

Vivian Ting
Jeff Leung

梁寶山
阿三
郭瑛
楊陽



藝評香港

Art Review
Hong Kong

issue 1 / 2016



目錄

前言

郭瑛

藝術，與社會參與模式缺了甚麼

楊陽

開拓展覽導賞的可能

梁展峰

讀尹麗娟翻不開的「書本」

丁穎茵

我們的藝術評論

阿三

簡介

Content

Preface

Ying Kwok

Art and What Is Missing in the Socially-engaged

Yeung Yang

Broadening the Possibilities of Docent Tours

Jeff Leung

Reading Annie Wan's Unopened Books

Vivian Ting

Our Art Criticism

Chan Sai Lok

Biography

01

03

17

23

29

35

前言

郭瑛
發起人
Art Appraisal Club

翻譯：袁蔚霞

我身為藝術家和策展人，卻鮮於視文字為主要溝通中介，大概是我不太擅長書寫。然而，它是一切藝術活動不可或缺的一員。藝術書寫不單鼓勵對話，豐富我們對作品的了解，更讓觀眾與藝術家溝通，互相裨益。遺憾的是，因資源所限，它往往是執行清單上的最末一項。

Art Appraisal Club為2014年於油街實現舉行的展覽《收藏家學會》的一重要部分，該展覽嘗試探究藝術於大眾消費與感知下的價值。Art Appraisal Club的六位創會成員為專業而經驗豐富的前線藝術工作者，包括阿三、梁寶山、梁展峰、丁穎茵、楊陽及我。我們緊貼香港藝術發展最新動向，又從藝術家個人及專業兩個層面理解他們的創作，背後的最大目的是推動本地藝評人之間的交流，點出討論之重要性。過往兩年半，我們每月舉行遊藝論說會，討論及評鑑當期焦點展覽，並定時發佈展覽推薦選單、藝評和主題文章。我們偶然半開玩笑地說，每月聚會是我們的「排毒會」。這別稱帶點諷刺卻不失真實，因為定期討論不單幫助我們揀選及了解每月舉行的各式各小藝術計劃與展覽，更激發批判思維，孕育新想法。我們雖然不一定能經常達成共識，但聚會卻讓我們對共同關注的藝術議題有更深刻的思辯。

Preface

Ying Kwok
Founder
Art Appraisal Club

As an artist and curator, I rarely see writing as the main communication channel for my practice because I could never quite handle this medium. It should, however, be one of the most important components in art practice. Art writing encourages communication and facilitates better understanding for the viewers and feedback for the artists vice versa. Unfortunately, with limited resources, it has always been left as the last thing on the ‘to-do’ list.

Art Appraisal Club was originally formed as part of *Collector Club*, an exhibition which took place in Oi! Art Space in 2014. It investigated in detail about the value of art in terms of its public consumption and perception. The core founding members of Art Appraisal Club are experienced professionals working at the front line: Chan Sai Lok, Anthony Leung Po Shan, Jeff Leung, Vivian Ting, Yeung Yang and myself. We have always been keeping up with the latest art developments in Hong Kong, and understanding artists’ work in both personal and professional aspects. Our main emphasis is to promote the importance of discussion amongst local art critics. Through publishing our own recommended exhibition lists, reviews and themed journals, we have been meeting monthly for the last two and a half years to discuss and review exhibitions. Sometimes we jokingly call it as our “detox session”. Ironical yet true, the discussions help us to filter and better understand the vast number of art events and exhibitions happening here in a short period of time. These regular meetings also play a critical role in stimulating our critical thinking, and

fostering new ideas. We don’t always get satisfactory conclusions or consensus from the group but it helps us build arguments around certain issues and concerns we have about art making.

We have a shared vision to develop local art criticism by encouraging critical thinking through effective exchange and discussion, to nurture a cultured audience and to widen the audience base. We have been trying to publish our discussions and writings with a fair rate on the right platforms. I sincerely thank the magazines and publishing channels that have worked with us before, for those opportunities were hugely important. Moving on we are hoping to have a more consistent platform with an effective distribution plan, ensuring our works can be seen by relevant parties and available for the public.

The first issue of *Art Review Hong Kong* consists of four articles. With Hong Kong at the centre of our discussion, we have Vivian Ting doing a decent review on Annie Wan’s practice; Yang Yeung using Samson Young’s works to elaborate on socially engaged art; Jeff Leung analyzing the popular docent tour as the interpretation medium for art exhibition; and Chan Sai Lok looking into art criticism with a set of Q&A. We are dedicating this biannual and bilingual publication to visual arts and artists. With the strong feeling that there is an urgent need to increase the quality and quantity of art writing and criticism, we would like to invite you to take this first step – the birth of *Art Review Hong Kong* with us.

我們對發展本地藝術評論風氣的共同想法是，透過交流討論鼓勵批判思考，培養有水準的觀眾，並擴大觀眾數目。在草創期間，我們曾嘗試在不同藝文平台發表討論文章。故此，我特別鳴謝過往曾合作的雜誌及媒體，給予我們寶貴的機會。展望將來，我期望Art Appraisal Club能踏上軌道，覓得穩定而通達的發表平台，讓我們的聲音傳至藝術圈內相關的崗位，並遍及公眾人士。

《藝評香港》創刊號由四篇文章組成，以香港為討論核心。首先，丁穎茵對尹麗娟藝術創作有詳細的討論；楊陽則透過Frances Barrett和楊嘉輝的作品，對社區參與藝術有一番闡釋與思考；另外還有梁展峰對「以導覽詮釋展覽」的分析，及阿三以答問形式探討藝評的本質。我們謹以此雙語半年刊，獻給視覺藝術及一眾默默耕耘的藝術家。香港急迫需要大幅提升藝術書寫的數量與藝評質素，我們誠意邀請你跟我們一起，見證《藝評香港》的誕生。

藝術，與社會參與模式缺了甚麼

楊陽
翻譯：李海燕

一

近年把藝術實踐之一種稱為「社會參與式藝術」的做法，讓人感覺既熟悉又含糊：熟悉，是因為它引發其他稱謂的產生，諸如社區藝術和公共藝術等，無一不強調藝術的公民責任，包括社會參與；含糊，是因為難以知道社會參與式藝術，是延續其他類似實踐，還是與之割裂。

社會參與式藝術著重甚麼？我在網上隨機搜尋現正接受申請、支援社會參與式藝術的資助，發現重複出現的關鍵詞包括：「社會共融」，暗示著重平等公民權，平等享有自由的權利；「領導才能」，暗示藝術家有能力通過操作群體關係，創新、提出，以及傳播原則；再來是「社會改變」，暗示社會現有結構的系統性轉化。這些幾乎毋庸置疑是藝術傾向的和促進的價值。尊重自由平等，等於抗拒明星文化把藝術家吹捧至特權位置；等於挑戰隨着藝術被抬舉而產生的光環效應，或者凸顯尊貴與藝術風馬牛不相及；等於抗拒藝術只供少數特權人士消費的想法。尊重集體活動，抗拒可能會演變成自戀[1]的極端個人主義，確立藝術與他者相遇的責任。抗拒學院利用宣判、仲裁和鑒賞能力，聲稱擁有排他的領導權力；尊重藝術和藝術家能夠創新藝術改變社會的衡量方法。一直以來，不同的力量在致力清楚說明及確立以上提出的。相對於藝術品，藝術的詮釋可以更有影響力，更混亂，更細緻。

Art and What Is Missing in the Socially-engaged

Yeung Yang

1

The recent habit in naming one way of practicing art as ‘socially-engaged’ registers both the familiar and obscure: the familiar for its evoking such other names as ‘community art’ and ‘public art’ that emphasize the responsibility of art in citizenship of which the socially-engaged is a part, and yet also obscure for how socially-engaged art may be a continuation or rupture of apparently similar practices.

What does socially-engaged art value? I have made a random online search for grants currently open calling for art projects that are socially-engaged. Some recurring key terms include ‘social inclusion’, suggesting the value of equal citizenship and equal rights to freedom for all; ‘leadership’, suggesting artists’ ability to innovate, bring forward, and convey principles through acting in group relations; and ‘social change’ suggesting systematic transformation of established structures in society. What might be the reasons for all these to be choice worthy for art? To value freedom and equality is to resist the privileged position of the artist hyped up by the signature and celebrity culture; it is to challenge the halo effect produced by an exaltation of art. It is also to resist the imperative to keep art ‘pure’ for the consumption by a select few. To value collective activities is to resist extreme forms of individualism, sometimes turning into narcissism, [1] and to affirm the responsibility of art towards its encounters with others. To value art and the artists’ capacity to lead is to resist

the closing off of institutions that claim the exclusive rights to lead by adjudication, arbitration, and connoisseurship, and to institute other ways of valuing art for social change. To articulate and affirm the value of all of the above has been part of the collective effort in interpreting art as having a broader reach – messier, and more nuanced, than the art object is able to suggest.

Socially-engaged art is an interpretation of specific cases and practices of art, and by being an interpretation, contributes to the understanding of art as all it could be, just as any particularity informs the activity of thinking all that could be. What keeps me wondering, however, is that if all these values registered by ‘socially-engaged art’ are already in our vocabulary of how art flourishes, what it offers to charm and challenge, how far does the designation of socially-engaged art help us understand art as all it could be? I am concerned whether sometimes the designation is too hastily coined (partly for the reason that the promise of the kind of resistance it carries is exaggerated) to be offering too little, too soon. If the socially-engaged directs us towards what is already recognizable, if the socially-engaged directs us towards what more than how it is made or done (for instance, how the internal governance of a project may reproduce existing institutional hierarchies of power, how artists come into a project and leave it, or leave it behind etc.), and if the designation is coined after

社會參與式藝術是特定的藝術個案和實踐的詮釋。就像特性讓思考不再空泛一樣，詮釋讓我們對藝術有更全面的理解。令我疑惑的卻是，如果所謂社會參與式藝術的價值，在我們的日常用語已經被描述為枝繁葉茂，具吸引力和富挑戰性，社會參與式藝術這一稱謂，對於全面理解藝術還有甚麼幫助？我擔心這稱謂太快太輕率地被定下來，其意涵太淺（部分原因是這一類對抗的承諾被誇大了）。如果社會參與把我們引導向已被認可的，如果社會參與把我們引導向進行方式以外的一些甚麼（例如，計劃的內在監管重複體制既有的階級權力架構，藝術家加入和離開計劃，或者撇下它不管，等等），如果稱謂是在計劃進行其時被冠以的，其時間和長度的考慮沒有在事後被細心咀嚼，我們對藝術曾經是甚麼和可能是甚麼的認知，將會有所欠缺嗎？

我希望思考兩個近期的藝術個案——分別在2016香港巴賽爾藝術展及2016香港Art Central舉行的楊嘉輝《到達那個島嶼的你已經年老》*So You Are Old by the Time You Reach the Island* 多媒體導行，以及法蘭西斯•巴雷特（Frances Barrett）《策展人》*Curator*，為詮釋鬆綁，讓我們進一步反思。楊及巴雷特的作品都涉及步行，有一定的表演性（即時現場發生），及持續一段時間。它們並不始於社群分享身份、興趣、或團結原因，而是面對和揭示來自這個不足的社會的疏離感。雖然以脫離為

起點，它們不是建立於藝術家純粹的自我之上。楊及巴雷特選擇首先曝露社會疏離感，然後從個人層面開始改變。他們的作品為自己和我們鋪設途徑，面對實在的情感，將之轉化為一種感知，放大和複雜化我們作為社會成員的偉大、重量和強度。考慮到二人的藝術關懷的優次，把他們的作品稱為社會參與式藝術好像不妥，但說沒有社會參與同樣不妥，因為作品召喚了例如社會共融、領導才能，以及社會改變等意念。只要詳細思考以上作品，便會發現沒有容易或方便的方法決定是否要把藝術活動稱為社會參與式藝術。詮釋不一定有助我們了解藝術家如何思考自己與社會、與他人的關係。即使現在流行社會參與式藝術，這問題仍然複雜，未被解答。以上作品有助拆解衡量社會參與式藝術的價值的常見原因。例如，我懷疑香港的當代藝術有否培育出自戀的藝術家。從藝術家對近來的社會運動引發的藝術和社會關係的反思〔2〕看來，他們一方面希望積極地投入社會狀況，一方面重視個人的思考空間，對香港改變中的社會，文化和政治情況應抱有的責任感和公民意識，提出深刻的詰問。藝術家們普遍而持續地思考這些問題。如果這兩個個案會教懂我們甚麼，應該是怎樣以藝術挑戰藝術的詮釋，揭示語言如何不足和偏離本意。

a synchronic analysis and not a diachronic one taking time and duration into consideration, what may we be missing in art?

Two artistic compositions recently presented in Hong Kong offer help with this question. Samson Young's multimedia *So You Are Old by the Time You Reach the Island* and Frances Barrett's *Curator*, presented in Art Basel Hong Kong 2016 and Art Central Hong Kong 2016 respectively, are both durational and involve activities of walking the city and elements of performativity (in their liveness). They begin not by social engagement in the sense of involving communities sharing identities, interests, or reasons for solidarity, but by confronting with and revealing estrangement produced by a deficient society. While they begin from detachment, they do not rely on the isolation of a pure, artist self. Young and Barrett both choose to expose the social estrangement first and begin from change on the personal level. Their works open up the passage for them and us to face up to and transform that concrete sentiment into a sensibility that expands and complicates the magnitude, weight, and intensity of social existence. Given the priorities in their artistic concerns, it does not seem right to name these works as socially-engaged art, but it does not seem right either to say they are *not* socially-engaged for the evocation of such ideas as social inclusion, leadership, and social change. Thinking through them indicates there is no easy or convenient way to apply the designation of socially-engaged art to an artistic activity, and that an interpretation, despite its

Samson Young, *So You Are Old by the Time You Reach the Island*, 2016. Hong Kong. Photo: Dennis Man Wing Leung. Courtesy of the artist. 楊嘉輝《到達那個島嶼的你已經年老》，2016年，香港。攝影：Dennis Man Wing Leung 相片由藝術家提供。



prevalence, does not necessarily help us understand how artists think about their relation with society and others. Learning through them is also helpful in examining more carefully the value of the socially-engaged in art. For instance, I doubt if contemporary art in Hong Kong has produced the narcissistic artist. Considering the many reflections on the relation between art and society out of recent social movements, [2] the enthusiasm artists express when they reflect on their immersion in social circumstances and their need for personal space to think, artists have been taking up questions of responsibility and citizenship in the changing social, cultural and political circumstances of Hong Kong. These are questions that have been not only prominent, but are becoming enduring. To learn from the two projects is to let art challenge the interpretation of art: the inadequacies and derivative nature of the language for art.

二

楊嘉輝《到達那個島嶼的你已經年老》由灣仔香港會議展覽中心巴賽爾藝術展現場開始，經過四十分鐘步行，在附近的金鐘結束。香港會議展覽中心是在1997年由英國及中華人民共和國共同建築的誌慶空間，用以展示其權力及授權管治；金鐘則在近年被人們藉着佔據，展示另一種尋求統治合法化的權力。步行的設定迫使我們思考國家如何為自己樹碑立傳，個人為着自己的本性和責任繼續追問那個終止的手勢代表甚麼。步行的經驗雖然是個人的，但不等於沒有社會參與。

步行甫開始便與我們的社會存在不可分割。參加者必須登記為群組成員，集體步行，直至我們可以讓過程變得個人化。千萬別小看登記，它清清楚楚是一張契約，註明成員之間短暫的社交接觸。比起公開和免費地分配藝術，結果卻只是複製不公平的可達性，楊的作品要求我們承諾參與一套新制定的（縱然是暫時的）社會關係。參加者必須在步行時攜帶「iPod」，觀看和聆聽關於「有派頭的戰鬥部」*Ministry of Gentlemanly Warfare*的「阿樂」的故事的九個錄像。聲音、歌聲、音樂、語言，與我們的腳步融為一體。在過程中，很多挑釁性和煽動性的視聽材料並置，因為篇幅關係我未能盡錄。我想更深入思考阿樂是怎樣跑出來的，希望藉此明白藝術家如何把「自己」挪用作品中。

楊飾演的阿樂，在錄像中進進出出。我們知道他喜愛收音機，他的母親製造收音機，他視主權改變為香港近期歷史，及更多。由於阿樂必須在參加者途經的指定地點和時間出現，他那「行走的、思考的身體」（旁述者在旅程開始時的用詞）由參加者代勞。他的確想很多——迫仄的都市空間的荒誕，即使因為都市更新被割裂但「仍然堅持的聲音標記」〔3〕，雖然其實只是掩飾破壞的委婉之詞；荷馬筆下的海神和獨眼龍的奇幻世界，令人熟悉卻被剝奪了歡愉的過去……他同時希望、期待——「為改變帶來靈感的聲音」〔4〕，讓旅程得以繼續的未來……與他一起，在他之內，我們經驗了自己的社會存在。

阿樂知道自己要往哪兒嗎？我認為這不是步行的重點。反之，步行迫使我們面對在群體中才變得有意義的疏離感，向我們展示群體不等於我們存在的全部的那種疏離感。群體和存在不可通約，令生命更生硬更直接地呈現：生命是被賦予的——是條件，也是禮物，生命來源的解釋永遠無法定案。在藝術家的帶領之下，我們的工作是在與未能名狀的親密連繫之中，起動我們的想像力。

步行終結時，出現了一個意料之外、令人激動的動作：有人舉起了傘。在其中一天，當約二十位參加者散佈在告士打道和龍和道交界時，雨下起來了。我們在聽着最後一則指示時，一位歌手逐次走到每位參加者身旁，

Samson Young's *So You Are Old by the Time You Reach the Island* is a 40-minute walk that began in Art Basel Hong Kong in the Hong Kong Convention and Exhibition Centre (HKCEC), Wanchai, and ended on the streets of neighbouring district Admiralty. For the HKCEC being also the ceremonial space created by Great Britain and the People's Republic of China around the year 1997 to display their power and authorize their rule, and for Admiralty being occupied by the people for displaying another kind of power seeking legitimacy of rule in recent years, the setting of the walk compels us (out of our nature and our duty) to reflect on the nations' apparatuses of self-monumentalization and to ask questions about them as gestures of closure. However, that the walk is an individuated experience does not make it not socially-engaged.

The walk was dependent on our social existence from the start, for as participants, we had to be willing to register as part of a group first, to be starting the walk together before moving onto processes of individuation. It is not trivial that these avowals were asked for, as making the temporary social contract with each other explicit. Compared to the open and free availability as another method of distributing art, which may end up in the reproduction of uneven accessibility, Young's work sought an undertaking from us to be involved in a set of newly constituted social relations, albeit temporarily. Participants were

to carry iPods during the walk, viewing and listening to nine videos telling the story of the protagonist Ah Lok, from the Ministry of Gentlemanly Warfare, with noise, singing voices, music, and language, blended into our footsteps. There were many provocative and evocative juxtapositions of visual and sonic materials throughout, and I cannot consider them all in the brevity of this essay. I would like to think more of how Ah Lok came to be, in the hope of understanding the way the artist appropriated his 'self' in the work. Played by Young himself, Ah Lok moved in and out of the video scene. We learnt of his love of the radio, his mother's experience in making radios, his take on the sovereignty change of Hong Kong as part of its recent history, and more. Tied and timed to specific places participants walked through, we became the 'walking, thinking body' (a phrase the narrator opened the journey with) that Ah Lok was. He did think a lot – the absurdity of hoarding in urban spaces and the 'sound marks that persevered' [3] despite their being cut up in 'urban renewal', a euphemism officially coined masking the damage it also brings, the fantastical world of Homer's Poseidon and the Cyclops, the past that called to home but bereft of things to please... Young also wished and hoped for 'sound to inspire change', [4] for a future towards which the journey would continue... It was with him and in him that we experienced our social being.

輕輕地唱歌。阿樂站在遠處的行人天橋上，看着一群陌生人無名的身體短暫的聚集，也看着藝術家以自己的身體扮演陌生人。歌唱完了，我們收到紙片，寫有電話號碼。電話接通後，傳來楊的聲音，那聲音在唱歌。〔5〕在時間和空間中，碩大的和微小的記憶平等地相遇。〔6〕意外出現的雨，帶來了為沒有傘的我們擋雨的一名義工。陌生人遇見陌生人的的一剎，有關在那場域開始的一次又一次的街頭抗爭（包括較大型的2014年的雨傘運動）的記憶，並沒有局限作品的意涵和美學，反而揭示了歷史的限制，不能完全記錄公民如何在社會空間要求知道真相。與此同時，社會空間充滿韌性，它仍然在進行中，指導時間走向未來。藝術揭示了規律性社會生活，與雨傘運動要求的改變，兩者不可通約，因而賜予場域生命；獲賜予庇蔭的我們，強烈地感受到社會和自己的存在感之間的不可通約性是何等嚴峻，單純的社會存在是何等困乏。根據一般的理解，楊的作品有很多不能被稱之為社會參與式藝術的原因，但它坦誠面對社會以及與之連結的慾望，卻又構成其社會參與性。套用約翰·伯格的描述，作品珍視將要發生的，帶着對知識好奇的矛盾心態，窺視前社會和反社會，避免自己被圍困在社會參與之中。

巴雷特的演出《策展人》，同樣把注意力從藝術展覽轉移到一个步行、思考和聆聽的自我。然而，視覺被中止了；而且步行的



Samson Young, *So You Are Old by the Time You Reach the Island*, 2016. Hong Kong. Photo: Dennis Man Wing Leung. Courtesy of the artist. 楊嘉輝《到達那個島嶼的你已經年老》，2016年，香港。攝影：Dennis Man Wing Leung 相片由藝術家提供。

是藝術家而非參加者。在平常的時間，以平常的步伐走過城市，藝術家穿越工具（例如是藝術展覽）的邏輯，超越工具之為工具的理由，讓我們以另一種觀點看生活的意義。巴雷特與策展人的「親密合同」，由她獲澳洲4A 亞洲當代藝術中心（4A Centre for Contemporary Asian Art）邀請出席香港 Art Central，飛抵香港機場的一刻開始。她蒙上雙眼，依賴策展人Toby Chapman和4A總監Mikala Tai的照顧下，開始她的廿四小時旅程。《策展人》最初由澳洲Liquid Architecture委約創作，要求巴雷特回應「覺得女性主義方法論聽起來像甚麼？」[7]在香港重演，巴雷特繼續她對藝術家——策展人的關係的探索，但因應版本之語境，巴雷特表示她「把演出的重點由細心聆聽轉移到藝術展覽的勞工和氣氛。」[8]

社會可能把蒙眼視為一種缺乏、剝奪（視力，或普遍來說一種能力），甚至是軟弱的原因之一。巴雷特的演出把目盲設定為權力來源，挑戰僵化的定義方式，要求重新商議。蒙上眼的巴雷特在我們和藝術家之間架起物理屏障，暗示她的世界沉著、完整，卻不容許我們介入。蒙上了眼的她，知覺與敏感性是未經教化的，重新分配的，獲提升的，重新接上的，但仍然不為我們所知。藝術家與我們一樣，把自己投進了未知及不確定，藉由蒙眼開拓出來的全新空間，容讓自己與外界，與他者建立關係。與楊嘉輝一樣，她把自己變成自己不認識的人，為的是抹掉自我與社會連結的方式，然後重新接上。懸置了的自主權騰出了空間，容納由藝

Did Ah Lok know where he was going? It seems to me this was not the point of the walk. Instead, the walk compelled us to confront estrangement constituted by the reality of what the social could make intelligible, showing us the estrangement that precisely comes from the failure of the social to exhaust all that there is to our existence. This incommensurability between the socially established and intelligible and all that which is not shows life as much more blunt and direct: life as given – as a condition and as a gift, with explanations of its origin perpetually unsettled. Our work, as led by the artist, is to activate our imaginative capacity and in an intimate engagement with the yet-to-be.

Lastly, the finishing point of the walk involved an accidental but emotionally charged gesture of an umbrella being put up. It so happened that during one day of the walk, rain fell upon the 20 or so participants scattered at the junction of Connaught Road Central and Tim Mei Avenue, around the entrance of the Central Government Offices. As we were listening to the last instructions, a singer approached each participant and gently sang to each. Ah Lok stood at a distance on a footbridge, watching this temporary aggregate of anonymous bodies as strangers to each other and the artist staged and embodied as stranger to himself. As the singing came to an end, we received a piece of paper with a number to call. The voice of Young picked up and it started singing. [5] The gigantic and the miniature of memory met on equal terms in time and space. [6] The accidental occurrence

of rain brought a volunteer over to some of us who didn't have an umbrella, offering shelter. The moment where strangers met strangers, evoking memories recurring street demonstrations that began in the site (including the larger scale Umbrella Movement in 2014) did not close up the meaning and aesthetics of the work, but rather reveal on the one hand the limit of historicizing the social space where citizenship was negotiated for understanding what happened, while on the other hand, the elasticity of the social space still in the making, directing time into the future. The art had given life to the place by revealing the incommensurability of routine social life and hope for change distributed in the Umbrella Movement; with the gift of shelter, the magnitude of the incommensurability was accentuated between the social and our sense of being, and the general deficiency of social existence laid bare.

There are many reasons to say Young's work is not socially-engaged art as it is often understood, but there are also many reasons to say it is, by being open and honest with how the social and the desire to engage have constituted the art. At the same time, it holds dear, to borrow John Berger's gesture, what is still coming about, resisting closure by engaging with the social, and probing into the pre-social and a-social in the sentiment and intellectual curiosity of ambivalence.

術的市場延伸至藝術的社會生活的另一種中介，縱使前者致力把兩者分開。巴雷特表示：「我把自己從階級中移除。」蒙眼同時是一個明顯的拒絕手勢——不是對抗式的拒絕，而是暫時退讓式的拒絕，讓敏感性可以受到照顧，重新組成。藝術家希望策展人關心她，不是為了售賣她的作品，而是視她為一個在專業和智力需要之外，也有生理和情緒需要的完整人類。

我們一方面可以把策展想像為策展人和藝術家之間的互相照顧，時刻伴隨；也可以理解為巴雷特的角色逆轉為蒙眼的策展人。兩者都行得通，因為如果我們期望策展人或藝術家任何一方無限地付出，我們只會走進死胡同。巴雷特思考自己的演出，認為它記下了策展人和藝術家作出的承諾和進行的持續協商，兩者之間的動力，以及他們為了作品可以走多遠。藝術家和策展人的交往，以及其關係如何被放置在社會之中，反映了藝術展覽雖然彷彿對社會無動於衷，卻完全受着生活內容支配。

三

為了討論社會性和參與性，我只能片面地描述兩個作品的某些層面。我感興趣的是，楊嘉輝和巴雷特以脫離和獨立於社會為起點，讓社會既有的理性被擱置。藝術家對社會性的敏感和警惕，撼動約定俗成的規則，令反思變得可能。對藝術家來說，社會性永遠是公開的，未決定的，就像陌生的他者一樣，

The performance *Curator* by Frances Barrett also directed attention away from the art fair by figuring a walking, thinking, and listening self. Sight, however, was suspended. It was also a walk performed by the artist, not participatory. By passing through the city at an ordinary time and rhythm of day, the walk gave shape to the artist's alternative vision of what it means to live by traversing such apparatuses as the art fair and what conditions them. Barrett's 'intimate contract' with her curators [7] began as she landed at the Hong Kong airport on outlying Lantau Island by invitation of 4A Centre for Contemporary Asian Art in Art Central, located at the Central District harbor front of Hong Kong Island. She blindfolded herself and began her 24-hour journey of being cared for by curator Toby Chapman and director of the Centre Mikala Tai. Curator was first commissioned by Liquid Architecture in Australia, which asked that Barrett respond to the question 'What does a feminist methodology sound like?' In the Hong Kong iteration, Barrett continued with her inquiry into the artist-curator relationship by thinking through how 'careful listening played out in the dynamic. [8]

Society may see the blindfold as signaling a lack and a deprivation (of sight, and of a capacity in general), even a source of weakness. Barrett's performance challenges and re-negotiates such a rigid mode of meaning-making by configuring the blind as a source of power. Barrett's blindfold sets up a physical barrier between us and the artist to suggest that her world is composed and intact but not available to us. Her senses and sensibilities as a result are unlearned, re-distributed, augmented, and re-connected, but again, not available to our knowing. Like us, the artist has also thrown herself into the unknown and indeterminate, for the blindfold crafted out a newly embodied space that enabled relationships to be forged between herself and her outside, her other. She has made

Frances Barrett, *Curator*, 2016, 36-hour live performance with Mikala Tai and Toby Chapman as part of 4A Centre for Contemporary Asian Art's 'Roundtable x 4A' at Art Central Hong Kong, Photo: 4A Centre for Contemporary Asian Art. Courtesy of the artist.
法蘭西斯・巴雷特《策展人》，2016年，與Mikala Tai和Toby Chapman的36小時真實生活表演。此為4A亞洲當代藝術中心參與香港Art Central的計劃《Roundtable x 4A》的其中一部分。
攝影：4A亞洲當代藝術中心
相片由藝術家提供。



herself a stranger to herself, like Young has, in order for the self and the way it connects socially to be unlearned and remade. The suspended autonomy leaves room for a different kind of agency that shows the continuum between the market of art and the social life of art, despite the former's effort to separate them. 'I removed myself from the hierarchies,' Barrett has said. To blindfold oneself is also an explicit gesture of refusal – not refusal by antagonism, but refusal by temporary withdrawal, so that one's sensibilities can be cared for and re-constituted. What the artist needs is the curator's care, not for the sake of the trading of her work, but for her being a full human being, with physical and emotional needs in addition to professional and intellectual ones.

While tapping the idea of curating as caring for, foregrounding the intimate, bodily relationship between the curator and artist, one can also interpret the role of Barrett as reversed, as her performing the blindfolded curator. It can work both ways because it shows the dead-end of sometimes non-stop giving expected on either end of the curator or artist. Barrett's performance registers the amount of commitment and constant negotiation required between curator and artist, the dynamic between them, and, according to Barrett, 'how far they would go to realize a work'. The sociality between the artist and curator, and its situated-ness in the larger society, shows how the art fair, as if apathetic to what is happening outside, is in fact fully dependent on what life offers.

我發現，只要我們多思考社會性，其表達以及其他選擇，我們將不再那麼恐懼改變。我希望我已經指出了藝術與詮釋之間的縫隙（語言上的，通常是按社會情況而形成的，但也包括正在產生中的），並為藝術挑戰詮釋開拓了小小的辯證空間。我希望我已闡明這樣做的理由，把這些理由組合起來，令我們反思社會參與式的詮釋，以保證社會參與式藝術的存在不是為了錯置的不安全感，不是藝術為了抗衡烏托邦的空想而作出的誇大承諾，不是因為把社會參與描繪成獨有地、不容置疑地好，就可以保證希望是可以派發的（因為以上所有的都有可能失敗，就像從同樣情況之中生成的各異的事物一樣）。我希望擁抱一種歡迎不定性和複雜性的藝術語言，它無須為了正義和命令而教誨，卻對所有我們向藝術投入的和從藝術獲得的，一如既往地負責任。



Frances Barrett, *Curator*, 2016, 36-hour live performance with Mikala Tai and Toby Chapman as part of 4A Centre for Contemporary Asian Art's 'Roundtable x 4A' at Art Central Hong Kong, Photo: 4A Centre for Contemporary Asian Art. Courtesy of the artist.
法蘭西斯・巴雷特《策展人》，2016年，與Mikala Tai和Toby Chapman的36小時真實生活表演。此為4A亞洲當代藝術中心參與香港Art Central的計劃《Roundtable x 4A》的其中一部分。
攝影：4A亞洲當代藝術中心
相片由藝術家提供。

3

I have not done justice to the richness of both works by focusing on only particular aspects for the purpose of discussing the social and the engaged. What interests me here is that both Young and Barrett begin by detaching and disengaging from society, so that its established rationalities are in suspension. Reflective judgment is made possible when the artists are sensitive and alert to the social, so that the grammar of society that has made them could be shaken up. For artists, the social remains constantly open and not-yet-resolved and is up for challenge as the unfamiliar other. [9] On the reception side, we experience concrete shapes of fear, anger, frustration, joy, pride, vulnerability, among many others, not all of which are socially intelligible and presentable. If we who interpret and write demand that the socially-engaged be a solution to this strangeness, we may leave much of art's intricacy and the ardor that comes with it untouched and untapped.

Art is not accountable only to us and each other in our sociality. I am not trying to be cryptic or abstract, but to point to the difficulties and challenges that art continues to present to us, and what needs to be upheld for art to breathe fully and freely. To be overly attached to the social – however sound the reasons may be – risks missing the non-human that also comes into life. It also misses the way artists are acutely aware of being

strangers to themselves, and of having to keep this strangeness alive for their art to go on. The social can humanize art too much and too soon, to miss the magical, the spiritual, and the poetic – all that which art gives unto life.

I see that with more thinking of the social and its manifestations and alternatives, the more likely we are in a better position to cope with the fear of change. I feel unsettled by the gap between interpretation (with language, always already socially constituted but also in the making) and art, and I want to make a small dialectical space for art to challenge the interpretation. I seek a more reflective interpretation of the socially-engaged. I seek to ensure its source is not misplaced insecurity, or an exaggerated claim for the promise of art to make social change in its fight against empty if not utopian ideals for the future, or any guarantee that hope could be distributed by making the socially-engaged an exclusive and unquestionable good – for all these could fail, just as all kinds of disparate things may arise out of the same conditions. I care more for a language for art that is open for more uncertainties and complexities, and for less righteousness and didacticism, while remaining as responsible as it can be for all that is to come of art.

*I would like to express my heartfelt gratitude to Madeleine M. Slavick for her comments on the English copy of this essay, and for Joanna Lee Hoi-yin's sensible and sensitive translation of this essay into Chinese.

補充資料

[1] 例如，Gablik批評用於理解現代藝術家身份的「絕緣的個人性」模式，以及她的「可連繫的自我」論點，61至75頁。貝克爾（Becker）後來引用了「集體活動」構想，得別見於第一及第二章。

[2] 見，例如，張慧婷分析2000至2010年之間，香港具有社會參與元素的代表性藝術作品。亦可參考活化廳出版，李俊峰編，回顧2011至2015年活化廳「藝術/行動者駐場計劃」的兩冊書刊。

[3] 楊嘉輝的語音步行旁述。

[4] 楊嘉輝的語音步行旁述。

Notes

[1] For instance, Gablik’s critiques the model of ‘insular individuality’ in the understanding of the modern artist’s identity and her argument for the ‘connective self’, 61-75. The idea of ‘collective activity’ is taken up by Becker, especially chapters 1 and 2.

[2] See for instance, Cheung’s analysis of exemplary art works in Hong Kong in 2000 to 2010 with a component of social engagement. See also the twin volume edited by Lee, published by Wooferten, that reviews the Wooferten’s Art/Activist in Residence from 2011 to 2015.

[3] From audio narration of Young’s walk.

[4] From audio narration of Young’s walk.

[5] Ah Lok (Young) sang the theme song of a popular television soap opera series Kwong Chiu 狂潮 (Cantonese: kwong4 ciu4) from the 1970s. An important benchmark in the history of television in Hong Kong, it is regarded as the first long-running series, with over 100 episodes. The song was originally sung by Kwan Kuk-ying關菊英. In this last stop of the walk, Ah Lok began singing, ‘It’s him, it’s also you and me. We are close to each other, love each other, and also fight with each other.’ (my translation, ‘是他也是你和我，同相親相愛也相爭’) See http://www.feitsui.com/lyrics_t/%E7%8B%82%E6%BD%AE-1361.html for the Cantonese pronunciation of the lyrics. See also http://www.ln.edu.hk/mcsln/20th_issue/feature_02.shtml for an analysis by Hong Lai-ching (my translation, 洪麗晶), Lingnan University Department of Cultural Studies Master of Cultural Studies online publication; in Chinese only.

[6] See Stewart, especially chapter 3, and Chow, especially chapters 4, 7 and 8.

[7] See the artist’s web page on Curator. Web. <http://francesbarrett.com/projects/curator>. 30 July, 2016.

[8] Interview with artist. 2 April, 2016. Hong Kong, and emails between me and the artist. 1-2 August, 2016.

[9] See Steiner, 139.

[5] 阿樂（楊嘉輝）唱了《狂潮》，一首1970年代受歡迎的電視劇主題曲。該劇播出超過一百集，被視為香港電視劇史重要里程碑。歌曲由關菊英原唱。在步行路線最後一站，阿樂唱出原來的歌詞，第一句是「是他也是你和我，同相親相愛也相爭。」見http://www.feitsui.com/lyrics_t/%E7%8B%82%E6%BD%AE-1361.html。洪麗晶對香港電視業如何生產文化商品的分析，見 http://www.ln.edu.hk/mcsln/20th_issue/feature_02.shtml，嶺南大學文化研究碩士網上雜誌。只有中文版。

[6] 見Stewart，特別第三章，及周蕾，特別第四、七、八章。

[7] 見藝術家的《策展人》網站。<http://francesbarrett.com/projects/curator>。檢索日期：2016年7月30日。

[8] 巴雷特與我在香港的面談，2016年4月2日，以及2016年8月1-2日的電郵追加對話。

[9] 見 Steiner，頁139。

Works Cited

Becker, Howard S. *Art Worlds*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2008. Print.

Cheung, Stephanie. *Taking part: participatory art and the emerging civil society in Hong Kong*. World Art, 5.1 (2015): 1-24. Print.

Chow, Rey. *Writing Diaspora. Tactics of Intervention in Contemporary Cultural Studies*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1993. Print.

Gablik, Suzi. *The Reenchantment of Art*. London: Thames and Hudson, 1992. Print.

Lee, Chun Fung, ed. *AAiR 2011-12*. Hong Kong: Wooferten, 2016. Print.

---. *AAiR II, Art, Community, Activism*. Hong Kong: Wooferten, 2016. Print.

Steiner, George. *Real Presences*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989. Print.

Stewart, Susan. *On Longing. Narratives of the Miniature, the Gigantic, the Souvenir, and Collection*. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 1993. Print.

Wu, Hung. *Remaking Beijing. Tiananmen Square and the Creation of the Political Space*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005. Print.

引用文獻（按作者英文姓氏排序）

霍華德· S· 貝克爾著：《藝術世界》*Art Worlds*。柏克萊：加州大學出版社，2008。印刷品。

張慧婷著： *Taking part: participatory art and the emerging civil society in Hong Kong*，載 *World Art*，第五卷第一期（2015）：頁1-24。印刷品。

周蕾著：《寫在家國之外：當代文化研究的干涉策略》。（布盧明頓及印第安納波利斯：印第安納大學，1993）。印刷品。

Suzi Gablik著：《藝術的魅力重生》。倫敦：Thames and Hudson，1992。印刷品。

李俊峰著：《AAiR 2011－12 活化廳－藝術行動者駐場計畫》。香港：活化廳，2016。印刷品。

李俊峰著：《活化廳駐場計劃II：社區——藝術——行動》。香港：活化廳，2016。印刷品。

George Steiner著： *Real Presences*。芝加哥：芝加哥大學出版社，1989。印刷品。

Susan Stewart著： *On Longing. Narratives of the Miniature, the Gigantic, the Souvenir, and Collection*。杜倫及倫敦：杜克大學出版社，1993。印刷品。

巫鴻著： *Remaking Beijing. Tiananmen Square and the Creation of the Political Space*。芝加哥：芝加哥大學出版社，2005。印刷品。

Broadening the Possibilities of Docent Tours

Jeff Leung
Translated by James Lam

Before the Claude Monet exhibition at the Hong Kong Heritage Museum ended, I went to pay my respects. Although there were only a limited amount of works on display, the explanations were quite substantial. The exhibition panels with different themes and introductory video materials, allowed the general public to get a glimpse of each artwork's creative backgrounds, different genres and artistic languages. The exhibition venue was jam packed and after failing to enter, I resorted to joining a docent tour. The docent gave us a condensed description, along with images from an iPad and printed materials, of the video materials and exhibition panel in a very patient, detailed and professional manner. For me personally, a short docent tour not only delivers information to visitors in a convenient way, it also suggests a way to view the exhibits (paintings). Therefore, my main interest is on how a docent: 1) plan a highlighted route instead of capturing every piece; 2) plan a descriptive theme to provide stories that are beyond the painting itself (i.e. the process and intentions of the work) Docent tours are often regarded as a supplementary tool to view the exhibition and educate the public. However, from the angle of museology, a docent tour is not simply a "highlighted tour" of the exhibition, nor is it merely an art education. Like the exhibition itself, it is a form of interpretation that provides a certain angle of interpretation for the selected exhibits. Therefore, a docent is not simply an explainer, he/she is an interpreter.

開拓展覽導賞的可能

梁展峰

在文化博物館舉行的《克勞德•莫奈作品展》剛結束，當時我也慕名參觀。展出作品不算多，但旁邊的解說文字不少，再配以不同專題和介紹性的錄像片段，讓大眾了解作品的創作背景、作品類型及當中體現的藝術風格。展覽場內人頭湧湧，我擠不進名作面前卻退而求其次的參加導賞。導賞員的講解當然用心，精要地把錄像片段和現場文字的重點重申一次，更用手上的iPad裡的或打印好的圖片幫助解說。我認為在有限時間的導賞裡，導賞的解說工作不只單單提供資料以方便觀眾，而是提供一種了解展品(那些畫作)的方法。因此我最感興趣是：導賞員如何1) 擬定參觀重點作品而不是全部；2) 擬定講解重點，以提供畫面裡看不見但相關的故事(如作畫的過程和意圖)。展覽導賞一般被看成教授藝術和輔助展覽的角色，然而從博物館學角度，導賞不只展覽的「精華遊」，也不只是藝術教育，其實像展覽一樣是詮釋的一種，為那些展品提供某一理解角度。因此導賞不只是解說者，還可以是詮釋者(interpreter)。

導賞是一種詮釋

博物館(包括藝術博物館)的功能之一，是為藏品和展品進行詮釋(即：說明它們的意義)，其詮釋手法分靜態與動態。展覽是多種靜態詮釋方法之一，藉陳列展品的方法和展品旁的解說文字來詮釋那些展品蘊藏的意思，反之導賞(中、台譯：導覽)則是動態的詮釋方法，以語言和行動向觀眾解說參觀的事物，在觀光和生態旅遊中最為常見。在香港，「導賞員」的英譯多為docent或tour guide，卻少譯為interpreter。docent這英文字源自意謂「教」(teach)和「講學」(lecture)的拉丁文docēre，包含了指導、

教育的意思。這個字義說明導賞員如同策展人般需要透過說明展品和展覽的內容和意義以達教育目的。過程中，導賞員其實已經對展覽內容和重點介紹的展品有相當的「剪裁」，用以有效地在導賞的時間空間和觀眾等特定條件下，提供精要內容和重要的視點。因此導賞員也是詮釋者，為展出的事物提供某種(而不是全部的)理解方法。從前，博物館策展人其實都會擔任導賞員，履行他們的詮釋任務。隨時代發展，觀眾對博物館的要求和館裡人事編制都在轉變，教育任務發展成一獨立部門，有專責的策展人，與策劃展覽的部門由從屬轉為合作的關係。策展人更多專注培訓導賞員和管理導賞活動，導賞員被視為傳遞策展人訊息的輔助者。

要有效地詮釋，當然要對展品有相當認識。本地公營藝術空間油街實現會委託中介公司聘請具有藝術知識和背景(如：年青藝術家或藝術院校畢業生)擔任「藝術大使」，以負責展覽的看守和導賞。這些大使有效地為展品提供不同的詮釋角度。不過，本地多數的藝術導賞由義工擔任，他們不一定具有豐富的藝術知識。雖然導賞員可以通過機構培訓和自修來更了解展品，但他們的知識基礎以及對導賞員的輔助者身份的界定，會否影響了他們對展品作詮釋的信心？我所經驗的本地大多數的藝術導賞，內容都則重於事實資料的陳述，細心陳述藝術展品各細部和創作技巧，這樣是否已符合了詮釋的基本任務？美國國家公園的資深導賞員和顧問Freeman Tilden (1883-1980) 在50年代出版的*Interpreting Our Heritage*一書裡指出(導賞的)詮釋包含導賞員的思考(his private contemplation)

Docent tour as a form of interpretation

One of the functions of museums (including art museums), is to interpret, or define the meaning of, the collection and exhibits. The methods of interpretation are both passive and active. An exhibition is one of many forms of passive interpretation. The ways in which exhibits are displayed, combined with panels that explain about the exhibits, is a form of passive interpretation. Docent tours, on the other hand, are forms of active interpretation. By language, gesture and movements, the audience receives an explanation about the exhibits, this is a very common method of interpretation in site seeing tours and eco-tourism. In Hong Kong, the term "docent" is interchangeable with the term "tour guide". But it rarely refers to the word "interpreter". The word "docent" originated from the Latin word "docēre" which includes the meaning of teaching and providing guidance. This explains how docents are like curators, both parties, through interpreting and explaining the exhibits, are doing this with an underlying educational purpose. In the process, docents have selectively chosen certain exhibition contents and highlighted specific works, effectively making use of the limited time and space under specific conditions to provide the audience with an excerpt and important viewpoints. Therefore, docents are also interpreters, providing a specific, but not holistic, understanding of selected items. In the past, museum curators would also take up the role of an interpreter and fulfill his/her duties as an interpreter. As society progressed, audience's expectations on museums, as well as the institutions themselves have evolved. The missions and visions of education has developed into an independent department, with

designated curators whose relationship with the curatorial department has morphed from one that receives orders, to one that is based on a levelled co-operational platform. Curators are more responsible for training docents and managing docent activities. Docents are seen as transmitters of the curators' messages.

In order to interpret effectively, one must of course have a certain degree of understanding of the exhibits. Local publicly funded art space Oi! invites agencies to hire people with art knowledge and background (i.e. young artists or art school graduates) as "art ambassadors" to be responsible for looking after the exhibition space and docent tours. These ambassadors effectively provide for the exhibition, different angles of interpretations. But most local art tours are run by volunteers without any art background. Although docents receive institutional training and self-learning to enhance their understanding of the exhibits, their knowledge foundation and the definition of the role of docent as a transmitter of messages may perhaps hamper their confidence in interpreting the works. Most of the docent tours that I have been on, focuses their content on laying out factual information, detailed description of the exhibits and the creativity involved. Does this fulfill the basic requirements of interpretation? Freeman Tilden (1883-1980), senior docent and advisor of The US National Park Service, published *Interpreting Our Heritage* in the 1950s. In his book, he points out how the docent's interpretation should include his private contemplation and his contact with the public:

"Information, as such, is not Interpretation. Interpretation is revelation based upon information. But they

和他與觀眾的交流(his contact with the public)，因此「詮釋不只是提供資料」：

‘Information, as such, is not Interpretation. Interpretation is revelation based upon information. But they are entirely different things. However, all interpretation includes information.’ [1]

於是我想參考他導賞的技巧，從中發現藝術導賞的一些重要方法或原則。Freeman在書中總結了從事導賞（這種詮釋工作）的六大原則：

- (1) 所有和參觀者個性與經驗無關的詮釋，都是沒用的。
- (2) 資訊本身還不是詮釋；詮釋是根據資訊做的解釋。
- (3) 詮釋本身是結合多種藝術的藝術，無論是針對自然物件或人為物件的詮釋皆同。每種藝術某個程度上都是可教的。
- (4) 詮釋的主要目標不是教訓(instruction)，而是挑釁(provoke)。
- (5) 詮釋應參考全局，而非拘泥細節，並且是針對所有的人。
- (6) 針對兒童的詮釋，不能用對成人的詮釋製成，一定要特別準備。

以香港藝術中心的義工導賞員為例，義工們不是藝術家，是對藝術充滿熱誠和好奇的普羅大眾，有其各自的專業和生活經驗。中心的培訓工作坊為導賞員提供美感教育和藝術欣賞的技巧、藝術資料的編採、導賞的規劃和操作（如：觀眾類型與藝術興趣的關係、溝通技巧）以及參觀預展並會見藝術家和策展人的親身「考察」。這些培訓大致可以實現「根據資訊做的解釋」的原則。導賞的專業性亦會通過工作坊後的見習(shadowing)、自學(DIY learning)和實踐(Practice)所構成的「實踐中學習」(Learning by Doing)[2]，得以維持和提升。

詮釋作為挑釁

我在參觀倫敦泰特現代美術館時，發現導賞員多是藝術家或藝術家學生。他們的藝術知識當然足以應付導賞員的工作，但觀眾都很主動的與導賞員溝通，表達對那些展品的認同或批評。這是關乎觀眾的主動性，並非純粹因為導賞員的個人努力和技巧。相對下，這種交流在香港的藝術導賞從過去的缺少到近年的慢慢增加。然而導賞員的細心介紹，依然讓觀眾成為藝術和展覽的「知道份子」，未容易激發觀眾思考和提問。這正突出了本地的藝術導賞依然重於說教式的教育性質，忽略了Freeman所強調的導賞重於「挑釁人們為自己而行動」：

‘The interpreter is engaged in a kind of education. It is not the classroom kind. I…… to provoke the listener to do something to himself.’ [3]

are entirely different things. However, all interpretation includes information.” [1]

I would like to refer to his docent techniques and discover some key methods or principles for art tours. Freeman distilled the work of docent tours and interpretation into six main principles.

1. Any interpretation that does not somehow relate what is being displayed or described to something within the personality or experience of the visitor will be sterile.
2. Information, as such, is not Interpretation. Interpretation is revelation based upon information. But they are entirely different things. However all interpretation includes information.
3. Interpretation is an art, which combines many arts, whether the materials presented are scientific, historical or architectural. Any art is in some degree teachable.
4. The chief aim of Interpretation is not instruction, but provocation.
5. Interpretation should aim to present a whole rather than a part, and must address itself to the whole man rather than any phase.
6. Interpretation addressed to children (say up to the age of twelve) should not be a dilution of the presentation to adults, but should follow a fundamentally different approach. To be at its best it will require a separate program.

Take Hong Kong Arts Centre's volunteer art docent programme for example. Although the volunteers

are not artists, they are a group of art loving members from the general public and have in them their unique professional and living experiences. The Centre organises workshops for the docents, providing them with aesthetics education and art appreciation techniques, art information research, the planning and running of the art docent programme (i.e. differentiating the audience segment and their level of interest in art, and enhancing their communication skills), as well as attending exhibition pre-openings and gathering information directly from artists and curators. These workshops can very likely fulfill the principles of “explaining through a gathering of information”. The professionalism of docents, through workshops that combine shadowing, DIY learning and practices, will be maintained and enhanced through these “Learning by Doing” [2] exercises.

Interpreting to provoke

When I was visiting London's Tate Modern Museum, I found that most docents were artists or art students. Their art knowledge was of course sufficient to handle the work of a docent, but the audience was also actively seeking out to communicate with the docents, giving their compliments or critiques of the exhibits. This is about the audience playing a proactive role and the experience not solely based on a docent's hardwork and techniques. In comparison, although these exchanges in Hong Kong's docent tours have gradually increased in recent years, the docent's detailed explanation continues to be the “know-it-alls” of art and exhibition and rarely provokes the audience to think and raise questions. This demonstrates how local docent tours still take the form of a top-down lecture-like form of delivery, neglecting Freeman's emphasis on docent tours being a call to action:

“The interpreter is engaged in a kind of education. It is not the classroom kind. It to provoke the listener to do something to himself.” [3]

導賞作為一種詮釋，顯然以旨在挑動觀眾自發行動。Freeman做的是生態導賞，要挑釁出的是保育意識。他在書裡雖沒有提及藝術導賞，但有篇章談及(大自然的)美感體驗。他提醒：不同人的感受不同，導賞員應該挑釁觀眾去發現自己體驗大自然美的方式。這也許可借用到藝術導賞中，讓它不只是傳遞藝術知識，而是開拓觀眾欣賞藝術的方法。於是藝術導賞的詮釋不同於策展人的，是如何以詮釋(interpretation) 來挑釁(provoke)出欣賞(appreciation)的動機和衝動。本地的導賞團有其發展趨勢。兒童和學生的導賞已經注入了工作坊的元素，社會對無障礙設施的重視促成了方便視障人士的口述影像導賞。不過面向一般成人的導賞，始終重於介紹展品的內容，少有提供「詮釋」和「挑釁」的成份，與Freeman提倡成功導賞還有一段距離。

[1] Tilden, Freeman. *Interpreting Our Heritage* (3rd ed.) Chapel Hill: The University Of North Carolina Press, 1977. p. 9.

[2] 參考自：Grenier, Robin. The Role of Learning in the Development of Expertise in Museum Docents. *Adult Education Quarterly*, Vol. 59 No. 2. February 2009. pp.142-157.

[3] Tilden, Freeman. *Interpreting Our Heritage* (3rd ed.) Chapel Hill: The University Of North Carolina Press, 1977. p. 111.

Docent tour as a form of interpretation apparently seeks to provoke audience into action. Freeman, as an ecological docent, is trying to provoke from his audience a sense of conservation awareness. Although he does not mention art tours, there is a chapter on (nature's) aesthetic experiences. He reminds his readers that people have different sensations, docents should provoke the audience into experiencing the beauty of nature in their own unique way. We can perhaps apply this idea onto art tours, so that the tours are not simply about transferring art knowledge, but ways to broaden how we all appreciate art. Therefore, the approach of art tours is different from that of curators, it is about the act of interpreting to provoke and bring to the surface, the motive and desire to appreciate. Local art tours are beginning to find their voices. Children and student tours are filled with workshop elements; the society has a much greater emphasis on providing equal opportunities to all, ensuring that facilities are accessible to all, resulting in audio description tours geared towards the visually impaired. But the common art tours for adult still place emphasis on introducing the content of the exhibition, often without the elements of interpretation and provocation. There remains a gap between what Freeman terms as an effective docent tour.

[1] Tilden, Freeman. *Interpreting Our Heritage* (3rd ed.) Chapel Hill: The University Of North Carolina Press, 1977. p. 9.

[2] Grenier, Robin. The Role of Learning in the Development of Expertise in Museum Docents. *Adult Education Quarterly*, Vol. 59 No. 2. February 2009. pp.142-157.

[3] Tilden, Freeman. *Interpreting Our Heritage* (3rd ed.) Chapel Hill: The University Of North Carolina Press, 1977. p. 111.

Reading Annie Wan's Unopened Books

Vivian Ting
Translated by Vicky Yuen

“Books can change the world. But I believe the most important part of a book is not on its pages, but between them.”

Annie Wan

Plato's Shadow

Blocked inside a dim cave, a group of prisoners stared straight at the stone wall at the far end. The fire behind them projected their shadows onto the wall in the outside world, which they would soon take as their reality. When one of them managed to escape, they would return to share what they saw in the outside with their fellows; but the inmates were so accustomed to the shadows that they could not believe what they were told of the outside reality.

The allegory of the cave is presented by Plato in his work, *The Republic*. He was optimistic enough to rest his trust firmly on books as a medium to view ideas and inspire the generations about “reality”. But do books really lead us out of barbarism, to an examination of our inadequacies, and keep us from repeating catastrophes of the past in this era of information explosion? What exactly do books preserve?

Hong Kong ceramic artist Annie Wan is far less confident about the cultural functions of books than Plato. With a delicate touch for the plasticity of the material, Annie congeals shapes, textures, and traces time on books through molding, presenting viewers with variations of books – be they stacked, tattered, or piled into a brilliantly-coloured wall. The books in Annie's works are deliberately detached from the conventional cultural context – they are blank and

尹麗娟翻不開的「書本」

丁穎茵

「書可以改變世界，但我相信它最重要的部分並非在紙上，而是在頁間。」

尹麗娟

柏拉圖的影子

昏暗的洞穴裡，一群囚徒給鎖著，只能直直的面向盡頭的石壁。耐人尋味的是，囚徒身後的火炬將外界物事的影子投射到石壁，使其深信這些影子即世界的真象。後來，有人逃出洞穴，看到外面的花花世界，便回去告訴同伴所見所聞。可是，大家對影子習以為常，誰也不相信洞穴以外竟然萬象紛紜。

這則寓言載於柏拉圖的《理想國》。顯然，柏拉圖是樂觀的。他相信書承載著真知灼見，足以喚醒世世代代的囚徒重新認識大千世界。但在這資訊爆炸的時代，書可曾帶領人走出蒙昧、檢視自身的卑劣，讓我們避過歷史的劫難？書究竟保存得了什麼？

對於書的文化功能，香港陶藝家尹麗娟似乎沒有柏拉圖的信心。她向觀眾展示了七彩亮麗的「書牆」、壘壘疊疊的「書本」、斑剝破爛的「書冊」……這些都是書的影子，藉由陶泥易於壓模塑形的特性凝住了書刊的形狀、肌理、材質，及歲月刻在其上的皺紋。尹氏的書謝絕翻閱、不立文字，灑灑的脫離原書的文化語境。一如洞穴世界的影像，這些書刊蒼白而無內容，本來伸手可及的日常物變得陌生又遙遠。然而，其曖昧不明卻扯出觀者與現實之間的裂縫，擘開虛無又抽象的想像世界。

書的「中」、「國」

在淨白的牆上，尹麗娟架起了一道書的彩虹：自驕矜的紅、明媚的橙、澄澄的黃過渡至怯怯的青，再由深沉的綠翻到澄澈的藍，直至魅惑的紫而止（圖一）。這組作品名為《「中」、「國」》（2013年），藝術家搜集了各式各樣的書，卻刻意抹走書脊的文字，獨獨剩下「中」、「國」兩字。於是這道彩虹不再維繫著知識，字句彷彿順著書的大小呎寸、顏色變化翩翩然越過書的牢籠。那末，觀眾如何解讀「中」、「國」兩字？那是政權的稱謂？種族文化的統稱？群體生活的公共領域？還是單純地理區的範疇？

除了「中」、「國」兩字，書中所有文字彷彿失去了指事達意的作用，一下子書架上與「中國」相關的知識被瓦解了。活生生的「中國」——廣漠的大地、多變的烹調手法、經濟發展數據——統統變成了朦朧的印象，甚至顏色、線條的抽象形式。書的「語言」只剩下色彩的跳躍與大小的節奏，與觀眾所欲探求有關「中國」的知識形成怪異的對比。書的視覺形式阻撓觀眾直接閱讀「中國」，而其了無意義卻又促使人超越視覺本身。觀眾唯有嘗試將有關「中國」七零八落的觀察、感受、知識、想像聚攏起來，重新檢視何謂「中國」，而又自己如何定義「中國」。



（圖一）一道書的彩虹嘗試解構觀眾對「中」、「國」的理解。
(Fig.1) A full rainbow of book titles attempts to deconstruct our understanding of “Zhong” “Guo”.

empty, just as the projected shadows on the cave walls. When a common daily object turns into something distant and unfamiliar, a palpable gap opens up between viewers and reality, conjuring a surreal world for the imagination.

“Zhong” “Guo” in Books

A full rainbow of book titles spans the white wall, with the words, “Zhong” and “Guo”, which is translated as “Middle Kingdom” or “China” (2013) (Fig. 1). The artist spreads words along the ridge of the collected books in various colours, except for the characters “Zhong” and “Guo”. The rainbow no longer holds knowledge as words and the sentences are freed from the limits of books, delivering meanings from the variation in book size and colours instead. The way in which viewers interpret “Zhong Guo / China” from the work – as the name for a governing party; as a collective name for a distinguished racial and cultural identity; as the name for a common sphere of communal life; or purely as a geographical entity – brings multiple meanings to the work.

The words other than “Zhong” and “Guo” are deprived of meaning, and any knowledge associated with China is dismissed. An energetic China – a vast land with diverse culinary delights and massive data for economic development, blurs into a hazy impression or abstract forms of shade and lines. The surfaces are in bizarre contrast when the “language” itself is reduced to a rhythm of colours and sizes, leaving viewers’ yearning for knowledge about China. The visual format of the books prevents viewers from directly interpreting China while their

emptiness invites viewers to explore beyond the visual boundaries. Viewers are left with no choice but to group their disjoint observations, feelings, ideas, and imagination about China together, in developing their personal interpretations for a more general definition of China.

Questions about Books

Annie does not duplicate the books, but the viewers' imagination towards their content. She turns books into speechless cubes by erasing the world of knowledge they might contain. The silenced books and the desire viewers have for knowledge creates push and pull forces that bring about a new way of reading – reconstructing knowledge and using imagination for the books with visual perceptions.

In Manchester, the John Rylands Library houses a magnificent collection of medieval and religious manuscripts, and a massive volume of academic books, to create its knowledge treasure. At the library, Annie placed 18 duplicated ceramic books (Fig. 2) of varying sizes, as cubic, white, and intricate objects. In a ridiculous manner they refuse to be classified, read, or interpreted. Yet, the captions clearly reveal their identities: an Oxford English Chinese dictionary, a Qiu-xianlong Chinese dictionary, and a Putonghua phonetic dictionary. Dictionaries as language learning tools only serve to give details about etymologies, pronunciations, meanings, and the variants for each word. If language is a vessel of knowledge, how do we understand how it shapes our expression and communication of ideas? With these ideas in mind, the artist deliberately veils the meanings of words with clay – rendering concepts/



(圖二)《迷失兩文三語》一作詰問不同的語文教曉我們什麼。
(Fig.2) *Lost in Bilateralism and Trilingualism* questions what we would learn from different language.

書的疑問

尹麗娟所複製的不是書，而是觀眾對書的內容——相關課題的知識——的想像。她將書的知識世界抽空，轉而凝結成無可言說的立方體。複製書的啞默與讀者渴望獲取知識及其已存的知識世界互相拉扯，又引出另一種閱讀方式：以視覺感受重整有關書的知識及想像。

收藏著羊皮書手稿、中世紀版畫、名人書信以及成千上萬的學術典籍，約翰蘭德圖書館可謂知識的寶庫。藝術家竟然在這所古色古香的大學圖書館放置了18本陶瓷複製書（圖二）。這些「書本」雖然大小不一、新舊有別，卻同樣的刷白、同樣的紋理細密、也同樣的方正笨拙。它們以莫名其妙的姿態拒絕觀眾分類、閱讀、詮釋。可是，展覽文字卻明白的告訴觀眾：這一塊是牛津英漢字典、那一磚是喬硯農中文字典、還有普通話拼音字典……字典本是學習語言的工具書，逐字逐詞的解釋字詞的來源、讀音、語意以及變體。而語言卻又是知識的載體。人類對語言的理解與運用，足以指涉世上萬事萬物，傳遞所思所感，增進不同社群的交流。尹氏的複製卻刻意用陶泥堵住文字的意義，使得名與實、形式與內容、文本與知識都變得無足輕重。複製的形式改變了讀者的思考：不是複製了什麼內容，而是為什麼複製？

這組名為《迷失兩文三語》的作品(2014年)陳列了英漢雙解、粵語普通話對照、繁體簡體字並舉的字典，也印證著香港人的學習經歷——活剝生吞的記下主語、謂語、賓語的定義，將之套用於中、英文的句式結構；生活於粵語的文化環境、但又接受以普通話學習中文比較優越；無視文字發展脈絡，但求一手隨時轉譯繁體字、簡體字、錯別字與白字……藝術家掏空了字典的內容，迫使觀眾詰問：兩文三語的字典教曉我們什麼？翻查這些字典，我們如何從字義、字音與字形認識語言、認識一字一詞所包蘊的歷史、文化與思想？當我手寫的文字形體大異其趣、我口所讀的文法與音義亦遠離日常生活時，我心又如何協調手與口的歧異？或許數碼科技早已取代厚重的字典，又或者學生早已厭倦兩文三語的喋喋不休，情願回到圖像符號的你猜我度。字典無用武之地，複製的字典不再是知識的載體，而是知識失效的實體，呈現出語文教育的蒼白。當英語、普通話以及粵語統統不為所用，究竟我們有否錯失了什麼？認識世界的國際視野？擁抱祖國的家國情懷？又或追溯自己文化經驗的本土定位？

objectives, format/content, text and knowledge insignificant. The duplication of the objects shifts the viewers' perspective: it's not about what to duplicate but why?

Entitled *Lost in Bilateralism and Trilingualism* (2014), this set of works displayed Chinese-English dictionaries, and their counterparts in Cantonese-Putonghua and traditional-simplified Chinese. They are valid proof of the painstaking learning experience that many Hongkongers go through: first reciting the definitions of Subject, Object, and Predicate, then applying them in Chinese and English sentences. We are so used to accepting the superiority of Putonghua over Cantonese despite our Cantonese cultural upbringing, and prefer quick translations between traditional and simplified Chinese, ignoring the development of the languages. By emptying the content of the dictionaries, Annie engages viewers to ponder: What do these bilateral and trilingual dictionaries bring us? How do we learn the history, culture, and ideas embodied by each word, phrase, and language if we are only to learn their respective meaning, pronunciation, and forms? How do we manage to speak for ourselves with the wide discrepancy between the written and spoken language? At a time when digital technology overrides bulky dictionaries, when students prefer emoticons to jabbering literacy, dictionaries are rendered useless. Their duplications, therefore, are no longer a medium for knowledge, but the evidence that exposes their deficiency and that of language education in the city. At a time when English, Putonghua, and Cantonese have become irrelevant, would we miss out on a liberal, global outlook, an emotional attachment to national identity, or a local positioning of our cultural experiences?

Books in Time

Books “freeze” the passage of time by preserving what we treasure and by fostering civilizations. Annie, however, has taken the effort to smear pages one after another with clay, filling the gaps between them to remove all content. The process is reminisce of the page-turning and reading experience of any reader – ceramic books leave no paper but traces of cracks between pages – the part Annie values most. The work is less about playing with forms, but transforming abstract ideas to emotionally touching objects that ask what is lacking from our realm of knowledge.

Annie depicts familiar scenes in the video footage of *The Road we Travelled* (2015) – children are running after a ball, workers bring homemade lunches to work, and the dusty reclamation work in Shatin. The footages are just like hands on a clock, flashing back, bringing us back to a seemingly thriving and confident era. Yet, the artist buried bits and pieces of the city's development with clay and brush (Fig. 3). The repetitive flipping and smearing replaces the meticulous movements of clock hands, imitating the clock's brief stay in the forthcoming and foregoing. Intriguing enough, with the video taken at a bird's eye view, viewers are invited to see the past gradually buried in the repetitive brushstrokes of the artist. The history buried underneath may belong to Annie as well as to all of us. The past has gone in front of the viewers and more questions arise: why would people insist on burying the past? What have we done to preserve the fading past at the blink of an eye? What past do we truly value?

書的時空

當時間以遺忘沖洗一切，書留存了我們所珍視的資訊，並成就人類的文明。但尹麗娟偏偏滌除了書的內容，以泥漿逐頁逐頁的塗抹書頁，填塞書的間罅。陶瓷書送入窯爐，紙張化為烏有，留下書頁罅隙的痕跡。其層層堆疊的複製過程彷彿讀者手指緩緩掃開書頁，眼睛徘徊於一字一行的閱讀經驗。尹氏認為書頁之間是書最重要的部份，正道出複製不僅在於形式，更在乎將讀者抽象的腦力運作轉化成觸動人心的物。

在《一起走過的日子》(2015年)一作，藝術家的錄像影片呈現了一幕幕似曾相識的景象——徙置區孩童追逐著西瓜波、工人提著飯壺魚貫上班去、沙田填海工程的塵土飛揚……錄像的默然彷彿吞下時鐘滴嗒滴的聲音，時間流轉到過去看似美好又自信的年代。可是，尹麗娟卻手執毛刷左拖右掃，以泥漿埋沒香港城市發展的片段（圖三）。翻書、塗書的動作來回往復取代了時針、分針一絲不苟的步伐，但時間要麼留駐在昂揚發展的某一情節、卻又偶爾站在過去消逝的當下輕輕嘆息。耐人尋味的是，錄像以俯視的角度拍攝，觀眾只看到藝術家雙手重複又重複的動作，然後過去就在一掃一拖之間隱沒。這雙手淹沒歷史也許是藝術家的，興許也是每一個人的。誰決意埋藏過去？在過去消逝的剎那間，這座城市的人又做了什麼保留消逝的事物？究竟什麼樣的過去值得我們珍而重之？

尹麗娟複製了翻閱有關香港歷史圖片的過程，亦即複製了思考歷史意義的過程。而燒成的陶瓷書竟如劫後餘燼落得焦黑斑駁，書頁的鱗鱗傷痕聚成記憶皺麻紛披的岩層，益發顯得回憶朝生暮死的蒼涼。歷史書如

何被人閱讀？它們掀起了怎樣的思考？往事繁華盡褪是否就表示今天不必回望過去？陶瓷書與原書面貌的差距塑造了閱讀的歷程：知識的存檔與訊息的刪除、新想法的生成與舊觀念的崩塌。唯有不斷篩選與自己相關的過去，讀者翻書、閱書、品書，方能開創出自身世界的地貌。就在過去日漸遠去之際，尹麗娟複製歷史圖錄，將昔日香港微縮到書頁的間隙，印證讀者與書與城市一段或淺或深的緣份。

（圖三）陶瓷製的歷史圖錄見證了往日舊事的消亡。
(Fig.3) The ceramic version of historical catalogues witnesses the fading past.



書的影子

書本載著不少真話、好話、官話、壞話、刁話、廢話、蠢話、鬼話、謊話、夢話、老話……尹麗娟的書卻將之一一塗抹，獨獨保留其殘影。柏拉圖認為閱讀萬象的影子並不能接近真實的世界。尹氏卻複製了書的影象以揭示書本形式與內容、知識與現實的距離，促使觀眾檢視自身的閱讀經驗，反思如何建構自己的知識世界。柏拉圖的書以其哲理讓人認識世界，而尹氏的書則以其蒼白讓人反問自己如何認識世界，而耳聞目睹的世界又為何物。閱讀二書，我們同樣得問：我們為何讀書？書裡頭有什麼？

Annie not only duplicates the process of flipping historical pictures of the city, but reflects on the meaning of history. When only dark ashes remain after the ceramic books are kilned, with traces of pages stacked up like layers of memory, the meaning of history is presented to viewers – what thinking processes do history books evoke and how are they read? Do we need to reflect on a prosperous past that has already gone? The great disparity between the ceramic books and their original versions signifies a reading process involving remembering and forgetting, formation of new ideas, and depletion of old ones. Viewers will soon realize that only through flipping, reading, and appreciating books, coupled with a screening of one's past, can new horizons be developed. Annie's work to duplicate historical catalogues not only abbreviates the city's past as gaps between pages, but also shows an obscure affinity among readers, books, and the city.

Shadows of Books

Annie coated all of the contents of the books regardless of their nature and tone, leaving shapes that are barely visible. While Plato believed that the reading of shadows did not bring one any closer to the truth, Annie copied the image of books to showcase the gap between form/content and knowledge/reality, forcing viewers to reflect on their personal reading experience and how their world of knowledge can be established. While Plato introduced the world to his readers through his philosophy, Annie poses a rhetorical question with blank ceramic books – how does one come to know the world? What does it mean to experience the world? Whichever book we are reading, the same question comes to our mind: why are we reading and what is in the books?

Our Art Criticism

Chan Sai Lok
Translated by Vicky Yuen

The definition of “art criticism” varies as much as the stance of art critics and approaches of art review magazines. With multiple focuses on artists – their recent situation, the standard and features of their works, the underlying concepts and details of the exhibitions delivery, Art Appraisal Club holds monthly meetings to discuss exhibitions open to show. With our attention on the ecosystem and way forward of the local art scene, this article is by no means authoritative. Rather, it aims to offer a brief history of art criticism and arguments put forward by key art critics, as well as to provide a practical framework for those eager to explore in the subject.

Q. While the general public perceives “criticism” as more noble than “appreciation”, it seems to mean “finger-pointing” for artists. Ricky Yeung once described art critics as “nitpicking” in an article in the brochure of an art summer camp; Anthony Leung commented the power of art criticism as an extension of authority of the European art criticism since the 19th century. Is art criticism thus well defined?

A. Let’s just treat art criticism as ordinary as we can. When artists, curators and art administrators alike devote themselves in exhibitions, they may well expect more audience, as well as discussions.

A. The word “criticism” basically means “to talk about”. Art criticism, then, is an act driven by curiosity, taking a close look at different modes of art, be they conventional or brand-new. With sharp observation, art criticism discerns artists’ intention and ideas in the creative process, and spots the minimal variations among works seemingly alike. It is interesting to note that while we perceive the word “appraise” rather negatively, it actually confirms the

我們的藝術評論

阿三

「藝術評論」定義眾說紛紜，各藝評人與藝評雜誌立場鮮明方針卻可迥異。Art Appraisal Club每月就當期展覽的遊藝說論會，以人為本，關心藝術家近況、其作品水平與特質，及展覽概念與執行細節，我們亦著緊眼前香港藝術生態與命途。這篇「藝評Q&A」絕非充當權威，而著力呈現我們撰寫藝評的經驗與態度——惟「我們」面貌不一，看法多樣。此外，本文摘取藝術評論小歷史及重要藝評人論調，嘗試勾勒具體而平實的框架，給關心藝評有志執筆的朋友導航。

Q. 我們看到「評論」這詞，便覺得比一般欣賞「較高層次」，而「評論」作品似乎是「指指點點」。楊秀卓在一藝術夏令營的文章用「諸多挑剔」形容藝評人，梁寶山則說「藝評殺傷力」是十九世紀以來歐洲藝評權威的延伸。到底，藝術評論是不是這樣呢？

A. 或者，我們可以把藝術評論看得平常一點。你（不論是藝術家、策展人或藝文團體行政人員）花盡時間心血辦了展覽，都想多點人來看，來討論一下吧。

A. 評論字源本指「談及」。討論之前，便是去看。藝評滿懷好奇，對見慣見熟或獨特新穎的藝術形式從頭到尾打量看清。他們有雙明眸，洞察或辨識出創作人意圖與創作時心神，又能把看似相同的作品找出些微差異。另外，打工仔看見「評定」（appraise）一詞可會滿有戒心，惟這有肯定被評定對象價值的意思，將該被稱許頌讚的人或事點出。

A. 事情越辯越清，有水準的藝評人跟創作人討論可會是稱心快慰的過程；當傾出精闢見解或意見能協助創作人發展，評論則更是美事。所以，我們每次開會，就作品與展覽拗過你死我活後倒感到精神爽利！

Q. 即使在文化藝術圈，我們都難對「藝術」理解有共識，那該怎樣去「評論」？藝術總有其主觀的因素吧。

A. 沒錯，評論本身是藝評人對作品的直接感應，是人與物件或物質間的感通，當中必然包含個人藝術素養與喜好差異。但關鍵的是，「主觀」不代表沒有討論空間。你發表判斷前，得說明你看到些甚麼、如何理解你看到的事情、如何串連你看到的事情，及憑甚麼藝術知識或理據作出這樣的判斷。

A. 又，評論是建立溝通橋樑的工作，包括作品／展覽與創作人／觀眾／社會之間。藝評人有責任提供理據與討論基礎，而非武斷丟下觀點而去。藝術恰恰是直覺／感受／情緒與理性／知識／創作判斷之間來回往返的思考過程，故討論藝術是件複雜難纏的工作。

A. 不同人對同一作品或展覽持不同或相反意見，其實很平常，有得拗才有進步。可是，只有立場欠缺理據的話，我們並不希望見到。

value of the appraised, giving merit to aspects that should be cherished.

A. Fruitful appraisals between artists and well-informed art critics bring pleasure to both; it is even more the case when insightful views exchanged foster the advancement of the artists. In fact, we all feel energized after heated debates on artwork and exhibitions!

Q. How are we going to appraise “art” when it is such a subjective concept that a consensus towards its meaning is not reached even within the art and cultural circle?

A. Art criticism is in itself an art critic’s intuition towards a work of art, a communication between himself / herself and the object / materials, with artistic personality and taste as a subject element. Having said that, the subjectivity of art does not hinder discussion on it – one always express how he / she comprehends what he / she sees and links them together by elaborating on his / her artistic knowledge and reasons that drive him / her to the judgment. These processes may facilitate discussions.

A. Appraisal is an act of bridging communication gaps, be they between artwork/exhibition and artists/audience/society. An art critic is obliged to ground his / her appraisal with evidence on a rational basis rather than merely stating viewpoints. When art is a thinking process taking one back and forth between instincts / feeling / emotion and rationality / knowledge / creative judgment, art criticism is of course as complicated and tough as one can imagine.

A. It’s perfectly normal to see viewers holding have different or even contrasting views towards an artwork or an exhibition. When discussions usually bring progress, those ungrounded may not help at all.

Q. What can the tough and tiring discussions in art criticism bring about?

A. At the start, art criticism brings artwork and exhibition into a related context that fosters expression of relevant artistic concepts and substantiation. Further, it offers new and different ways of seeing and thinking to members of the audience, guiding them through a journey to new horizons. Art criticism should start by grasping the artist's concepts and aesthetic standards before deliberating on his / her works in case the artist himself / herself is the target. While it might well be expected that blind spots prevail in artists long devoted to his / her subjects of attention, art criticism serves to eliminate them or, if possible, to partner with the artist. Last but not least, art criticism judges the quality of artwork and exhibition with a view to foster debates with multiple perspectives free from authority.

A. Art critics bear the responsibility of mapping the artist landscape and trend apart from critiquing individual artwork or shows. This makes them somewhat like art history editors. Another indispensable role is to introduce or recommend to the general audience works and shows that are experimental, cult, full of potential/creative energy or receiving little attention. As time passes, prevailing artistic concepts and vocabulary may turn obsolete. Art critics are there to supply new ones that serve to aptly describe the present and project for the future.

Q. The appraisal steps put forward by Lawrence Alloway (description, analysis, interpretation and evaluation of works of art) are so widely accepted that they are referenced in the prevailing art curriculum. Having said that, quite frequently readers may find art appraisals deviating from the steps and thus hard to comprehend. Is there any particular approach towards art appraisal writing?

A. Visual art teachers and students in secondary schools must be reminded that art appraisals are not to be produced under rigid formula. While Lawrence Alloway provides the basic principles governing art appraisal writing through induction, there

Q. 既然討論如此難纏，那藝評具體可以做些甚麼？

A. 最基本的，是將作品與展覽放入恰當的語境，述說理據與相關藝術概念，繼而打開觀眾雙眸，提供不同的觀看角度與思考方式。如果對象是創作人，藝評應先明白創作人的藝術觀念與審美標準，後判斷作品面貌呈現出來的實況。創作人長年忠於自己的關注課題，有盲點不難理解。藝評的作用是協助創作人弄清盲點，甚至成為創作人的伙伴。最後又可能是最重要的，是判斷作品與展覽的好與壞。不過，評論應該是雙向或多向的思辯，藝評人絕非一言堂。

A. 除了個別作品與展覽，藝評人有責任為時代把脈，模塑當下藝術家的發展與整體趨勢，類近編寫藝術歷史的工作。香港藝術展覽或計劃多不勝數，藝評人的另一使命，是向大眾引介或推薦鮮為人知、具實驗性、小眾及有潛質與創作能量的作品與展覽。此外，時勢變化萬千，既有觀念與詞彙隨時不合時宜，藝評人需要提供新詞彙、新觀念描述現況，展望將來。

Q. Lawrence Alloway提出的評論步驟（包括描述、分析、詮釋及評核）深受各界認同，甚至成為學校藝術教育課程的參考。但不少藝評文章卻非按此去寫，讀者或偶遇到艱澀難明的理論論述。到底，評論的書寫該是怎樣的？

A. 首先得向中學視藝科老師及選修視覺藝術的學生說，藝評文字絕不能以僵化程式生產，Lawrence Alloway的方法是歸納出來的基本原則，藝評如何介入作品，應當可

以自家作主。最根本的介入是，作品有甚麼特質觸動到你？

A. 理論概念有助開啟討論大門，而藝術知識為理據基礎，卻多涉及術語。如果我們相信藝評是溝通的橋樑，那應該用淺白的日常語言，清楚準確地述說資料與觀點，而不是處處迷信理論，拋出術語又缺乏闡釋。書寫傾向學術還是黎民百姓，則視乎藝評人的取態。

A. 書寫是常見的藝評形式，但面談或討論，也可視作為藝評。所以，策展人藝術家偶然安排私人或公開的傾偈會，在工作室或展覽空間內，類似歷史裡的「文化沙龍」或「文人雅士遣興」；而導賞亦可以是評論的一種。

Q. 藝評人該是接受過藝術訓練的人，要不是懂得創作，有辦展覽經驗，就是讀藝術史或藝術理論出身的吧？

A. 的確，要判斷「甚麼是藝術？」需要藝術歷史與理論知識，包括美學觀念發展、各地各時代藝術面貌轉向，或藝術生態與展示空間等。所以，不少藝評人的出身與藝術科目有關。

A. 不過，現當代藝術涉獵範疇不下於傳統藝術領域，社會學理論、文化與影像理論、當代哲學、文學理論、經濟或政治理論、殖民與性別、資本或消費等，統統與藝術有關。所以，藝評人可來自不同知識領域。同時，過去歷史只有「藝術評論」一籠統概念，惟現在其範圍不斷擴大並開支散葉，例如電影評論、建築評論、音樂評論或設計評論等。

stands unharmed the flexibility of approaches art appraisals adopt to mediate with an artwork. Ask just the most fundamental question before attempting art appraisal: what quality of an artwork moves you the most?

A. Theories and concepts add fuels to the art discussion supported by artistic knowledge. If art appraisals serve to bridge communication gaps, it would be better to express viewpoints and provide information with simple language but not dull theories and jargons without proper explanation. Nonetheless, art critics may adopt academic or casual approach in critique writing depending on their individual preferences.

A. While written criticism is the most common form of art critique, spoken criticism or studio critique stand an equal footing. Private or public discussions organized by curators and artists alike, casual chats and sharing in workshops and exhibitions space like scholars in the past once had, as well as guided-tours, are all counted as appraisals.

Q. It seems logical to say art critics are artistically trained - in creative process, in art history or art theories, or gained practical experience in curating exhibitions.

A. It is true to say that quite a number of art critics have relevant background – it takes one's knowledge on art history and theories to judge what art really is. The knowledge, including those for the development of artistic concepts, turns art takes across time and space, and art ecosystem and exhibition space, to name but a few, would certainly pave an easy way for art critique.

A. Theories in disciplines like sociology, culture, visual images, philosophy, literature, economics and politics, colonialisation, gender, capitalism and consumerism all have their role to play in the broad spectrum of contemporary art. It perfectly explains why art critics nowadays are from diverse backgrounds. As the scope of art criticism extends and flourishes, sub-genres like critiques of films, architecture, music and design prevail, overriding

the outdated and overgeneralized concept of “art critique”

A. Art critics nowadays assume multiple identities. As Sally O’ Reilly puts it, “We are also artists, curators, lecturers, art historians, theorists, and editors all-in-one.”

A. However, artists may challenge art critics, usually by posing such questions as “How are you going to judge my work when you yourself have no practical working knowledge of materials?” The art critics’ background and identity is giving way to the way he /she communicates with the artist / works / exhibitions. And what matters most is whether the discussion / appraisal touches the heart of the work / show to bring new insights to artists, audience and art critics alike.

Q. With the diverse facets of contemporary artwork, is every single art critic knowledgeable across different disciplines to be qualified for the job?

A. That would be impossible! As all rounded as Renaissance person, personal perspectives and comprehension that may bother a rational judgment. This fully explains why art critics have to be humble at all times. For instance, when most of us see Chinese painting and ink art as challenging subjects stemming from a unique aesthetic system and historical context, we’d better not touch them with our western art oriented academic training.

A. The other way around, an appraisal is in itself a process of self-criticism. When we deliberate, we in fact expose our artistic concepts and aesthetic standard. Though there exist limitations and blind spots, we can make fewer mistakes by substantiating our judgment and comments.

Q. With the rapid development of the Internet comes freedom of expression for each and everyone literally. At a time when expression of personal comments on social media comes with a handy click, can we then all be art critics?

A. 另一方面，藝評人多不只有一個身份吧！誠如Sally O’Reilly所言：「我們（藝評人）均是藝術家、策展人、教授／講師、藝術史家、理論家及編輯。」

A. 惟現實是，藝術家或會質疑：「你都沒有落手落腳的創作經驗，你怎樣去判斷我的作品？」故此，不論藝評人的出身與身份是怎樣，他／她能否找到與創作人、作品與展覽溝通的橋樑，觸碰到討論核心或「要害」才是關鍵。

Q. 如果當代藝術作品面貌繁多，藝評人是否個個學識淵博，貫通各知識領域？

A. 沒可能！再通才的Renaissance person也有自身的無知與限制。個人喜惡、觀看角度與理解方法左右判斷，所以藝評人要謙卑與自量，對了解不通透的事情不應加把嘴。例如，我們覺得當代書畫及水墨作品是個「棘手」議題。中國藝術有其美學系統與藝術歷史脈絡，而不少作品是或不是屬於當代領域又難以說清，我們各人接受的學術訓練多傾向西方思維。

A. 另一角度看，評論是自我檢視的過程。我們去述說，其實在反映自身藝術觀念與審美要求，坦蕩蕩把自己放於人前。既然藝評人有其限制與盲點，給自己提供足夠理據，說錯話的機會也自然減低。

Q. 現在網絡發展極速，言論開放於眾人之手，開個帳戶作個人發表平台易如反掌。那麼，誰都可以成為藝評人嗎？

A. 我們不能反對這說法，畢竟開放門檻是鼓勵評論的必要條件。然而，網絡如同汪洋，文章水平參差無可避免，越多的評論文字會否造成越多的視而不見呢？網絡，是個教人既愛且恨的空間，而有編輯把關的傳統紙媒實體雜誌，仍然有其位置。

Q. 藝評人身份多重，在藝術圈裡人脈關係千絲萬縷。這位是你的多年好友，那位是提攜你的恩師前輩，撰寫他們的東西時該如何落筆，又如何保持個人中立？

A. 藝術倫理與道義問題大家都要小心，因文章而反臉之事時有聽聞。藝評文字一出，會影響到藝術家當刻的感受、日後的創作決定、在公眾或業界的聲譽，甚至藝術市場價值，故藝評人切記慎言，三思而後寫。而不同情況的邀約（藝術館、畫廊或藝術家的），藝評人得清楚利害關係，及文章刊出後可能出現的反響。最難落筆的是，當你見到藝術家苦心經營，卻著力於錯誤方向，你何以忍心跟他／她坦誠告白——你的作品很不濟？

Q. 最後，如果我想當藝評人，還有甚麼條件方能實現？

A. 你先要有腳骨力及充裕的時間。當藝評要到處走，港九新界或大中華圈展覽多不勝數；探訪藝術家或觀看展覽費時，寫稿時間長短則因人而異。你也得有穩定的收入，一來支付昂貴的交通費，二來維持當藝評的工作。要知，單靠賣文糊口談何容易？稿費向來微薄不足以為主業，而有稿費的園地，香港並不多見。

A. We cannot disagree to this saying. It is undeniable that a lower threshold is a catalyst thriving art appraisal, critiques of diverse standards and quality emerge as a result, and risking art appraisals into massively produced yet ignored texts. The Internet is surely a space to love and hate, while traditional print media still manage to secure a standing in the changing time.

Q. The multiple identities of art critics bring about complicated relationships within the art circle. What can one do to maintain neutral from the inextricable interpersonal relationships when attempting critique?

A. One must be cautious when it comes to art ethics and morality. It’s not uncommon to see people going their separate ways because of opposing views in art reviews. As they carry far-reaching impacts – not only on artists’ feeling, but also his / her future approaches in art, his / her goodwill and value in the art business. These clearly explain why art critics must be prudent in his / her critiques. Before accepting invitations, be they from museums, galleries or artists, an art critic must also bear in mind the stakes and possible reactions that may emerge once the critique is published. Imagine how hard it can be to appraise a devastating work completed with wholehearted effort from an artist. Are you frank enough to break your opinion to him and say – your work is no good?

Q. What does it take to become an art critic lastly?

A. You need plenty of time and to be physically fit first and foremost, as you need to walk great distance visiting exhibitions and artists across the territory and overseas alike, and devote your time in writing critiques. Platforms for publishing of art critiques in Hong Kong are as minimal as the royalties you can expect, you will find it utterly difficult to support your life with the meager earnings, if any. It would be much better if you have a stable income to finance the high transport fares and your job as an art critic.

簡介

阿三，畫者、寫作人。遊走於藝術創作、文學書寫、教育、評論及性別研究場域。香港中文大學藝術系畢業，後修畢藝術碩士（創作）及性別研究文學碩士課程。近年展覽包括《在何地》、《文學刺青·墨成肉身》、《在寨城公園前散步》、《現》、及《相逢恨晚》等。著有展覽小書《單程票》（2007）、《與記憶不符的將來》（2008）及《書寫繪畫》（2016）。現為自由藝術工作者、兼職大專講師及香港文學館理事。

梁寶山，先後畢業於香港中文大學及英國列茲大學，修讀藝術及藝術史。浮游在藝術與政治之間；會教書、寫作、研究、做飯、坐禪和上街。曾為「Para/Site藝術空間」、「獨立媒體（香港）」及「文化監察」等成員。研究範圍包括藝術勞動、城市空間及文化政治等。評論文章見於《信報》、《獨立媒體》、《號外》、《藝術界》、《今藝術》等；編著有《殖民地的現代藝術——韓志勳千禧自述》、《七一仔你遊香港》（白雙全作品集）、《Q[蹺]K[蹺]——陳育強標本集成》及《楊秀卓紅色二十年》等。梁氏剛於香港中文大學完成文化研究博士課程。

梁展峰現為獨立策展人及大學兼任講師，曾在本港各類藝術機構負責展覽行政及策劃工作。梁曾統籌海外展覽，包括《韓國光州藝術雙年展》（2002）的「Para/Site藝術空間」展館、《威尼斯國際藝術雙年展》（2003）的中國香港館。梁現專注研究香港藝術，並策劃展覽，包括K11藝術購物商場的開業展《藝遊》（2009）和中港台巡迴展覽《1+1：兩岸四地藝術交流計劃》（2011）等，亦為藝術雜誌定期撰寫有關香港展覽的文章。

郭瑛一直致力以不同項目探索策展人、藝術家及觀眾之間的互動與合作。2006-2012年間擔任英國華人藝術中心策展人，負責規劃中心的藝術項目，策劃展覽，並推行藝術家駐場計劃。2013年起，郭瑛以獨立策展人身份策劃各大小國際展覽，當中包括於油街實現的《收藏家學會》，《天下無事》2014英國曼徹斯特亞洲三年展，《這麼近，那麼遠》波蘭Łaznia藝術館，《耍緊張》紐約La MaMa Galleria。郭氏於2015年獲授亞洲文化協會獎助金，到美國展開有關參與性藝術項目的研究。

丁穎茵現為獨立研究員、策展人及兼職大專講師，教授博物館學及藝術策展。畢業香港中文大學，她於英國萊斯特大學取得博物館學博士學位，先後任職於巴斯東亞藝術博物館及布里斯托市立博物館。曾參與的策展項目包括：《擺渡：講文化·講創意》（2010）香港；《土非土：台灣、香港、日本三地當代陶藝展》（2011）香港及星加坡，及油街實現的《入區搞搞震》（2015）香港等。其研究計劃旨在思考何謂文化消費以及藝術與當代社會的關係。

楊陽從事教育、文字及策展工作。近年書寫定期見於《AM Post》（2014-2016）。書寫收入國際藝評人協會香港分會網站。編輯書籍包括*Stamped*, *Glocal Project*（2014）, *Ten Years After – sketches*（2013）, 《人多的地方不要去——林嵐的藝術》（2013）及《聽者言》（2013）。出版包括 *Hong Kong/ China Photographers Series 7 – Alfred Ko*（2012）。2008年成立藝術組織聲音掏腰包，與香港、日本及美國藝術家合作培育聲音及聆聽文化。2013年獲亞洲文化協會獎學金。2015年成立“a walk with A3”，鼓勵非謀利藝術於街道上與公眾相遇的機會。現任中文大學通識教育基礎課程講師。

Chan Sai-lok as a painter and writer, glides across fields of art and literary practice, education, art criticism and gender studies. Chan graduated with a Bachelor's Degree in Fine Arts and a Master of Fine Arts from the Chinese University of Hong Kong, and completed a Master of Arts in Gender Studies from the Chinese University of Hong Kong subsequently. His solo exhibitions and art projects he curated include *Somewhere*, *INKarnation: Literary Tattoos, Taking a Walk in Kowloon Walled City Park, In/visible*, and *Meeting Late*. His exhibition catalogues *One Way Ticket, Future, at Variance with Memories* and *Writing Painting* were published in 2007, 2008 and 2016 respectively. Chan is now a freelance art practitioner, part-time lecture in universities and executive committee member of the House of Hong Kong Literature.

Leung Po-shan Anthony is a multi-disciplinary art practitioner. She studied Fine Arts at the Chinese University of Hong Kong and Art History at the Leeds University. She was a member of Para/Site Art Space, In-Media (Hong Kong) and Hong Kong Culture Monitor. Her research interests include, among others, artistic labour, city space and cultural politics. Her essays and commentaries have been published in the *Hong Kong Economic Journal*, *InMedia (Hong Kong)*, *City Magazine*, *Leap*, *Artco* and etc. Publications edited by her include *Modern Art in a Colony: Narrated by Hon Chi-fan at the Millennium*, *Odd One In: Hong Kong Diary* (by Pak Sheung-cheun), *QK – Specimen Collection of Chan Yuk Keung*, *The Red Twenty-years of Ricky Yeung Sau-churk*, etc. She has just completed her Ph.D study Cultural Studies at the CUHK.

Jeff Leung is an independent curator and part-time lecturer. Jeff has a wealth of experience in exhibition administration and curatorship, having spearheaded institutional projects both locally and abroad, including the Para Site Art Space pavilion at the *Kwangju Biennale* (Korea, 2002) and Hong Kong Pavilion at the *Venice Biennale* (Italy, 2003). In addition to contributing exhibition reviews for art magazines, Jeff currently is engaged on the study of Hong Kong Art and curated the inaugural show *Hiking Arte* (2010) at the K11 Art Mall and the touring exhibition *1+1: A Cross-Strait-Four-Region Artistic Exchange Project* (2011).

Ying Kwok is noted for her inventive curatorial approach, which is centered on “boundaries of collaboration” between curators, artists, and the wider community. Kwok is the sole curator at the Chinese Arts Centre in Manchester in the UK between 2006 and 2012. Since 2013, Kwok became an independent curator working internationally. She curated *Collector Club* in Oi! in Hong Kong (2014), co-curated *Harmonious Society*, as part of Asia Triennial Manchester (2014), *From longing to belonging* at Łaznia Centre for Contemporary Art in Poland (2014), *No cause for alarm* at La MaMa Galleria in New York (2016). In 2015, Kwok was awarded the Asia Cultural Council Fellowship to carry out a five-month research on participatory and engagement projects in the US.

Vivian Ting is an independent researcher, curator and a part-time lecturer teaching Museum Studies and Art Curatorship in universities. Graduated from The Chinese University of Hong Kong, she did Museum Studies at the University of Leicester and gained curatorial experiences at the Museum of East Asian Art in Bath and the Bristol City Museum and Art Gallery. Vivian has been involved in many curatorial projects, such as *Re-Orientation: Heritage X Art X Design*, Hong Kong (2010), *UN•Earth: An Exhibition of Contemporary Ceramic Art from Taiwan, Hong Kong and Japan*, Hong Kong and Singapore (2011); and *Let's Art*, Hong Kong (2015). In addition to her creative practices, her research focuses on culture consumption and the value of art to contemporary society.

Yeung Yang writes about art and occasionally curates. She was a regular contributor to *AM Post* (2014-2016) and is particularly interested in writing on the practices of emerging artists collected in the AICAHK online archive. She collaborated with artists in the capacity of editor in such publications as *Stamped*, *Glocal Project* (2014), *Away from the Crowd - the art of Jaffa Lam* (2013), *Pocket 2: say, Listen* (2013), and *Ten Years After – sketches* (2013). She was writer for *Hong Kong/China Photographers Series 7 - Alfred Ko* (2012). She founded non-profit soundpocket in 2008 and has been presenting programs in Hong Kong and in collaboration with artists' communities in Japan and the US. She was awarded the Asian Cultural Council Fellowship in 2013. She founded “a walk with A3” in 2015 to encourage the public encounter of not-for-profit art on the street level. She currently teaches classics for General Education at the Chinese University of Hong Kong.

《藝評香港》

二〇一六年第一期

主編：郭瑛

編輯：丁穎茵／阿三／梁展峰／梁寶山／楊陽

設計：灰熊

出版及發行：Art Appraisal Club

聯絡：writer@artappraisalclub.com

http://www.artappraisalclub.com

國際標準書號：978-988-77665-0-6

2016年9月初版・印刷數量1000本

版權所有・翻印必究

Art Review Hong Kong

issue 1/2016

Chief editor : Ying Kwok

Editors: Chan Sai-lok / Jeff Leung / Leung Po-shan Anthony / Vivian Ting / Yeung Yang

Designer: fuihung

Published and distributed: Art Appraisal Club

Contact: writer@artappraisalclub.com

http://www.artappraisalclub.com

ISBN: 978-988-77665-0-6

First edition, 1000 copies / September 2016

2016 Art Appraisal Club All rights reserved

Supported by



“Hong Kong Arts Development Council fully supports freedom of artistic expression.

The views and opinions expressed in this project do not represent the stand of the Council.”

「香港藝術發展局全力支持藝術表達自由，本計劃內容並不反映本局意見。」



