

# 行政院國家科學委員會專題研究計畫 成果報告

日常生活的實踐：芭比貝克之‘生活表演系列’中的‘身體’，‘空間’，‘性別’，‘食物’與‘觀眾’(I)  
研究成果報告(精簡版)

計畫類別：個別型  
計畫編號：NSC 98-2410-H-343-038-  
執行期間：98年08月01日至99年10月31日  
執行單位：南華大學外國語文學系

計畫主持人：張嘉怡

計畫參與人員：大專生-兼任助理人員：郭貽禎

報告附件：國外研究心得報告  
出席國際會議研究心得報告及發表論文

處理方式：本計畫涉及專利或其他智慧財產權，2年後可公開查詢

中華民國 99 年 12 月 27 日

## 報告內容

### 一、前言

本人研究美國單人獨白劇 (solo performance monologue) 表演者的敘述、創作與表演策略。光就字面意義來看，單人獨白劇無外乎是表演者對著觀眾述說自己的個人經驗與親身經歷，且是一個人的獨白劇，因此單人獨白劇均被歸類為單人自傳劇場 (solo performance of autobiography)；根據劇場評論家喬·邦妮 (Jo Bonney) 與米理·巴倫格 (Milly Barranger)，此類表演形式 (form) 的歷史背景可回溯至希臘時期的獨白者 (Greek monologists)、中世紀的遊唱詩歌表演者 (medieval English traveling minstrel)、非洲傳統口述歷史長者、十九世紀初盛行於歐陸的雜耍演員 (vaudeville circuit)、餐館表演者 (cabaret) 與 19 世紀早期流行於美國的單人說笑話表演 (stand-up comedy) 等均是單人獨白劇場的雛型。

此外，筆者發現以往評論家在分析單人獨白劇時，均將重點放在表演者的表演手法、故事內容或是將此類劇場與教堂中信徒對神父告白的過程畫上等號，即單人獨白劇場其實僅是一披上戲劇外衣 (theatrical frame) 的藝術告白表演 (performance of confession) 而已，觀眾看到的只不過是表演著的無病呻吟、自我可憐與博得觀眾同情與掌聲的表演。

此外，本人於研讀關於美國戲劇與劇場歷史資料時，發現二十世紀初期至五零年代期間關於戲劇的期刊文章與史料並無真正關心主流以外的社會邊緣人。換句話說，所謂「他者」(the other) 在 50 年代以前的戲劇期刊論文中不但是缺席且是被消音的。此一現象到了 60 與 70 年代由於女性主義運動、黑人文化 / 政治運動、學潮與反戰運動推波助瀾，使得關於「他者」的論述才相繼出現，而單人劇場也正於此一時期逐漸發展成型。因此本人選擇單人獨白劇場作為博士論文主題，探究「他者」如何經由「單一演員」的演出而得以發聲並反應其所處受壓迫與消音窘境。

在另一方面，本人發現不論是在內容與形式上，單人劇場表演者均承襲由 30 至 60 年代發展出的「記錄劇場」(documentary theater, or docudrama)，即表演者的素材皆為真實的歷史、政治與社會事件。因此，表演者如何於作品中再現「自我」外 (the self)，這些所謂歷史、政治與社會事件中的「他者」(historical and sociopolitical other) 是如何被呈現的卻少被評論家提及，更遑論及表演者運用真實事件作為其表演素材之後的意圖與所希冀達到何種戲劇張力。循著此一歷史脈絡，本人於探究單人劇場時質疑 (一) 表演者於採用史實事件作為素材的意圖為何？(二)「演員本身」(the self/actor) 於再現「他者」(the character/other) 時，是否也同時因為演員本身的「自我」(the self) 政治意識或其他意識形態而刻意剪裁、選擇甚或編纂「他者」的記憶與親身經歷，導致無法原始呈現出歷史事件與切斷了人與自我、人與人、人與社會與人與自然等四面向於共時以及歷史的關聯性。

依上所述，本人除了專注於單人劇場表演的美學層次 (aesthetic aspects)，亦另由以下兩點出發 (一) 表演者於演出前如何檢選表演題材與編排演出內容先後

順序的過程及其意圖為何，(二) 單人劇場表演者除了扮演自己外，於其表演中如何藉由敘述策略 (narration strategy)、肢體表演策略 (performance/ acting strategy) 與外表模擬 (mimetic) 元素再現社會/政治/文化他者 (sociopolitical and cultural other)，此處社會/政治/文化他者是指於主流社會中被排擠至社會邊緣不具任何發聲機會的邊緣人，此點也是本人發現被劇場評論家忽視的一點。

## 二、研究目的

此一計畫研究的對象與其作品是英國女性單人劇場表演者芭比·貝克 (Bobby Baker，以下簡稱貝克) 的《生活藝術表演系列》(Daily Life Series)，此一《生活藝術表演系列》包含五個作品：《一、廚房秀，1991》(1. Kitchen Show, 1991)、《二、購物日誌，1993》(2. How to Shop, 1993)、《三、偷窺，1995》(3. Take a Peek!, 1995)、《四、成人學校，1997》(4. Grown-Up School, 1997) 與《五、盒中故事，2004》(5. Box Story, 2004)。選擇單人劇場與專注在貝克的作品作為此一研究計畫的領域與對象原因如下：

(一)、貝克的作品是以自己的親身經歷作為創作題材；此外，貝克於現實生活裏扮演兩種角色—母親與表演者。身為女性且同時扮演兩種角色，貝克如何以其自身身體 (body) 為媒介 (medium) 再現 (re-present) 個人親身經歷與日常生活經驗 (the practice of everyday life)；而另一方面，本人想釐清的是，「身體」(body, or matter)，是否如同自六零年代以來所謂後現代理論家，例如巴特勒 (Judith Butler) 與傅科 (Michel Foucault) 等及其追隨者所言為一文化/語言上的建構 (body, or matter, is culturally and linguistically constructed)；但是本人認為如果身體是文化/語言建構下的產物，是否意味「身體」僅是一抽象的概念而無實體 (substance)，如果身體是一不具實體的抽象概念，那麼日常生活經驗與個人體驗如何發生？更甚之，在我們眼前我們所看到與可觸及到的這個所謂「人型的軀體」(body figure) 又是什麼？貝克如何看待與何運用此一可讓她得以再現日常生活經驗與個人體驗的身體？借由分析貝克的作品，本人的核心問題是在貝克的《生活系列》中「身體是什麼」(What is the body in Baker's Daily Life Series?)？

(二)、接續第一個原因，本人想探究貝克作品中的身體與其表演空間的關聯性為何？貝克的作品都不是在一般的劇場舞台空間 (stage of the theater) 裏展演，而是在公共與私人空間展演，例如自家廚房 (《一、廚房秀》)、裝置帳篷 (《二、偷窺》)、購物中心 (《三、購物日誌》)、小學教室 (《四、成人學校》) 與教堂 (《五、盒中故事》)。本人欲探究為何《生活藝術表演系列》中的作品分別於這五個不同的空間展演，而不是在一般的劇場舞台空間表演？此時的身體在不同的空間裏又扮演何種角色？此時的空間僅是單純的廚房、禮堂、購物中心、小學教室與教堂嗎？還是這些空間分別被不同的作品解構而失去了原來在文化上、意識形態上與社會/政治上所謂原本的定義了 (so-called cultural, ideological and sociopolitical

definition?) ?

上述兩點原因時為回應與指出自六零年代以來藝術評論家在分析單人劇場時只針對此類劇場本身的形式 (form) 與表演者借此一形式所呈現關於政治、社會與文化上的議題；而在表演研究範疇 (performance studies) 裡則將演說 (speech)、傳道 (sermon)、教導 (instruction)、演講 (lectures)、背誦 / 說書 (recitation and storytelling)、告白 (confession) 或甚至性變態 (sexual perversions) 等歸類為單人表演。上述活動於進行過程中，由於都有 (或是針對特定) 在場觀看與聆聽的觀眾，此類劇場型亦常被冠上「獨白」(monologue) 的稱號，因此評論家會加上「獨白」二字來稱呼「單人劇場」為「單人獨白劇場」。此外，亦有劇場評論家以「獨白」二字切入分析單人劇場與維多利亞時期的戲劇性獨白英文詩歌 (dramatic monologue in English poetry) 之間在形式上的關聯性，由於此類獨白詩歌的特色是說話者 (narrator) 針對一無聲的觀眾發表個人意見與想法，殊不知無聲的觀眾已察覺到說話者在高談闊論的同時已無意中顯露自身性格上的缺點而達到諷刺性 (ironic) 的戲劇張力 (dramatic impact)；因此，戲劇評論家亦將戲劇性獨白英文詩歌視為單人獨白劇場的前身。然而，劇場評論家似乎並未將焦點放置在此類劇場中一個重要且具關鍵的元素：表演者本身，即表演者的身體 (the presence of the performer's body)。單人獨白劇院的特色不能只單就其形式 或由美學層次來界定或論述，單人獨白劇場之所以吸引評論家的注意與引起觀眾的共鳴，本人深信，是來自於表演者如何運用其單一身體與所在劇場空間 (stage or the space of the performance) 產生連結進而達到與觀眾的互動，或甚至借由再現政治、社會與文化議題而與劇場外的世界有所連結。此點正是本人於先前研究單人劇場時未深入探討的面向，尤其是表演者身體 (the performer's body) 與表演空間 (the performance space) 的關聯性，因此希冀藉由此一計畫案做一深度的探討。

### 三、文獻探討

以本人目前所閱讀到的資料來看，「食物」的運用每每出現在貝克的作品中；因此，關於食物的使用、意象與其背後的意義也是評論家的焦點之一；不過，就本人的觀察，這些評論文章僅談論到食物在貝克作品中的重要性，且是片段式的討論，並未將食物與身體和空間，或甚至是和觀眾有所連接，例如 Lucy Baldwin 的“Blending In: The Immaterial Art of Bobby Baker's Culinary Events,” Elaine Aston 的兩篇文章“‘Transforming’ Women's Lives: Bobby Baker's Performances of ‘Daily Life’,”與“Making a Spectacle Out of Herself: Bobby Baker's *Take a Peek!*”等，這幾篇文章談論的重點均圍繞在「食物」在貝克單一作品中如何達到讓觀眾感受到「驚奇」(spectacle) 的效果；另外一篇有談論到「空間」的文章是 Marcia Blumberg 的“Domestic Place as Contestatory Space: the Kitchen as Catalyst and Crucible”，此篇文章是關於貝克的 *Kitchen Show*，根據 *Kitchen Show* 的風格 Blumberg 將貝克的作品歸類為「廚房劇場」(Kitchen theater)，即貝克顛覆了「廚房」原有

「性別」(gender)與「文化」(cultural)上的含義(implication):廚房不再是只屬於女性的空間,且女性也不應該只被侷限在「廚房」的空間;Blumberg 著重的角度是性別與空間的關連性,且由文化研究角度切入,而並未從戲劇角度處理貝克作品中的「劇場元素」(theatricality)。

關於討論貝克作品專書方面,目前只有一本,是 Michele Barrett 與貝克共同編輯的 *Bobby Baker: redeeming features of daily life* (2007),而這也是貝克自 70 年代後期開始由繪畫轉向劇場創作以來唯一的一本專書;此書第一部份是貝克的生平資料;第二部份是評論與訪談錄部份,上述文章亦收錄在此部份;第三部份是貝克舞台作品內容的譯寫(transcription)。

如果只是因為貝克身為女性劇場作者、母親與因為她在作品中始用「食物」,就將她的作品歸類在如前所述的「廚房劇場」,而未爬梳英國女性劇場史的演進過程,那麼上述的評論文章,難免流於片面說辭與以偏概全;因此,本人希冀借此計畫案,從貝克的《生活藝術表演系列》出發,而能在單人劇場領域,結合「身體」、「空間」、「性別」與「觀眾」,從英國女性劇場史與「劇場元素」(theatricality)的角度提供一整合性的研究,而不單只專注於單人劇場中的單一元素,而能針對目前關於貝克作品有限的劇場研究有所貢獻;因此,本人會將此計畫成果發表於國際戲劇研討會或是專業的戲劇期刊。

#### 四、研究方法

本研究計畫將由英國女性劇場史出發,原因在於目前關於女性劇場發展史的論述多以美國劇場史為主流,或是將英美女性劇場史納入西方劇場史(以歐陸為主)這大框架中,直至 60 年代第二次女性主義浪潮所提倡「身體即政治」(body is political),從事表演藝術(performance art)的女性創作者始受重視,目的是以自身身體為媒介抗拒與挑戰父權制下的性別定義,如此而有女性身體藝術(body art)的出現,例如 Carolee Schneemann 的代表作 *Interior Scroll* (1975)、Rachel Rosenthal 的 *The Arousing* (1979) 與 Lesile Labowitz 的 *Sproutime* (1980) 等。但如果本人單就以英國女性劇場史出發,不但範圍龐大且易犯以偏概全與片斷式的史料爬梳;因此本人將此計畫中關於英國女性劇場史料爬梳範圍所小至 60 年代以降,以女性單人劇場表演者貝克的創作年代過程為主,探究為何貝克會採取別於傳統劇場的不同空間作為表演的場所,且運用「食物」為其創作元素:如何和「身體」、「觀眾」、「性別」與「空間」產生交互作用?其背後的運作機制為何?「身體」、「空間」與「性別」的意涵是否會隨著展演空間的置換而有不同的意義?因此本計劃的研究理論除了英國女性單人劇場史學外,還包括空間理論、性別論述與系譜學。茲略述如下:

##### (一) 史料分析

主要目的是分析 60 年代以來英國單人女性劇場的演進,包含劇場工作者

或是當中 各流派的主張與關於此英國單人女性劇場的定義和對性別議題的陳述與主張。重要的是於分析史料時，本人將採取由 Dwight Conquergood 所提出的「表演系譜學」概念，來分析英國女性單人劇場史；此概念由傳科的「系譜學」論述而來，簡言之即探究與發掘事實（truth）、權利（power）與知識（knowledge）三者間的歷史關係；事實與知識的產生是由於在國家機器中各社會／政治機構、懲訓機制或甚至是宗教機構等產生不管是文化上或意識形態上的拉扯衝撞而發生的；借用此一概念爬梳英國女性單人劇場發展史時，勢必考慮英國女性劇場史自 60 年代以來與其所處當下的政治、文化與社會等三方面關係，以及這三方面如何影響英國女性單人劇場發展過程，因為英國女性單人劇場不會單一存在，也不可能不受其他戲劇、劇場和表演藝術等先之於前的論述的影響；因此，「表演系譜學」強調戲劇、劇場與表演三文類於歷史上承先起後的演進過程，而達到挑戰權威論述。

## （二）空間論述

關於劇場的空間論述，Peter Brook 的《空的空間》（*The Empty Space*）堪稱代表，此外還有 Marvin Carlson 的 *Places of Performance: The Semiotics of Theater Architecture*、Una Chaudhuri 的 *Staging Place: The Geography of Modern Drama*、Stanton Garner 的 *Bodied Spaces* 與 Keir Elam 的 *The Semiotics of Theatre and Drama* 等較為人知。Chaudhuri 與 Garner 探討現代戲劇作家（modern playwrights）作品中虛構的空間與其劇中主題間的共鳴關係，然而此二書並未從表演實務（performance practice）切入，也沒有將演員的身體納入考量。Carlson 與 Elam 討論在於將劇場空間符碼化（codified），亦即從符號學的角度解釋劇場內各元素的內在意涵，例如燈光、道具、舞台、音效等等。上述這些作品的焦點均是集中在傳統的劇場空間，而並未考慮劇場以外的空間，且也少提及表演者的身體如何和所在展演空間產生關聯性，而使得劇場空間不具流動性而顯呆板成為 Brook 所言「死的空間」（dead space）；且把劇場空間符碼化似乎已將劇場空間中的各個元素的意涵視為固定不變的；如本人述貝克的作品均發生在劇場以外，如果運用上述理論家的觀點來分析貝克作品中的空間則稍顯不足。但如果是發生在劇場空間之外，還能將貝克的作品歸類在「劇場」（theater）的範疇內嗎？或是「表演藝術」（performance art）？

「劇場空間」的意義的發生是由於在空間中正在進行的事件而產生，即透過演出者、展演的內容與觀眾的互動導致這個劇場空間具有意義。如此來看，劇場空間的意義並不是恆久不變的，而是具有能動性會隨時改變。因此本人將借用 Gay McAuley 在其著作 *Space in Performance* 中「溝通的能動過程」（dynamic process of communication）的概念，來分析貝克作品裡的空間，不只納入表演者本身與作品內容，還會加入觀眾的「觀看」與「參與」、時間（time）與目的（the goal）的部份，打破劇場空間只由演員支配與運用的單

一向度，賦予劇場空間能動性 (the dynamic) 與溝通性 (the communicative)。

### (三) 性別論述

本人將由 Butler 所提出的「操演」(performative) 概念來審查貝克作品中反映的性別問題。根據 Butler，我們的行為舉止或是言談均受到社會與文化的規範，而這些規範的產生則來自於上述「權力」與「知識」間的衝撞，由於這些規範的鉗制使得一切的行為舉止與言談都成為一連串操練式「形式活動」(a series of stylized acts)。因此，由「操演」概念出發，本人希冀指出貝克作品中試圖打破性別論述中二元對立—非男即女—的狀態，以突顯父權社會在賦予女性地位與限制女性空間時無意間展露的霸權與矛盾心態。

### (四) 考古學論述

此一概念由傅科的著作《考古知識學》(*The Archaeology of Knowledge*) 一書而來，此書用意在於試圖分解西歐自 16 世紀文藝復興以來理性主體—人—的生成與論述，並對由傳統歷史學所建構出的時間秩序採取否定態度。因此傅科從「知識」、「權力」、「言說」、與「身體」等面向層層討論，由空間的橫切面切入，而非如傳統歷史學家作線性式的描述，目的在質疑西歐自 16 世紀文藝復興以來對「人」此一概念所下的定義。

## 五、結果與討論

回顧貝克的表演時，貝克的內容實為自身日常生活經驗，因此我們如何界定貝克的表演風格與其對身體的運用？她是在「演戲」(acting)? 「表演」(performing)? 「呈現」(present)? 亦或是在「再現」(represent)? 由於有著多重的可能性，「身體」似乎亦隨者表演內容的轉變，而有不同的解釋。筆者不經懷疑，貝克是否把身體當成是語言/文化符號的建構？身體本身並不具任何意義，而是時空的置換與場域的交替賦予了身體意義，而使身體被符號/碼化了。

本人將貝克的作品納入「英國劇場史」，如審查委員所言，似乎有待商榷；因為，在研讀資料過程中本人發現，在英美，相關作品多半被納入「表演藝術」(performance art) 或「身體藝術」(body art) 而非傳統劇場史。

此外，審查委員亦提及，本人無形中忽略了表演藝術與劇場史的關連，而暴露出本人在「表演藝術」概念上不足的疑點；即「表演藝術」不但具備高度劇場性，更具備「視覺藝術」之美術史的背景；因此，論「表演藝術」的同時，本人實應將視覺藝術之美術史納入考量；據此，本人所謂系譜學的研究方向有待修正。

此點的忽略，實為本人並未考量到貝克在從事劇場表演前身為雕刻家與畫家的身分，貝克畫家的身分多少影響她日後表演的風格與呈現的方法。此點也提供本人下一計畫探討的課題。

另一方面，本人將展演錄影 DVD 等錄像媒介做為文本時發現，身體已經過媒

介處理，且空間也經過剪接，因此本人所要研究的空間與身體已失真，本人計畫中所謂的身體與空間究竟為何？誰的身體？誰的空間？實是本人更應該需處理的問題。

除此之外，計畫中繁雜的理論，如第二位審查委員所言，易產生以空泛的理論與以理論套理論的方法來闡釋單人表演；因此，於計畫進行當中，本人轉向從表演實務觀點來分析演員、空間與觀眾之間交互作用的關係，及表演體系的探究。

本人亦發現，「道具」多是單人表演者精心挑選之下所影射政治、性別的工具，所以具有特殊的符號功能；而「食物」僅是貝克表演中的「道具」之一，因此「道具」一辭隱含更宏觀的論述與兼具原創性，故本人以「道具」取代「食物」來探討貝克的作品。

綜觀貝克的「日常生活系列」，表演空間有貝克自家廚房（“Kitchen Show,” 「廚房秀」）、小學教室（“Grown-Up School,” 「成人學校」）與教堂（“Box Story,” 「盒中故事」，另兩部作品則分別在大學講堂（“How to Shop,” 「購物日誌」與裝置帳篷（“Take a Peek,” 「偷窺」。）；各表演中的角色分別為家庭主婦、小學老師、購物專家、女性病人與母親/女兒。如系列之名所言，每個作品都是日常生活所遂與平淡無奇的事物；但如果是平淡無奇，其表演的目的為何？展演空間也不是一般我們熟悉的劇場空間，這些特定的（女性）空間又代表什麼？角色與空間、道具與空間、作品內容與空間或甚至是作品/空間/觀眾之間的關連性又是什麼？是要由小空間抗拒男性宰制的公共間？還是要告訴我們其實空間無性別，反而是被建構出的，我想此處的答案似乎很明顯了。

此外，表演一開始，貝克都會對觀眾解釋待會她要表演的內容與主題（通常是貝克親身故事），此舉一方面像是在「告白」，也無形中帶領觀眾到貝克為觀眾設定好的故事內容中，觀眾處於被動，但表演過程中也不難發現其內容又與貝克一開始所言相異，每當貝克開始提及她一開始所言的故事內容時，往往又離題，觀眾一直處於等待的狀態中，自身的離題與觀眾的等待似乎隱含抗拒，是抗拒自身的獨白？還是抗拒觀眾？自身獨白轉換為表演時，這過程已賦予這些親身內容劇場元素，而成為「再現」(representation)，而不是「呈現」(presentation)，而從「再現」來看，此處的「親身故事」就有待商榷了。

以上所言之問題與疑點，表演藝術/視覺藝術/美術史的交互關聯性與媒體影像錄製問題為本人提供下一個計畫案所需深入探討的課題。



# 國科會補助專題研究計畫項下赴國外(或大陸地區)出差或

## 研習心得報告

日期：99年10月20日

計畫編號	NSC 98-2410-H-343 -038 -		
計畫名稱	日常生活的實踐: 芭比貝克之生活表演系列中的身體、空間、性別、食物與觀眾 (I)		
出國人員姓名	張嘉怡	服務機構及職稱	南華大學外國語文學系
出國時間	99年10月14日至 99年10月18日	出國地點	英國倫敦

### 一、國外(大陸)研究過程

本人於10月14日前往英國倫敦收及關於此計畫案的資料，包括書本與影音光碟，書本多關於表演與導演體系之書籍；選擇此類書籍原因是：此劃案關於身體、空間、性別與觀眾的交互作用關係，因此應以表演實務觀點與表演體系兩方面來分析上述議題。所以此次資料收集多以表演與導演為主。

倫敦劇院與倫敦 Westend 為本人主要前往地點。多數的書籍與 DVD 都是在倫敦劇院購買；而在 Westend，本人觀看兩齣行事風格迥異的作品，一是 *The Mouth Trap*，二是 *Krapp's Last Tape*。前者屬於傳統寫實風格，其原因與劇本本身時代性與劇情有關，所以以傳統線性式展演，演員肢體的運用，如手勢、眼神與身體等多配合台詞的意義。後者則較屬實驗性質的前衛表演，整齣劇主角台詞不多，而身體於此處則被當成語言來使用，身體本身就是語言；此外，整齣劇並不是線性式的發展，而是前後置換，打破職線性思考，由觀眾來決定故事的發展。

兩齣表演都具故事性，且都是虛構的故事，而異於貝克自傳式的表演；兩齣劇中的身體則是隨著劇情而有不同的運用，因此觀眾可以很清楚的看到，此處的身體是經過符號畫的身體；然而，當筆者回顧貝克的表演時，貝克的內容實為自身日常生活經驗，因此我們如何界定貝克的表演風格與其對身體的運用？她是在「演戲」(acting)? 「表演」(performing)? 「呈現」(present)? 亦或是在「再現」(represent)? 由於有著多重的可能性，「身體」似乎亦隨者表演內容的轉變，而有不同的解釋。筆者不經懷疑，貝克是否把

身體當成是語言/文化符號的建構？身體本身並不具任何意義，而是時空的置換與場域的交替賦予了身體意義，而使身體被符號/碼化了。

除此之外，貝克畫家的身分(接觸表演藝術前，貝克從事雕刻與繪畫的工作)多少影響她日後表演的風格與呈現的方法。此點也提供本人下一計畫預探討的課題來源。

## 二、研究成果

上述兩齣劇對於身體的運用，提供本人在思考身體於貝克作品中，如何被使用提供一出口。此外本人另收集到貝克其他作品的DVD: “Drawing on a Mother’s Experience”、“Cook Dems”與“Table Occasion 19”。

另外，本人也前往位在 London, Convent Garden 的 Kettle’s Yard Gallery 與位在 Cambridge 的 Acme Gallery 觀看貝克的水彩創作: “Mastering the Art of Piping”與”Elitist Jam”。貝克在繪畫方面的表現，亦提醒本人表演藝術與視覺藝術的交互作用，而這更是本人下一個計畫預探討的主題之一。

## 三、建議

## 四、其他

國科會補助專題研究計畫項下出席國際學術會議心得報告

日期：99 年 7 月 21 日

計畫編號	NSC 98-2410-H-343-038-		
計畫名稱	日常生活的實踐：芭比貝克之《生活表演系列》中的「身體」、「空間」、「性別」、「食物」與「觀眾」(I)		
出國人員姓名	張嘉怡	服務機構及職稱	南華大學外國語文學系助理教授
會議時間	98年12月17日至 98年12月18日	會議地點	Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey
會議名稱	(中文)第十七屆英國作家研討會：古雷希與他的作品 (英文)17th METU BRITISH NOVELISTS CONFERENCE: Hanif Kureishi and His Work		
發表論文題目	(中文)古雷希《我的美麗洗衣店》中斷裂的身體空間 (英文)Fragmented Body Space in Hanif Kureishi's <i>My Beautiful Laundrette</i>		

一、參加會議經過

Middle East Technical University 每年都會針對一位英國作家舉辦國際型研討會，與會的學者均是當年被選出討論作家的知名學者，至今已有 17 年的歷史。今年第 17 屆大會的研究對象是古雷希(Hanif Kureishi，巴基斯坦後裔英國人)，眾多學者中，引人注目的是 Susie Thomas。Susie Thomas 是目前研究古雷希作品學者中最重要的一位，出版書眾多書籍與期刊，頗具影響力。此次大會討論的議題涵蓋性/別(gender and sexuality)、文化/政治認同(cultural and political identity)、歷史論述、(narrative of history)、後殖民論述(post-colonialism)、全球化(globalization)與身體再現(representation of body)。古雷希本身除了小說創作外，也寫過劇本，例如：*My Son the Fanatic*, *Sammy and Rosie Get Laid*, *London Kills Me*, *The Mother*, *Venus* 與 *My Beautiful Laundrette* 等。因此，大會並未限定討論的作品的文類(genre)，舉凡古雷希的小說(fiction)或是戲劇(drama)作品的論文，均可以參加此次研討會。

我個人 98 年之國科會研究案《日常生活的實踐：芭比貝克之〈生活表演系列〉中的「身體」、「空間」、「性別」、「食物」與「觀眾」(I)》就有討論到「身體」與「性別」；此外，貝克和古雷希的作品，泰半為自傳式，作品均是與自身成長環境與生活經驗相關，所處理的議題也都是跟性/別(gender and sexuality)、身體再現(representation of body)與文化/政治認同(cultural and political identity)等。除此之外，本人還觀察到兩者作品中亦處理空間問題，而這是比較不被評論者所關注的議題；由於這些原因，本人決定參與此次研討會，希望藉由分析古雷希作品時，能同時激發自己在觀看貝克作品時，有更寬廣的視野，例如在處理空間問題時，兩者(古雷希為男性作家，而貝克為女性作家)的差異為何？面對性/別議題時，兩者態度為何？雙方在對抗所謂白人文化主流(white male cultural mainstream)時的策略是什麼？本論文在 2009 年 9 月底接獲接受信，而在同年年底於 Middle East Technical University 發表。

此研討會在土耳其安卡拉的 Middle East Technical University 舉行。研討會分成兩天舉行，與會學者總共有 35 位，分 14 個場次發表論文，此外尚有新進學者(含博士生)之場次；論文全部以英文發表；除此之外，大回還安排播放古雷希的作品被改編成電影的影片。

與我同一場發表的包括兩位土耳其學者，一位是 Buket Dogan 發表“London Staged as a Post-Colonial City in Hanif Kureishi’ s *London Kills Me*”；另一位是 Gokhan Albayrak 發表“Gender and Sexuality in Hanif Kureishi’ s *My Beautiful Laundrette*.”。在這場次的發表裡，我的文章是惟一運用理論解釋 *My Beautiful Laundrette* 中「斷裂的身體空間」，其餘兩位學者分別處理「後殖民空間」與「性/別空間」問題，以文本為主，且都從歷史角度為出發點配合文本中所透露的歷史年代，連接當時英國政府的種種政策來討論文本中呈現出的政治、文化與性別問題。可能由於這個場次的與會學者對於我所運用的理論(Arnold Van Gennep 的“rites of passage”)不熟悉，而踴躍發問，問題多半圍繞在所謂「身份過渡」問題，即身分認同如何因為空間的置換而有所轉變，其背後

轉變的機制又是如何運作的？

這些問題引發我自己在觀看貝克作品時所會面臨的問題，例如我如何能不受理論影響，純粹由貝克本身與其作品出發，來探究她的表演體系、身體再現、性別與空間問題？同時，理論又能幫助我什麼？理論是否會將作品視為是驗證其權威性的附屬品，而使作品失焦？這些是我參加此次會議重要的收穫；也了解到文本本身的豐富性，是不需理論來錦上添花。

## 二、與會心得

於碩士班與博士班求學期間，所受的訓練都是以文學理論為主，以理論來分析文本，或是以理論為文本，希冀尋找出理論本身的矛盾性與侷限性。這次大會所發表的論文，甚少運用理論，只有我與其他3位跟我同樣來自台灣的學者有用到理論。我不禁問自己，我們是否仍以理論套理論的侷限角度來闡明我們想說的話？這些話到頭來，會不會是理論的話，而不是我們原本想說的？同時忽略或甚至將文本置於邊界，或是強制以理論推演出自己已預設好的立場，而忽略文本的內在的豐富性？我想這是我們在看待文本/表演作品與理論時，必須先釐清的問題。

## 三、考察參觀活動(無是項活動者略)

## 四、建議

## 五、攜回資料名稱及內容

於會場購買了 *My Beautiful Laundrette* 的 DVD、My Mother 劇本與和 Kureishi 作品相關評論書籍。

## 六、其他

會議論文全文：

### **Fragmented Body Space in Hanif Kureishi's *My Beautiful Laundrette*<sup>1</sup>**

**Chia Yi Chang**

**Dept. of Foreign Languages and Literature  
Nanhua University**

---

<sup>1</sup> Do not quote, or cite without permission of the author.

In the “Introduction” written to *My Beautiful Laundrette* (1986),<sup>2</sup> Hanif Kureishi states that he “cut most of the dialogue and [added] more stage directions” (3). In addition, the script is comprised of numerous external/interior scenes exchanging one over the other. Because of this, the script as a whole creates a sense of flow, that is, “people running about” and “the thing moving” (3). On the other hand, due to the scale of the film and budget, he decided to “set the film in the present, though references to the past remains” (5). We might ask, (1) How are references of the past depicted in the film?; (2) Where can the audience locate in the film the references to the past?; (3) Why does Kureishi “keep the thing moving” and “keep people running about” in the film?; (4) What is “the thing” and who are “the people” referred to in the film?

*MBL* characterizes racism, unemployment and Thatcherism. In the first facet, the film describes South Asian immigrants, the Pakistanis, occupying conflicting class positions in England. Because of their ethnic subject positions, the Pakistanis are disempowered and marginalized as the film implicates. The Pakistanis in the film may appear as successful businessmen capable of maintaining luxurious private lives, but their sociopolitical stance remains low. Moreover, they are regarded as slaves shipped to England as Genghis says to Johnny, “I’m angry. I don’t like to see one of our men groveling to Pakis. They came here to work for us. That’s why we *brought them over*. OK?” (*MBL* 38, emphasis added). The idea of Englishness, or England’s national narratives, marginalizes and silences the postcolonial presence (of Pakistanis).

Next, in the case of unemployment, one character, the Englishman, once said in the gathering at Nasser’s bedroom that “In my country! The only prejudice in England is against the useless” (21). In response to this remark, Salim satirized, “It’s rather

---

<sup>2</sup> Quotations from Hanif Kureishi’s work are cited in the text with the abbreviation listed below: *MBL: My Beautiful Laundrette* (London: Faber and Faber, 1986).

tilted in favour of the useless I would think” (21). We might question who the useless are? The Pakistanis, or the “white men”? Johnny and his group of friends (Genghis and Moose), to some extent, represent the “useless” white men who do nothing but enjoy the privilege. While the film “navigates through different social hierarchies,” the audience may discover no negotiation between the “minor” (the Pakistanis) and the “mainstream” (the white men of England).

The film, conversely, “questions the basis of national and cultural identities by exposing [both parties’] constructed and imbricated nature” (Swamy 143). It seems both the Pakistanis and the white men are caught in an inbetween sociopolitical space. While the gangs attempt to silence and get rid of the Pakistanis from their society, they seem to refuse, or are unable, to acknowledge the fact that they are the useless as compared with “the Pakistani business class that thrives on Margaret Thatcher’s capitalism” (Sen 65). Viewed this way, what Genghis says to Johnny sounds ironic, “Why are you [JOHNNY] working for them? For these people [the Pakistanis]? You were with us once. For England” (38). Whose England is referred to? As Nasser says to Omar, “In this damn country which we hate and love, you can get anything you want. It’s all spread out and available. That’s why I believe in England. You just have to know how to squeeze the tits of the system” (17). Both the concept of England and the rigid sociopolitical hierarchies had been redefined, or shattered, by the Pakistani business class. In other words, “England” as a whole has been put into an “inbetween” space, where there is no clear-cut definition.

“The tits of the system,” in a way, can be referred to “bourgeois materialism of Thatcher’s England” (Gairola 38). In expressing her view on the rising percentage of immigrants into British nation, Thatcher insinuated,

That is an awful lot, and I think it means that people are really afraid that this country might be swamped by people of a different culture....We are

a British nation with *British characteristics*. Every nation can take some minorities, and in many ways they add to the richness and variety of this country. But the moment *a minority threatens to become a big one*, people get frightened. (qtd in Solomos xiv, emphasis added).

What is “a British nation”? What are British characteristics? How can “minorities” become a big threat? What are the threats that “minorities” bring to Britain? This speech explicates infamously that non-white immigrants are a burden to the nation. In the meantime, the immigrants will deteriorate the nation into a *colored* one. From this perspective, “A British nation” refers to the one without colored people, and “British characteristics” regard “white” culture as the mainstream by excluding non-white cultures.

More importantly, this speech provokes fear of non-white immigrants, as the scribbles painted on the boarded-up windows well illustrate, “Your greed will be the death of us all,” and “We will defeat the running wogs of capitalism” (*MBL* 9). It seems that non-white foreigners were/are flooding Britain. Because of this fear, racism and violence towards non-white immigrants were justified in Genghis’ opinion. In response to this phenomenon, Frears criticizes, “Thatcher has divided the country between North and South, between the employed and unemployed, between the rich and poor, the people who’ve got and the people who haven’t” (qtd in Gairola 39). For “Thatcher has established a climate in which officials in the health service, employment, education, housing, social and welfare services would, without benefit of edict, insist on passports and identity checks before affording a service to [non-white] citizens” (Sivanandan 45). By so doing, Thatcher has positioned those outside her sociopolitical policies and her so-called “[nostalgic] British nation” as “dangerous and divisive” (Gairola 40). This well illustrates the undertone of Salim’s words to Omar, “Your uncle can’t pay you much. But you’ll be able to afford a decent



shirt and you'll be with your own people. Not in a dole queue. Mrs. Thatcher will be pleased with me" (*MBL* 15).

This *division* and *assumed danger* are evidenced by Thatcher's remarks that Britain is "sick-morally, socially, [and] economically" (Jenkins 66-68). In Curry's words,

[Thatcher] advocated the promotion of the traditional family as the only social structure which could advance Britain economically and socially, and she attacked the force which she saw as most subversive to the accomplishment of her neo-Conservative moral society—homosexuality. (12)

From this perspective, it is not difficult to find that the achievement of Thatcherism is constructed on *classist* and *heteronormative notions of family/nation*. In terms of spatial passage, what Thatcher had attempted to achieve is to silence, or even to exclude, those who were non-white by removing any ambiguous space they occupied. This ambiguous space is what Victor Turner terms "liminal passage," a "threshold" to pass through in order to redefine one's social position. To remove "liminal passage" is to forbid the non-white entering into "A British nation."

Contrary to Thatcher's uprooting the "liminal passage," *My Beautiful Laundrette* extols this "inbetween" space those non-white immigrants (Pakistanis) have taken. Though this "inbetween" space appears subversive towards classist and heteronormative notions of family/nation, as will later become clear, it remains "behind" the mainstream of "A British nation" as Thatcher claimed. Because of this "inbetween" space, moreover, the body space of the Pakistani characters in the film appears fragmented from which I depart to analyze by applying the concept of "liminal/liminality" that Victor Turner developed by appropriating Arnold van Gennep's "rites of passage." This "inbetween" space explicates a spatial passage from

one social status to another accompanied by a parallel geographical movement from one place to another. This spatial passage, more specifically, associates with the subject moving from preliminal to postliminal status that involves the crossing of the sociopolitical/cultural identity.

The Pakistani characters—Tania, Omar, Hussein, Salim, Nasser, Cherry, and Bilquis—best exemplify this geographical inbetween action through, on the one hand, the interrelationship of the characters to one another, and on the other hand, the resistance of the characters to the outer hegemonic “white” sociopolitical and cultural mainstream in Britain of the 1980s. To make clear this oxymoronic phenomenon, I shall explicate (a) how the inbetween action is brought about, and (b) how they work to re-appropriate the fixation of meaning the hegemonic sociopolitical and cultural mainstream has long constructed. By this, I argue that though Omar may have attempted to resist post-capitalism, he remains caught in a state of being “inbetween,” incapable of articulating his racial and cultural identity.

Let me explain before I proceed the background of the term liminal/liminality appropriated to analyze “the inbetween space” I have observed in *My Beautiful Laundrette*. In his 1960 book, *The Rites of Passage*, Arnold Van Gennep explores various ways in which religious rituals in semicivilized cultures define symbolically the social status of (an) individual(s). This symbolic definition implicates that “the life of an individual in any society is a series of passages from one age to another and from one occupation to another” (2-3). Any changes from one stage to the next, or from one group to another, is “accompanied by special *acts*,” since “among semicivilized peoples such acts are enveloped in ceremonies, since to the semicivilized mind no act is entirely free of the sacred” (3, emphasis added). Specifically, the life of an individual involves actions and reactions under the socio-religious regulations and confinement by which the society as a whole functions

without discomfort and disorder. The significance of these transitions from “groups to group and from one social situation to the next are looked on as implicit in the very fact of existence, so that a man’s life comes to be made up of a succession of stages with similar ends and beginnings” (3). The essential purpose of these transitions is “to enable the individual to pass from one defined position to another which is equally well defined...since in any case the individual involved has been modified by passing through several stages and traversing several boundaries” (3).

Van Gennep categorizes the *acts*, or the ceremonial patterns, of passing from one situation to another, be it social, political, cultural, or physical, as *rites of passage*. The term can be subdivided into “rites of separation (preliminal rites), rites of transition (liminal rites), and rites of incorporation (postliminal rites)” (11). “Rites of separation” involves symbolic behavior—particularly “symbols of reversal or inversion of things, relationships and processions”—which indicates the *detachment* of the ritual subjects from their previous social statuses (Turner 24). The ritual subjects, then, enter into the margin or limen (threshold), “a period and area of ambiguity” having “few of the attributes of either the preceding or subsequent profane social statuses or cultural states” (24). The rites of incorporation demonstrate the *return* of the ritual subjects to their new, stable and well-defined position in the society (24). That is to say, for the subjects undergoing the rites of passage, “they have been...prepared for a whole series of changes in the nature of the cultural, [or the sociopolitical] activities to be undertaken and of the relationships they will then have with others” (25).

“*Rites of passage*,” on the other hand, explicates not only passage in time, but also a *geographical movement* from one place to another. This spatial passage, Victor Turner notes, might “involve a long, exacting pilgrimage and the crossing of many national frontiers before the subject reaches his goal” (25). It could also imply “the

precursor of a real and permanent change of residence or geographical sphere of action” (25). To put it differently, the rites of passage take the form, literally or symbolically, of (an) open door(s), or of a threshold, for the subjects to cross.

I have observed that the open door(s), or the literal crossing, itself is carrying the concept of “inbetweenness” that the subjects must pass through before they reach the incorporation rites. This “inbetweenness” is that which “between leaving one post and taking up another world...both in regard to the subject and to those whom [the subject] is leaving and joining” (26). More specifically, the subjects are outside the society, and are temporarily undefined, beyond the normative social structure. Symbolically, the subjects are “*dead* to the *social* world, but *alive* to the *asocial* world” (27, emphasis added). This phenomenon is what Victor Turner has termed, “liminality” in which “social relations may be discontinued, former rights and obligations are suspended, [and] the social order may seem to have been turned upside down” (27). Within liminality, moreover, the subjects play with the familiar elements that they defamiliarize in the meantime. Because of this, the subjects are capable of emerging from “unprecedented combinations of familiar elements,” from which new order, model, and paradigm arise (27).

Hanif Kureishi’s *My Beautiful Laundrette* depicts tactics the marginalized protagonists adopt to cross the strict sociopolitical identity set up by the England narratives. On the other hand, *My Beautiful Laundrette* encapsulates a change underway by telling the story of Omar with a South Asian immigrant background. Here, the term “marginalized” refers to someone who has been pushed to the edges of society and out of position of power or influence. By this, “place” can be an integral factor that determines individual identity. In her *Gender, Identity, and Place*, Linda McDowell warns us that we should not regard identity as constructed based on difference, that is, the One against the Other and vice versa. Conversely, we should

think of identity as “a fluid amalgam of memories of places and origins, constructed by the through fragments and nuances, journeys and rests, of movement between” (215). “Movement between” indicates the interaction between people and places. Because of this, people may project outward their idea about places, be it negative or positive. Places, furthermore, can be defined “by the socio-spatial relations that intersect there and give a place its distinctive character” (McDowell 4). In other words, the identity of a place is formed by social structures and power relations that in the meantime determine who is included within and excluded from places.

To supplement the interrelation between individual and places McDowell constructs, I add “body” into this spatial interrelation. This means that place reveals itself to us through a sense of our own body. Place also extends our body in space and time. In other words, place comes into being as our body moves in that when moving with body we create a space and with that, embed in space with a meaning that records what has once happened, is happening and will happen in that space. To put it differently, place signifies a sense of location where “the activities of human being occurs” (Orum and Chen 15). As a site of human activities, place “may furnish the basis for our sense of identity, as human beings, as well as for our sense of connection to other human beings, in other words, our sense of community” (15).

As the film unfolds, the first image that comes into our mind is a “detached house” in South London, “a rough area” (*MBL*13). We later discover that most of then scenes are taken in South London where Omar and his father, PAPA live, “a small, damp and dirty place which hasn’t been decorated for years” (11). “The laundrette is “in bad condition. It’s situated in an area of run-down second-hand shops, betting shops, grocers with their windows boarded-up” (25-6). “South London” seems to become a space within a social hierarchy that reveals the lower class identity of not only Omar and his father, PAPA, but also Johnny and his friends. That is to say, the

social perception of who they are decides what kind of place they should stay. Thus framed, the appearance of South London carries a symbolic meaning that confines the social status of these lower class people as inferior and nothing. One's "identity" is mainly a sociopolitical production so to speak. A change, thereby, becomes urgent as Omar says to Johnny that he wants "big money," and he will never "be beat down by this country" (51). He first works for his uncle, Nasser, and then runs one laundrette for his uncle. Like Nasser, Omar learns how to "squeeze the tits of the [capital] system" (17). Because of this, Tania notes that Omar is greedy like her father (36).

In addition to the sociopolitical inbetweenness, "cultural" inbetweenness is another barrier that Omar encounters. Upon his arrival to join the family gathering, Omar's aunt, Bilquis, introduces him to other women in the living room. When Omar shows his surprise that Cherry has been to Karachi, she expresses her contempt, "You stupid, what a stupid, it's my home. Could anyone in their right mind call this silly little island off Europe their home?" (19). Upon hearing this remark, Bilquis explains, "Cherry, my little nephew knows nothing of that life there" (19). Cherry, then, exclaims scornfully, "Oh God, I'm so sick of hearing about these in-betweens. People should make up their minds where they are" (20). For Cherry, England does not equal home in that it is merely a place where her body is situated. Karachi, instead, is home. In other words, though Cherry is living in England, since Karachi is home to her, she is at home in her body which means she symbolically inscribed Karachi on her body. By taking England as a temporary location and Karachi as the homeland, Cherry evokes that the presence of Omar is split between England and Karachi. By so doing, Omar's dislocation, whether culturally or socio-politically, from Karachi implicates that he is not at home in his own body. Furthermore, Omar is alienated from his own people.

The next scene as Omar enters the bedroom to meet his uncle also emphasizes

the “inbetweenness.” Down the corridor to Nasser’s room, Tania opens the door and lead Omar in. In slow motion, then, Omar enters the room silently and “stand inside the door shyly, and takes in the scene” (20). As the scene displays, Omar is positioned between the brightness of the room and the darkness of the threshold. Omar steps back into the darkness as Nasser notices his presence and calls him to come in. However, we observe that Omar does not sit with his uncle and the men from whom he separates himself by standing on the other side of the room. This manifests Cherry’s words that Omar is one of the “in-between,” standing in the darkness and the threshold.

The spatial context of the laundrette complicates the inbetweenness even more. The laundrette is situated in South London Street where there are shops with their windows boarded-up. On the other hand, the laundrette is in bad condition. Both of these suggest that the laundrette, like Omar, is placed on the margin of the society. The consumers of the laundrette are from the lower class not embraced by Thatcher’s capitalism. As such, “the laundrette becomes an ironic utopian paradise where characters act out their desires and fantasies” (Rueschmann xix). In other words, the laundrette functions as a protective shelter or a home for Omar, Johnny and the other members of this run-down neighborhood. However it might be taken as “an urban oasis” in Gairola’s words, the cocaine sales Salim smuggles provide funds for the building of the laundrette.

If the laundrette equals the home for Omar, Omar is at home in his body as we witnessed in Cherry’s Karachi example. In addition, though it may appear as an ironic place, the laundrette becomes a site where Omar and Johnny cross the thresholds of race, class and gender (Hall 171). In this way, it is not difficult to discover that the laundrette business is not a gendered one as both Nasser’s garage business and Salim’s drug smugglings have demonstrated. But we must remember that though

Omar is the boss of the laundrette, he remains being closeted in the back office where no one can look in from the outside, but only from the inside. More specifically, the politics of in/visibility are involved in this scene. This means that the one-way mirror, separating the back office from the public, provides Omar and Johnny a panoptic power, but they remain invisible. On the other hand, the laundrette is constructed upon the exploitation of Thatcher's praise for South Asians as the new entrepreneurs who bring wealth to England. Under these circumstances, Omar is positioned on the margin of the margin, or in the inbetween of the inbetween and with that, his body appears more spatially fragmented and incomplete.

Consequently, the laundrette as a space facilitates a negative critique of the liminality, or rites of transition. The laundrette, to some extent, does bring "big money" to Omar. Nevertheless, this metamorphosis from lower class to upper class does not make Omar a successful Pakistani and consolidate his sociopolitical and cultural identity. On the contrary, Omar has merely become a successful Pakistani businessman. In the end, redefining the meaning of the laundrette as a distinctive home space does not help Omar transgress and subvert the rigid class and race barriers. Conversely, the position of the laundrette pushes Omar even more into the private. From this perspective, though Omar may have attempted to resist post-capitalism, he remains caught in a state of being "inbetween" in Cherry's words, incapable of articulating his racial and cultural identity.



## Works Cited

- Anderson, Benedict. *Imagine Community: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso, 1991.
- Ball, John Clement. "The Semi-Detached Metropolis: Hanif Kureishi's London." *Ariel* 27.4 (1996): 7-24.
- Felski, Rita. "Nothing to Declare: Identity, Shame, and the Lower Middle Class." *PMLA* 115.1 (2000): 33-45.
- Gairola, Rahul K. "Capitalist houses, queer homes: National belonging and transgressive erotics in My Beautiful Laundrette." *South Asian Popular Culture* 7.1 (2009): 37-54.
- Gilroy, Paul. *There Ain't No Black in the Union Jack*. Chicago: U of Chicago P., 1987.
- Kumar, Amitava. "A Bang and a Whimper: A Conversation with Hanif Kureishi." *Transition* 10.4 (2001): 114-31.
- Maxey, Ruth. "'Life in the Diaspora Is Often Held in a Strange Suspension': First-Generation Self-Fashioning in Hanif Kureishi's Narratives of Home and Return." *The Journal of Commonwealth Literature* 41.3 (2006): 5-25
- Salmon, Paul. "Revising the Traditions: Hanif Kureishi and Contemporary British Cinema." *Canadian Journal of Film Studies* 2.2-3: 107-15.
- Swamy, Vinay. "Politicizing the Sexual, Sexualizing the Political: The Crossing of Political and Sexual Orientations in Stephen Frear's and Hanif Kureishi's My Beautiful Laundrette." *Comparative Literature Studies* 40.2 (2003): 142-58.
- Thomas, Susie. Ed. *Hanif Kureishi: A reader's guide to essential criticism*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.
- . "Something to Ask You: A Conversation with Hanif Kureishi." *Changing English* 14.1 (2007): 3-16.

# 國科會補助計畫衍生研發成果推廣資料表

日期:2010/12/21

國科會補助計畫	計畫名稱: 日常生活的實踐: 芭比貝克之"生活表演系列"中的"身體" "空間" "性別" "食物"與"觀眾"(I)
	計畫主持人: 張嘉怡
	計畫編號: 98-2410-H-343-038- 學門領域: 戲劇及劇場
無研發成果推廣資料	

98 年度專題研究計畫研究成果彙整表

計畫主持人：張嘉怡		計畫編號：98-2410-H-343-038-					
計畫名稱：日常生活的實踐：芭比貝克之‘生活表演系列’中的‘身體’、‘空間’、‘性別’、‘食物’與‘觀眾’(I)							
成果項目		量化			單位	備註（質化說明：如數個計畫共同成果、成果列為該期刊之封面故事...等）	
		實際已達成數（被接受或已發表）	預期總達成數(含實際已達成數)	本計畫實際貢獻百分比			
國內	論文著作	期刊論文	0	0	100%	篇	
		研究報告/技術報告	0	0	100%		
		研討會論文	0	0	100%		
		專書	0	0	100%		
	專利	申請中件數	0	0	100%	件	
		已獲得件數	0	0	100%		
	技術移轉	件數	0	0	100%	件	
		權利金	0	0	100%	千元	
	參與計畫人力 (本國籍)	碩士生	0	0	100%	人次	
		博士生	0	0	100%		
博士後研究員		0	0	100%			
專任助理		0	0	100%			
國外	論文著作	期刊論文	0	0	100%	篇	
		研究報告/技術報告	0	0	100%		
		研討會論文	1	1	100%		
		專書	0	0	100%	章/本	
	專利	申請中件數	0	0	100%	件	
		已獲得件數	0	0	100%		
	技術移轉	件數	0	0	100%	件	
		權利金	0	0	100%	千元	
	參與計畫人力 (外國籍)	碩士生	0	0	100%	人次	
		博士生	0	0	100%		
博士後研究員		0	0	100%			
專任助理		0	0	100%			

<p>其他成果 (無法以量化表達之成果如辦理學術活動、獲得獎項、重要國際合作、研究成果國際影響力及其他協助產業技術發展之具體效益事項等，請以文字敘述填列。)</p>	<p>無</p>
--	----------

科 教 處 計 畫 加 填 項 目	成果項目	量化	名稱或內容性質簡述
	測驗工具(含質性與量性)	0	
	課程/模組	0	
	電腦及網路系統或工具	0	
	教材	0	
	舉辦之活動/競賽	0	
	研討會/工作坊	0	
	電子報、網站	0	
	計畫成果推廣之參與(閱聽)人數	0	



## 國科會補助專題研究計畫成果報告自評表

請就研究內容與原計畫相符程度、達成預期目標情況、研究成果之學術或應用價值（簡要敘述成果所代表之意義、價值、影響或進一步發展之可能性）、是否適合在學術期刊發表或申請專利、主要發現或其他有關價值等，作一綜合評估。

1. 請就研究內容與原計畫相符程度、達成預期目標情況作一綜合評估

達成目標

未達成目標（請說明，以 100 字為限）

實驗失敗

因故實驗中斷

其他原因

說明：

2. 研究成果在學術期刊發表或申請專利等情形：

論文： 已發表  未發表之文稿  撰寫中  無

專利： 已獲得  申請中  無

技轉： 已技轉  洽談中  無

其他：（以 100 字為限）

3. 請依學術成就、技術創新、社會影響等方面，評估研究成果之學術或應用價值（簡要敘述成果所代表之意義、價值、影響或進一步發展之可能性）（以 500 字為限）

本人由閱讀所收集的資料中發現評論家在探討芭比貝克的表演作品時，多半單方面討論作品中之單一元素，例如演員的身體、性別或空間，甚少對其作品與表演者貝克作一全面性的探討，例如結合身體、性別、空間、道具與觀眾等元素；此外，更少有資料是討論作品中的道具運用與觀眾對作品的反應。因此，本人此一計畫以表演者為中心與出發點，結合表演者本身身體、性別、展演空間、作品中運用之道具與觀眾反應來進行討論貝克的作品。