

莎士比亚研究十讲

陆谷孙 著

● 复旦大学出版社

莎士比亚研究十讲



陆谷孙 著

图书在版编目(CIP)数据

莎士比亚研究十讲/陆谷孙著. —上海: 复旦大学出版社, 2017. 11
ISBN 978-7-309-13106-2

I. 莎… II. 陆… III. 莎士比亚(Shakespeare, William 1564-1616)-人物研究
IV. K835.615.6

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字(2017)第 169623 号

莎士比亚研究十讲

陆谷孙 著

责任编辑/陈麦青

复旦大学出版社有限公司出版发行

上海市国权路 579 号 邮编: 200433

网址: fupnet@fudanpress.com <http://www.fudanpress.com>

门市零售: 86-21-65642857 团体订购: 86-21-65118853

外埠邮购: 86-21-65109143 出版部电话: 86-21-65642845

上海盛通时代印刷有限公司

开本 890 × 1240 1/32 印张 7.375 字数 193 千

2017 年 11 月第 1 版第 1 次印刷

ISBN 978-7-309-13106-2/K · 619

定价: 48.00 元

如有印装质量问题, 请向复旦大学出版社有限公司出版部调换。

版权所有 侵权必究

弁言

这里搜辑的是本人近半个世纪关于莎士比亚剧作教学、演出观摩和研究的一些心得体会，选录正文凡十五篇，附录六则，尺幅不一，分为十讲，时间跨度长达四十年（如果把1964年那篇经扩写的学生时代习作《科利奥兰纳斯》算入的话）。

笔者选文时避开了一些读者耳熟能详的莎剧，并非为了另辟蹊径，而是意在打开在我们这里不太有人注意的窗牖，从这儿去探视更完整的莎士比亚。事实上，自从20世纪80年代以来，在笔者给研究生开的“莎士比亚：文本精读”课上，逐字逐句讲解的莎剧中更多的是《汉姆雷特》、《威尼斯商人》、《第十二夜》等大家熟悉的剧目。据说教学效果尚好。现在北大工作的张沛老弟当年听过《汉姆雷特》，至今仍有“内容丰赡，会意深邃，穷文尽义，曲说毫芥”的课堂记忆。我很高兴，因为自己多少继承了复旦外文系注重感悟文本胜于第二手阐释的传统，倒是颇与苏珊·桑塔格(Susan Sontag)的主张相暗合呢。

从选文中读者不难看出随着时间的推移笔者有些观点的改变，如初时多见莎剧与中国戏曲表演相通之处，然而待到国内莎学界主张“莎剧中国化”，昆曲、京剧、扬剧、越剧都来争演莎士比亚之时，笔者又开始忧虑莎士比亚精髓的“失落”，盖因辩言过理，则易与义相悖。当然这也

可能是笔者本人对中国戏曲知之甚少，蔽于一义而暗于大理，一种浅薄的偏见而已。识者评之。

另外，关于莎剧的某些见解与观感，顽强萦绕脑际，可能在本书不同的选文中屡有复现。为“hard-sell”计，选编时仍按原样，祈读者宽谅。

本书由陈麦青兄策划并担任责任编辑。我这人从来做事率性，不善系统保留旧稿，致使麦青兄几番奔波，跑上图和早已改制的原上海人艺，于故纸堆中寻检鄙人旧文，发掘湮沦，其职业精神和盛情雅意，令我感激之余，愧悚不已！门下诸君胼胝我事，虽说从磁带录音描记成文、翻译、编辑等都是业务活动，但毕竟给他们增加了负担，多少影响各人的研究计划。特别是朱绩崧老弟，校我中文，译我英文，无不孜孜矻矻，肫勤直言文中瑕疵，使我有检身不及之感。对以上各位，允笔者在此一并致谢！

2005年7月于复旦大学

目 录

弁言	1
1 “ <i>Shakespeare und kein Ende</i> ”	1
—— <i>In Lieu of a Welcome Address</i>	
汉译:“莎评无尽”——代欢迎辞	6
2 <i>Open-endedness of Shakespeare</i>	11
汉译:莎士比亚的开放性	46
3 帷幕落下以后的思考	71
——评第一届中国莎士比亚戏剧节	
4 博能返约,杂能归粹	101
——试论莎士比亚戏剧的容量	
5 从《亨利五世》看莎士比亚的历史剧	119
6 <i>Hamlet Across Space and Time</i>	135
汉译:逾越时空的汉姆雷特	149
附:一部《汉姆雷特》“前传”	157

7 漫谈《驯悍记》及其他 161

- 附:观剧评点:《威尼斯商人》(中国青年)、《奥瑟罗》
(内蒙古人艺)、《泰特斯·安德洛尼克斯》(上海戏
剧学院)、《李尔王》(武汉话剧院) 174

8 《科利奥兰纳斯》的悲剧真谛:官能失调 183

9 莎剧的适演性与适读性之争 203

10 莎学杂谈 209

- 关于讲授莎剧的一封信 210
莎剧书话 213
莎士比亚的“标准像” 218
从莎士比亚姓氏的歧异拼法说起 221
莎学花絮 224
也谈福尔嘉莎士比亚图书馆 227
附:福尔嘉·莎士比亚图书馆(方芬) 229

*“Shakespeare und
kein Ende”*

—In Lieu of
a Welcome Address

a quote
from Goethe

I quote Goethe for the title of this presentation, which is concurrently meant to be a welcome address to all participants to this colloquium. As it is a major event we have ever hosted at Fudan University, I feel rueful for not being able to take part physically to meet old acquaintances “long time no seen” or make new friends. With “my thoughts and wishes bend[ing] toward” the United States, where my first grandchild was newly born, I have to take this duty-bound trip thither while “bow[ing] them to your gracious leave and pardon.” (*Hamlet*, I, ii, 55) A joke, of course.

Now the brass tacks.

five recent
Shakespearean
books

“Shakespeare and No End”, the borrowed Goethe title in English for this presentation, continues to be an unfailing truism in the 21st century. Among the books I have read or read of over the past couple of years are: *Ungentle Shakespeare* by Katherine Duncan-Jones in 2001 (The Arden Shakespeare), *Shakespeare: For All Time* by Stanley Wells in 2002 (Oxford University Press), *The Age of Shakespeare* by Frank Kermode in 2003 (The Modern Library), *Shakespeare as Literary Dramatist* by Lucas Erne in 2003 (Cambridge University Press), and, most recently, *Will in the World: How Shakespeare Became Shakespeare* by Stephen Greenblatt in 2004 (W. W. Norton & Co.).

To me, all these books attest to a resurgent robust

interest in a historical approach to the Bard; the man, his times, his sources, the differences between various editions (alias "textual criticism") and his "after-life" both on the page and on the stage. For instance, if Frank Kermode focuses on how a 17th century low-born from the rural outback became a theatrical upstart when he was next known, Stephen Greenblatt supplies a missing link by filling in Shakespeare's "lost years" between leaving school in the late 1570s — or early 1580s — and materializing in London about ten years later. Working on old stories with educated guesses, Greenblatt has elaborated on a theory of Shakespeare working as a tutor for a family in Lancashire secretly subscribing to Catholic tenets abolished by the ruling Protestants with a verisimilitude reminiscent of *The Shakespeare Conspiracy* by Graham Phillips and Martin Keatman in 1995 that Shakespeare was a government spy in addition to his "split personality" as a grain merchant in his hometown and a dramatist in London. Logicizing in the light of a "historical detective", Greenblatt weaves together clues pointing to the fact that Shakespeare's son, Hamnet by name, died young shortly before the father set about writing *Hamlet*. Hence the description in the play of purgatory and of praying for the deceased or allowing the soul of the dear departed to languish in flames.

a resurgent
robust interest
in a historical
approach to the
Bard

"historical
detectives"

More significantly, critics of the new century

Roman in-
fluences

likewise show an interest in catching at more distant shadows, say, Roman influences, on Shakespeare. In her essay *Whirligig* in *London Review of Books* on 2 September 2004, Professor Barbara Everett dwells at length on how in *Hamlet* Shakespeare borrowed Nero's stepfather's name for Hamlet's uncle, Claudius thus becoming the only Roman name among the play's *dramatis personae*. Claudius was poisoned by his wife Agrippina after he had adopted her son Nero by a previous husband. Nero poisoned his own mother, murdered Claudius' son, a half brother, and married Claudius' daughter, a half sister. Presumably drawing on Erasmus' *Institutio Principis Christiani*, the retired Oxford woman professor suggests that Roman history helped set the motif for *Hamlet*: murder by poisoning, "a little more than kin, and less than kind" (*Hamlet*, I, ii, 65), usurpation, and incest.

a whirligig
and "throwback"

A whirligig indeed. If it is a discernible and basically viable pattern for Shakespearean criticism to follow over the past four hundred-odd years from a historical approach with the playwright at the centre to the New Critical approach with the text as a point of departure and thence to deconstructionism with whoever is at the receiving end free to "appropriate" Shakespeare (*Appropriating Shakespeare* by Brian Vickers in 1994 [Yale University Press]), don't we see in these contemporary

critics a kind of “throwback” to the past at the beginning of the new century?

But the bottle doesn’t hold old wine only. A dash of the new is found here and there, tasting a bit outlandish. Frank Kermode, for instance, suggests that “Shakespeare had a nose for business as well as an eye for metaphor.” Partaking in the shares by one-tenth in Lord Chamberlain’s drama company, Shakespeare was a “company man”, as it were, in the present-day sense of the term, and was able to buy himself New Place, the second largest residence in Stratford-on-Avon. (An envy of craving homeowners in China today!) Lear’s lesson should be learned by later-day hereditarily-minded entrepreneurs, while Hamlet’s by those indecisive young CEOs. In other circumstances, the young lovers of *A Midsummer Night’s Dream* are “hormone-dominated” whereas Greenblatt speaks of Shakespeare as “a remarkably nonfanatical writer [who] doesn’t like ideological heroism or suicide missions”, — all but saying the Bard was a far cry from condoning terrorism.

Despite the things being read anew into Shakespeare, I think, overall, the word “whirligig” has provided a key to the phenomenon of “Shakespeare and No End”. This is an observation I wish to share with you.

Thank you.

a dash of
new wine found
in the old bottle

“莎评无尽”*

——代欢迎辞

歌德引语

我引用歌德之语为题发言，亦以此谨向莅临本届研讨会的诸君表示欢迎。复旦大学主办如此盛会，而本人无缘躬逢，不能“重沐旧雨”，又难交结新知，甚感愧憾。近日鼻孙在美降生，使我“殷殷心念”彼邦，是以此行义不容辞，唯“切盼恩准，便好动身”（《汉姆雷特》第1场第2幕第55行）。诸位一笑。

以下言归正传。

5 部评莎新

著

“莎评无尽”，区区小文即以歌德此语为题，而此语在21世纪依然是颠扑不破之真理。近些年我读过原书或者读到过相关文章的，2001年有凯瑟林·邓肯-琼斯的《莎士比亚非君子》（阿登版），2002年有斯坦莱·威尔斯的《万世莎翁》（牛津大学出版社），2003年有弗兰克·柯墨德的《莎士比亚的时代》（近代丛书）和卢克思·欧恩的《文坛剧家莎士比亚》（剑桥大学出版社），还有最近的一本：2004年，斯蒂芬·葛林布莱特的《“威”加海内——莎士比亚成长录》（W·W·诺顿书局）。

在我看来，上述各部著作都印证了莎学中历史主义方法的汹涌回潮，重在研究著者生平、时代背景、作品所本、各版异同（所谓“文本校勘”是也），以及莎翁在书页和

* 本文系作者为2004年12月16—19日由复旦大学主办的“莎士比亚在中国：回顾与展望”全国研讨会所作的欢迎辞“Shakespeare und kein Ende”之汉译，朱绩崧译。

舞台上的“茫茫身后事”。例如，倘说弗兰克·柯墨德着力描写了17世纪一个出身寒门蓬户、来自内地乡野的普通人如何成为菊坛新宠，继而文名大噪，那么斯蒂芬·葛林布莱特则会把1570年代末期（抑或1580年代早期）莎士比亚离别乡序直到大约十年后他在伦敦重出江湖的这一段“冥鸿岁月”填补出来，以此接续年表断缺。葛林布莱特在昔时传说的基础上加以猜料推理，敷衍出一种观点，认为莎士比亚那些年是在兰卡夏郡给一户人家作西席教授，这家人秘密崇奉已经被得势的抗罗宗新教信徒废除了的罗马旧宗信条。如此振振有辞，让人想起戈拉厄姆·菲利普斯与马丁·吉特曼于1995年写的《莎士比亚阴谋》，说莎士比亚除了那个在老家贩粮谷，在伦敦写戏文的“分裂人格”外，还是政府的密探！葛林布莱特成了“历史侦探”，运用逻辑思辨，把各种线索交织汇总，指出莎翁那位大号唤作“汉姆甯特”的儿子是在父亲动笔写《汉姆雷特》前不久夭折的。因此，剧中才有了关于炼狱的描写，才有了祈祷阴魂安息鬼域或听任亡亲苦熬劫火的描写。

“历史侦探”

更具意义的是，新世纪的批评家们同样也表现得兴致勃勃，要在莎翁身上捕捉到更古远的影子，比如古罗马文明对他的影响。芭芭拉·爱芙芮特教授发表在2004年9月2日《伦敦书评》上的《流转轮回》一文，洋洋侃侃，论述《汉姆雷特》一剧中，莎翁以尼禄之继父命名汉姆雷特之叔父，因而“克劳狄斯”成了全剧角色名单中唯一的罗马人名。克劳狄斯收养了妻子阿格丽琵娜与前夫所生的儿子尼禄，旋遭新弦鸩杀。后来，尼禄药死生母，又暗

罗马影响

害了克劳狄斯的亲生子，即自己的异父弟，还迎娶了克劳狄斯的亲生女，即自己的异父妹。或许是汲取了伊拉斯谟《基督教义要旨》的思想，这位牛津大学的退休女教授认为，古罗马历史在奠定《汉姆雷特》一剧的母题方面有所作用：毒药谋杀、“近亲过头，亲近不够”（《汉姆雷特》第1场第2幕第65行）、篡位、乱伦。

诚“流转轮回”也。从以剧作家为中心的历史主义方法到以文本为出发点的“新批评”方法，再由此发展到以任何人为接受终端、肆意“霸占”莎士比亚的解构主义（参见《霸占莎士比亚》，布赖恩·维克斯著，耶鲁大学出版社1994年出版），如果这算得上四百年来的莎剧批评一种明晰易辨且基本符合实际的模式，那么，我们在当代评家们的身上难道还看不出某种世纪伊始的“返祖倾向”吗？

当然，瓶里装的不尽是旧酒。隔三差五也能发现一痕新异，但品来略嫌怪诞。例如，弗兰克·柯墨德认为，“莎士比亚既有独到眼光，善发妙喻，更兼鼻观灵敏，能嗅商机”。老莎享有“公庭大臣司下演剧社”十分之一的股份，即依今日之语义，似亦可谓“公司人”也；他还能给自家购置下“新屋”这块基业，那可是爱文河畔斯特拉特福镇上第二大宅（足令今日中国“疯求房”的业主们艳羡了吧）。李尔王的教训应为后世钟情于家族内放权交班的企业家们吸取，而汉姆雷特的教训则该让那些年轻气盛却遇事逡巡的首席执行官来接受。余者如《仲夏夜之梦》里的青年爱侣们，被说成是“受荷尔蒙之控”，而葛林布莱特则把莎士比亚评为“远非狂热激烈的作家，[他]不喜欢意识形态上的英雄主义，不喜欢自杀任务”，就差说莎翁

“流转轮回”与“返祖倾向”

旧瓶中的
些许新酒

从不赞成恐怖主义了。

尽管人们能从莎士比亚的作品中读出各色新奇怪异,而我认为,综观全局,“流转轮回”一语倒很能为阐释“莎评无尽”这个现象提供一柄密钥。以上心得,愿与诸同好共享。

谢谢。

