

## 李竞雄个展 LeJX

北京空白空间  
WHITE SPACE BEIJING  
2014.03.01~2014.04.19



《白种运动家》，2014年  
地板，高尔夫与马球器械，C-print，黄铜，  
木板手刻  
136×92.5×19.5厘米  
***W.A.S.P Master***, 2014  
Floor, golf and polo equipment, c-print,  
brass, hand-carved wood  
136 x 92.5 x 19.5 cm

李竞雄在个展前，发表过一篇文章《毁了艺术家的9件小事儿》，语调带着调侃和艺术家本能的自负，大胆地把他对艺术家与艺术系统、行业、艺术史之间关系的看法和想象暴露给我们。这篇文章与他在北京的首次个展或多或少有些联系，他在展览中用极端的隐喻继续讨论这些议题，而且还为它们找到了宗教、种族、性别、个人性等载体。但是，我仍然把这次个展看作一次艺术家的自我检验，至于处于检验的哪个阶段，现在难有定论。

在《Portrait 3》中，李竞雄用尿液影射杜尚的小便池，用霓虹灯拼出杜尚的女性化名“Rose Selavy”（罗丝·瑟拉薇），亚克力板制作的透明箱体上镶嵌着两只喇叭，你隐隐可以听到“脏海滩”的成名作《上帝最懂》。作品是艺术家为自己所“画”的第三幅自画像，杜尚的情欲色彩和性暗示被放大，似乎在暗示一种艺术家之间秘密的连接和融合。这件作品是整个展览的入口，“艺术家”的身份成为整个展览的基础。

语焉不详的还有挂在墙上的作品《我们一起游荡在

夜的黑暗中，然后被微风吞噬》，艺术家折服于一种芯片生产说明书的美感，把它打印在轻飘飘的绢布上，用两个精美的纪梵希耳夹在墙上钉住，再通过两根鱼线与上方左右两侧的渔具相连。这件更加封闭的作品也不无矛盾的意味，形式的精致和空虚一同透露。旁边的作品《死的刘易斯》灵感来自于艺术家对贾斯帕·琼斯艺术的兴趣，也在指涉艺术创作本身：刘易斯是运动员常用的名字，钉在墙上的机械臂据艺术家说是他自造的画画机器，两者再加上“写”在旁边凸起于墙面的木板上的黑色方框（艺术家所认为的“匿名”文字符号），仿佛在比喻艺术家工作中“重复”与“意义”的生成之间微妙曲折的关系。相比之下，对面墙上戏仿劳伦斯·韦纳的作品《艺术从别的艺术而来》来得太直接，令人担忧。

李竞雄在《Takete 66》和《白种运动家》两件作品中用了更为迂回的方法，测量艺术家自我在某一特定语境中的位置。这种测量显然是建立在假设基础之上的。在《Takete 66》中，他按照凡·艾克兄弟的祭坛画作尺寸

制作了一个壁龛，并将采集到的66名中国人的血液渗入到壁龛中的黑色浅槽里，壁龛的背面参照里尔克的诗作《豹》画上了豹纹。艺术家应该是对宗教在美学中所扮演的角色有所关注，他用不同文本的互文假设了宗教性与艺术的一种抽象的遭遇方式，但似乎并没有明确针对的问题。

通过戏仿、变形和互文的方式，李竞雄对于运用来自艺术史和文学领域中的素材显得驾轻就熟，甚至太过老练，强烈的表达欲，借助大量来自不同领域的文本重叠，形成了足够的冲击力。在艺术世界倾向于妥协和共识的困境中，李竞雄试图在创作中不断塑造和变动艺术内部的讨论区域，以求区别于平均化的艺术立场，突破僵化的边界。我完全赞同这一明确的创作出发点，也想直接说出我的疑问：当艺术家通过多种美学形式和文本塑造艺术的内部，促成多种“遭遇”的情境时，是否也需要辨别哪些遭遇是真实的、生动的、质朴而深刻的、甚至不可避免因而更要反思的？在你用艺术实践回应历史的书写、个体政治的演变、美学话语的交锋这些议题的时候，如何找到它们的思想根源而让自己的工作更加不可替代，从真实的思想碰撞里找到独立的力量？ 苏伟

Prior to this exhibition, Li Jingxiong published an essay titled “Nine Little Things that have Destroyed Artists.” Assuming the mocking tone of the intrinsically conceited artist, he shares bold opinions on the relationships between artists, the art system, the art industry, and art history. There is a certain degree of connection between the essay and the exhibition, which features hyperbolic metaphors that address the same topics through proxies such as religion, race, gender, and individuality. However, I still see this exhibition as an artist’s self-examination. As for which phase of self-examination it represents—that remains difficult to determine.

In *Portrait 3*, Li Jingxiong uses urine to cast aspersions at Duchamp’s *Fountain* and spells out Rose Sélavy—Duchamp’s feminine pseudonym—in neon lights. Two speakers embedded in a transparent acrylic box quietly play Dirty Beaches’ signature tune, “Lord Knows Best.” As a self-portrait, the work amplifies Duchamp’s sexual character as if to insinuate a kind of secret connection and blending between the two artists. At the entrance to the exhibition, this work established the artist’s identity as a central theme.

*We Spin around the Night, Consumed by the Breeze*, an abstruse piece hung on the wall, suggests that the artist was convinced of the aesthetic beauty of a set of instructions for the production of microchips. The instructions are printed on a fluttering piece of silk and pinned to the wall with a pair of Givenchy ear clips,

which are in turn attached with fishing line to two pieces of fishing tackle. This enigmatic work is not without a sense of conflict in its combination of vacuity and exquisite formality. The neighboring artwork, *Dead Lewis*, demonstrates Li Jingxiong’s interest in Jasper Johns and also takes aim at the art-making process itself. According to the artist, the mechanical arm attached to the wall is a painting machine of his own design. Beside it, a series of raised black square frames protrude from the wall (the artist’s idea of “anonymous” writing); these elements combine to analogize the subtle, inflected relationship between repetition and the production of significance in an artist’s work. In comparison, the facing work, an apparent imitation of Lawrence Weiner titled *Art Arises from Other Art*, is a bit too direct, not to mention a little worrying.

In *Takete 66* and *W.A.S.P Master*, Li Jingxiong employs more circuitous methods to appraise the artist’s sense of self, clearly carried out on a speculative basis. For *Takete 66*, Li created an alcove corresponding to the dimensions of the Ghent Altarpiece. He then stained the grooves in the alcove walls with blood collected from 66 Chinese people. The other side of the alcove is painted with spots in reference to Rainer Maria Rilke’s poem, “Der Panther.” The artist is clearly interested in the aesthetic role of religion, using intertextuality to postulate an abstract collision between art and religion—but the work fails to directly address the issue.

These references, distortions, and send-ups demonstrate that Li Jingxiong operates with ease—perhaps too much ease—while drawing on material from art history and literature. In his strong desire for expression, he draws on diverse and overlapping texts, generating ample impact. In an art world plagued by compromise and consensus, Li attempts to use his work to continuously shape and shock the internal discussion of art in hopes of differentiating himself from the average artist’s position and breaking down rigidifying boundaries. I wholly approve of this, but also want to directly state my doubts: when an artist uses multiple aesthetic forms and texts to shape the interior of art and effect circumstances of collision, must we not also remember to identify which collisions are authentic, vivid, unaffected, profound, and even unavoidable and thus all the more deserving of reflection? If one uses art to respond to topics such as historical writing, the evolution of individual politics, and the interchange of aesthetic discourse, must one not also identify their philosophical underpinnings in order to make the art irreplaceable, and locate the independent power within the collisions of authentic ideas? **Su Wei** (Translated by Daniel Nieh)