浮動的符號與脆弱的遺跡 —
梁美萍的《好掛住芬達》
(及其他聯想) (譯文)
FLOATING SIGNS AND FRAGILE
MONUMENTS — LEUNG MEE-PING’S
I MISS FANTA (AND OTHER ASSOCIATIONS)

任卓華 VALERIE C. DORAN
2011年的一個冬夜，梁美萍撰文提及她的《好掛住芬達》創始源起。文中提及，她住在香港的曾祖父，緊密縮寫為《香港故事》。其中提到過34年的可口可樂巨型廣告牌已毁於一炬，而環境保護思想也由雅致的澳門街道，傳來一種嚐試優秀的不協調存在感，也因此這標誌成為城市的標誌。是這標誌必到的拍攝景點，甚至成為觀光客的必到站。但對於許多當年澳門人，或在過去數十年間常到訪的香港人來講梁美萍而言，這個招牌不僅僅是一個觀光景點，它已經成為澳門城市建築不可或缺的組成部分，其重要性遠遠超過一般緊密聯系的觀光景點。此標誌不僅是澳門的一部分，更豐富著當地及個人的脈絡。

當梁美萍更仔細審視當下景點時，她發現原先掛在可口可樂招牌後面，一個書畫箱的小招牌也消失了。但吊掛在另一棟建築物的舊芬達學校卻還保留著。因此，梁美萍的作品取名《好掛住芬達》，事實上是把自己緊密為可口可樂招牌，從可口可樂的角度出發，抒發對芬達的懷念之情，過去已逝去，懷念的點滴痕跡仍徘徊於當下。

憑著專注的好奇心，也是帶著狂熱的決心，梁美萍決意要把這個可口可樂招牌消失的原因的幾個訪問，終是尋到它的下落，其實它們已流落在澳門的可口可樂製造工廠。在那裏，兩個招牌被放置在工廠外的平台上，自從它們所在的建築物在2010年6月28日在出世後，就一直被放置在那裏。梁美萍給我兩張照片：分別是可口可樂招牌全盛時期在澳門市中心，及它被放置在工廠外的背景。看着它們，我突然感到一陣沉重的無力感，同樣不由自主的，我的腦海裏浮現著各種來自過去，不同時段卻又相互關連的聯想。

1981年春天，我與一位大學同學從上海乘火車前往雲南省，當我們與一位家人在昆明的香港學生一同誤入一間裝滿各種食物的街邊攤內，晚上入睡前，一陣熟悉的味道在我們耳邊響起，火車長鍾聲傳進來，用手電筒照著我們說：「快來！快來，車上有一位外國乘客看了重病！」我們便立即往火車後面的硬臥車廂趕去，看到一群人围着一個年輕外國人，他面孔陰鬱且昏倒在座位旁，那位護士立即拍了拍他的體溫，說他正發着高燒。在眾人的幫忙之下，我們把這位年輕人移到我們的包廂內，讓他躺在其中一個床位休息。下來的數小時，我們想盡辦法幫他降溫，甚至試圖送他喝水，但都徒勞無功，外國青年並不見有甦醒的跡象。當火車抵達山河站時，我們見到了護士下車接車的父親——一位十分有名的外科醫生，年輕時曾在歐洲留學，他給了年輕人的病況後，便立即致電中央醫院，安排病人入院治療（他說：「不然，他會有生命危険。」）結果，那位年輕人安然渡過難關，漸漸恢復。那位醫生後來來信邀我與我同學到他家吃飯慶祝，我們想帶點特別的禮物表達感激之情，便向護士詢問。她羞澀的回答：「我父親特別喜歡喝可口可樂，但只有專為外國人而設的友善商店才可以買到，你們可以買一些嗎？」當我們帶着一整打可口可樂出現時，老醫生的雙眼都亮了，就好像我們給他帶來了上好的香檳。老醫生拿走一瓶可樂，小心翼翼的放在手中把玩，後來捧着盛滿豆漿的珍貴，細細端詳了整整一分鐘，彷彿勾起了一些回憶與往事，最後才打開瓶蓋，小啜了一口。

可口可樂在1928年進駐中國大陸與香港的市場。但在解放戰爭之後，可口可樂被認定為西方帝國主義的產品，被限制銷售，被劉經國無法購買。1979年，美國與中華人民共和國簽署《上海公約》的七年後，第一批3000箱的瓶裝可口可樂由火車運送至北京，可口可樂自此再次
In her description of the genesis of *I Miss Fanta*, Leung Mee-ping writes that on a winter’s night in 2011, she was standing at the Largo do Senado in Macau and suddenly noticed the glaring absence of a neon-lit sign in the form of a giant Coca-Cola bottle that had hung from an old building on the Avenue Almeida Ribeiro for over 43 years. The vintage look of the Coca-Cola sign, the monumental size of the iconic bottle and the silly incongruity of its prominent position amidst the shabby gentility of the Macanese street, all contributed to the popularity of the sign’s presence in tourist photographs (and tourist-oriented postcards) of the area. But for many Macau residents and many Hong Kongers who, like Leung, had visited the city multiple times over the decades, the sign was more than a tourist attraction. It had become an integral part not only of Macau’s urban architecture, but of the architecture of collective and personal memory.

Making a closer examination of the site, Leung also discovered the absence of another, smaller old sign featuring a Sprite bottle, which used to hang just behind the Coca-Cola sign. But an old Fanta sign, attached to a different structure, was still hanging in its original place. Thus the title of her project, *I Miss Fanta*, is in effect a sentiment expressed from the perspective of the Coca-Cola sign itself; the dismantled past speaking to the traces of itself that linger on in the present.

With the focused curiosity and slightly manic determination of a true artist, Leung set out to discover what had happened to the Coca-Cola sign. She eventually traced it (and its companion, Sprite) to the premises of the Coca-Cola bottling factory in Macau. The two signs had been placed on an outdoor platform at the factory after being taken down in June 2010, when the building they were attached to was sold.

When Leung showed me photographs of the Coca-Cola sign both in its glory days in downtown Macau and in its diminished position on the ground outside the factory, I was unexpectedly moved by their poignancy. And just as unexpectedly, my mind was flooded with associations from a different, yet not unrelated, past.

In the spring of 1981 I was travelling on a train from Shanghai to Yunnan province with a fellow university student. We were asleep in an unusually luxurious “soft bed” compartment that we were sharing with a young nurse from Hong Kong, a stranger to us whose family lived in Kunming. Suddenly in the darkness an urgent knock sounded on our door. The train conductor came bursting into the room, pointing his flashlight at us and urging us: “Hurry up! Hurry up! There is a foreigner very sick on the train!” We all rushed to the “hard seat” section at the back, where a large crowd was pressing in around the only other Westerner on the train, a young man with red hair and a flushed face, who had fainted in his seat. The nurse from our compartment felt his forehead: he had a raging fever. With the help of other passengers, we carried him back to our compartment, and placed him in one of the bunks. Over the next few hours we tried to cool him down and forced drops of water into his parched mouth, but for all our
為雙方恢復貿易關係後第一家能在中國銷售產品的美國公司。根據最近的數據，可口可樂在中國2011年上半年的銷售數量超過了十億瓶。

自20世紀90年代初期，可口可樂就具象徵性的瓶身及標誌，已被許多中國實驗性藝術家所挪用，並重新詮釋成存 }

在20世紀80年代中國「新浪潮」藝術運動的主要成員之一周廣義，在1990年首次推出他到時廣受歡迎的「大批判」系列。藝術家把文革時期的宣傳海報與西方知名的消費產品商標並置，在他的早期作品中，最具代表性的是當有可口可樂標誌的創作。1996年，藝術家王穎曾構思一個藝術計劃，名為《萬里長城：To Be or Not to Be》。藝術家高名潞曾描述該計劃：

「這個計劃將於冬季在位於甘肅省甘肅長城遺址的一個區域進行。以無數的罐裝及瓶裝可口可樂來填補一座高塔及一連高牆。以冰凍的可口可樂與等比例的長城，成為一件無國界、能順行全球的商品。與此同時，長城遺址本身則象徵著一個國家的永恆國境。中國的長城變成了其中的一個象徵，象徵一種變化中的民族主義，呈現中國作為一個新型開放式的消費主義社會，正在被世界經濟形態所改變和影響，也強調出當中那份既接受又抗拒的矛盾情緒。」

當M+邀請梁美萍以油麻地舊區——未來博物館大樓的毗鄰——創作特定場域的公共藝術裝置時，藝術家立刻聯想到澳門那個緊迫回憶的可口可樂標誌。她在調查的過程中發現，原來購買那罐掛上可口可樂報廢建築物的買主為香港一家知名珠寶公司，珠寶公司堅持拆除原有招牌，認為新舊招牌放在一起會有所衝突。也許是基於一種補償的心態，藝術家希望把可口可樂和雪碧的招牌帶回香港，在展覽期間重新懸掛在一棟舊的建築物上，再一起亮起來。梁美萍也試圖找回消失的建築物和空間感，讓空間本身就成了一種歷史的痕跡。藝術家推測的做法把招牌懸掛在油尖旺區的一個空置、等待重建的舊樓。梁美萍認為，這種做法可以讓觀眾更直接地看到公共空間的改變和未來的可能性，也能讓觀眾更清楚地看到公共空間的改變和未來的可能。

有趣的是，梁美萍所選用的是可口可樂的圖像，創造了新與傳統、新與舊、可見與不可見的對比。在可口可樂的案例中，物件作為商業廣告的載體，表現了操控式商品主義那種特殊的影響力，而梁美萍對這個問題的思考角度則更為貼近當代藝術家的個體經驗。在不同的文化背景和社會環境中，藝術家的創作往往能更直接地反映社會的現狀和人們的生活態度。
efforts he didn’t regain consciousness. When the train pulled into Kunming station, we were met by the nurse’s father, a well-known surgeon who had studied in Europe in his youth. Hearing of the young man’s plight, he made some urgent calls and managed to get him admitted to the military hospital. In the end, the young man pulled through, and the doctor invited us to his family home for dinner to celebrate. We asked his daughter what special treat we could bring to thank them for helping to save the young man’s life. She said shyly: “My father loves Coca-Cola. They sell it at the Friendship Store where foreigners can shop. Could you possibly get some?” We bought a dozen bottles, and when we walked in the door the doctor’s eyes lit up as though we were bringing fine champagne. He took one of the small glass bottles in his hands, turned it around carefully as though it was very fragile and looked at it for what seemed like a full minute, before finally opening it and taking a careful sip. It seemed to stir many memories and associations in his mind.

Coca-Cola first entered the China and Hong Kong markets in 1928. After the Communist Revolution, as a Western imperialist product it was unavailable to the masses. In 1979, seven years after the Shanghai Communiqué re-established diplomatic ties between China and the United States, the first 3,000 boxes of glass-bottled Coca-Cola arrived in Beijing by train, making Coca-Cola the first US company to resume distribution of its products in the Chinese mainland. According to recent company statistics, in the first six months of 2011, over a billion bottles of Coke were sold in China.

Since the early 1990s, the iconic image of the Coca-Cola bottle and logo has been appropriated in the work of a number of Mainland Chinese experimental artists, almost always encoded with a strong political or social critique. In 1990, Wang Guangyi, one of the key figures of the Chinese New Wave movement of the 1980s, debuted his now-famous Great Criticism series of paintings, in which he juxtaposed imagery from Cultural Revolution propaganda posters with the logos of famous Western consumer brands. One of the most iconic early paintings of this series prominently features the Coca-Cola logo. In 1996 the artist Wang Jin proposed a project called The Great Wall: To Be or Not to Be. As critic Gao Minglu describes it:

It would take place during the winter at a site in Gansu Province adjacent to a ruined section of the Great Wall and would involve forming a section of wall and a tower out of innumerable Coca-Cola cans and bottles. The “Great Wall” of frozen Coca-Cola would be of a “boundaryless” universal commodity, while the ruins of the actual Wall remain a monument of an “eternal” boundary of a nation. The Great Wall of China becomes an abstract symbol of nationalism in transition as a new, open consumer society is wrought by the global economic system and the contradiction between acceptance and resistance is highlighted.
在梁美芬一項長期進行的錄像計劃《鄉驚何處》(2007-2012)中，她首先選定一個亞洲城市為研究目標。她來到該城市的一個獨特社區遊走數小時，嘗試在一個緊密連結的社區中尋找無所依賴的孤立個體。這些個體可以是無家可歸的老婦人，有精神問題的男子，或是經濟風暴下絕望的受害者。藝術家拿着攝錄機靜靜的跟在目標背後，不干擾，也不介入他們的生活空間，只是純粹的紀錄他們的生存狀況，極致呈現他們流離失所的孤獨感。

梁美芬另一部錄像《塵》(2006) 記錄藝術家在法蘭馬利村莊聖德尼亞斯皇家修道院內一系列的行動。在最近一次的訪談中，梁告訴我她在德法拉村莊附近，平日只會有空，就會造訪這間空無一人的教堂。她注意到日光下的教堂牆壁和雕像都覆蓋上一層細密的灰塵。這個發現觸發了她的想法——灰塵不僅是灰塵，它還代表着過去歷史的層層積累，和現在的生活糾纏在一起。終於有一天，藝術家偷運了一台攝影機進入教堂，收集這些灰塵並放置在一個塑膠袋中，然後帶回香港。直到現在，這些灰塵還保留在她的工作室裏。梁美芬收集灰塵的錄像，與另一位藝術家——徐冰的《處處惹塵埃？》(2004)彼此呼應。徐冰在911事件後在倫敦的一個哈頓街街道上收集塵土，然後將收集的塵土鋪滿整個畫廊的地板，再把唐代楊宗六祖惠能的禪詩壓印在上面。

「菩提本無樹，明鏡亦非台。本來無一物，何處惹塵埃？」

徐冰的作品顛覆了灰塵的物質性，同時轉化（或者減弱）灰塵，使之成為一種意識形態的溝通工具。在梁美芬的作品中，灰塵本身就具備一種言語性上的表現力，藝術家的創作只是確認它、收集它、揭露它、組織它、甚至是保存它，使它活於一瞬間，那就像口可口可樂的符號本身帶有各種層面的意義，內涵豐富，延伸性強，含義能因應思考本質而改變。

撰寫這篇文章之際，梁美芬曾提及對展示可用可樂和雪碧招牌的另一個方案，若一切順利，兩個招牌就可能會被陳列在油蔭道荃仔打老道一幢大樓後方的空地上。如同它們當初被外置在澳門可口可樂工廠外的情況。藝術家也設法在晚上點亮招牌上的霓虹燈，展覽場地的對面有一間由先生所經營的小店。專門回收和翻新被棄置的物品。藝術家同時會在此處放置三個燈箱，展示招牌當初在澳門全盛時期的圖片及它們被放置在工廠外的照片。梁美芬的作品《好掛住芬芳》強調「標籤」的遠大。至於相應的答案，我們可以想像那將會是相當感動的，藏於物質本身，也在我們觀者的心中。
When Leung Mee-ping was invited by M+ to create a site-specific public installation in the Yau Ma Tei district of Hong Kong, near where the future museum building will be constructed, her thoughts turned to that memory-saturated old Coca-Cola sign molding in the factory yard. In her investigations she had discovered that the new tenants of the building where the sign had been dismantled were a successful Hong Kong jewellery company who had insisted on its removal, saying it interfered with their own commercial signage. Perhaps partly as a form of recompense, she wanted to find a way to bring the Coca-Cola sign and its sidekick Sprite to Hong Kong, re-hang them on an old building and light them once more, bringing them back to life, even if only for the duration of the exhibition. Her first proposal was that the signs be attached to a vacant building in the Yau Tsim Mong area, much of which is slated for redevelopment. However, due to complexity of government ordinances regulating the placement of signage, her plan did not come through. Her next step was to try and identify a public site in the busy Yau Ma Tei-Mong Kok area, and find a way to convince the relevant public departments that these old and fragile monuments to consumerism had been transformed, through the artist’s “re-framing”, into something other than commercial advertising.

It is interesting here to compare Leung’s adoption of the Coca-Cola sign for her art action, and the appropriation of Coca-Cola imagery and materials by the Chinese experimental artists mentioned above. For Wang Guangyi and Wang Jin (and other artists since then) the thing-in-itself (whether a slick logo, a distinctively shaped glass bottle or a bright red aluminum can) is inseparable from its utilitarian origins. It represents the ultimate impact of its function as a commercial vehicle — in this case, manipulated consumerism. But Leung’s perspective is more like that of the Kunming doctor: she recognises the material form as a container of different histories and memories, both personal and collective — as a palimpsest of past and present realities. To borrow a term from Lévi-Strauss, it is a “floating signifier”.

A thread that runs throughout Leung’s artistic practice is the activity of surveillance and exposure, elements also present in the œuvre of French artist Sophie Caille. But unlike many of Caille’s surveillance works, which tend to produce an effect of invasive sensationalism, the ultimate effect of Leung’s projects is a kind of gentle clinical framing that brings our attention to what exists in the in-between spaces, in the situations where a person or a thing-in-itself has been jarred loose (whether intentionally or through some act of fate) from the safety of its social or historical moorings — or rather, when it is “floating”.

In her long-term video project Out of Place (2005–11), Leung visited a number of cities in Asia for her investigations, including Taipei, Beijing and Hong Kong. Once there, she would plant herself in a particular area and walk for hours, if necessary, looking for someone who clearly “didn’t belong”, who wandered in isolation through the already-connected community. It might have been a homeless elderly woman,
《塵》(2007)
萊美在法蘭西瑪德蒙小鎮上的聖德尼斯皇家修道院內現學

Dust (2007)
Lecog collecting the dust at The Royal Abbey of St Denis in Marnay
a mentally retarded man or a dazed and desperate economic refugee. She would follow her subject quietly with her camera, not intervening, not interposing: just simply recording and ultimately preserving these specimens of displacement and aloneness.

Leung’s performative video Dust (2006) documents a series of actions undertaken by the artist in a medieval church called The Royal Abbey of St Denis, in the village of Marnay in France. In a recent conversation, Leung stayed near the village during a residency and liked to visit the church in the weekdays, when it was nearly always empty. She noticed that in the daylight the church floor and statues were visibly covered in a fine layer of dust. The dust intrigued her, mingling minute traces of the ancient past with the present. One day she smuggled a vacuum cleaner into the church and began to collect the dust, which she then placed in plastic bags. When she returned to Hong Kong, she brought the bags with her, and the dust specimens remain in her studio till today. Leung’s video resonates interestingly with the work of another artist also involving the gathering of dust: Xu Bing’s Where Does the Dust Itself Collect? (2004). Xu created this installation from dust he collected from the streets of Manhattan in the wake of the September 11th terrorist attacks, when whole blocks were covered in grey ash. He used the dust to create a field spread out across the gallery floor, onto which he imprinted the text of a Zen poem by the seventh-century patriarch Hui-neng:

The Bodhi (True Wisdom) is not like the tree;  
The mirror bright is nowhere shining;  
As there is nothing from the first;  
Where does the dust itself collect?

Xu clearly honours the materiality of the dust, yet in a way, also transforms it (and perhaps diminishes it) by using it as a medium of ideological communication. In Leung’s case, the dust-in-itself is seen as eloquent: the artist’s work here is to identify it, gather it, examine it, mirror it, frame it, perhaps even preserve it, at least for a time. Like the old Coca-Cola sign, it carries all possible meanings within itself — malleable and changing according to the nature of the mind that encounters it.

As of this writing, Leung has hit on an alternative plan to display and light the Coca-Cola and Sprite signs in Hong Kong. If all goes well, they will be laid on the ground at the back of a building on Waterloo Road in Yau Ma Tei, in a position identical to the way they were placed outside the Coca-Cola factory in Macau, and she will light them up at night. In a small shop across the way, where an old gentleman salvages and repairs discarded items, she will display three light boxes showing photographs of the signs in their original positions of prominence in the Avenue Almeida Ribeiro and in their discarded state at the factory. Leung’s project is, in effect, to amplify the dying words of this “sign” from the past: I Miss Fanta. As for the reciprocal reply, we can imagine it. It is implicit, in the material and in ourselves.