

编者按：在工业化社会中，我们早已难以亲近真正的自然，甚至也远离了古代社会中文人以书画、园林营造出的人与自然相融合的诗情画意。在很多人看来，当代人是与自然相脱节的，但事实上，在当代，我们只是运用各种新媒介来对自然、对人与自然的关系进行了符合时代语境的诠释。邓国源教授的《诺亚花园 II》即以精心制作的假植物取代了原有空间中的梅、兰、竹、菊、松等自然植物，运用多重镜像，透过影像与装置的多重组合，带来了视觉上真实与虚幻的交织，从而也展现了现代人的自然观念。

Editor's note: In the industrialized society, we have long been

unable to be close to true nature, and even away from the poetic beauty characterized by the harmony between men and nature created by men of letters through paintings, calligraphy and gardens in the ancient society. It seems to many people that people in the present age are divorced from nature; however, in fact, in the contemporary era, we have only made use of various new media to give explanations of the relationship between men and nature that conform to the context of the times. In Professor Deng Guoyuan's work *Noah Garden II*, the natural plants such as plums, orchids, bamboos and chrysanthemums in the original space are replaced by artificial plants made with meticulous care, and the use of multiple mirror images and the multiple combinations of images and installations have created the visual interweaving of reality and illusion and show the modern people's concept of nature.

邓国源 《诺亚花园 II》 (2016)

Deng Guoyuan *Noah's Garden II* (2016)

项丽萍 / Xiang Liping

在英文中，自然（nature）和文化（culture）有着直接而有趣的联系，后者是施加于前者的“栽培”“耕作”，以及由此而来的“文化”和“教养”。邓国源专门为本次新加坡双年展创作的《诺亚花园 II》即是对此命题的一个颇具意味的表现。

中国园林是中国士大夫阶层对自然加以模仿、改造的一个文化典范，将建筑、文学、书画、雕刻和工艺等集于一炉，是一个有形的物质的园和无形的精神的场。邓国源的花园装置挪用了造园的方式，呈现了传统和当代视角的转变和差异，以及绘画、雕塑、建筑等传统艺术门类和装置之间的对话和对比。

这是一个由植物、假山组成的花园，也是一个用镜子构成的迷宫。步入这个装置，人们像是进入了万花筒，在被不断复制的镜像之中，会有主体消失的感觉，而不是在万花筒外置身事外地冷静欣赏。

观众进入其中，美好的童年记忆和游戏感会被唤起，也会产生乌托邦的联想，但同时会有疑惑和迷茫：自己究竟身在何处？眼睛所见哪一处是真实，哪一处是虚幻？一如一直以来人类对整个外部世界进行探索时的那种不确定的心理状态，所以人类需要制作地图加以确认。但是，这

件作品同时也让我们质疑了人类对世界的认知和地图制作的真实性、准确性。这件作品让人们感受到了探索未知世界过程中的那种怀疑的、不确定的和不可名状的心理状态，它创造了一个乌托邦，同时也在自我消解。

在《诺亚花园 II》中，艺术家做出了关键性调整，把以往花园装置作品中使用的梅、兰、竹、菊、松等自然植物换成了假植物，并涂以炫目的色彩。另外，艺术家还特别带入了地图的概念。假植物的色彩和假山上的点、线和色块都来自世界地图，象征了不同地貌、地域和国家的色彩在此失去了原本的识别功能。

从艺术家最初使用经过墨染的、传统文化中最具代表性的真实花草造园，到本次作品中以浓妆艳抹的假植物代替，造园这样一种寄情山水、充满诗情画意的风雅之举，如今变成了对艳俗的工业产品的组合和波普式的戏谑，花园成了游乐园。这是对人类和自然山水渐行渐远的关系的弥补，还是对人类大肆破坏和掠夺自然的行为的粉饰？显然，人类对自然的所作所为不再是以往那样“栽培、耕作”进而“文化、教养”的。

项丽萍：2016年新加坡双年展策展人







邓国源 诺亚花园（局部2）





邓国源 诺亚花园 II (局部 3)





邓国源 诺亚花园II(全景) 铝合金钢架, 玻璃(镜面), LED照明灯, 半自动旋转门, 植物, 山石 长11.562米, 宽6.494米, 高3.2米 2016年





邓国源 诺亚花园 II (局部 4)

《诺亚花园 II》

Noah's Garden II

车建全 /Che Jianquan

地图

在《诺亚花园 II》专门为新加坡双年展创作的版本中，邓国源特别引入了“地图”的理念，世界上最早的地图是被用作保护领地的祈祷书，护佑和平与坚固。《诺亚花园 II》借用了这个概念，从这些最早的石壁和泥板印记中，拓展出为世界祈愿的美好愿景，成为和具有警示意味的主题相呼应的隐性线索。

不同的颜色象征着整个世界地貌中的不同区域和国度，艺术家特意将色彩的鲜艳度纯度推向极致，令情境充满波普和时尚的热力，通过让感官在色彩中无限膨胀的方式，增强镜像的冲击力。

点

作品中的点状元素的运用取自公元前 6000 年新石器时代地图壁画的主要表达手段，这些具有绘画性的点状与象征地域轮廓的线条交相辉映，成为贯穿石头和植物的主要语言线索，同时艺术家也借用了中国传统瓷瓶中的花园图式和吉祥纹样，进一步加强在地图构成的云图中为世界祈祷的美好期待。

色彩

色彩是感受作品的关键。《诺亚花园 II》的颜色选择本身具有特殊的文化意义，它的灵感来自地球分区的图表颜色启示，海洋、沙漠、山脉、森林、草地以及行政区划的特殊色彩引发了艺术家对色彩的联想，他将色彩转化为象征性的元素，并将这种象征性实施于山石和园中植物，并打破了地图色标的原有功能，它象征了太平洋、大西洋、欧亚大陆和非洲大陆，也打破了这种识别功能，它象征了整个世界以及世界的丰富性，也象征了世界的包容性，象征了中国与世界的融合性。因此，艺术家打破了色彩配置的位置和关系，更

Map

This version of *Noah's Garden II* is specially created for this time's Singapore Biennale by Deng Guoyuan, in which the concept of map is particularly planted into the work by the artist. The very first map was used as a prayer book to protect the territory and maintain peace and firmness. The work *Noah's Garden II* borrowed this concept and, from these original rocks and clay tablets, expanded it to a great vision of praying for the world and turned into the hidden clues which echoed the theme of warning.

Different colours symbolize different landscape, territory and country. The artist particularly pushes colour brightness and purity to excel and make the scenario be filled with heat of Pop art and fashion. Through expanding people's sense organ in colour indefinitely, the work enhances impact force of mirror image.

Points

The idea of using dot elements in this work is inspired from the Map murals in the neolithic age in 6000 BC. These points with painting quality merged with lines which represent geographic profile and became main language clue through the rocks and plants. In the meanwhile, the artist also borrowed auspicious patterns on classical Chinese porcelain, and further strengthened good expectation for world peace in the cloud picture made up of maps.

Colour

Colour is the crucial part of feeling this exhibition. The selection of colour in *Noah's Garden II* has its specific cultural meaning. It is inspired from different colour of partitions of world. The specific colours of ocean, desert, mountain, forest, grassland and administrative division stimulate the artist's association about colour. He converts colour into symbolic element and puts this symbolic meaning into effect towards rocks and plants in the garden. He breaks the original functions of color code on map, which represents the Pacific Ocean, the Atlantic, the Eurasia and the African continent. It also breaks the recognition function, which represents the richness and containment of the world, and the integration between the world and China as well. Therefore, the artist shatters the location and relation of color configuration and enhances the meaning of fusion. There is no doubt that, this work is endowed with



邓国源 诺亚花园 II (局部 5)
Deng Guoyuan, Noah's Garden II (detail 5)





邓国源 诺亚花园II (局部6)
Deng Guoyuan, Noah's Garden II (detail 6)



邓国源 诺亚花园 II (局部 7)
Deng Guoyuan, Noah's Garden II (detail 7)





邓国源 诺亚花园 II (局部 8)
Deng Guoyuan, Noah's Garden II (detail 8)

加强调了融合的意义。毫无疑问，作品被赋予了更高的文化意义，那就是融合，它既有中国与世界的所指，更包含了世界各种冲突与矛盾的能指，色彩成为作品中最活跃的指向。

路径

单一的引导性路径在之前的《诺亚花园》中具有在环抱性空间中游园的意味，伴随观者的进入，徐徐转动的反光镜面在有限的空间中制造出无限延伸和变化的空间，在《诺亚花园 II》中环抱式的空间变成两个，以单色和多色区分的两个既独立又互补的空间，单一的园游路径在乘以 2 之后，变得更加复杂，它意味着观者将有更多意料之外的视觉遭遇。

多重镜像

多种元素的交织与植入让《诺亚花园 II》呈现出更为复杂的镜像结构，从单色石头和植物到多色石头和植物，到地图元素的分布植入，到艺术家表达的多层次文化含义，全部交织在不断转动构成的多重镜像之中，它们交织，重叠，一扇门后打开另一扇门，迎面而来的是无限延伸的复杂景象，正面、背面、头顶和脚下，就像一个万花筒打开一个没有开始也没有尽头的世界，或者说它是一件需要亲身进入亲身经历的 VR 空间，带你进入身在其间的魔域视界。

真实与虚幻

此次艺术家特别为展览做出关键性调整，即把原有空间中梅、兰、竹、菊、松等自然植物替换成了精心制作的假植物，这些假松假竹被炫目的色彩描绘包裹后，形成亦真亦幻的梦幻效果，进一步混淆了真实与虚幻的边界，构成了一个无限延伸无限反射的超现实魔幻世界。

借此，艺术家提出真实与非真实的关系命题，它涉及现象与本质的思考，现象的包裹遮蔽了本质的含义，生命体被逼真的复制品代替，替代品独立存在，并被赋予超现实的酷炫颜色，以至于让人忽略甚至忘记被替代之物的本相。

车建全：广州美术学院教授

higher level of cultural significance, that is, fusion. It includes not only the signified of China and world, but also the signifiers of all kinds of conflict and contradiction in current society. Color becomes the most active part in terms of orientation in this work.

Pathway

The single leading path had an implication of visiting an encircled space in the previous *Noah's Garden* work. With the entering of viewers, the slowly rotating reflectors created infinite extension and changes of space in very limited room. In *Noah's Garden II*, the encircled space is turned into two both independent and complementary parts of space, which are differentiated by single color and multi-color. With the previous single touring route being doubled, the maze becomes more complicated, which means that visitors may have more unexpected visual experience.

Multiple Mirror Image

The interlacing and implantation of different elements make *Noah's Garden II* show an even more complex mirror structure. From monochrome rock and plant to polychrome ones, to the distribution and implantation of map elements, and to multi-level cultural meanings by artist's expression, they all merge into the rotating multiple image, tangling and overlapping each other. When one door open, people find another one behind. The oncoming and inconceivably extended complex scene, with front, back, head and feet, is just like a kaleidoscope, a world without start or end, or a VR world that you need to step into personally, which will bring you inside a realm of chaos.

Reality and Illusion

This time, the artist made a crucial adjustment by replacing the natural plants, such as plums, orchids, bamboos, chrysanthemums and pines which were normally used in past works, with elaborate fake plants. After being coated with glaring colour, those fake pines and bamboos bring visitors a sort of unreal aesthetic experience. They further confuse the boundary of reality and illusion, building up an infinitely extending and reflecting surreal magic world.

The artist has raised the proposition of the real and unreal whereby, which involve the deep thinking in terms of phenomenon and essence. The packaging of phenomenon covers up the essential meaning and the life entity being replaced by the lifelike reproductions. The succedaneum exists independently and it is endowed with surreal cool colour so much as to make people ignore or even forget the original feature of the superseded substance.

Che Jianquan: professor at Guangzhou Academy of Fine Arts

继往开来 厚积薄发

——“炉火正红——王建中艺术作品展”述评

Inheriting the Tradition and Keeping Forging Ahead:

A Review of “When Ceramic Meets Glass: Wang Jianzhong’s Artwork Exhibition”

谭芳芳 / Tan Fangfang

编者按：“炉火正红——王建中艺术作品展”集中展示了王建中教授从业以来设计创作的艺术精品，涵盖陶瓷、紫砂和玻璃等艺术领域。通过艺术作品全面展现器以载道、器以载美的工艺造物理念。此次“炉火正红——王建中艺术作品展”既是对传统的传承，亦是对时代精神的弘扬，同时是王建中教授职业精神的彰显。这些作品都是在漫漫历史长河中积淀下来的艺术结晶，从这些艺术作品中，我们看到王建中教授的设计独具匠心，艺术内涵丰富大气，古今相融，独具气质。

Editor’s note: “When Ceramic Meets Glass: Wang Jianzhong’s

Artwork Exhibition” is a concentrated display of the top-notch art works designed and created by Professor Wang Jianzhong since he started his artistic career, covering ceramics, boccaro ware, glass, etc. The ideas guiding the creation of handicraft articles, “objects as a vehicle of the Way” and “objects as a vehicle of beauty”, are fully manifested in his art works. “When Ceramic Meets Glass: Wang Jianzhong’s Artwork Exhibition”, in which both the inheritance of tradition and the highlighting of the spirit of the times are embodied, manifests Professor Wang Jianzhong’s professional spirit. These works are products accumulated in the long process of history, from which we can find that Professor Wang Jianzhong’s design is unique in its abundant and impressive connotation and its combination of ancient and modern elements.

“炉火正红——王建中艺术作品展”开幕仪式于2016年11月24日在中国美术馆举行，此次展览由清华大学美术学院张敢副院长策展。王建中教授的艺术作品具有鲜明的特色，他在弘扬时代精神的同时蕴含着丰富的传统文化。其作品在造型处理上深谙中国传统文化精神，巧妙运用一些古代造型艺术中的纹样或符号，既不使人感到突兀，又恰当地将历史感与现代艺术语汇表述方式融为一体。经过炉火烧炙淬炼出的陶瓷、紫砂、玻璃作品，透彻纯净，简洁大气，厚重幽远，高雅清新，都以美的形式冲击着人们的感官，使得观者体悟到亲切感、认同感，并从中感受到王建中教授淳朴的个人品格和文人情怀。

在陶瓷艺术领域，王建中教授的突出贡献是对具有实用功能的陶瓷制品应有的审美功能给予理论上足够的支撑，更在实践中做出了富有成果的探索。他倾注于陶艺造型的基本形态和形式美的研究，探寻其一般规律和普遍原理。在此基础上，力图将陶瓷产品的功能性、经济性和审美性融于一体，使其产生社会意义。他的陶瓷作品在吸收西方陶艺流派

王建中
《永恒系列》之三
38 × 35 × 90cm
1998年





王建中 宇宙洪荒 玻璃作品 11×13×21cm 2006年

精华的同时，并没有迷失研究方向，而是博采众长，努力将传统文化与现代艺术语汇完美地融汇在一起，在表现内外的张力的同时致力于创新变革，在继承中发展，在发展中继承，走出了一条既保持本土文化特性，又符合时代精神的陶瓷艺术发展道路。

王建中教授是一位中国现代玻璃艺术的开创者。他的玻璃艺术品，充分发挥玻璃材质特殊的艺术表现力，用透明、反射、折射所形成的神秘影像建立新的审美意趣，使得原本冷峻的材料、单调的色泽，变得生动、富有想象力，也让观者体悟到玻璃艺术的奇幻之美和作者的品格与情怀。王建中教授从玻璃折射的光色微妙变化中看到了瞬间的永恒，从光

怪陆离的结晶分布和光影的构成中找到了艺术形式的生成方式。他借鉴西方玻璃艺术，并融入东方气派，观众从其作品中能看到汉唐的浪漫大气、宋明的清朴素雅，色彩单纯而具有丰富变化，其作品充分融合了西方现代主义的精华与中国传统审美意蕴的多元开放的体系。王建中的许多玻璃艺术精品，如《望风云卷舒》《回声》《元·初》等，都是经过他精心酝酿、构思，通过玻璃在炉火中的熔炼，又经他适时地识别和决断创造出来的，刺激人们勇敢探求未知的激情，鼓舞人们热爱艺术，热爱创造，热爱生命。这些作品体现了他“采宇宙光华，纳天地神韵，循自然之道，守造物之法”的玻璃艺术创作过程。王建中说：“大澈、透明、火热、冷峻、



王建中 清风明月

光韵、律动，这就是玻璃艺术。”二十年以来，他在学习、实践中逐渐把握了玻璃艺术的这些属性，并致力于追求一种新的发现、新的探求，使玻璃属性得到有效的释放，创造出有文化深度、有视觉感染力的艺术品。

在展览的研讨会上，各相关学术领域的教授、专家对王建中教授的作品和为人给予了高度评价。清华美院张守智教授称：“（他是）集陶瓷与玻璃艺术大成者。将玻璃与陶瓷的审美特性紧密地联系在一起，形成了独具魅力的新的审美感受，堪称时代精品。他一切工作的出发点，都不是将个人名利摆在前面，也从不以个人好恶为标准，而是时刻将国家的需要、社会的需要、人民的需要、振兴中国陶瓷和玻璃事

业的需要放在首位。”中国艺术研究院研究员吕品田副院长评价：“王建中的陶瓷艺术造型很讲究、很大气，对于器皿的起伏、收放都有一种全新的变化，端庄中透露出一种灵动、活泼的因素。他的作品是以艺术的面貌呈现出来，其中有高度的技术含量，不是炫耀技术，而是出于主题表现的需要，出于审美意象表达的需要，结合得很完美。”清华大学美术学院院长助理方晓风教授评价王老师的玻璃创作很好地完成了本土化的过程，在玻璃里面的材料熔化后产生的絮状肌理效果，取得了一种类似于水墨的视觉感受，加上造型切割的纵深感是其玻璃创作中国化的体现。清华大学美术学院学术委员尚刚主任对于王建中教授作品的日用瓷这样评价：



王建中 途·夜 35cm×11cm×81cm 2016年

“适用的并且是好用的，期待建中的作品能够让陶瓷艺术界狂怪、无理的面貌得到根本的改进。”天津美术学院艺术与人文学院邵亮院长评价说：“王教授能够用一些最新的视野、最新的观看模式，可以用自己的作品跟今天的视野进行互动的对话，从而让作品更加耐人寻味。因此，融合和贯通不仅仅表现在技艺上，更重要的是要有现当代的视野，有价值的坚守，在坚守和视野开拓中间，这样一种融合是非常可贵的东西，也真正能够从艺术作品中得到提示，这是好的现当代艺术家所需要的一种精神。”清华大学吴倬教授评价说：“王建中的造型艺术是赋予陶土、瓷土、玻璃等物质以生命和灵魂的美好艺术创造，能够以蕴含于其中的人文精神启迪着人们的思想，激荡着人们的情感和引导着人们的价值诉求。”王建中教授很好地把握了时代精神，将民族优秀文化艺术传统的传承和充分发挥个人的个性和灵感有机结合在一起，碰撞出当代艺术的火花。

王建中教授始终坚定而执着地走自己的艺术道路，孜孜不倦地为中国陶瓷和玻璃艺术发展做出积极贡献。真、善、美是王建中教授的艺术追求，正如他所说：“如果你的艺术，你所创造的美，感动了别人，使人觉得幸福和美好，你便获得了最大的成功和奖赏。”“基础知识的宽厚是创新的源泉，学科交叉和审美意识的通达是创新的重要途径。”这是他一直践行的学术主张。王建中教授胸怀美好理想，秉承包容、豁达的态度和不断开拓创新的精神，运用不同材质，历经炉火淬炼，创造出大气、灵动、有韵味的艺术作品，洗尽铅华，返璞归真，使人感受到兴奋、欢愉、思考，乐享其中。这就是王建中艺术作品的魅力带给人们的美感享受，相信在未来的路上，王建中教授一定厚积薄发，把陶瓷和玻璃艺术推向一个新的艺术高度。

谭芳芳：设计理论硕士

“超越性”在中国当代艺术界的缺失

“Transcendence” Absent in China’s Contemporary Art World

刘礼宾 文 岳中生 译 /Text by Liu Libin, translated by Yue Zhongsheng

编者按：本文重提的“超越性”，实际是作者对当代艺术再次梳理和反思的过程中所理出的当代艺术发展的可能性线索。现代艺术发展的背景、当代艺术的纷繁现象、艺术家的身份都结合现象得以论及。艺术史、艺术理论、艺术评论的各个层次，也由于作者在这些层面的广泛涉猎而有所展现。中国当代艺术怎么来，到哪里去，作者书写了一些方向。

Editor’s note: The issue of “transcendence” readdressed

“超越性”和“介入性”应该是中国当代艺术的两个指向，但在时下，相对于“介入性”各种变体的发展来讲，“超越性”的缺失是亟须提醒的问题。凸显这个问题，明确这一长期被忽视的维度，列举它被遮蔽的原因，所造成的对诸多艺术现象的或遮蔽，或抬高，从而可以引起从业者和旁观者的警觉。正本清源，可以给诸多艺术家寻找一个理论的栖息之地，创作的着力之点，为中国当代艺术开启一扇长久半闭半掩、时开时合的“门”。

一、“超越性”为何被遮蔽？

1. 十九世纪中叶以来，国家危亡的遭遇，对“民族国家”确立的期待，列强侵略的痛楚，艺术服务对象的明确，对“现代”的憧憬与期待，乃至强国富民的迫切感等等，均使“美术”（以及各种艺术门类）转向“现实”，自动或者被迫的“工具化”，使“超越性”成为一个悬置的问题。

从“美术改良说”到“美术革命说”，再到徐悲鸿对于“写实主义”的强调以及与“现代主义”的争论，“国画”一词的出现以及“国画家”的艰难探索，新兴版画运动（亦包括随着印刷业发展而兴起的漫画创作）的如火如荼，倏然由为寺庙、陵墓服务的传统雕塑转为指向现实的中国现代雕塑的出现，20世纪上半叶，各个门类的视觉艺术家均有一大部分在寻找一个“路径”——艺术介入外在现实之路径。在如此国民惨痛遭遇之际，爱国志士乃思自身化为枪林弹雨射向侵略者，何况艺术创作哉？

1949年新中国成立后，服务对象的明确，服务意识的强调，在改革开放之前，艺术家的“超越性”追求多被归类为“小资情调”“风花雪月”“封建迷信”等等，艺术倾向被迫与阵营相连接，此时，再谈“超越性”已经不仅是一个艺术问题。

in this paper is, in fact, a possible clue that the author draws through a reexamining effort to developing contemporary Chinese art. Also under scrutiny are this period’s background, art phenomena, and artists’ identity. Besides, art history, theory and criticism at all levels are touched upon thanks to the author’s extensive reading. And the paper, too, offers an insight into the origins and developmental trends of China’s contemporary art.

“Transcendence” and “engagement” may be deemed two directions in contemporary Chinese art. However, the absence of the former becomes an urgent concern in contrast to the latter’s varieties. It helps warn professionals and laymen of this long-neglected dimension to highlight this issue, study its background, and explore why many art phenomena are under- or over-estimated. Such an illuminating effort may lend artists a support for theoretical explanation and creation, and reveal a secret, untold “gate” leading to China’s contemporary art.

I. Why Has “Transcendence” Been Shrouded?

1. Since the mid-19th century, “transcendence” has been suspended because “fine arts” (and other art categories) became more “realistic” and “tool-like,” willingly or unwillingly, due to China’s suffering and humiliation from foreign invasions, a clearer body of art consumers, and an urgent demand of Chinese nationals for making their home country powerful in the international community.

In the first half of the 20th century, the majority of Chinese visual artists were seeking a “path” engaging art in external reality. China witnessed “Fine Art Reform,” “Fine Art Revolution,” the painter Xu Beihong’s emphasis on “realism” and his debate with those who advocated “modernism,” the appearance of the term “traditional Chinese painting” and the painstaking explorations of traditional Chinese painters, the vigorous New Woodcut Movement (including cartoonists who rose with the growing print industry), and the sudden change from traditional sculpture (which used to serve monasteries and ancient tombs) to modern sculpture relating to reality. In those sorrowful days some patriots even wished to become revengeful bullets at foreign invaders, to say nothing of the community of artists.

After the founding of the People’s Republic of China in 1949, with service object made clear and awareness of service emphasized, artists’ pursuit of “transcendence” was labeled as “a taste of petty bourgeoisie,” “a manner of romance,” “a feudal superstition,” and the like, until China launched its economic reform and opening up. Artistic notions would be ill-intentionally interpreted as signs of incorrect political stances. So, “transcendence” was no longer an art topic.

After the 1980s, behind social obsession with “modernity,” “post-

上世纪80年代之后,起初对于“现代”的痴迷,此后对“后现代”的推崇,再到时下对“当代”的讨论,其实都潜藏着一种时间的紧迫感,对“进化”最高层级的向往,一直潜藏于艺术家的创作之中。这既源自对平等“对话”的渴望,也源自百余年来一直处于“学徒”地位的自卑心理。赶超GDP增长指数的心态在艺术界并不罕见。

分段论、进化论基础上的时间模式构建了一个“咬尾蛇”怪圈,个体陷入其中,在“过去”“当下”“未来”三段之间的穿越、突围、延续,都会陷入模式之中。个人如此,一个国家民族何尝不是如此?

2. 知识分子所推崇的“反思”所蕴含的“平视”视角,使“敬畏”变得稀缺。再加上上世纪后半叶的“打倒”,90年代“后学”的洗礼,本来几近隔绝的“传统”体无完肤,而西学的引进多在“经世致用”层面,而其理论的超越性维度被忽视,这表现在各个学科,各个领域。

俯视使人愧怍,仰视使人失节,平视方不卑不亢。或许,“平视”是知识分子最可贵的品质之一。笛卡尔的“我思故我在”或许是中国流传最广的谚语之一,所有一切,必须放在“怀疑”的放大镜下来重新审视,没有经过“反思”的经验、历史、人物乃至生活是不值得肯定的。

问题在于:反思者本身的知识结构、道德水平、反思动机、特殊时代给他们留下的心理架构很少作为被考量的对象!

敢把皇帝拉下马,有的是勇气、胆量,缺少的是什么呢?借助知识量的占有,很多知识分子把历史人物与自己的水平扯平。“扯平”是“平视”吗?

孔子、老子、孟子等等皆被解构,或成“丧家犬”,或称营营苟且之徒。津津乐道朱熹之时,并非谈他的“理学”主张,而是流传的逸闻趣事。经考证老子可能并无其人,释迦牟尼也只是个历史的虚构。在考古学、历史学、地理学等学科的新发现之下,儒道释三家的核心要义变得虚无缥缈,人们只是看到一把把好似剪刀云彩的剪刀和斧头。

“西学”引进百余年来,各学科奉为圭臬的先哲无数。在突出其在各学科的独特贡献之时,背后错综复杂的知识背景往往被过滤。尤其在当下的语境下,他们的宗教背景,或者我们称之为的“神秘学”背景或者被弱化,或者被剔除。比如美术史学家瓦尔堡和“占星术”之间的渊源、福音派教义对罗斯金的重要影响、牛顿乃至笛卡尔的宗教背景、荣格与《易经》的关系、包豪斯机构中的宗教人士的影响力、蒙德里安的宗教信仰、导演大卫·林奇的禅学背景等等均被忽视。“经世致用”可得一时之利,但削足适履的阉割所引入的学科知识往往是孱弱的。无源之水在本地尚且难以长流,何况在中国?我们严重低估了他们知识的诸多来源对他们的影响。或者我们只是习惯了俯视、“伪平视”,放弃了仰望星空。

3. “简单的二元对立思维”——“社会决定论”——“意义明确论”(推崇“有效性”)——“再现论”,形成了环环相扣的链条,弥漫于创作、教学、批评的各个领域。创作者、研究者对自身的思维模式缺少反思。

“二分法”本来是人类正常的思维方法之一,但是忽视复杂性、多面性、历史性的简单“二分”,从而形成的长期以来的“简单的二元对立思维”却是具体时空下的产物。简单抽象,分成阵营,制造“对立”,目的是一方压倒另一方,是这一过程的习惯步骤。

在此,“分类标准”是一个关键问题。标准在特定时期是多变的,“财产”曾经作为标准,“出身”曾经作为标准,“贫富”可能是当下的主要变体。

modernity,” and current discussion over “contemporaneity” was a sense of urgency, a longing of “evolution” up to the highest level, which had long been hidden in the creation of Chinese artists. This partly comes from a desire for an equal “dialogue,” partly from a sense of apprentice-like inferiority, which has been more than one century old. A state of mind like catching up in GDP growth index is not rare in China’s art community.

So, a temporal mode on the basis of stage theory and evolution theory helped form an “ouroboros-like” vicious circle. Individuals were trapped into it and struggled in vain to survive through the stages of “the past,” “the present,” and “the future.” Incidentally, it is also true with a nation.

2. A “head-up” or equal perspective, implied in “reflection” that China’s intellectuals value most, makes “reverence” a rarity. Even worse, tradition, which was almost separated from us, has been reduced to misery due to China’s political movements marked by “Down With ...!” in the second half of the last century, and the baptism of postics in the 1990s. Moreover, Western sciences mostly remain pragmatic in China: their theoretical transcendence has been neglected, as shown in a variety of disciplines or fields.

In fact, a critical attitude developed from arrogant overlooking or from humble looking-up is a shame or disgrace. Only an equal perspective prevents haughtiness and humility, which may be mostly valued in intellectuals. That explains why René Descartes’ statement that “Cogito ergo sum” (I think, therefore, I am) is among the most widespread in China. Everything must be placed under the magnifying glass of “doubt” for re-examination. No experience, history, figures or life is trustworthy unless they have been “reflected upon.”

However, the problem is this: little is considered about a reflector’s own knowledge structure, morality, motives, and psychological framework shaped in a special period!

For one who dares to unhorse the emperor, he does have enough courage. But what lacks in him, may we ask? With the aid of their abundant knowledge, a good many intellectuals try to reduce historical figures to the same level as theirs. But, is this an “equal” footing?

For example, they choose to deconstruct historical figures including Confucius, Laozi and Mencius as “poor homeless dogs” or low fellows. When they speak about the theorist Zhu Xi, they never care about his philosophical ideas but his anecdotes. They may claim there was no such a person as Laozi or Sakyamuni in history after so-called “investigation.” They, with new archaeological, historical, and geographical discoveries, may even declare core Confucian, Taoist and Buddhist ideas are illusory, which, in the eyes of the public, seem to be scissors or axes attempting to cut clouds.

Over the past more than 100 years of importing “Western learning” to China, outstanding academicians rose in their fields. However, their multiple backgrounds behind their achievements tend to have been filtered. Particularly, in the current context, religious or “mystical” (as we call it) impacts on them are lessened or removed in China. Examples are: astrology upon the art historian Aby Warburg; evangelicalism upon the critic John Ruskin; religious beliefs upon Sir Isaac Newton, Descartes and the painter Piet Mondrian; *The Book of Changes* upon the psychologist Carl Gustav Jung; religious people upon art institutions like Bauhaus; and Zen upon the director David Lynch. “Pragmatic” knowledge can be temporarily useful, but a “castrated” learning must always be vulnerable. This, like a sourceless river, will not last long even in a home country, let it alone in a foreign land like China. Actually, we have gravely underestimated the role of sources upon their knowledge. Or, we may have long been accustomed to “overlooking,” “pseudo-looking head up,” and have given up the thought of “looking up to the sky overhead.”

3. “Simplistic binary opposition thinking” — “social determinism” — “meaning-clarifying theory” (where “validity” is valued) — “representational theory” — all of these form an interlocking chain, operating in art creation, teaching and criticism. However, artists and researchers seldom reflect on their own thinking patterns.

Basically, “dichotomy” is one of normal ways of human thinking. However, if complexity, all-sidedness and historicity are neglected, it will be reduced to “simplistic binary opposition thinking,” an outcome of specific time and space—simplified and abstract, causing sharp division into hostile camps and forming “opposition” purposefully to overwhelm one’s rival, which are the habitual steps of this process.

Here lie a key issue—“classification criteria,” which may change in a particular period: historically from “property,” “family background,”

去除复杂,掩盖问题,减弱问题意识,最后坚持的只能是立足于自己存在“伪立场”。站位易得,“立场”难求。

既然不能寄托于“超越性”,则走向“现实性”。而这个现实性,又桎梏在“社会决定论”强硬的框架之中。由于“简单抽象思维”的隔膜,此“现实”非彼“现实”,而是各种话语,尤其是主流话语所制造的浮光掠影。在这里,“话语”的真实性恰恰是不容置疑的,它不仅是认知问题,文化问题,也是政治问题,国家意识形态问题。

为了追求艺术的有效性,必然强调意义的明确性,如此便需要删繁就简,丧失的是艺术的微妙性、模糊性,而“微妙性”“模糊性”正是艺术的价值所在。比如,将绘画作品削减为一个口号容易做到,但可能得到的只是一张具有明确意义的宣传画。如果还是词不达意,可以在画上面写上标语。

“简单的二元对立思维”恰恰与20世纪所推崇的“再现论”暗渠相通。主客观世界分裂,无论如何再现、表现,都可以视为主客观世界沟通的一个桥梁,但此时丧失了主客体相容、相融、合一的可能性。何况,“再现论”有一层华丽的外衣,那就是科学。当科学求真精神变为“唯科学主义”的时候,它又变成一套更加强硬的桎梏,对其不能有丝毫怀疑,科学所推崇的实证反而退居二位,乃至烟消云散了。

如此之“再现”,其实只是模仿,或者照抄,对象可能是风景、山水、特定人群,抑或是图像构成的第二现实,但除了证明自己具有不明所以然的技法能力之外,实在看不到其他什么价值。

传统艺术形式,比如绘画、雕塑等如此,观念艺术、装置艺术、多媒体艺术等等无不落入窠臼。创作如此,教学亦然。作品艺术形式的花哨,并不能掩盖固化模式的影响,乃至限制。

4. 现实世界的迫切性、长期的劣势地位所导致的民族自卑心理使“超越性”似乎遥不可及。

“平视”是平等对话的前提。但百余年来,国力的衰落,民族的屈辱,经济的劣势,科技的落后,这些集体性的记忆已经深深影响了个体心理状态。我们不但不能仰望星空,还仰视“西方”。

“西方”当然是一个包含着太多信息的术语。它有自己的历史渊源,也有自己的盛衰曲折。但当这个“西方”被抽象化为一个笼统的概念的时候,它的能指早就发生了无尽的漂移。而在中国百余年的历史中,对它的观照、憧憬、反叛、抗争都在强化它的存在。

隔在星空之间的这团云层可能百余年后会淡淡略去,但此时它的存在毋庸置疑。暴雨之下,怎能妄谈“超越之维”?至少大多数的民众是很难做到的。

在这样一种心理之下,即使有艺术家取得了全球意义上的某种成就,当其作品涉及某种“超越性”时,吊诡的是,反而被国内环境下成长起来的一些批评家所不容。批评的逻辑也极为简单与粗暴——这些艺术家借用了“中国传统符号”。

简单抽象的思维往往看不到艺术作品的价值所在以及其微妙性,而最容易捕捉到的就是“符号”。这类阅读模式的背后,其实还是追求明确意义的冲动,仍然是简单“再现论”的比照逻辑。

5. 20世纪特定的知识构成使对中国古代画论核心词的理解蛇影杯弓,也影响到对中国画的阐释。

在“唯科学主义”“再现论”的背景下,对中国古代画论核心词的理解往往发生了扭曲。比如“外师造化,中得心源”。

在现有的惯常阐释中,对它的解释是:“造化”,即大自然,“心源”即作者内心的感悟。“外师造化,中得心源”也就是说艺术创作来源于对大自然的师法,同时源自自己内心的感受。

to “class stratification due to gap of wealth,” which may be currently a primary variety.

If complexity is removed, problems are concealed, and questioning consciousness is weakened, what is then left is a “pseudo stance” for one to hold on. For us a spot is easy to get, while a “stance” is hard to find.

When we cannot depend on “transcendence,” we have to turn to “reality.” However, this reality is shackled within the iron-clad framework of “social determinism.” With the hindering of “simplistic abstract thinking”, this distorted “reality” is but a body of broken pieces created by a variety of discourses, especially by mainstream ones. Here, the authenticity of “discourse” is precisely beyond doubt, which is not only cognitive, cultural, but also political, and nationally ideological.

If we are to ensure the effectiveness of art, the clarity of meaning must be emphasized. Then simplification is a sure choice, but at the cost of subtlety and ambiguity, which precisely reflect the value of art. For example, it is easy to reduce a piece of painting to a slogan, but what is left may be just a poster with a definite meaning. Then, if still the meaning is not well expressed, a slogan may be added to the painting.

In fact, “simplistic binary opposition thinking” coincides with “representational theory” in a secret way, which was greatly valued in the 20th century. When the subjective and objective worlds are divided, either representation or expression can be regarded as a bridge connecting the two, but at the cost of chances of combining or blending them. Further, “representation” has a gorgeous cloak with it—science. When the spirit of truth-seeking in science devolves into “scientism,” it turns into even tougher shackles bearing the least doubt. At this point, positivism, which was originally valued in science, has retired or even disappeared.

Accordingly, such “representation” is nothing but imitation. Though the painter’s object may be scenery, landscape, a given population, or a second reality consisting of images, little value can be seen from his work, except proving the artist’s skills whose wherefores he might not know himself.

It is also true with traditional art forms, e.g. painting, sculpture. So is it with conceptual art, installation art, multimedia art, and whatsoever. Such a situation exists in both art creation and teaching. Therefore, the diversity of art forms cannot hide the effects or restrictions of stereotyped modes.

4. “Transcendence” seems unattainable due to the urgency of the real world and the national inferiority complex caused by China’s long-term vulnerable status.

“An equal perspective” is a prerequisite for equal dialogue. But over the past a hundred years, miserable collective memories—China’s poor strength, historical humiliation, disadvantageous economy, backward technology—all have deeply affected individuals’ psychological state. Chinese nationals would not look up to the sky—thinking about their nation’s future; they would even worship “the West.”

To speak of “the West,” this is truly a broad term. It has its own origin, rise and decline. But when it is so abstract as to become a general concept, its signifier has long been drifting endlessly. In fact, any effort of contemplating on, longing, disobeying or fighting with the West has strengthened its existence over the past a hundred years of Chinese history.

Though such an impediment may finally disappear a century later, its presence is beyond doubt for the time being. In this context, how can we address the “dimension of transcendence?”

Under such a mentality, even if an artist makes certain achievement in a global sense, whose work involves “transcendence,” some Chinese critics who have grown up in a domestic environment will not accept him. This is surprising enough. Their logic of criticism is extremely rude and simple—use of “traditional Chinese symbols.”

With simplistic abstract thinking, one tends to neglect the value of artwork and its subtlety; “symbols” will be so near at hand. Behind this reading mode, in fact, is still an impulse to pursue a clear meaning, a comparative logic of simplistic “representational theory.”

5. The particular 20th century knowledge composition led to a distorted understanding of core concepts in ancient Chinese painting theory and artworks.

Such a misunderstanding occurs in the context of “scientism” and “representational theory.” Let us take the ancient painter Zhang Zao’s statement “*Wai Shi Zao Hua, Zhong De Xin Yuan*” (the division comes in a psychological source) as an example.

As a usual interpretation, *Zao Hua* is taken as nature, and *Xin Yuan* as the artist’s inner comprehension. So, that idea means that art creation

在这样的一种解释中，可以注意到几个问题：

第一，“造化”被物质化、静态化、客观对象化为“大自然”，“万物相生，生生不息”的演变之理、动态特征在这样的解释中完全看不到。“物质化”“静态化”过程和20世纪流行的“唯科学主义”有关，当然，唯物论在此起了至关重要的作用。而“客观对象化”很大程度上是主客观二分法的流行所造成的必然。

第二，“师”，在“再现论”的背景下，多被理解为“模仿”“临摹”。在这个词组中，“师”是一个动词，除了有“观察”等视觉层面上的含义之外，应该包含了“人”（不仅是艺术家）面对“造化”所构建关系的所有题中之意，比如“体悟”“感知”，也包含“敬畏”“天人合一”等更深层的哲学含义。这个问题看起来只是个理论问题，其实直接影响到艺术家的“观看之道”，“创作之法”。

第三，“中”被时代化了。按照对仗要求来讲，“外师造化，中得心源”中的“中”应该为“内”，或者“里”，但是张璪写的是“中”。而恰恰“中”与儒道释三家都密切相关。比如“中庸”等，又和三家实践者静坐、打坐、修行的身心经历以及追求相关。问题是，“中”所普遍理解成的“内”，是个什么样的内？是翻江倒海、瞬息万变之念头，还是现代主义所推崇的精神癫狂，极致追求之渴求，抑或是澄明之境，还是洛克的“白板”，以及“中庸”“涅槃”“悟道”？几种状态，哪一种可谈“得”物象相生之法，气韵贯通之理，万物自在之道？如果联系到“致中和，天地位焉，万物育焉”，“中”在此处更多的是一种修为状态，而非惯常解释之“内心”。

第四，时下的理解，“中得心源”“得”到了情绪、感知、情感波动、灵感时刻，乃至激情。将“心之波动”理解为“心源”，这就类似把河流的波纹理解为河流的源头了。

对中国古代画论核心概念作“当下理解”的情况比比皆是。每个时代都会对以往的概念进行重新阐释，这不足为奇，奇怪之处在于，当宏大的、被删除了超越性的西方学科系统笼罩在本不以学科划分的“画论”之上时，基本切断了“画论”更深层的精神指向，尤其简单化了画论作者经史子集的治学背景，以及个人道德诉求，更甚之，曲解了他们的生命状态。这不仅对于画论作者，也包含我们现在所称的“画家”。

二、忽视“超越性”遮蔽了什么？

1. “主体”问题的被忽视。反映在美术界，“当代艺术家”被单层面化，“艺术家”精神活动的复杂性、个体性、超越性被忽视。

从历史维度上来讲，“文人”向“知识分子”的转变，本来就是“主体”的严重撕裂。知识分子的反思和批判，当遭遇各种壁垒，而没有体制为其保驾护航的时候，其影响力和时效性就更值得怀疑，知识分子找寻自我定位的痛苦也就可想而知了。修身，未必齐家，更别说平天下了。

20世纪以来，以往的读书人一直在找寻自己新的定位，不舍传统，又能积极入世，“新儒家”基本是在这样的时空节点上产生的。如今看来，这一脉在现实中的实践并不得意。

自觉归类为“知识分子”一员的“艺术家”，只能放入这一更宏观的身份角色定位中去考量。目前，“艺术家”如何看待自己的艺术实践、现实定位、传承节点、与西学关系？尽管当下没有多少艺术家做此类思考，但不思考不见得问题消失。事实是，这些问题在更深层面不停地搅动着艺术家的神经，呈现出价值取向，乃至艺术创作的混乱。

雪上加霜的是，对艺术家的深度个案分析至今依然严重欠缺。符号化解读的结果，致使很多艺术家被单层面化了。优秀的艺术家不停地向前探索，而“标签”似乎却不消失。有些艺

derives from imitating nature, and from the painter's own feelings at the same time. However, here four doubts arise as follows:

First, “Zao Hua,” when regarded as nature, gets materialized, static, and objectified. Nonetheless, no dynamic characteristics and evolutionary truth of “endless mutual generation of all things” can be seen at all in this interpretation! “Getting materialized” and “static” is related to “scientism,” which was popular in the 20th century. Of course, in this process materialism plays a crucial role. Moreover, “objectification” is largely an inevitable outcome of dichotomy popularization involving the subjective and the objective.

Secondly, “Shi” is often misunderstood only as “copy,” a verb with a visual meaning of “observe,” under the background of “representational theory.” In fact it should include both connotations involving “humans” (not only artists) and their opposite “Zao Hua,” e.g. “experience,” “perceive,” and deeper philosophical meanings, e.g. “revere,” “unite heaven and man.” This seems a mere theoretical issue, which in fact directly affects the artist's ways of “viewing” and “creating.”

Thirdly, “Zhong” is wrongly given a contemporary meaning. As required for traditional Chinese antithesis, it should have been replaced herein by “Nei” or “Li,” meaning the inner. However, Zhang purposefully chose such a different word, which precisely has close ties with three Chinese beliefs: Confucianism, Taoism and Buddhism (as in “Zhong Yong,” the doctrine of mean) and their followers who sit in meditation for moral purification. Then our doubt is: if we take “Zhong” as “Nei,” what does it mean then? Wild, capricious inner thoughts? A modernism-valued crazy state of mind, or an extreme longing for ultimate perfection? A calm, clear saintly scene, or tabula rasa as put in John Locke's theory? Or “the doctrine of mean,” “Nirvana,” “approaching the ultimate truth of the universe?” Which of them can “lead to” the law of mutual generation of things and images; the flow of artistic resonance; and final freedom of all things? However, if we remember the statement “Zhi Zhong He, Tian Di Wei Yan, Wan Wu Yu Yan,” meaning the heaven and the earth are put in good order and all things begin to prosper when moderateness is achieved, it is safe to say that “Zhong” is rather a show of self-discipline state or kind of religious cultivation state than inner feelings as generally understood to be.

Fourthly, it is wrong to take “the fluctuations of the mind” as “the origin of the mind,” like taking ripples on the river as the source of it. A current misunderstanding is that, with “Zhong De Xin Yuan,” we “get” emotions, perceptions, emotional fluctuations, moments of inspiration, and even passion.

Such examples of “contemporary misunderstanding” are countless. It is natural that every generation reinterprets historical concepts. But it is surprising that “painting theories,” which should have never been categorized like disciplines, are overshadowed by broad Western disciplinary systems, from which transcendence has been unfortunately removed in China. So, deeper, spiritual dimensions that “painting theories” may concern are basically cut off. Particularly, painting theorists' academic background involving Confucian classics, history, philosophy, belles-lettres, and their moral pursuit are oversimplified. Even worse, their life status may be misinterpreted. This is also true with painting theorists and “painters” that we call today.

II. What Has Been Shrouded When We Neglect “Transcendence?”

1. “The subject.” As shown in the community of Chinese fine arts, “contemporary artists” are unilaterally understood; the complexity, individuality and transcendence in their mental activity are neglected.

Historically, the transition from “literati” to “intellectuals” suggests deterioration of the status of “the subject.” The influence and timeliness of intellectuals' reflection and criticism are doubtful particularly when they face various barriers and no official system stands by them. Then it is easy for us to understand their pain in seeking their own position. In fact cultivating one's moral character does not necessarily bring good luck to his family or his country.

Since the 20th century, intellectuals have been looking for a new position, struggling to balance themselves between tradition and the secular world. It was in this spatio-temporal node that “Neo-Confucianism” was born. So far their practice has been unsuccessful in reality.

There are “artists” who consciously regard themselves as “intellectuals.” Only when they are placed in this broader identity role can we measure them. Currently, how do “artists” treat their own

术家本身也在藏家期待、市场行为的作用中不得不屈服，成为符号、专利的复制者。

现实层面如此，在此语境中，再谈“超越性”，仿佛是一种奢侈。艺术家是一个时代最有可能接近“超越性”的群体，事实上，很多艺术家的确在做此类探索。

问题是，对中国艺术家传统转化创作的阐释常常遇到归类于“玄学”的困境，无论这位艺术家动用的何种传统哲学理念，都引不起观众或者批评者的兴趣。“神道儿了”，“玩玄的”！诸如此类的口语评价，可以折射出批评界对此类创作的兴趣索然。这一方面可能在于艺术家创作的无力，更可能是批评家自身对传统的无知。以基督教作为自己精神寄托的艺术家也面临类似的尴尬。

与此相类似的是，高名潞所提出的“意派论”所受到的冷遇。高名潞指出西方艺术史仍然受困于“二元对立”的理论架构，“再现论”依然是其最根本的理论核心。他在对中国哲学的梳理中，期望给当代艺术以传统衔接之可能，由此提出了“意派论”观点，并做了细致的当代艺术梳理。尴尬的是，由于过多触及到“传统”，至今在批评界并无有效的回应，也无有效的分析。一曲独奏，满座动容，而无觥筹交互。

2. “艺术语言”问题的被忽视，背后是对“艺术本体”的无视。“语言”相对于“题材”、“立场”而言，变得好像不太重要。

在三十多年的中国当代艺术的发展历程中，“题材批判”“前卫批判”发挥了作用，但“艺术语言的批判性”在文本梳理、展览展示中一直被忽视。在“事件”优先、“戾场”至上的当代艺术氛围中，前两种批判中的潜在的“艺术语言”线索也被遮蔽。深层原因是对“艺术本体”的严重忽略，更深的原来自于“庸俗社会文化论”的扭曲变形，无孔不入。

如果细致梳理中国当代艺术史，从吴冠中对“形式美”重要性的提出，到“85美术新潮”艺术家在语言层面的探索（比如浙江美术学院张培力、耿建翌有意识地以“平涂”对抗“伤痕美术”艺术家的苏联、法国绘画技法传承），乃至90年代的“政治波普”艺术家的语言特质（比如张晓刚这段时期绘画语言特征的转变），以及新媒体艺术、装置艺术、摄影、行为艺术等等，都可以发现“语言”一直是困扰、促成艺术家创作的一个最敏感也最具挑战性的命题。更毋论中国抽象艺术家的持续探索，实验水墨艺术家融合中西，这些在现在看来并不十分成功的努力。

时下，当代艺术家的“艺术语言探索”已经弥漫出视觉语言层面，或者抽象艺术领域，已经成为“主体”自我呈现的一种方式。“物质性”“身体在场”被反复提及，两者紧密的咬合关系也已经建立，他们的“批判”已经冲出“题材优先”“立场优先”这一弥漫于20世纪中国艺术的迷雾，并与西方艺术界对此问题的探索表现出相当大的差异。如果此时不把这样一种探索进行充分展现，可能是我们的失职。

3. 忽视的艺术现象：

(1) 恪守“传统”一脉的水墨创作被忽视，近几年有转机，比如卢甫圣、丘挺、秦祥洲、侯拙吾、何建丹等。相对于求新图变的国画家来讲，这些艺术家避免陷入二元对立的“再现论”窠臼，从宋元明清，乃至先秦寻找探寻国画产生的源头，于笔墨方寸间，将自己对文化传承的体悟、时代格局的判断注入其中。在风格求异求新的今天，其作品不是让人兴奋，而是让人敬畏和沉静。

(2) “素人”画家被忽略。他们是没有经过专业训练，但基于特殊经历从事艺术创作的艺术家，这类艺术家在中国数

practice, positioning in reality, tradition-inheriting nodes, and relationship with Western learning? Although not many of them think about these, such concerns remain there, which, in fact, trouble their nerves from time to time in a profound way, showing confusion in value orientation and even in creation.

Worse is the fact that there is still a serious lack of in-depth case study of individual artists. As a result symbolic interpretation leads to underrating many of them. Brilliant artists continue their exploring efforts, but the “label” on them remains untouched. Some yield to expectations from collectors or to market behavior, degrading themselves to the position of symbol and patent copiers.

In such a realistic context, any debate over “transcendence” seems to be a luxury. Arguably, artists are a community that is likely to be closest to “transcendence,” many of whom are on their way in this direction indeed.

The problem is: any effort to interpret Chinese artists’ transformation from tradition often encounters the dilemma of “metaphysics.” Whatever traditional philosophical ideas an artist deals with will arouse no interest from critics or the audience. Their responses are “Greek to me!” “Too mysterious!” and the like, which unmistakably reflect critics’ indifference about such creation. This is likely to have resulted from artists’ inability of creation, but more likely from critics’ own ignorance of tradition. Artists who believe in Christianity face similar embarrassment.

Again similarly, the critic Gao Minglu’s “Yi Pai theory” has been coldly greeted. He notes that Western art history remains trapped in the theoretical structure of “binary opposition,” whose core is still “representational theory.” While examining Chinese philosophy, he hopes to connect contemporary art with tradition by his Yi Pai theory, and has done a careful study of it. However, it is embarrassing that his ideas have received no effective response or analysis because they touch on “tradition” too frequently. His innovation has aroused just concern, no interaction.

2. “Art language” as well as “art itself” are ignored. “Language” seems less important than “subject matter” and “stance.”

In the course of more than 30 years development of contemporary Chinese art, “subject matter criticism” and “avant-garde criticism” have showed their significance. However, the “criticality of artistic language” has always been neglected in text study and exhibitions. In an art atmosphere where “event” is given priority and “emotional aggressiveness” prevails, potential “art language” clues in the first two criticisms are no longer seen. For this, a deep reason is the serious neglect of “art itself,” and another further one is all-pervasive, distorted, “vulgar socio-culturalism”.

A close look at contemporary Chinese art history shows that “language” is a most sensitive and challenging issue which has troubled and contributed to artists’ creation, from the painter Wu Guanzhong addressing the value of “beauty in form” to “85 New Wave” activists exploring in the perspective of language (e.g. Zhang Peili and Geng Jianyi of Zhejiang Academy of Fine Arts consciously rose against “Scar” artists who followed Soviet and French painting techniques with their technique of even application of color), to the 1990s’ “political pop” artists showing language idiosyncrasy (e.g. Zhang Xiaogang, whose painting language characteristics changed in this period), and to those engaging in new media art, installation art, photography and performance. A more telling example is China’s abstract artists continuing their similar efforts, and experimental ink painters absorbing Chinese and Western elements, though without much success so far.

Present-day “artistic language exploration” has gone beyond the level of visual language or the scope of abstract art, and has become a self-presenting way of “the subject”. “Materiality” and “presence of the body” have been so repeatedly mentioned that close engaging ties between the two have formed. Their “criticisms” have dispersed the mist of “subject matter priority” and “stance priority” which overshadowed China’s art over the 20th century, showing a significant difference from efforts in the Western art world. So, if we fail to seize this opportunity to present such explorations, that would be our substantial neglect of duty.

3. Artistic phenomena neglected:

(1) The school of “traditional” ink painting. However, recent years have seen improvement, e.g. in the works of the artists Lu Fusheng, Qiu Ting, Tai Xiangzhou, Hou Zhuowu, and He Jiandan. In contrast to reformist traditional Chinese painters, they try to avoid the trap of “representational theory” of binary opposition. They trace the origin of traditional Chinese painting back to the dynasties of Qing, Ming,

量庞大，且很多作品艺术价值很高，比如最近几年出现的“美院食堂画家”汪化。前几年，长征空间推出“素人艺术家”郭凤仪，上一届威尼斯双年展，郭凤仪作品参加了主题展。网上的讨论集中在郭凤仪的“神婆”身份，以及她知识结构中的道教渊源。其实，中国当代艺术界对如此“身份”、如此“玄学背景”的艺术家是缺少容纳度的，本来“素人艺术家”在国内艺术圈一直不被关注，他们的出路主要在于获得国外诸多素人艺术家博物馆的“发现”。网上一面风传着澳大利亚一位老太太80岁才开始学画，作品价值上百万的“传奇”，一面对自己本国的“素人艺术家”嗤之以鼻。这里真是出现了一个奇妙的滑稽风景！更有问题的是，这背后到底出了什么问题？

(3) 艺术界、学院创作中的“有机”“世界”倾向被忽视。如果对此现象不太明了，我们可以设想美国著名女性艺术家奥基弗，如果在中国，她会是怎样的遭遇？

与此相对应，是对“爱”的表述的乏力。2015年11月，配合在林冠画廊的个展，小野洋子的讲座在中央美术学院美术馆举行。在讲座之前，小野洋子用毛笔写下“世界人民团结幸福福福福”几个大字。后期对讲座的报道，多集中在她看似怪异的行为，其实“爱”是小野洋子在整个过程中最为关注的话题，这不禁让“恨意”弥漫的中国当代艺术界尴尬。

其实当代艺术圈、美院都不缺乏有着丰富的个人世界、从动植物世界汲取作品意象的艺术家和学生。她们的世界丰富、富饶，充满着神奇丰富的线条与色彩，那是一个绚丽多彩、爱意充盈的世界。在寻找“意义”的观众面前，她们的作品多是“无效”的。太爱找寻意义了，哪怕给你一个世界，他们也会毫不感动！

(4) 抽象风格（或者“意象”风格）艺术的精神内涵长期被忽视，近几年有好转迹象，比如尚扬、谭平、马路青等人的创作逐渐被重视。出现这一现象，和“艺术语言”长期被忽视密切相关。更深层面讲，抽象绝非仅仅是语言问题，艺术形式问题，它所呈现的艺术家对完整主体性的追求，对传统渊源当代转化的探索，都蕴含着丰富的基因。

在他们的创作中，笔触如有温度的生命印记，颜料交织融合的肌理似张开的毛孔，呼吸着，证明不为再现服务的自我的在场。笔触作为身体与物质触碰的结果，成为身体与物质交互生成的异质存在。当这一存在的目的，不再仅仅服务于客观世界的图像再现时，笔触自身的特性便得以在画布上自由显现。笔触仿佛成为了物质与画家的精神肉体，时而转动，时而狂奔，时而跳跃，时而慢行。画家通过动作牵动着笔触，体验着生命运动的痕迹——上一刻的速度、这一刻的力度以及下一刻的方向；另一方面，笔触自我激活的强烈的在场性也对身体形成强大的吸引力：由身体所控制的每一次落笔都由前一笔所引导，笔笔相生。

艺术家身体内的气息涌动与心念变化伴随双手的游走穿附艺术品。稍对画面用心的观者便能感知这种精神上的气息是如何穿透毛孔，随着呼吸进入心灵。因此，身体与作品的关系不再仅发生于艺术家身上，而向观众身上蔓延，形成一种即时的观看现场。此时，“剧场”存在与否已经不是关键因素。

艺术家的主体构建既需要时刻内省式的自我反观，也需要保持对于“物”的敏感与反思。这双重体验是参透心性于物性的起点，若将这两种省思深入下去，主体构建的过程便逐渐清晰地显现成“物我同化”的过程，并通过艺术创作最终于作品中展现其融合的成果。

由于每个人的心性不同，面对的物性不同，“物我同化”过程及落实在“体”上的语言转译也就丰富不同。物性与心性

Yuan, Song, even back to the pre-Qin period, and translate their insights into tradition and modernity into works. In this novelty-seeking age, their works are not to bring the audience excitement but reverence and serenity.

(2) “Outsider artists” as a group. They are an untrained body of artists whose creation depends on special past experience. They are great in number, and many of their works are high in artistic value. A recent example is Wang Hua, an “outsider” working with a dining hall at China Central Academy of Fine Arts. There is Guo Fengyi, a female “outsider artist”. She first appeared in public in Long March Space years ago. She also attended the thematic exhibition in the previous Venice Biennale. However, debate online focused on her identity—“a witch”—and her connection with Taoism. In fact, the Chinese art community lacks due recognition of those with such “identity” and “metaphysical background.” Domestically, they gain little attention, who expect to “be discovered” by foreign museums open to “outsider artists” just like them. To our delight, there is a success story far out in Australia—a “legend”: an old lady began to learn drawing at the age of 80, and her artwork is worth over one million dollars now! So, what a sharp difference! Ridiculous! What is the matter behind the contrast?

(3) The “organic” and “internationalization” tendencies in the creation of art professionals and college teachers. If we know little about this, we can imagine: what would happen to Georgia O’Keeffe, a famous U.S. female artist, if she were in China?

Therefore, the expression of “love” is pale in China. I remember Yoko Ono, who delivered a lecture at China Central Academy of Fine Arts in November 2015, in support of a solo show at Fairschou Beijing. Before the lecture, she brushed out 11 Chinese words with big strokes: “*Shi Jie Ren Min Tuan Jie Xing Fu Fu Fu Fu*,” meaning that the united world people are all happy. Later, the coverage of her lecture mostly focused on her seemingly odd behavior. In fact, “love” was her primary concern in the whole process, and that embarrassed China’s contemporary art world, which is filled with “hatred”.

In fact, either China’s contemporary art circle or academies of fine arts do not lack artists and students with colorful, personal worlds, who absorb images from habitats of animals and plants. Their worlds are full of rich, magical lines and colors—a rosy, charitable space. However, in the eyes of the audience who pursue “meaning,” most of their works are “invalid.” If people only keep their eye on “meaning,” they would never be moved even for the whole world!

(4) The spiritual connotations in abstract-style (or “image” style) art. Neglect in this field has been long, though signs of improvement have shown in recent years (for example, the artworks of Shang Yang, Tan Ping, and Ma Luqing have gained wide attention). This phenomenon is closely related to the long-neglected “art language.” From the deep sense, abstraction involves not just language or artistic form at all; actually, it suggests clues to an artist’s pursuit of complete subjectivity, and exploration of transforming age-old tradition to meet contemporary needs.

In the process of creation, their drawing strokes are like emotional imprints of life. Textures of intertwining pigments seem to be open pores, breathing and proving that the self is being present, no longer for the sake of representation. Strokes, as an interacting result of the body and the material, become a heterogeneous existence outside them. When this existence ceases to represent the images of the objective world, strokes’ own characteristics unfold freely on the canvas. They seem a spiritual body for both the material and the artist: moving around, running, jumping, or slowing down from time to time. The painter, while maneuvering his strokes through movements, is experiencing the traveling traces of life: the previous moment’s speed, this moment’s strength, and the next moment’s direction. On the other hand, the intense presence of strokes through self-activation creates a strong appeal to the body in turn: every ending stroke controlled by the body is ushered in by its predecessor; and this cycle repeats.

Then, the running energy within the artist’s body, his active mind and his moving hands begin to act upon the work. A careful viewer can perceive how this spiritual breath penetrates into his pores, and into his mind together with inhalation. Therefore, what exists between the body and the work no longer remains in the artist alone, but extends to the audience, forming a real-time scene. At this moment, whether the “theater” exists or not is no longer a key factor.

For an artist, subjectivity-constructing requires both introspection and lasting sensitivity to “object” and reflection. This dual experience is the starting point of comprehending temperament and objecthood.

的交织让外在的“体”变成一种实在的错觉，并只有相信这是一种错觉，才能看到主体的心性与物性是以何种样貌交融于这个世界的，从而成为中国当代艺术家拒绝再现主义、坚持语言纯化的一种独特方式。艺术语言使“物”的实在结构与文化心理之间形成巨大的张力——隐秘的力量。

(5) 对当代艺术家的近期创作转型阐释的无力，如面对隋建国《盲人摸象》、展望《应形》近几年无明确主题指向、符号或者材质无明确含义的创作，很多批评处于“失语”状态。作为中国最具代表性的两位艺术家、雕塑家，为何几乎同一时期出现了这一转向？这是偶然吗？显然不是，是他们在与“物”（雕塑泥，不锈钢）几十年浸润中，激活了身体与材质的互通性，而这与中国人注重触觉的感知方式息息相关！

“物”是什么？“物”在被披上“实在”这层外衣的同时，其实处于了真空状态。“极简主义”在进行极致的“物”展示时，企图以“实在”凸显物性，只是停留于物质的物理外表层面，并配合剧场化的情境从视觉上对观者进行“欺骗”。“形式”只是物质的形貌。即使“极简主义”艺术家参与了“形貌”的制作，这样的“介入”也并没有将“艺术家”糅入作品之中。艺术家还是“物质”的“观望者”，其背景仍然是主客体对立关系的世界观。

关注“物我相融”关系，不仅表现在中国传统文化的各种文本中，作为哲学，抑或玄学，也缺少与当下衔接的土壤。但这一关系，在日常生活层面，依然影响着人们对物我关系的理解，也影响着艺术家在创作过程中对材质的感受方式和介入方式。

“主体”感知方式的特殊性，会导致作品艺术语言的差异性。受弗雷德所质疑的“剧场”中的“物性”，因中国艺术家对“物质”的特殊理解与感知，再加上其身体所承载的历史记忆，在创作过程中将这一感受糅入作品材质之中，反而使作品具备了相对的“自足性”——没有剧场，这些作品依然可以成立。

其实，隋建国和展望的近期创作让我看到了可能性！

(6) 因为不符合时下主流批评话语的理论架构，“隐士”艺术家的被大量忽视。山西大张的自杀，可能是中国当代艺术界绕不过去的一个话题。在过多以市场价格、知名度、出境率为追逐对象的当代艺术界，诸多默默探索、体系庞杂、精神指向超越的艺术家并没有获得关注，任其自生自灭。

三、忽视“超越性”抬高了什么？

1. “主体”的简单化，“戾场”优先、“立场”缺失的艺术创作的哗众取宠。

在当代艺术领域，艺术家也需要表态，通过艺术作品进行言说，表达自己的文化批判性和前卫性。“表态”是艺术家艺术立场、思考状态的呈现，也是艺术家获得“前卫”身份的必备条件。笔者质疑的是，当“表态”变成一种身份从而获得筹码的时候，这种表态已经变得无足轻重，只是名利场的赌注、噱头，和出身鉴定、血亲认祖没有任何区别。尤其值得注意的是，在商业利益充斥的当代艺术领域里，这种表态成了获得经济成功的途径，以及故作姿态而全然没有实质内涵的“前卫”艺术家的一部分，有点类似激愤的小丑，做着文化巨人的美梦。

强调文化多元、突出身份差异、做虚拟的政治批判、对时下全球格局进行后殖民主义分析……在所有的现实政治环境和意识形态控制的氛围中，这些姿态都具有背离现实、反思现实的正确性。但在艺术领域，判断这种正确性的基础是什么？是不是仅有一种姿态就够了？批评家是不是看到一种反叛的姿态，就要赞誉有加？在当代艺术领域，对现实社会的反叛姿态已经具有一种无法讨论的“正确性”，对这种姿态的质疑仿佛

If the two channels of thinking go deeper, the process of subjectivity-constructing will, more clearly, evolve into that of “the continuity of object and self,” whose result will eventually come in the form of finalized artwork.

The process of “the continuity of object and self” and the rendering of language into the “carrier” vary considerably with an artist’s temperament and objecthood he faces, the interaction of which makes the external “carrier” into a real illusion. Only when this is convinced to be an illusion can we see how the temperament of the subject and object are blended in this world, thus forming a unique way for contemporary Chinese artists to reject representational theory and adhere to language purification. The artistic language creates a huge tension possible between the real structure of the “object” and cultural psychology—a hidden force.

(5) Interpretation of the transition in recent works of contemporary artists. For example, little criticism is available to the sculptor Sui Jianguo’s *The Blind Men and the Elephant*, and the sculptor Zhan Wang’s *Morph*, which show no clear theme, or whose symbols and material show no definite meaning. Why did they—China’s most representative sculptors—make this shift almost at the same time? Is this a coincidence? Obviously not. In fact, decades of their contact with “objects” (sculpture clay, stainless steel) have activated an intercommunication between the body and the material, which is closely linked to Chinese people’s way of sensing, which emphasizes a sense of touch!

What is “object” then? Since the moment it is given a “literalist” meaning, it starts to remain in a vacuum state. When “minimalism” displays an “object” in an extreme way, it is attempting to highlight “objecthood” with “literalness,” which remains only at an external, physical surface level, and visually “deceives” the viewer, with the support of the theatrical scene. “Form” is nothing but physical appearance. Even if “minimalists” participate in the making of the “appearance,” such an “intervention” never incorporates “the artist” into his work, who is still an observer of “substance”, and whose background still reflects a world view in which the subject and the object conflict with each other.

The “object and one self in harmony,” which is attributed to philosophy or metaphysics in traditional Chinese cultural texts, lacks a link to our age, because both philosophy and metaphysics are currently overlooked. Such a relationship plays its role in the public’s daily life, and also influences the artist’s ways of perceiving the material and intervening in it in creation.

The particular mode of the subject’s perception will lead to differentiation of artistic language concerning works. In opposition to the “objecthood” in “theatricality” questioned by Fried, Chinese artists have a special understanding and perception of “substance.” Further with historical memories their body has carried, they incorporate this feeling into the material of works in the process of creation, which enables the work itself to possess relative “self-sufficiency”—without theatricality, these works can stand themselves.

In fact, the recent works of Sui Jianguo and Zhan Wang give the author hopes of such a possibility!

(6) “Hermit” artists. They are largely overlooked, whose artworks clash with the theoretical framework provided by current prevailing critic discourses. The suicide of the performance artist Zhang Shengquan may be a topic that the community of China’s contemporary art cannot elude. Countless honest, marginalized and noble-minded artists are left at the mercy of fate in an age when high market value, popularity and frequent public appearances are worshiped.

III. What Has Resulted from Neglect of “Transcendence?”

1. The simplification of the “subject,” lack of stance, and “emotional aggressiveness” priority to please the audience.

In the field of contemporary art, artists need to air their attitudes—their own cultural criticality and avant-garde via artwork. This is a presentation of their artistic mind and stance, and a prerequisite to acquire his identity as an “avant-garde artist.” However, the author suspects that, once such an identity is acquired and then used as a bargaining counter, this airing will be worthless—nothing but another form of bet or stunt in Vanity Fair, nothing different from blood ties identification. Particularly, it is noteworthy that, in the circle of contemporary art where commercialism prevails, this act is a shortcut to profiteering success, reminding so-called affected, “avant-garde” artists who seem to be kind

就是和主流的合谋，但是我要质疑的是，如果一种没有立场的“反叛”沦为“时尚”和投机取巧的“捷径”以后，它的针对性是什么？批判性何在？如果说主流艺术是在给现实涂抹脂粉，那么在我看来，这些伪前卫艺术家是在用貌似鲜血的红颜料使自己在前卫艺术领域“红光亮”。

“仅作为表态的前卫性”之所以成为可能，在于许多艺术家仅将“前卫”视为一种表态，而这种表态和自己的立足点却了无关系，前卫成为一种可以标榜的身份，一种貌似叛逆的、言不由衷的站位。与“传统”的简单对立和盲目逃离，不见得就是“前卫”，缺少现实批判性的“前卫”，就像射出去的无靶之箭，看似极具穿刺性，实则轻歌曼舞，毫无用处。

尽管在现实情况下，各类“他者”的现实权利并没有实质性的增长，但以“他者”为立足点的各类艺术创作却在艺术领域有了独特的地位。一方面，进行此类创作的部分艺术家，或者放大自己的真实边缘状态，或者已经金银满屋、名车豪宅，依然标榜自己的边缘状态，并基于此进行创作。另一方面，以“他者”为处理对象的一部分艺术创作仅将选择“他者”视为一种策略，作为自己进军当代美术界的利器，于是，只有边缘人群成为被选择的对象，唯有血腥暴力成为吸引眼球的诱饵，第三世界反而成为国际展览的“主角”。在这样的正确性中，作品的艺术性无人问津，艺术评价标准成为“题材决定论”的时下变体，艺术作品则沦为理论的注脚，“他者”权利在艺术领域被虚拟地无限扩张。

自文艺复兴以来，“艺术家”这个称呼开始在欧洲获得独立身份，经历过现代主义的“艺术英雄”阶段，“艺术家”获得更加自由的空间，强调“艺术自律”的现代主义艺术史无疑慢慢将这些艺术家奉上了神坛。从尼采说“上帝死了！”之后，艺术家在某种程度上侵占了神坛的一角。尽管在中世纪以及以前，他们更多是为神坛服务的奴婢。

自古以来，中国的职业“画家”“雕塑家”（或者统称为“职业艺术家”）从来没有很高的社会地位。只是更多文人介入绘画，才使其地位得以抬升，但是他们身份的真正获得是在20世纪。西方的社会分层机制影响了中国，“艺术家”逐渐成为一个可以与“读书人”（20世纪分化的一支被称为“知识分子”）平起平坐的社会角色。

这是我们谈论“艺术家”的历史语境。当我们说“艺术家”，我们在说什么？说的是哪个类型的艺术家？

我想很多人反映出的是现代主义的“艺术英雄”们，梵高、塞尚、高更、毕加索、马蒂斯……中国与之对应的林风眠、庞薰粟、关良、常玉、潘玉良、赵无极、吴冠中……杜尚颠覆了现代主义的艺术自律模式之后，我们怎么看艺术家呢？随之而来的社会文化史的研究方法更是从各种角度指出这些“艺术英雄”与社会的更深层的关联性。

杜尚之后又出现了博伊斯，随后的安迪·沃霍尔、杰夫·昆斯、村上隆，接连颠覆“艺术”和“非艺术”的界限，于是有艺术史学者惊呼：“艺术死亡了！”

这一得到发展的艺术史脉络以共时性的方式在中国纷纷登场，各有一批拥戴者。中国当代艺术以其“批判性”“介入性”“问题针对性”为其主要基点，其实和康有为、陈独秀、徐悲鸿及其学生、国统区、根据地新兴木刻运动，乃至“艺术为工农兵服务”政策有更多的潜在的关联性。

上述两个貌似对立的艺术史阐释模式无时不在影响着中国艺术家。

但有两个问题一直是中国当代艺术的软肋：艺术家主体性的自我建构；中国当代艺术语言的独立性。

of angry clowns daydreaming to become cultural giants some day.

It sounds correct to take a reflective attitude in any real political or ideologically-controlled environment, e.g. emphasizing cultural diversity, highlighting identity difference, making virtual political criticism, conduct post-colonialism analysis of current global patterns.... But what is the basis for correctness judgment in the art world? Is it enough to take a single attitude only? Is it right for a critic to praise whatever defying attitude he spots? In the field of contemporary art, any rebellious gesture against the real world possesses “correctness” beyond discussion, any questioning of which is taken as a conspiracy with the mainstream. But my suspect is: if a stance-less, indiscriminate rebellion is reduced to a “fashion” and “shortcut” for profiteering, what are its targets then? What is it critical of? Personally speaking, if the mainstream art is assumed to overpraise reality, those pseudo-avant-garde artists can be deemed to be making themselves striking in avant-garde art with seemingly blood-like red pigment.

Then, why is “avant-garde just as an attitude” possible? The reason is that many artists just hold “avant-garde” as an attitude, which, however, has nothing to do with their standing points, and has become a show-off of identity, an apparently rebellious yet insincere stance. Simplistic opposition to or blind escape from “tradition” is not necessarily “avant-garde.” If any “avant-garde” is not critical of reality, it would be like an aimless arrow, which looks so penetrative at first sight, but will end up feathery and useless.

Although all kinds of actual rights for “the other” have not gained substantial growth in practice, the creation based on “the other” has won a unique position in art. On the one hand, part of such artists exaggerate their true marginal status, or claim they are still on such a status even if they live a luxurious life. On the other hand, others who deal with “the other” select it only as a strategy of rising to prominence in contemporary art. Then only marginalized groups are chosen, and only bloody violence is sensational. Accordingly, the third world countries have become the “arena” of international exhibitions. For so-called correctness, few care about artistry; and art evaluation criterion become a current version of “subject matter determinism.” Works are reduced to the footnotes of theory, and the rights of “the other” are extended unrestrainedly in a virtual manner.

Since the Renaissance, the term “artist” has gained an independent identity in Europe. After the stage of modernist “artistic heroes,” it has won larger space of freedom. Undoubtedly, modernist art history, which emphasizes “the autonomy of art,” has inched its way to enshrine artists. Since the moment the philosopher Friedrich Wilhelm Nietzsche declared, “God is dead!” artists, to some degree, have stealthily occupied a corner of the altar, though they were mostly only servants in service of the altar in the Middle Ages and before.

In ancient times, China’s professional “painters” and “sculptors” (or collectively referred to as “professional artists”) never achieved a high social status. Only after China’s literati joined painting, the former’s status began to rise. However, they had not actually reached their identity until the 20th century. Thanks to the influence of Western social stratification mechanism upon China, “artists” have gradually acquired a social role equal with that of “scholars” (part of whom have been called “intellectuals” after a division in the 20th century).

The above is the historical context in which we speak about “artists.” So, when we discuss the word, what do we really mean? What type of them we mean?

Many, the author believes, would remember a list of “art heroes” involving modernism: Van Gogh, Paul Cézanne, Paul Gauguin, Pablo Picasso, Henri Matisse, etc. And their Chinese counterparts would be: Lin Fengmian, Pang Xunqin, Guan Liang, Chang Yu, Pan Yuliang, Zao Wou-ki, Wu Guanzhong, etc. How should we treat artists after Marcel Duchamp overturned the art autonomy model in modernism? Then, the approaches to socio-cultural history revealed deeper associations between “art heroes” and society from a variety of perspectives.

Duchamp was followed by Joseph Beuys, Andy Warhol, Jeff Koons, and Takashi Murakami, who successively subverted the bounds between “art” and “non-art.” It is no surprise that some art historians announced: “Art is dead!”

Synchronically, this developmental trend of art history is replayed in China, having won waves of supporters. But contemporary Chinese art is mainly based on “criticality,” “intervention,” and “problem-orientation,” which, in fact, have more potential connections with thinkers like Kang Youwei and Chen Duxiu, Xu Beihong and his followers, the KMT-controlled areas, New Woodcut Movement in base areas, and even CPC’s

在潮流的激荡中,在现今的政治、经济、文化语境的笼罩下,很少有青年人能成为时代的“冲浪者”。技术难以对付情景的时候,做一两声尖叫,或许能引来更多的关注,这也就是“戾场”的由来。纵观这十几年的中国当代艺术,多少青年艺术家采用这样的方式,并策略性地充当“事件艺术家”,当短暂的浪花平息之时,发现自己只是一个尴尬的裸奔哥?

不“立”何来“场”?中国当代艺术的转型期是否已经到来?包括我在内的所有人可能都只感觉到一个朦胧的意象。但基于对自我主体的塑造与深入挖掘、对社会问题更细致关注的心态已经出现,这不能不让人惊喜。

“从戾场到立场”与其说是一个判断,不如说是一份期盼。抛出这个问题本身可能会引来更多的警觉,这份警觉不仅对艺术创作有益,对批评行为、策展活动、当代艺术史的书写可能都有所价值?

2. “艺术语言”的大量简单模仿:比如“德表风”“里希特风”“霍克尼风”“李松松风”“王音风”,当下市场推动的“视觉抽象”风,前些年海外市场大行其道的“抽象水墨风”等等。

在摄影术发明之后,艺术家便在借用各种艺术手段“突围”。某种程度上说,一部西方现代主义艺术史可以视为一部艺术家突围史。更罔论伴随着印刷术的进步,各时期视觉资源、经典作品通过书籍的传播,现在随着网络、移动终端的兴起,世界已经形成一个图像的海洋。除去我们惯称的“自然”(Nature)之外(其实我们观看“自然”的方式,也受到了图像传播的极大影响),艺术家如何处理这一“海洋”,已经是一个无法回避的问题。

中国改革开放之后,艺术界更多遇到的是西方艺术作品图像的轰炸问题。当时能看到比较精美的印刷图片,或更幸运,能出国看到原作的艺术家,在某种程度上都改变了原有的对艺术作品的模糊认识,澄清了对这类艺术形式的误读。当然,他们也感知到一种重压。面对西方绘画语言的精彩纷呈,一部分艺术家选择了模仿,或者不自觉地撞车,由此也引发了当代艺术批评对上世纪80年代部分艺术家的否定。另一部分艺术家在语言自觉的自我提示下,开始了漫长的艺术语言探索之路。

在中国艺术界,“与图像的对话”催生了几个重要事件:

(1) 80年代初乡土写实主义绘画的诞生;(2)与之相对应的杭州“池社”艺术家对四川画派部分艺术家的批判,对平涂技法的选择;(3)尽管出发点与“池社”不同,“北方艺术团体”部分艺术家也在风格上选择了忽略激情的冷静笔触;(4)上世纪90年代早期“新生代艺术家”以及“政治波普”艺术的出现;(5)世纪交接时“里希特式平涂技法”的流行,一直持续至2008年里希特个展在中国美术馆举办;(6)随之是“李松松式厚涂技法”各种样式的时下流行,伴随着后两者的,是在“解构主义”的名义下,各种“简单挪用方法”的泛滥,政治家、明星头像成为最多出现在画面中的符号;(7)2006年左右,第四代批评家开始在这个问题上发力,并侧面导致了“抽象艺术”的“繁荣”。可是10年不到,我们悲哀地发现,大多数抽象艺术便成为了“装饰画”,或者“观念的工具画”。尽管有奥利瓦的中国行为兴奋剂,但“抽象”正在被市场提前透支。

其实“与图像的对话”远远没有结束……在中国当代艺术已经受到更多关注的当下,在市场起主导作用、批评逐渐式微的处境中,在国外艺术大师频频来访,引起一个个潮起潮落(里希特风、基弗风、弗洛伊德风、霍克尼风,或者即将爆发的……)的今天,这一“无根之木,无源之水”的境遇如何改变?又如

policy that “Art Should Serve the Workers, Peasants and Soldiers.”

The above two interpretation modes of art history, seemingly opposite to each other, always exert an influence upon China's artists.

However, there have been two soft spots in contemporary Chinese art: self-construal in artists' subjectivity; language independence in contemporary Chinese art.

In the context of current political, economic, and cultural storms, few young people can become “surfers” of their times. When they cannot tackle a difficult situation with their art skills, one or two outcries may capture attention, which explains why “emotional aggressiveness” occurs. A look at the past decade of contemporary Chinese art will show that many young artists choose this method, and strategically act as “event artists,” who eventually find themselves just an art stalker when short-lived pomp dies out!

How can one develop his “standpoint” if he is not “independent?” Has the transitional period of contemporary Chinese art come? Everyone, including the author, may have just a vague idea about this. Nonetheless, it is amazingly encouraging that a new state of mind has emerged, which is based on self-construal and probing as the subject, and pays further detailed attention to social concerns.

“Going from emotional aggressiveness to stance” is more an expectation than a judgment. Such a concern itself may draw more awareness, which may be of value to creation, criticism, curatorial activities, and contemporary art history writing?

2. Mere, massive imitation of “artistic language.” Artistic fashions come and go, successively after “German expressionism,” “Gerhard Richter,” “David Hockney,” “Li Songsong,” “Wang Yin,” “abstract ink” popular in overseas markets a few years ago, currently market-driven “visual abstraction,” etc.

After the invention of photography, artists borrowed a variety of media for “breakthroughs.” To a certain extent, a modernist Western art history can be seen as a history of breakthroughs. With the progress of printing, visual resources and classic works of individual periods spread extensively via books. Currently, with the rise of internet and mobile terminals, our world has already been a sea of images. Except to “Nature” as we habitually call it (in fact, even our ways of seeing “Nature” have greatly been affected by image communication), how to deal with this “sea” is already a challenging issue artists have to confront.

After China's reform and opening up, art world encountered a more pressing problem: image bombing from Western artworks. Chinese artists who were able to see exquisite print pictures, or who had the luck to go abroad and see original Western works changed their vague understanding of such works to some extent, and corrected their previous misinterpretation. Of course, they felt pressure on them. In the face of striking Western painting language, some Chinese artists chose to imitate, or unconsciously resemble their Western counterparts, which led to contemporary critics' negation of part of the 1980s artists. Others, with the hint of language self-consciousness, began a long way to explore artistic language.

In China's art circles, “the dialogue with images” triggered several significant events:

(1) Local realism appeared in the early 1980s. (2) At the same time, Hangzhou-based “Pond Society” artists criticized part of Sichuan Painters, and chose the technique of even application of color. (3) Though from different starting points, some “Northern Art Club” artists chose calming strokes in style, neglecting passionate ones. (4) “New Generation Artists” and “Political Pop” artists rose in the early 1990s. (5) “Richter-style even application of color” became widespread at the turn of 21st century until a Richter solo show was held at National Art Museum of China in 2008. (6) “Li Songsong-style impasto” gained popularity in various forms. Along with the latter two, all kinds of “simple appropriation” flooded in the name of “deconstruction,” and head portraits of politicians and film stars were most common symbols in paintings. (7) China's fourth generation critics began to attack this situation around 2006, and indirectly contributed to the “prosperity” of “abstract art.” Unfortunately, even within 10 years, we are sad to see that most of abstract art has turned into “decorative painting,” or “tool painting of concepts.” Though stimulated by Archile Bonito Oliva's visit to China, such an art is being overdrafted by the market in advance.

In fact, that “dialogue with images” is far from ending up. How will such an artistically rootless trend improve, when contemporary Chinese art has caused more concern; when the market is playing a leading role, and criticism is declining; and when foreign art masters continually visits China, causing rounds of imitation (after Richter, Anselm Kiefer,

何谈论中国当代艺术的语言逻辑、自足特征? 已经成为一个不得不回答的问题!

从上世纪 80 年代, 王广义基于对贡布里希“图式修正”概念的个人理解开始了《后古典》系列作品的创作, 到 90 年代《大批判》使他成为“政治波普”的重要代表人物, 中国画家和“图像”的对话持续展开, 到现在已经 30 年了。

在所谓的“图像时代”, “与图像的对话”可以和以前画家的“对景写生”相提并论, 不过现在更像是“对镜写生”, 这个“镜子”就是图像所构建的“第二现实”。时下绘画界问题出在更多画家难以审视图像, 只是将它作为现实的替代品, 既往速写工具的替代品, 绘画的“拐杖”。对图像的简单处理常见两种方法: 一是采取“小李飞刀式”的短平快方法, 对图像进行简单截取、挪用、嫁接、对比; 二是“金钟罩式”的滤镜化的处理方法, 在图像之上覆盖上一层个人化“笔法”。前者偏重题材, 后者偏重技法。体弱者对“拐杖”更多是依赖, 或者产生近乎“恋物癖”的眷恋, 而非审视, 这无疑和任何图像理论都形成了南辕北辙的关系。

在电子媒体时代, 绘画存在的空间愈加狭小, 这可能是一种悲哀, 但如果运用好这个狭小的空间所给出的“局限性”, 或许能带给画家更多的创作可能性。面对“图像”的压力, 如何面对现实? 如何面对虚拟? 好像都不再是单极的问题。具体的创作缝隙要由画家来寻找、扩大, 并实现为具体的作品。“破图”不失为一种选择, “集合”其成果便可以呈现一代画家的努力轨迹。

3. 以“点子”为核心, 动用各种材质, 视觉化为“标准当代艺术作品”的情况泛滥。

各种类型的“标准当代艺术”喧嚣于当下, 比如:

(1) 标准化了的“坏画”。微信公众号“绘画艺术坏蛋店”里的“坏”画艺术家其实很多只是为了“坏”而怪。一个不会颠球的足球运动员, 直接抱着球冲向球门, 把足球当橄榄球打, 谁又能说什么呢? 即使看似“怪”, 也基本陷入在套路里面。一点涂鸦, 几件现成品钉在画布上, 再写几句英文脏话; 里希特+霍克尼+视错觉+青春记忆等等。写实+偶然肌理(俗称“鼻涕画”)。一种样式一旦出现, 立即泛滥成灾。

(2) 材料转化试验品。与绘画类似, 用一截木头局部雕出一个西瓜, 涂一些鲜艳的色; 用硅胶翻制一个正在融化的石碑, 或者坦克; 把石头雕成的锁链和铁质锁链组合在一起; 用透明塑料复制一下过安检的衣物等等。基本是静态“蒙太奇”, 简单的二元转化。

在现在的当代艺术展览中, 还有诸多类型化的当代艺术创作, 在表面炫酷的背后, 其实是简单的思维习惯在作祟。

结语

重提“超越性”的目的在于期待出现真正的平视视角, 平视是完整的人之间的问题交流的基础, 而不受没经思考的思维模式、知识结构以及民族心理的限制。正本清源, 涤荡以往对中国当代艺术的猎奇眼光以及意识形态滤镜。真正的平视, 并不需要自绝于“超越性”, 而是对其传统渊源、现实处境、个人经历的充分尊重。

当然, 也是自重!

2016年9月2日于中央美术学院

刘礼宾: 中央美术学院美术学研究所副研究员 博士
岳中生: 中国民航大学副教授

Lucian Freud, Hockney, or forthcoming...)? Further, how can we address the language logic and self-sufficient characteristics of contemporary Chinese art? Indeed, a tough question we have to answer!

The painter Wang Guangyi, based on his personal understanding of E.H. Gombrich's "schema and correction," began his "The Post-classical" series in the 1980s. About ten years later, his "Mass Criticism" series made him an important representative of "Political Pop." And the dialogue between Chinese painters and "images" has been continuing for three decades now.

In a so-called "image age," the "dialogue with images" can be mentioned in the same breath with "painting from nature," as in the past. But the present case is more like "painting from the mirror," a "second reality" built with images. A serious problem is that a great number of painters are unable to examine images, which they just take as a substitute for reality, for past sketch tools, and as "a pair of crutches" for painting. There are two simple, common ways of image processing: 1) quick interception, transferring, and contrast; 2) filter-type treatment, i.e. covering individualized "strokes" onto images. The former focuses on subject matter while the latter on techniques. Undoubtedly, this has nothing to do with any image theory, as an invalid depends on rather than examines his crutches, for which he might develop a liking close to "fetishism."

Admittedly, to our sadness, the survival space for painting is gradually narrower in an era of electronic media. However, good use of the "limitations" provided by this small space may bring artists additional creative possibilities. Under the pressure of "images," how should artists face reality? And the virtual? Seemingly no longer unilateral problems. Specifically, the creation space has to be discovered and enlarged by painters before artworks are materialized. "Image breaking" may, after all, be an option, and the trajectory of a generation of painters' efforts can be displayed by "combining" its results.

3. "Idea-centered" overuse of materials before visualizing the idea into a "standard contemporary art work".

All sorts of "standard contemporary art" are reigning as follows:

(1) Standardized "bad paintings." An example is seen in a WeChat public account "Painting Art Bad Guys Shop," in which many artists seem bizarre just to make their works "bad." What can we say if we find a football player, who even does not know how to juggle a ball, directly rushing to the goal with the ball held with two hands as in a rugby match? Even so, there are some tricks behind them: a little graffiti, a few pieces of ready-made articles nailed on the canvas, and then a few English dirty words; Richter + Hockey + visual illusion + youth memory; realism + accidental texture (colloquially known as "snot painting"). Once a new pattern emerges, it will be imitated immediately, widely and excessively.

(2) Experimental articles of material conversion. For example, as in painting, a chunk of wood is locally carved into a watermelon, then painted with bright colors; silica gel is made into a melting stone tablet or tank; a chain carved out of stone is combined with an iron one; transparent plastic is used to copy clothing under security check. Basically, those are created by static "montage," a simple dualistic transformation.

In present-day contemporary art exhibitions, there are also many other stereotyped contemporary artworks. What actually support those cool show-offs are simplistic thinking habits always working there.

Conclusion

The purpose of readdressing "transcendence" is to expect the arrival of a true, "equal" perspective, which is the basis for communication between integrated people, without being limited by thoughtless thinking modes, knowledge structure and national psychology. Such a perspective will lead to a fundamental interpretation, helping clean up a novelty-seeking mentality and ideological filters on contemporary Chinese art. A true, "equal" perspective does not need to break away with "transcendence;" instead it pays full respect to its origins and tradition, realistic situation, and personal experience.

Of course, that means self-respect, too.

China Central Academy of Fine Arts, September 2, 2016

Liu Libin: doctor, associate research fellow at Fine Arts Research Institute, China Central Academy of Fine Arts
Yue Zhongsheng: associate professor at Civil Aviation University of China

二十世纪女性艺术中“私密化叙事”的文化探析

Cultural Analysis of “Private Narrative” in Female Art in the 20th Century

刘 玥 /Liu Yue

摘要: 中国女性艺术家从男性话语权中分离出来, 转向对自我成长经验、性别体验的关注和自身价值的探寻, 部分女性艺术家在艺术创作中第一次明确地将女性的身体置于历史的舞台上, 使之不再处于中国文化领域遗失缺席的境地, 这将对我国现当代女性艺术的发展具有很重要的现实意义。

关键词: “私密化叙事”; 20世纪女性艺术; 身体;

20世纪90年代, 政治运动对于国民的影响已渐渐淡化, 中国政府将改革开放、经济建设作为工作的中心, 经济上的开放必然带来文化上的发展, 这使得整个社会在思想方式、话语方式和价值观念上, 面临着一场前所未有的历史文化巨变。伴随着90年代世界妇女大会在北京的召开和西方女权主义理论的传入, 中国妇女界开始了对以往妇女解放理论及成果的反思, 提出了性别差异的文化命题, 中国真正意义上的女性艺术得以提出。这时的女性艺术已不只是对旧社会男尊女卑不平等的社会地位的批判, 而是更侧重对当今社会及文化中女性性别问题的关注, 是对自身存在的一种关怀与思考。女性艺术家们试图以自己的身体为线索, 揭示不同历史时期、文化背景下女性的遭遇与内涵。这里的“身体叙述”更多的是作为一种社会物质生活与精神生活的载体。它形成了90年代女性艺术中一个引人注目的现象——“女性私密化叙事”书写, 它使女性的身体由私密性的位置走向了公共性, 由生物性转向了社会性, 这既是一种来自女性身体深处的自发力量, 更是一种用身体言说的冲动与张扬, 是对男权社会下的女性秩序的一种反叛。

一、女性艺术“私密化叙事”文化倾向的背景解读

(一) 时代背景

1973年, 中国在全国范围内实行了计划生育, 这一政策的实施使我国人口数量下降, 进入80年代城市独生子女家庭已占绝大多数, 就是在农村一个家庭也最多有两个孩子。这一政策的实施给中国传统重男轻女的文化观念带来了极大的冲击, 它迫使每位家庭成员重新看待女子在家庭中的地位, 这是一次从社会基础结构出发的, 对家庭内部男女平等文化观念的变革。它一方面提高了女性的社会地位, 另一方面也

女性艺术

Abstract: Chinese female artists have separated themselves from the discourse power of the male and begun to focus on their personal experience of growth and gender experience, and to explore their own value. Some female artists for the first time clearly put female bodies on the stage of history, which will no longer be absent in the field of Chinese culture. This will be of practical significance to the development of modern and contemporary female art in China.

Key words: “private narrative”; female art in the 20th century; body; female art

提升了女性的独立意识和对自我价值的认定标准。当代女性艺术的主力军大部分出生于20世纪70年代末和80年代初, 她们正是这一政策的受益者, 她们有着前人不曾拥有的鲜明个性。这一时期也恰逢我国实行改革开放政策、党和国家把经济建设作为工作重心的大好时机, 人们僵化的、教条的思维模式逐渐被打破, 生存方式由原先的计划经济向市场经济进行转换, 生存观念也由原先的依赖型向自主型转变。这次经济上的变革必然带来文化上的变革, 中国的都市文化进入了空前宽松的文化语境, 女性成为拥有完整人格和独立精神品格的社会成员。正是她们所拥有的发自内心的强烈的独立意识和社会所给予的宽松环境, 促使她们在绘画语言的表现上更多地运用了一种女性身份本质的“女性的私密化叙事”的表达方式, 并以此来区别于以往的女性艺术家。

(二) 文化背景

伴随着改革开放的不断深入, 西方的各种文化思潮、学术流派、艺术运动源源不断地涌入中国, 为中国艺术打开了新的视野, “八五”美术思潮的艺术家们以空前的热情在短短的几年时间之内把西方一个多世纪的现代艺术经历了一遍, 大大加深了我们对西方艺术的了解。大量的理论书籍、学术论文被引进, 向国人介绍了许多西方的艺术观念, 同时女性主义文献资料的引进开阔了国内女性艺术家的视野, 为20世纪90年代的女性艺术的产生, 以及从男性的话语权中分离出来转向对自我价值、自我语言的探寻做了理论上的准备。特别是在1995年联合国召开的“第四次世界妇女大会”上, 中国妇女界通过对以往中国妇女解放理论和成果的反思, 使大家认识到对女性主义的研究不能只停留在旧社会男尊女卑的层面, 而更多的是对于当代社会文化意识上的性别差异

问题的关注。一时间,创作界、出版界和理论研究界对女性艺术作品表现出浓厚的兴趣与关注。多种艺术刊物推出女性艺术作品专号,多家出版社以丛书的形式出版女性艺术家作品集,女性艺术专题展也不断举办。如1995年,策展人廖文以女性艺术家个人感觉方式、表达方式探索为主题的“中国当代艺术中的女性方式”艺术展、“八五”新潮美术女性艺术展,1998年在中国美术馆举办的“世纪·女性”艺术展等。在这个具有“狂欢节”色彩的年代里,以路青、申玲、陈羚羊、奉家丽、何成瑶、林天苗等为代表的女性艺术家异军突起,她们在艺术观念上都不同程度地受到西方女权主义思想的影响,但在艺术的表达上并没有西方女性艺术家那么激进,她们吸取了中国传统文化与现代文化的精髓,更多的是一种对于个人的成长经验和性别体验的内在关照。她们以自身所特有的存在方式和表述功能不断尝试对内心世界进行深度的挖掘,在诸如快感、欲望、意念、感受及潜意识等个性化的女性“独语”中将女性的身体展示于外部世界,在身体与自我之间、身体与自然之间、身体与社会之间、身体与时代之间等多重关系中向自我的“处身性”本我立场进行回归,建构起一种对于身体本体的指归,从而使90年代的女性艺术界呈现出一个引人注目的文化现象——对身体的“私密化书写”。

作为身体的“私密化书写”,这里的“身体”已具有独特的内容与形式,正如法国哲学家梅约翰·奥尼尔所述:

“身体一部分是肉体的碎片,一部分是精神的呓语,处于两者之间的则是以身体为符号隐喻的整个人类文化。”^①基于这一悖论,随后的尼采、狄尔泰、梅洛·庞蒂、伊格尔顿等哲学家在对身体的物质性与精神性的论述中把身体指向为一个身体的文化隐喻——身体的“肉身性”背后是历时性与共时性、自在性与自为性交织的庞大的文化网络。^②如果我们从这个角度去理解,女性艺术家们对身体的私密化描述就是在人类精神力的推动下所进行的一次返回身体本源的艺术表述,让身体作为一个不受其他社会历史因素侵扰的独立存在,并能自由地发出声音,无论其来自于对历史的申诉还是来自于对性别个体的探索,在这里每一种声音都将被看作是个体按照身体的意愿自我表达的一种方式。

二、“身体的私密化叙事”在女性艺术中的呈现

20世纪90年代部分女性艺术家在艺术的创作中第一次明确地将女性的身体置于画面之中,使其不再在人类文化中莫名地失声与缺席。这是一种来自女性身体言说的冲动与张扬,是女性身体的自发力量。这一类女艺术家坚定而明确地以“我的身体”为叙述的话题,她们以历史、环境、文化为切入点表达女性在社会文化问题和历史环境中的欢乐与悲伤,她们的作品往往带有殉葬感。将自己的身体或身体的一部分作为绘画表现的主体,而“我”作为叙事的载体,来表达女性复杂的内心感受,甚至有时是不择手段。

如女性艺术家路青在1994年完成她的首件极具性别挑衅性的艺术作品《我是荡妇》。这是女性艺术首例具有性别挑衅意味的艺术作品。作者以非常单纯和直接的方法,运用招贴画的形式,将自己的一张黑白摄影头像表现于作品之中,其图像既没有绚丽的色彩也没有带有挑逗性的姿态,

是一张十分朴素含蓄的摄影作品,只是在图片下面注上了一行又粗又大的黑体字“我是荡妇”,使之具有了不同凡响的影响,它毫不含蓄地甚至近乎生硬地刺激每一个观赏者的心理,这四个字给人们的心理所带来的冲击与震撼并不是在画面的图像上,而是对中国传统社会文化和伦理观念的挑战,对于中国传统女性的贞操观的挑战,是对男权统治下对女性“贤良淑德”“淑女”规范的挑战。《我是荡妇》这幅作品虽然并没有像西方女权主义艺术家那么直白地去表现“情欲”“性征”,但给周围人所带来的震动却像辐射线一样蔓延开来,每一位观看者都会因立场的不同、身份地位的不同而产生强烈的心理反应,其中包含了太多的历史禁忌和对于历史的评价与理解,因此这简单而又有些粗俗并且具有挑衅意味的“口号”成为中国女性艺术史最直接、最具叛逆性的“呐喊”。^③这是一件严肃而带有涅槃式的痛苦的艺术作品。又如行为艺术家何成瑶以身体为表现形式在2001年5月完成的作品《开放长城》。当时许多艺术爱好者和记者来到北京的金山岭长城遗址参观由德国艺术家舒尔特创作的“废品人”装置作品,何成瑶脱去自己的上衣走在了队伍的最前列,一直走到烽火台。艺术家希望以此来反驳和质疑男性文化下对女性的种种规范和定义。这是对性别、伤害和在历史舞台上女性失语的一种重新诠释,在整个过程中她并没有开口说话,并没有把撕开衣服的动作升华为民族的呐喊,只是一种行为,更多的是一种对女性不公正问题的关注与表达。我们通过她的这一观点也能更好地解读她随后的作品《妈妈和我》《向妈妈致敬》《和杜尚对弈》《99针》等作品。这种痛苦感一种是对女性生存历史中已经接受或被认为是“正常”的观念而感到的不正常的意识唤醒后的愤怒与反思,还有一种是对前面所经历的痛苦追寻其原因后所产生的无奈与彷徨。这种痛苦的反思与彷徨也代表了90年代的部分女艺术家不再愿意通过别人的眼睛去审视自己并对自己的社会性别角色产生质疑的精神状态。在四川籍女艺术家赵跃2003年创作的作品《格子》及随后创作的《独自》中,艺术家面对镜子用刀片分别将自己的脸和腹部、大腿划出格子的伤痕,鲜血直流,让人触目惊心。作者利用“格子”的字面意思,即方形的空栏或框子,来喻示在当代社会父权主义规划之下的女性世界。揭示当今社会生活中对女性品格、才华的弱化现象,和以女性的外貌来衡量女性未来发展前景的社会潜规则。她希望通过这种自残的方式来唤起更多女性自身的觉醒。

如果说路青、何成瑶、赵跃的“身体”作品是一种叛逆的直面表达,将其转化为一种愤怒和发泄的痛快,那么还有一些女画家并没有像何成瑶她们那么激烈,而是以自己的身体为身体进行不同角度的思考和体悟。她们作品的焦点往往集中在身体的创伤感和“性”的文化上。画家奉家丽在以自己的身体作为艺术形式时更多的是将女性的个人经验与人文关怀融为一体,1996年,奉家丽在北京的妙峰山表演的行为艺术《桃色行为》中,危坐在一片荒山野岭的老桃树下,头系由卫生纸做的粉红色的桃花发带,手上则系一条与枯树根相连的粉红色丝带,好像在祈祷,又好像在与老桃树进行同感对话。作者希望以此来缅怀古往今来无辜逝去的女性们。随后她的作品《妊娠就是艺术》以自己的亲身体验为出

发点,将自己怀孕的身体作为一种感受的对象,她在自己已经非常凸起的腹部上写上明确的文字“补维生素、补锌、补钙、补铁、保胎”等几个大字,她希望以此来提出女性的身体并不仅仅作为一种孕育生命的工具而存在,它更是具有自身独立的精神性。作者希望在艺术文化的范围内对男性文化寄予女性的规范进行重新梳理,去除传统文化中对于女性的伤害。雕塑家向京以自我的灵魂和对人性的思考为创作土壤完成了《敞开着》《22岁了,还没来月经》和《果儿》等作品,表现女性所面临的某种痛苦与矛盾的处境。

另一类中国女性艺术家可能是由于我国传统文化及传统文本的影响,尽管其观点鲜明,内心的感受也非常激烈,但在以身体作为艺术的表达方式上却选择了一种比较含蓄内敛的象征式的隐喻方式,她们往往很少直接去描写女性的身体和性器官,而选择一些具有女性特征的文化符号,以此作为她们艺术思索的起点。这些符号与她们的生活、感觉有着千丝万缕的联系,是男性无法感知的。在她们作品中充满着一种“痛苦”与“自虐”的创伤感。雕塑家李秀勤《呼应系列》《被开启的记忆》的系列作品表现了一种被撕裂、被破坏的感受。她将那些大树段生硬粗暴地劈开或撕裂,露出湿润的鲜嫩的树木的肌理,并在其中生硬地塞进或钉上坚硬的铁条,给人带来一种痛苦感和粗暴感。有时也在其中塞挤进一些层层叠叠的被撕碎的具有不规则边缘的带有盲文的纸张,它既衬托了纸的脆弱和柔软,同时也具有一种人文的关怀。她的作品更多的是对中国妇女在面对困难时所表现出的坚韧与抗争的歌颂。如果说李秀勤所表现的是一种憨厚的固执,那么,陈妍音则表现的是一种敏感和“尖锐”。她的作品向观者表达了一种在现实社会生活中女性生活与周围环境之间的矛盾,其间以两性矛盾最为强烈,作者希望通过《箱子》《箱子-5,不受孕的卵子》和《一念之差》等系列作品,对于传统男性观念下的“爱欲”进行一种否定。女性艺术家张新的装置作品《苹果》并没有直接地去描绘“性”,而是将其进行了物化,作者对苹果切开后有核部分与无核部分的象形性加以引用,并用石膏翻制,使苹果的属性更加模糊,“性”的特征更加凸显。她巧妙地将苹果所具有的“性”的文化特征与女性的外生殖器官相结合,使这些无生命的石膏苹果成为了具有生命的生物体,给观赏者带来了强烈的心理刺激,并以此来达到一种发人深思的文化效果。同时也有一大部分女性艺术家选择了具有女性特征的花作为其身体的象征符号。此时的花已不是一种植物,而更多的是一种精神的延展,一种精神的物化,是一种女性立场的宣言,是一种对男权秩序中的性别话语的反抗,是一种对社会性别的探讨。如陈羚羊的摄影作品《十二花月》,蔡小丽的《蓝色鸢尾花》,蔡锦的《美人蕉》,宋红的《育之花》《生之恐惧》,廖海瑛的雕塑作品《盆景系列》和孙国娟的《花荣》系列等,画家们将女性的循环周期和生殖器官与花的物象联系在一起,似花非花。她们希望借此把女性“真实”的感受传达出来,借助“花语”折射出女性艺术家们在现存世界中所特有的一种或伤感、或恐惧、或不安、或质疑、或呐喊等的心灵体悟,给画面注入一种文化批判的力量,是艺术与生活的双重体验。

随着“女性私密化叙事”的广泛呈现,众多女性画家对此种表达方式已心领神会并乐此不疲。她们的作品不论是直接指向女性的身体还是对身体象征符号暗示所进行的观念表达都与她们自身的感受相连,揭示男性中心话语下对女性的伤害,表达了女性无论作为个体还是群体对于反体制化、反本质主义、反传统性别秩序、反性别压迫的一种书写焦虑,是身体作为人类共有资源与外部现实秩序的一次明确的分裂,成为女性艺术家表达思想的文化载体。这种艺术语言带有一种强烈的摧毁性和自虐倾向,具有巨大的震撼性和颠覆性,表现了当前女性创作中较“激烈”的一面,也正是这种在创作方式上与传统女性创作观的背离决定了新的女性艺术的出现。我们从中也可以体会到“身体私密化叙事”的叙事方式是一种生理和心理的综合体,是社会文化、历史以及女性的生活环境的交织记忆,她们的艺术作品无论是指向身体本体还是精神,都能唤起观者的反思与共鸣,寓意深刻。它被视为一种象征女性的文化符号,成为她们艺术创作思考的起点,已经自然而然地进入到女性艺术家的视野之中。当然在“身体私密性叙事”发展过程中也存在着许多驳论的呼声,认为其掉入了“性”的怪圈,认为有些女性艺术家是在为“性”而画,但我认为,不论怎样,当代女性艺术家以自己的身体和与身体有关的艺术语言创作出了大量的新作品,这种艺术形式填补了美术史的遗憾,丰富了人类的艺术精神。

注释:

- ①西蒙娜·德·波伏瓦:《第二性》,郑克鲁译,上海译文出版社,2011年。
- ②杨丽梅:《中国当代女性艺术中的身体表现》,《云南艺术学院学报》2007年第4期,第16—18页。
- ③杨徐虹:《女性艺术》,湖南美术出版社,2006年。

参考文献:

- [1]任姝亭.当代艺术中女性艺术家的身体叙事研究[D].武汉:华中师范大学,2014.
- [2]廖雯.女性艺术——女性主义作为方式[M].长春:吉林美术出版社,1999.
- [3]汪民安.身体、空间与后现代性[M].南京:江苏人民出版社,2006.
- [4]徐虹.我的感觉、我的身体、我的方式——解读20世纪90年代女性艺术[J].文艺研究,2003(2):120-129.
- [5]贾方舟.自我探寻中的女性话语——九十年代女性艺术扫描[J].美术研究,1996(2):45-51.
- [6]马淑贞.论当代文学中“身体说话”的历史变迁[J].文化研究,2005(10):25-28.
- [7]张小横.女性身体的丑怪书写[D].桂林:广西师范学院,2010.
- [8]李安安.花语与吃语[D].武汉:华中师范大学,2012.
- [9]乔以钢.女性写作与文化生存[J].甘肃社会科学,2002(1):15-16.