

LENIN IN 1918

GALERIEURSMEILE 麦勒画廊

鄢醒 近作 Yan Xing Recent Works

2013



GALERIEURSMEILE 麦勒画廊

鄢醒  
近作

Yan  
Xing  
Recent Works

# 渡河 入林

汉斯·乌尔里希·奥布里斯特

这篇专访2013年11月27日完成于伦敦与洛杉矶

# Across the River and into the Trees

by Hans Ulrich Obrist

Interview conducted between  
London, U.K. and Los Angeles, U.S.A.  
November 27<sup>th</sup>, 2013

汉斯·乌尔里希·奥布里斯特（以下简称奥布里斯特）：很有意思，本来应该是伦敦和北京之间的对话，现在变成了伦敦和洛杉矶之间的对话。是什么原因促使你搬到了洛杉矶？

鄢醒：我出生于重庆，2009年从四川美术学院毕业后搬到北京待了四年，这四年我和北京不少优秀的策展人，艺术机构以及画廊合作过。我想是时候换一个环境了吧。

奥布里斯特：有什么具体的推动因素吗？

鄢醒：我恋爱了，这是我自己也没想到的。

奥布里斯特：我们还是回到最开始的话题，我想知道一切都是怎么开始的？你是怎么走进艺术的？或者说艺术是如何来到你身边的？

鄢醒：最早是受我母亲的影响，她曾经是一位服装设计师，我很小的时候，她就支持我往文艺方向发展。家里有不少关于艺术与设计的书籍，使我有机会接触到不少相关的资料。她当时的一些朋友现在看起来都有点波西米亚主义，与那时候中国内地保守的大部分人有一些异样。我小时候的文艺启蒙全来自于我的家庭。

奥布里斯特：你能说说在你的艺术生涯中谁对你影响最大吗？谁是你的英雄？

鄢醒：我虽然不能代表与我同时代出生的人，但我这一代可能没有非常强烈的一个个体英雄。有很多的艺术家的影响过我，像我作品里面出现的帕索里尼（Pier Paolo Pasolini, 1922–1975）、侯麦（Éric Rohmer, 1920–2010）、爱德华·霍普（Edward Hopper, 1882–1967）、谷克多（Jean Cocteau, 1889–1963）、委拉斯凯兹（Diego Velázquez, 1599–1660）……我不知道这算不算得上是“英雄”，我也不确定“英雄”是什么概念。

奥布里斯特：这些都是来自西方的影响，有没有来自中国的？

鄢醒：没有。我小时候受的文学艺术启蒙是西方范本。我接触最多的信息以及材料都来自于西方，“中国的”经验我不能说不了解，因为我自始自终都身处在这个语境当中，再不了解，还是比较了解的。只是，我没有仔细去琢磨过。

奥布里斯特：你的作品集里的头号作品会是哪一件？

鄢醒：应该是《他们不在这里》（2010）。

奥布里斯特：你能谈谈这件作品吗？

鄢醒：这件作品来源于一个展览邀请，居住在北京的艺术家何迟（1978–）邀请我参与一个非常规的介入项目。每位艺术家自己决定展览的场地，我把展览的地点选在了北京的一个旅店。我邀请了七位演员，他们也是我身边的朋友，我们一起执行了一个虚构的故事。每个参与者都有自己的角色，我扮演了一位艺术家，但他可能并不是鄢醒，而是一个抽象的艺术家形象。我用手持的照相机同步拍摄了最后的作品，同时，隐藏起来的摄像机也记录下了现场发生的一切。这为我以后的作品找到了一个方向——我后来很多作品都是通过多种媒介来生成一个项目。

奥布里斯特：你的展览生涯的起点是哪？

鄢醒：很好的一个问题，你用到的这个词语在中文里意味深长——“展览生涯”，这可能是当今的艺术家们独有的一种生涯吧。从我毕业到进入职业生涯的时间只有很短的四年。我起步于“展览系统”，目前为止的所有作品也都基于展览。我脑子里正在进行视觉整合却还没有付诸实践的项目也都基于展览，我肯定是那类伴随着展览而工作的艺术家。

奥布里斯特：能谈谈你的第一个展览吗？

鄢醒：真正意义上的第一个展览是2010年受策展人刘鼎与卢迎华邀请参加英国曼彻斯特华人艺术中心的群展“解放——及其相对的意义”，我呈现的作品正是之前提到的《他们不在这里》。

奥布里斯特：我对你发起成立的一个团体、一项运动——“公司/COMPANY”项目很感兴趣，这项运动与历史中的那些前卫运动不同，没有什么宣言。我们第一次在北京见面是在出租车上，你当时谈到了这个机构。能再清楚地解释一下“公司/COMPANY”到底是怎么回事吗？

鄢醒：从某种意义上来说，中国目前的现状下所有的艺术家都是一个“自我组织”（self-organization）的单

Hans Ulrich Obrist: It’s interesting, because we started this conversation between London and Beijing and now it’s a conversation taking place between London and Los Angeles because in the meantime you’ve moved. I just want to ask you what prompted your move to L.A..

Yan Xing: I was born in Chongqing. I stayed in Beijing for four years after I graduated from Sichuan Fine Arts Institute. I’ve been working with many excellent curators, art institutions and galleries, but now I think it’s time for a change.

HUO: And also were there any specific triggers for this move?

YX: I’m in love. I’ve never thought of that, you know.

HUO: So to come back to the beginning, I’d like to know how it all started. How did you get into art, or how did art get into you?

YX: When I was very young, I was influenced a lot by my mother, a fashion designer. She encouraged my interest in art when I was young. At home we had lots of books on art and design. I learnt a lot from them. Some of my mother’s friends looked a bit Bohemian to people in China at that time, who were mostly conservative. It was my family that laid the foundation for my early interest in art.

HUO: And can you tell me about your heroes or those people who influenced you?

YX: Of course, it’s impossible for me to speak for my generation as a whole, but I can say there aren’t many individuals that can be called a hero and who strongly influenced our generation. In my case, I was very inspired by Pier Paolo Pasolini (1922–1975), Éric Rohmer (1920–2010), Edward Hopper (1882–1967), Jean Cocteau (1889–1963), Diego Velásquez (1599–1660), and some others. I don’t know if they can be called my “heroes” or even what “hero” really means. I’m not sure.

HUO: These are all people from the West. Did anyone from China influence you?

YX: Very few. In terms of my exposure to the arts and literature, all my role models are Western. Most of the information and materials I had were from the West. I don’t mean I don’t understand the “Chinese experience”. I’ve never left this context. Even for those who say they don’t understand the “Chinese experience”, for sure they have some knowledge about it. It’s only that I’ve never thought about it.

HUO: What is the first work in your Catalogue Raisonné?

YX: It should be *They Are Not Here* (2010).

HUO: Can you tell me about this work?

YX: Actually, it started with an exhibition invitation. He Chi (1978–), an artist in Beijing, invited me to an unconventional intervention project. The artists were asked to choose their own venue, so I chose a hotel in Beijing. I invited seven actors, who were also my friends, to perform a short play with me. Everyone had their own role. I played an artist, but probably I wasn’t Yan Xing then because I only had the abstract idea of an artist then. During the performance I was taking pictures with a camera. There was also a hidden video camera recording all what was happening. This project inspired a lot of my later work. I used multimedia a lot later.

HUO: Where did you start your career as an exhibiting artist?

YX: A very good question. “Exhibition career” is unique to contemporary artists. It’s only been four years since I graduated and started my career as an artist. I started by exhibiting and up until now I’ve exhibited all my works. I’ll also be exhibiting all the future projects I’ve envisaged. I must be one of those “exhibition-type” artists.



元。当年(2009)我大学毕业来到北京,正好赶上了金融危机,当时中国的艺术市场完全依赖于经济,大崩盘几乎瓦解了中国的当代艺术。那时候,最能卖钱的艺术家都卖不出作品,我们这些年轻艺术家毕业之后到北京几乎是没有机会的。如果只是等待机会,不可能有展览。所以,我跟好友陈轴(1987-)、李明(1986-),以及四年的同窗李然(1986-),决定发起这样一个“类组织的机构”,自己进行策划实践,主动去寻找或制造一些机会,就是当时的“公司/COMPANY”。我们相互鼓励,希望彼此都不要放弃,能继续从事艺术创作,我们也抱着积极的态度慢慢往职业道路发展。

奥布里斯特:“公司/COMPANY”后来发展情况如何?

鄢醒:最初我们四人就一致决定它不是一个组织,也不是一个团队。我们在一起实践了一些项目,目前并没有解散,我们偶尔还想要一起制造点儿新行动,但都因为各自的发展而耽搁了。这两年好像没有什么动静,未来尚不明确。

奥布里斯特:这次展览的灵感从何而来?

鄢醒:我个人的发展遵从我整个生命发展的过程。比如,在成为艺术家之前我从来没离开过中国,我是被艺术活动邀请到其它国家,近距离地观看了西方艺术。我不断地因为艺术成长着。

很少有一下子突然让我震惊的改变,小时候熏陶我的文学和艺术,不允许那种为之一震的愕然。我对待各种“震撼”挺谨慎,我会仔细去分析,去消化,比较慢。《DADDY项目》(2011)是一个比较意外的作品,这是我第一次亲自做现场行为表演,在那件作品之后我得到了很多展出机会,虽然现在看起来它略显单薄,但它确实在那个时候带给了我很多的机会以及曝光率。我很感谢这件作品。

奥布里斯特:你在中国创作了作品《DADDY项目》,你认为这是你很重要的作品。前面的谈话中你提到抚养你长大的设计师母亲对你的影响很大。你还提到过父亲的缺失。能否谈一下这些因素和作品《DADDY项目》之间的关系吗?这件作品是怎么产生的?

鄢醒:我的作品跟我的人生体验混杂在一起,当然,我相信很多艺术家也这样消耗着自己的生命。我会因为爱情去往另外一个国家生活,展开新的创作,我的作品基于血液,家庭或者家族所带给我的影响。

《DADDY项目》中缺失的父亲形象对我产生着异常重要的影响。我的生活中从来没有父亲的角色,这也许造成了我对于所有的权威都不畏惧,小时候就没有一个足够强大的力量来束缚管教我,我有点无所惧怕。尽管如此,我也并没有觉得这些问题会真的对我造成翻天覆地的变化,我从缓慢的改变中塑造起来的自我,已经不允许我对它进行彻底的改造了。就好比我在中国这样一个环境里成长起来,却真没觉得这种环境就能够改变人。我在社会主义这种教育体制下被塑造起来,却没有被教育成一个共产主义者。这是一种幸运还是不幸呢?

奥布里斯特:能不能说一说过往的展览对这次你在麦勒画廊的最新展览的影响?

鄢醒:2011年我在麦勒画廊举办了我的第一次个展,最主要的作品是《现实主义》(2011)。我当时研究了布勒东(André Breton, 1896-1966)的《超现实主义宣言》(*Surrealist Manifesto*, 1924),通过文本衍生出来的材料整合成了一个表演,同时又有其它的媒介与之共存。

虽然这件作品已经过去两年,和现在的作品还是有关联的。我目前的大部分作品也是依据历史中已有的线索摸索出一条新的途径,通过这条新的暗道,我还会捏造一些“合情合理但不一定真实的”佐证来塑造一个全新的世界。在《现实主义》里,有一部分内容是虚构的,他们来源于我对艺术语言的经验,而不依仗于我们生存的经验世界。

奥布里斯特:上世纪90年代艺术界的一个焦点是移动影像。2000年1月1日我和马修·巴尼(Matthew Barney, 1967-)做过一次电话采访,马修·巴尼谈到了他对“现场体验”的强烈愿望,“现场体验”已经越来越重要,在艺术界这也成为理所当然的一部分了。

鄢醒:你提到的这些关于“现场”的部分恰好是我目前试图反思并且控制的部分,我在《现实主义》这件作品里“现场的表演”很明显,在新的作品里表演的部分已经降低了。我常常思考如何去定义“行为”,到底是在美术馆内发生的部分,还是在美术馆外。

我在为作品《艺术,太艺术的》(2013)决定分镜时选择了深受霍普影响的两位优秀的中国艺术家——王兴伟(1969-)和谢南星(1970-)作为我的演员。这种真实的艺术和语言范畴的艺术进行交叉,是我近期尤其感兴趣的部分,到底该如何去执行行为表演以及描摹对象。

HUO: And can you tell me about your first exhibition?

YX: Strictly speaking, my first exhibition was *Liberation—and its Relative Meaning*, a group exhibition curated by Liu Ding and Carol Yinghua Lu at Manchester Chinese Arts Center in 2010. *They Are Not Here*, the work I just mentioned, was shown there.

HUO: It's interesting that you formed a group and started a movement in 2008 called “COMPANY”. And it wasn't really a movement with a manifesto as those historical avant-garde movements. When we met for the first time in a Beijing taxi, I remember you told me that you are most alive when working within this kind of structure, so I'm interested to know more about what exactly “COMPANY” was?

YX: In one way, every modern Chinese artist is a “self-organized unit”. When I came to Beijing after college in 2009, the world was caught up in the financial crisis. The art market in China then was almost totally reliant on the economy, and so the contemporary art market in China almost collapsed because of that crisis. Back then, even the best-selling artists were finding it very difficult to sell their art, let alone young art graduates in Beijing like us. If you just waited around for opportunities to come to you, you would never have an exhibition. So, I got together with my friends Chen Zhou (1987-) and Li Ming (1986-), as well as Li Ran (1986-), my classmate for four years and started a “group” to make our own plans and create opportunities. It was our “COMPANY”. We encouraged each other to go out there and make it as professional artists.

HUO: So how did the group “COMPANY” evolve?

YX: We all agreed that it was not an organization per se in the beginning. We did some projects together, and it still exists, once in a while we may get an idea and do something together. But we all have our own plans now and so we haven't been doing much together recently. I don't know what will happen to it in the future.

HUO: What would you consider to be your epiphany for this exhibition?

YX: Actually, my career follows my life. For example, when I became an artist, I'd never left China. Then I was invited to overseas art events and so I left China. Art helps me to grow.

There have been few surprising changes in my life. The art and literature I was exposed to as a child did not give me that kind of “Wow!” feeling. I'm a fairly cautious person. I analyze everything carefully before absorbing it. It's a relatively slow process. But *DADDY Project* (2011) is an exception. It was my first self-performance art and it led to a series of exhibitions. Now it may seem that I could have made it richer, but at the time it opened a lot of doors for me and elevated my profile. It really was a blessing for me.

HUO: You consider *DADDY Project* to be a key piece in your portfolio. You said earlier that in the beginning, your mother, who was a fashion designer and who brought you up, was a big influence on you. You also talked about the absence of a father. Could you talk a little bit about this in relation to *DADDY Project* and what prompted this piece?

YX: I think my works are mixed up with my experiences in life. Of course, many artists use their lives in this way. Because of love, I am going to live in another country and continue making art. My art is fed by my blood, my family and all those influences from my family.

The absence of a father did have great impact on me. There has never been a father in my life, which might explain why I cannot tolerate authority. There was never any power figure strong enough to discipline me, so I never felt fear. Even so, I don't think it had such a great impact on me. I was shaped gradually—slowly to the extent that there was no chance for myself to make radical changes to myself. I grew up in a Chinese environment, but I don't think such an environment can significantly change people. I grew up within a Communist system, but I am not Communist. Is that good luck or not?

每位艺术家只对细微的部分有自己独特的理解，大体上还是趋同的，这也是目前艺术发展的趋势。艺术的变化非常缓慢，它的一切都有“慢”的属性。两位艺术家之间或者一位艺术家的不同年代之间，真正的变化其实是很平缓的。

奥布里斯特：我们谈谈你在平丘克基金会 (Victor Pinchuk Foundation) “未来世代艺术奖” (Future Generation Art Prize) 的作品吧！这两件表演作品，我都看过。一件作品是在基辅，一件是在威尼斯。这两件作品都是你基于 Gilbert & George 所说的“现场雕塑”来创作的，我们可以看到你在基辅创造的环境——在一间房间玻璃后面，有一位主角，也许应该称他是表演者，他在阅读，还有一条蛇，表演中弥漫着缓慢的气息。但在威尼斯展出的作品完全不同，应该说观众还没到，表演就已经开始了，我想观众是在表演已经开始后才到达现场的。

鄢醒：我试图在我的每一件作品中让所有的细节都恰到好处合理并且真实，《现代，更现代的》(2012) 里每一件材料的建构都采用了永恒稳定的形式。而《甜蜜电影》(2013) 基于展示空间的限制，或者说“底色”更恰当吧，在这样的底色上，我只能采取这样的手法。媒介、材料、手法对我来说都不是问题，我掌握着挺多的把式，在中国能利用很多资源帮助自己实现想法。虽然这两件作品差距很大，还是能从中擒到我的特质。

《现代，更现代的》里海明威 (Ernest Hemingway, 1899–1961) 是一个关键人物，对整件作品的精神气质是个凝聚。而《甜蜜电影》回敬的是法国导演凯瑟琳·布雷亚 (Catherine Breillat, 1948– )，简单地说，她是一位偏执的女权主义者。这些都是对我经验里关于“艺术的材料”的再分解，再分析，再整合。

奥布里斯特：在威尼斯双年展上，有针对你作品的审查，作品几天后便看不到了。能不能谈谈是什么导致了这次审查？能否再谈谈这件作品？我想在双年展开幕之前，你带来了几位表演者和行为表演。

鄢醒：我想，这个宫殿的主人是天主教徒，他们在我布展的时候就表达了强烈的反对。我布展的每分每秒都在与他们斗争，平丘克艺术中心的策展人 Bjorn Geldhof 也一直在和宫殿的负责人沟通。最后，我们决定至少要保证作品在开幕的时候得以完整呈现。我比较悲观，面对审查我是“接受的”，可能这个词容易让人产生抗拒，就算是没有宗教审查，也会有政治审查，或者说性

别审查，宽泛一点儿地说，还可能存在一种对“好坏”的审查，这就是我们身处的现实。有很多朋友喜欢这件作品，希望通过各种途径敦促主办方再次展示，我很感激。

对于斗争、反抗，我有自己懦弱的一面。同时，我对某些中国艺术家的反抗与斗争也挺置疑，准确地说，我对这种反抗与斗争所获得的褒奖置疑。艺术家的职责应该在艺术语言的探索上，这是一个有充分理由崇高的目标。我几乎没在中国提过我遭遇的作品审查，我不希望夸大与“审查”相关的讨论。我也不期待审查为我的作品增添多一层的解读。这件作品完成之后我脑子里已经在构想下一件作品了，这才应该是我的工作。

奥布里斯特：现在我们再谈谈你最近的展览，也是刚结束的展览。这次展览涉及很多不同的元素，所有的部分都很重要，包括展览的开幕式、展览的设计，展览开始的方法，各种不同的元素，开幕和之后的酒会，这些似乎都是展览的元素。你是怎么看待“总体艺术”这个概念的？

鄢醒：我最初的目标是接近一个没有“主题”的展览——“近作”，这是我的最新思考，我想在能力范围之内做出最好的“正常展览”。那么多貌似前卫和奇怪的展览，当然它们可能同样地好，但那些“激进”的戏法我已经没有兴趣了。因此，我对你谈到的瓦格纳前后期的分野很有共鸣。当然，我的生命周期还没有到达那个长度。

我同意你说的“参与”的交接，我目前在抑制观众“参与”的可能性，也希望能克制并且精准地指涉我所企及的一种精神。我不希望受“现场”这个狭隘概念的打扰。

你提到的这次展览的安排，整个展览由四个部分组成，入口处还有一件小作品。各个项目间的大小、层次的分配，都是有意规划的。基于这个空间我也做过很多论证，包括观众参观的路线，都做过设计。

奥布里斯特：我注意到开幕式上院子门口有一个监视器，是对我前年以89岁高龄辞世的朋友理查德·汉密尔顿 (Richard Hamilton, 1922–2011) 的致敬，他是英国一位先驱性的人物。他有一句名言：“是什么使今天的家庭如此非凡，如此有魅力？”院子里的这件作品在整个展览中扮演了什么角色？

鄢醒：我非常喜欢你这个问题，其实很多人都没有注意到这件作品。

HUO: I was wondering if you can tell me about the shows you held before this new one at Galerie Urs Meile? How did one thing lead to the next?

YX: I had my first solo at Galerie Urs Meile in 2011. The most important work in that was *REALISM* (2011). I studied Andre Breton's (1896–1966) *Surrealist Manifesto* (1924) and used some of the material from that in a piece of performance art. There were also other media.

That show was held two years ago, but it's still relevant to the work I am doing now. Many of my works are born out of history. I also made up some “realistic but not necessarily real” evidence to shape a new world. Part of *REALISM* is contrived: that was based on my own experience of art language rather than the world we are living in.

HUO: In the 1990s, the art world was focused on the moving image. I had a phone conversation with Matthew Barney (1967–) on January 1<sup>st</sup>, 2000. Mathew talked about this desire for a “live experience” and that is something which has become much more prominent and much more visible in the art world since.

YX: This “live” aspect you are talking about also happens to be something I am trying to reflect on and control. The “live performance” in *REALISM* was obvious, but there is not as much of this in my new work. I often think about how to define “performance”, and whether it takes place inside or outside the gallery.

For *Arty, Super-Arty* (2013), I chose Wang Xingwei (1969–) and Xie Nanxing (1970–), two important Chinese artists who were greatly influenced by Edward Hopper (1882–1967), to be the performers. The link between genuine art and the art on a theoretical level really fascinates me. It tells me how to perform and how to approach what should be included in art.

An artist has his own unique understanding of small details, and for a large part, there is not a lot of difference, which is the current trend of artistic development. Art evolves slowly. It is something about “being slow”. When you are among different artists or look at one artist from differ-

ent time periods, you'll see that change comes rather slowly.

HUO: Let's talk about the works you did for *Future Generation Art Prize* at the Victor Pinchuk Foundation. They are two performance pieces, which I both saw, one in Kiev and the other one in Venice. Basically both pieces are based on the idea of what Gilbert & George called the “living sculpture”. In Kiev, the scene you created is viewed behind glass. There was a protagonist, maybe we should call him, a performer, and he was reading and there was also a serpent. I had a feeling that it was about slowness. While the performance in Venice was very different. We should say that the visitors were not there yet when the performance started.

YX: In every one of my works I try to be faithful to the small details—to make them believable and real. In *Modernist, Super-Modernist* (2012), everything had a stable form, whereas *The Sweet Movie* (2013) was limited by the exhibition space, or we'd better call it the “background”. It was the only choice I had. Media, materials and techniques are not a hindrance, because I can work around them. In China there are a lot of resources to help us turn our ideas into reality. These two works are different, but you can still detect my mark in them.

In *Modernist, Super-Modernist*, Hemingway (1899–1961) plays a key role that determines the overall feel of the work. *The Sweet Movie* paid homage to the French movie director Catherine Breillat (1948–), a staunch feminist. This is how I re-decomposed, re-analyzed, re-recognized and re-organized “materials for art” in my experience.

HUO: In Venice your show was censored and was banned after a few days. Can you talk a little bit about what prompted this censorship and also about this piece, because I think you brought in some actors before the opening?

YX: The palace (the venue of the show) belonged to the Catholic Church, which was already protesting well before the show started. Actually, I struggled with them right from the very beginning. Bjorn



奥布里斯特：这是出人意料的第五件作品，新闻稿里并没有提到。

鄢醒：这件作品叫《跋》（2013），安装在这个回廊式建筑的入口，被很多人忽略掉了。这就是我对现代展览的思考——“是什么使今天的家庭如此非凡，如此有魅力？”你可以再重复一次这个句子，“是什么使今天的家庭如此非凡，如此有魅力？”到底是不是艺术？这件作品后来出现在开幕式后的私人派对的大屏幕上，这个提问又延伸到了其他的场域。

奥布里斯特：展览从录像作品《脏的艺术》（2013）开始。你提到这些循环播放的视频灵感源于爱德华·霍普，它包含了很多不同的场景。能谈谈这件作品的情况以及整体的理念吗？

鄢醒：这件作品是从我去年的作品《艺术，太艺术的》延续下来的，当时我沉迷于对爱德华·霍普的研究，我想继续深入探索。我塑造了一个取材于他的创作结构，但全然不是普遍意义上的“灵感来自于……”的全新作品。

奥布里斯特：没错，我看过了。有很多不同的场景，是一个系列的，他们被整合在了一起。能谈谈这个涵盖不同元素的“活人画”艺术作品吗？

鄢醒：霍普的原作呈现的是一个止泻药广告的店铺橱窗，这太有现代意义了。作品的录像部分，有的关于性与肮脏，是中国文化中对恶心与脏既想表达又想隐藏的心理。一面是脏本身，一面是表达上的迟疑与隐忍。比如说痰盂，既用来撒尿，又被权贵用来吐漱口水，还可以用来吐痰，《霸王别姬》（1993）里面张公公（太监）对小豆子实施鸡奸之前，用痰盂来盛少年的尿液，充满了性暗示。我不想过多地强调文化层面的异样性，这是文化发掘者的工作，但每一种定义在它自己的文化里都有根源，我使用这些图像，是将它们作为一个语汇。

中国人对脏有自己的理解，又享受，又鄙夷。洗脚，在两个男人之间，充斥着丰富的性政治，它还沟通了被俘与奴役，这个举动在肮脏污秽与骄、奢、淫、逸间闪闪发光。

奥布里斯特：我想问一个关于作品《列宁在1918》（2013）的问题。从1913年到2013年，整整过去了100年。1913年，弗洛里安·伊利斯（Florian Illies）写了一本书叫做《1913：风暴来临前的一年》（1913: The

*Year before the Storm*, 2013），他在里面探讨了文学、音乐和艺术还有各种极端例子，都是发生在1913年的事件，与此同时，世界格局面临着第一次世界大战的阴影。但是，你的作品不是1913年，而是1918年，你对当时的文化进行了再创作，用来再现1918，而不是1913，还指涉了当时很多的艺术家的作品，如康斯坦丁·布朗库西（Constantin Brâncuși, 1876–1957）和马约尔（Aristide Maillol, 1861–1944）。《列宁在1918》这件作品还配有文字信息。现在我们来谈谈所有这些是如何联系在一起的？

鄢醒：这件作品的题目取自苏联电影《列宁在1918》（1939），电影的背景发生在十月革命后的俄国内战。我很早就决定了这个题目，它几乎同时与我的视觉想像一拍即合，像榫卯一样。

这件作品让我有机会回到我一直希望去做的工作，对具体内容的分布，对具体作品的塑造，就像委拉斯凯兹画马，怎样去塑造一匹具体的马？色彩、构成、起伏、穿插、强弱……这些东西我很痴迷。我前期的大量工作伏案于对各种资料的分析解读上，这可能是我比较独特的一种工作方式。我很关心制作前对作品定下的基调，比如这件作品与政治题材的关系。我的整个研究范围，作品中出现的很多指证，甚至那些找不到具体指涉的象征性介质，都属于那个时期的遗产。我在整个空间里运用的色调，对整个空间的布局，包括细节、塑造的手法都回到了概念中的列宁时期。

比如，在圆台上有三个灵感来源于布朗库西的球体，右边墙上一幅取材于塞尚（Paul Cézanne, 1839–1906）《三个梨》（*Three Pears*, 1879）的绘画，另一面墙上的画取材于马蒂斯（Henri Matisse, 1869–1954）的《游戏的球瓶》（*Game of Bowls*, 1908）……从具体形象到抽象提炼，再现并取材于我们落于窠臼的生活。我们在现代主义后弑父求进步的心理特征，对遗产的理解……可以说这是一种精神性的创作。对数量、材料、排列、体积无数次的权衡，这个创作的过程我很愉悦。

奥布里斯特：接下来的问题是关于你跟随段建宇（1972–）的作品而创作的《女收藏家》（2013）。在这件作品里，你的身份成了一位绘画者，跟随段建宇到了乡村或者说大自然里。雷姆·库哈斯（Rem Koolhaas）曾经和我说过“未来的趋势其实是回归乡村”。

鄢醒：段建宇是一位表现“乡村题材”的艺术家，不过，现在很难定义这种“乡村”。她有一个非常精彩的句子时常在我脑子里萦绕“回家，哪儿都比不上回家！/游魂，

Geldhof, the curator of Pinchuk, had been talking with those in charge and in the end we decided that the work had to be presented as a whole, at least at the opening. I was not very optimistic. I don't think censorship is an ugly word, I should say. This word can mean resistance. Even if there had been no religious censorship, there might have been political censorship, or gender censorship. More broadly speaking, there might have been quality censorship. And so it's inevitable there will be problems. Many of my friends were really interested in this piece and they tried every means to persuade the organizer to present this work again. I really appreciate what they did.

I'm not brave enough to struggle or resist. I also have doubts about the way my fellow artists in China struggle and resist today. What I mean to say is that I'm skeptical of the praise one gets for these kinds of struggles and resistance. The artist's job is to explore the language of art, a lofty goal in every sense. In China, I didn't talk much about the censorship of my work because I didn't want to focus on any discussion about "censorship". Neither did I expect the censorship to add to the interpretation of my work. I usually start to think about my next work even when I'm working on something. This is my job.

HUO: Now the time has come to talk about your recent show, the exhibition which has just finished. It involved many different stages and I suppose all these parts matter. The opening, the exhibition design, and of course, how it was run, all different stages, the party before and after, all of these parts seem to be elements of the exhibition itself. I'm very interested in how you understand the notion of the "Gesamtkunstwerk".

YX: My original goal was to return to an exhibition without a "theme", called *Recent Works*; this is really what has been on my mind recently. I really want to have a "normal exhibition" within the scope of my own ability. There never seems to be a lack of avant-garde or weird exhibitions — they are likely good but I've just lost interest in all that. I agree with what you said about Wagner's ideas. Of course there is still a long way to go before I get to his age.

I agree with what you said about the transition of "participation". I'm cutting down the audience's opportunities to "participate". I want to restrain myself and to make precise references. I don't want to be disturbed by such a limited notion of "live".

The exhibition you mentioned consisted of four parts, and there was a minor work at the entrance. I carefully planned the size and structure of each project and spent a long time making plans for the space, including the visitors' route.

HUO: At the opening of the exhibition, there was a monitor, a TV actually in the courtyard, that was a homage to my friend Richard Hamilton (1922–2011) who died the year before last year at the age of 89. He was a great English pioneer. He famously said: "Just what it is that makes today's homes so different, so appealing?" Can you talk a little bit about this and the role of that courtyard piece?

YX: I like your question; many people missed it.

HUO: It was an unexpected fifth element. The press release just talked about four elements and so it was almost like a surprise.

YX: It's called *Epilogue* (2013). I placed it at the entrance to the building but many people missed it. It embodies what I think about modern exhibitions. "Just what it is that makes today's homes so different, so appealing?" You could repeat it again. Was it about art? It was shown on the big screen at a private party after the opening. And this question can be extended to other areas as well.

HUO: The exhibition started with the videos that you called *Dirty Art* (2013). You mentioned that they were inspired by Edward Hopper. They were basically short videos, which are looped, involving different forms and situations. So I am wondering if you could talk about these and the overall concept of the piece?

YX: This work is a continuation of one of my works last year, *Arty, Super-Arty* (2013). I was fascinated by



她既不属于城市，也不属于农村。”在我之前的创作中，从没涉及过乡村题材。这三组作品，每组七张，是我跟随段建宇作品中指涉的内容在中国乡村的实地写生。有意思的是，在段建宇的原作里，她自己并没去过这些地方，这是她丰富的艺术想象。我根据她作品里假的事实去真正实践了这样一次旅行，我却没有强调这种真实性。展厅里的石墩、饭帚都是段建宇原作中不断出现的庸俗的中国乡村农具。这和我自己的美学经验冲撞很大，我极力把这些元素整合到我的气质中，包括墙面这种凌厉的绿色，整个平衡有序的布局，尽量与“更现代”的物质世界近一点。

展览开幕当天我把她从广州邀请来了现场，我提供了头等舱机票、五星级酒店，以及私人司机。她来参加一位艺术家根据她原作而作的个展，像位收藏家一样来参加艺术活动，你很难确定最终到底谁在收藏这些作品。这个过程，被我有意识弱化了。我让真正的行为渐隐成为背景，我希望这些细枝末节在未来有人读到今天我和你的访谈时才会被挖掘出来。

奥布里斯特：最后一个问题是关于展览里最大的那个展厅的作品《两部录像，三张照片，几件与之相关的杰作和美国艺术》（2013），现在你也搬到了洛杉矶，这和美国艺术有什么关系？这个空间涵盖了很多不同的元素，能讲讲这件作品吗？

酈醒：这件作品与我来不来洛杉矶并没有直接关系，但艺术家的生命就是这样，作品和生活永远交织在一起。作品里出现的族裔，不是政治层面的种族问题。“美国”这个词，作品中出现的黑人形象以及性刑具，观众会产生简单的联想。这些解读都在我的预设之中。这件作品中有一个“美国”，那个“美国”不能以地域来勾勒，它是一个经过蒸馏后的悲剧性词汇，你可以说它是一个国家，一种精神，或更像一场人类的苦役，艰难跋涉后得到的真理？

在这件作品中我还想探讨人们如何看待“杰作”，包括艺术和杰作的关系。抱歉，我目前还不能很清楚地阐释这件作品，但我对这些与之相关的陈列与制作很满意。

奥布里斯特：在Blouin Artinfo的采访中，你说：“我曾经会这样认为，但现在越来越觉得艺术家的出处是不能回避的，但这次展览中首次出现的大量所谓的中国元素，并不是传统意义上的中国元素。我希望我的作品能够更加开放地面对如今这个混杂的世界。”我

想以菲利克斯·冈萨雷斯·托雷斯（Félix González-Torres, 1957–1996）来结束我们的对话，上世纪90年代的时候我们有过很多对话，我想知道菲利克斯·冈萨雷斯·托雷斯是否对你有所启发，你是否参照过他的作品？菲利克斯经常谈到他的作品和美国的自由有很大的关系。他渴望自由。所以，我想你是否同意你的作品也和自由有关，比如渴望中国的自由，或者全世界的自由。菲利克斯经常对我表示他在美国社会感受到的压抑的空间感。在我们的一次对话中，他认为对同性恋来说个人空间是不存在的。他提到了1986年“鲍沃斯诉哈德韦克”（Bowers V. Hardwick）一案，美国最高法院的判决把隐私权排除在同性性行为之外，美国各州的法律可以对人们的隐私进行规范，对“违规爱情行为”进行惩处。从这个角度看，菲利克斯的作品和这些有很大的关系，在对话中，他经常表达为某种特定背景下的自由而斗争，他认为当时的美国非常不公平。他认为艺术家的角色在某种程度上看就和间谍一样，他告诉我他想成为一名间谍，想成为某种可以渗透进入系统的人，就像病毒那样。病毒一直是我們面对的最强大的敌人，但是从某些方面而言，它也是我们的楷模，它不是简单的对峙，而且很难去定义。我们可以在这些机构里调整自己。他说这些意识形态机构总是在不停地复制自己。如果我们能像病毒一样，那么我们就可以和这些机构一起不断复制自己。所以，考虑到菲利克斯在美国创作的具体环境，他说他并不一定非要处于对立面，但是他希望像病毒那样可以渗透进去。我想问的是，中国是否和菲利克斯曾在美国感受到的一样压抑？

酈醒：菲利克斯·冈萨雷斯·托雷斯是我学习的榜样之一，他对当今艺术创作的影响还将持续。

关于自由与抗争的问题，第一、我清楚自己好斗的性格。与体制斗争，会耗费我的全部精力，我不愿这样消耗自己。我愿意用更抽象的手法表达自由，但并不是说这些手法就更先进或者更好，而是更符合艺术的严苛规律。第二、在中国，每个人都在与制度角逐，但斗争的方式却愚昧落后，中国自古以来就是野蛮笨拙的新政权采用暴力手段打倒旧政权，往往复复。第三、对自由意志的向往是人类的普遍追求，这是作为人的基本斗争，不需要强调。即便是斗争也并非要把自己奉献出去，那是一种彻底的恐怖主义。我选择做艺术家就是不希望把自己奉献给现实而白白浪费，而是要去塑造某一个自己，一个更完整、更丰腴的自己。

关于教育的问题，我所有的教育都在中国完成，我不觉得糟糕的制度真的能影响我。我想，人类可以有更高级的，关于心灵与精神的追求。

Edward Hopper and I wanted to go even further. I managed to do a totally new work that was based on his structure but one that could be described generally as “inspired by.”

HUO: Yes, absolutely. I saw the clips, they are different situations. It’s a whole series, and they were combined. Can you tell me about this tableau?

YX: Hopper’s work has a shop window with anti-diarrheal ads. It has absolute modern significance. My videos on sex and filth expose the Chinese mentality towards what is disgusting and dirty. It is about what is dirty, and it is also about hesitation and tolerance.

Take the spittoon for example. It is for peeing in, while the aristocracy also used it to hold spit mouthwash, and it is also for sputum. In *Farewell, My Concubine* (1993), Eunuch Zhang put Xiaodouzi’s urine in the spittoon before he sodomized the boy. Here the spittoon represents sex. There are rich implications. I don’t want to dwell on cultural diversities, since that is the concern of those doing cultural research. But every concept is rooted in its own culture and these images are put together as a vocabulary.

The Chinese have their own understanding of what constitutes filth. They enjoy it and despise it. If two men wash each other’s feet, that implies sexual politics and also enslavement. So it could mean anything from dirt to luxury.

HUO: Another thing I want to ask you on the exhibition is about *Lenin in 1918* (2013). It has been 100 years from 1913 to 2013. Florian Illies (1971–) wrote a book called *1913: The Year before the Storm* (2013), where he looked at literature, music and art and those extremes explored in 1913, the world was on the cusp of a World War. But you didn’t choose 1913, you chose 1918. In *Lenin in 1918*, there are all these cultures, which you recreate, which you appropriate, in order to represent 1918, not 1913. But you also bring in Constantin Brâncuși (1876–1957), Aristide Maillol (1861–1944), and many other artists of that time. So can you tell me why 1918 and how does it all connect?

YX: In fact, this work was named after a Russian film called *Lenin in 1918* (1939). It is about the civil war after the October Revolution. I chose this theme long ago, and it is connected to my imagination like a tenon and mortise joint.

This work gave me a chance to return to something I had always dreamed of: the specific layout and the structure of a work. It’s like a Velasquez drawing of a horse: How does one get a real horse? What are its colors, what is its composition, etc.? This fascinated me. It took me a lot of time to analyze all the materials, but this is probably just my way. I’m very cautious about the key tone I set before starting any piece of work. This work, for example, is certainly connected to politics, but I studied a lot of materials and a lot of other works and I had no way to know what they were referring to, all belonged to that specific period. The colors I chose for the space, the layout, including the details and my techniques went all the way back to Lenin’s time.

For instance, the three balls on the round table came from Constantin Brâncuși (1876–1957), the painting on the right wall was Cézanne’s (1839–1906) *Three Pears* (1879), the painting on another wall was from Henri Matisse’s (1869–1954) *Game of Bowls* (1908)... These real images were refined and reconstructed to represent our life. It is about our psychology after our modernist patricide for progress and our understanding of legacy... It is a spiritual production, so to speak. This art production became more appealing because of the countless trials over numbers, materials, and arrangement.

HUO: Now another aspect of the exhibition is *The Collectress* (2013) based on the idea of following a particular painter. You started as a painter and then moved on. You connect here to painting by following the artist Duan Jianyu (1972–) which brings you to the countryside, villages, and nature. Rem Koolhaas talked to me earlier about how he thinks “the future is the countryside.”

YX: Duan Jianyu is absorbed with matters of the countryside, but it is hard to define her “countryside”. Something she said did strike me though. She said: “Go home. There’s nowhere like home! A wandering soul belongs neither to the city nor

国家的失败肯定是不幸的，但如果把个体的失败归为国家的失败则更为不幸，当我不满时，我可能不会怪罪于某个国家或者某种机制。

交替传译：罗泰

翻译：Benedict Armour, Dinah Gardner

to the countryside.” I have never made any art that focuses on the countryside. In this work, there are three groups of seven paintings depicting life in the countryside. Actually, what’s most interesting about Duan Jianyu’s work is that she’s never been to these places: it’s all in her imagination. She’s an imaginative artist. I set off on a trip lured by the false reality depicted in her work. I don’t highlight this kind of reality in my work. For example, the stone seat, the broom-like pot cleaners, are all ordinary countryside objects in Duan’s work. They are at odds with my own aesthetic sense, but I tried to integrate it into my own work, including the color of green walls and the ordered layout, in order to be closer to the “modern” material world.

What’s interesting is that I actually invited her to the opening ceremony of the exhibition. I bought her first-class air tickets, booked a five-star hotel, and provided her with her own personal transport. She came to a solo exhibition based on her original work. Like a collector at an art event, you never know who actually collect those works in the end. I wanted the real action to become part of the background. I hope such details could be found out in the future when someone is reading our conversation today.

HUO: My last question is about *Two videos, three photographs, several masterpieces, and American art* (2013). After you move to Los Angeles, you will see that American art has many different elements. Can you tell me about this piece?

YX: This has no direct bearing on whether I’m going to Los Angeles or not, but artists and their works become a syncretic whole. The people of color in my work have nothing to do with racial problems in the political sense. I expected images of black people as well as sexual torture to provoke simple associations. The term *American* in this work is not a geographical term but a distilled tragedy of vocabulary. You may call it a country, a kind of mentality, but it is more like a truth after hard labor.

I also wanted to talk about how to view a “masterpiece”, including the relationship between art and masterpieces, but I couldn’t explain it clearly and I’m sorry. Even so, I’m fairly happy with the composition and the production here.

HUO: In an interview with Blouin Artinfo, you said: “I used to think like this, but now I think that an artist’s origins cannot be avoided. This exhibition is the first time that a large number of ‘Chinese’ elements have appeared in my work, but they are not Chinese elements in the traditional sense. I want my work to face today’s mixed up world head-on.” I want to end with this conversation with Felix Gonzalez-Torres (1957–1996) with whom I used to talk a lot in the 1990s. I was wondering if Felix has ever been an inspiration to your work. Have you referred to any of his works? Felix was talking a lot about the fact that his work has a lot to do with freedom in America, his desire for freedom. So I am wondering if you would agree that your work has a lot to do with the desire for freedom, desire for freedom maybe in China or a desire for freedom in the world. Felix was often talking to me in my interviews with him about oppressive dimensions he had found in American society. He once told me in an interview about the case of *Bowers V. Hardwick* in 1986, in which the Supreme Court decided that gay men have no right of privacy and that the state could go into bedrooms and penalize men for having sex with each other. And so Felix often dwelled on these topics in his work, this fight for freedom in those areas that he considered were very oppressive in America. He thought the role of the artist was something like the role of the spy. He told me that he wanted to be a spy, he wanted to look like someone else so he could infiltrate; he could become a virus. The virus is our worst enemy, but can also be a model in terms of not just opposing and not being easy to define. He said these ideological institutions are always going to be there and are always replicating themselves. If we are going in as a virus, we would have to replicate ourselves together with these institutions. And so looking at the very specific context in America in which Felix works, he said he did not necessarily only be part of the opposition but he wanted to be like a virus to infiltrate the system. I want to ask you, is China, similar to how Felix found America during his lifetime, in other words oppressive?

YX: Felix Gonzalez-Torres is an example for me, and he has enduring influence on the world of art. I have the following things to say on freedom and struggle. Firstly, I’m aggressive. To struggle



against the system will consume all of my energy, which is something I don't want. So I want to fight for freedom in a more abstract way, but that does not necessarily mean that my way is more advanced or better, but more adapted to the rigid rules of art. Secondly, everyone is struggling with the system in China, but the way they struggle is backwards and ignorant. Since ancient times, China has been ruled by uncivilized and clumsy new regimes, each new one bringing down the old one. Thirdly, all human beings aspire to have free will; it is our fundamental struggle, and there's no need to focus on this. You don't have to sacrifice yourself to struggle. This would mean downright terrorism. I choose to be an artist because I do not want to sacrifice myself to reality. I want to build another self, a more complete and richer one, instead.

I was educated in China, but I don't think I have been greatly affected by the educational system. I believe the human race has higher pursuits in terms of mind and intellect.

It is always sad when a country fails, but if we ascribe an individual's failure to that of a country, that would be a worse tragedy. When I'm dissatisfied, I am likely not to blame the country or the system.

Consecutive interpretation: Lothar von Falkenhausen  
Translated from the Chinese by Benedict Armour &  
Dinah Gardner