

让舞台留痕：萧伯纳与戏剧出版贸易
(1883—1903)Imprinting the stage: Shaw and the publishing trade,
1883-1903

作者：凯瑟琳 E. 凯莉- (KATHERINE E. KELLY)

译者：彭子君 刘红卫

Shaw's efforts to publish his plays for a large reading public helped define the "New" or "Modern" Drama as a reading as well as performing canon. Deliberately following the example of Henrik Ibsen whose plays often circulated in printed translations before being produced, Shaw aimed to fashion his plays as "high" art by giving his published scripts the material look and poetic weight of fiction and poetry. Shaw promoted play publication not to devalue stage production but to reclaim for the playwright from the actor-manager both legal ownership and primary authorship of the written script. Determined to strengthen playwrights' economic and cultural leverage by establishing their status as authors, Shaw argued for the literary merits of drama and for the author's exclusive right to the script as a property. Grounding his economic plan for selling his labour in Fabian socialist principles, Shaw anchored his aesthetic plan for publishing his plays in a modest adaptation of William Morris's revolutionary return to the arts of paper making, printing, and bookbinding.

By all indications, Shaw's program to reform the profession of play-wright was long overdue. Before 1911, the weakness of nineteenth-century copyright protection for dramatic scripts and the absence of a significant reading public for drama made it virtually impossible for most playwrights to earn a sustained income from their published works. Playwrights not only failed to make money from

萧伯纳努力出版其剧作，以此定义“新”或“现代”戏剧，不仅为舞台表演，也为广大读者所阅。他有意仿效亨利克·易卜生的做法，易卜生的剧作经常在上演前以印刷翻译本形式流传，萧伯纳旨在通过赋予其出版的剧本小说和诗歌的物质外观和诗性质感，将其塑造为“高雅”艺术。他推动戏剧出版的目的不是贬低舞台制作，而是为了从演员—经理人手中夺回剧作家对书面剧本的法律所有权和主导作者地位。萧伯纳决意通过确立剧作家作为作者的身份，加强他们在经济和文化上的影响力，他为戏剧的文学价值和作者对剧本的独家权利进行了辩护。他通过出售自己劳动力的经济计划是基于费边社会主义原则，而他的美学计划则是对威廉·莫里斯在造纸、印刷和装订艺术上革命性回归的适度调整。

从各方面来看，萧伯纳改革剧作家职业的计划应该早就实施了。1911年以前，19世纪对戏剧剧本版权保护十分薄弱，且戏剧没有广泛的读者群。这使得大多数剧作家几乎不可能从他们出版的作品中获得持续的收入。剧作家们不仅没能从写作中赚钱，而且还缺乏保护他们作为作者权利的法律手段。

their writing but also lacked the legal means to protect their rights as authors. As J. R. Stephens has noted, "For effective copyright protection, the drama requires a formula which covers not merely the words on the page but the representation of that text in public performance on the stage" In the absence of such a formula, unethical publishers had a long established practice of printing versions of plays still in manuscript, while unscrupulous theatre managers planted groups of long hand writers in audiences to copy particular characters' parts, which, when combined, amounted to a full manuscript of a play gotten merely for the cost of the copiers' labor. To the dramatist's peril, the drama posed an anomalous case for copyright legislation, which the law effectively ignored and/or failed to enforce until the Copyright Act of 1911, which improved dramatists' odds of winning damages.

By 1886, Shaw was earning the attention of literate intellectuals as an art critic, but disappointing notice as a novelist, with editors variously informing him that readers "are not much interested in socialism." Undaunted, Shaw wrote to Hubert Bland in 1889, "My one line of progress is from writing stories, reviews, and articles, more and more towards writing fully and exhaustively what I like." But what Shaw "liked" was as influenced by his shrewd assessment of the business of publishing as it was by his socialism. With one eye on the popularity of Ibsen among "discriminating readers," and another eye on the censor's banning of Ibsen's plays, Shaw eventually set out to write and publish plays as mid-priced works of literature --- a mode of literary production that publishers and readers customarily associated with prose fiction and poetry. Correctly anticipating the dawn of a mass reading market, Shaw looked for a way to create in England and the US what he believed could be a play-reading habit. Writing to publisher T. Fisher Unwin in September of 1895, Shaw hinted broadly at his interest in being published: "If I thought that people were picking up the French trick of reading dramatic works, I should be strongly tempted to publish my plays instead of bothering to get them performed" The playwright who could encourage this trick might realize a decent income from publication rights and avoid the pitfalls of dramatic piracy, so entrenched in the British theatre that three attempts at legal reform (1833, 1842, and 1911) were needed to change the practices of managers, publishers, and

正如J. R. 斯蒂芬斯所指出的, "为了有效地保护版权, 戏剧需要一个准则, 这个准则不仅涵盖书面文字, 还包括该文本在舞台上公开表演的呈现方式"。在缺乏这样一个准则的情况下, 不道德的出版商长期以来一直采用印刷仍是手稿的剧本的做法, 而无良的剧院经理则组织一群写手混在观众中抄写某个角色的表演部分, 这些角色加在一起, 就相当于一个完整的剧本手稿, 而这一切只花费了雇佣抄写员的劳动成本。对剧作家来说, 这是危险的, 因为戏剧为版权立法提出了一个反常的案例, 法律有效地忽略了它和/或未能执行它, 直到1911年的《版权法》出台, 才提高了剧作家赢得赔偿的几率。

到1886年, 萧伯纳作为一个艺术评论家, 已经引起了文化界知识分子的注意, 但作为小说家的身份却令人失望。编辑们以各种各样的方式告诉他, 读者 "对社会主义没有多大兴趣"。但萧伯纳并不气馁。1889年, 他写信给休伯特·布兰德说: "我进步的一条道路就是写故事、评论和文章, 越来越全面而详尽地写我喜欢的东西。" 但是萧伯纳 "喜欢" 什么, 既受到了他对出版业的精明评估的影响, 也受到了他对社会主义的看法的影响。他一方面注意到易卜生在 "有鉴别力的读者" 中的受欢迎程度, 另一方面又注意到审查员对易卜生戏剧的禁令, 最终以中等价格的文学作品形式开始创作和出版戏剧——出版商和读者通常把这种文学创作模式与散文小说和诗歌联系在一起。萧伯纳正确地预见到了大众阅读市场的曙光, 他努力寻找一种方法能在英格兰和美国创造他认为可能成为一种戏剧阅读习惯的东西。1895年9月, 萧伯纳给出版商T·费舍尔·安文写信, 大致暗示了他对出版的兴趣: "如果我觉得人们开始采纳法国人阅读剧作的习惯, 我将会强烈倾向于出版我的剧本, 而不是费尽心思去安排它们的上演。" 能够鼓励这种习惯的剧作家可能会从出版中获得可观的收入, 并避免戏剧盗版的陷阱。戏剧盗版在英国剧院中根深蒂固, 以至于需要三次法律

agents accustomed to dividing among themselves the benefits owed the playwright.

Shaw improvised a strategy for writing, designing, printing, binding, and marketing his plays that would recognize the value of his labor while fashioning his authorial persona as a literary socialist with high-art appeal. Even as he planned to publish his plays, he pushed to have them produced in England and the US, hoping they would succeed in drawing large numbers of spectators, which they eventually did. But he recognized that, more often than not, the economics of play production and the power of the censor worked against the challenging dramatic author. Under the right conditions, the book-selling market would permit him greater access and control over the production of his works than the collaborative and traditionally exploitative system of play production. If he could write and publish inexpensively a “literary” drama, that is, entertaining drama that called attention to its commerce with politics, philosophy, science, and fiction, he could extricate his labor from the grip of the censor and the playwrighting pirates while creating for himself a position in the canon of an emerging “modern” drama.

By 1884, when Shaw's third novel, *An Unsocial Socialist*, was being published serially in *To-Day*, the new “Monthly Magazine of Scientific Socialism,” he had already decided against assigning his copyright to a publisher indefinitely. He wrote to Swan Sonnenschein & Co. in February of 1885, “I am willing that you shall have the exclusive right to publish the book for five years on the conditions named. But the copyright must remain my property, and the book come under my control again to alter, withdraw, or do what I please with”. When Swan et al. responded by offering him a fifteen year lease at a 10 percent royalty, Shaw refused, demanding a higher percentage, which he justified by sketching the future of the publishing industry over the next fifteen years. Shaw correctly predicted falling printing costs, rising values of monopoly copyrights, the bankrupting of compositors, the lowering of profits for the selling and publishing of works with competitive value, and a new preference for publishing on commission. In the event of an International Copyright Treaty, Shaw also correctly predicted that authors of reputation would deal directly with publishers in the US. After agreeing in the

改革（1833年、1842年和1911年）来改变经理、出版商和代理人习惯于在他们之间瓜分应属于剧作家利益的做法。

萧伯纳即兴创作了一种写作、设计、印刷、装订和营销他剧本的策略，这种策略让他的劳动价值得到承认，同时将他塑造为一位具有高雅艺术魅力的文学社会主义者。他在计划出版自己的剧本时，力促同时在英国和美国出版，希望它们能够成功地吸引大量观众，最终他做到了。但他意识到，更多时候，戏剧制作的经济条件和审查权力对于具有挑战性的剧作家是不利的。在适宜的条件下，与合作性质和传统上具有剥削性的戏剧制作系统相比，书籍销售市场能赋予他对自己作品更大的获取和控制权。如果能够以低廉的成本创作并出版一部“文学”戏剧，在其中呼吁人们关注商业与政治、哲学、科学间的联系，他就能把自己的劳动从审查员和剧本盗版者的手中解脱出来，同时在新兴的“现代”戏剧准则中为自己创造一个位置。

到1884年，当萧伯纳的第三部小说《业余社会主义者》在新创办的“科学社会主义月刊”《今日》上连载时，他已经决定不把他的版权无限期地转让给一个出版商。他于1885年2月写信给斯旺·索南希恩公司说：

“我愿意你们在所列条件下享有五年出版这本书的专有权。但是版权必须属于我，这本书再次归我所有，我可以修改、撤回，或者随心所欲地处理它。”当斯旺等人答复说可以给他一个15年的租约，并支付10%的版税时，萧伯纳拒绝了，要求更高的版税，他用对未来15年出版业的简要预测来证明这一点。萧伯纳准确预见了印刷成本的降低、版权垄断价值的上升、排字工人面临破产、竞争性作品销售与出版利润的减少，以及对委托出版日渐增长的偏好。在《国际版权条约》实施背景下，萧伯纳还正确地预见到，有名望的作家将会直接与美国的出版商进行合作。在大体上同意萧伯纳的预测后，公司提出一个折中方案：租期七年，版税10%，

main with Shaw's forecast, the firm offered a compromise of a seven years' lease at 10 percent royalty, renewable at their option at 20 percent. Shaw accepted on condition of specifying additional points and concluded by proposing a 33 percent royalty rate on foreign copyrights. When the revised contract arrive, there were more amendments, the most sensitive of them touching on the issue of copyright assignment. Shaw wrote, "I have altered 'shall be the property of to 'is hereby assigned by the author to.' Although a copyright is personal property, I believe we have no power to declare by a deed that it is the property of anyone in particular". Shaw clearly claimed the copyright as his and his alone.

The serializing of *An Unsocial Socialist* brought Shaw no payment from the editors of *To-Day*, but it did bring him to the attention of William Morris and Annie Besant, the socialist publisher of *Our Corner*, who eventually ran two more of his novels in serial form. The novels never drew much notice beyond this circle, and Shaw eventually abandoned attempts to write long works of prose fiction, announcing five years after completing his third and last novel, "I tried novelizing again . . . but I could not stand the form: it is too clumsy and unreal. Sometimes in spare moments I write dialogues. . . . When I have a few hundred of these dialogues worked up and interlocked, then a drama will be the result". Shaw the failed novelist had no desire to court further rejection, while Shaw the Fabian socialist suspected that sermonizing in dialogue repudiated "individualism" more readily than sermonizing in long narrative blocks. In the 1887 appendix to *An Unsocial Socialist*, Shaw expressed what Michael Holroyd has called his puritan preference for romantic fiction over social fact. But the uneasiness also could be read as Shaw's suspicion of a single-voiced narrative that crowds out social facts. In the "hundred of these dialogues worked up and interlocked," Shaw may have anticipated a social reality emerging from the interplay of voices in conflict. In any case, looking back fifty years later, Shaw claimed "I really hated those five novels ... I wrote novels because everybody did so then; and the theatre, my rightful kingdom, was outside literature." During the 1890s, Shaw would work to bring Modern Drama within the realm of literature by securing the publication of his plays in carefully prepared editions aimed at the growing market of literate readers.

可按20%的选项续约。萧伯纳接受了这个条件,但要具体说明一些附加条件,最后他建议对外国版权收取33%的版税。当修改后的合同寄达时,增加了更多的修改项,其中最敏感的涉及版权转让问题。萧伯纳写道:

“我已将‘应归……所有’改为‘作者特此将版权转让给……’。虽然版权是个人财产,但我认为我们没有权力通过契约宣布它是某个特定人的财产。”萧伯纳明确地声称版权是他的,而且是他一个人的。

《今日》上的《业余社会主义者》的连载没有给萧带来报酬,但却引起了威廉·莫里斯和《我们的角落》的社会主义者出版商安妮·贝桑特的注意,后者最终以连载形式出版了他的另外两部小说。这些小说在这个圈子之外从未引起过多大注意,萧最终放弃了写长篇散文小说,在完成第三部也是最后一部小说五年后宣布:“我又试着写小说了……但我受不了这种形式:它太笨拙、太不真实。有时在闲暇时我写对话……当我把几百个这样的对话串联起来,结果就成了一部戏剧。”萧不想再作为一个失败的小说家遭受更多的拒绝,而他这个费边社会主义者则怀疑用对话方式布道比用长篇叙述方式布道更容易否定“个人主义”。在1887年《业余社会主义者》的附录中,萧伯纳表达了迈克尔·霍尔罗伊所说的他对浪漫小说甚于社会现实的纯粹偏爱。但这种不安也可以理解为萧伯纳对单一声音叙述把社会事实排挤在外的怀疑。在“成百上千个这样的对话中,它们相互交织在一起”,萧伯纳可能预见到了从冲突的声音的相互作用中涌现出来的社会现实。无论如何,回首50年后,萧伯纳声称“我真的讨厌那五部小说……我写小说是因为当时每个人都在这么做;而剧院,我合法的王国,却在文学之外”。在19世纪90年代,萧伯纳致力于将现代戏剧带入真正的文学领域,他精心准备了自己的剧本,以期针对日益增长受过良好教育的读者市场出版。

While struggling to write novels he would later claim to hate, the Shaw of the 1880s was formulating a political identity that would have implications for his dealings with the publishing trade. Shaw's reading of the first volume of Karl Marx's *Das Capital* (in French translation) is widely described as occurring against the backdrop of his prior reverence for Henry George's land nationalism and single tax doctrine, his flirtation with H.M. Hyndman's Social Democratic Federation (SDF), and his early involvement with Secularism, Iconoclasm, and other varieties of free-thinking. Joining the Fabian Society on May 16, 1884, and its executive committee in January of 1885, marked Shaw's shift from anarchism and the Marxism of the SDF toward the middle-class evolutionary socialism of the Fabians. By 1886, the Fabians had broken with the revolutionary SDF and with the anti-constitutional anarchists and the Socialist League. *The Fabian Manifesto* of 1887 declared their "permeation" strategy by which they would influence national policy by becoming politically active at all levels, especially the local, or municipal level. From such local activism, a national socialist movement would grow.

Like most English readers of Marx throughout the 1880s, Shaw subscribed to three essential political principles: a belief in "a labour theory of value, an iron law of wages, and the idea that monopolies underlie exploitation". Beyond these commonly held principles, Shaw had unique beliefs with regard to human nature and economic competition, several of which he illustrated in his early novels. The practice of economics, believed Shaw, grew from the essentially self-interested nature of each human being. Competition between capitalists would favor the economy of larger firms, thus creating a tendency toward monopolies and trusts. Breaking up and preventing monopolies and trusts would "naturally" lead to a free-trade Utopia.

Shaw encouraged capitalist publishers to compete for his work as a means of safeguarding his authorial interest and securing favorable royalties and other terms. His efforts in this regard could only be described as prodigious, as witnessed by his exchange of letters with publishers and editors. In March of 1885, *Time* published Shaw's short story of sixteen pages, "The Miraculous Revenge," together with his book review of Michael Davitt's "Leaves from a Prison Diary," a review Shaw undertook at the request of *Time* publisher Miss Abdy-

在努力创作后，他声称自己憎恶小说的同时，19世纪80年代的萧伯纳正在塑造一种政治身份，这将对他与出版业打交道产生影响。人们普遍认为，萧伯纳阅读卡尔·马克思的《资本论》（法语译本）第一卷的背景是他先前对亨利·乔治的土地国有主义和单一税理论的崇敬，与H·M·海因德曼的社会民主联邦（SDF）的短暂接触，以及他早期对世俗主义、偶像破坏主义和其他各种自由思想的涉猎。萧伯纳于1884年5月16日加入费边社，并在1885年1月成为其执行委员会委员，这标志着他从无政府主义和SDF的马克思主义转向费边社的中产阶级渐进社会主义。到1886年，费边社与革命的SDF、反宪法无政府主义者和社会联盟决裂。1887年的《费边主义宣言》宣布了他们的渗透战略，他们将通过在各级层面特别是地方或市政一级的政治活动来影响国家政策。从这种地方的积极行动开始，一个全国性的社会主义运动将发展起来。

与整个20世纪80年代大多数马克思的英国读者一样，萧伯纳赞同三个基本政治原则：相信“劳动价值论、工资铁律，以及垄断是剥削的基础”的观点。除了这些普遍持有的原则外，萧伯纳对人性和经济竞争也有独特的看法，其中一些观点他在早期小说中阐述过。萧伯纳认为，经济学的实践源于每个人本质上的自私自利本性。资本家之间的竞争有利于大企业，从而产生垄断和托拉斯的趋势。打破和防止垄断和托拉斯将“自然地”导致自由贸易乌托邦。

萧伯纳鼓励资本主义出版商竞相出版他的作品，以此来维护他的作者权益，并确保有利的版税和其他条款。他在这方面的努力只能用“惊人”来形容，他与出版商和编辑的书信往来就是明证。1885年3月，《时代》杂志发表了萧伯纳16页的短篇小说《奇迹般的复仇》，连同他对迈克尔·达维特的《监狱日记抄录》的书评。这篇书评是萧伯纳应《时代》杂志出版商阿卜迪-威廉姆

Williams, who requested the review at a meeting of the Fabian Society. When sent a check from *Time* publishers Swan Sonnenschein & Co. for £33 sod, Shaw returned it with the request that he be paid the full amount owing him, £99 sod. Soon thereafter he wrote Miss Abdy-Williams for clarification, explaining, “[I]t is quite impossible for me to express to you how emphatically I would have refused to review Michael Davitt for a capitalist magazine for nothing... We said nothing at all about payment: I concluding that there would be no question about the usual terms”. Shaw defined for Swan et al. the “usual terms” to be ½ guinea per page, “the usual rate of payment for a shilling magazine,” adding acidly, “and the rate paid to the contributors to *Time* when it was ½ its present price”.

Shaw delivered to the same publisher in October of 1885 a brief lesson on the role of the free market in setting his value as a writer: “My standing and the value of my work are fixed by the operation of the market; and you are no more in a position to fix my price at four and three pence than I am to fix it at 400 and three pence”. In an exchange lasting eight months, Shaw and Swan et al. illustrated competing views of the literary market, with Swan claiming to determine fees based upon their personal judgment of a particular writer’s worth, and Shaw insisting that their judgment was not independent of the same market forces controlling his own worth and other publishers’ pricing practices. It does not appear that Shaw “won” in this exchange, but he secured the satisfaction of delivering “a couple of essays on P[olitical] E[conomy]” to publishers who were fighting to keep the upper hand in negotiations with authors. The 1884 forming of the Society of Authors, which Shaw joined in 1887, signaled the beginning of a shift in the balance of power that would eventually favor the author during publishing negotiations.

By 1889, Shaw the Fabian was relishing the prospect of publishing *Fabian Essays*, approaching many of the same publishers who had rejected his fiction and noting privately, “There is nothing like [the Essays] in the market & it is commercially unproducible”. The volume would appeal by virtue of its uniqueness, while retaining its Fabian difference from commercial best-sellers. The Essays were originally to have been undertaken by Unwin Brothers’ firm at Chilworth,

斯小姐的要求而写的，她是在费边社一次会议上约稿这篇书评的。当《时代》杂志的出版商斯旺·索南希恩公司寄来一张33英镑的支票时，萧伯纳退回支票，要求支付欠他的全部金额99英镑。不久之后，他写信给阿卜迪-威廉姆斯小姐要求澄清，解释说：“我无法向你表达我将如何坚决地拒绝为一家资本主义杂志免费评论迈克尔·戴维特……我们根本没有谈到报酬问题：我的结论是，按照通常的条件，应该没有问题。”萧伯纳为斯旺等人定义了“通常的条件”，即每页0.5基尼，“这是发行一先令杂志的通常报酬率”，他尖刻地补充说：“这是按目前的价格支付给《时代》杂志投稿人的报酬率。”

萧伯纳在1885年10月给同一个出版商写了一封信，谈论自由市场在确定他作为作家的价值方面的作用，他指出：“我的地位和作品的价值是由市场决定的；你不能把我的价格定在4便士3分，正如我不能把它定在400便士3分一样。”在持续八个月的交流中，萧伯纳和斯旺等人展现了对文学市场的对立观点，斯旺主张根据个人对作家价值的评判来决定费用，而萧伯纳则坚持认为这种评判并非独立于控制他自身价值和其他出版商定价实践的同一市场力量。在这次交流中，萧伯纳似乎并没有“赢”，但他获得了向那些努力在与作者的谈判中占上风的出版商们递交“几篇关于政治经济学的文章”的满足感。1884年成立的作家协会（萧伯纳于1887年加入）标志着力量平衡开始发生变化，在出版谈判中最终有利于作家。

到1889年，费边主义者萧伯纳正为出版《费边主义随笔》而欣喜不已，他接触了许多曾拒绝他小说的出版商，并私下里指出：“市场上没有任何东西能像《随笔》一样，它在商业上是不可生产的。”这本书以其独特性而受到欢迎，同时保留了其与商业畅销书的费边主义差异。《随笔》最初由位于奇尔沃思的安文兄弟公司承办，该公司

which, since 1889, had been involved in a union wage dispute. When chairman Edward Unwin refused to permit the secretary of the London Society of Compositors to attend a conference in 1889 to discuss fair wages, Shaw withdrew the *Essays* and redirected the printing job to Arthur Bonner's "fair house". Significantly, Shaw supervised all facets of production, paid for entirely by the Fabians. *The Essays* first appeared in December of 1889. The original 1,000 copies, distributed from Edward Pease's flat, "wet up like smoke" and the volume proved a surprisingly steady seller. Later, in September of 1890, the Fabians published a "cheap" (six shilling) edition with the Walter Scott Publishing Co., using the plates they purchased from Bonner.

By September of 1890, Shaw was writing to Will H. Dircks, editor and reader of the Walter Scott Publishing Co., who had offered to increase the royalty rate on the essays by a halfpenny. Shaw retorted that the increase had been owing the Fabians all along. Shaw further rejected Dircks's presumption that the Fabians would agree to a two-shilling cloth edition, suggesting instead, "We might not object to allowing you to print a half crown edition on large paper, provided you gave us sixpence a copy or so". (During Shaw's absence, a split Fabian executive committee accepted Dirck's proposal for a two shilling cloth edition, provoking Shaw to write to Pease, "Ass that I was to trust my copyright to a council of pigeons!")

When Shaw completed the financial analysis in his letter to Dircks, he turned to an aesthetic critique, blasting Scott's cover design and rejecting the handbill "with disdain." Typeface, type size, and choice of reviewers' extracts all called forth Shaw's mock rage, topped by a threat that, should Scott even consider redesigning the cover of his novel, *Cashel Byron*, to include a design "of some pugilistic kind . . . without first submitting the cover to me, I will have your heart's blood". The pugilist figure did appear on the cover of the novel, presumably with Shaw's approval. With the publication of *Fabian Essays*, Shaw began to exercise control over the design, printing, and publishing of his books in a manner consistent with his Fabian principles, which included using union (or equivalently paying) printers, protecting his copyright as a property right, maximizing his royalties by stimulating competition, and exercising control over book production,

自1889年以来一直卷入工会工资纠纷。当董事长爱德华·安文拒绝允许伦敦作曲家协会的秘书参加1889年讨论公平工资的会议时，萧伯纳收回了《随笔》，并将印刷工作转交给亚瑟·邦纳的“公平出版社”。值得注意的是，萧伯纳监督了出版的各个方面，完全由费边主义者支付费用。《随笔》于1889年12月首次出版。最初的1000册从爱德华·皮斯的公寓分发出去，“像烟一样迅速销声匿迹”，这本书的销量出人意料地稳定。后来，在1890年9月，费边社利用从邦纳那里购买的印版，与沃尔特·斯科特出版公司一起出版了“廉价”（六先令）版。

到1890年9月，萧伯纳写信给沃尔特·斯科特出版公司的编辑兼读者威尔·H·迪尔克斯，提出把这些散文的版税提高半便士。萧伯纳反驳说，费边社一直就应该提高版税。萧伯纳进一步拒绝了迪尔克的假设，即费边社会同意两先令的平装本，而是建议：“我们可能不反对允许你用更大的纸印制半克朗的版本，只要你给我们每本6便士左右。”（在萧伯纳不在期间，分裂的费边社执行委员会接受了迪尔克关于两先令平装本的提议，这激怒了萧伯纳，他写信给皮斯说：“蠢货，我竟然把我的版权托付给一群鸽子！”）

当萧伯纳在给迪尔克斯的信中完成了财务分析后，他转向了审美批评，抨击斯科特的封面设计，并“轻蔑地”拒绝了宣传册。字体选择、字号大小和评论家摘录的选择都引起了萧伯纳的佯装愤怒，甚至还威胁道，如果斯科特考虑重新设计他的小说《卡谢尔·拜伦》的封面，包括“某种拳击风格的设计……而不先把封面提交给我审看，我会让你血债血偿”。拳击手的形象确实出现在小说的封面上，大概是经过了萧伯纳的批准。随着《费边主义随笔》的出版，萧伯纳开始以符合他的费边原则的方式对他的书籍的设计、印刷和出版进行控制，包括使用工会（或同等支付）印刷商，保护他的版权作为财产权，通过刺激竞争来最大限度地提高他的版税，并对书籍生产进行控制，从版面

from the setting of plates to the setting of prices.

The success of the Essays boosted Shaw's career as an (unpaid) lecturer, whose appearances on the platform had, until this time, been limited primarily to Sundays. By September of 1890, Shaw records in a letter, "[T]hirteen lectures within thirteen days", and notes one month later, "My addresses were magnificent - most of them; but they needed to be multiplied by dozens to be of much use". Shaw's devotion to Fabian public speaking both in London and in the provinces coincided with a near tripling of London Fabian memberships (from 300 to nearly 900) between the years 1890 and 1899. Provincial memberships increased rapidly from 1890 to 1893, peaking at about 1,500. In retrospect, however, Shaw judged his oratory harshly, telling Lena Ashwell, "My career as a public speaker was not only futile politically . . . It was sometimes disgraceful and degrading". Public speaking, the contingent, embodied performance of political conviction to a randomly gathered audience, later embarrassed a Shaw who had become adept at professionalizing his political and artistic efforts.

Ibsen: artform meets platform

In his next publication, *The Quintessence of Ibsenism*, Shaw reconciled his political and aesthetic principles, finding in Ibsen a compelling critic of Victorian cant and a symbol for his own iconoclasm and that of his fellow Secularists, Richard Aveling, Eleanor Marx, and others. Shaw's iconoclasm - a cheerful rejection of dogmatism in favor of skepticism - was illustrated by his claim, "I never gave up an old belief without feeling inclined to give three cheers and jump into the air". It was roughly synonymous with "freethinking" and evolutionary in its progress. The "freethinking will" could grow and develop within an individual's world view, just as Fabian socialism would grow and spread throughout English society. But freethinking was not compatible with all forms of socialism, a strategic point Shaw made before the Fabian Society, where he embraced Ibsen as a freethinking Fabian socialist and an enemy of idealist socialism.

The Quintessence began as Shaw's contribution to the Fabian lecture series, "Socialism in Contemporary Literature," proposed in the late spring of 1890. Shaw selected Ibsen as his subject and spent two months writing a lecture that eventually raised a storm of controversy. For the most part, the

设置到价格设置。

《费边主义随笔》的成功促进了萧伯纳作为（无偿）演讲者的事业，在此之前，他只在星期天出现在讲台上。到1890年9月，萧伯纳在一封信中写道：“13天内做了13次演讲。”一个月后又写道：“我的演讲大部分都很宏大，但要想发挥作用，还需要再增加几十次。”萧伯纳在伦敦和各省都致力于费边主义的公开演讲，恰逢伦敦费边主义会员在1890年至1899年间增加了近两倍（从300人增加到近900人）。各省的会员在1890年至1893年间迅速增加，大约达到了1500人顶峰。然而，回想起来，萧伯纳苛刻地评价了自己的演讲术，告诉丽娜·阿什维尔：“我作为一个公共演说家的生涯不仅在政治上是徒劳的，有时还是不光彩且有失体面的。”公共演讲，即对随机聚集的听众进行的政治信念的即兴且具体化表达，后来让已经精通于将自己的政治和艺术努力专业化的萧伯纳感到尴尬。

易卜生：当艺术形式与平台相遇

在他接下来的著作《易卜生主义的精髓》中，萧伯纳融合了他的政治和美学原则，在易卜生身上找到了对维多利亚时代伪善的有力批判，并将其视为自己及其同道中人，如理查德·艾弗林、埃莉诺·马克思等世俗主义者的偶像破坏精神的象征。萧伯纳的偶像破坏主义——一种对教条主义的愉悦拒绝和对怀疑主义的拥护——通过他的声明得以体现：“每当我放弃一个旧信念时，我总是感到想要欢呼三次并跃入空中。”这大致上是“自由思想”的同义词，而且发展过程是渐进的。“自由思想的意志”可以在一个人的世界观中成长和发展，就像费边社会主义会在整个英国社会中发展和传播一样。

《易卜生主义的精髓》一书始于萧伯纳在费边社做的系列讲座《当代文学中的社会主义》，该系列讲座始于1890年春末。萧伯纳选择易卜生作为他的讲座主题，花了两个月的时间写了一篇讲座稿，最终引起了一场

published essay expands upon the lecture, but Shaw deleted several fragments of the original lecture from the published book. These fragments, printed in J. L. Wisenthal's *Shaw and Ibsen*, reveal the particular political context within which Shaw constructed Ibsen as an anti-idealist. "With Ibsen's thesis in one's mind," wrote Shaw in an excised fragment, "it is impossible to think without concern of the appalling adaptability [sic] of Socialism to idealist purposes... and [a] consequent number of members whose entire devotion to the ideal of Socialism enables them to enlist under the red flag as revolutionary socialists without meaning anything whatever by the word. I know that many of my colleagues believe that we shall never enlist enthusiasm for our cause unless we, like the gentleman in [Ibsen's] *Pillars of Society*, hold up the banner of the ideal". Shaw continues, "Socialism means practically the nationalization of land and capital, and nothing else. Yet we are constantly told by our own members that we lay too much stress on the economic side of socialism ...The idealist Socialist always rebels against a reduction of socialism to practice...". The lecture provided the political occasion for Shaw's frontal attack on what he called the "idealist socialism" of the Marxists, an attack that used Ibsen's plays as a powerful aesthetic springboard. But in revising and expanding the two-hour lecture for the first published edition of 1891, Shaw would relegate the intrasocialist quarrel to a submerged, simmering text, lending subterranean intensity to his defense of Ibsen as a debunker of the ideal. Of the several lecture segments omitted from the published version, the longest pointedly condemns the anarchist Social Democratic Federation and the Socialist League, calling down - by name - those Shaw felt had sacrificed the practice of socialism for the satisfaction of proclaiming its ideals. In revising his lecture for publication, Shaw strategically avoided exposing socialist divisions, bending his energies instead on expanding his literary analysis to give his work the heft of an extended and current critical analysis of Ibsen's plays. With the significant omission of his pointed attack on the SDF and the Socialist League, Shaw's lecture provided the majority of the material for the 1891 published edition. The new material - an essay entitled "The Two Pioneers" comparing Shelley and Ibsen, an analysis of *Emperor and Galilean* and *Hedda Gabler*, as well as expanded analyses and descriptions of other individual plays

争论风暴。在很大程度上，发表的文章扩展了这篇讲座稿，但萧伯纳从出版的书中删除了原稿的几个片段。这些片段，刊登在J.L.Wisenthal的《萧伯纳与易卜生》中，揭示了萧伯纳将易卜生塑造成反唯心主义者的特定政治背景。“在一个人的头脑中记住易卜生的论点”，萧伯纳在一段被删去的片段中写道，“不可能不考虑社会主义对唯心主义目标的可怕的适应性……以及相应数量的成员，完全忠于社会主义的理想，使他们能够在革命社会主义者的红旗下应征入伍，而丝毫不顾这个词的含义。我知道我的许多同事都认为，除非我们像[易卜生的]《社会支柱》中的绅士一样，高举理想主义的旗帜，否则我们永远无法为我们的事业赢得热情”。萧伯纳继续说：“社会主义实际上意味着土地和资本的国有化，除此之外别无其他。然而，我们自己的成员不断告诉我们，我们过于强调社会主义的经济方面……理想主义社会主义者总是反对把社会主义简化为实践……”这次演讲为萧伯纳正面攻击他所谓的马克思主义的“理想社会主义”提供了政治机会，这次攻击使用了易卜生的戏剧作为强大的审美跳板。但在将两小时的演讲修订并扩充为1891年首次出版的版本时，萧伯纳把社会主义内部的争议降为潜在的、暗中沸腾的议题，这为他对易卜生作为理想揭露者的辩护增添了地下的强烈力度。在被删减的出版版本中，最长的一段演讲尖锐地批评了无政府主义者的社会民主联盟和社会联盟，并特别指出那些在萧伯纳看来为宣扬理想而牺牲社会主义实践的人。在为出版而修改演讲稿时，萧巧妙地避免了揭露社会主义分歧，而是将精力投入到扩大他的文学分析上，使他的作品具有对易卜生戏剧进行扩展和当前评论分析的分量。由于对社会民主联盟和社会联盟的尖锐攻击被明显删去，萧的演讲为1891年出版的版本提供了大部分材料。新的材料——一篇名为《两个先锋》的比较雪莱和易卜生的论文，对《皇帝》《伽利略》和《海达·加布勒》的分析，以及对其他单部戏剧的扩展分析和描述——完全集

- concentrated solely on his literary and philosophical analysis of Ibsen. The layering of art and politics accomplished in Shaw's *Quintessence* foreshadowed the later Prefaces written to lengthen and mediate the reader's introduction to his published plays.

Five months after reading his lecture before the Fabian Society, Shaw wrote to French socialist Jules Magny, "I hope soon to get it into print. When Ibsen's new play appears, I shall complete my paper by an analysis of it, and then set to in earnest to get it published". Shaw recognized the potential of his lecture - widely reported in London newspapers as well as European capitals, which also covered Ibsen's responses to reports of the lecture - to attract a readership, writing in the Preface to his 1891 edition: "I had laid [the lecture] aside as a *pieced* occasion* which had served its turn, when the production of *Rosmersholm* at the Vaudeville Theatre... the inauguration of the Independent Theatre by Mr. J.T. Grein... and the sensation created by the experiment of Elizabeth Robins and Marion Lea with Hedda Gabler, started a frantic newspaper controversy, in which I could see no sign of any of the disputants having... ma[d]e up his mind definitely as to what Ibsen's plays meant, and to defend his view face to face... And I came to the conclusion that my explanation might as well be placed in the field until a better could be found". Controversy created readers, and it was no doubt the wave of public interest in "Ibsenism" together with a heated response to his lecture, that prompted Shaw to try his fortunes by expanding it into a short, book-length monograph eventually titled, *The Quintessence of Ibsenism*.

Shaw appears to have intended all along to offer the first edition of *The Quintessence* to Walter Scott for publication, in spite of goading Fisher Unwin in March of 1891 to make an extravagant counter-bid: "I have... attacked the Ibsen essay... Scott is immensely on to it ... I suppose you are not particularly sweet on it. If you are, send me by return of post a cheque for £5,000, with an agreement securing me a 66 ⅔% royalty, not to commence until the sixteenth copy". Three weeks later Shaw advised Unwin in a statement balancing gentlemanly honor with free market socialism, "I am in a certain degree bound to Scott, provided he offers me no worse terms than anyone else [my emphasis]: partly because he has behaved handsomely to Ibsen... and partly because

中在他对易卜生的文学和哲学分析上。在萧伯纳的《易卜生主义的精髓》中完成的艺术和政治的层次预示了后来的序言，这些序言旨在延长和调节读者对他已出版的戏剧的介绍。

在向费边社做完演讲五个月后，萧伯纳给法国社会主义者朱尔斯·马格尼写信说：

“我希望很快能把它刊印出来。当易卜生的新剧本出现时，我将通过分析它来完成我的论文，然后认真地着手出版它。”萧伯纳认识到他的讲座的潜力——伦敦报纸和欧洲各国首都的报纸都广泛报道了他的讲座，其中还包括易卜生对讲座报道的反应——吸引读者，他在1891年版的序言中写道：“我把[这篇讲座]放在一边，作为一个偶然的时机，当沃德维尔剧院的《罗斯默肖姆》……格林先生的独立剧院的开幕……以及伊丽莎白·罗宾斯和马里恩·利娅的《海达·加布勒》的实验引起轰动时，开始了一场疯狂的报纸辩论，在这场辩论中，我看不到任何争论者……明确地决定了易卜生戏剧的意义，并面对面地捍卫自己的观点……我得出的结论是，在找到更好的解释之前，我的解释可能也只能放在这个领域里。”争议创造了读者，毫无疑问，公众对“易卜生主义”的兴趣浪潮，以及对他的演讲的热烈反应，促使萧伯纳试图把它扩展成一本短小的、和一本书那么长的专著，最终命名为《易卜生主义的精髓》。

尽管在1891年3月刺激费舍尔·昂温提出一个过高的竞价，萧伯纳似乎从一开始就打算把《易卜生主义的精髓》的第一版交给沃尔特·斯科特出版：“我已经……批判了易卜生的文章……斯科特对此非常了解……我猜你对此并不特别感兴趣。如果你真的感兴趣，请寄给我一张5000英镑的支票，并签署一份协议，保证我获得66 ⅔%的版税，但版税从第十六本开始计算。”三周后，萧伯纳在一份既体现绅士荣誉又符合自由市场社会主义的声明中对昂温说：“在一定程度上，我受斯科特的约束，只要他提供给我的条件不比别人更差[强调我的话]：部分原

he published Cashel Byron... (The shilling edition of the Essays [i.e. the *Fabian Essays*] - 20,000 of them all sold at one volley - must have recouped him a bit) ”. Scott published 2,100 copies of the book in September of 1891 at a price of two shillings, six pence. Two pirated US editions - a common occurrence during this period - were issued in 1891 and 1894. All told, *The Quintessence* sold 2,000 copies between 1891 and 1897.

因是他对易卜生表现得得体……部分原因是他出版了《卡西尔·拜伦》（《散文集》（即《费边散文集》）——一次性售出了20,000本——肯定让他有所收益）。” 1891年9月，斯科特以2先令6便士的价格出版了2100本书。1891年和1894年出版了两个美国版的盗版——这一时期的常见现象。总之，1891年至1897年，《易卜生主义的精髓》共售出2000本。

译者简介：刘红卫，中南财经政法大学外国语学院教授，现主要从事英美现当代戏剧研究，文学伦理学批评；彭子君，中南财经政法大学外国语学院2023级硕士研究生。