遗址与图像
SITES AND
IMAGES

巫鸿 (Wu Hung)
郭伟其 (Guo Weiqi) 主编

SITES
AND
IMAGES

遗址与图像

巫　鸿（Wu Hung）

郭伟其（Guo Weiqi）主编

遗址与图像

OCAT研究中心展览与文献研究丛书

目　录

<div style="text-align: right">

CONTENTS

</div>

附录
Appendix

目 录　　　　　　　　　　　CONTENTS

第二部分

天龙山石窟和造像——历史照片与新图像技术
The Buddhist Cave Temples and Sculptures of Tianlongshan: Historical Photographs and New Imaging Technology

附录
Appendix

丛书总序

黄 专

    OCAT研究中心一直致力于在中国建立一种关于当代艺术的"历史研究"模式，它强调当代艺术与人类精神史、观念史、思想史和视觉文化史的整体关系，关注当代艺术史与古典艺术史研究的学术贯通，作为一个艺术史研究机构，OCAT研究中心的很大一部分工作是对中国当代艺术的文献整理和研究性展示，而这套丛书就是关于这些研究性成果的出版物。

    我们这样理解历史与当代的关系：它们不是过去与现在之间线性的时间过程，而是一种复杂的交融和互释运动，这种运动既促使我们在记忆中去搜寻现实的各种可能，也帮助我们在当下的问题中去思考历史的意义，而文献和展览构成了这种双向运动最为贴切的物理形式，中国民族摄影艺术出版社和OCAT研究中心合作出版的这套丛书就是力图通过一种新型的出版尝试，形成一套以文献整理、研究展览和学术出版为一体的学术机制。

    我们希望这套丛书能够达到这样一些目的：首先，它将对中国当代艺术的出版建筑在一种研究性的模式之中，从而使它与中国当代学术的其他领域保持一种有机性的关系，在我们看来，只有这种联系才能使当代艺术的出版与中国其他学术领域处于同等的学术水准之上；其次，我们希望通过这套丛书的出版形成一套持续的文献收集和研究机制，将中国当代艺术的研究建立在历史学要求的基本技能和知识范畴之上；最后，我们希望一个独立研究机构与一个专业出版机构的合作会为中国当代艺术的社会运行机制增添一种新的能量，一种探索思想、尊重知识和推进文明的能量。

    是为序。

<div align="right">2015.6</div>

OCAT Institute Exhibition and Archival Research Series
GENERAL PREFACE

Huang Zhuan

The OCAT Institute has always been devoted to establishing in China a historically grounded model of research for contemporary art. This model foregrounds the integral relations between contemporary art and the history of the human mind, the history of ideas or intellectual history and that of visual culture, and seeks to forge connectivities between traditional art history and research on modern and contemporary art. As a research centre dedicated to the discipline of art history, the Institute takes as one of its major commitments the archival compilation and research-based presentation of Chinese contemporary art. The OCAT Institute Exhibition and Archival Research Series presents the outcome of these research projects in published form.

We would like to define the relationship between history and contemporaneity in the following terms: instead of representing a linear temporal progression that proceeds from the past to the present, historicity and contemporaneity constantly participate in a complex dynamic of interpenetration and mutual illumination. This dynamic both compels us to retrace latent realities in memory and guides us to contemplate the significance of history for issues that confront us in the present; this temporal and mental toing and froing is materialised most fittingly through the joint activities of archival research and exhibition. This book series, both as a collaboration between China Nationality Art Photograph Publishing House and OCAT Institute and as an experiment in publication practice, endeavours to initiate a scholarly framework that integrates archival compilation, research-based exhibition, and scholarly publication into a coherent whole.

The aims we wish to achieve through this Series are threefold. Firstly, it installs a research-oriented approach at the heart of publications on Chinese contemporary art, thereby upholding its organic relationship with other research fields in contemporary scholarship in China. In our view, only through such a relationship could contemporary art publications attain equal intellectual standing with other scholarly fields in China. Secondly, we wish to formulate a sustained mechanism for the collecting and research of archival materials, and to advocate the techniques and knowledge base of the historical discipline as a fundamental prerequisite for all research on Chinese contemporary art. Lastly, we hope that the collaboration between an independent research institute and a professional publishing platform could generate a new kind of energy for the social and institutional engagement of Chinese contemporary art, an energy that probes intellectual potentialities, respects the value of knowledge, and works towards the betterment of our culture and civilisation.

June 2015

弁言：在多元比较的视野下

郭伟其

〔OCAT 研究中心学术总监、广州美术学院副教授〕

艺术史上的一些概念，比如"艺术意志"，在 20 世纪以来环环相扣的艺术史学发展中起到了非常关键的衔接作用，在今天得到越来越充分的反思。回到李格尔（Alois Riegl）的时代，我们可以看到这个概念的提出与发挥实际上与 19 世纪末欧洲考古与文物调查密不可分。继《风格问题》正式提出这个概念之后，李格尔紧接着在 1901 年出版的《罗马晚期的工艺美术》中做出更加深入的阐释，而后者正是他受奥地利皇家教育部邀请参与奥匈帝国文物调查的主要成果。此外，李格尔还在 1903 年发表的《对文物的现代崇拜：其特点与起源》一文中运用这一现代艺术史概念对文物价值进行区分，他在文章的结尾总结道："在承认教会有越来越多的自由去证实它对中世纪风格的偏爱时，应该让其代表者明白，要适当考虑基督教艺术文物的年代价值，因为对这些文物的欣赏超出了教区的范围，关涉到广大公众的长久利益。"这正是雅希·埃尔斯纳（Jaś Elsner）在 2017 年 OCAT 研究中心年度讲座"从欧洲中心主义到比较主义：全球转向下的艺术史"开头所提到的关键节点，西方艺术史学正是在这种背景下发展成为独立学科。

为了配合年度讲座，OCAT 研究中心促成了两所顶尖大学的联合展示，即"遗址与图像：牛津大学和芝加哥大学的两个研究计划"。牛津大学的部分，是隶属大学考古研究所的"历史环境图像资源库"（Historic Environment Image Resource，简称 HEIR）所提供的考古遗址历史照片，包括"'彼时'与'此时'"、"摄影作为艺术"、"考古遗址的发掘与再造"三个单元的照片，并对 1939 年英国萨顿胡（Sutton Hoo）船葬遗址发掘过程进行整体的幻灯片展示。正如埃尔斯纳教授所说，这些摄影作品提供了两种比较形式，来自多个地区的不同记录方式构成了 19 世纪中叶欧洲中心主义视角下的多元文化比较，而通过这些在不同时期记录相同遗址的摄影文献我们又可以在当代学术的视野下尝试更进一步的比较，即遗址与进入博物馆之前的文物所经历的变化，包括它们在物质上的变更以及在人们的目光与想象中的变迁。这一点也正是芝加哥大学"天龙山石窟项目"的出发点，研究人员对散落海外的天龙山造像进行三维扫描，采集信息并建立模型，以数字化的方式呈现石窟。尤其有意义的是将藏于海外的天龙山造像与石窟的历史照片相对照，为造像找到原址，通过数字技术将这些残缺部件重新组合起来，从而使被

肢解的佛头和佛手在虚拟世界中找到了曾经失去的身体。这种文物对于原境的要求，被巫鸿教授概括为"不可移动的文物"。除了埃尔斯纳教授与巫鸿教授的文章之外，关于19世纪以来摄影对考古发掘、研究、教学等方面的影响与反思，可详见本书中由牛津大学凯特琳娜·乌尔姆施耐德（Katharina Ulmschneider）博士与莎莉·克劳福德（Sally Crawford）博士撰写的文章与图录。关于天龙山项目的内容与意义，详见芝加哥大学蒋人和教授的文章，关于展览的技术问题可参考太原理工大学张晓教授的说明文字。在本书中，我们还收录了《对文物的现代崇拜：其特点与起源》的完整英文译本，以及陈平教授最新修订的中译本，供读者参考。

当今天的展览重新关注文物与遗址的问题时，艺术史学已经经过了一百多年的发展，期间图像学、风格学、空间转向乃至描述本身等诸多问题都已经经受过多次学术反思，这使得我们能够带着新的眼光回到这个"原点"。"从欧洲中心主义到比较主义"是2017年OCAT研究中心年度讲座与年度展览的一条主线。雅希·埃尔斯纳教授通过批判性地回顾西方艺术史的发展进程，将落脚点放在对不同文明的比较之中，力求在"全球转向"的语境中探寻艺术史研究的新方向。天龙山项目则在这种比较中有效地展现了中国艺术史上的典型案例。实际上，除了埃尔斯纳教授所提到的两种比较之外，牛津大学与芝加哥大学研究项目在OCAT研究中心的并置，无疑又进一步丰富了其各自本身所具有的比较维度，在这里HEIR的老照片获得新的展示，与一个代表东亚文明发源地、同样面临诸多文物问题的国度直接对话；天龙山的完整造像重新回到中国，却进入了一种全新的语境；19世纪的摄影技术遇见了当代的三维数码技术，它们之间的会面将会促进有关艺术史研究与图像媒介的新思考。而OCAT研究中心也期待再次成为沟通经典艺术史与当代艺术研究的桥梁。

这次展览及其出版物能够与公众见面，离不开各位学者与同事的通力合作。首先要把诚挚的谢意献给雅希·埃尔斯纳教授以及其在HEIR的同事。2016年12月，我与同事钱文逸赴牛津大学与埃尔斯纳教授商议年度讲座与年度展览的大致框架。期间埃尔斯

纳教授提出了有关展览的最初构想，并请 HEIR 的工作人员为我们专门举办了一次小型的资料展示，本次展览的牛津部分就是在这个基础上形成的。感谢埃尔斯纳教授和乌尔姆施耐德及克劳福德两位博士在展览及出版方案确定之后专门撰写了精彩的文章、前言与图录。其次，我们要衷心感谢巫鸿教授及其在芝加哥大学的同事蒋人和、林伟正两位教授，他们为本次展览提供了天龙山项目的最新研究成果，并撰写了文章、前言与其他说明文字，极大地丰富了本次展览的比较维度。我们还要感谢太原理工大学的张晓教授在展览中呈现了天龙山第 2 窟虚拟复原成果，并撰写了相关技术说明文字；感谢上海大学的陈平教授为我们提供李格尔文章的最新译本；同时感谢为我们提供帮助的各界朋友以及参加整个年度讲座项目的多位学者，他们的无私奉献与辛勤工作，使得本次展览与这本图书的出版最终得以实现。

2017. 7. 20

IN THE LIGHT OF PLURALIST COMPARISON

Guo Weiqi
Translated by Wang Xiaoze

Throughout the twentieth century, certain art-historical concepts such as *Kunstwollen* emerged at critical junctures in the interlocked stages of disciplinary development. These concepts and their historiography are given further reflections today. If we go back in time to the era of Alois Riegl, it is not difficult to notice that the invention and application of *Kunstwollen* as a notion was inextricably linked to the archaeological investigation of monuments and objects in late nineteenth-century Europe. After the concept's 1893 debut in *Stilfragen: Grundlegungen zu einer Geschichte der Ornamentik* (translated as *Problems of Style: Foundations for a History of Ornament*), Riegl made an even more thorough elucidation in *Spätrömische Kunstindustrie* (translated as *Late Roman Art Industry*), which was published in 1901; this latter *magnus opus* was a major outcome of his participation in the archaeological project commissioned by the Austro-Hungarian Empire, under the invitation of the Austrian Ministry of Education. Moreover, Riegl soon published the essay *Der moderne Denkmalkultus: sein Wesen und seine Entstehung* (translated as *The Modern Cult of Monuments: its Character and Origin*) in 1903, in which the distinctly modern concept of *Kunstwollen* was put forward as an serviceable tool to distinguish the values of monument. At the end of this paper, Riegl concludes: "in accepting the Church's increasing freedom to confirm its inclination toward medieval styles, one should impress on its representatives that age-value be given adequate consideration in monuments of ecclesiastical art, which are appreciated far beyond the parish and involve the far-reaching interests of the widest public." This is precisely the critical moment of transition with which Jaś Elsner opens his 2017 OCAT Institute Annual Lectures *Eurocentric and Beyond: Art History, the Global Turn, and the Possibilities of Comparativism*, and it is against this historical context that western art history gradually established itself as an independent scientific discipline.

To coincide with the Annual Lectures, the OCAT Institute sets the stage for a joint exhibition by research teams from two leading universities, entitled *Sites and Images: Two Research Projects of Oxford University and the University of Chicago*. The Oxford section is curated by members of the Historic Environment Image Resource (HEIR) under the Institute of Archaeology at Oxford University, and showcases historical photographs of archaeological sites in three sections—'"Then' and 'Now"', 'Photography as Art', and 'Excavating and Recreating Archaeological Sites'. These are followed by a full-sequence projection of photographs documenting the 1939 excavation of the Sutton Hoo ship burial site in Britain. As is mentioned by Jaś Elsner, these samples of archaeological photography offer us two forms of comparison. On the one hand, various types of record made at disparate geographic regions constitute a multi-cultural comparison that is inevitably underpinned by mid-nineteenth century Eurocentrism. On the other hand, photographic documents made at different moments over the lifespan of one particular site offer a further kind of comparison that is made possible only recently by contemporary scholarship. The comparison

staged by these images allows us to track the change of sites and objects—both in terms of their materiality and their visual and imaginary receptions—over the history of their movement from sites to museums. It is precisely this comparative scenario that is taken up by the Tianlongshan Caves Project. In this project, researchers at the University of Chicago conducted 3D scans of the Tianlongshan statues currently held in oversea collections in order to build models that present the caves in digital reconstruction. Especially noteworthy is their effort to compare the actual statues housed in foreign museums with historical photographs of the caves, and to accurately locate these statues back to their original sites. The sculptural fragments of Buddha heads and hands were put back together through digital technology, their lost bodies reassembled in the world of virtual images. This contextual imperative in the study of monuments and objects lies at the heart of what Wu Hung terms as *immovable monuments*.

Apart from Jaś Elsner's introductory essay and Wu Hung's theoretical reflection, HEIR's two directors Katharina Ulmschneider and Sally Crawford co-authored the article and catalogue entries for the Oxford section, in which they offered a sustained look at the impact of photography on archaeological excavation, research, and teaching since the nineteenth century. For the Chicago section, Katherine R. Tsiang from the University of Chicago contributed a detailed introduction to the Tianlongshan Caves Project and its scholarly significance, whereas Zhang Xiao from Taiyuan University of Technology provided a short explanatory text on the technologies involved in the virtual reconstruction of Tianlongshan caves. At the end of this volume, we have also included, for the readers' reference, a complete English translation of Riegl's *Der moderne Denkmalkultus*, alongside its Chinese version, which is especially revised for publication by Chen Ping—Riegl's most persistent translator in China.

As our current exhibition revisits the questions of monument and site, art history as a discipline has already gone through over a hundred years of development; it has seen constant reflections and critiques over a range of methodological issues from iconology to stylistic analysis, from the spatial turn to the practice of description itself. Without such a historiographic glance, it would be difficult for us to start afresh and look at the discipline with new eyes. As such, the plea for a methodological shift *from Eurocentrism to comparativism* forms a common thread that runs through OCAT Institute's Annual Lectures and Annual Exhibition in 2017. Through a critical reappraisal of western art historiography, Jaś Elsner eventually arrived at a comparativist stance towards world cultures and their artistic productions, in the hope of searching new orientations in the wake of the discipline's *global turn*. The presence of the Tianlongshan Caves Project as a paradigmatic case in Chinese art history speaks to that comparativist approach. In fact, on top of the two forms of comparison outlined by Jaś Elsner lie still further layers

of juxtaposition and comparison that enrich the dimensions of both projects presented at the OCAT Institute. Here, the lantern slides that fell into disuse in the Oxford archives are given a new display, through which they enter into a direct conversation with a country that both prides on its ancient roots as the birthplace of East Asian civilisation and is constantly challenged by contemporary issues of cultural heritage and site preservation. Here, the homecoming of the Tianlongshan statues, reconstructed in their entirety, transposes them into an altered context. Here also, the meeting between the photographic techniques of the nineteenth century and the contemporary technologies of 3D digitisation will hopefully stimulate new ways of thinking on the relationship between art-historical research and the visual media of which it makes constant use, whether consciously or unconsciously. The OCAT Institute hopes to take this opportunity to once again forge connectivities between traditional art history and research on contemporary art and culture.

The exhibition and the accompanying catalogue are made available to the public through the collaboration of many scholars and colleagues. First of all, we would like to express our sincere gratitude to Jaś Elsner and his colleagues at Oxford University and HEIR. In December 2016, my colleague Wenyi Qian and I visited Oxford University and discussed the framework of the lectures and the exhibition with them. During that time, Jaś Elsner proposed an initial idea of the exhibition and arranged for us a small collection display at HEIR. The Oxford section was formulated on the basis of this modest display. We are grateful to Jaś Elsner, Katharina Ulmschneider, and Sally Crawford for writing the excellent essays and entries for this catalogue, after the plans for the exhibition and its publication were set in motion. Meanwhile, we would like to thank Wu Hung and his colleagues at the University of Chicago, Katherine R. Tsiang and Wei-Cheng Lin, for generously sharing with us the latest research outcome of the Tianlongshan Caves Project and for writing the articles and explanatory panels, which greatly enriched the comparative nature of this exhibition. We would also like to thank Zhang Xiao of Taiyuan University of Technology for working on the display of the virtually reconstructed cave at Tianlongshan in the exhibition and for contributing the explanatory text on the technologies involved. This catalogue would be incomplete without Chen Ping's carefully revised translation of Riegl's article and the entire annual program left astray without the support and guidance of all the friends and scholars who participated in it one way or another. It is their selfless dedication and hard work that finally brought this exhibition and its catalogue to everyone.

20 July 2017