

II Art in the Theatre

劇場藝術

Art...teaches to convey a larger sense
by simpler symbols.
— Emerson

II 劇場藝術

Art in the Theatre

藝術……教我們用簡單的符號
表達廣闊的意念。
——愛默生¹

There seems to be a wide divergence of opinion today as to what the theatre really is. Some people say it is a temple, some say it is a brothel, some say it is a laboratory, or a workshop, or it may be an art, or a plaything, or a corporation. But whatever it is, one thing is true about it. There is not enough fine workmanship in it. There is too much incompetence in it. The theatre demands of its craftsmen that they know their jobs. The theatre is a school. We shall never have done with studying and learning. In the theatre, as in life, we try first of all to free ourselves, as far as we can, from our own limitations. Then we can begin to practice “this noble and magical art.” Then we may begin to dream.

When the curtain rises, it is the scenery that sets the key of the play. A stage setting is not a background; it is an environment. Players act in a setting, not against it. We say, in the audience, when we look at what the designer has made, before anyone on the stage has time to move or speak, “Aha, I see! It’s going to be like *that!* Aha!” This is true no matter whether we are looking at a realistic representation of Eliza crossing the ice or at the setting for one of Yeats’ *Plays for Dancers*, carried to the limit

¹ 1803–1882，被稱為「和諧聖人」（Sage of Concord）的美國評論家、詩人、超經驗主義者。作品有*Nature* (1837)、*Representative Men* (1850)。

當今之世似乎對劇場的本質充滿了歧義，有人說它像殿堂、有人說它是妓院、也有人說它是實驗室或工作坊，更或者有人質疑它是一種藝術型態、還是玩物或者是企業。不論劇場的真意是什麼，其中只有一件事實，那就是到處充斥著不適當的東西，而精緻的技藝太少，劇場需要它的從業人員清楚的了解自己的職分。不論在劇場裡或生命中我們都不能停止學習和鑽研，而劇場就如同一座學校，先得極盡所能從各自的侷限中自我釋放，接著才能開始學習這一門高貴又奇幻的藝術，然後我們才能開始有夢。

大幕升起的那一刻，佈景是通往戲劇的關鍵之鑰。舞台佈景並不是單純的背景，而是一種情境，表演者是在佈景中演出，而不是在佈景面前表演（in a setting, not against it）。當舞台上的表演者還沒開始動作或說話之前，觀眾一看到設計師的作品呈現時，我們會希望觀眾想著：「啊！原來會是這樣！我知道了！」不管我們是看伊麗莎（Eliza）穿越冰雪寫實演出的場景²，或是葉慈（Yeats）極具象徵性的劇作《為舞者寫的劇本》（*Plays for Dancers*）其中一景也好³，這個期望

² 出自Harriet Beecher Stowe 1952年出版的反奴隸小說*Uncle Tom's Cabin*《湯姆叔叔的小屋》或譯《黑奴籲天錄》，經常被改編為舞台劇，其中對於女奴伊麗莎越過俄亥俄冰河逃離一幕刻畫生動。

³ 原書作者筆誤，原著為*Four Plays For Dancers*，1921年初版，應用日本能劇的戲劇形式，極富深奧象徵性，作者葉慈（1865–1939）。

of abstract symbolism. When I go to the theatre, I want to get an eyeful. Why not? I do not want to have to look at one of the so-called “suggestive” setting, in which a single Gothic column is made to do duty for a cathedral; it makes me feel as if I had been invited to some important ceremony and had been given a poor seat behind a post. I do not want to see any more “skeleton stages” in which a few architectural elements are combined and re-combined for the various scenes of a play, for after the first half hour I invariably discover that I have lost the thread of the drama. In spite of myself, I have become fascinated, wondering whether the castle door I have seen in the first act is going to turn into a refectory table in the second act or a hope-chest in the last act. No, I don’t like these clever, falsely economical contraptions. And I do not want to look at a setting that is merely smart or novel or *chic*, a setting that tells me that it is the latest fashion, as though its designer had taken a flying trip like a spring buyer and brought back a trunk full of the latest styles in scenery.

I want my imagination to be stimulated by what I see on the stage. But the moment I get a sense of ingenuity, a sense of effort, my imagination is not stimulated; it is starved. That play is finished as far as I am concerned. For I have come to the theatre to see a play, not to see the work done on a play.

都將是不變的事實。當我走進劇場，我希望能大飽眼福，這又有何不可？我不想看所謂的「暗示性」舞台設計，企圖用一根哥德式柱子來表現一座大教堂應有的恢宏，這讓我覺得像是受邀去參加一場重要的典禮，偏偏座位被安排在柱子後面一樣。我再也不想看到所謂「概說式」的舞台，就是那種拿一些建築元素來結合和重組，企圖用來製造劇中所有不同的場景，因為我發現在半個小時後我已經完全找不到戲劇的思路了，而開始入迷的猜想第一幕裡的城堡大門，會不會在第二幕變成修道院的餐桌？還是最後一幕會變成少女的嫁妝箱？我不喜歡看到這樣為了省錢而不適當的奇計淫巧。我也不想看到佈景設計只是賣弄時髦或新潮的流行，這樣只讓設計者像個時裝採購員，空運了一大堆當季的流行佈景回來。

我希望我的想像被舞台上的景象激發，可是當我一旦感覺到匠心、感覺到造作，我的想像不但沒有被激發反而死去了，我認為這樣一齣戲已經完了，因為我走進劇場是為了看一齣戲，而不是來看這齣戲被作成怎樣。

A good scene should be, not a picture, but an image. Scene-designing is not what most people imagine it is—a branch of interior decorating. There is no more reason for a room on a stage to be a reproduction of an actual room than for an actor who plays the part of Napoleon to be Napoleon or for an actor who plays Death in the old morality play to be dead. Everything that is actual must undergo a strange metamorphosis, a kind of sea-change, before it can become truth in the theatre. There is a curious mystery in this. You will remember the quotation from *Hamlet*:

My father!—methinks I see my father.

O where, my lord?

In my mind's eye, Horatio.

Stage-designing should be addressed to this eye of the mind. There is an outer eye that observes, and there is an inner eye that sees. A setting should not be a thing to look at in itself. It can, of course, be made so powerful, so expressive, so dramatic, that the actors have nothing to do after the curtain rises but to embroider variations on the theme the scene has already given away. The designer must always be on his guard against being too explicit. A good scene, I repeat, is not a picture. It is something seen, but it is something conveyed as well: a felling, an evocation. Plato says somewhere, "It is beauty I seek, not beautiful things." This is what I mean. A setting is not just a beautiful thing, a collection

好的舞台設計不應該像一幅畫而是一種意象，它更不該像一般人認為是室內設計的一種分支。舞台上的一個房間絕不該是另一個房間的重製，有如扮演拿破崙的演員絕不會是拿破崙，或者在古老的道德劇中扮演死神的絕不會是死人一樣。一切的真實必經歷過一種奇妙的羽化過程，像是一種劇變。在舞台設計中有一種奇妙的涵義，我想你應該記得《哈姆雷特》（*Hamlet*）中的對白：

哈姆雷特：我的父親！我彷彿看到我的父親！

霍拉旭：在哪？殿下！

哈姆雷特：在我心靈的眼中！霍拉旭。

舞台設計應該和心靈的眼睛對話。我們用外在的眼睛觀察，同時用內在的眼睛閱讀。一個舞台不應該只有看到的表象，它應該是而且必須是，如此的強而有力、如此的有表現性、如此的具戲劇性，以致於幕起之後，演員只能在它已經傳達的主題當中去潤飾、變化而已。一個設計者永遠要小心不要表現的太過明顯。我再重複一次，一個好的舞台絕不會是一幅畫，它不只是被看到；同時也能主動傳達情感、喚醒記憶。柏拉圖曾經說過：我追求的是美，而不是美好的事物！我說的正是這個意思，舞台不僅是美的東西或是美好物件的蒐藏，它是一種儀態、一種情緒、一股煽動戲劇燃燒的

of beautiful things. It is a presence, a mood, a warm wind fanning the drama to flame. It echoes, it enhances, it animates. It is an expectancy, a foreboding, a tension. It says nothing, but it gives everything.

Do not think for a moment that I am advising the designer to do away with actual objects on the stage. There is no such thing as a symbolic chair. A chair is a chair. It is in the arrangement of the chairs that the magic lies. Molière, Gordon Craig said, knew how to place the chairs on his stage so they almost seemed to speak. In the balcony scene from *Romeo and Juliet* there must be a balcony, and there must be moonlight. But it is not so important that the moon be the kind of moon that shines down on Verona as that Juliet may say of it:

*O, swear not by the moon, the inconstant moon
...Lest that thy love prove likewise variable.*

The point is this: it is not the knowledge of the atmospheric conditions prevailing in northern Italy which counts, but the response to the lyric, soaring quality of Shakespeare's verse.

暖風，它引起共鳴、強化力量、賦予生命，它更是一種期待、一種預兆、一種張力。它一句話都沒說，但它呈現了所有的一切（It says nothing, but it gives everything）！

千萬不要以為我建議設計師們不要在舞台上放實際的物件，椅子就是椅子，從來沒有所謂象徵性的椅子，而是椅子安排的方式創造出劇場中的魔術。葛登·克雷格（Gordon Craig）⁴曾指出：莫理哀（Molière）知道如何安排他舞台上的椅子，以致於他的椅子似乎會說話。《羅密歐與朱麗葉》（*Romeo and Juliet*）中的樓台會一景中，一定要有個露台，也一定要有月光，但並不一定像照耀在維洛那的月光，如同朱麗葉所形容的這樣：

噢！不要對著月亮起誓，那多變的月亮……
那只會讓你的誓言像她一樣多變。

重點並不是義大利北方的月光所透露出的氛圍，而是對莎士比亞崇高的詞句所具有特色的回應。

⁴ 1872–1966，具有世界影響的英國演員、舞台設計師和戲劇理論家，女演員 Ellen Terry 之子。

The designer creates an environment in which all noble emotions are possible. Then he retires. The actor enters. If the design's work has been good, it disappears from our consciousness at that moment. We do not notice it any more. It has apparently ceased to exist. The actor has taken the stage; and the designer's only reward lies in the praise bestowed on the actor.

Well, now the curtain is up and the play has begun.

When I go to theatre to see a play performed, I have got to be interested in the people who are performing it. They must, as the saying goes, "hold" me. It is my right as a member of the audience to find men and women on the stage who are alive. I want to respect these players, to look up to them, to care for them, to love them. I want them to speak well, to move well, to give out energy and vitality and eagerness. I do not wish to look at the physically unfit, the mentally defective, or the spiritually violate. They bring to my mind Barnum's cruel remark that normal people are not worth exhibiting. I wish to see actors in whom I can believe—thoroughbreds, people who are "all there." Every play is a living dream: your dream, my dream—and that dream must not be blurred or darkened. The actors must be

舞台設計創造了一個引發崇高情緒的情境之後，他就隱退，演員隨之登場。如果它的設計夠好，在此同時作品本身將從我們的意識裡消失，我們再也不會去注意它，它已然停止存在，因為演員已經佔領了舞台，而設計者所得到的獎賞是觀眾給予演員們的讚美。

好啦！現在幕已升起，戲已開演。

當我走進劇場觀賞一個演出，我期待舞台上的表演者能引起我的興趣。作為一個觀眾我有權利要求台上的表演者是有生命的，我想要尊敬這些演員們，仰望他們，憐惜並且愛他們。我希望他們能好好的說話、好好的行動，從而散發出他們的能量、活力以及渴望。我不願意看到那種在生理上不自在、心理上不健全、精神上受侵害的演員在台上遊走，這些人讓我想到巴納姆（Barnum）⁵對「一般人不適合被展示」的殘酷評論。我期待看到能讓我相信的演員——一種「全然存在」的高尚人種。每一齣戲都是一個夢，是你的也是我的夢——但這個夢絕不能夠模糊或者晦暗，在其中的每一個演

⁵ 1810–1891，美國職業演出家、馬戲大王，與 James Anthony Bailey (1847–1906) 共同創辦 Barnum and Bailey's Circus。

transparent to it. They may not exhibit. Their task is to reveal.

To reveal. To move in the pattern of a great drama, to let its reality shine through. There is no greater art than this. How few actors live up to its possibilities! Some actors have even made me feel at times that they were at heart a little bit ashamed of being actors. I call this attitude offensive. The right attitude is that of the distinguished old English character actor who, when engaged to play a part, was accustomed to say, "Sir, my fee is so-and-so much," as if he were a specialist from Harley Street. It is easy of course, to understand why there are not more good actors on the stage today. The *métier* is too hard. This art of acting demands a peculiar humility, a concentration and dedication of all one's energies. But when an actor moves before us at last with the strange freedom and clam of one possessed by the real, we are stirred as only the theatre can stir us.

I am thinking of the company of Irish Player from the Abbey Theatre in Dublin who first gave us the dramas of Synge and Yeats in 1910. As one watched these players, one saw what they

⁶ 1871–1909, 愛爾蘭劇作家、詩人，作品有 *Riders to the Sea* (1904)、*The Playboy of the Western World* (1907)。

⁷ 1865–1939, 愛爾蘭劇作家、詩人，作品有 *The Land of Heart's Desire* (1894)、*The Wind among the Reeds* (1899)、*Last Poems and Plays* (1940)，獲1923年諾貝爾文學獎。

員必須清晰透亮。他們不是用來被展示的，他們的工作是來展現。

展現。一齣戲劇崇高的精髓，經由演員的運轉展現出來，而戲劇因此散發光芒。沒有一種藝術型式比表演更高貴了，但是又有多少演員實踐了這樣的可能性！有時候有些演員讓我覺得他們在內心深處就不以自己的工作為傲，這樣的態度令人反感，正確的態度應該像一些卓越的古代英國演員一樣，當被邀請去扮演一個角色的時候，習慣告訴人家：「先生！我的酬金是……！」因為他們把自己看成和倫敦一流醫生住宅區哈雷街（Harley Street）上的專科醫生一樣崇高。這也就很容易理解到，為什麼現在已經沒有幾個好演員存在在舞台上了。這個行業太嚴苛了，它需要極度的謙遜，需要全心全意奉獻自己一切的能量和精力。最後，當我們看到一個演員被不可思議的自在和冷靜所完全佔據時，我們才能被撼動，唯有如此，這樣的劇場才能撼動我們。

這讓我想到在1910年首度把辛吉（Synge）⁶和葉慈⁷的戲劇介紹給我們的那一群，來自都柏林愛比劇院（Abbey

knew. I kept saying to myself on that first evening: Who are these rare beings? Where did they come from? How have they spent their lives? Who are their friends? What music they must have heard, what books they must have read, what emotions they must have felt! They literally enchanted me. They put me under a spell. And when the curtain came down at the end of the play, they had become necessary to me. I have often asked myself since that time how it was that actors could make me feel such strange emotions of trouble and wonder; and I find the answer now, curiously enough, in an address spoken by a modern Irish poet to the youth of Ireland—*keep in your souls some images of magnificence*. These Irish players had kept in their souls some images of magnificence.

Exceptional people, distinguished people, superior people, people who can say, as the old Negro said, “I got a-plenty music in me.” These are the actors the theatre needs.

I think it needs also actors who have in them a kind of wildness, an exuberance, a take-it-or-leave-it quality, a dangerous quality. We must get clean away from the winning, ingratiating, I-hope-

Theatre)⁸的愛爾蘭演員們，當你看到他們的表演後，你能夠看到他們所有的經歷。看完表演之後的第一個晚上；我不斷的問自己，這些傑出奇才誰？他們從哪來？他們怎樣過日子？他們的朋友是些什麼樣的人？他們聽些什麼音樂？看些什麼書？而從當中他們又得到怎樣的感動？他們像下了魔咒一樣的讓我深深著迷。當演出結束大幕落下的同時，他們已經變成我不可或缺的一部分了，從此以後我常常自問：一個演員要怎樣才能讓我在情緒上，感受到如此特殊的困擾與迷惑？很有趣的是，我發現答案竟然在一位愛爾蘭詩人對他們年輕人的演說中——讓你的靈魂中保有一些壯麗的映像。這一群愛爾蘭演員辦到了！

正好像老黑奴驕傲的說「音樂就在我身體裡」一樣，這麼特殊的一群人，這麼傑出的一群人，這麼超凡的一群人，我可以說這樣的人才是劇場需要的演員。

我想作為一個演員必須有著旺盛的精力、狂野的心、提的起放的下的特質，那是一種危險的特質。我們必須要揚棄那

⁸ 都柏林的劇場，1904年建立，1951焚毀。1966重建，孕育了葉慈、辛吉、O'Casey等劇作家的愛爾蘭國民戲劇中心。

you're-all-going-to-like-me-because-I-need-the-money quality of a great deal of the acting we find today. I remember Calvé's entrance in the first act of *Carmen*. Her audiences were actually afraid of her. Who has seen Chaliapin in the mad scene of *Boris*? Some of the best actors in the world are to be found on the operatic stage. What a Hedda Gabler Mary Garden would have made! It seems as if these actor-images were set free by the very limitations of opera—the fixed melodies, the measured steps and pauses. They cannot be casual for one instant. They must be aware. They must know how to do what they have to do. They must have style. And they must have voices.

It is surprisingly difficult to find actors who seem to mean what they say. How often one is tempted to call out to them from the audience, "It's a lie! I don't believe a word of it!" A deep sincerity, a voice that comes from the center of the self, is one of the rarest things to be found on stage today. It seems odd that this quality of conviction should be so hard to find in the theatre.

⁹ 1858–1942，法國歌劇女高音，以演出卡門尤為聞名。

¹⁰ 1873–1938，俄國男低音歌唱家，著名的演出角色即為包瑞斯·郭德諾夫。

¹¹ 俄羅斯國民樂派作曲家穆索斯基1874年完成之作，俄國最重要的歌劇作品之一，包瑞斯為劇中主角俄國沙皇。

種像乞丐一樣，討好取悅觀眾的惡劣習性，可是偏偏在當今的舞台上，經常看到這樣的演員。世界上一些最優秀的演員反而是出現在歌劇舞台上。我記得卡爾威（Calvé）⁹所扮演的《卡門》（*Carmen*），在第一幕裡的確令觀眾驚歎又畏懼。有誰看過夏里亞賓（Chaliapin）¹⁰在《包瑞斯·郭德諾夫》（*Boris Godunov*）¹¹當中的瘋狂場景？如果讓瑪利·加登（Mary Garden）¹²來扮演《海達·蓋伯勒》（*Hedda Gabler*）¹³，那將會是怎樣的畫面啊！似乎這些優秀演員的形象，反而是建立在一個具高度限制性的歌劇裡才能被發揮出來——固定的旋律、精準的步伐和喘息，一秒鐘都不能放鬆，他們要建立語調、建立聲部，必須隨時提高警覺，明白的知道下一步該怎麼做。

令人驚訝的是，演員似乎很難精確的傳達他們台詞中的意義，有多少次你坐在觀眾席裏，想對著演員大喊：「你在說什麼？見鬼了！我一個字也不信！」今天在舞台上，很難找到從內心裏所發出來真誠的聲音，在劇場裡找不到這樣有說服力的特質，似乎是一件奇怪的事。

¹² 1874–1967，出生於蘇格蘭，活躍於美國歌劇界女高音。

¹³ 挪威劇作家及詩人易卜生（Henrik Ibsen, 1828–1906）1890年完成的劇作，女主角海達為極富戲劇性的角色，有「女哈姆雷特」之稱。易卜生以社會問題劇著稱，名作有《玩偶之家》（*A Doll's house*）、《群鬼》（*Ghosts*）、《野鴨》（*The wild duck*）等等。

But I have been speaking of actors, not of acting.

Great roles require great natures to interpret them. Half our pleasure in seeing a play lies in our knowledge that we are in the presence of artists. But this pleasure of watching the artists themselves is soon forgotten, if the play is well performed, in the contagious excitement of watching a miracle: the miracle of incarnation. For acting is a process of incarnation. Just that. And it is a miracle. I have no words to express what I feel about this subtle, ancient, sacred art—the marvel of it, the wonder, the meaning. The designer creates with inanimate materials: canvas, wood, cloth, light. The actor creates in his living self. And just as the good designer retires in favor of the actor, so does the good actor withdraw his personal self in favor of the character he is playing. He steps aside. The character lives in him. You are to play Hamlet, let us say—not narrate Hamlet, but *play* Hamlet. Then you become his host. You invite him into yourself. You lend him your body, your voice, your nerves; but it is Hamlet's voice that speaks, Hamlet's impulses that move you. We may be grateful to Pirandello for showing us, in his *Six Characters in Search of an Author*, the strange reality of the

¹⁴ 1998年台灣商務出版社出版中文譯本。

我現在說的是演員，而不是表演。

精采的角色需要精采的本質去詮釋。欣賞戲劇的愉悅，有一半來自我們體認到與藝術家們共同存在的事實，如果藝術家表演得精采，這種看明星的愉悅很快就被忘記了，忘情於熱切地企盼參與一種幻化的奇蹟之中，因為表演本身沒有別的，就是一種幻化的過程，同時也是一種奇蹟。我不知道能用怎樣的言語表達，這一種精緻、古老又神聖的藝術中，它的精采、神妙與真意。就如同設計師們用無生命的素材，像是木頭、布料、燈具來創造藝術，演員們卻是用他們活生生的生命來創造藝術。也正如出色的設計師在幕啟後將劇場退讓給演員一樣，優秀的演員也必須把自己退讓給所扮演的角色。演員真實生活中的自我在這個時候暫時離開，而角色在此時鮮活了起來。假如你今天扮演——而不是「敘述」哈姆雷特，你就變成了哈姆雷特的「宿主」，把你的身體、你的聲音、你的神經借給他，但是說話的是哈姆雷特的聲音，是哈姆雷特他的衝動帶領著你移動。我們很感謝皮藍德婁（Pirandello）在《六個尋找作者的劇中人》（*Six Characters in Search of an Author*）¹⁴當中，讓我們看到了劇作家在創作角色

creations of the playwright's mind. Hamlet is as real as you or I. To watch a character develop from the first flashes of contact in the actor's mind to the final moment when the character steps on the stage in full possession of the actor, whose personal self looks on from somewhere in the background, is to be present at a great mystery. No wonder the ancient dramas were initiation-ceremonies; all acting is an initiation, if one can see it so, an initiation into what Emerson calls "the empire of the real." To spend a lifetime in practicing and perfecting this art of speaking with tongues other than one's own is to live as greatly as one can live.

But the curtain is up, and the play has begun. We look into a scene that is filled with excitement. See. That man is playing the part of a beggar. We know he is not a real beggar. Why not? How do we know? We cannot say. But we know he is not a beggar. When we look at him we recall, not any particular beggar we may happen to have seen that day, but all beggars we have ever seen or read about. And all our ideas of misery and helplessness and loneliness rush up in our imaginations to touch us and hurt us. The man is acting.

How is he dressed? (And now I am speaking as a costume-designer.) The man is in rags. *Just rags*. But why do we look at

時腦袋裡的奇形怪狀。但是哈姆雷特卻和你我一樣真實。看著一個演員和角色靈光乍現的第一次接觸開始，到演員完全被角色佔有後走上舞台，而演員自己卻成了後台旁觀者的那一刻為止，那真如一場神奇又偉大的儀式啊！也無怪乎古老的戲劇源自於啟蒙的儀式，如果我們把所有的表演當成一種啟蒙，一種愛默生所謂 "the empire of the Real" 的啟蒙，那麼就值得我們花上一輩子的時間，去鍛鍊、精粹這表演他人的藝術，而不只是扮演生活中的自己，這就是人生最精湛完美的演出。

幕已升起，戲正上演。我們眼前的景象充滿驚奇。看！有一個人在扮演乞丐！我們為什麼會知道他不是真的乞丐？有哪些事證明了他不是乞丐？很難說，但是我們明確的知道他不是乞丐。因為當他出現在我們眼前時，他絕不是我們今天走進劇場前，所碰到的某一個特定乞丐，而是所有關於遭遇不幸、無助、孤獨的感受湧現我們腦海，觸動我們內心，所以我們知道他不是真的乞丐，而是演出。

他是怎麼打扮的？（現在我以服裝設計的身分來說話。）他的穿著破爛，只是破布而已！如果他只是穿著普通的破

him with such interest? If he wore ordinary rags we wouldn't look at him twice. He is dressed, not like a real beggar, but like a painting of a beggar. No, that's not quite it. But as he stands there or moves about we are continually reminded of great paintings—paintings like those of Manet, for instance. There is a curious importance about this figure. We shall remember it. Why? We cannot tell. We are looking at something *theatrical*. These rags have been arranged—“composed” the painters call it—by the hand of an artist. We feel, rather than see, an indescribable difference. These rags have somehow ceased to be rags. They have been transformed into moving sculpture.

I am indebted to the great Madame Freisinger for teaching me the value of simplicity in the theatre. I learned from her not to torture materials into meaningless folds, but to preserve the long flowing line, the noble sweep. “Let us keep this production noble,” she would say to me. The costume-designer should steer clear of fashionableness. That was the only fault of the admirable production of *Hamlet* in modern dress. It was so *chic* that it simpered. I remember that in the closet scene, as the Queen cried out:

布，我想我們不會多看他一眼，但我們又為什麼會充滿興趣地看著他？因為他被裝扮過，而不是真的乞丐，反倒像是畫作中的乞丐。不！也不全然是這樣。很難說為什麼當他起身開始移動的時候，他會像一幅又一幅偉大的畫作——一如馬奈（Manet）的作品，深深地刻印在我們腦海。因為我們看到了被「劇場化」的東西，這些破布是被藝術家們所親手「安排」過的——畫家們會喜歡用「構圖」（compose）這個字眼。我們不只是看到，同時也察覺到這些破布已經不再是破布了，它們已經轉化成移動的雕塑品。

在服裝的領域裏非常感謝佛萊辛夫人（Freisinger）¹⁵，讓我認識了在劇場中不造作的重要性，我從她身上學到了保留長而流暢的線條，體現了高雅的延伸，而不再浪費時間處理一大堆不必要的細節。她常常跟我說：「我們讓這個製作品看起來高雅一點吧！」服裝設計師最應該避免的就是所謂的流行趨勢，我想這也是最近這一檔以時裝演出的《哈姆雷特》當中唯一的敗筆吧！我記得在皇后臥室的那個場景，當她嘶喊著：

¹⁵ 二十世紀初劇場服裝設計師。

O Hamlet, thou hast cleft my heart in twain.

And her son answered:

*O, throw away the worser part of it,
And live the purer with the other half,*

A voice near me whispered, “I wonder if she got that negligee at Bendel’s?” And the program told us all that Queen Gertrude of Denmark did, indeed, get that negligee at Bendel’s. And, furthermore, that Queen Gertrude’s shoes came from the firm of I. Miller, Inc., and that her hats were furnished by Blank and her jewels by Dash, and so on. Think of it. Two worlds are meeting in this play, in this scene—in the night, in Elsinore. And we are reminded of shoes and frocks!

Many of the costumes I design are intentionally somewhat indefinite and abstract. A color, a shimmer, a richness, a sweep—and the actor’s presence! I often think of a phrase I once found in an old drama that describes the first entrance of the heroine. It does not say, “She wore a taffety petticoat or a point lace-ruff or a farthingale”; it says, “She came in like starlight, hid in jewels.” There she is in that phrase; not just a beautiful girl

噢！哈姆雷特，你已經把我的心撕成兩半了，

她的兒子回答道：

啊！那就把邪惡的一半拋棄，
和那剩下善良的一半共活吧！

我身邊突然傳來了一陣耳語：「我猜她的睡袍是 Bandel 公司買的！」的確，因為節目單上說明了丹麥皇后葛楚德（Gertrude）睡袍是由該公司提供，甚至於她腳上的鞋子是由 I. Miller 公司提供，頭上的帽子是 Blank 提供，身上的首飾是由 Dash 贊助。想想看，是怎樣衝突的兩個世界在舞台上同時呈現——在艾辛諾（Elsinore）的夜晚，但我們心裡所想的卻是女主角的鞋子和衣服。

在我做過的許多服裝設計裡，有時候我刻意讓它們看起來不那麼絕對，甚至有點抽象，像是一抹色彩、一道閃光、一種濃厚、一股流動——以及演員的丰采。我常常想到我以前在一個劇本當中讀到，作者如何形容女主角的出現，劇本裡並沒有說：「她穿著有皺折的襯裙，或是有著蕾絲披襟的領口，更或者是穿著大大的裙撐。」而是這樣寫著：「她隱藏在珠寶裡，像星光一般的出現。」她可能不只是穿著華美衣

dressed up in a beautiful dress, but a presence—arresting, ready to act, enfolded in light. It isn't just light, it is a stillness, an awareness, a kind of breathlessness. We ought to look at the actors and say, Why! I never saw people like *that* before! I didn't know people looked like *that*!

The subtlety of stage lighting, the far-flung magic of it! When a single light-bulb wrongly placed may revel, as Yeats said, the proud fragility of dreams!

Shakespeare knew more than all of us. How he uses sunlight, moonlight, candlelight, torchlight, starlight! Imagine Hamlet as he stands with Rosencrantz and Guildenstern on the forestage of the Globe Theatre, under the open sky, looking up at the stars, saying:

*...this brave o'erhanging firmament, this
majestical roof fretted with golden fire...*

I have often wondered whether the Globe Theatre and the Swan Theatre were not oriented towards the east as ancient temples are, in order to take advantage of the lighting effects of nature. Think of the play of *Macbeth*. It begins on a foggy afternoon before sundown. The day goes. The sun sets. Torches

服的漂亮女孩而已，更是一種令人難忘的丰采，在光線的簇擁下，隨時準備表演。而還不只是光的關係而已，那更是一種沉靜、一種警覺、一種讓人屏息的氛圍。我們該看看演員們，而且讚嘆一下：「真是的！我以前從來不知道有人可以看起來像這樣，我想不出來誰可以看起來像你一樣！」

舞台燈光是非常微妙的，但也卻是最偉大的魔術。只要有一個放錯位置的燈泡，就馬上顯露出葉慈所說的「狂妄脆弱的夢幻」。

莎士比亞似乎比我們所有人懂的都多，他完全知道如何去運用陽光、月光、燭光、火炬、和星光，試想當哈姆雷特與羅森格蘭茲（Rosencrantz）和吉登斯坦（Guildenstern）一起站在環球劇院舞台前緣的天空下，仰望著星空，說：

……這璀璨高懸的昊空，
這鑲嵌金光之雄渾天幕……

我常在猜想，環球劇院和天鵝劇院其實都像古老廟宇一樣利用自然天光。想想看《馬克白》（*Macbeth*）這齣戲，它是從一個日落前，霧氣濃重的下午開始；長日將盡，日落西

are brought in. We enter deeper and deeper with the play into an extravagant and lurid night of the soul. Or take the trial scene from *The Merchant of Venice*. The scene is played by torchlight. The auditorium is dark. We see the sky overhead. The trial draws to an end. Shylock is defeated. There is a gay little interlude, the byplay with the rings. The stage grows lighter. The torches are carried off. Now the scene is finished. Portia, Nerissa, and Gratiano go away...The full moon rises over the wall of the theatre and touches the stage with silver. Lorenzo and Jessica enter, hand in hand.

*...on such a night
Did Thisbe fearfully o'ertrip the dew...*

The sole aim of the arts of scene-designing, costuming, lighting, is, as I have already said, to enhance the natural powers of the actor. It is for the director to call forth these powers and urge them into the pattern of the play.

The director must never make the mistake of imposing his own ideas upon the actors. Acting is not an imitation of what a director thinks about a character; it is a gradual, half-conscious unfolding and flowering of the self into a new personality. This process of growth should be sacred to the director. He must be

山，火炬進來了，我們隨著劇情，一步步深入那靈魂中無止盡的陰森夜晚。再看看《威尼斯商人》（*Merchant of Venice*）這齣戲中審判的場景，這場戲是在火把的照耀下演出，審判終了，夏洛克（Shylock）輸了，接著是一段關於戒指的愉悅小插曲，舞台漸漸變亮，火把被帶下場，此幕終了。波西亞（Portia）、妮瑞莎（Nerissa）、葛提亞諾（Gratiano）離場……升起的滿月照在劇場的牆壁上，把舞台面上染成一片銀光，羅倫佐（Lorenzo）和潔西卡（Jessica）手牽著手進場。

……正是這樣的一個夜晚
提斯柏膽顫心驚地踏著露珠……

我一再說明，舞台、服裝、燈光的設計，是在強化演員天生的力量，而導演的職責，就是把這股力量召喚來，並且驅策這股力量進入演出的形式中。

導演絕不能犯的一個錯誤，是把自己的意念投射到演員身上，表演並不是模仿導演對角色的想法，那應該是讓一個人在半意識狀態中，逐漸地展開綻放成為另一種人格。在這過程中，他必須以神聖謙遜的態度來面對，滋養它、激發它、

humble before it. He must nourish it, stimulate it, foster it in a thousand ways. Once the actors have been engaged, he should address himself to their highest powers. There is nothing they cannot accomplish. In this mood, ignoring every limitation, he fuses them into a white energy. The director energizes; he animates. That is what Max Reinhardt understands so well how to do. He is an animator. A curious thing, the animating quality. Stanislavsky had it; Belasco had it; Arthur Hopkins has it. One feels it instantly when one meets these men. One sees in them what Melville calls “the strong, sustained and mystic aspect.” The greatest stage director I ever heard of, incidentally, is Captain Ahab in Melville’s *Moby Dick*. Turn to the scene of the crossed lances and read how Ahab incites the crew of the *Pequod* to hunt the white Whale to the death: “*It seemed as though by some nameless, interior volition, he would fain have shocked into them the same fiery emotion accumulated within the Leyden jar of his own magnetic life...*” That is stage-directing, if you please.

Now I come to the playwrights. I am not one of the calamity-howlers who believe the theatre is in a dying condition. On

¹⁶ 1873–1943，奧裔美國導演與演員。

¹⁷ 1863–1938，真名 Konstantin Sergeevich Alekseev，俄國戲劇家、演員，著有《我的藝術生活》（*My Life in Art*, 1924）、《演員的自我修養》（*An Actor Prepares*, 1936）等。

¹⁸ 1853–1931，美國劇作家，導演與製作人。

愛護它。當演員開始參與其中，導演就必須把自己準備好，面對這些無上的能量。沒有什麼演員做不到的。在這樣的基調下不用在乎任何限制，導演把這些力量融合匯聚成一種白熾的光芒，因而賦予充滿了力道的生命，像導演麥克斯·萊因哈德（Max Reinhardt）¹⁶就深深地了解這種作為賦予生命力的精髓。史坦尼斯拉夫斯基（Stanislavsky）¹⁷、貝拉斯可（Belasco）¹⁸、亞瑟·霍普金斯（Arthur Hopkins）¹⁹都具有這種賦予生命活力的奇妙特質。只要一旦遇見這一類導演，你馬上就會發現他們的特質，一如梅爾維爾（Melville）²⁰所稱的，「一種強烈的、持續性的、令人敬畏的面貌。」順帶提一下，我所聽過最優秀的導演指示是梅爾維爾《白鯨記》（*Moby Dick*）裡的亞伯船長，當描寫到交叉魚叉一景時，聽聽看亞伯是怎樣煽動琵琶號上的水手去獵殺大白鯨：「一股莫名的意志，叫他不由地，想把那宛如蓄電瓶裡飽滿的生命力化作電能，為他們帶來等同的火熱情感……。」聽聽看！這才叫舞台指示！

現在到了編劇的部分。我不是那種誇大其詞，說當今劇場

¹⁹ 1878–1950，知名百老匯製作人與導演。

²⁰ 1819–1891，美國作家，以《白鯨記》一書著稱，該小說為海洋冒險小說之經典。

the contrary. The American Theatre, as the advertisements of the revue, *Americana*, said, is a “star-spangled wow.” And at all times we have before us the heartening example of Eugene O’Neill, whose work would be outstanding in any period of the world’s dramatic history. But to my way of thinking, many of the playwrights of today are being swamped by their own facility, snowed under by their very cleverness. A kind of tacit conspiracy seems to be on foot to rob the theatre of its ancient mystery and its ancient awe. We seem somehow to have lost the original immediate experience of the theatre. Familiarity has bred contempt. In the dramas of today one feels an odd secondary quality. They are, so to speak, accessories after the fact. Our playwrights give us schemes for drama, recipes for drama, designs for drama, definitions of drama. They explain drama with an elaborate, beguiling ingenuity. But in so doing they explain it away. Instead of trying to raise us to the imaginative level of true dramatic creation, they have brought the theatre down to our own level. And so the ancient audacity has vanished, the danger, the divine caprice. The wonderful wild creature has been tamed. Our theatre has become harmless, and definite, and amiable. The splendid vision has faded into the light of common day.

There is nothing wrong with this recipe-theatre of ours except that it isn’t the real thing. There is no dramatic nourishment in it.

將死的那種人。相反的，當今美國劇場正有如那齣時事諷刺劇《美國人》（*Americana*）²¹的廣告詞所說「燦若明星」一般，像是令人激賞的尤金·歐尼爾（Eugene O’Neill）²²的劇作，放在世界上任何一個劇場史的時空當中都絕不遜色。但是就我的眼光來看，現下太多劇作家沉溺於技巧，反而被自己的聰明給淹沒了。似乎有一種寂靜的陰謀，一步步的把屬於劇場的原始敬畏與神祕給侵蝕了，我們似乎再也感覺不到那種屬於劇場的親密經驗。要說是「親暱生狎侮」一點也不為過，當今的戲劇充斥著一種奇異的次等特性，劇作家給我們看到了戲劇的概要、戲劇的配方、戲劇的編造、戲劇的定義，如此聲嘶力竭以炫目的技巧來說戲劇，反而讓戲距離我們越來越遠。想要激發我們對戲劇的想像，反而把劇場降低到自我的層面。因此，古老戲劇裡的威脅、放肆、非凡的狂想消失了，這頭奇妙的野獸被馴服了，我們的劇場變得毫無作用，既規矩又溫和，那神妙的視野已經消失在日常的光線下。

中規中矩的戲劇並非不好，只是他不應該是戲劇的全貌。

²¹ 1927年於美國紐約 Belmont Theatre 首演的音樂劇，原著 J. P. McEvoy，音樂創作 Conrad 及 Henry Souvaine。

²² 1888–1953，美國二十世紀著名劇作家與導演，得過四次普立茲獎，作品多專注於社會議題之上。

We are hungry, and we are given a cook-book to eat instead of a meal. We expect to go on a journey, and we have to be satisfied with a map and a time table. So long as this secondary art, this substitute theatre, continues to be their image of the theatre, our playwrights will continue to belong not with the artists but with the fabricators of the theatre.

And now I have come to my real point. I know that there are young people in this country who will really create for the theatre of their time, who will bring something into existence there that has never existed before. A few. Not many. The theatre will be fortunate if it can claim a half-dozen of them. But it is this half-dozen to whom we look to lift our common experience into a higher region, a clearer light. We do not want shrewdness or craftiness or adroitness from them. We have had enough mechanism in the theatre, and more than enough. Let them go beyond this; let them give us the sense of the dramatic moment, the immortal moment.

Think of this moment. All that has ever been is in this moment; all that will be is in this moment. Both are meeting in one living flame, in this unique instant of time. This is drama; this is theatre—*to be aware of the Now*.

這一類的劇作缺乏了戲劇的養分，就好像有人肚子餓了，你卻只丟一本食譜給他，而不是讓他飽餐一頓；期望去旅行的人，卻只拿到一本地圖和時刻表。如果像這樣的次等藝術，這樣的冒牌劇場，持續被劇作家當成真正的劇場來看待，那麼這些人永遠都只會是劇場裡的裝配工，不能成為真正的藝術家。

現在來談談我的重點。我知道有一些年輕人在創造屬於他們這個時代的劇場，而也是同一批人給劇場帶來一種前所未有的特質，但是這些人實在太少了！如果能留住這其中幾個人，對我們劇場而言也夠幸運了，也正是這少數中的少數，能提升我們平凡的經驗到另一更高的層次，這是令人期待的境界。我們要不是他們的機巧、伶俐或是匠意，劇場裡已經到處充滿這些沒生命的東西，更重要的是讓他們超越這個皮相，讓他們散播戲劇性的一刻，那永恆的瞬間。

試想這樣的一個片刻，所有過去曾經有過的，和未來可能出現的，都在這特殊的同時，存在於一叢跳躍的火焰中，這才是戲劇，這才是劇場，因為這是對存在的驚覺（to be aware of the Now）。

But how is one to come aware? Someone may ask. I answer,
Listen to the poets. They can tell you.

Of all people in the world, Sir Philip Sidney said, poets are the
least liars. Poets are reporters. They set down what they see. I
will give you an example from *Hamlet*:

O good Horatio...
If thou didst ever hold me in thy heart
Absent thee from felicity awhile...

Absent thee from felicity awhile. Here are some of the most
beautiful words ever written in the English language. But this
is not all. These words are a plain record of fact. Hamlet,
drawing his last breath as he spoke them, was not interested in
phrasemaking, nor was Shakespeare. Hamlet did not think up an
exquisite phrase at that moment. He spoke out of a real vision
of felicity, immortal. He saw the clear light, the happy forms. He
saw the felicity. He called it felicity.

²³ 1554–1586，英國廷臣、軍人、文人。作品有 *Arcadia* (1590)、*Astrophel and Stella* (1591)、*The Defense of Poesie* (1595)。

但是一定會有人問如何才能夠驚覺？聽聽詩人的吧！他們
會告訴你！

飛利浦·席德尼爵士（Sir Philip Sidney）²³曾說，世界上最
不會說謊的就是詩人，他們像個紀錄者，紀錄了他們眼裡所
看到的。我再舉一個《哈姆雷特》的例子：

親愛的霍拉旭……
如果能讓我留駐在你心裡
能否暫時擱置你永恆的幸福……

「能否暫時擱置你永恆的幸福」，這是在英語世界中，少
數最美麗的詞句之一，但他不只是美麗而已，他也是一個事
實的陳述，哈姆雷特在最後的喘息中說出這些話，他無法在
意詞句的修飾，莎士比亞也不願意這麼做。哈姆雷特沒有說
出細膩的語句，只說出了他對永恆和幸福的願景，他眼裡看
到了光明、喜悅，看到了他以為的幸福。

I could give you hundreds of examples. Poets know that what they see is true. If it were not so, they would have told you.

Nothing can stop progress in the American theatre except the workers themselves. To them I say: There are no limitations there except your own limitations. Lift it. Get the personal *you* out of your work. Who cares about *you*? Get the wonder into it. Get your dream into it. Where are your dreams?

Great drama does not deal with cautious people. Its heroes are tyrants, outcasts, wanderers. From Prometheus, the first of them all, the thief who stole the divine fire from heaven, these protagonists are all passionate, excessive, violent, terrible. "Doom eager," the Icelandic saga calls them. If we are meant to create in the theatre—not merely to write a wall-constructed play or supply nice scenery, but to create—we shall imagine ourselves into these heroic mood. They will carry us far. For the soul is a pilgrim. If we follow it, it will lead us away from our home and into another world, a dangerous world. We shall join a band of poets and dreamers, the visionaries of the theatre: the mummers, the mountebanks, the jongleurs, the minstrels, the troubadours.

我還可以舉出上百個例子。詩人知道如何陳述他們看到真實，如若不然他們也會據實的告訴你。

除了劇場工作者自己之外，沒有人可以阻擋劇場前進的腳步。我想說的是除了你自我設限之外，從來沒有止境。拋開桎梏！把「你」從你的作品中拋開，誰會在乎你是誰？把魔力放進去，把夢想放進去，你的夢想在哪呢？

偉大的戲劇從不處理小心謹慎的人物，劇中英雄是暴君、是被驅逐的人、是流亡的人，打從那個將聖火自天堂偷來到人間的普羅米休斯（Prometheus）開始，這些主角都是熱情的、極端的、狂野的、可怖的。冰島的英雄傳奇中稱之為「毀滅的渴望」（Doom eager），如果我們企圖創作——不單是提供結構完整的戲劇，或提供漂亮的佈景——而是創作，我們就必須把自己放到這些英雄的位置上，因為心靈會像一個朝聖者一樣，把我們遠遠的帶領到另一個世界。一個充滿挑戰的世界。我們應該加入詩人和造夢者的行列，以及伶人、江湖術士、吟遊詩人等等對劇場有遠見的人。

有多少人在劇場裡還有夢，有多少人忘記了自己的夢。

現代人的延伸思考

作者非常認真仔細的將劇場各部門的工作一一分解陳述。確實，幕起燈亮的一剎那，映入觀眾眼簾的第一個畫面就是舞台佈景，對大多數人來說，佈景不就是佈景嗎？有那麼大的學問嗎？要山給山、要水給水，指著客廳就會有沙發。如果真是這樣，為什麼所有演出的節目冊上要有一個「舞台設計」這個職位？今天我們可以原諒觀眾不知道舞台設計是什麼，但是我們劇場工作者裡面，有多少人可以確實的知道身為一個舞台設計的職責？有多少人把自己的工作當成是問題排除者（trouble shooter）？有多少人把設計者當成繪圖師、裝潢工？有多少人把演出當成展現自我的工具？聽聽大師的幾句話“Players act in a setting, not against it.”或是“*For I come to the theatre to see a play, not to see the work done on a play.*”又說“*It says nothing, but it gives everything.*”這是對自我工作上多麼深的期許啊！演員只能在已經傳達的訊息中去潤飾一句，傳達出多麼偉大的雄心。作為一個舞台設計者必須肩負多麼大的使命？但又必須保持多麼謙遜心靈？在最後一段隱退之說卻又是多麼謙和的態度！捫心自問我們還有多少人對自己的工作（不管任何行業）有如此深刻的認知？

表演是一種冒險的工作，演員是一個危險的行業，身為演員從事表演工作有多少人能夠真的昂首闊步、抬頭挺胸的對人說：「我是一個演員！」似乎並不多見。多少人是卑微的態

度面對自己的行業，可是作者用了多麼尊貴的詞句來形容演員的工作——「展現」。而戲劇的光和熱也切切實實地必須經由演員才能夠散發給觀眾，否則對觀眾來說到底為什麼要花那麼多錢，去聽一個表演者自己都不懂的劇本？事實上，又有多少次當你我坐在觀眾席裡，心中真有一股怨氣，想要叫台上的演員閉嘴？

然而作者以一個設計家的身分，輕而易舉地點出了許多表演工作者心中的迷思，這一個「進入」與「退讓」之間的分際，是多麼精確的描述，卻也是多麼艱鉅的任務。而作者又能夠如此精闢地劃分「演員」與「表演」之間的分野，又實在無法不令人讚佩他對自己工作之外所投注的關心與注目，這更不難令人想到當今之世又有多少人，對自己工作周圍領域的人投以全然的關注和了解？多少人是劃地自囿？自以為是？作者之所以能有如此精確的見解，全賴於對自身工作的熱愛，因為愛所以關心，因為關心所以了解，因為了解所以更投入。這也是為什麼筆者每在工作遭遇不順之時一再重讀此書，從作者熱情洋溢的文辭當中重拾對劇場的熱能。

當然作者所形容的歌劇演員在國內是極為罕見的，要知道國內歌劇的演出多半是由聲樂演唱家兼職演出，而不是由歌劇演唱家來表演，一個歌劇演唱家所要接受的是在聲樂之外，許多

表演相關的專業訓練。事實上，曾經有幸能有機會觀賞由帕華洛帝在大都會歌劇院所演出的歌劇，筆者還是會希望坐在自己家裡，聽由他演唱的歌劇CD，起碼不必忍受西裝、領帶、硬底皮鞋和狹窄座位的煎熬，看一個面無表情的大胖子，用他絕世無雙的嗓音，唱著你聽不懂的歌詞。因為帕華洛帝先生就是聲樂演唱家，表演對於他來說是另外一個世界的事，反而是世界上許多優秀的歌劇演員對國內觀眾來說是完全地陌生。

作者第三次使用類似召喚、喚醒等的詞句，來針對服裝設計寄予期望。的確，有時候我們所眼見的服裝設計作品，過於追求細節的精緻，以至於忘記第3排以後的觀眾已經看不清車縫線，第10排以後的觀眾完全看不到扣子的式樣。當然，某些必須注重時代考證的演出，這些細節方面精緻度的追求是必然的。但是，我們也必須要提醒自己，我們的工作並不是電影或電視，觀眾沒有機會仔細地審視細節，更重要的應該是一種視覺上的風采吧！展現一個被角色進駐後的演員所散發出來的風采。而不見得一定是精巧的作工、昂貴的布料、甚或是設計的才華，而是角色所散發出來的光芒。這一段最後一句話，完全

點出服裝設計師的另一種功能——心理醫師，要知道最後在舞台上面對觀眾的只有演員，沒有別人，所有的設計師、導演、編劇，全部不是躲在觀眾席，就是在後台某個角落。因此最需要心理建設的，就是這一群既高貴又可憐的演員。而服裝設計師又是諸多設計當中和他們最貼身接觸的人，作為一個設計者，除了讚嘆他們之外，還有什麼更好的鼓勵呢？

作者寫作的年代，燈光在劇場中的發展還相當有限，並不如我們現在所知道的數位操控、電腦調節等等裝置，因此在整篇文章中，針對燈光設計所提建言部分的份量並不重，但是他卻點醒我們燈光在劇場演出中所應該扮有的角色。相反地，現在在軟、硬體設備發達的今天，我們似乎常常忘記了我們原本的職責，反而經常為變化而變化、為炫耀而變化。要知道不管時代和科技如何在進步，劇場永遠是一個由「人」所組合而成的場域，電腦或者說科技永遠只應該是手段，而不是目的，若反其道而行，那麼「人」終將從劇場消失，先是我們的觀眾，接著是我們。