the present discourages us”⁷ said Machado de Assis, “we turn our eyes to the hopes of the future. In the author of *Demônio familiar* [José de Alencar], these hopes are legitimate”⁸.

The following years indicate that this meaning remained prevalent for the expression “modern theater.” In 1872, writer Pessanha Póvoa wrote a preface to the first edition of Narcisa Amália’s book of poems *Nebulosas*. In this text, Póvoa provides an overview of Brazilian literature of the period, expanding his considerations beyond the lyrical genre. Thus, when addressing Brazilian theater, the preface states that “The creator of modern theater burned *As asas de um anjo*”⁹.

As asas de um anjo is a play written by José de Alencar in 1858. Initially authorized by the Conservatório Dramático to be performed on stage, the play was banned after the third performance on the grounds that it contained immoral scenes. This episode was a determining factor in José de Alencar’s frustration with writing plays, hence the figurative meaning that the author *burned* the work. However, what is most interesting about Pessanha Póvoa’s statement is that it indicates that Alencar was “the creator” of *modern theater* in Brazil. This allusion clashes head-on with the historiographical studies mentioned

earlier, whose conception of the modern encompasses creations from the 1930s and, above all, the 1940s.

Let’s continue, however, for a few more lines still in the 19th century: in 1877, the newspaper *A Província de São Paulo* (future *O Estado de São Paulo*) talked about a play by the Portuguese writer Pinheiro Chagas, which had premiered in Brazil that year, and affiliated it to the “dominant school in what is called the *modern theater*”¹⁰. The text then linked the play to creations by Alexandre Dumas Filho and Octave Feuillet. Two years later, in 1879, the same newspaper published a column entitled “*Feições do teatro moderno*”, which discussed the two French playwrights at length. In 1887, *A Província de São Paulo* published the phrase “the master of modern theater”¹¹ as a way of pointing towards the playwright Émile Augier, also an important figure in French theatrical realism.

These examples from the second half of the 19th century show how the use of the term modern to refer to aesthetic trends in Brazilian theater had a very different meaning from what has usually been conceived of as modern Brazilian theater since the mid-20th century. That is, the concept of the modern apparent in these instances seems to be almost exclusively linked to French theatrical realism. While often associated with the so-called “alta comédia” (high comedy), there was also a broader understanding of the term, which occasionally encompassed French theater in general, seen as the beacon of novelty, as a model of innovation and aesthetic excellence that Brazilian theater should emulate, according to contemporary expectations.

In the early years of the 20th century, a comment made by the Portuguese actress

Sophia Gallini indicates that the expression modern associated with theater has this generic sense of novelty. In an interview in 1907, Gallini tried to highlight her own interests in *modern theater*, saying: "I am a modern actress... I like everything modern"¹².

However, until at least 1916, there were still those who referred to modern theater as synonymous with French theatrical realism of the mid-19th century. The *Revista de Teatro & Sport*, from Rio de Janeiro, published a series of articles on Brazilian theater that year. In the May 13, 1916 issue, the following was written in reference to the *Gymnásio Dramático* and names such as José de Alencar: "Modern theater in Brazil has preserved in the works cited the photograph of our individual customs, which have crossed the frames of our childhood with the passions of life and the defects of time"¹³. This quote demonstrates how the meaning of modern, when referring to Brazilian theater, still followed a prevailing sense from the 1800s, exemplifying that the term's link with French theatrical realism persisted for decades.

New Moderns in Sight

At the same time, nevertheless, another sense of modern theater began to coexist with the French sense of theatrical realism. And, as can be seen in newspaper articles and some studies from the period, this new meaning replaced the understanding of modern in Brazilian theater as synonymous with 19th century French plays. For example, in 1918, Portuguese actress Palmyra Torres visited Brazil on a tour to perform Henry Bataille's play *Marcha Nupcial*. In an interview, she regretted not being able to attend Brazilian

theatrical performances, but said that she knew "all the modern theater in Brazil"¹⁴. When asked about her favorite author of that theater, she mentioned not a 19th century writer, but Roberto Gomes, a Brazilian author with a symbolist tendency who was gaining prominence at the time with bold plays in thematic and aesthetic terms. As well as mentioning Roberto Gomes, the actress also points out the similarity between his dramaturgy and that of Henry Bataille, author of dramas with a symbolist touch from the late 19th and early 20th centuries. The term modern, therefore, shifts away from its association with French Realism and comes to encompass new aesthetic features, such as theatrical symbolism.

The following year, 1919, a Brazilian newspaper published an article on the *Manifesto do teatro futurista sintético*, by Filippo Tommaso Marinetti, Emilio Settimelli and Bruno Corradini, and also presented some short plays by these authors. From then on, it became very common to use *modern theater* and related terms for various Brazilian playwrights of the time. In 1920, the writer Renato Vianna was considered one of the best of *modern theater* – a note in the *Jornal do Brasil* indicated that even the President of the Republic was going to see his play *Salomé*: "The day after tomorrow we will see, at the Carlos Gomes, the representation of another Brazilian original of high value, one of the most interesting works comparable to the best that modern theater has produced"¹⁵. A few years later, in 1928, the *Teatro de Brinquedo* theater company, linked to the names of São Paulo's modernists, dodged the *futurist* label: "*Theatro de Brinquedo* is not futurist. We have this old habit of thinking that artistic movements that are

different from others are futuristic. Futurism is what Marinetti does. The rest is modernism. Álvaro Moreyra [from *Teatro de Brinquedo*] is a modernist¹⁶, says the article. Also in 1928, a columnist for the *Diário Carioca* answered a short question: “What is the characteristic of modern theater? The presentation of all the phenomena of the subconscious¹⁷. Linking the prospect of a *modern* theatrical creation to a psychological bias, the text then gives prominence to a play by the Brazilian playwright Abadie Faria Rosa.

The term appeared several times in the late 1920s and throughout the 1930s. The playwright Oduvaldo Vianna is mentioned repeatedly, either as one of the authors of “one of the most beautiful works of modern Brazilian theater¹⁸, or as one of the names that acted most “in favor of a modern and intelligent Brazilian theater¹⁹. The play *Amor*, by the same Oduvaldo Vianna, came to be seen in the year of its premiere, 1934, as “not only the best play in modern Brazilian theater²⁰, but also “one of the most revolutionary works published lately in Brazil²¹. In 1933, a headline highlighted the play *Deus lhe pague...*, by Joracy Camargo, as “the most serious case of modern Brazilian theater²², and this would be another author to whom the term *modern theater* would come to be linked. A few years passed and, in 1939, the name of playwright Cláudio de Souza appeared, described in a magazine page as the “creator of modern Brazilian theater²³.

Consecration Put into Perspective

José de Alencar, Roberto Gomes, Renato Vianna, Álvaro Moreyra, Abadie Faria Rosa, Oduvaldo Vianna, Joracy Camargo

and Cláudio de Souza... Faced with so many names, what happens from the 1940s onwards is intriguing: Nelson Rodrigues’ play *Vestido de noiva* premieres on December 28, 1943 in Rio de Janeiro and this creation’s rise to a kind of *ground zero* for *modern* theater takes place in a short space of time. In fact, even before its first appearance on stage, this work by Nelson Rodrigues was already garnering enthusiastic comments about its modern aesthetic. It was two months before the curtain at Teatro Municipal of Rio de Janeiro opened for *Vestido de noiva*, and one of the best-known literary critics of the period, Álvaro Lins, decreed: “[the play] is within the norms of the most modern theatrical life: that of a Pirandello and a Lenormand, for example²⁴. Three days after the first performance, another critic wrote that it was “the true notion of modern theater²⁵. The expression, used to refer to *Vestido de noiva* and Nelson Rodrigues, reappeared in 1944, when a journalist said that the play had made Brazilian theater “a theater of modern resources²⁶, and when the set designer himself, referring to the tour he would be making in São Paulo, said: “we will close the season with the greatest success of modern Brazilian theater, which was *Vestido de noiva*, by Nelson Rodrigues²⁷.

The vectors of the interpretation of the *modern* in Brazilian theater – which had been around since the mid-19th century and defined so many different authors and works as *modern* – began to converge in the direction of *Vestido de noiva*. From the 1950s onwards, the play would establish itself as the most important point in *modern Brazilian theater*, with the publication of historiographical studies on Brazilian theater, such as the unavoidable works by Décio de

Almeida Prado and Sábato Magaldi. The former, in a 1955 historiographical text, argued that, with the premiere of *Vestido de noiva*, “[...] we welcomed the aesthetic currents that had been manifesting themselves in Europe since the beginning of the century. Modern theater began in Brazil”²⁸. Another author of important historiographical work, Sábato Magaldi, pointed out, in a critical text from 1958, that there was a certain consensus about this: “It is worth repeating, without cost, that Brazilian theater was born with it [*Vestido de noiva*]”²⁹. In 1962, in the first edition of the book *Panorama do teatro brasileiro*, Magaldi would go on to say that “The breath of renewal in contemporary dramaturgy came from *Vestido de noiva* – it can no longer be disputed”³⁰.

Given all of the above, and the widespread use of the term *modern* to refer to Brazilian theater in other times, one gets the feeling that positions such as those of Décio de Almeida Prado and Sábato Magaldi end up neglecting other meanings of *modern*, applied at different times and to other names, other works. In addition, these notable critics often attach a sense of *delay* to the arrival of *modern* on Brazilian stages, mentioning a kind of *theatrical emptiness* between 1922 (the year of the *Semana de Arte Moderna*) and 1943, when *Vestido de noiva* premiered. In this panorama, then, we can see how *modern* Brazilian theater between the mid-19th century and the mid-20th century could, at the same time, have many fathers and be an orphan.

The complexity is accentuated when we move on to the next moment: in 1967, the Teatro Oficina group, directed by José Celso Martinez Corrêa, decided to stage a hitherto forgotten play by Oswald de Andrade, written 30 years earlier (before *Vestido de noiva*,

therefore), and this event began to shed light on the modernity of that hitherto almost unseen creation. The title of Oswald de Andrade’s play, *O rei da vela*, began to be associated with the question of *modern* in Brazilian theater³¹. This staging had an impact on both Décio de Almeida Prado’s impressions and, more strongly, on Sábato Magaldi’s speeches. In 1971, the former made adjustments to his text published for the first time in 1955: the expression “The modern theater in Brazil was beginning”³² was moved to appear after the mention of several other names, including Oswald de Andrade, an author who had not even been mentioned in the 1955 edition. Sábato Magaldi, for his part, changes his thinking that “it is no longer disputed”³³ that *Vestido de noiva* is the advent of *modern* in Brazilian theater. Sábato Magaldi’s interpretative turn is recorded in his doctoral thesis from the 1970s, published as a book in 2004, which reads: “From the point of view of dramaturgy, however, it is worth claiming the precedence of Oswald de Andrade’s work [...]. Many of the innovations in Nelson Rodrigues’ texts can already be found in Oswald de Andrade’s”³⁴. *Modernism* in Brazilian theater, then, began to take on new forms. Currently, studies have emerged to glimpse the plurality of possible perspectives on the *modern* in theatrical terms. It is important to mention, in this sense, a book like *Veto ao modernismo no teatro brasileiro*, by Giuliana Simões, and an essay like *Crítica da Razão* [TEATRAL] *Negra*, by Guilherme Diniz.

Defending the Contradictions

At the end of this journey of understandings about the modern in Brazilian theater, what can be said in terms of

a – provisional – conclusion to this debate? Profitable reflections can emerge from this contorted outline of modern Brazilian theater. Modern, as we have seen, is not an *in natura* term with a stable meaning. The very meaning of the word, in a broad sense, not strictly associated with the arts, has gone through a series of different and sometimes even opposing meanings. The word *modern*, as Hans Robert Jausz has shown, paradoxically has very old applications. In his 1965 text “Literary Tradition and the Current Consciousness of Modernity”³⁵, Jausz provides a historical overview of the concept to demonstrate the different meanings and value judgments that the category modern has taken on since the 5th century (C.E.) until the 20th century.

Something similar happens in our case, even taking into account that the time frame observed here is much more modest: we are dealing with Brazilian theater from the mid-1800s to the end of the 1990s. The appearance of the word “modern” in reference to Brazilian theater over several decades throughout the 19th and especially the 20th centuries reveals the variations in meaning and historicity that the expression “modern theater” and related terms carried. This helps us modalize discourses of a single origin for aesthetic innovations in terms of both dramaturgy and staging, and, it seems to me, calls into question rigid temporal delimitations.

In *Desenvolvimento combinado e desigual: por uma nova teoria da literatura-mundial*, the Warwick Research Collective recommends an expansion of traditional temporal notions in relation to the modern in the arts, i.e. modernisms. The parameters of time “need to be positioned earlier than they conventionally are, so as to

incorporate the great wave of writing from the mid-nineteenth century onwards”³⁶. The collective work goes on to reiterate: “Avoiding the normative periodization of modernism, we insist on its temporal and geographical elasticity”³⁷.

It is necessary to go back to the Nineteenth Century and understand it as already pregnant with a certain penchant for *novelty* and aesthetic *transformation*, which is sometimes expressed through the use of the word *modern*. Of course, this should not lead to the understanding that the modern of this entire period is the same; nor should we reject the powerful vectors of *innovation* that established 20th century pieces, such as *Vestido de noiva*, carry, in the name of attempts to create previous milestones. Although these are not our concerns, we can say that the point is to see that, since the mid-19th century and for much of the following hundred years, various proposals of *rupture* with tradition have clashed over time.

Returning to Hans Robert Jausz, his study outlines that, since the second half of the 19th century, the awareness of *modernity* has been defined no longer as an opposition to the ancients or classics, but as an accelerated succession of oppositions against itself. It is therefore fruitful to look at Brazilian theater from this perspective: not as a gradual *progression* of the sedimentation of a single modern theater, of a single modern dramaturgy; nor as a rupture made by a work that becomes the advent of the *modern* on Brazilian stages. On the contrary, the history of Brazilian theater seems to point to clashes of different perspectives on what could even be modern, perspectives that change over time. As Antoine Compagnon advises in *Os cinco paradoxos*

da modernidade, “Let’s not be tempted by the mirage of synthesis; let’s keep the contradictions, which are by nature insoluble”³⁸. I don’t hope to present a summary of when, by which author or director Brazilian theater became modern. On the intertwined road of these stories, the vastness of the

term’s appearance over more than a century shows how some moderns accelerated along the path of other moderns, leading to vertiginous transformations in the designation of the repertoire of plays, aesthetics and authors that were adjectivized in this way at some point.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Assis, Machado de, “Ideias sobre o teatro”, in *O Espelho: Revista de Litteratura, modas, industria e artes*, no. 4, 1859, p. 1-2.
- Assis, Machado de, “Semana literária”, in *Diário do Rio de Janeiro*, no. 62, 1866, p. 1-2.
- Assis, Machado de, “Semana literária”, in *Diário do Rio de Janeiro*, no. 74, 1866b, p. 2.
- Borba, José Cesar, “A ‘premiere’ de ‘Vestido de noiva’”, in *O Cruzeiro*, no. 37, 1944, p. 20.
- C., “‘Deus lhe pague’, o caso mais sério do teatro brasileiro moderno”, in *A Gazeta*, no. 8257, 1933, p. 4.
- Chapuzeau, “Actriz Sophia Gallini”, in *Almanaque do teatro*, no. 1, 1907, p. 235.
- Compagnon, Antoine, *Os cinco paradoxos da modernidade*. Tradução de Cleonice P. Mourão, Consuelo F. Santiago e Eunice D. Galéry, 2. ed., Belo Horizonte, Editora UFMG, 2010.
- Vieira, David, “O teatro no Brasil (continuação)”, in *Revista de teatro & Sport*, no. 81, 1916, p. 6.
- Diniz, Guilherme, “Crítica da Razão [TEATRAL] Negra”, in *Horizonte da cena*, 2018, <<https://www.horizontedacena.com/critica-da-razao-teatral-negra/>>. Last accessed: 11 April 2024.
- Dória, Gustavo, *Moderno teatro brasileiro: crônica de suas raízes*, Rio de Janeiro, Ministério da Educação e Cultura/ Serviço Nacional de Teatro, 1975.
- Faria, João Roberto, “Por uma nova história do teatro brasileiro”, in João Roberto Faria, *História do teatro brasileiro, volume 1: das origens ao teatro profissional da primeira metade do século XX*, São Paulo, Perspectiva, Edições SESC-SP, p. 15-20, 2018.
- Faria, João Roberto, *História do teatro brasileiro, volume 2: do modernismo às tendências contemporâneas*, São Paulo, Perspectiva, Edições SESCSP, 2013.
- Ferreira, Reynaldo, “Fala Palmyra Torres”, in *Jornal A Época*, no. 2270, 1918, p. 7.
- Figueiredo, Guilherme, “‘Vestido de Noiva’, de Nelson Rodrigues, no Municipal, pelos ‘Comediantes’”, in *O Jornal*, no. 7262, 1943, p. 6.
- Gerson, Brasil, “Se S. Paulo compreende o Teatro de Brinquedo...”, in *Diário da Noite*, no. 1017, 1928, p. 6.
- “Guilherme Orsat”, in *Jornal do Commercio*, no. 71, 1859, p. 2.
- Jauss, Hans Robert, “Tradição literária e consciência atual da modernidade”, in Heidrun Krieger Olinto, *Histórias de literatura: as novas teorias alemãs*, São Paulo, Editora Ática, 1996, p. 47-100.
- Leão, José, “Feições do teatro moderno”, in *A Província de São Paulo*, no. 1390, 1879, p. 1.
- Magaldi, Sábato, “Cinematographia e Cinematographistas”, in *Cine-Modearte*, no. 15, 1928, p. 37.
- Magaldi, Sábato, “Vestido de noiva”, in *Suplemento Literário*, no. 80, 1958, p. 5.
- Magaldi, Sábato, *Panorama do teatro brasileiro*, São Paulo, Difusão Europeia do Livro, 1962.
- Magaldi, Sábato, *Moderna dramaturgia brasileira*, São Paulo, Editora Perspectiva, 1998.
- Magaldi, Sábato, *Teatro da ruptura: Oswald de Andrade*, São Paulo, Global, 2004.
- Mendes, Octavio, “Letras e artes: Victor Hugo”, in *A província de São Paulo*, no. 3643, 1887, p. 1.
- “Novas e ecos”, in *Jornal do Brasil*, no. 163, 1920, p. 11.
- “O Feitiço, de Oduvaldo Vianna, em Porto Alegre”, in *A Noite*, no. 6689, 1930, p. 5.
- Oliveira, Valdemar de, “Amor’ de Oduvaldo Vianna pelo ‘Grupo Gente Nossa’”, in *Diário de Pernambuco*, no. 197, 1934, p. 2.

- Oliveira, José de, “‘Vestido de noiva’ e ‘O escravo’”, in *Diário Carioca*, no. 4706, 1943, p. 4.
- “Os ‘Comediantes’ farão uma temporada no Municipal”, in *O Jornal*, no. 7392, 1944, p. 5.
- Póvoa, Pessanha, “Prefácio”, in Narcisa Amália, *Nebulosas*, prefácio de Pessanha Póvoa, apresentação e posfácio de Anna Faedrich, 2edição, Rio de Janeiro, Gradiva Editorial, Fundação Biblioteca Nacional, 2017, p. 15-28.
- Prado, Décio de Almeida, “A evolução da literatura dramática”, in Afrânio Coutinho, *A literatura no Brasil*, vol. II, Rio de Janeiro, Editorial Sul Americana, 1955, p. 249-283.
- Prado, Décio de Almeida, “A evolução da literatura dramática”, in Afrânio Coutinho, *A literatura no Brasil*, vol. VI, Rio de Janeiro, Editorial Sul Americana, 1971, p. 7-37.
- Prado, Décio de Almeida, *O teatro brasileiro moderno*, São Paulo, Perspectiva, 2009.
- Sady-Garibaldi, “Depois da meia noite: ‘O leader da maioria’, tres actos de Abadie Faria Rosa, pelo actor Fróes e seus Comediantes, no Lyrico”, in *Diário Carioca*, no. 50, 1928, p. 2.
- Simões, Giuliana, *Veto ao modernismo no teatro brasileiro*, São Paulo, HUCITEC/FAPESP, 2017.
- “Theatro de S. José”, in *A Província de São Paulo*, no. 737, 1877, p. 3.
- Vilalva, Mario, “Elogio de dois poetas e um escritor”, in *Aspectos: Mensario de Letras, artes sciencias, política...*, no. 18, 1939, p. 86-90.
- WRcC – Warwick Research Collective, *Desenvolvimento combinado e desigual: por uma nova teoria da literatura-mundial*, tradução: Gabriela Beduschi Zanfelice. Campinas, SP, Editora da Unicamp, 2020.

NOTES

1. The edition consulted for this work is from 2009, as stated in the bibliographical references.
2. Translated by the author. Original: “introduzir nesta côrte a verdadeira escola moderna” (Alencar, 1957: 1).
3. Translated by the author. Original: “Theatro moderno brasileiro” (Guilherme, 1859: 2).
4. Translated by the author. Original: “O teatro é para o povo o que o Coro era para o antigo teatro grego: uma iniciativa de moral e civilização”. (Assis, 1859, p. 2).
5. Translated by the author. Original: “Assim os desvios de uma sociedade de transição lá vão passando e à arte moderna toca corrigi-la de todo.” (Assis, 1859: 2).
6. Translated by the author. Original: “o chefe da nossa literatura dramática” (Assis, 1866: 1).
7. Translated by the author. Original: “[...] quando a realidade do presente desanima” (Assis, 1866b: 2).
8. Translated by the author. Original: “voltam-se os olhos para as esperanças do futuro. No autor do *Demônio familiar* [José de Alencar], estas esperanças são legítimas.” (Assis, 1866b: 2).
9. Translated by the author. Original: “O criador do teatro moderno queimou *As asas de um anjo*” (Póvoa, 2017: 21).
10. Translated by the author. Original: “escola dominante no que se chama o *theatro moderno*” (Theatro, 1877: 3).
11. Translated by the author. Original: “o mestre do teatro moderno” (Mendes, 1887: 1).
12. Translated by the author. Original: “sou uma atriz moderna...gosto de tudo moderno” (Chapuzeau, 1907: 235).
13. Translated by the author. Original: “o teatro moderno no Brasil conservou nas obras citadas a photographia dos nossos costumes individuaes, que atravessaram os quadros da nossa infancia com as paixões da vida e os defeitos do tempo.” (David, 1916: 7).
14. Translated by the author. Original: “todo o teatro moderno do Brasil” (Ferreira, 1918: 7).
15. Translated by the author. Original: “Depois de amanhã assistiremos, no Carlos Gomes, à representação de mais um original brasileiro de alto valor, obra das mais interessantes comparável às melhores que o teatro moderno tem produzido.” (Novas, 1920: 11).
16. Translated by the author. Original: “o Theatro de Brinquedo não é futurista. Temos essa velha mania de supor futuristas os movimentos artísticos diferentes dos outros. Futurismo é aquilo que se parece

- com o que faz Marinetti. O resto é modernismo. Álvaro Moreyra [do Teatro de Brinquedo] é um modernista.” (Gerson, 1928: 6).
17. Translated by the author. Original: “Qual a característica do teatro moderno? A apresentação de todos os fenômenos do subconsciente.” (Sady-Garibaldi, 1928: 2).
 18. Translated by the author. Original: “uma das mais lindas obras do teatro brasileiro moderno” (M.S, 1928: 37).
 19. Translated by the author. Original: “em prol de um teatro brasileiro moderno e inteligente” (O Feitiço, 1932: 5).
 20. Translated by the author. Original: “não só a melhor peça do teatro brasileiro moderno” (Oliveira, 1934: 2).
 21. Translated by the author. Original: “das obras mais revolucionárias que se tem publicado, ultimamente, no Brasil” (Oliveira, 1934: 2).
 22. Translated by the author. Original: “o caso mais sério do teatro brasileiro moderno” (C., 1933: 4).
 23. Translated by the author. Original: “criador do teatro brasileiro moderno” (Vilalva, 1939: 89).
 24. Translated by the author. Original: “[a peça] se acha dentro das normas da mais moderna vida teatral: a de um Pirandello e de um Lenormand, por exemplo.” (Oliveira, 1943: 4).
 25. Translated by the author. Original: “a verdadeira noção do teatro moderno” (Figueiredo, 1943: 6).
 26. Translated by the author. Original: “um teatro de recursos modernos” (Borba, 1944: 18).
 27. Translated by the author. Original: “encerraremos a temporada com o maior sucesso do moderno teatro brasileiro que foi *Vestido de noiva*, de Nelson Rodrigues” (Os Comediantes, 1944: 5).
 28. Translated by the author. Original: “[...] acolhemos as correntes estéticas que se vinham manifestando na Europa desde o começo do século. Começava o teatro moderno no Brasil” (Prado, 1955: 274).
 29. Translated by the author. Original: “Cumprir repetir, sem custo, que o teatro brasileiro nasceu com ela [*Vestido de noiva*]” (Magaldi, 1958: 5).
 30. Translated by the author. Original: “A lufada renovadora da dramaturgia contemporânea partiu de *Vestido de noiva* - não se contesta mais.” (Magaldi, 1962: 202).
 31. In the book *As voltas de O rei da vela no teatro brasileiro moderno* (The twists and turns of *O rei da vela* in modern Brazilian theater) (Editora Alameda, 2024), I devote special attention to the differences in the work’s reception and the impact this play had on the writing of Brazilian theater histories.
 32. Translated by the author. Original: “Começava o teatro moderno no Brasil”.
 33. Translated by the author. Original: “não se contesta mais” (Magaldi, 1962: 202).
 34. Translated by the author. Original: “Sob o prisma da dramaturgia, porém, cabe reivindicar a precedência da obra de Oswald de Andrade [...]. Muitas das inovações dos textos de Nelson Rodrigues já se encontram nos de Oswald de Andrade.” (Magaldi, 2004: 7).
 35. Original title: *Literarische Tradition und gegenwärtiges Bewusstsein der Modernität*.
 36. Translated by the author. Original: “[...] precisam ser posicionados antes do que convencionalmente o são, de modo a incorporar a grande onda de escritas do meado do século XIX em diante [...]” (WReC, 2020: 44).
 37. Translated by the author. Original: “Evitando a periodização normativa do modernismo, insistimos em sua elasticidade temporal e geográfica.” (WReC, 2020: 215).
 38. Translated by the author. Original: “Não sejamos tentados pela miragem da síntese; mantenhamos as contradições, por natureza insolúveis” (Compagnon, 2010: 15).