中國劇場傳統與劇場記號學
的基本論點

林國源

一、引論

透過記號學研究我國劇場傳統一直是筆者想加以嘗試的論題。其實，這方面的論點，早在民國七十年，姚一統先生於「論平劇的創新」①一文中就已提出來了，復在「論奇雙會的結晶模式」②一文建立了劇場與戲劇的結構分析的典範。筆者在法國巴黎第一大學美學研究所所撰寫的博士論文「布列希特敘事詩劇場與中國平劇之比較研究」③正是遵循姚先生所建立的分析典範進一步探索了西方現代劇場與中國劇場傳統記號學研究的論題，一方面對劇場記號學有了較深人的理解與把握，另方面對我國的劇場傳統——特別是平劇劇場——也做了些基本的分疏工夫。但學士論文以文法撰寫，思路及材料運用稍嫌椏序受制，對我們自己的劇場傳統的認識與表達更不無有稚氣與稚弱之嫌；因此，回國任教以來，頗思約同幾位國內平素對我國劇場傳統有深入研究及實務經驗的同仁，以有以教我，自己則不自搖謾，嘗試梳理劇場記號學的方法論基架，分析我國劇場傳統與西方劇場記號學發展的相關性，並試著指陳對我國劇場傳統進行記號學研究的幾個可能進向。

對中國劇場進行記號學分析的專文，以卡瑞爾·布魯莎克（Karel Brusák）的「中國劇場中的記號」（Signs in the Chinese Theatre，1939）④一文為嚆矢；此文詳於論次中國劇場中的視覺記號系統，其間的聽覺記號則論而不詳。在此之前則有波托·布烈希特（Bertolt Brecht）的「中國劇場表演藝術中的疏離效果」（Alienation Effects in Chinese Acting，1936）⑤與「論中國的傳統劇場」（A propos du théâtre chinois，1936–1942）⑥，此兩篇文章雖不能算是自覺的記號學研究的成果，但在理論上源於俄國形式主義美學家什克羅夫斯基（Viktor Shklovskij）的反常化觀念（priem ostranenija）；什氏是布拉格學派記號學的思潮源頭之一，布烈希特論中國劇場的文章，一方面是於一九三五年觀賞了梅蘭芳劇團在俄國的演出，布氏驚嘆、激賞為這正是他所一向追求的「敘事詩劇場」（Epic theatre），另方面則在觀看梅劇團演出之前，愛崔提亞可夫（Tretiakov）之引見，布氏見了什克羅夫斯基，什氏「反常化」的觀念自此與布氏前此在德國的劇場實踐的經驗（與畢斯卡多合作編「好兵帥克」⑦及自行編演「三便士歌劇」及「莎阿戛尼城」⑧）深相結合，「疏離效果」一詞成了他的劇場觀的核心觀念，從而布氏論中國劇場的文章也可以說具有
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The present paper expounds the correspondence of traditional Chinese theatre to some basic concepts of the semiotics of theatre. The initial attempt was to apply the orientation and methodology of the semiotics of theatre to the study of traditional Chinese theatre. As it turns out, however, the author discovers that in the formative stage, especially in the case of the Prague School, the study of traditional Chinese theatre made a significant contribution to the development of the semiotics of theatre.

In the spring of 1935, Mei Lan-fang and his troupe performed several representative pieces of Peking Opera in Moscow and Leningrad. Theatre and cinema experts such as Stanislavsky, Meyerhold, Eisenstein, Piscator, Brecht and others, were all deeply impressed by the theatrical art of Mei's troupe. Brecht's "Alienation Effect in Chinese Acting" (1936), Eisenstein's "To the Enchantress of the Pear Garden" (1939), and Brusak's "The Signs in the Chinese Theatre" (1941) were all written in the wake of Mei's visit to Russia.

This paper examines Brecht, Eisenstein and Brusak's understanding and interpretations of the Chinese Theatre. Both Brecht's "Verfremdungseffekt" and Mukarovsky's "aktualisace" came evidently from Shklovski's "priem ostraneija". Brusak's interpretation of the Chinese theatre directed attention to this long neglected non-European culture. His conceptually consistent approach also contributed to the epistemology of semiotics.

Recognizing the correlation between the tradition of the Chinese theatre and the discipline of semiotics, the author proposes the following subjects for future teamwork study by interested scholars: (1) the semiosis of the repertory of Peking Opera; (2) stage hands (chiensch'ang) and characteristic treatment of time and space in dramatic action and on stage; (3) the kinesic system in peking Opera; and (4) the percussion system of Chinese theatre.
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