

Copyright 2019 Department of Fine Arts, The Chinese University of Hong Kong.

預測話語分析理論的構想與應用
——以越後妻有大地藝術祭香港部屋為例
Conception and Application of
Predictive Discourse Analysis Theory
— Case Study of Hong Kong House
at Echigo-Tsumari Art Triennale

楊天帥 Yeung Tin-shui

作者為東京藝術大學國際藝術創造研究科博士生。
The writer is PhD Student (Global Arts) of Tokyo University of the Arts.

英文翻譯 English translation : 李挽靈 Lee Wan-ling Mary

摘要

近年社會參與藝術（socially-engaged art, SEA）的分析與討論，儘管有各家說法，但均缺乏從主體經驗到話語改變、到社會變革的明確理論框架。本文結合話語分析（discourse analysis）與預測理論（predictive processing）試圖創設嶄新的理論方法解決上述問題。筆者嘗試以這套理論分析日本「越後妻有大地藝術祭」的「香港部屋」之策展過程，得出香港部屋の策展面對「藝術」與「社群」兩項話語衝突的結論，同時勾勒這衝突如何影響策展人的行動以及對展覽的理解。

1. 背景

近年，社會參與藝術成為藝術領域、文化領域等的熱門討論題目。社會參與藝術還有許多含義類近的名字，如社會參與藝術（socially-engaged art）、關係性藝術（relational art）、對話藝術（dialogical art）、新類型公共藝術（new genre public art）、社群藝術（community art）與社會實踐（social practice）等（Cartiere&Zebracki, 2016）。而在日本，類近的實踐則稱為「藝術項目（アートプロジェクト）」（熊倉純子, 2014）。為方便討論，下文一概稱為社會參與藝術（SEA）。

出現如此多名目的其中一個原因，與歷史相關。根據日本藝術項目學者Justin Jesty的研究（2017），社群藝術、公共藝術（public art）及當代藝術（contemporary art）本來是三個界線相對明確的分野，直至九十年代才開始變得模糊。六十年代，全球多地出現大型社會運動浪潮，藝術佔有重要角色。七十年代，浪潮漸退，但許多藝術工作者仍認為藝術應直接回應社會議題，因而積極介入社群，是為社群藝術。然而其實踐當時普遍並不被視為公共藝術及當代藝術。九十年代，一些本來具明顯公共藝術及當代藝術背景的藝術家，開始向社群藝術借鏡，衍生出「新類型公共藝術」（Lacy, 1995）及SEA等。由此不難推論，現時實踐 SEA 的人均有其各自的話語脈絡，這些脈絡令他們對自己實踐的著眼點、意圖、方法、評價角度均不一樣。眾多名目便是由此而來。

既然著眼點不同，不同人在實踐SEA的時候自然亦有差異。不過，上述斑駁的脈絡到底如何影響實踐者的決定與做法？又如何影響人們對這些實踐的理解？目前仍未有一套完善理論方法可以說明。最能提供解釋的理論，大概是 Claire Bishop (2004) 所引用，¹ 來自Ernesto Laclau 與 Chantal Mouffe 的話語分析（1985/2014），因為話語分析能較完整解釋話語、統識（hegemony）與不確定性（undecidability）（Laclau, 1990/2010）的關係，然而話語分析在單一主體經驗、行動，以至話語本身如何改變等問題上，均沒作清晰描述。筆者認為，其中一大原因是，話語分析本屬政治學層面，它關心的是宏觀上關於民主、自由等話語在社會如何變化，而鮮有需要觸及個體經驗。然而在藝術領域，由於討論過程必須涉及單一主體創造、經驗作品的過程，當中自不免要回到最根本的問題：主體、經驗、話語等概念的關係，到底是甚麼？

1 Claire Bishop 後來被許多論者批評曲解話語分析理論，例如見 Justin Jesty 的“Debates of the Social Turn” (2018)，不過這並不影響本文討論，故從略。

Synopsis

In recent years, despite the various approaches to the analysis and discussion of socially-engaged art (SEA), there still lacks a clear theoretical framework for the same, from subjective experience, to changes of discourse, to social change. This essay combines discourse analysis and predictive processing theory, in an attempt to create a new theoretical methodology to solve the aforementioned problem. With this theory, I analyze the curatorial process of the “Hong Kong House” at the “Echigo-Tsumari Art Triennale” (Echigo-Tsumari) in Japan, from which stems the conclusion that the curatorial approach of the Hong Kong House faces a conflict between the discourses of “art” and “community.” Meanwhile, this essay illustrates how this conflict influences the curator’s actions and understanding of the exhibition.

1. Background

In recent years, socially-engaged art has become a hot topic of discussion in the field of art and culture. The art world has named these activities as socially-engaged art, relational art, dialogical art, new genre public art, community art, and social practice (Cartiere & Zebracki, 2016). In Japan, practices of similar nature are called “art project (アートプロジェクト)” (Kumura Sumiko, 2014). For the sake of discussion, in this essay all such practices shall be referred to as “socially-engaged art (SEA).”

One reason for this plethora of names is historical. According to the study of Japanese art project scholar Justin Jesty (Jesty, 2017), community art, public art and contemporary art were originally three separate fields with distinct boundaries, until they became blurred in the 1990s. In the 1960s, a global wave of large-scale social movements affected many regions, in which art played an important role. As the wave gradually subsided in the 1970s, many artists still believed that art should directly respond to social issues, and actively participate in the community, which makes it “community art.” However, at the time this practice was generally not considered as public art or contemporary art. In the 1990s, some artists with distinctive public art and contemporary art backgrounds began to borrow from community art, from which emerged “new genre public art” (Lacy, 1995) and SEA. It is therefore a natural deduction that people who practice SEA now come from diverse discourse contexts, leading to very different focuses, intentions, methodologies, and evaluations in their practices. Thus the many names.

As the foci are different, it follows that there are differences in SEA practices. However, how do the above-mentioned crisscrossing trajectories influence the practitioner’s decisions and methodologies, and people’s understanding of these practices? There is still no comprehensive theoretical methodology that can provide an explanation. The closest to it is probably Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe’s discourse analysis (1985/2014) as referenced by Claire Bishop (2004),¹ as discourse analysis has more holistic explanations for discourse, hegemony and undecidability (Laclau, 1990/2010). However, discourse analysis does not provide a clear description of issues such as individual subjective experience, action, and how discourse itself changes. It may be that, originating from the realm of political science, discourse analysis is more concerned with, at the macro level, how discourses of democracy and freedom change in the society, and rarely touches upon the individual experience. Whereas in the field of art, since the discussion process necessarily involves the creative and

1 Claire Bishop was henceforth criticized for misinterpreting discourse analysis theory, see for example Justin Jesty, “Debates of the Social Turn” (2018). As it does not affect the discussion outlined in this essay, this subject shall be left untouched.

本文主旨即在提出一個理論框架解決上述問題。首先，筆者會在下文解釋如何結合話語分析以及安迪·卡拉卡 (Andy Clark) 關於預測處理的研究 (2016)，推導出一套解決上述問題的理論方法。然後，筆者會嘗試用這套框架分析「香港部屋」的策展過程，以探討這套方法的實用性。

2. 方法論：預測話語分析理論

表一：「預測話語分析」符號列表

D	話語 (Discourse)
S	主體 (Subject)
P	預測 (Prediction)
A	行動 (Action)
U	感知 (Perception)
E	經驗 (Experience)
H	統識比例 (Hegemonic ratio)
A	對抗性 (Antagonism)
->	帶來 (leads to)
P(D:E)	根據話語 D 對經驗 E 作出的預測
U(D:E)	根據話語 D 對經驗 E 作出的感知

筆者將本文提出的理論方法名為「預測話語分析」，以下將略述「預測話語分析」的構造。

由於上述問題涉及主體與經驗，因此理論設計上無可避免從基礎開始。首先，本理論將「話語 (Discourse, D)」定義為特定的元素² 接合方法。話語作為主體 (Subject, S) 對世界的理解方法，為主體提供經驗的預測 (Prediction, P)，指導主體行動 (Action, A)，並感知 (Perception, U) 行動所得的經驗。上述流程可用以下表述顯示 (符號表達詳見表一)：

$$P(D:E) \rightarrow A \rightarrow U(D:E')$$

E 為經驗 (Experience)。P(D:E) 即根據話語 D 對經驗 E 作出的預測。同理，U(D:E') 即根據話語 D 對 E 的經驗作出的感知。這裡使用 E' 而不是 E，因為行動後得出的經驗，未必等同預測時的經驗。

同一主體在同一時空可以同時擁有多個不同話語。由於這些話語提供的預測不同，因此會指導主體作不同行動。這些話語於該特定時空中，對主體各有其不同重要性，筆者稱之為「統識比例 (Hegemonic ratio, H)」。在此特定時空，主體面對經驗 E 的預測與感知，就是各話語按其統識比例疊加³ 的總結果。因此：

2 關於元素的定義，參考 Laclau & Mouffe (1985/2014)。

3 必須說明的是，由於預測與感知均非數值 (scalar)，這裡所言的「疊加」，並非直接相加。

experiential process of the individual subject, where inevitably one must be brought back to the fundamental question: What is the relationship between concepts such as subject, experience, and discourse?

The purpose of this essay is to propose a theoretical framework to solve the above problems. First it shall explain how to derive a theoretical approach to the above problems by combining discourse analysis with Andy Clark's research on predictive processing (2016), followed by a case study of "Hong Kong House," where this framework will be applied to analyze the curatorial process, to explore the practicality of this methodology.

2. Methodology: Predictive Discourse Analysis Theory

Table 1: List of symbols for "predictive discourse analysis"

D	Discourse
S	Subject
P	Prediction
A	Action
U	Perception
E	Experience
H	Hegemonic ratio
A	Antagonism
->	leads to
P(D:E)	Discourse D's prediction according to experience E
U(D:E)	Discourse D's perception according to experience E

The theoretical methodology proposed here in this essay shall be referred to as "predictive discourse analysis." The structure of "predictive discourse analysis" shall be briefly outlined below.

Since the above questions involve subject and experience, it is inevitable that the design of the theory should start from the basics. Firstly, the theory defines "Discourse (D)" as a specific method to articulate elements.² Discourse is the Subject's (S) method of understanding the world. It provides the subject with Prediction (P) of experience, guides the subject's Action (A), and leads to the Perception (U) of the experience obtained from the action. The above process can be demonstrated in the following formula (see Table 1 for the symbolic expressions):

$$P(D:E) \rightarrow A \rightarrow U(D:E')$$

E is Experience. P(D:E) is the prediction of experience E based on discourse D. Similarly, U(D:E') is the perception of experience E based on discourse D. E' is used here instead of E, because the experience obtained after the action may not be equivalent to the predicted experience.

2 For the definition of element, see Laclau & Mouffe (1985/2014).

$$P(E) = \sum_{n=1}^m H_n(P[D_n:E])$$

若這些話語的統識比例相近，它們對主體便有差不多同樣重要的影響。這情況下，若這些話語導出的行動又互不兼容，由之產生的經驗便是「對抗性 (Antagonism, A)」。⁴

對抗性的定義問題正可反映話語分析的限制。Laclau & Mouffe 將對抗性定義為「一切客觀性的限制的『經驗』」⁵ (Laclau & Mouffe, 1985/2014)。若把這客觀性理解為身分或政治理念上的客觀性 (如「香港人必然能講廣東話」)，這對抗性不難理解。然而在單一主體層面，並非所有客觀概念都與身份及狹義政治有關，比如說，若有一話語內含「檸檬必然是酸」的客觀表述，那針對此一客觀性的限制的經驗 (即對抗性) 可以是「吃一個甜檸檬」。然而這種客觀性的挑戰——在藝術的範疇有時被稱為「感官刺激」——到底如何像 Claire Bishop (2004) 及 Laclau & Mouffe (1985/2014) 所言，促進多元主義及基進民主，實有商榷之處。

筆者在「預測話語分析理論」中，將對抗性定義為「一切客觀性的限制的『經驗』」，包括一般歸類為價值觀以及感官的經驗。符號表述上，對抗性可理解為：

若：

$$P(E) \rightarrow A \rightarrow U(E')$$

$$P(D_x:E) \rightarrow A_x \rightarrow U(D_x:E_x')$$

則：

$$A_x = H_x(U[D_x:E'] - P[D_x:E])$$

A_x 即 D_x 產生的對抗性， D_x 泛指任何話語。

換句話說，對抗性粗略可理解為「某人 (在某話語指導下) 估計自己會作某行動，這行動帶來某經驗，並讓他感知某個結果；然而最終其感知到的結果卻與當初估計不同。」這差異導致主體無法完善根據該話語的預測導出行動，因此行動結果亦變得不明朗，基於認知系統追求將熵 (entropy) 壓至最低的原則 (Clark, 2016)，認知系統會作出最適當⁶ 調整，以消除對抗性。

從 $A_x = H_x(U[D_x:E'] - P[D_x:E])$ 可知，消除對抗性 A_x 的變數包括 H_x 、 D_x 、 E 及 E' 。在特定經驗 (即 E 及 E' 為常數) 下，可以改變的是 H_x 、 D_x 。這顯示，消除對抗性的根本方法是改變各話語之間的統識關係 (包括新增特定話語)，否則就是改變話語本身。如是，一般語言上所謂「藝術帶來思想改變」，便可視為創造特定經驗 (E)，以在特定主體 S 上產生某一話語認知 ($U[D_x:E']$) 與該話語的預測 ($P[D_x:E]$) 不符的情況，誘發對抗性 (A_x)，進而引起主體 S 該話語的改變，及 / 或話語之間的統識關係改變。

⁴ 關於對抗性的定義，參考 Laclau & Mouffe (1985/2014)。

⁵ E. Laclau, & C. Mouffe, *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics* (London: Verso, 1985/2014): 122.

⁶ 最適當是根據「金髮姑娘原則 (Goldilock principle)」而判斷，參見 Clark (2016)。

A subject may possess multiple discourses at the same time. As the predictions induced by these discourses vary, the subject will be led to different actions. These discourses have different significances for the subject in particular time and space in which the subject is situated, to be called here the “hegemonic ratio (H).” In this particular time and space, the subject’s prediction (or perception) of experience E is the weighted sum of the prediction (or perception) of all the discourses and their respective hegemonic ratio.³ Therefore:

$$P(E) = \sum_{n=1}^m H_n(P[D_n:E])$$

The closer the Hegemonic ratio of these discourses, the more similar is the impact they have on the subject. In this case, if the actions derived from these discourses are incompatible with each other, the resulting experience would be “Antagonism (A).”⁴

The problem of defining antagonism reflects the limitations of discourse analysis. Laclau & Mouffe defines antagonism as the “‘experience’ of the limit of all objectivity”⁵ (Laclau & Mouffe, 1985/2014). This antagonism is not difficult to understand if “objectivity” is seen as objectivity in identity or political ideal (such as “Hong Kong people necessarily speak Cantonese”). At the individual subject level, however, not all objective concepts are related to identity or politics in the narrow sense. For example, if there is a discourse that involves the objective expression “lemon is necessarily sour,” then the experience of this limit of objectivity (i.e. antagonism) can be “to eat a sweet lemon.” However, how this challenge against objectivity— sometimes referred to as “sensory stimulation” in the arts – can promote pluralism and radical democracy, as suggested by Claire Bishop (2004) and Laclau & Mouffe (1985/2014), is contestable.

In this “predictive discourse analysis theory,” I define antagonism as “the ‘experience’ of the limit of all objectivity,” including the experience that is generally classified as value and sensory perceptions. In terms of symbolic expression, antagonism can be understood in this way:

If:

$$P(E) \rightarrow A \rightarrow U(E')$$

$$P(D_x:E) \rightarrow A_x \rightarrow U(D_x:E_x')$$

Then:

$$A_x = H_x(U[D_x:E'] - P[D_x:E])$$

A_x is the antagonism generated by D_x , while D_x refers to any discourse.

In other words, antagonism can be roughly understood as “someone (under the guidance of a certain discourse) predicts that he or she will take an action, which will bring about an experience that allows him or her to perceive a result; however, in the end the perceived result is different from the original prediction.” This difference leads to the subject’s inability to generate the action based on the prediction by the discourse, rendering the result of the action uncertain. Based on the principle that the cognitive system opts for the

³ It is necessary to note that since neither prediction nor perception are scalars, the “total sum” referred to here is not a direct addition.

⁴ Regarding the definition of antagonism, see Laclau & Mouffe (1985/2014).

⁵ E. Laclau, & C. Mouffe, *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics* (London: Verso, 1985/2014): 122.



圖一 Plate 1
「香港部屋」開幕禮。Opening ceremony of “Hong Kong House.”

lowest entropy level (Clark, 2016), the cognitive system will make the most proper adjustments⁶ to eliminate antagonism.

From $A_x = H_x(U[D_x:E']) - P[D_x:E]$ one can see that the variables that eliminate the antagonistic A_x include H_x , D_x , E and E' . In a particular experience (i.e. when E and E' is a constant), H_x and D_x are variable. This shows that the fundamental way to eliminate antagonism is to change the hegemonic relationship between the various discourses (including the addition of specific discourses), or to change the discourse itself. Thus, in general the so-called “art brings about changes of thought” can be regarded as creating a specific experience (E) to produce a certain dissonance between the perception by this discourse ($U[D_x:E']$) and the prediction by this discourse ($P[D_x:E]$), inducing antagonism (A_x), which in turn causes the change of discourse in subject S , and/ or the change of hegemonic relationship between discourses.

3. Case Study: Curation of Hong Kong House

In this section, the above theoretical methodology will be applied to the analysis of the case of “Hong Kong House” at the “Echigo-Tsumari Art Triennale.” (Plate 1)

The Echigo-Tsumari Art Triennale (hereinafter referred to as “Echigo-Tsumari”) is one of Japan’s largest art projects (アートプロジェクト) (Sumiko, 2014) (see Table 2), which is held every three years since 2000. According to the official website,⁷ postwar Japan saw a period of high economic growth and migration of rural population to urban areas, aggravating regional population aging and other social problems. It is exactly the motive of Echigo-Tsumari to activate the region and ameliorate the above problems.

Practically, the goal of Echigo-Tsumari can be summarized as follows:

- 1) To link men and nature;
- 2) To explore the inheritance and development of regional culture;
- 3) To discover regional values and charms;
- 4) To revitalize agriculture and villages.

Table 2: Information of Echigo-Tsumari Art Triennale 2018 and Hong Kong House

Echigo-Tsumari Art Triennale	
Venue	Tokamachi city and Tsunan town, Niigata Prefecture, Japan
Exhibition size	760 square kilometers
Organizer	Echigo-Tsumari Art Triennale Executive Committee
General Director	Kitagawa Fram
Exhibition period	29 July to 17 September, 2018
Number of exhibits	378
Number of participating artists	335 units (from 44 countries and regions)
Number of visitors in 2018	548,380

⁶ The most proper adjustments are based on the Goldilock principle, see Clark (2016).

⁷ <http://www.echigo-tsumari.jp>.

3. 案例分析：香港部屋の策展

在這部份，筆者將會嘗試以上述理論方法分析越後妻有大地藝術祭的香港部屋案例。（圖一）

越後妻有大地藝術祭（下稱「大地藝術祭」）是日本最大型的藝術項目（アートプロジェクト）（熊倉純子，2014）之一（詳見表二），由2000年開始三年一度舉行。根據藝術祭網站，⁷日本戰後進入高度經濟成長期，人口向都市外流，令當地高齡化等問題日益嚴重，大地藝術祭的動機，就是活化該地區，改善上述問題。

具體而言，該祭目標整理如下：

- 1) 連繫人與自然；
- 2) 探討地域文化承傳與發展；
- 3) 發掘地方價值，發揮地方魅力；
- 4) 重振農業，振興農村。

表二：2018 年大地藝術祭及香港部屋資料

大地藝術祭	
地點	日本新潟縣的十日町市及津南町
展覽面積	760 平方公里
主辦單位	大地藝術祭執行委員會
總監	北川富朗（北川フラム）
舉行日期	2018 年 7 月 29 日至 9 月 17 日
作品數	378 件
藝術家數	335 組（來自 44 個國家與地區）
2018 年觀眾人數	548,380
香港部屋	
主辦單位	康樂及文化事務署（主辦）藝術推廣辦事處（籌劃） 越後妻有大地藝術祭（協辦）香港演藝學院（協辦）
合作單位	聲音掏腰包 《字花》 遊藝說論 版畫工作室
營運期	2018-2021（暫定）

⁷ 網址：www.echigo-tsumari.jp。

Hong Kong House	
Organizers	Leisure and Cultural Services Department (Presenter) Art Promotion Office (Organizer) Echigo-Tsumari Art Triennale Executive Committee (Collaborator) Hong Kong Academy for Performing Arts (Collaborator)
Collaborators	soundpocket <i>Fleurs des lettres</i> Art Appraisal Club Hong Kong Open Printshop
Exhibition period	2018-2021 (tentative)
Exhibitions	2018: “Tsunan Museum of the Lost” by Leung Chi-wo + Sara Wong 2019: “Give Us This Day Our Daily Bread” by Annie Wan 2020: “L Museum” ⁸ by L sub (Pak Sheung-chuen, Wendy Wo and Yim Sui-fong) (Also creations and performances by “Frog King” Kwok Mang-ho in 2018)

In 2018, Art Promotion Office (APO) established “Hong Kong House” in Tsunan, recruiting participating artists (see Table 2) mainly through open call for application, in an attempt to “create an exchange platform for opening dialogue through art.” (Art Promotion Office, 2018) (Plate 2)

According to an interview with APO on February 13, 2019, the establishment of Hong Kong House can be traced back to the practice of APO’s vision and mission.⁹

I categorize these visions and missions into two trajectories. The first is targeted at the community, namely “to incorporate art into the community, and to enable community engagement into the arts,” and “to enrich the living environment and enhance quality of life by launching innovative art projects.” Let this be called “community-oriented” (D₁). The other group is aimed at artists, namely “to provide one-stop service for art talent from art training and creation to presentation,” “to nurture young artists and new ideas.” Let this be called “art-oriented” (D₂).

An analysis of the interview shows that Lesley Lau, Head of APO, articulated the “community-oriented” mission with “public art.” According to Lau, although in the early days APO also did “public art,” it was mostly in the “traditional” approach, such as placing a single sculpture in a public space. She thought that this approach “eventually failed to answer people’s views of and demands for art,” while in “the progress of the global art scene,” Japan’s “Echigo-Tsumari Art Triennale” has created a “new genre public art,” which is an art that “responds to the region and the environment” and involves “community exchanges.” In 2016, Fram Kitagawa came to Hong Kong and met with Lesley Lau when he proposed for her to participate in Echigo-Tsumari. Due to the said “community-oriented” considerations, Lau agreed to the proposal. Lau mentioned that since “Hong Kong House” is part of Echigo-Tsumari and not completely independent, the organizer’s visions have to be taken into account, which results in “Hong Kong House’s” aspirations to “community exchange.” From this one can see that APO’s participation in Echigo-Tsumari is partly based on

⁸ According to an interview with the artists on June 6, 2019, the name is not yet finalized.

⁹ See APO website: https://www.lcsd.gov.hk/CE/Museum/APO/zh_TW/web/apo/apo_mission.html.



圖二 Plate 2
「香港部屋」建設中。“Hong Kong House” under construction.

香港部屋	
計劃出展作品	2018：梁志和+黃志恆「津南遺失博物館」 2019：尹麗娟「記憶日常」 2020：L sub（白雙全、胡敏儀及嚴瑞芳）「L 美術館」 ⁸ （另外 2018 年有「蛙王」郭孟浩作創作及表演）

2018 年，藝術推廣辦事處（Art Promotion Office，下稱 APO）在津南設立「香港部屋」，主要以公開徵件方式招募參展藝術家（詳見表二），試圖「以藝術來開展對話的交流平台」（藝術推廣辦事處，2018）。（圖二）

根據筆者與 APO 於 2019 年 2 月 13 日的訪問，香港部屋の成立可追溯至實踐 APO 的理想、使命。⁹

筆者將這些理想、使命分為兩組脈絡。一組以社群為對象，即「讓藝術融入社群，讓社群投入藝術」，以及「推出創新藝術項目，豐富生活環境及提升生活質素」，筆者稱為「社群面向」（D₁）。另一組以藝術家為對象，即「為藝術人才提供一站式服務，包括藝術培訓、創作及籌辦展覽」、「培育年青藝術家及創新意念」，筆者將此稱為「藝術面向」（D₂）。

分析訪問內容可知，APO 總監劉鳳霞將「社群面向」的使命接合到「公共藝術」。她提到，早期 APO 雖然也做「公共藝術」，但多採用「傳統」的手法，如在公共空間放置單件雕塑作品。她認為這種手法「漸漸不能滿足人們對藝術品的看法和訴求」，反而在「全世界藝壇向前發展」的形勢下，日本的「大地藝術祭」創作「新型的公共藝術」，亦即「因應地區、環境衍生」、含有「社群交流」的藝術品。2016 年，北川富朗來港，期間與劉鳳霞會面，向她提出參加大地藝術祭的建議。基於上述關於「社群面向」的考慮，她決定參與。劉鳳霞提到，由於「香港部屋」是「大地藝術祭」一部分，而非完全獨立，因此對大會的理念應予尊重，「香港部屋」對「社群交流」的期望便由此而來。由此可見，APO 參與大地藝術祭一部份建基於其社群面向。此外，劉鳳霞特別指出，若要實踐這一面向，須「在事前設有策展方向，比如人情味較濃厚。」

然而影響劉鳳霞策展方向的主要話語不止 D₁，還有一個以藝術為核心的話語（D₂）。整理其訪問內容，可發現這 D₂ 又分兩條脈絡。第一條主要來自 APO「培訓藝術家」的宗旨，這一點在劉鳳霞眼中接合「推廣本地藝術家到海外」。另一條脈絡則源於她提到，自己作為「藝術策展人」，工作的原點始終是「藝術」。她怎樣理解「藝術」？劉鳳霞直言，作為一個修讀藝術出身的人，她認為藝術可以「感染人」產生情緒反應。她強調這感染「並非單一指歡樂，而是因人而異。她又將自己對藝術的理解接合到其自身背景：學士修讀創作，曾考慮做藝術家，但認為自己無天份，碩士時轉讀「藝術史」。她形容，其關於「藝術」的話語一方面源於一貫的藝術史脈絡，另一方面出於她了解創作人心態。對這心態，她提到兩點：第一是視覺藝術訓練藝術家「創作只為自己」；第二是「藝術」的創作要「框架闊」。

⁸ 根據筆者於 2019 年 6 月 6 日與藝術家的訪問，此名稱為暫名。

⁹ 參見 APO 網頁，https://www.lcsd.gov.hk/CE/Museum/APO/zh_TW/web/apo/apo_mission.html。

its “community-oriented” mission. In addition, Lau pointed out that in order to put it into practice, it was necessary to “have a curatorial direction beforehand, for example, a strong human touch.”

However, the main discourse affecting Lesley Lau’s curatorial direction is not only D₁, but also the “art-oriented” discourse (D₂). From the interview, this D₂ is further divided into two trajectories. The first one is mainly APO’s aim to “train artists,” which according to Lau articulates with “promoting local artists abroad.” The other stems from Lau’s mentioning that as an “art curator,” the origin of her work is always “art.” How does she understand “art?” Lau admitted that as someone who had a training in art, she believed that art can “inspire people” to emotional reactions. She emphasized that this inspiration does not “exclusively” refer to joy, but varies from person to person. She also articulated her understanding of art with her own background: She studied art creation at university, had wanted to be an artist but regarded herself untalented, and turned to “art history” for her master’s degree. She described her discourse on “art” came from conventional art history on the one hand, while on the other her understanding of creative mentality. About this mentality, she mentioned two points: Firstly that visual arts training teaches artists to “create only for him/herself;” secondly, that “art” creation requires a “broad framework.”

Since in the curatorial process of Hong Kong House there appears to be no conflict between the above discourses on “art” and promoting artists abroad, and according to Lau, “Echigo-Tsumari” fulfills both at the same time.

However, there is a conflict between D₂ and D₁. “Public art” in D₁ is connected to “incorporate art into the community, and to enable community engagement into the arts,” meaning the chief target is the community; whereas “public art” in D₂ is connected to the definition and principle of “art.”

As a result, P (D₁: curating public art) will lead to a community-oriented curatorial practice; while P (D₂: curating public art) will lead to an art-oriented curatorial practice. Moreover, it is obvious from the interview that H₂ has a much higher value than H₁. Lau clearly stated that “Whether it is to make art through community, or to make community through art, despite their commonalities, there are different priorities and orientations.” She also expressed that although there is no right or wrong between the two, and the overall balance of the art ecology requires various practices, her personal attitude tends towards “to make art through community.”

Hence, in the curation of Hong Kong House, the overall prediction can be understood by the following steps:

Let E_H be “the experience of curating Hong Kong House,” and the main discourses affecting the curatorial judgment presumably be only D₁ and D₂.

$$\begin{aligned}
 P(E_H) &= \sum_{n=1}^m H_n(P[D_n: E_H]) \\
 P(E_H) &= H_1(P[D_1: E_H]) + H_2(P[D_2: E_H]) \\
 \therefore & \text{From the interview, } H_2 \gg H_1 \\
 \therefore & P(E_H) \approx P(D_2: E_H)
 \end{aligned}$$

In other words, Lesley Lau’s curatorial principle has always been based on art, while the community becomes somewhat like a bonus, just as she said in the interview, “We have noticed that there is such a discourse in Echigo-Tsumari... to help the local residents. This is undoubtedly very good, but can the result be this ideal every time? In practice it is something very difficult to achieve.”

由於在策劃香港部屋的過程中，上述對「藝術」的話語與推廣藝術家到海外未見衝突，而按劉鳳霞理解，「大地藝術祭」可同時實現這兩個目標。

然而， D_2 與 D_1 在接合上有衝突。 D_1 的「公共藝術」是接合到「讓藝術融入社群，讓社群投入藝術」的，亦即以社群為主要對象；然而 D_2 的「公共藝術」卻接合到「藝術」的定義和原則。

於是， $P(D_1: \text{策劃公共藝術})$ 會引導出以社群為對象的策劃行動； $P(D_2: \text{策劃公共藝術})$ 會引導出以藝術為對象的策劃行動。此外，從其訪問可知， H_2 遠大於 H_1 。她明言，「到底是透過社群去做藝術，還是透過藝術去做社群，兩者雖然有其共通性，但也有不同重點取向」，並表示，雖然兩者並無對錯之分，而藝術生態要有各種做法，才能達至整體平衡，但自己的取態是「透過社群去做藝術」。

是以在香港部屋の策劃中，其整體預測可用以下步驟理解：

設 E_H 為「策劃香港部屋の經驗」，並假設影響其策展判斷的主要話語只有 D_1 與 D_2 。

$$P(E_H) = \sum_{n=1}^m H_n(P[D_n:E_H])$$

$$P(E_H) = H_1(P[D_1:E_H]) + H_2(P[D_2:E_H])$$

∴ 從其訪問可知， $H_2 \gg H_1$

$$\therefore P(E_H) \approx P(D_2 : E_H)$$

也就是說，劉鳳霞的策展原則，始終是以藝術為本位，而社群方面則變成類似額外收獲，正如她在訪問說：「我們有留意到大地藝術祭有這種表述 [.....] 幫助當地居民。這一點做得到的話無疑十分好，但是不是次次都那麼理想？現實上很難做到。」

由此可見劉鳳霞的行動主要源於上述兩套話語的衝突。兩者結合的預測，令她採取一種兩者之間並傾向藝術面向的策展手段。比如說，劉鳳霞沒有向藝術家及合作單位作明確指示，¹⁰ 包括沒有要求與當地社區交流。按 D_1 的脈絡，她應該要向藝術家解釋大地藝術祭的歷史與精神，但終究主宰的 D_2 則令她認為，無論藝術家怎樣做、居民有甚麼感覺，她都會接受。¹¹

亦是因此，香港部屋所得的交流結果難言理想。根據筆者與七個不同持份者進行的訪問（詳見表三），如果將「深刻交流」定義為主體透過與他者互動產生龐大的認知轉變，絕大部份都反映香港人與當地社區沒有深刻交流。此外，除蛙王因其一貫藝術風格¹² 而認為交流重要，以及鄭萃恒因曾有其他藝術祭的義工經驗，而看重藝術祭的交流元素外，其他成員均表示交流不重要，或將交流的定義定得甚廣（如「在市內行走也是交流」）。

10 表三的受訪者，包括羅樂敏、陳世樂、鄭萃恒、梁志和、黃志恆，亦提到與 APO 的交流中，APO 沒有對他們就交流給予任何意見及方向。

11 這種認知方法也是主要源於 D_2 的「藝術可以產生各種情感」。

12 關於蛙王強調交流的藝術風格，可參考 Cho (1999)。

Here one can see that Lau's actions mainly come from the conflict between the above two discourses. The combination of the two predictions led her to adopt a curatorial approach that is in-between the two with a tendency towards the art-oriented. For example, Lau did not give very clear instructions to collaborating artists and parties,¹⁰ including the requirement to exchange with local communities. According to the context of D_1 , she should explain the history and spirit of Echigo-Tsumari to the artists involved, but the dominating D_2 leads her to accept whatever the actions of the artists and feelings of the local residents.¹¹

Because of this, the exchange accomplished in Hong Kong House cannot be said to be satisfactory. According to the interviews with seven different stakeholders (see Table 3), if “in-depth exchange” is defined as “a huge cognitive shift produced by the subject's interaction with others,” in most of the case there have not been any in-depth exchange between people from Hong Kong and the local communities. On the other hand, apart from Frog King's usual artistic practice rendering an emphasis on exchange,¹² and Brian Cheng who with his other volunteering experience at other art festivals paid special attention to the exchange elements, most other participants expressed that exchange was not important, or defined it very broadly (such as “walking around town is also a kind of exchange”).

Table 3: Points related to exchange from the interview with seven different stakeholders

Name of interviewee	Role	Experience and perception of exchange at “Hong Kong House”
Lesley Lau	Head of APO	See section three of this essay
Frog King (Kwok Mang-ho)	Artist (Performance)	He believed that exchange is “more for us to learn than to share.” Sharing is “to use Frog King's 60-year creative experience as a constructive gift,” while learning is about Japanese aesthetics, such as “their ultra minimalist art.” (Plates 3,4)
Louise Law	Executive Director of <i>Fleurs des lettres</i>	Expressed frankly that there was no “very in-depth exchange” in the events of <i>Fleurs des lettres</i> , “only chats (with the locals).” She pointed out that it is difficult for writers who had only spent one to two weeks there to produce something profound related to the local community.
Chan Sai-lok	Member of Art Appraisal Club	He thought that “Echigo-Tsumari is about exchanging with the land,” “had exchanged a few words with people during meals, walking around Tokamachi town is also a kind of exchange, albeit shallow and nonreciprocal.” He pointed out that he had no particular desire to exchange with the community where Hong Kong House belonged. Language barrier also proved to be a big issue.

10 Interviewees in Table 3, including Louise Law, Chan Sai-lok, Brian Cheng, Leung Chi-wo and Sara Wong all mentioned that in their communication with APO, there had been no opinion or direction as regards exchange.

11 This cognitive approach also comes from D_2 : “Art can produce all kinds of emotions.”

12 Regarding the artistic style emphasized by Frog King, see Cho (1999).



圖三 Plate 3
蛙王（中）。Frog King (middle).



圖四 Plate 4
蛙王為上鄉丁香座的義工表演。Frog King performing for the volunteers of Kamigo Clove Theatre Restaurant.



圖五 Plate 5
梁志和+黃志恆「津南遺失博物館」(局部)。Leung Chi-wo, Sara Wong, “Tsunan Museum of the Lost” (details).

Name of interviewee	Role	Experience and perception of exchange at “Hong Kong House”
Brian Cheng	Manager of Hong Kong House	Having spent two months in the community where Hong Kong House is, he had frequent exchanges with the volunteers of the neighboring facility “Kamigo Clove Theatre Restaurant.” From his experience volunteering at “Setouchi Triennale” he believed that at Echigo-Tsumari, exchange is more important than art.
Leung Chi-wo, Sara Wong	Artists for 2018 (Visual art)	They conceded that they did not specifically aim at community exchange, especially in the early stages, when they even believed that the research process of collecting local old photographs could be conducted online. It was only later after communicating with Art Front Gallery, the curatorial unit, that they got in touch with the locals. Result of exchange chiefly took the form of expanding the understanding of their work. (Plates 5, 6, 7)
A, B, C, D, E (Anonymous)	Local Volunteers of Kamigo Clove Theatre Restaurant	Some volunteers had visited the exhibition and saw the performance of Frog King at Hong Kong House. They found the programs interesting, but had not had any “exchange” in particular. Though during the preparation and operation process they had frequent communications with people from Hong Kong, so had more exchanges with them, they had no special impression regarding them. (Plate 8)

It is worth noting that Lesley Lau’s perception (U) of the results of her actions mainly come from D_2 (i.e. $U[E_{HF}] \approx U[D_2: E_{HF}]$, E_{HF} being the exhibition experience). In this discourse, “artistic” is connected with “broad framework.” This leads to her lenient judgment on the results of Hong Kong House. It is also because of this lenient judgment that Lau finds no need to change the overall discourse structure even when faced with the conflict between D^1 and D^2 , because “as art allows for any situation, it also allows for failure.”

4. Conclusion

This essay shows that the theory of “predictive discourse analysis” plays a certain role in the analysis of SEA. Due to word-limit constraint the theory cannot be further expounded here. Yet it is necessary to point out that as a tool involving discourse, experience, action and cognition, “predictive discourse analysis,” in addition to analyzing curatorial practices, can also be applied to the analysis of many other issues, such as the change of discourse structure of the spectators, and the resulting so-called “social impact.” It is hoped that further researches with case studies will prove and strengthen the theory.

As for Hong Kong House, one can see from the above that the “exchange platform” that APO wants to create is hardly successful. One remedy is to change the curatorial policy, from “art-oriented” to more emphasis on “community-oriented,” or to develop a new discourse to unify the two orientations. On the other hand, APO should also articulate the kind of artistic experience it wants to produce: Who is the target of “exchange?” Is it



圖六、七（右） Plates 6, 7 (right)

「津南遺失博物館」的搜集資料過程。Data-collection for “Tsunan Museum of the Lost.”

表三：七個不同持份者訪問中，與交流相關的重點

受訪者名稱	身份	「香港部屋」的交流經驗及觀感
劉鳳霞	APO 總監	詳見本文第三部份
蛙王 (郭孟浩)	藝術家 (表演)	認為交流是「我們來學習多於分享」。分享是「用蛙王近六十年的創作經驗給他們有建設性的禮物」，學習則是主要與日本美學有關，如「他們的極簡藝術」。(圖三、四)
羅樂敏	《字花》行政總監	坦言《字花》的活動沒有「很深的交流」，「只是(與當地人)聊過一下」。她指，作家只在當地逗留一兩星期，較難寫出與當地社群深刻相關的作品。
陳世樂	遊藝說論成員	認為「大地藝術祭是與大地交流」，「與吃過飯的人聊過幾句，行十日町，也是交流，雖然是淺薄和單向」。他指，沒有特別想與香港部屋所屬社區深入交流。語言差異亦是一大問題。
鄭萃恒	香港部屋管理人	由於在香港部屋所屬社區逗留近兩個月，因此與毗鄰藝術設施「上鄉丁香座」的義工有頻密交流。基於此前在「瀨戶內國際藝術祭」當義工的經驗，認為在藝術祭中，交流遠比藝術本身重要。
梁志和、黃志恆	2018 年藝術家 (視覺藝術)	直言沒有特別想過要做社群交流，特別是創作之初，甚至一度認為收集當地舊照片做素材的過程，可以網上實行。後來在與策展單位Art Front Gallery溝通後，才轉而直接與當地人接觸。交流的成果主要在於擴展他們對自己作品的理解。(圖五、六、七)
A、B、C、D、E (匿名)	上鄉丁香座當地義工	部份受訪義工曾參觀香港部屋展覽和蛙王表演項目。他們認為兩個作品很有趣，但沒作特別「交流」。倒是由於香港部屋準備與營運過程中，她們與不少香港人頻繁接觸，因此與這些香港人交流較多，但仍說不出對香港人有何特別印象。(圖八)

值得一提的是，劉鳳霞對其行動結果的感知 (U) 亦是主要來自 D_2 (即 $U[E_{HF}] \approx U[D_2 : E_{HF}]$ ， E_{HF} 即審視展覽經驗)。而這一話語中，「藝術性」接合「框架闊」。她對香港部屋成果判斷之寬鬆，便是由此引起。也是因為這寬鬆，令劉鳳霞即使面對 D^1 與 D^2 的衝突 (粗略來說就是「因為藝術容許任何情況，所以也容許失敗」)，也不需要改變整體話語結構。

4. 結語

本文顯示，以「預測話語分析」理論分析SEA能發揮一定作用。礙於篇幅所限，筆者未能更全面解釋本理論。筆者希望指出，「預測話語分析」作為一套涉及話語、經驗、行動與認知的工具，除了能分析策展實踐外，亦能分



圖八 Plate 8
上鄉丁香座的女義工。Female volunteers of Kamigo Clove Theatre Restaurant.

Hong Kong people learning from local people? Hong Kong people inspiring local people? Or is it a reciprocal exchange? Or is it Hong Kong people and locals working together to inspire external audiences (Wodiczko, 2015)? Secondly, what does “exchange” mean? Is it purely to take people on a walk in the city; is it necessary to create antagonism? Or by creating a chain of equivalence to form a new imaginary community (Laclau & Mouffe, 1985/2014)? Clearer answers to the above questions will help APO better meet its aim at an “exchange platform.”

Editor’s note: In 2018, Art Promotion office set up “Hong Kong House” at the Echigo-Tsumari Art Triennale. In this essay, the writer proposes a methodological analysis of the curatorial direction and its relationship with the expected outcome.

析許多其他問題，諸如觀者的話語結構轉變，以及由之而來的所謂「社會影響」等。筆者冀在往後的研究能繼續透過案例分析證明、補強。

香港部屋方面，從上述可見，APO想營造的「交流平台」難言成功。改善方法之一是改變策展方針，即從「藝術面向」改為更強調「社群面向」，或開發一套嶄新話語以統一兩個面向。此外，APO亦宜更細緻策劃它欲生產的藝術經驗：「交流」對象是誰？是香港人向當地人學習？香港人啟發當地人？還是雙向交流？抑或，是香港人與當地人共同啟發外部觀眾（Wodiczko, 2015）？其次，「交流」是甚麼意思？是純粹帶人在市內行走；抑或是要創造對抗性？還是透過創造等價鏈，構成一個新的想像共同體（Laclau & Mouffe, 1985/2014）？對上述問題有更明確答案，有助APO更能做到其「交流平台」目標。

編按：2018年，藝術推廣辦事處在日本「越後妻有大地藝術祭」設立「香港部屋」，本文作者從方法論角度分析計劃的策展方向與期望成效的關係。

參考文獻 Bibliography

(按作者姓氏以英文字母次序排列 According to alphabetical order of writer's last name)

藝術推廣辦事處編：《香港部屋》（小冊子）。香港：康樂及文化事務署，2018。
Art Promotion Office ed. Hong Kong House (catalog). Hong Kong: Leisure and Cultural Services Department, 2018.

Bishop, C. “Antagonism and Relational Aesthetics” in *October*, 2004. No.110: 51-79.
doi:10.1162/0162287042379810

Bishop, C. *Artificial Hells: Participatory Art and the Politics of Spectatorship*. London: Verso Books, 2012.

Bourriaud, N. *Relational Aesthetics*. Dijon: Les Presses du Réel, 2010.

Cartiere, C. & Zebracki, M. *The Everyday Practice of Public Art: Art, Space, and Social Inclusion*. London: Routledge, 2016.

Cho, H. 編：《郭孟浩遊藝三十年 1967-1997》。香港：郭孟浩，1999。

Cho, H. ed. *Kwok-Art Life For 30 Years 1967-1997*. Hong Kong: Kwok Man-ho, 1999.

Clark, A. *Surfing Uncertainty: Prediction, Action, and the Embodied Mind*. Oxford.: Oxford University Press, 2016.

Jesty, J. “Is it Socially-Engaged Art? Discussions on Art, Theatre, Japan, America, and...” Lecture presented at the Tokyo University of the Arts, Tokyo on December 9, 2017.

Jesty, J. 〈社會的転回の論争〉(Shakaiteki tenkai no ronso)，載アート&ソサイエティ研究センター SEA研究会（藝術與社會研究中心——SEA研究會）編《ソーシャリー・エンゲイジド・アートの系譜・理論・実践》。東京：Filmart, 2018，頁221至254。

Jesty, J. “Debates of the Social Turn” in Art and Society Research Center – SEA Research Association ed. *Socially Engaged Art: History, Theory, Practice*. Tokyo: Filmart, 2018: 221-254.

Kester, G. H. *Conversation Pieces: Community and Communication in Modern Art*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2004/2013.

熊倉純子編：《アートプロジェクト：芸術と共創する社会》（藝術企劃：藝術與共創社會）。東京：水曜社，2014。

Kumakura, Sumiko ed. *Art Project: Art and the Co-created Society*. Tokyo: Wednesday Publishing, 2014.

Laclau, E. & Mouffe, C. *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics*. London: Verso, 1985/2014.

Laclau, E. *New Reflections On The Revolution Of Our Time*. London: Verso, 1990/2010.

Lacy, S. *Mapping the Terrain: New Genre Public Art*. Seattle: Bay Press, 1995.

Liotard, J. *The Differend: Phrases in Dispute*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2007.

Mouffe, C. “Agonistic Democracy and Radical Politics” in *Pavilion Journal of Politics and Culture*. 2014, December.

Rancière, J. *Aisthesis: Scenes from the Aesthetic Regime of Art*. London: Verso, 2014.

Wodiczko, K. “The Inner Public” in *FIELD*, 2015, Issue 1. Retrieved July 10, 2017. <http://field-journal.com/issue-1/wodiczko>.