

<p>BR, “Poetics of Displacement”, March 2009</p> <p>Min Tian, <i>The Poetics of Difference and Displacement: Twentieth Century Chinese-Western Intercultural Theatre</i>. Hong Kong University Press, Hong Kong, 2008. Hardback, 282 pp.</p> <p>Professor Min Tian is an expert on Chinese theatre (xiqu, kunqu, jingqu, bangzi); intercultural theatre, including a millennium of Chinese-Western inter-influences; the staging of Greek and Shakespearian tragedy in traditional Chinese formats; female impersonation as a Chinese art form; the person and life of Mei Lanfang, (book forthcoming), greatest early modern exponent of the latter; and more. His works, (Mandarin and English), emanate mostly from the Universities of Illinois and Iowa, with roots at the Beijing Central Academy of Drama. Married, living in the USA, his deep scholarly grasp embraces Western avant-garde and postmodernism.</p> <p>The book, not easily read, must enrich any erudite library whose owner claims a broad cultural love of world twentieth century stage drama. No exceptions. One hopes that the dominance of the linear, black--white print medium of polite academia will soon allow a book/DVD set, despite copyright pains. Why? Traditional Hebei Province theatre music (“Hebei bangzi”, see Chapter 10), with its ‘resounding power and tragic evocation and...high-pitched, vigorous singing’ (p. 195), would likely resemble, to untrained ears, the catastrophic drum-banging of ethnic funerals. Like eating sea-urchin, these are acquired tastes, not paper-based. If you believe theatre, or its music, are universal, try offering Lucia di Lammermoor’s <i>bel canto</i> to the unfamiliar. Awful? ‘Universality’ is too often one-sided, (Chapter 1), requiring the mediation of true intercultural knowledge. Enter Min Tian: now there’s no defence for ‘chinoiserie’.</p>	<p>BR, 《移置的诗论》，2009 年 3 月</p> <p>Min Tian 《差异和移置的诗论：二十世纪中西方跨文化戏剧交流》，香港大学出版社，香港，2008 年。硬皮精装，282 页。</p> <p>Min Tian 教授专门研究中国戏剧（戏曲、昆曲、京剧、梆子）；跨文化戏剧交流，包括上千年的中西方相互影响；以传统中国形式上演的希腊悲剧与莎士比亚悲剧；作为中国艺术形式流派的男扮女装表演；以及梅兰芳其人及生平，而他（即将出版的书）是对后者最伟大的早期现代解读。当然，Min Tian 教授的专攻还涉及其它方面。他的中文和英文论述大多出自伊利诺伊州立大学及爱荷华州立大学，但其根源乃在北京中央戏剧学院。已婚并居于美国的他先锋派和后现代主义亦有深刻的学术领会。</p> <p>本书不易读懂，但如果有人声称对二十世纪舞台戏剧怀有广泛的文化热爱，那么本书就能丰富其书藏。对此没有例外。人们希望儒雅学界的线性、黑白印刷媒体权威能在不久出版一套本书的书本/DVD 套装，不管版权问题多么令人头疼。为什么？虽然传统河北戏曲（“河北梆子”，见第 10 章）以其“共鸣力量、悲剧唤起...以及有力的高音唱腔”为特色，但在未经训练的耳朵里，它听起来就像少数民族葬礼上的悲惨击鼓声。与吃海胆类似，这些都是后天获得的品味，而不以书面理论为基础。如果你相信戏剧、或其音乐是世界共通的，那请你把《拉美摩尔的露西亚》的美声唱法给不熟悉歌剧的人来听。效果很糟糕吧？‘世界共通性’通常是片面的（第 1 章），它需要真正跨文化知识的协调。引用 Min Tian 的话：现在，西方对中国的艺术风格不再设防了。</p>
--	---

Yet one feels throughout that the ‘true and the beautiful’, or let’s say, ‘historical forms’ and pure art, are about to disappear (again?) in a consuming surge of eclecticism, in which the Empire will finally lose all chance to ‘write back’. Thence arise fears that neo-colonialism, that hardy beast, will yet plagiarize and disrupt any still-extant versions of authentic mainland China voices or texts. The corrupted product is then set free, by brand-new imperialists of culture, as ‘real’. (Introduction, pp 2-6. For other Chinese views of ‘pure theatre’, see p 142 ff.)

An intense exchange among Russian, West European, USA and traditional Chinese theatre is revealed from 1900 to 1935. This included the intellectuals’ NTM (Guoju Yundong, or National Theatre Movement), led by pioneers such as Yu Shangyuan, who studied abroad. Film is untouched, though Eisenstein is multi-referenced. Meyerholdt’s biomechanics receive attention. The early ‘greats’, Stanislavsky, Brecht, Artaud, Gordon Craig appear within the relevant Chinese milieu, with so many more, even back to Voltaire, en passant par Isadora Duncan. Thus, this book is essential for any sincere devotee of the fusion of twentieth century ‘meanings’ via drama.

Debates abounded in that seminal period: thorny (‘Elizabethan!’) issues of men playing women; naturalism and realism vs. stylization; and more. A danger soon arose (p 149) of Chinese theatre withering to a decadent Western-ness. Meanwhile, the writer clearly shows that Mei Lanfang, who toured the USA in 1930, and was greatly admired by Soviets and others, was deliberately ignored, post-1935, by Craig, who also downplayed traditional Indian theatre (pp 95-96). Min Tian is so polite that he declines to grandstand on Craig’s gross ethno-centrism, gently concluding that richness of exchange, severely limited by

不过，有人始终感觉‘真正的、优美的’或说‘历史形式的’纯粹艺术正在汹涌澎湃的折衷主义浪潮中消失（再一次消失？），而“帝国”将在其中最终失去所有“回信”的机会。一种恐惧由此而生，即新殖民主义这头猛兽将对中国大陆正宗的声音艺术或文本艺术的任何现存版本进行剽窃和破坏。随后，崭新的文化帝国主义者将释放被视为“真实”的糜烂文化产物。（绪论，pp 2-6. 欲知其它对‘纯粹戏剧’的中国看法，请见 p 142 ff.）

在俄国、西欧、美国与传统中国戏剧之间的高密度交流于 1900 至 1935 年间显现出来。这包括由留学先驱余上沅在知识分子中间领导的国剧运动。尽管爱森斯坦（Eisenstein）也被多次引用，但电影仍未被触及。Meyerholdt 的生物力学也受到关注。而早期的几位‘大师’，包括斯坦尼斯拉夫斯基、布莱希特、阿尔托、戈登·克雷格、甚至到更早的伏尔泰，一直到伊莎朵拉·邓肯，都出现在相关的中国文化环境中。因此，对于那些真正热爱通过戏剧来融合二十世纪“意义”的人来说，本书是必读之书。

那个萌芽时期充满了争论：男人扮演女人的棘手问题（伊丽莎白时代的！）；自然主义和现实主义相对于风格化；等等。中国戏剧被毁于颓废西方戏剧的危险也在不久后出现了（p 149）。同时，作者清晰的指出，那位于 1930 年去美国巡演、并广受苏联人和其他人钦佩的梅兰芳，竟在 1935 年之后遭到克雷格的故意忽视，而克雷格对传统印度戏剧也是轻视的（pp 95-96）。儒雅的 Min Tian 并没有哗众取宠的大肆针砭克雷格令人作呕的民族优越感，他只是温和的做了一个

<p>Western ignorance of China's theatrical essences, is based frequently on incomprehension. He styles this panorama, the good, the bad and the ugly, very generously as 'poetics'.</p> <p>The 1940's and 50's seem somewhat skimmed, but this is not a chronology. Chapter 8 addresses 1950's theatre, including Li Zigui, renowned Chinese xiqu actor-director. Page 126 touches revival of kunqu in that period. There is no homage to popular Western entertainment, so Moulin Rouge, Broadway, Les Girls et al, are out. I feel some sensitive subtitles, (not 'user-friendly', facile subheadings), to highlight themes inside chapters, would add to ease of use.</p> <p>Driven perhaps by necessity, the writer moves, via Ibsen, to Eugenio Barba's 'Eurasian theatre' and his Theatre Anthropology (Chapter 5), then to Peter Sellars (not Sellers, the British comedian), whose postmodern opera, 'Nixon in China', c. 1988, was a response to the Red Ballet extravaganza offered in 1972 by Mao to the Americans. (Chapter 6.) The libretto has verses wildly removed from lines in Nixon's diary. Min Tian writes more strongly on Sellars' 1998 appropriation of 'Mudan ting', ('The Peony Pavilion'), an undisputed 1598 Chinese classic, heavily adapted, street-sexed and plexiglassed for global markets. One critic called it 'multimedia mayhem'. (See p 136.)</p> <p>There are rare photos, too few, painstakingly gathered. Page 202 pictures a traditionally staged, contemporary 'Medea' from Hebei, with the author's moving commentary on Chinese characterizations of infanticide and grief. The 'Works Cited'</p>	<p>总结：跨文化戏剧交流的丰富性因西方对中国戏剧精华的忽视而遭受了严重的限制，而这种忽视往往是因为缺乏理解。他描写这一历史全景及其中好事、坏事和丑事的文笔确实如“诗论”般颇具雅量。</p> <p>二十世纪 40 年代和 50 年代似乎被作者跳过了，但这也无妨，因为本书毕竟不是戏剧编年表。第 8 章讨论了二十世纪 50 年代的戏剧，其内容涉及知名中国戏曲演员及导演李子贵。第 126 页触及了昆曲在那个时期的复兴。本书没有对流行西方娱乐业致敬，因此红磨坊、百老汇、巴黎之恋等元素并未在书中出现。我觉得用一些敏锐的副题（而非“用户友好的”、易做的副标题）来突出每章主题可以增加易读性。</p> <p>也许是受到了必要性的驱使，作者的探讨由易卜生从欧亨尼奥·巴尔巴的‘欧亚戏剧’及其‘戏剧人类学’（第 5 章），一直到了彼得·塞拉斯（可不是英国喜剧演员塞勒斯），后者为了回应毛泽东在 1972 年带给美国人民的‘红色芭蕾’的华丽表演而创作了后现代歌剧《尼克松在中国》（c. 1988）。该歌剧野蛮的将尼克松日记中的句子拿出并改编成韵文。但 Min Tian 对塞拉斯 1998 年重编《牡丹亭》一事的评论更为强烈，这部于 1598 年诞生的无可置辩的中国戏剧经典被很大程度地改编、世俗化和树脂玻璃化，以迎合全球市场的口味。一位戏剧评论家将这次改编称为“多媒体重伤”（见第 136 页）。</p> <p>此外，作者还辛苦地搜集到了几张罕见的照片。第 202 页的照片展示了一部来自河北省、以传统方式上演的当代《美狄亚》，作者还配以动态注释来解说中国戏剧对杀婴和悲痛塑造。本书的</p>
--	--

<p>and footnotes are goldmines. A Glossary gives names and terms in Mandarin characters, but omits entries like Foucault, Macbeth, Grotowsky, perhaps needed by non-scholars and students. The Index is thorough.</p> <p>A ground-breaking book, not for the faint-hearted. What are the risks? More frivolous gambles with Chinese ingredients—kungfu violence, facepainted heroes, red lantern erotica? The possible switch of Mei Lanfang to a mere gay poster; the morphing of displacement and intertextuality into intellectual theft or frank untruth? Oliver Goldsmith wrote in 1759, in a witty Drury Lane review, “...the refined European has...had recourse even to China...to diversify the amusement of the day.” (Cited pp 24-25.)</p> <p>“The more it changes, the more it is the same.” Let us hope that the poetics of real dramatic intercultural exchange will take us far beyond that.</p> <p>Zophia Newborne, BA (University of New South Walse), Dip. RSA, TESOL (UK), has taught English language on four continents since the early 1980’s. Her original interests were poetry, the French and Spanish languages and the history of ideas. Living since 2002 in Shanghai, she is a native of Perth, Australia and a great lover of Macau’s rich cultural heritage. She has established a small press (2009) and is preparing a collection of environmental and religious poems, spanning 1973-2008.</p>	<p>“参考文献”和注脚也可谓珍贵。本书的词汇表虽然解释了部分名称和术语，但却没有对包括福柯、麦克白、格罗托夫斯基等名词的注释，而这却是学生和非专业读者所需要的。本书的索引非常完整。</p> <p>这本具有重大突破性的书并不适合胆怯的读者。有什么危险？难道它会拿中国元素进行更轻率的赌博—功夫暴力、花脸英雄、红灯笼色情？难道它会把梅兰芳描绘成同性恋；把文化移置与互文性变成知识的盗窃或明显的谎言？奥利弗·戈德史密斯于 1759 年在一篇诙谐的特鲁里街戏剧评论中写到，“...为了让每日的娱乐变得丰富多样...优雅的欧洲人...已经开始向中国求助...”（引用第 24-25 页）。</p> <p>“它越变化，就越单调。”让我们希望，真正戏剧性的跨文化交流的诗论将带我们超越这种局限。</p> <p>左菲亚·纽波恩，学士（新南威尔士大学）Dip. RSA, TESOL（英国）。她从 20 世纪 80 年代起先后在四个大陆教授英语。她最初的兴趣是诗歌、法语、西班牙语，以及思想史。虽然她在澳大利亚佩思长大，后于 2002 年起居于上海，但她十分热爱澳门丰富的文化遗产。她已创建了一家小型出版社（2009），并且正在筹备一套 1973-2008 年间创作的环保和宗教诗歌合集。</p>
---	--