

介面 · 空間 · 場域—— 臺灣近代雕塑及其研究課題之回顧

Interface, Space, and Field: Modern Taiwanese Sculptures and
A Retrospective Study of Research Topics

國立臺灣師範大學美術學系教授

Professor, Department of Fine Arts, National Taiwan Normal University

白適銘

PAI, Shih-Ming

國立台灣美術館
National Taiwan Museum of Fine Arts

摘要

臺灣近代雕塑之濫觴，源自日治時期西方美術觀念之傳布，臺、府展雖未設置雕塑部門，不過，隨著黃土水、陳夏雨等人留學日本而開啓其端緒。當時，受到日本藝壇主流寫實主義及現代主義的雙重影響，臺灣戰前雕塑注重自然觀察，強調與土地、現實的連結。戰後，省展設立雕塑部門，加上美術院校雕塑教育的開展，雕塑人才輩出，臺灣雕塑進入全盛時代。

迄於戰後初期，仍普遍以寫實風格居多，1950、60年代之後，雕塑家逐漸轉向抽象簡約，對造型及空間進行多方探索，形塑出深具現代感、前衛性的風貌。七、八〇年代，雕塑團體紛紛成立、留學生持續返國，不約而同地帶動技術、材質、觀念等方面的實驗更新，除複合媒材廣為流行之外，裝置、環境及公共藝術等非傳統領域雕塑興起，成為當代化的重要標誌。

臺灣雕塑史研究晚至九〇年才正式開始，初期以田野調查、人物傳記或作品介紹為主，偏向通史式的梳理方式。隨著解嚴時代的來臨，脫殖民或脫政治意識形態逐漸高漲，臺灣近代雕塑歷經模仿日本、面對西方到回歸自我等不同歷程，跳脫媒材、介面的限制，走向空間、場域的探討，進而思考臺灣主體性的建構問題，雕塑史研究自此進入後殖民、後解嚴論述之時期。

關鍵字：黃土水、楊英風、五行雕塑小集、朱銘、現代雕塑、後殖民、後解嚴

國立台灣美術館
National Taiwan Museum of Fine Arts

壹、臺灣雕塑史學之濫觴

通常我們在談臺灣美術史學史建構的問題時，一般都會同意王白淵的重要性，但是，在其代表著作〈臺灣美術運動史〉中，¹是否特別討論到雕塑呢？其次，在西洋美術中，繪畫、雕塑、建築三足鼎立，然而，為什麼在臺灣，雕塑跟繪畫不平行，建築又像屬於工科人的範疇，同樣均未受到與繪畫等同的重視？這是在臺灣特殊歷史情境底下所造成的。關於這些問題，必須檢視這篇具有臺灣美術史學奠基意義的文章，看看裡面怎麼談雕塑的問題。

首先，是有關臺灣雕塑史學的濫觴，亦即王白淵如何開啓討論，或始自何時？例如，「到日本學美術者，有天才雕刻家黃土水。……其技巧的透徹、構圖的雄大、詩意的橫溢，真是不愧一代的名作，……」，或者「民國三十年四月二十六日起五日間，臺陽美術協會在臺北市公會堂，舉行第七屆美術展覽會，本屆之重要事，為新設雕刻部，陳夏雨、蒲添生、日人鮫島臺器之三雕刻家均參加為會員……」等所見，主要是針對個人或活動而起，同時，雕塑是包覆在美術史框架底下而被討論，處在學科和非學科之間的模糊地帶，並且缺乏具體的「雕塑史觀」。

其所謂的新美術，就是跟傳統美術有所區隔的現代美術或純藝術，是在日治時代之後才出現的，該文講得非常清楚。但問題是，有關被視為新美術的雕塑方面的梳理，臺籍雕塑家其實總共才講了三位，就是黃土水是戰前，然後戰後是陳夏雨跟蒲添生兩位。為什麼他在談臺灣雕塑發展的時候，只舉出這三位？雖然當時雕塑家比較少，但也不盡如此，這個當然牽涉到他自己的史學架構、建立的手法及關注程度等問題。

根據該文可知，在提及黃土水的時候說：「黃氏的雕刻，有透徹的寫實主義與理想主義，其內容富於雄壯美，生平酷愛水牛及十九世紀的法國大雕刻家羅丹」，討論技巧、構圖、詩意等等，比較像是風格層面的形容；論及陳夏雨說：「氏的雕刻，根據其正確的寫實主義，表現其種種內心的理想，在本省的雕塑界，只有他可以繼黃土水之遺志，……」，認為主要是從寫實主義跟理想主義而來的，涉及作品特色、表現意圖及歷史地位等；關於蒲添生則說：「其作品雖多，但可謂傑作者尚未多見，氏年輕力壯，當可矚望其將來」，僅酌表鼓勵而已，對作品等未多加討論。寫實主義跟理想主義，一直是我們在討論戰前到戰後初期的學院雕塑風格時，很重要的一個修辭、語彙上的慣常表現。

其次，他又引用《臺灣教育會雜誌》（後易名《臺灣教育》）〈回憶黃土水君〉一文說：「不得不痛感同君於本省藝術史上，實為一大光輝也」，黃土水畢竟是臺灣美術史上的最早先驅，以他為起點故不成問題。不過，此處所謂的「本省藝術史」，指的又是什麼呢？是中國還是臺灣，還是什麼？其實這是有一個相對曖昧的問題，那麼，黃土水到底代表是中國雕塑史的第一人？還是臺灣美術史的什麼什麼的第一人？雖然，我們通常會以這樣的方式去談他的先驅性，但王白淵並沒有很清楚去界定，本省藝術史是不是等於臺灣藝術史的問題，臺灣雕塑史這個命名的問題，其實是要等到解嚴之後才出現，反映日治或戰後時期，雕塑尚未被視為一門學科的事實，是否具備雕塑史的觀

1.王白淵，〈臺灣美術運動史〉，《臺北文物》，第3卷第4期，1955年3月。

念，事實上是不清晰或者甚至是缺乏的。

另外，繼承王白淵之後，比較重要的戰後臺灣美術史的書寫就是謝里法，同樣有必要檢視他如何梳理雕塑的問題。其實，他的理論或寫作構思，跟王白淵非常接近，一樣都是採取美術運動史的角度，最主要是透過像畫會這樣的組織觀念，來架構整個美術發展的脈絡關係。認為美術運動，基本上是在畫會組織的消長過程中，帶動前進的力量。

在《日據時代臺灣美術運動史》（該書自1976年6月至1977年12月連載於《藝術家》雜誌，1978年由藝術家出版社集結出版）一書中，²他提及日治時代的50年間，臺灣產生了第一批洋畫家及東洋畫家，但唯獨沒有特別講到雕塑家這個名稱。只有在討論像黃土水的時候，才刻意地去提醒或標舉他如何如何、經歷何種歷程，他是透過在東京美校的學習，吸取西歐的寫實主義風格，然後表現臺灣的地方色彩、風俗民情，藉以掌握所謂民族造型、刻劃鄉土的輪廓。

同時又說：「黃土水對羅丹藝術觀的體現，並沒有徹底，理由是他怎麼也脫不掉鄉土的氣息，這種地域性的藝術情操始終區限著他，使他對純雕刻性的理念無法施展開來」，³認為即便是第一位入選帝展的臺灣人，之所以無法成為國際性雕刻家的理由，在於受到地域性的限制所致，限制了他在藝術上的發展，無法發展出純粹的雕刻性理念。他這樣的說法是否公平或符合史實，是另外一回事，但是謝里法處理或面對的，比較像是他個人的評論，並非建構所謂的雕刻史、論述雕刻家的學術方法。

同樣的，在談陳夏雨跟蒲添生的時候，基本上還是從他們個人入選的經歷來討論，然後他說陳夏雨在雕刻方面沒有如預想中的成就，跟他生活的困苦有很大的關係，蒲添生的問題也是一樣，認為說他都是忙著在幫名人做胸像等等。雖然生活比陳來得好，但他的藝術成就還不能斷言，事實上可能是比較屬於或傾向負面的。然而，謝里法繼王白淵之後，重新書寫臺灣美術運動史的過程當中，對於雕塑的問題，或是他有沒有抱持著雕塑史就是建構雕塑發展脈絡的意識，來書寫或探討所謂的雕刻家？我個人覺得是比較沒有的。

或許，這是因為臺、府展沒有設立雕塑部門，導致臺灣雕塑比較無法獲得發展的一個最主要的原因，論述亦同。這個是我們在探討早期臺灣美術史書寫的過程中，如何梳理雕塑的部分，必須關注的問題。基本上跟寫繪畫是一樣的，就是以人（藝術家）為中心，然後探討他的風格、經歷，然後再做一些評論，這種史學書寫方式被架構起來，成為我們建構臺灣美術史的最早方法。另外像葉龍彥，很有趣的是，根據雕塑部門的審查「感想」，同樣再次梳理全省美展的一些內容，其實書寫的方法跟王白淵非常接近。有關於雕塑的部分，事實上是根據該類評審的一些感想綜合而成的。

在其言論中，不論是針對日本或西方的批評，同樣反映鮮明而濃厚的國族主義激進色彩，例如：「由於過去受日人的壓制和審查，對於美術是不能盡情發揮的」，⁴或者「中國雕刻向較西洋早為發達，我們觀中國美術史，遠在唐朝，已由後來興盛的佛教藝術傳入，乃漸漸失去純粹之美術性」、「而西洋方面的雕刻，雖進步較慢，但是他們追求自然的意欲很強烈，按部就班地達到今日

2.謝里法，《日據時代臺灣美術運動史》，臺北，藝術家，1978年。

3.同註2，頁38。

4.葉龍彥，〈戰後初期的「臺灣省全省美術展覽會(1946-1955)」〉，《臺北文獻》第126期，1998年12月，頁129。

完美的藝術」等等，⁵字裡行間，透過「先進的」中國、「進步較慢」的西洋等比對方法，鼓吹透過塑造民族性以恢復舊有榮光。

值得注意的是，該文還特別提出所謂「中國雕刻」或雕刻的「再中國化」，牽涉到佛教雕刻的問題。亦即，他認為中國雕刻之所以不進步，是因為受到宗教強烈的牽制，所以無法達到類似西方現代雕刻那樣「完美」（純粹或進步）的情況，必須排除佛教之影響，回到盛唐時期反映現實的風格，藉以復興「中國獨有的藝術」，亦即所謂的「民族性」。在「從這些審查感想，可知本省的洋畫水準最高，表現最佳，雕刻則有待努力」這樣的評論觀點中，可以知道，為何葉龍彥會認為雕刻是省展部門中最弱的理由。

上述，有關日治時代到戰後雕塑史書寫的問題，雖然尚未具備明確的美術史學科概念或學理根據，基本上一開始是從雕塑家的個人風格著手，或者是去關聯他們的歷史脈絡、文化淵源，反映的是一種史學建構的「企圖」，而非實質。故而，臺灣美術史或臺灣雕塑史的早期建構，並非源自學科或學術，而是從探討藝術家個人或如何彰顯民族特性的角度而起，亦是當時撰述者要積極面對及選擇的。換句話說，亦即透過雕刻家生平經歷的梳理、對作品風格的探討，再往上進行歷史脈絡的聯繫，形成從「個人史」擴大到「國族史」這樣的一種以人為中心的史觀及架構。

貳、研究方法之初步建構

解嚴前夕，臺灣社會已出現對一黨專政、極權統治的極度不滿，出國人數漸增，對於世界、國際現況的整體理解，亦遠較戰後初期以來更為深入、具體。1980年代，盱衡國際局勢藉以檢視中國文化的欠缺，已成為「在地化」現象的重要指標，在雕塑方面，藉由西方美術史知識的傳播，開始推行獨立學科概念，並進行史學（理論）建構的倡議。例如，蓋瑞忠即說：

在中國藝術史裡，雕塑藝術家似乎從未企圖建立起理論體系，進而推展雕塑活動成為一門獨立的藝術，使與繪畫、書法、建築等並駕齊驅。……在長期的文化傳統和線條藝術所薰陶下的東方中國雕塑界，……表現在雕塑藝術作品上的風格，如非全盤西化，即係模仿東方的日本，……。⁶

可以知道，夾雜在西、日、中文化狹縫中的臺灣戰後美術，雖然仍和國族思想糾纏不清，不過，卻反映其在與外部少量的接觸過程中，促使中國雕塑史的研究遠較中國大陸更早起步，蓋氏所謂「中國雕塑史綱的完成」，更可理解為雕塑「知識化」、「學科化」及「國際化」需求檯面化的一種里程碑。

上述說法，同時彰顯一種屬於跨文化式的學術眼光，透過東西、中日關係的比較框架，討論臺灣或中國雕塑界何去何從的問題。他清楚表示，當時的雕塑作品不是過度西化就是模仿日本，特別

5.同註4。

6.蓋瑞忠，〈談現代雕塑〉，《教師之友》21卷，9-10期，1980年11月，頁13-14。

對朱銘、楊英風、陳夏雨及陳英傑做了個案探討；還提出說，藝術史和其他任何的歷史一樣，有賴於「一個專斷的選擇原則」來進行「條理性」性的連貫，中國雕塑史綱的完成就是要朝這樣的目標去建立等等。不只在介紹雕刻家、學習背景或得獎經歷，而是企圖透過與中國古代雕塑的聯繫，完成一部具「條理性」連貫意義的雕塑史，因此直接引用西方現代雕塑研究者的「簡史」書寫方法，來架構自身的史綱。

此外，蕭瓊瑞在1990年代已經很關心雕塑研究的重要性，其所謂臺灣雕塑史的開端，黃土水之後，就是陳英傑。當然陳的成名同樣來自於入選帝展的過程，但問題是，他覺得陳英傑最重要的代表性或意義，在於「跳脫先輩固守的寫實風格之制約，開拓出具有現代造型意味的作品，且影響及於年輕一代雕塑家」，⁷故而認為陳是「臺灣現代雕塑的先驅者」。

尤其重要的是，對於藝術家進行歷史定位的聯繫，之前的討論比較侷限於描述的、感想的、傳記式的或非學術性的鋪陳，缺乏從宏觀的歷史框架來界定藝術家本身的位置。可以見到，蕭瓊瑞即便是在對個別雕塑家進行討論，卻已經從一個比較清晰的美術史脈絡來進行定位。得以受到美術史重要定位的藝術家，絕非只是一味延續前人風格、具有品質或超越他人的傑出藝術家而已，必須具備上述所謂「開拓性」、「影響力」及「先驅性」。這樣的觀點，為尙處渾沌階段的臺灣／中國雕塑史，無疑提供了更為客觀的標準，可以說是促使雕塑研究、雕塑史建構走出國族主義，進入現代學科視野的先聲。

不過，透過雕塑家個人的介紹、評析或歷史串聯，藉以建構一個國家、地區或民族等比較龐大的歷史概念，亦即從「個人史」到「國族史」的演變，雖然範圍有別，卻同樣是基於以人為中心的概念而起，亦可謂在戰後歷史學發展的數十年間，逐漸摸索形成的。尤其，蕭瓊瑞不只較王白淵和謝里法持續討論更多雕塑家，更向戰後現代雕塑的領域邁進，突顯如何形成美術史變革的重要性，藉以進行歷史定位，展現更為寬廣、平衡及建立學術準據的書寫態度。

同時指出陳英傑大大跨出一步，成為足以作為臺灣戰後第一代雕塑家的代表，「大約在一九七六年以前，陳英傑的風格已經完全確立」⁸，從「先驅」（開拓性、革命性）到「代表」（典範性、標誌性），代表以人物為主的臺灣雕塑史，已歷經草創、摸索、定型到完成現代化建構的不同階段，意義至為重大。逐漸地在透過個人史的梳理過程中，建立個人史觀，並進而進入時代史觀的範疇。

另外，江如海的研究中，也呼應了蕭瓊瑞一文的觀點，同時開始使用「臺灣現代雕塑」這樣的用語。⁹ 這個用語的出現，和現代水墨、現代繪畫、現代版畫類似，目的在於突顯與傳統雕塑之間的差異，並賦予其特殊的時代意義。在風格問題的討論上，江文以蒲添生、陳夏雨的作品為中心，認為二人「在不脫離具象形體所能表現的空間與造型的技法觀念上，專注於雕塑本身表現問題的探討」；同時，透過「由寫實邁向抽象雕塑風格的轉換過程」、「強調以精神內涵為主的創作觀念」等總結，賦予戰後初期「現代雕塑」明確的歷史位置，反映強烈的史觀建構意圖。¹⁰

7. 蕭瓊瑞，〈臺灣現代雕塑的先驅者——陳英傑的生命圖融〉，《臺南文化》第46期，1998年12月，頁217-240。

8. 同註7。

9. 江如海，〈陳夏雨、楊英風與戰後台灣現代雕塑的起源〉，《現代美術學報》第7期，2004年5月，頁98-99。

10. 同上註。

所謂「雕塑本身表現問題」，亦即在空間及造型等方面，進行技法及觀念的純粹探討，可以說是戰後雕塑現代化最重要的出發點；同時，此種追求純粹性的創作觀，更透過抽象化、幾何化的過程強調藝術家個人的「精神內涵」，實為一大轉變。其中，楊英風扮演了極其重要的角色。另一方面，基於戰後以復興中華文化為目標文化政策之影響，認為楊英風是少數開始形塑「現代中國雕塑」的雕塑家之一，刻意和西方現代雕塑進行區別，是一位「成功地建立具有鮮明中國特色的作家」，反映戰後現代美術發展中無可避免的國族思想。值得注意的是，所謂「臺灣雕塑家」或「臺灣雕塑史」的這個名稱，此時經常與中國並稱，暫時處於並存又獨立之間的游移狀態。

參、「臺灣雕塑史」的命名與系譜

鄭水萍在整理臺灣戰後雕塑發展的時代變遷時，曾歸納時至1990年代初期，臺灣雕塑史觀建構過程的具體結果，發現相關研究嚴重不足的情況，並嘗試提出補救建言。他說：

台灣整體藝術史正在建構中，其中雕塑史料部分的整理，是比較弱的一環。目前仍停留在圖像資料的檔案建立與個別藝術家的研究階段。……由於台灣學界有關雕塑研究的文字原本不多，「台灣雕塑」研究的論著更是趨近於零。¹¹

文中一方面明言指出，研究成果「趨近於零」的狀態令人驚訝，突顯雕塑史在美術史範疇中仍位處邊緣、遭受忽視的處境。另一方面，他更直陳研究方法的闕如，僅停留在圖像資料建檔及個別藝術家的討論之上，缺乏史料整理，故難以提出整體性的史觀。

在這篇以建構「臺灣雕塑史」自身歷史脈絡為前提的研究中，鄭水萍為彌補先前缺漏，認為必須仰賴田野調查、圖錄資料以及部分非學術性相關文獻，進而歸納出「臺灣雕塑家的系譜」。據其結果，此系譜可分為：（一）先住民雕塑傳統系（南島系）、（二）閩南移民民俗雕塑傳統性（民俗系）、（三）日本帝國主義殖民時期留日系（留日系）、（四）戰後大陸來臺雕塑家系（大陸系）、（五）大戰後留歐美諸系、（六）戰後學院系（以國立藝專雕塑科為主，人數最多）以及（七）素人雕塑系等類。

此種分類手法，在於透過個人（亦即雕塑家）或族群的角度，藉由時間性的順序進行串聯，追溯源流，形成前後連貫的客觀歷史脈絡，在破與立的反覆交錯中，形塑此部歷史的基本書寫框架。他特別將上述系譜戲稱為「清單」，可謂建構臺灣雕塑「全」史的重要基礎。此種以個人或族群角度所建構的史觀或書寫脈絡，符合其所謂全史或通史的撰史企圖，呈現此一階段走出國族主義框限的積極意義，同時亦是一種「命名」的結果。

鄭水萍建議補充田野調查、圖錄資料及相關文獻的方法學，的確足以完成一部較為宏觀的歷史藍圖。同時，經由源起（發生學）、風格變遷，藉以確認臺灣百年雕塑發展演化規則的概念，在結果上，與王白淵等人所謂運動史的概念，實不謀而合，宛若此起彼落的浪潮般，推進著時代的進

11. 鄭水萍，〈戰後雕塑的破與立（上）〉，《雄獅美術》第273期，1993年11月，頁22。

步。值得注意的是，此種撰史方法，企圖扭轉過往個人史「由下而上」的不足，形成藉以「貫通上下」的系譜脈絡，上述七大類雕塑系譜，包含南島系、民俗系、留日系、大陸系、歐美系、學院系及素人系，並非人類學式的系譜，而是在不同時空下建構的不同群屬系譜，具有逐漸朝向「族群史」視角的撰寫傾向。

在「個人史」或「族群史」的觀點之外，王慶台另外觀察到學院雕塑體制延續日治時期或西方等架構上的遲滯不前，「並未進一步對雕塑在比較文化差異上提出研究，甚至語法因時空不同的發微也付之闕如」，同時，質疑世界上任何區域文化是否得以進行橫向（空間）移植，臺灣雕塑的發展必須進行「文化史」式的重新審視，尤其更應關注文化移植過程中的橫向差異，而非垂直影響。¹²

蕭瓊瑞在同年（1998）稍早的另一篇文章中，和鄭水萍上文近似，展現跨越時代或族群框架的雄心，以所謂「世紀檢驗」的角度（亦即以百年為段落檢視歷史），連結人（雕塑家）、機構、事件、政治背景及作品分析等複合方式，探討臺灣雕塑歷經日據、戰後兩階段的發展實況。此種從政權轉移過程或權力關係演變的角度，界定不同階段所具備的時代意義，較接近「政治史」或「朝代史」的手法。尤其是提及政治因素或權力機構對雕塑發展的實際影響時，即說：「臺灣戰後的雕塑發展，基本上受於政治環境的制約，公共空間的佔有，原是權力延伸最有力的表徵」，反映政治因素的考量在此種撰史方法中的重要位置。¹³

雖然，該文朝向以政治變遷、政治影響力作為主軸來架構或詮釋歷史，不過，卻不代表在於迎合任何一方的統治者，反而是透過個人評論的方式來彰顯獨立不阿的史家意識（「史識」）。例如，在討論省展這種由少數評審掌控的權力機構，一方面說：「仍是戰後培養人才最重要的場所」，另一方面，則說：「不過，由於評審的人數有限，固定的風格走向，較難激發多元的思考與表現」，雖對其發揮的功能表示肯定，又同時能指出欠缺所在。另外，對缺乏時代訴求及特色因而飽受批評的省展雕塑作品，亦能以「不能說臺灣『展覽型』的雕塑藝術，毫無風格、手法、主題、材質上的創新或探索」等溫和堅定的口吻為其平反，反映其站在客觀的角度「檢驗」歷史得失的書寫特點。¹⁴

以日據、戰後（國民政府遷臺）二階段為時間架構進行歷史書寫的方式，在日後的雕塑史論述中，雖有逐漸被接受的趨勢，然而，在進入1990年代之後卻產生了另外一種變化，亦即出現更為細密的時間分期，例如十年、二十年或幾〇年代。此種縮短時間的雕塑史分期研究，成為百年史之後較為特出的梳理方式，其優點，尤其能將原本不易掌握、難以定焦或過度簡化的演變軌跡論述問題，交代得更為清晰、具體而詳實。同時，也體現雕塑因應時代產生變化的速度逐漸加劇的現象，以及問題複雜化、普遍化的整體趨勢。

例如，呂清夫即以「十年來」這樣有史以來最為短暫的時間分期，從雕塑公園的開始興起，到雕塑藝廊、雕塑展、雕塑創作營、雕塑大賽、國際化或國際交流、獎助條例等等，鉅細靡遺地對雕塑界與公部門及社會大眾之間的關係，透過社會需要何種「景觀雕塑」（或「公共藝術」）的問題

12. 王慶台，〈台灣雕塑歷史的過往〉，《臺灣美術》第31期，1996年1月，頁54-60。

13. 蕭瓊瑞，〈世紀黎明——臺灣雕塑藝術的世紀檢驗〉，《藝術家》第282期，1998年11月，頁524-528。

14. 同上註。

進行了「總體檢」，真正跳脫過往討論方式及內容上的侷限。¹⁵

李美蓉的論文中，不僅繼承上述有關政治史的書寫方法，同時在時間分割上，巧妙結合日據、戰後二段分法以及以10年為單位的分期方法。例如，她分別認為日據時代雕塑家「創造具象裸體像、民間風情、人物肖像」、政府遷臺後多見「寫實中具有理想化政治人物雕像」、六〇年代的雕塑轉向「有機抽象」、八〇年代出現「幾何抽象與極限藝術」、解嚴後「新添了批判性、觀念性」等等，進行了彷彿階梯般的層次分析，可以視為一篇以風格演變為撰述基礎、目的的學術著作。¹⁶類似的斷代分期法，亦見於林明賢有關戰後雕塑的系列著作中，或單以「戰後」作為檢視對象，或單選某一年代進行考察。¹⁷

接著，許惠敏另以「解嚴」作為時間分界，探討其後「二十年來」臺灣雕塑的轉變歷程，即為此種新風氣的一種反映。該文，一方面認為解嚴讓雕塑家真正脫離政治束縛，回歸美術自身的現代化，同時亦是「臺灣雕塑史」漸受重視的開始。關於後者的問題有諸多抒發，例如，作者以更為清楚的角度回顧、評析過往研究的歷史，重新探討「臺灣雕塑史」觀念如何形構的過程，甚為重要。¹⁸在此種研究前提下，作者特別對鄭水萍上述研究予以關注，不僅給予甚大肯定，更認為：「這是一篇描述戰前到戰後，脈絡清楚且完整的臺灣雕塑史，從文章中，讀者可以清楚了解影響臺灣雕塑解構與重構的種種社會因素」，建立最為「清晰而且完整」的歷史脈絡，並回應鄭文中有關破與立的討論架構。最後，更說：「臺灣雕塑史，是近20年最多人企圖建構的研究內容，研究的時代多以日治時期的黃土水為起點，分各個時期介紹具有代表性的藝術家」，歸納眾學說之間的共通點，對時間起點、方法學或不同時期作品特色進行歸納，堪稱一部簡易的臺灣雕塑「史學史」。¹⁹

透過命名，亦及運用可能的史學方法，確立何謂「臺灣雕塑史」的學術定位，不論其立足點何在，卻從而引發系譜學式的探討興趣及分期需要，進而成為1990年代之後，促使雕塑史終於走出美術史附庸地位的重要起步。尤其是，有更多的學者，例如鄭水萍，企圖以更積極的態度、更明確的目標、更系統化的史學觀念，談論臺灣雕塑史的發展脈絡問題，進行一種學理性、自主性的「解構與重構」。從上述討論所見，此時的臺灣雕塑史研究，已經完全朝向「非單一史觀」的前進狀態，亦即在多元視角的梳理下，形塑出兼具宏觀及微觀的歷史視野，顯示一種兼容並蓄的繁榮景象。

肆、「史用」之必要——實踐史學的公民性

雖然，臺灣雕塑史的建構歷程得之相當不易，從無到有，或從有到獨立，甚而藉由脈絡化及學理化的過程成為一門亞學科，反映戰後到解嚴期間的演變、成長軌跡。一如許惠敏文中刻意提及解嚴或1990年代之後的改變說：「公共藝術可說是近十年很熱門的討論主題」，²⁰隨著外部環境的急

15. 呂清夫，〈十年來臺灣現代雕塑之走向——一個雕塑公園熱的年代〉，《炎黃藝術》第50期，1993年10月，頁17-29。

16. 李美蓉，〈臺灣雕塑藝術現象淺論〉，《美育》第114期，2000年3月，頁64-71。

17. 林明賢，〈戰後臺灣雕塑的發展〉，《臺灣美術》第91期，2013年1月，頁52-75；〈從形塑到造型——六〇年代臺灣雕塑的演變〉，《臺灣美術》第105期，2016年7月，頁4-27。

18. 許惠敏，〈雕形塑意——二十年來臺灣雕塑研究〉，《臺灣美術》第59期，2005年1月，頁30-36。

19. 同上註。

20. 同註18。

遽變遷，雕塑似乎已無法安然地存在於學院、競賽等體制之中，「景觀雕塑」（或「公共藝術」）的出現，為這種問題掀開序幕。同時，臺灣雕塑史的研究將如何因應？進入何種重新建構的狀態？顯得至關重要。

當雕塑開始與所謂的「景觀」或「公共藝術」產生連結時，雕塑不能僅存於競賽、學院等象牙塔之中，應該進入社會、走向大眾的提問，即成為必然。然而，符合社會大眾期待的雕塑，應該具備何種具有公共性的形式要素與溝通能力，或如何面對各種外部空間，已成為其中的核心問題。從上述對臺灣近代雕塑發展歷史的回顧可知，設立於公共空間的雕塑作品多為政治人物或歷史聞人，表達純粹藝術概念的作品，僅見於比賽之中。關於偉人形象佔據各種公共空間的現象，蕭瓊瑞認為只不過是「標示著一種威權的延伸與心靈的掌控」而已，致使一般人無法察知雕塑藝術的本質。²¹

延續上述「世紀回顧」（「百年史」）的時間分段手法（1998），書寫於隔年（1999）的以上文章，提出一種更為細密的分期總結看法。排除前文日據、戰後之二段分法（亦即「政治史」或「朝代史」的概），本文中特別將臺灣近代雕塑發展分為：（一）日治時期、（二）戰後初期、（三）現代主義時期、（四）鄉土運動時期、（五）解嚴後多元並呈的戰後第二波西潮時期等五個段落，透過代表性雕塑家及該當作品風格的兩相對照（「個人史」及「風格史」），對各期的發展進行重點內容概括。此種分法，基本上與其處理臺灣美術史分期的方法一致。

呂清夫在前引文中，曾詳細地對雕塑界、公部門及社會大眾之間的關係進行討論，目的在於反省社會需要何種「景觀雕塑」或「公共藝術」，並進而對雕塑如何面對群眾的問題提出批評，引發雕塑如何成為一種社會實踐的思考，將雕塑研究從純粹的史學分析，帶向社會學或公共關係的領域。蕭瓊瑞上文的題目，特別標舉「走向群眾」這樣的關鍵字，呼應了此種時代趨勢，目的在於藉由更為細膩的歷史分期，突顯解嚴之後外部環境的巨大轉變，如何促使藝術家「從狹小的展場中走出來，走向人群，走向公共空間」、破除威權對空間的掌控等問題。

對於分期概念的解構與重構，林明賢在連續幾篇戰後雕塑史的研究中，亦曾嘗試以「階段」的角度細分其間發展梗概，提出「戰後三階段」的說法：（一）戰後初期／日治時期之轉接、（二）1950年代以後／歐美現代思潮之影響、（三）1980年代以後／解嚴後的多元顯現，分別可以對應蕭瓊瑞上文之第（二）、（三）、（五）期，階段分期的基礎或重點在於創變，而非守成，故而為何並未列入蕭文中之第（四）期，理由應可不辯自明。上述研究，不論其調整分期的概念或立場如何，事實上更有利於吾人以不同的角度、方式，重新認知臺灣雕塑百年發展的各種階段及細節。

在不斷的解構與重構之間，臺灣近代雕塑史以多元並陳的視角，不斷展現一種學術自主化、對文化進行具主體性關照的詮釋手法等特徵。在此種建構歷史的過程中，隨著材料、架構、方法、史觀等的逐漸成形，一部經過單篇文章多年連載後彙整而成的書籍，於焉出版。蕭瓊瑞在《台灣近代雕塑史》的序文中說：

台灣近百年的近代雕塑史，先是殖民、後是戒嚴，接著是法令的束縛，如何在重重的局限中，為未來的台灣雕塑發展，開發出一條更寬廣的道路？²²

21. 蕭瓊瑞，〈走向群眾的台灣雕塑藝術〉，《鄉城生活雜誌》第60期，1999年1月，頁11-13。

22. 蕭瓊瑞，《台灣近代雕塑史》，臺北市，藝術家出版社，2017年10月。

延續其對「百年史」時間分段手法的習慣及興趣，本書仍然以此種時間架構，梳理所謂的「近代」雕塑歷史。然而，值得注意的是，上述文句中出現的三個主要時間節點—「殖民」、「戒嚴」、「未來」，分別代表著（一）日治、（二）戰後國民黨統治，以及（三）解嚴之後等三個階段，較上文五期分段更為簡潔。

此外，本文有關臺灣百年雕塑史發展之諸種提問：例如，是否已然走出「重重的侷限」？如何「開發出一條更寬廣的道路」？創作者的歷史應如何「不被遺忘」？都可說是，此部首見的臺灣雕塑史專著最為關心之課題。不論如何，對於百年來已然「走出各自成就」的創作者的生命及作品，作者認為必當「成為未來歷史的重要養分」，反映一種強調「借鑑歷史」、「古為今用」重要性的想法。同時，該書更以數量高達三十的龐大篇章，彰顯豐富而具包容性的結構、主題及內容，藉以建構具有總結性意義的「全史」概念。

透過以上研究可知，臺灣近代雕塑，歷經模仿日本、面對西方到回歸自我等不同發展歷程，雕塑家跳脫媒材、介面的限制，走向空間、場域的探討，進而思考文化主體性的建構等問題，顯示臺灣雕塑史研究自此進入後殖民、後解嚴論述之嶄新階段。不論論述之觀點或分期之方法孰優孰劣，身處當今民主化、多元化及全球化時代的我們，應如何重新看待、甚至不斷重構自身美術史、雕塑史的問題，已然不再侷限於個人，而須對社會、大眾或世界不斷開放，反映必要的公民性、普世價值。同時，該書另透過類似自省或呼籲讀者的雙向提問，彰顯一種在史學、史材、史識之外，提倡「史用」——以史為用的實踐性想法，藉此為臺灣雕塑史的書寫開拓更為寬廣、更有未來的道路。

參考資料

- 王白淵，〈臺灣美術運動史〉，《臺北文物》，第3卷第4期，1955年3月。
- 王慶台，〈台灣雕塑歷史的過往〉，《臺灣美術》，第31期，1996年1月，頁54-60。
- 江如海，〈陳夏雨、楊英風與戰後台灣現代雕塑的起源〉，《現代美術學報》，第7期，2004年5月，頁98-99。
- 呂清夫，〈十年來臺灣現代雕塑之走向——一個雕塑公園熱的年代〉，《炎黃藝術》，第50期，1993年10月，頁17-29。
- 李美蓉，〈臺灣雕塑藝術現象淺論〉，《美育》，第114期，2000年3月，頁64-71。
- 林明賢，〈戰後臺灣雕塑的發展〉，《臺灣美術》，第91期，2013年1月，頁52-75；〈從形塑到造型——六〇年代臺灣雕塑的演變〉，《臺灣美術》，第105期，2016年7月，頁4-27。
- 許惠敏，〈雕形塑意——二十年來臺灣雕塑研究〉，《臺灣美術》，第59期，2005年1月，頁30-36。
- 葉龍彥，〈戰後初期的「臺灣省全省美術展覽會(1946-1955)」〉，《臺北文獻》，第126期，1998年12月，頁129。
- 蓋瑞忠，〈談現代雕塑〉，《教師之友》21卷，9-10期，1980年11月，頁13-14。
- 謝里法，〈日據時代臺灣美術運動史〉，臺北，藝術家，1978年。
- 鄭水萍，〈戰後雕塑的破與立（上）〉，《雄獅美術》，第273期，1993年11月，頁22。
- 蕭瓊瑞，〈臺灣現代雕塑的先驅者——陳英傑的生命圓融〉，《臺南文化》，第46期，1998年12月，頁217-240。
- 蕭瓊瑞，〈世紀黎明——臺灣雕塑藝術的世紀檢驗〉，《藝術家》，第282期，1998年11月，頁524-528。
- 蕭瓊瑞，〈走向群眾的台灣雕塑藝術〉，《鄉城生活雜誌》，第60期，1999年1月，頁11-13。
- 蕭瓊瑞，〈台灣近代雕塑史〉，臺北市，藝術家出版社，2017年10月。

Interface, Space, and Field: Modern Taiwanese Sculptures and A Retrospective Study of Research Topics

PAI, Shih-Ming

Abstract

Modern sculpture was introduced into Taiwan during the Japanese colonial period when western art concepts were brought in. Official exhibitions such as Taiwan Fine Arts Exhibition and Taiwan Governmental Fine Arts Exhibition did not have a separate category for sculpture at the time. But sculpture as an art form began to develop thanks to artists Huang Tu-Shui and Chen Hsia-Yu, who traveled to Japan to further their art studies. During that time, realism and modernism dominated Japanese art. As a result of these stylistic influences, sculpture in Taiwan before WWII focused on the importance of observing nature and the connection between the land and real life. After the war, the official Taiwan Provincial Fine Arts Exhibition set up a separate section for sculpture. Fine arts schools also began to offer sculpture classes. A generation of talented sculptors emerged. It was a golden age for sculpture in Taiwan.

Realism continued to dominate the majority of sculptural works in the early post-war years. This was replaced by simple, abstract styles in the 1950s and 1960s, when sculptors began to explore form and space in many different ways. It led to works that were both modern and avant-garde in nature. A number of groups formed by sculptors appeared in the 1970s and 1980s. At the same time, artists who had studied overseas returned and experimented with techniques, materials, and concepts using alternative new approaches. Mixed media was popular. Non-conventional types of sculptures emerged. Installations, environment and public art appeared to become key symbols of the modern era.

Studies into Taiwan's history of sculpture was not officially initiated until the 1990s. Early works either provided information of artists and their works or presented the results of academic studies. Arrangement of information was still more in a general history style. Later, the end of martial law rule over Taiwan and rising awareness of decolonization and depoliticization took modern Taiwanese sculpture through different stages, from direct imitation of Japan to confronting the west and then to return to oneself. In the process modern Taiwanese sculpture broke the limits set by material and interface and began to explore the spatial relationship between sculptural artworks and its location. This was followed by questioning and establishing the subjectivity of Taiwan itself and subsequently brought discussions of Taiwan's history of sculpture into the new post-colonial and post-martial law era.

Keywords: Huang Tu-Shui, Yuyu Yang (Yang Ying-Feng), Zodiac Sculpture Group, Ju Ming, modern sculpture, post-colonialism, post-martial law period

I. The Beginning of Studies into Taiwan's History of sculpture

It is generally agreed that the artist and writer Wang Bai-Yuan (王白淵) was important to the writing of Taiwan's art history studies. But did Wang mention sculpture in his celebrated article "History of Taiwanese Art Movement (臺灣美術運動史)"?¹ In western art, as a general rule, painting, sculpture, and architecture are of equal importance. All three are regarded as pillars of art. In contrast, why is sculpture in Taiwan not as appreciated as much as painting? Why is architecture considered to be more about engineering than art? Why does sculpture and architecture not share the same level of attention and appreciation as painting? The answer lies perhaps in Taiwan's particular situation and historical background. First it is necessary to review Wang's article, which was significant because it laid the foundation for art history studies in Taiwan and see how he described sculpture.

What were the first words written on Taiwan's history of sculpture? How or when did Wang begin to initiate discussions on this subject? In the article he mentioned "Among those who went to Japan to study art was the extremely talented sculptor Huang Tu-Shui (黃土水)....His complete mastery of sculpting skills, the magnificence of his structural design, and the expressiveness of the poetry in his works made them masterpieces of a generation..." He also wrote that "Tai-yang Art Society opened its seventh art exhibition at the Taipei City Public Hall on April 26th, R.O.C. year 30 (1941). The exhibition lasted for five days. This year's exhibition had a separate section for sculpture. Pu Tian-Sheng (蒲添生), Chen Hsia-Yu (陳夏雨), and Japanese artist Samejima Taiki all took part in the exhibition. The three sculptors were also members of the Society..." The article's reference to sculpture focused on individual sculptors and the events that featured sculptural works. Sculpture was discussed as part of the art history framework. It was ambiguous as to whether sculpture could count as a discipline itself or not. A clearly-defined view of history of sculpture could not be found in Wang's article.

New art (or art nouveau) refers to modern art or pure art as opposed to conventional or traditional art. The article stated clearly that new art appeared in Taiwan after Japanese colonial rule. However, it named only three Taiwanese sculptors in the article, including Huang Tu-Shui in the pre-war period and Chen Hsia-Yu and Pu Tian-Sheng in the post-war period. Why did he only quote three examples when he remarked on the development of sculptural art in Taiwan? There may have been few sculptors at the time, but Wang's writing inevitably reflected his observation of art history, the approaches he chose to construct his discourse, and the amount of attention he paid to different forms of art.

The article observed that "Huang Tu-Shui's sculptures are thorough presentations of realism and idealism. They are full of majestic strength, power, and beauty. Huang had a passion for water buffalos. He was a great admirer of the 19th century French master sculptor Rodin." Wang's description of Huang's technique, composition, and poetic qualities were stylistic in general. On Chen Hsia-Yu Wang said, "Chen's sculptures reflect realism in its true form and express the many ideals he believed in. He was the only Taiwanese sculptor who picked up the unfinished work left by Huang Tu-Shui..." Wang was of the view that the features, the intent, and the historic value of Chen's works came from the artist's belief in realism and idealism. As for Pu Tian-Sheng, "He produced many pieces, but few outstanding ones. He is yet young and energetic. His future is to be expected." There were words of encouragement but very little mentioned of Pu's work. Realism and idealism are terms that appear frequently when discussing pre-war and post-war sculptural styles in art schools.

1. Wang, Baiyuan (王白淵), "History of Taiwanese Art Movement" (臺灣美術運動史), *Taipei Artefacts* (臺北文物), Vol.3, No.4, 1955.3.

The article went on to quote “In Memory of Huang Tu-Shui” (回憶黃土水君) from *Journal of Taiwan Educational Council* (臺灣教育會雜誌, later renamed *Education in Taiwan* (臺灣教育)), which commented that “Huang was undoubtedly a brilliant mark in provincial Taiwan’s art history.” Huang was an early pioneer in Taiwan’s art history. It is acceptable to regard him as the starting point of Taiwan’s art history. Nonetheless, what was “provincial Taiwan’s art history” referring to here? Did the article mean Taiwan or mainland China or somewhere else? There is also another ambiguous issue. Was Huang the first in modern Chinese history of sculpture? Or was he the first in Taiwan’s art history? Huang’s status as the person who opened a new era in art history is generally accepted. However, Wang did not give a clear definition of Huang’s historic role. Discussions on issues such as whether provincial Taiwanese art equals Taiwanese art history and if there was an appropriate title for Taiwan’s history of sculpture did not take place until the lift of martial law. Sculpture was not recognized as a separate discipline or category during the Japanese colonial period. The idea of sculptural history as an academic discipline was not yet defined or even present at the time.

After Wang Bai-Yuan, Hsieh Li-Fa’s (謝里法) was another one of the more noted figures to write about Taiwan’s post-war art history. Therefore it is also necessary to examine Hsieh’s approach to the history of sculpture. Hsieh’s theories and writings were very similar to Wang. They both began their observation with art movements and structured the context of art history through art societies and artist groups. They believed that organizations such as these were the forces that drive art forward.

Hsieh noted in the *History of Taiwanese Art Movement During Japanese Occupation* (日據時代臺灣美術運動史, published in 1978, the book was a collection of articles he published in the *Artist Magazine* earlier)² that the first group of western-style and Japanese-style painters emerged during the fifty years of Japanese colonial rule. There was no mention of sculptors. Only when Huang Tu-Shui’s name was mentioned did Hsieh specifically pointed out the sculptor’s achievements and progress. For example, what Huang learned at the Tokyo Fine Arts School, how he absorbed realism from Western Europe, and how he tried to depict Taiwan’s local colors, customs, and people through his grasp of the rustic outlines of Taiwan and its people?

Hsieh claimed that “Huang’s expression of Rodin’s concepts of art was not thorough. The reason is that he could not get rid of his rural upbringing and continued to be constrained by his rustic artistic sentiments. It limited his ability to put his ideas of sculpture into full practice.”³ In other words, even though Huang was the first Taiwanese artist to have his work selected by the Imperial Art Exhibition, he did not achieve fame as an internationally acclaimed sculptor because he was artistically confined to his regionalism and therefore unable to develop purely sculptural concepts. Regardless of whether this statement was fair or true to history, Hsieh’s comments were more like his personal opinion rather than writing a history of sculpture or an academic account of a sculptor’s creative process.

Similarly, accounts of sculptors Chen Hsia-Yu and Pu Tian-Sheng mostly described how their works were selected by official art exhibitions. Hsieh argued that Chen’s impoverished state was the main reason why the sculptor did not achieve the level of artistic expected originally expected of him. Pu has the same problem. He was too busy making bust sculptures for celebrities. Financially, Pu was in a better state compared to Chen. However, his artistic achievement was still uncertain at the time. It could be argued

2. Hsieh, Li-Fa (謝里法), *History of Taiwanese Art Movement During Japanese Occupation* (日據時代臺灣美術運動史), Taipei: Artist Publishing Co., 1978.

3. See note 2, p.38.

that his performance in art was not on a par with Chen. In the process of rewriting Taiwan's history of art movements, was Hsieh consciously trying to describe the historical background of sculptural art in Taiwan? Or did he make a conscious attempt to write about sculptors? My personal opinion is that he didn't.

Perhaps it was because there was no separate section for sculpture at the official exhibitions. This could have been a key reason for the lack of progress in sculptural art. This is one of the key issues to be taken into consideration when studying earlier writings of Taiwan's sculpture and art history. Most of the literature basically followed the same method of writing. An individual (artist) forms the core of the discussions and descriptions around his/her personal style, life, and educational background, followed by comments of his/her works. This was one of the earliest approaches to writing Taiwan's art history. Another example was an essay by Ye Long-Yen (葉龍彥), whose writing featured a collection of "comments" from jurors of the sculpture category at official art exhibitions. In a way his method was similar to Wang Bai-Yuan's in that both their articles were based on remarks made by jurors at the Taiwan Provincial Fine Arts Exhibition.

Ye's criticism of the west and of Japan was distinctly and intensely radical and nationalistic. For example he argued that "Art was not able to express itself fully in the past due to Japanese oppression and censorship."⁴ Or "In the past, Chinese sculptures was more advanced than the West. An examination of Chinese art history would find that the pure artistic qualities of sculpture as an art form began to disappear when Buddhist art prospered in the Tang Dynasty." As well as "Western sculpture progressed at a slower speed. But western sculptors cared strongly about the pursuit of naturalness. Thus step by step they managed to produce the perfect form art that we see today."⁵ The comparisons he made between an "advanced" China and a "less developed" western world and the suggestions he made between the lines signified his nationalist mindset and an aim to restore Chinese art to its previous glory.

It is worth noting that the article also pointed to the association between Buddhist sculptures and the so-called "Chinese sculpture" or the "re-Chinalization" of sculptural works. In other words, Ye claimed that Chinese sculptural art did not achieve the same level of "perfection" (pure or advanced state of art) because of the restraints imposed by religious demands. Therefore Buddhist influences must be removed for sculptural works to return to the realistic style found in the heydays of the Tang Dynasty. This will lead to renaissance in "a form of art unique to China". This is also what Ye meant by "national quality." His comment that "It can be observed from the jurors' reviews that the western-style painting category by Taiwanese artists performed best and produced the highest standard of works. Much is left to be desired of the sculpture category" explained the reason why he considered sculpture artistically the weakest category in the Taiwan Provincial Fine Arts Exhibition.

The above is an account of some of the issues related to the writing of Taiwan's history of sculpture from the Japanese colonial period to the post-war years. There was yet no clearly-defined framework of art history as an academic discipline. Nor was there a theoretical basis for historical discourse. Discussions mostly started with the sculptor's personal style or the sculptor's cultural background and historical context. Such were merely "attempts" to build up methods of historical research, but not real academic study. It goes on to show that the early frameworks for academic studies into Taiwan's history of sculpture and art took analyses of individual artists as a starting point to construct the history of a nation.

4. Ye, Long-Yen (葉龍彥), "Taiwan Provincial Fine Arts Exhibition in the Early Post-War Years (1946-1955)" (戰後初期的「臺灣省全省美術展覽會(1946-1955)」), *Taipei Historical Documents Quarterly* (臺北文獻), No. 126, 1998.12, p.129.

5. See note 4.

II. Early Efforts in Research Methodology

There were already signs of discontent in the society before the lift of martial law. The public was extremely dissatisfied with the one-party authoritarian rule in Taiwan. The number of people traveling overseas and going abroad was on the increase. A general view of the state of the world and Taiwan's situation was also more prevalent and more concrete than the early post-war years. It had become a standard "localization" practice in the 1980s to examine and analyze the international situation and in turn inspect the shortcomings of Chinese culture. In sculpture, the idea of it as a separate discipline appeared thanks to the spread of western art history into Taiwan. It was also suggested that studies into the history of sculpture should establish a theoretical framework. For example, Rui-Zhong (蓋瑞忠) once mentioned in his essay:

In China's history of art, it seems that artists who work with sculptures rarely made any attempt to build a theoretical framework in order to establish sculpture as a separate form of art on a par with painting, calligraphy, and architecture....Over the years Chinese sculpture had long been immersed in traditional culture and the conventional brush stroke art...yet what we see in sculptural works are either thoroughly western styles or imitations of Japanese works....⁶

Here we see how art in postwar Taiwan was caught up in the confluence of western, Japanese, and Chinese culture. At the same time it was also deeply influenced by nationalist ideals. Although the amount of external exposure was limited, studies into Chinese history of sculptures in Taiwan still managed to gain a head start compared to mainland China. What Gai described as "the completion of an outline of Chinese history of sculpture" could also be considered as a milestone that confirmed the fact that sculpture should be recognized as "a type of knowledge", "an academic discipline", and "an international art genre."

The above statements express a cross-cultural academic perspective to explore the future direction of sculpture in Taiwan and China by offering a framework for comparing east and west, Japanese and Chinese. Gai explicitly explained how sculptural works at the time either thoroughly westernized in style or simply replications of Japanese works. The essay included case studies of sculptors including Ju Ming (朱銘), Yuyu Yang (楊英風), Chen Hsia-Yu, and Chen Ying-Jie (陳英傑). He then went on to argue that similar to other historical studies, art history depends on "a decisive selection principle" to create "orderly" coherence and that the outline for Chinese history of sculpture should be established with this objective in mind. In other words, a history of sculpture should not only state a sculptor's personal information, educational background, or the awards he or she may have won, but also express an attempt to deliver an orderly and a coherent presentation of past events in the world of sculpture. Modern western methods in writing "brief historical accounts" should be adopted to build up an outline for our own history.

The art historian Hsiao Chong-Ray (蕭瓊瑞) was one of those who already believed in the value of sculpture research in the 1990s. Taiwan's history of sculpture began with the sculptor Huang Tu-Shui, followed by Chen Ying-Jie. Similar to Huang, Chen made his name because his work was selected by the Imperial Art Exhibition. However, Hsiao argued that Chen was a representative sculptor because "Chen freed himself from the limitations and the constraints posed by the realist style of his seniors. He developed

6. Gai, Rui-Zhong (蓋瑞忠), "A Discourse on Modern Sculpture" (談現代雕塑), *Teachers Companion* (教師之友), Vol. 21, No. 9-10, 1980.11, pp.13-14.

works that were modern in form and style and impressed a younger generation of sculptors.”⁷ Thus Hsiao considered Chen to be a “pioneer in modern Taiwanese sculpture.”

A more critical issue is how art historians find a place for artists in history. Previous discussions were mostly limited to descriptive, biographical, sentimental, or non-academic depictions of artists and less about defining the role individual artists play from a broader historical framework. Hsiao’s essays also featured individual sculptors. However, it was evident that he gave a much more clearly outlined presentation of the artists based on the context of art history. Those manage to make their name in art history are not only outstanding artists who produce high quality works, nor do they simply continue to work in the style of their predecessors, but those who are trailblazing, pioneering, and influential. Hsiao’s method offered a more objective approach to the construction of Taiwan/China’s history of sculpture, which were still in a state of chaos and confusion. He was one of the first to lead studies in sculpture and history of sculpture away from nationalism and into modern academic research.

The writing of history thus progressed from personal accounts, comments, analysis, or historical associations of individual artists into a wider historical perception of race, area, or nation. From history that portrays individual artists to history that features a nation, the scope seems to have expanded in scale. Nonetheless, it is still a human-centered concept and something that gradually took shape in historical studies in the decades after the war. Compared to his predecessors Wang Bai-Yuan and Hsieh Li-Fa, Hsiao’s writing not only included more sculptors, but also made advances into the study of post-war modern sculptural works. He highlighted the importance of driving change in art history and the significance of defining an artist’s role in history. His approach to the narration of art history was broader in scope, more balanced, and more capable of establishing an academic standard.

Hsiao pointed out that Chen made a major step in his career that allowed him to stand as a representative figure as the first generation of sculptors in post-war Taiwan. “Chen’s style was very much established by 1976.”⁸ Chen’s position in art history progressed from a trailblazing revolutionary and pioneer to a representative symbolic paradigm. The writing of Taiwan’s history of sculpture had gone through several stages, from initiation to exploration, from taking shape to taking a modern perspective. This progress is significant because it shows that Taiwan’s history of sculpture has shifted its focus on individual artists into a more modern point of view.

Furthermore, Jiang Ru-Hai’s (江如海) research also echoed Hsiao’s views. The words “modern Taiwanese sculpture” also began to appear in their works.⁹ The term “modern” was used to signify the difference between new art forms and traditional styles. It was the same with modern Chinese ink and brush painting, modern painting, and modern woodblock printing. These new terms had a special significance related to the age these artworks appeared. When comparing stylistic differences, Jiang focused his review on Pu Tian-Sheng and Chen Hsia-Yu’s works. He believed that these two sculptors “were able to remain dedicated to the research of how to present their ideas through the sculptural work itself without giving up the techniques and concepts on form and space allowed by figurative presentations.” He also concluded that modern sculpture had gone through “the transition process from realism to abstract sculptural styles” and now “focus on the soul and the spirit of the work itself.” His words defined the historical status of “modern

7. Hsiao, Chong-Ray, “A Pioneer in Modern Taiwanese Sculpture: the Harmonious Aesthetics of Chen Ying-Jie” (臺灣現代雕塑的先驅者——陳英傑的生命圓融), *Tainan Culture* (臺南文化), No.46, 1998.12, pp. 217-240.

8. See note 7.

9. Jiang, Ru-Hai (江如海), “Chen Hsia-Yu, Yuyu Yang and the Origin of Modern Sculpture in Postwar Taiwan” (陳夏雨、楊英風與戰後台灣現代雕塑的起源), *Journal of Taipei Fine Arts Museum* (現代美術學報), No.7, 2004.5, pp.98-99.

sculpture” in the early postwar years and reflect a deliberate intention to construct a historical perspective.¹⁰

The phrase “present ideas through the sculptural work itself” refers to pure artistic exploration in technique and concept and in form and space. It could be considered a key starting point in the modernization of postwar sculpture. At the same time, this pursuit for purely artistic creation places special emphasis on the individual artist’s “soul and spirit” by making the artwork abstract and geometric. It was indeed a major shift in style. The sculptor Yuyu Yang played a critical role in this process. In the early postwar years, the cultural policy at the time advocated a renaissance of Chinese culture. Yuyu Yang was one of the few sculptors who began to produce his idea of “modern Chinese sculpture” and intentionally distinguished his works from modern Western sculptures. He was an artist who “successfully established a unique Chinese style.” This was the result of influence of nationalist and patriotic ideology in Taiwan’s postwar modern art. The terms “Taiwanese sculptor” and “Taiwan’s history of sculpture” were used interchangeably with Chinese and China. For the time being, the words “Taiwanese” and “Chinese” were used at the same time to refer to the same ideas.

III. Naming and Genealogy of “Taiwan’s History of Sculpture”

While looking through the changes in sculpture over the post-war years in Taiwan, Zheng Shui-Ping (鄭水萍) once concluded his research results while trying to build an outline for the history of sculpture in Taiwan up until the early 1990s. He identified a shortage of relevant study and made several suggestions to help solve the issue. He claimed:

Overall, Taiwan’s art history is still in the process of construction. There is insufficient literature and material regarding the history of sculpture. At the current stage we are still collecting pictures and images and studying artists....Not much has been written about sculptures in the academic world, not to mention There is almost zero academic research on “Taiwanese sculptures.”¹¹

In his article Zheng pointed out that it was surprising and shocking to find that there was “almost zero” academic research on sculpture. This shows that historical accounts on sculpture were still marginalized and overlooked in art history. On the other hand, he also spoke frankly of the lack of research methodology. Insufficient historical material coupled with discussion that focused mainly on individual artists and archiving that featured mostly pictures and images led to failure in a more constructive historical perspective.

Since the purpose of Zheng’s essay was to establish the historical context for Taiwan’s history of sculpture, he argued that in order to build a “genealogy of Taiwanese sculptors”, it would be necessary to undertake field study, build catalogs of image data, and collect non-academic literature related to the subject. This genealogy would include the following six categories, (1) traditional sculptures made by aborigines (the Austronesian family); (2) traditional sculptures in the style of southern Fukien folk customs (the folk custom family); (3) sculptures by Japan-educated artists during the Japanese colonial period (the Japan-educated family); (4) sculptures by mainland Chinese artists who migrated to Taiwan after the war (the mainland

10. Ibid.

11. Zheng, Shui-Ping, “Groundbreaking and Breaking Ground in Post-war Sculpture” (戰後雕塑的破與立(上)), *Lion Art*, (雄獅美術), No. 273, 1993.11, p.22.

family); (5) sculptures by U.S. and Europe-educated artists; (6) sculptures by post-war art school graduates (most were graduates of the Department of Sculpture at National Taiwan Academy of Arts); and (7) amateur sculptors.

This approach to categorization was based on the temporal relationship between individual sculptors and groups in order to find connections and traces to their origins to form a coherent and objective historical account. The basic framework for writing this history took shape in the repeated interactions of groundbreaking and breaking ground behavior. He called the aforementioned genealogy a “list”, which is an important basis to construct the “entire” history of sculpture in Taiwan. This historical perspective or historical context of writing based on individual artists and artist groups serve to meet Zheng’s attempt to write general history. It is an active move to break the limits and restrictions of nationalism. It is also the result of a certain type of “naming” system.

Zheng Shui-Ping suggested adding field research, image catalogs, and methodology on relevant literature are indeed sufficient to deliver a much broader blueprint of history. At the same time, acknowledging the birth and origin of sculpture, and changes in style in its history, are enough to confirm the rules in Taiwan’s past one hundred years of sculpture. It is the same concept as Wang Wai-Yuan’s art movement history. The development of history are like tidal waves that go up and down and push the times forward. It is worth nothing that this approach to writing history, is an attempt to change the shortcomings in the “bottom-up” style of writing personal history into a “coherent” genealogy. The aforementioned seven sculptural families include Austronesian, folk, Japan-educated, mainland China-Educated, Europe and U.S., Art Schools, and non-professionally trained sculptors. There are genealogies for different groups given difference in time and space and gradually took on a “community history” perspective toward writing.

In addition to aspects such as “personal history” and “community history”, Wang Ching-Tai (王慶台) also observed delays in the academic framework for studying sculpture. The academic world continued to follow established systems from Japan and the West instead of making advances in its own study. “They did not make further studies on sculpture or compare cultural differences. Nor did they note the intricacies in works produced in different times or at different places.” Also, in order to question and challenge the horizontal (timely) transplant of regional culture, the development of sculpture in Taiwan must also re-examine in a “cultural history” manner, paying particular attention to the horizontal differences rather than the vertical influences in the cultural transplant.¹²

Another essay from Hsiao Chong-Ray in the same year (1988) was similar to Zheng’s in the ambition it expressed to transcend time and communities. Hsiao examined the past one hundred years of history from a “centennial review” perspective to explore the association between individual artists, institutions, events, political background, and sculptural works. The development of sculpture in Taiwan through Japanese colonial rule and the postwar years were reviewed in two stages. This approach to defining history by looking at transitions of power and political relationships was more similar to the way “political history” or “dynasty history” are written. Regarding the practical impact of political institutions and political considerations on sculpture, Hsiao stated that “The development of Taiwan’s sculptural art after the war was restricted by the political environment and the possession of public space, which is a most powerful expression of authoritative power.” His remarks reflect the importance of political considerations in this

12. Wang, Ching-Tai, “Taiwan’s History of Sculpture” (台灣雕塑歷史的過往), *Journal of National Taiwan Museum of Fine Arts* (臺灣美術), Vol.31, 1996.1, pp.54-60.

method of history writing.¹³

Although Hsiao's essay attempted to interpret or to construct history on the basis of political changes and political influences, it was not meant as a praise for any political regime. Instead, the essay made a point to emphasize a conscious "historical awareness" through the presentation of personal opinions. For example, Hsiao claimed that the Provincial Fine Arts Exhibition "was still the most important venue for artists after the war" despite the fact that the Exhibition was a powerful institution controlled by a mere handful of jurors. He also argued that "Due to the limited number of jurors and their rigid styles, it was not that easy to stimulate diversity and expressiveness." Hsiao approved of the Provincial Fine Arts Exhibition's aim to encourage artistic creation, at the same time he also pointed out its shortcomings. At the time, the sculptures displayed at the Exhibition were criticized for the lack of style and irrelevancy to the current situation. However, Hsiao disputed against this by saying that "It could not be argued that the 'exhibition-style' sculptural artworks suffer from no innovation or investigation in style, method, subject, or material." The way he "inspects" history from an objective point of view is one of the features of Hsiao's writing.¹⁴

The division of history into two stages, first the Japanese colonial period, followed by the postwar years (after the relocation of the Nationalist government from mainland China to Taiwan) became an accepted method in subsequent historical writings in sculpture. But in the 1990s another shift took place that changed the way history was written. In the 1990s researchers began to record history in much shorter periods of time, for example in ten years, twenty years, or decades. Compared to the centennial method, this was a new and alternative approach to writing a history of sculpture. Among its many advantages were more straightforward, more concrete, and more detailed explanations of past events. Problems such as over-simplification or over-concentration on specific issues could be avoided. Also, the new approach reflected how sculpture respond to increasingly dramatic changes in the current situation and to increasingly complicated and universal social issues.

Examples include Lu Ching-Fu's (呂清夫) article on the rise of sculpture parks. In his article Lu examined past events on a "ten year" basis, marking the shortest period of time observed in historical studies. He described in great detail the interactions between the sculpture world, the general public, and the public sector. From sculpture galleries, sculpture exhibitions, sculpture camps, sculpture contests, international exchanges and interactions, and sponsorship programs and rules, Lu offered an overall review of the type of "landscape sculpture" or "public art" the society needs. The method he applied was completely different from previous approaches. It also allowed him to avoid being limited by established means and subjects of discussion.¹⁵

Li Mei-Rong's (李美蓉) thesis followed the abovementioned approach in writing political history. She skillfully combined the two-stage method (Japanese colonial period and postwar years) and the ten-year method. For example, she stated that sculptors from the Japanese colonial period "created expressive nude statues that portrayed the people and the customs at the time", whereas after the war there were many "realistic statues of idealized political figures". This was replaced by "organic abstract" sculptures in the 1960s. In the 1980s "geometric abstract and minimal art" appeared, followed by "critical, challenging, conceptual new works" after the lift of martial law. She analyzed the history of sculpture in steps and stages.

13. Hsiao, Chung-Ray, "Dawn at the Century: Reviewing the Past Century of Taiwan's Sculptural Art" (世紀黎明——臺灣雕塑藝術的世紀檢驗), *Artist Magazine*, No. 282, 1998.11, pp.524-528.

14. *Ibid.*

15. Lu, Ching-Fu (呂清夫), "The Direction of Modern Sculpture in Taiwan during the Last Ten Years: A Preference for Sculpture Parks" (十年來臺灣現代雕塑之走向——一個雕塑公園熱的年代), *Yen Huang Art* (炎黃藝術), No. 50, 1993.10, pp.17-29.

Thus her essay could be regarded as an academic thesis that aimed to write about stylistic shifts over the years.¹⁶ A similar method of dividing history into decades could also be found in Lin Ming-Hsien's (林明賢) works on postwar sculpture, in which only sculptural works from a selected decade or period of time after the war were examined.¹⁷

This was followed by Hsu Hui-Min's (許惠敏) investigation of the subsequent "twenty years" of transformations in Taiwanese sculptors after the lift of martial law. Hsu's work was a response to the new atmosphere at the time. Her essay argued that the lift of martial law rule allowed sculptors to overlook political influences and restrictions and to return to the modernization of art itself. At the same time she also believed that this was the time when Taiwan's history of sculpture began to gain attention. She went to great lengths to review the past from a more focused angle to re-examine how ideas regarding a history of sculpture was formed in Taiwan.¹⁸

In this light, special attention was given to Zheng's research. Hsu approved and complimented Zheng's efforts by saying that "This is an essay that provided a complete and explicit picture of Taiwan's history of sculpture from the prewar to the postwar years. The many social issues that influenced the deconstruction and reconstruction of Taiwan's sculptural art is clearly visible and comprehensible for readers." She also commented on Zheng's discussions on groundbreaking and breaking ground. Finally, she claimed that "Taiwan's history of sculpture is something that many have attempted to construct in the past twenty years. Most of the research began with the sculptor Huang Tu-Shui in the Japanese colonial period. Most of the research work featured outstanding artists from each period in time." Such was her conclusion of a common feature found in most of the academic writing on the history of sculpture. Her comparison between the differences in research methodology and in the style of the works could perhaps be called as a brief "history of historiography" of sculptural art in Taiwan.¹⁹

The selection of a title for different periods in history and application of all possible approaches in the study of history help to confirm the academic status of Taiwan's history of sculpture. Regardless of the reason behind such studies, the key is how we encourage researchers to examine the association and connection between past events. Taiwan's history of sculpture finally established itself as a discipline independent of the general art history in the 1990s. An increasing number of scholars such as Zheng Shui-Ping debated over the development and the context for Taiwan's history of sculpture with positive attitudes, clearly-defined goals, and systematic and structured ideas of how history should be studied. They offered a scientific approach to the "deconstruction and reconstruction" of history. In the preceding discussions it could be discovered that by this time research in Taiwan's history of sculpture had moved beyond a singular historical point of view. In other words, it was an all-inclusive vibrant scene that embraced both macro and micro perspectives of history and welcomed multiple points of view.

IV. The Need to "Apply History for Practical Use" : Citizenship and Practical Use of History

16. Li, Mei-Rong (李美蓉), "A Brief Discussion on the Art of Taiwanese Sculptures" (臺灣雕塑藝術現象淺論), *Journal of Aesthetic Education* (美育), No.114, 2000.3, pp.64-71.

17. Lin, Ming-Hsien (林明賢), "Post-War Development of Taiwan's Sculptural Art" (戰後臺灣雕塑的發展), *Journal of National Taiwan Museum of Fine Arts*, No. 91, 2013.1, pp. 52-75; "From Shaping to Modeling: The Transformation of the Taiwanese Sculpture Art in the 1960's" (從形塑到造型——六〇年代臺灣雕塑的演變), *Journal of National Taiwan Museum of Fine Arts*, No. 105, 2016.7, pp.4-27.

18. Hsu, Hui-Min (許惠敏), *Sculpting Forms and Meanings: A Study on Sculptures in Taiwan during the Past Two Decades* (雕形塑意——二十年來臺灣雕塑研究), *Journal of National Taiwan Museum of Fine Arts*, No. 59, 2005.1, pp. 30-36.

19. Ibid.

Taiwan's history of sculpture was built from almost nothing to something, from a subordinate section of art to an independent form. This was in part thanks to the contextualization and theorization process that allowed sculpture to become a separate sub-disciplines of its own. It also reflected the evolution and the growth of sculptural art from the early postwar years to the post-martial law era. As Hsu Hui-Min intentionally remarked in her essay of the changes after the lift of martial law and in the 1990s, "Public art has been a popular subject of discussion for the last ten years."²⁰ Given dramatic changes in the external environment, it seems that sculpture could no longer stay within an institution that consisted of only the academic world and art contests. The emergence of "landscape sculpture" (or "public art") raised new issues in sculpture. Therefore, answering the following questions seem all the more critical. For example, how should the study of Taiwan's sculptural history respond to the new situation? How should research in Taiwan's history of sculpture reconstruct?

When sculpture begins to establish a connection with so-called "landscape" or "public art", it is no longer confined to an ivory tower of art contexts and art schools. In the process, sculptural works inevitably come face to face with questions raised by society and by the general public. However, how should sculpture meet public expectations? What are the formal elements and communication skills required to for sculpture as an art form to interact with the public? How should sculpture respond to different external space? These are some of the core issues. From the above reviews of the history of sculpture in Taiwan's recent past, it could be observed that sculptures found in public spaces mostly portray political or historical figures. Sculptures that are purely artistic expressions only appear in art competitions. Hsiao Chong-Ray believed that this was nothing but "a manifestation of control over the soul and an extension of authoritative rule." This made it impossible for most people to acknowledge the true essence of sculptural art.²¹

In an essay published in 1999, Hsiao followed the same approach as in his 1998 essay, in which he continued to look back at art history in the aforementioned "centennial review" (centennial history) method. He proposed a more detailed division of history into different periods. In addition to separating the history of modern sculpture in Taiwan into pre-war Japanese colonial period and postwar years (in other words, dividing history from a "political" or "dynasty" perspective", he portrayed the development of sculpture in Taiwan into five different segments. (1) Japanese colonial period; (2) early postwar years; (3) modernism; (4) rustic movement; (5) diversity in the post-martial law era and the second wave of western art in postwar Taiwan. Hsiao compared sculptors and sculptural works (i.e. narration of past events that individual artists went through and the development of art styles) that were typical of a certain period in history to present an overview of the key developments in each period. It was basically consistent with his division of Taiwan's art history into different periods.

Lu Ching-Fu's thorough investigation of the relationship between sculptors, the government, and the society at large was mentioned earlier in this essay. His aim was to reflect on the type of "landscape sculpture" or "public art" that society demanded or required. He then offered his criticism and opinion of how sculpture should confront the public, encourage thoughts on the social practice of sculptural works, and lead studies of sculptural art from purely historical examination into the realm of sociology and public relations. The title of Hsiao's essay specifically used the words "embracing the crowd", which echoed the trend at the time. His objective was to divide history into smaller segments of time in order to highlight the tremendous changes that were taking place in the external environment after the lift of martial law rule and

20. See note 18.

21. Hsiao, Chung-Ray, "Embracing the Crowd: Sculpture Art in Taiwan"(走向群眾的台灣雕塑藝術), *Suncity Life Magazine* (鄉城生活雜誌), No. 60, 1999.1, pp.11-13.

to encourage artists to “come out of their tiny display venues to embrace the crowd and public space” and break the previously authoritarian government’s control of space.

In a series of studies on the history of sculpture after the war, the researcher Lin Ming-Hsien also made an attempt to outline the different “stages” in art history through deconstruction and reconstruction. He proposed that there are three stages of development in postwar Taiwanese art: (1) the transition period from the Japanese colonial years to early postwar; (2) the 1950s and beyond when modern concepts and artistic influences from Europe and the U.S. were introduced into Taiwan; (3) the post-1980s post-martial law period when diversity was increasingly valued and expressed. These three stages correspond with Hsiao Chong-Ray’s second, third, and fifth period in art history. It could be argued that Lin’s rationale for dividing history into three different stages was to emphasize innovation and change rather than to hold on to conservative conventions. Therefore, it is perhaps obvious why Hsiao’s fourth period was missing in Lin’s version. Regardless of the reasons or the grounds for the division, the above studies provide a variety of perspectives and approaches to examine the development of sculpture in Taiwan during the past one hundred years in detail.

Thus in a continuous cycle of deconstruction and reconstruction, Taiwan’s modern history of sculpture manages to see the subjectivity of culture through a perspective that incorporates diverse elements. Sculpture is investigated as an independent discipline in its own right. In this process, the material and the framework, the means and the views related to writing art history gradually takes shape. A book that contains a collection of articles published over the years is finally released. Hsiao mentioned in the foreword to his *History of Taiwan Modern Sculpture* (台灣近代雕塑史),

During the past one hundred years, Taiwan’s modern history of sculpture first went through colonial rule, followed by martial law, followed by legal restrictions. How should Taiwanese sculpture carve a wider way out for its future? ²²

In this book Hsiao continued to adopt the same practice of dividing the past one hundred years of Taiwan’s history into different segments to narrate Taiwan’s “modern” history of sculpture. However, it is worth noting that the three key time points: colonialism, martial law rule, and the future correspond to (1) Japanese colonial period, (2) postwar Nationalist Party rule, and (3) post-martial law, respectively. There are three instead of five stages compared to the preceding part of the text and therefore more concise.

Regarding the many questions raised on the centennial history of sculpture in Taiwan, such as has sculpture freed itself from “multiple layers of limitations?” How should sculpture “carve a wider way out for its future?” How should the history of the sculptors remain “unforgotten?” All these issues were covered in Hsiao’s *History of Taiwan Modern Sculpture*. Regarding the life and the works of sculptors who had “each achieved their success” during the past century, Hsiao believed that these efforts shall “become important nutrients for future history”, reflecting his firm belief in “drawing lessons from history” and “making the past serve the present.” Also, the book contains thirty chapters, covers a rich variety of subjects and contents, with an all-inclusive narrative structure that incorporates the complete history of sculpture in Taiwan.

The above research efforts offer insight into the progress of modern Taiwanese sculpture. From imitating Japanese works to encountering western influences to return to oneself, sculptors in Taiwan freed themselves from the limitations imposed by material and interface and began to explore different venues

22. Hsiao, Chong-Ray, *History of Taiwan Modern Sculpture* (台灣近代雕塑史), Taipei: Artist Magazine, 2017.10.

and sites and went on further to consider the issue of culture subjectivity. It shows that studies in the history of sculpture in Taiwan have left colonialism and martial law rule behind to enter a new era. The preceding paragraphs described several perspectives and ways to examine sculpture in different periods of history. Regardless of the strengths and weaknesses of each method, it is perhaps more important for us to reevaluate and to reconstruct our own history of art and sculpture in this age of diversification, democratization, and globalization. Art is no longer just about individual artists. It is an act of continuous interaction with the general public, with the society at large, and with the world. Art is about citizenship and universal values. The issues raised in Hsiao's latest book encourage a two-way interaction with the reader to both ask questions and to examine within ourselves. In addition to historiography, historical material, and historical awareness, Hsiao called for a "practical use of history." This practice of applying history for practical use shall open up more potentials and a more expansive road for the future of research into Taiwan's history of sculpture. (Translated by LO, Ya-Hsuan)



References

- Wang, Baiyuan, "History of Taiwanese Art Movement", *Taipei Artefacts*, Vol.3, No.4, 1955.3.
- Wang, Ching-Tai, "Taiwan's History of Sculpture", *Journal of National Taiwan Museum of Fine Arts*, Vol.31, 1996.1, pp.54-60.
- Jiang, Ru-Hai, "Chen Hsia-Yu, Yuyu Yang and the Origin of Modern Sculpture in Postwar Taiwan", *Journal of Taipei Fine Arts Museum*, No.7, 2004.5, pp. 98-99.
- Lu, Ching-Fu, "The Direction of Modern Sculpture in Taiwan during the Last Ten Years: A Preference for Sculpture Parks", *Yen Huang Art*, No. 50, 1993.10, pp. 17-29.
- Li, Mei-Rong, "A Brief Discussion on the Art of Taiwanese Sculptures", *Journal of Aesthetic Education*, No.114, 2000.3, pp.64-71.
- Lin, Ming-Hsien, "Post-War Development of Taiwan's Sculptural Art", *Journal of National Taiwan Museum of Fine Arts*, No. 91, 2013.1, pp. 52-75.
- Lin, Ming-Hsien, "From Shaping to Modeling: The Transformation of the Taiwanese Sculpture Art in the 1960's", *Journal of National Taiwan Museum of Fine Arts*, No. 105, 2016.7, pp.4-27.
- Hsu, Hui-Min, *Sculpting Forms and Meanings: A Study on Sculptures in Taiwan during the Past Two Decades*, *Journal of National Taiwan Museum of Fine Arts*, No. 59, 2005.1, pp. 30-36.
- Ye, Long-Yen, "Taiwan Provincial Fine Arts Exhibition in the Early Post-War Years (1946-1955)", *Taipei Historical Documents Quarterly*, No. 126, 1998.12, p.129.
- Gai, Rui-Zhong, "A Discourse on Modern Sculpture", *Teachers Companion*, Vol. 21, No. 9-10, 1980.11, pp. 13-14.
- Hsieh, Li-Fa, *History of Taiwanese Art Movement During Japanese Occupation*, Taipei: Artist Publishing Co., 1978.
- Zheng, Shui-Ping, "Groundbreaking and Breaking Ground in Post-war Sculpture", *Lion Art*, No. 273, 1993.11, p. 22.
- Hsiao, Chong-Ray, "A Pioneer in Modern Taiwanese Sculpture: the Harmonious Aesthetics of Chen Ying-Jie", *Tainan Culture*, No.46, 1998.12, pp. 217-240.
- Hsiao, Chung-Ray, "Dawn at the Century: Reviewing the Past Century of Taiwan's Sculptural Art", *Artist Magazine*, No. 282, 1998.11, pp. 524-528
- Hsiao, Chung-Ray, "Embracing the Crowd: Sculpture Art in Taiwan", *Suncity Life Magazine*, No. 60, 1999.1, pp.11-13.
- Hsiao, Chong-Ray, *History of Taiwan Modern Sculpture*, Taipei: Artist Publishing Co., 2017.10.