



最初的道路：情感在地化及語言民族化  
——論黃土水與劉錦堂

The Original Path: Emotive Localization  
and Linguistic Nationalization On Huang  
Tu-shui and Liu Chin-tang

倪又安 | Yu-an Ni

國立臺灣師範大學美術研究所博士生  
Doctorial student,  
National Taiwan Normal University,  
Department of Fine Arts



## 摘要

在現有的臺灣美術史研究中，日治時期的臺灣美術運動，往往被詮釋為「透過日本而接引到源於歐洲的現代美術」這樣一個具有過渡性質的時代角色。在此偏重整體性而忽略藝術家個人表現的強勢概念化詮釋下，諸多留日臺籍美術家的作品，成為專家眼中的「外光派遺續」，或是迎合帝國主義眼光品味的「南國風光」的文化產品。而上述的主流論述，用於書寫日治時期的臺灣美術發展，也確實能呈現某些方面的真實。然而，站在新世紀的今天，回顧近百年前由前輩們所開啓的新美術運動，我所關注且企圖尋找的是，在那樣一個不可能避免「殖民化」又必定要侷限在「橫的移植」之格局的年代，有沒有人能夠突破那無形的限制，開始走出具有獨立思考能量的美術本土化的新頁？同時，日治時期的臺灣美術，除了有「日本導師與臺灣學生」的垂直關係外，我們能否提出「日本導師與臺灣大師」或「臺灣大師與臺灣大師」這樣平行的結構？從此角度出發，我更加將重點放在臺籍美術家在接受日本現代美術洗禮後，如何藉由對自身文化處境的反省所產生的藝術翻轉。這種翻轉，可能出自對殖民者的反骨（如陳植棋），可能出於對鄉土由衷的思戀（如黃土水），甚至可能出於我們如今避之唯恐不及的祖國認同（如劉錦堂、陳澄波），但無論其內在來源動能如何相異，但實踐到藝術創作上，最終則體現了兩條根本的路徑：即情感在地化和語言民族化。而非常湊巧的，臺灣美術史上最早留學日本的雕塑家黃土水與畫家劉錦堂，正是情感在地化和語言民族化的代表人物。若從作品的數量來看，他們可能都因為英年早逝而有所不足，但就創作質地而言，無論黃土水的〈釋迦像〉、〈水牛群像〉，或劉錦堂的〈亡命日記圖〉、〈棄民圖〉，都該是放到世界一

流美術館也依然靈光煥發的不朽傑作。這篇文章，從日治臺灣美術寫到日本現代美術，從立體的雕塑寫到平面的繪畫，也從藝術家的生平寫到他們的理想與感情，只希望透過個人的研究與論述，能使黃土水、劉錦堂這一對最早出發的「臺灣大師與臺灣大師」的美術史位置，有更為適切且準確的輪廓。

**關鍵詞：**日治臺灣美術、情感在地化、語言民族化、黃土水、劉錦堂



## Abstract

In the existing research on the history of Taiwanese art, the art movement in Taiwan during the period of Japanese rule is often interpreted as a historical transition in the form of “modern art connecting to its European sources via Japan”. This dominant, conceptualized interpretation focuses on general character and neglects the idiosyncrasies of individual artists. The works of many Taiwanese artists who had studied in Japan are accordingly seen by experts either as “legacies of plein-airism” or cultural products sporting a “southern exoticism” that catered to the imperialistic perspective and taste. This mainstream discourse does lay bare certain realities indeed in the writing of the development of Taiwanese art during the period of Japanese rule. However, as we in the new century today look back on the new art movement initiated by our forebears nearly a century ago, what I am concerned about and hope to uncover is this: In the era when “colonialism” was unavoidable and being confined to a gestalt of lateral transplants was necessary, was anyone able to break through the invisible limitations and start a new page with the energy of independent thinking towards the indigenization of art? Other than the vertical relation between “Japanese mentors” and “Taiwanese students,” can we, in the matter of art in Taiwan under Japanese rule, put forth an alternative structure of parallels— such as “Japanese mentors” vis-à-vis “Taiwanese masters,” or “Taiwanese masters” vis-à-vis “Taiwanese masters?”

Approaching from this angle, I focus more on how Taiwanese artists reflected on their own cultural situation after returning from their immersion in modern art in Japan, and how they thereby came up with artistic reversals. Such reversals might have stemmed from rebelliousness against the colonialists (as seen, for example, in Chen Chih-chi), a heartfelt attachment to the native countryside (as seen, for example, in Huang Tu-shui), or even the sort of identification with the motherland that we today would distance ourselves from (as seen in, for example, Liu Chin-tang and Chen Cheng-po). However different the inner motivations might have been, the resultant artistic praxes ultimately boiled down to two fundamental routes of evolution — i.e., the localization of sentiments and the nationalization of artistic language. The sculptor Huang Tu-shui and the painter Liu Chin-tang, two of the earliest figures in the history of Taiwanese art to study in Japan, happened to be representative of these two trends. The opuses of both men may be small in quantity due to their early demises, but as far as artistic quality is concerned, Huang Tu-shui's *Siddhartha* and *Water Buffaloes* as well as Liu Chin-tang's *Days on the Run* and *Forsaken People* count as immortal masterpieces that would shine in any top museum in the world.