游戏英语
教程

房晓溪 主 编

游戏英语教程

房晓溪　主　编

侯宇坤　副主编

内 容 简 介

游戏产业和相关游戏教育行业越来越呈现跨国界的特点，从游戏策划到 3D 游戏设计和开发，国际交流越来越广泛。本书用 5 个部分 32 章的内容全面展示了国内外经典游戏案例并且论述了游戏的策划、美术设计、程序设计及运营全部过程的理论和实践。读者可以领略到原汁原味的国际国内经典游戏的特色及其共有的规律，可以极大地提高读者设计和制作游戏的能力。

本教材适合作为高等学校动漫游戏专业学生的教材，也可作为动漫游戏爱好者的参考用书。

书　　　名：游戏英语教程
作　　　者：房晓溪　主编

前　言

随着计算机技术、网络技术和数字通信技术的高速发展与融合，传统的广播、电视、电影快速地向数字音频、数字视频、数字电影方向发展，与日益普及的电脑动画、虚拟现实等构成了新一代的数字传播媒体。数字媒体艺术专业是一个宽口径的以技术为主、艺术为辅，技术与艺术相结合的新专业。本专业的毕业生需要掌握信息与通信领域的基础理论与方法，具备数字媒体制作、传输与处理的专业知识和技能，并具有一定的艺术修养，能综合运用所学知识与技能去分析和解决实际问题。

数字媒体艺术专业旨在培养具有良好的科学素养以及美术修养、既懂技术又懂艺术、能利用计算机新的媒体设计工具进行艺术作品的设计和创作的复合型应用设计人才。使学生能较好地掌握计算机科学与技术的基本理论、知识和技能，能熟练掌握各种数字媒体制作软件，具有较好的美术鉴赏能力和一定的美术设计能力，能应用新的数字媒体创作工具从事平面设计，网络媒体制作，游戏、动画制作，数码视频编辑和数字化园林景观设计等方面工作的专业技术人才。

本书用5个部分32章的内容全面展示了国内外经典游戏案例并且论述了游戏的策划、美术设计、程序设计及运营全部过程的理论和实践。读者可以领略到原汁原味的国际国内经典游戏的特色及其共有规律，可以极大地提高读者设计和制作游戏的能力。本教材适合作为高等学校动漫游戏专业学生的教材，也可作为动漫游戏爱好者的参考用书。

本书由北京吉利大学房晓溪任主编，并负责全书的结构设计及最后的定稿。侯宇坤任副主编，负责全书的内容编写。在编写过程中，作者参阅了大量同类教材、专著，在此向相关作者表示衷心的感谢。由于时间仓促和水平有限，书中难免有不妥之处，敬请读者批评指正。

编　者

2012年8月

Contents

PART I INTRODUCTION

PART II MACHINATE

PART III ART

PART IV PROGRAM

PART I
INTRODUCTION

What Is Game

1.1 Decision Making

I offer this term in an effort to destroy the inane and overhyped word "interactive". The future, we are told, will be interactive. You might as well say, "the future will be fnurglewitz". It would be about as enlightening.

A light switch is interactive. You flick it up, the light turns on. You flick it down, the light turns off. That's interaction. But it's not a lot of fun.

All games are interactive. The game state changes with the players' actions. If it didn't, it wouldn't be a game. It would be a puzzle.

But interaction has no value in itself. Interaction must have purpose.

Suppose we have a product that's interactive. At some point, you are faced with a choice: You may choose to do A, or to do B.

But what makes A better than B? Or is B better than A at some times but not at others? What factors go into the decision? What resources are to be managed? What's the eventual goal?

Aha! Now we're not talking about "interaction". Now we're talking about decision making.

The thing that makes a game as a game is the need to make decisions. Consider Chess: it has few of the aspects that make games appealing — no simulation elements, no role-playing, and damn little color. What it's got is the need to make decisions. The rules are tightly constrained, the objectives are clear, and victory requires you to think several moves ahead. Excellence in decision making is what brings success.

What does a player do in any game? Some things depend on the medium. In some games, he rolls dice. In some games, he chats with his friends. In some games, he whacks at a keyboard. But in every game, he makes decisions.

At every point, he considers the game state. That might be what he sees on the screen. Or it might be what the gamemaster has just told him. Or it might be the arrangement on the pieces on the board. Then, he considers his objectives, and the game tokens and resources available to him. And he considers his opposition, the forces he must struggle against. He tries to decide on the best course of action.

And he makes a decision.

What's key here? Goals. Opposition. Resource management. Information. What decisions do players make in this game?

1.2　Goals

Sim City has no goals. Is it not a game?

No, as it's own designer willingly maintains. It is a toy.

And the only way to stay interested in it for very long is to turn it into a game — by setting goals, by defining objectives for yourself. Build the grandest possible megalopolis; maximize how much your people love you; build a city that relies solely on mass transit. Whatever goal you've chosen, you've turned it into a game.

Even so, the software doesn't support your goal. It wasn't designed with your goal in mind. And trying to do something with a piece of software that it wasn't intended to do can be awfully frustrating.

Since there's no goal, Sim City soon palls. By contrast, Sid Meier and Bruce Shelley's Civilization, an obviously derivative product, has explicit goals — and is far more involving and addictive.

"But what about Role-playing Games?" you may say. "They have no victory conditions."

No victory conditions, true. But certainly they have goals; lots of them, you get to pick. Rack up the old experience points. Or fulfill the quest your friendly GM has just inflicted on you. Or rebuild the imperium and stave off civilization's final collapse. Or strive toward spiritual perfection. Whatever.

If, for some reason, your player characters don't have a goal, they'll find one right quick. Otherwise, they'll have nothing better to do but sit around the tavern and grouse about how boring the game is. Until you get pissed off and have a bunch of orcs show up and try to beat their heads in.

Hey, now they've got a goal. Personal survival is a good goal. One of the best.

If you have no goal, your decisions are meaningless. Choice A is as good as Choice B; pick a card, any card. Who cares? What does it matter?

For it to matter, for the game to be meaningful, you need something to strive toward. You need goals.

What are the players' goals? Can the game support a variety of different goals? What facilities exist to allow players to strive toward their various goals?

▼KEYWORDS :

goal	目标	Role-playing Game	角色扮演类游戏
Sim City	模拟城市	orcs	半人兽

1.3 Opposition

Oh, say the politically correct. Those bad, icky games. They're so competitive. Why can't we have cooperative games?

"Cooperative games" generally seem to be variants of "let's all throw a ball around." Oh golly, how fascinating, I'll stop playing Mortal Kombat for that, you betcha.

But are we really talking about competition?

Yes and no; many players do get a kick out of beating others with their naked minds alone, which is at least better than naked fists. Chess players are particularly obnoxious in this regard. But the real interest is in struggling toward a goal.

The most important word in that sentence is struggling.

Here's a game. It's called Plucky Little England, and it simulates the situation faced by the United Kingdom after the fall of France in World War II. Your goal is to preserve liberty and democracy and defeat the forces of darkness and oppression. You have a choice: A. Surrender; B. Spit in Hitler's eye! Rule Britannia! England never never never shall be slaves!

You chose B? Congratulations! You won!

Now, wasn't that satisfying? Ah, the thrill of victory.

There is no thrill of victory, of course; it was all too easy, wasn't it? There wasn't any struggle.

In a two-player, head-to-head game, your opponent is the opposition, your struggle against him; the game is direct competition. And this is a first-rate way of providing opposition. Nothing is as sneaky and as hard to overcome as a determined human opponent. But direct competition isn't the only way to do it.

Think of fiction. The ur-story, the Standard Model Narrative, works like this: character A has a goal. He faces obstacles B, C, D, and E. He struggles with each, in turn, growing as a person as he does. Ultimately, he overcomes the last and greatest obstacle.

Do these obstacles all need to be The Villain, The Bad Guy, The Opponent, The Foe? No, though a good villain makes for a first rate obstacle. The forces of nature, cantankerous mothers-in-law, crashing hard-drives, and the hero's own feelings of inadequacy can make for good obstacles, too.

Just so in games.

In most RPGs, the "opposition" consists of non-player characters, and you are expected to cooperate with your fellow players. In many computer games, the "opposition" consists of puzzles you must solve. In LARPs, the "opposition" is often the sheer difficulty of finding the player who has the clue or the widget or the special power you need. In most solitaire games, your "opposition" is really a random element, or a set of semi-random algorithms you are pitted against.

Whatever goals you set your players, you must make the players work to achieve their goals. Setting them against each other is one way to do that, but not the only one. And even when a player has an opponent, putting other obstacles in the game can increase its richness and emotional appeal.

The desire for "cooperative games" is the desire for an end to strife. But there can be

none. Life is the struggle for survival and growth. There is no end to strife, not this side of the grave. A game without struggle is a game that's dead.

What provides opposition? What makes the game a struggle?

▼KEYWORDS：

opposition	障碍	Hitler	希特勒
politically	政治上，贤明地	obstacle	障碍，妨害物
cooperative game	合作性游戏	plucky	有勇气的
consist of	由什么组成	simulate	模拟
semi-random	半随机	surrender	投降
algorithm	算法		

1.4 Managing Resources

Trivial decisions aren't any fun. Remember Plucky Little England?

There wasn't any real decision, was there?

Or consider Robert Harris's Talisman. Each turn, you roll the die. The result is the number of spaces you can move. You may move to the left, or to the right, around the track.

Well, this is a little better than a traditional track game; I've got a choice. But 99 times out of a 100, either there's no difference between the two spaces, or one is obviously better than the other. The choice is bogus.

The way to make choices meaningful is to give players resources to manage. "Resources" can be anything: Panzer divisions, Supply points, Cards, Experience points, Knowledge of spells, Ownership of fiefs, The love of a good woman, Favors from the boss, The good will of an NPC. Money. Food. Sex. Fame. Information.

If the game has more than one "resource", decisions suddenly become more complex. If I do this, I get money and experience, but will Lisa still love me? If I steal the food, I get to eat, but I might get caught and have my hand cut off. If I declare against the Valois, Edward Plantagenet will grant me the Duchy of Gascony, but the Pope may excommunicate me, imperilling my immortal soul.

These are not just complex decisions; these are interesting ones. Interesting decisions make for interesting games.

The resources in question have to have a game role; if "your immortal soul" has no meaning, neither does excommunication. (Unless it reduces the loyalty of your peasants, or makes it difficult to recruit armies, or... but these are game roles, n'est-ce pas?) Ultimately, "managing resources" means managing game elements in pursuit of your goal. A "resource" that has no game role has nothing to contribute to success or failure, and is ultimately void.

What resources does the player manage? Is there enough diversity in them to require

tradeoffs in making decisions? Do they make those decisions interesting?

1.5 Game Tokens

You effect actions in the game through your game tokens. A game token is any entity you may manipulate directly.

In a Board Game, it is your pieces. In a Card Game, it is your cards. In a Role-playing Game, it is your character. In a Sports Game, it is yourself.

What is the difference between "resources" and "tokens"? Resources are things you must manage efficiently to achieve your goals; tokens are your means of managing them. In a board War Game, combat strength is a resource; your counters are tokens. In a Role-playing Game, money is a resource; you use it through your character.

Why is this important? Because if you don't have game tokens, you wind up with a system that operates without much player input. Will Wright and Fred Haslam's Sim Earth is a good example. In Sim Earth, you set some parameters, and sit back to watch the game play out itself. You've got very little to do, no tokens to manipulate, no resources to manage. Just a few parameters to twiddle with. This is mildly interesting, but not very.

To give a player a sense that he controls his destiny, that he is playing a game, you need game tokens. The fewer the tokens, the more detailed they must be; it is no coincidence that Role-playing Games, which give the player a single token, also have exceptionally detailed rules for what that token can do.

What are the players' tokens? What are these tokens' abilities? What resources do they use? What makes them interesting?

1.6 Information

I've had more than one conversation with a computer game designer in which he tells me about all the fascinating things his game simulates — while I sit there saying, "Really? What do you know? I didn't realize that."

Say you've got a computer War Game in which weather affects movement and defense. If you

此为试读，需要完整PDF请访问：www. ertongbook. com