

观念之后的视觉感动——童雁汝南的肖像画探索

管郁达

谢谢主持人鲁虹老师，还有童雁汝南的邀请。我的观点放在后面再讲，我先回应一下夏可君先生刚才的发言。

刚才好几位先生都谈到了童雁汝南的绘画是在一套观念指导下的创作实践，大家都提到了现象学。在当代艺术的语境里面，我们对文本有一种过分解读的欲求。当然，根据每个人的知识、背景、经历每个人对作品会有不同的解释，这从理性的角度来讲是被允许的。但是我想这种过份的阐释会造成新的争议，甚至会使胡塞尔或是梅洛·庞蒂讲的“现象学还原”遥遥无期，成为一种云山雾海或是镜花水月般的阅读期待。

我觉得，童雁汝南做的事情其实是观念之后的绘画，不仅是要恢复感觉，恢复人与生俱来的观看的感觉和手感，这种手感严格来讲，从中世纪到文艺复兴，一个画家本质上是一个手艺人或者匠人，通过长期的视觉经验积累会形成一套肌肉记忆和手感逻辑，这就是童雁汝南的绘画让我感兴趣的地方，而不是说我们可以依赖理论阐释去建构一个绘画的系统。不论是他的肖像，还是他的一些转化方式，比如行为性的绘画，就是面对面的这种方式，都不是观念先行的结果。所以我不认为童雁汝南的绘画是观念实践的结果，相反他的绘画是反观念的结果，他是观念之后的绘画，是力图恢复手感、手艺性和观看的纯真的努力。这种努力在今天变得非常艰难，为什么呢？因为绘画史从文艺复兴开始，整个西方在肖像画方面建立了一个非常完善的系统，其实他们在其他领域是一样的，比如风景画的实践也是这样子。西方绘画一直在追求如何真实的观看这个问题，这个真实在文艺复兴时强调的是所谓的科学，后来大卫·霍克是延续这个的思路，他写《图像的历史》就是想梳理，观看从原来肉眼的静态观看到现在用ipad之类的电子绘画来解决何为“真实”的问题。我们一直幻想有一个纯真的、客观的观看，这相当于伯拉图讲的是那种物的理念。这是一种形而上的追求，这种观看的欲望到今天，包括在童雁汝南这样的艺术家身上都没有消失过。在奥尔巴赫、弗洛伊德、培根他们身上也是一样的。所以，童雁汝南的绘画追求也是这股潮流的一部分。

有一点我觉得要特别提醒大家注意，那就是童雁汝南实际上更多的是想恢

复中国视觉文化传统中观看的逻辑，这个逻辑是什么呢？就是我们一直在讨论的写实和写意的问题，面对对象时，我想汝南他肯定要先清除很多障碍，学院的障碍、艺术史的障碍、肖像画系统的障碍，甚至对象本身给他造成的观看障碍，他要剔除这些东西，才能正本清源，回到真实纯粹的观看。这有一点像庄子说的“庖丁解牛”的过程。这个过程我觉得是一种现象学意义上的还原，就是他通过对观念的分辨和清理以后，回到意念性的“神遇”而非物理性的“目视”，就是以神似而不以目遇，中国山水画家为什么都强调对境写生？就像王希孟的《千里江山图》一样，他的山水不是面对一个实景的现实主义具象式的模写，而是一种印象的回忆，其中就挟带了个人的经历、情感、气质和心境。童雁汝南的肖像画，我觉得还是很江南的，有一种文人抒情的情调在里面，那种唯美的东西、抒情的东西是江南的烟雨朦胧润育的。从这个角度来讲，他的绘画和中国传统绘画，特别是江浙一带的文人画系统在意念、意象和气质上完全是可以接通的。

在中国的绘画传统里面肖像画或人物画常常被人忽略。我们通常讲画鬼容易画人难，因为画鬼画家可以想象，画人就涉及到一个具体的对象，就是像不像的问题。所以童雁汝南的探索实际上又回到了传统中“似与不似”的争论。刚才王林老师和连辑先生的发言，他们都在争论一个时代的问题，我特别同意王老师的观点，如果用童雁汝南的肖像画代表这个时代潮流的话，说实话我觉得他是一个很差劲的画家，他不是根据梅洛·庞蒂或者是胡塞尔的现象学来画画的。他不是一个被艺术史定义的画家，我觉得他的贡献恰好是恢复了作为一个人的感觉，作为一个艺术家，他的身体本能、肌肉记忆和视觉经验才是最本质的，也是最本真的存在。而童雁汝南的这种视觉经验严格来讲和中国文化自身的传统，特别和江浙一带的文人画传统与视觉文化传统有很深的渊源和联系。

Visual Impression Following Concept: Exploration of Portraits Made by Tong Yanrunan

Guan Yuda

Thank the host, Mr. Lu Hong. Thanks for the invitation of Tong Yanrunan. I would like to state my view later on. Let me first respond to Mr. Xia Kejun's statement now.

Several gentlemen have just talked about that Tong Yanrunan's painting is a creation practice under the guidance of a set of concepts, and everyone has mentioned phenomenology. In the context of contemporary art, we have an excessive desire to interpret the text. Of course, different people have different interpretations of his works based on their knowledge, background and experience, which is allowed from a rational point of view. But I think this excessive interpretation will create new controversy, and even leave "phenomenological reduction" by Husserl or Merleau Ponty to the indefinite future, and become a misty sea of clouds or a moonlight for reading expectations.

In my opinion, what Tong creates is actually paintings follow concept. He not only restores feelings of viewing, which people are born with. Strictly speaking, from the Middle Ages to the Renaissance, a painter is essentially a craftsman. Long-term accumulation of visual experience will form a set of muscular memory and sensory logic, which is what Tong's painting interests me. It is not said that we can rely on theoretical interpretation to construct a painting system. Both portraits made by him and some of his transformations, such as behavioral painting, follow the way of face-to-face, but not the result of the concept ahead. So I don't think his works are the result of conceptual practice. On the contrary, his paintings are the result of anti-concepts. He presents us a painting follows concepts and an effort to restore feeling of painting, craftsmanship and the innocence of viewing. Such efforts are becoming very difficult today. Why? Because the history of painting begins from the Renaissance, the whole West has established a very perfect system in portrait painting. In fact, they are the same as other fields, such as the practice of landscape painting. Western painting has been focused on real viewing, which was so-called science in the Renaissance. Later, David Hawk continued this idea. He wrote "History of Images" to sort out the problem of "reality" from the naked eye, which leads to

an original static viewing, to the present electronic painting tools, such as the ipad. We always fantasize about having a pure and objective view, which is equivalent to what Plato is talking about. It is a metaphysical pursuit, and a desire for viewing that has not disappeared today. Artists, like Tong Yanrunan, still hold it. The same is true of Albach, Freud and Bacon. Therefore, Tong's pursuit of painting is also part of this trend.

One thing, I think we should pay special attention to, is that Tong Yanrunan actually wants to restore the logic of viewing in Chinese visual culture tradition. What is this logic? It is the realistic and freehand methods we have been discussing. When facing the object, I think Runan must clear many obstacles first, such as the obstacles of college, art history, portrait system, and even the obstacles of viewing caused by the object itself. Only by removing these obstacles, can he return to the true and pure view. It is a process of being similar to "Dismembering an Ox by A Skillful Butcher Pao Ding" that Zhuangzi said. The painting course, I think, is a kind of phenomenological reduction. In other words, he returns to the ideological "catching mien" rather than the physical "vision" after distinguishing and clearing up the concepts. That is to say, he catches one's mien beyond vision. Why do Chinese landscape painters all emphasize painting from the context? *A Thousand Miles of Rivers and Mountains* created by Wang Ximeng, for example, shows that landscape painting is not a realistic representation of a real scene, but an impressive memory, which carries personal experience, emotion, temperament and mood. The portrait paintings made by Tong Yanrunan, I think, have a strong flavor of south of the Yangtze River. There is a kind of literati's Lyric sentiment in it. The aesthetic and lyric things are nurtured by the misty rain in the south of the Yangtze River. From this point of view, there is absolutely empathy between his paintings and traditional Chinese paintings, especially the literati painting system in Jiangsu and Zhejiang, in terms of ideas, imagery and temperament.

Portrait or figure painting is often neglected in Chinese painting tradition. We usually say that drawing ghosts is easier than painting people, because painters can imagine what ghost looks like while a specific object comes down to concreteness. The exploration of Tong Yanrunan actually returns to the traditional debate of "likeness and unlikeness". Just now, Mr. Wang Lin and Mr. Editor are debating the

issue of an era. I particularly agree with Mr. Wang. If portraits made by Tong Yanrunan represent the trend of the times, to tell the truth, I think he is a very poor painter. He doesn't create depending on the phenomenology of Merleau-Ponty or Husserl. He is not a painter defined by the history of art. I think his contribution is to restore the sense of being a person. As an artist, his body instinct, muscular memory and visual experience are the most essential and real existence. Strictly speaking, the visual experience of Tong is related to the tradition of Chinese culture itself, especially the literati painting tradition and visual culture tradition in Jiangsu and Zhejiang.