

多元感知与多元描绘

Multi Perceptions/Multi Portraits

鲁本·A·阿尔克莱

Ruben A. Alcolea

雷祖康 赵晨 译

Tr. by Lei Zukang Zhao Chen

摘要 自从电影问世以后，“复制”现实就成为人类现代文明的一大特征。计算机和互联网技术的出现更把“整体”复制渗透到人们生活的方方面面。这种无限次复制的现象被称为当代的“多元化感知”。明星建筑师库哈斯利用这种“多元感知”对自己设计的波尔多住宅进行了“多元描绘”，揭示了一座普通住屋背后不易被觉察的空间细节和行为情节，启示我们应当积极探索建筑和新媒体以及新的表达方式之间的关系。

关键词 复制 多元感知 多元描绘 库哈斯

ABSTRACT Since the appearance of movie, 'reproduction' of reality has become a characteristic of modern civilization. The emergence of Computer and Internet technology have made 'complete' portrait penetrated into every aspect of our daily life. Such phenomenon of infinite reproduction is referred as 'multi perceptions'. As a star architect, Koolhaas used such 'multi perceptions' to 'multi portrait' the Bordeaux house he designed. In such a way, Koolhaas revealed the hardly detectable spacial and behavioral details behind a common dwelling, which inspired us that we should put more attention on exploring the relation among architecture, new media and new mode of expression.

KEY WORDS reproduction, multi perception, multi portrait, Koolhaas

中图分类号 TU-026 **文献标识码** B **文章编号** 1000-3959 (2010) 02-0010-06

“One evening I had a near-hallucinatory vision. The question-and-answer session that led up to this vision went something like this: Suppose you shoot a whole movie in a single frame? And the answer: You get a shining screen. Immediately I sprang into action, experimenting toward realizing this vision. Dressed up as a tourist, I walked into a cheap cinema in the East Village with a large-format camera. As soon as the movie started, I fixed the shutter at a wide-open aperture, and two hours later when the movie finished, I clicked the shutter closed. That evening, I developed the film, and the vision exploded behind my eyes. This idea struck me as being very interesting, mysterious, and even religious.”

——Hiroshi Sugimoto

The idea of the “complete” portrait, or of the “complete” reproduction, is not new. It is now nearly a century since Walter Benjamin announced that the future will be defined by reproduction, in what became one of the more suggestive texts of the twentieth century. In his very well known essay “*The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction*”, published in 1935,^① Benjamin addresses a modern, technologically

“一天晚上，某种类似幻觉的景象浮现在我脑海里。让我产生这种幻景的问题和答案是样子的，试问：设想在某种单一的背景中，拍一部完整电影会是什么样子？回答：是闪亮的银幕。我随即付诸行动，试着将这种幻景变为现实。我装扮成观众，带着大幅摄影机，走进一家位于东村的廉价电影院。电影刚开始，我就按下快门，将光圈调到最大。两个小时后电影结束时，我立即关上快门。那天晚上，我把电影制作了出来，这种景象给我的视觉造成了很大的冲击。这个有趣、神秘甚至有些宗教式的想法就这样突然降临。”

——杉本博司 (Hiroshi Sugimoto)

现今，“完整”写照或“整体”复制的想法已不新鲜。瓦特·本杰明 (Walter Benjamin) 曾在一本书中提出“未来即复制”的说法，虽然到现在快一个世纪了，但即使在20世纪看来，这一提法仍然很有启发性。本杰明在1935年发表的著

effectuated transformation in the nature of art and, by extension, the political implications of that transformation. The idea of being able to transform a single object, or piece of art, into a non-unique object that could be experienced beyond the possibilities of people willing to make a pilgrimage to the artwork's location was clearly one of the ideas ready to change art theory in modernity. Benjamin contrasts the traditional art objects with modern artworks, whose broad spectrum of reproductions, as images, sound recordings or film reels, were going to be mechanically copied and distributed widely. A few years earlier, the French thinker Paul Valéry wrote, in an article titled “*La Conquete de l'ubiquite*,”^② that we should “expect great innovations to transform the entire technique of the arts, thereby affecting artistic invention itself and perhaps even bringing about an amazing change in our very notion of art.” In that text he made clear that in all arts there were a physical component which could no longer be considered or treated as it used to be, which couldn't remain unaffected by modern knowledge and power. A departure point in the turning from the nineteenth to the twentieth century would strive to make clear that matter, space and

名论文《机械复制时代的艺术品》中^①，描述了一种现代的、受技术影响的艺术本质的变革。广义而言，这种变革带有政治意味。能够将单个物体或艺术片断转变为某种不再特殊的物件，使那些乐意到艺术作品所在地去朝圣的人能够很方便去体验，这种想法显然是打算改变现代艺术理论。本杰明在比较了传统艺术品和现代艺术品之后，提出了更广阔的“复制”领域，像图片、声音或电影胶片，都将被机械复制并广泛传播。几年前，法国思想家保罗·法雷 (Paul Valéry) 在一篇名为*La Conquete de l'ubiquite*的论文中写道^②：我们应该期望有彻底的创新来改变全部的艺术技巧。因此，这可能会影响艺术创作本身，甚至可能会给我们对艺术的认识带来惊人的变化。他在那篇文章中明确指出，我们不能再原来的方式看待所有艺术品中那些已有的物质组成部分，这些组成部分必然会受到现代知识和技术的影响。19世纪和20世纪之交的时代转折点，将力图证明物质、

time had no longer the same status they had from time immemorial.

Actually, both Benjamin and Valéry were setting up a scenario for theoretical principles able to frame our contemporary culture, nearly a century later. Given the large number of thinkers that continue paid attention to their work, Benjamin and Valéry's manifestos can be considered to still have contemporary currency. In fact, we should consider that today not only matters the possibility of having our artwork reproduced globally, hanging in the walls of our every living room, but the very possibility of having the whole reality reproduced, even in real time, and transmitted to every other possible location. Analogue reproductions are being replaced by the digital, opening the field for the infinite. And since reproduction is no longer linked to size, format or media; it cannot be linked to any specific geographical place either.

In short, as some contemporary writers like Jacques Rancière have noted, the concept of image is neither unique, nor double. The artistic image separates its operations from the technique that produces itself. But it does so in order to discover a different resemblance en route: a

空间和时间不再享有和先前时代同样的地位。

事实上，本杰明和法雷都在试图为一个世纪后的当代文化构架的理论原则设计某种蓝图。如果说曾有许多思想家注意过本杰明和法雷的作品，他俩的构想即使在当代也会颇受关注。事实上，我们应该想到，现今的时代不仅关系到把我们的艺术品在世界范围内进行复制和将它们悬挂在每一个起居室墙上的可能性，而且也关系到对整个现实进行复制，甚至复制真实时间，并传送到每个地点的可能性。模拟复制品正被数码复制所取代，这个领域无限开放。况且，既然复制不再和尺寸、规格或媒介有关，它们就也不会和任何具体的地理位置产生关联。

简而言之，正像一些如杰克斯·兰瑟 (Jacques Rancière) 式的当代作家所说的那样，图像的概念既不是独特的，也不是双重的。艺术图片把产生它的技术同产生它的操作分离开来。但它这样做是为了在过程中能够发现某种特殊的



Hiroshi Sugimoto (Japanese, born 1948) -*Radio City Music Hall*, 1977-Gelatin silver print 16 1/2 x 2 1/2 inches Collection Miami Art Museum, promised gift of Charles Cowles-© 2008 Hiroshi Sugimoto, Courtesy Sonnabend Gallery, NY

此图主题为无线电城市音乐厅，由杉本博司（日本人，生于1948年）于1977年拍摄。图像为明胶银版印像，尺寸为16.5 in x 2.5 in，并由查尔斯允赠，目前收藏于迈阿密艺术博物馆（图像版权为杉本博司所有，纽约索纳本艺术馆提供）

resemblance that defines the relation of a being to its provenance and destination, one that rejects the mirror in favour of an immediate relationship between its origins and results. Resemblance is, now, the one that instead of providing just the replica of reality attests also to the elsewhere whence it delivers and also to the everywhere where it is going to be reproduced.^③

And somehow, this is what makes the idea of a multi-portrait even older. Painters, architects and photographers had always travelled, side by side, in order to create, of better re-create reality

“相似性”，这种相似性定义了事物存在的原因与结果之间的关系，它不同于镜像式那种物与镜之间的瞬间关系。如今，相似性不仅提供现实的复制品，而且能够证实它开始传递的地方和它将被复制的所有地方^③。

因此，无论如何这使得多元描绘的想法变得更加古老。画家、建筑师和摄影家经常一起旅行，他们想尽办法创造更美好的现实。对19世纪到20世纪之交形成的巨型城市的描摹，比如说尔根·阿尔杰（Eugène Atget）所描绘的巴黎，柏瑞耐·亚伯特（Berenice Abbott）所描绘的纽约，不管怎样，都是一种巴尔扎克“人间喜剧”式的直接写照。这种描摹被定义成一种将现实变换成直接视觉复制品的方式。对城市的多元描绘，加上构成主义者发明的蒙太奇摄影技术，是形成描画或

in the most absolute way possible. The portraits of the mega-cities of the turning of the nineteenth to the twentieth century, let's say Eugène Atget's Paris, or Berenice Abbott's New York are, somehow, the direct translation of Balzac "*La Comédie Humaine*", in what was defined as a way to transpose reality into direct visual reproduction. Multi portraits of cities, in addition to the "invention" of photomontage by the constructivists, was a key point in the history of picturing/reproducing cities and, in extension, reality itself.

Portraying reality is no longer a simple

者复制城市，甚至现实世界本身的关键点。

描绘现实不再是一种简单的操作。它从一种复制的行为变成了一种多产的活动（这使它名副其实地现代化了）。我们可能会怀念未来主义者、构成主义者或是模仿时代的作品和方法。波西尼（Boccioni）和第劳涅（Delaunay）所创作的绘画和摄影艺术及其所具备的绝对可塑特性，与现代生活的快节奏不谋而合。以维托（Verto）的视觉机器为例，电影艺术表现为所有机器同时运作，而且把视觉艺术转化为机械艺术。同时，至上主义和构成主义建筑师把信息和形式转换为建筑物和构筑物所表现出来的活力。在所有这些事例当中，图像的作用不再是消极的，而是暗指对艺术的调节和转换。艺术作为有活力的实体，越来越多地将注意力集中在生产和复制过程上，而对传统意义

operation. It stops being an act of reproducing to become also (and that makes it genuinely contemporary) a productive act. We might think of the works and programmes of the Futurist, Constructivist or Simultaneist age. Painting and photographing conceived by Boccioni or Delaunay, with its absolute plastic dynamism, embraced the accelerated rhythms of modern life. Cinema, with Vertov's Eyemachine for example, rendered all machines synchronous, and transformed the act of seeing into something mechanical. Also, Suprematists and Constructivist architects transmitted messages and forms as the represented dynamism of builders and constructeurs. In all these cases, the role of images is no longer passive, but implies mediation of act, transformation, art as an active identity focused more and more into production and reproduction, and less into the essence of what traditionally has been considered an artistic procedure.

This is exactly what Sugimoto, in its absolute and complete portrait of a film, is doing. The artist is producing its work by selecting a scenario, sitting and watching through a couple of hours, in order to produce a pure and blank square that contains a whole universe, as if it were Borges's *Aleph*: that miraculous point of space that contained all other points in the universe. In Borges's story, the one who gazes into the aleph can see everything in the

上的艺术过程所体现的实质内容关注越来越少。

这正是杉本（Sugimoto）所提出的绝对的和完全的电影复写所要做的事情。这位艺术家在创作他的作品时，为了能够产生某种包含整个宇宙的纯净和空白的空间，就好像是博格（Borges）的《阿莱夫》（*Aleph*），其中包含了整个宇宙所有其他方面的奇迹般的空间点，会选择一个电影脚本，坐着观看好几个小时。在博格的故事里，那个凝视着阿莱夫的人，可以同时从所有角度看到宇宙中的任何事情，而不带任何歪曲、重叠和混淆。杉本的阿莱夫包含了电影中每个单一画面，而且也包含了观众们各自的独特经历：所有这些均被某个独一无二的空白空间所包容，提供了一种完全抽象的观点。他能够将一种完整的动态图像转化为某种静止和抽象的东西。我们身处这样一个社

universe, simultaneously, from every angle, without distortion, overlapping or confusion. Sugimoto's *Aleph* contains every single frame of the movie, but also every single experience of the spectators: all of them caught into a single unique blank square that provides a fully abstract view. He is able to translate the representation of the whole, moving image, into something static and abstract. In a society where we are surrounded, everywhere, all the time, by hundreds of multiple and simultaneous images (in airports, shopping centres, streets and on our computer and television sets), the idea of just having a single and silent image commanding our attention becomes absolutely rare. As Beatriz Colomina suggested, it seems as if we need to be distracted in order to concentrate. As if we—all of us living in this new kind of space, the space of multiple information—could be diagnosed en masse with attention deficit disorder. Rather than wandering cinematically through the city, we now look into one direction and see many juxtaposed moving images. These are much more than what we can possibly synthesise or reduce to a single impression.^④

Because in the present time contemporary society has stopped dwelling just into a reproduction age, and has moved into a streaming age, there is now another reality, an illusion streaming itself online. We have got examples that could have been never imagined by Benjamin,

会, 每时每刻被成千上万的图像冲击和包围, 这些图像多种多样而且几乎是同时存在 (在机场、购物中心、街道, 以及电脑和电视上) 的。这种用单一和无声的影像来控制我们注意力的想法颇为罕见。正如毕屈斯·科罗明 (Beatriz Colomin) 所建议的那样, 为了集中注意力, 我们好像需要先被分散注意力。这就好比我们都生活在一个新型且充斥着多元化信息的空间中, 我们可能会被集体诊断为患有注意力缺失症。我们现在朝一个方向看去, 会看到许多并置的移动图像, 而不是在城市里徘徊运动, 这些视觉冲击远远超出了我们能将其综合或概括成某种单一印象的能力^④。

当今, 我们的社会已不再停留在一个复制的时代, 而是进入到一个流动的时代。现在又出现另一种现实, 即网络, 其中某种幻想的流动本身就是

Atget or Abbott, such as global webcams, global satellite streaming images or even global on-time geo-location. They make possible our world to be pictured several times, at any time, in what has been defined as the contemporary multi-perception.

But multi-perception should be defined as something more than mere moving-image practices and technologies that exchange the white cube of the exhibition space for the black box of image projection. Multi-perception holds a context where reality is not linear, but complex and even contradictory. It has the ability to put together not only the representation of the objects into their context, but also the meaning of reality and its singularities. Some artists and critics predicted that the raising of the moving-image (connected to video, holography or new forms of computer-based imaging), will certainly modify the status of the work of art in our information age. In fact, as the collage technique and photography replaced oil-paint, the LCDs will replace the canvas. But it is not only technological determinism. The projected and multi-framed image has found its way, surprisingly, into the museums and also into the discourse of modernity.^⑤

This has a lot to do with the evolution of the discourses between cinema and art, as cinema and all its derivations have become one of the

一种现实。我们能举出很多令本杰明、尔杰或亚伯特意想不到的例子, 比如全球网络视频、全球卫星移动图像或全球同步定位系统。因这些技术的发明, 我们的世界在任何时间中可以被描绘数次, 这样的现象被定义为当代多元化感知或多元感知。

虽然多元感知能将图像放映的黑盒子转变为放映空间的白色立方体, 但是它不应该仅仅被定义为可移动图像的实践和技术。多元视角秉持的意境在于现实是非线性的, 而且复杂甚至相互矛盾。它不仅有能力将对象的代表物放入其意境之中, 还可以将现实的意义和它的奇特之处并置。一些艺术家和评论家预测了移动图像的兴起 (链接视频、全息摄影术或以电脑技术为基础的新型图像形式) 将肯定会在我们所处的信息时代改变艺术品的现状。事实上, 拼贴画技术和摄影业已

most representative fields of work in contemporary art. As Peter Wollen pointed out in his essay "*The Two Avant-Gardes*", we should define a clear-cut categorical distinction between an avant-garde that is critically and creatively dealing with the established language of cinema, and an avant-garde formalistically focused upon the self-reflexive use of the medium, or what has been termed Greenbergianism as applied to film.^⑥ But these seemingly opposed categories actually require mediation, and in our present situation, is quite clear that there is no longer a desire for clear-cut categories any more, but for integration of apparently very opposite intentions. In this respect, the history of photography is very significant. As Jeff Wall defended in his lucid essay "*Marks of Indifference*", a photographers like Walker Evans worked as photojournalists in the 1930s while striving to achieve the status of a modern artist. In turn, vanguard artists in the 60s—such as Dan Graham or Robert Smithson—used the model of the photojournalist to reject the false heroism and formalism that was part of the image of the modern artist.^⑦ Nevertheless, this rhetoric supposes that photographers, film-makers and artists might strive to achieve the status of a vanguard artist, but the fact is that "real" vanguard artists use the media of film, photography and the broad visual field without

取代油画; 液晶显示器 (LCD) 似将取代画布, 但这不仅是技术决定论。令人惊奇的是, 幻灯片和多框架图片在博物馆和现代论著中也找到了它们各自的出路^⑤。

这与电影和艺术之间交流的演进有很大的关系, 因为电影及其所有衍生物已经变成当代艺术领域最具代表性的作品。正如皮特伍伦在他的论文《两种潮流》中指出的那样, 我们应该清晰地界定两种潮流的严格区别: 一种潮流与已经成熟的电影语言之间存在密切且创新的联系, 另一种潮流则从形式上关注对媒介的自发使用, 或者把审美主义这样的术语应用于电影中^⑥。但这些表面看来互相矛盾的类别实际上需要调解, 而在目前这种形势下, 显而易见的是我们不再需要界定清晰的类别, 但是却需要把对两种显然对立的意图

fine-art ambitions, many times simply to provide and contextualise visual information and, implicitly, to satirise fine-art ambitions.^⑧

Architecture production is not isolated. In this time of extreme and absolute vis/virt-uality, architecture gets involved in a process of only-reproduction and not constructing. The world of ideas and avant-garde is getting somehow impossible in our so called real-life world, and it is now only possible in the mirror, in a place where categories are pure, absolute, abstract and, perhaps, even more real than reality itself. On the other hand, if the photographic image assumed the category of a manifest icon during the modern movement, embodying its own autonomy with respect to the represented object, now our contemporary, global and instantaneous society lets reality be recreated in each of our homes. It is no longer necessary to have seen reality itself, not even through public events at which authors narrate the personal history of his or her works. This filtered and nuanced trip has become a personal and intimate show, letting viewers to participate in private and almost secret travels through new mediums.

Contemporary architecture production has, also,

进行整合。就这个方面而言，摄影史的意义意味深长。正如杰夫·沃尔在他浅显易懂的论文《漠视的标记》中所辩解的那样，像沃克·埃文斯那样的摄影师，作为20世纪30年代摄影记者之一，工作的同时，也努力去获取现代艺术家的地位。随后，60年代的前卫艺术家，如丹·格雷厄姆和罗伯特·史密森，也曾用摄影记者的模型去驳斥现在艺术影像中的英雄主义和形式主义^⑦。尽管如此，这些雄辩的言辞仍旧认为摄影记者、电影制片人，还有艺术家应该努力去获得前卫艺术家的那种地位。但实际上真正的前卫艺术家仅仅是通过运用电影、摄影技术和广阔的视觉领域这样的媒介提供背景方面的视觉信息，却并无将艺术精细化的抱负，这暗含了对精细艺术的批判^⑧。

建筑产品不是孤立存在的。在这样一个极端而又完全视觉化或虚拟化的时代，建筑参与的仅仅是一个复制过程而不是建造过程。理念和前卫的世界，从某种程度上而言，在我们所谓的真实

something to do with it. Let's take, for example, the case of the house built by Rem Koolhaas in 1998 in Bordeaux for a physically handicapped man. In his film "Houselife" Koolhaas brings up the house by means of different interlinked video sequences. Koolhaas' *Houselife* is not so much an attempt to exhaustively describe the house down to its very details. In this sense it is quite different from the majority of architectural documentaries. This, perhaps, because *Houselife* explains the building, its structure and its virtuosity only to let the viewer entering into the invisible bubble of the daily intimacy of an architectural icon. As the author states, "It's not flattering, it's realistic!" There is no flattery of the house or the architecture, but merely reality. In an interview included at the end of the movie, Koolhaas declares his surprise about the working methods of Guadalupe, the maid in charge of cleaning. He is surprised of watching her carefully polishing parts of the house that possibly would never be used. So he says: "Such generic cleaning to such an exceptional building... I am surprised... it seems completely insane. You see here two systems colliding: the system of the platonic conception of cleaning with the platonic

世界里，已经变成一种不可能实现的东西，而且现在只可能存在于镜像中，即这样一个地方：类别单纯、绝对且抽象，而且，或许比现实本身更真实。另一方面，在现代运动中，如果摄影图片具备明显的形象，能够体现现象物自身的自主性，那么我们这个现代化、全球化而且快速发展的社会，就能够在我们的家中再现真实世界。已经没有必要再去观看现实本身，甚至不需要通过公众事件来了解现实，尽管作者会在其中叙述他们作品的个人历史。这个具备过滤性的微妙旅行变成了一种私人化的表演，让观众通过新媒介参与这种私密的旅行。

当代建筑产品同样和它有关。举例来说，1998年莱姆·库哈斯在法国的波尔多(Bordeaux)为残疾人建造住宅。在他的电影《住家生活》中，库哈斯使用多个互相联结的视频对住宅进行不同角度的序列式拍摄。库哈斯的《住家生活》虽算不上是对住宅及其细节详尽描述的一种尝试，但它却显然不同于大多

conception of architecture." And this is precisely the main interest of Koolhaas *Houselife*: to depict an absolutely daily reality, to give life to a work of architecture, replete with disorder. He wants to reveal those moments that are never shown, where it is possible to see the daily "reality", a tangible "reality" that perhaps surpasses and restricts the established myths. The canonical spaces suffer from this restlessness, just like Jeff Wall did at the Mies Pavilion in Barcelona, his most radical and evocative transformation.

These two examples present a new way of looking at architecture, undoubtedly expanding their field of representation. This notion of "enlarging the field of representation" means offering a new and different perspective to both of the house and the pavilion. This is different in that brings novelty to the already familiar propagation of the works through photography in mass-consumption media. It is strange that in *Houselife*, Guadalupe, the cleaner and assistant, is in charge of explaining the building (and certainly not the owner). She is the one to explain and so expand our field of representation. Through those who know its secrets the house shows

数建筑纪录片。这或许是因为以住家生活解释建筑本体，它的结构与艺术特点仅仅是为了让观众了解建筑形象背后隐藏的私密日常生活的缩影。正如作者所说的那样：“这不是奉承，现实就是这样的。”影片没有对住宅或建筑的奉承，而是现实的实体呈现。在影片结尾的一个访谈中，库哈斯透露了他对负责清洁工作的瓜达卢普(Guadalupe)的工作方法感到吃惊。他很惊讶地看到，她在擦拭住宅中那些很可能根本用不到的部分。因此，他说：“对这种精美的建筑进行如此的清洁，让我感到很吃惊，这简直太荒唐了。你可以看到这里有两种系统在碰撞：对清洁的柏拉图式观念系统和对建筑的柏拉图式观念系统。”这恰好就是库哈斯《住家生活》的主要兴趣所在：对日常生活进行真实描绘，赋予建筑作品以生命，虽然这种生命是无序的。他期待展示那些从未显现过的片段，通过这些片段可以看到日常的“真实”，一种或许可超越并限制已成神

its “implementation” . Therefore, “Following and interacting with Guadalupe, an unusual and unpredictable viewpoint about the structure of the building opens up” . It is as if by watching the movie we all become Guadalupe, witnessing a complete dissection of the house.

Ila Bêka and Louise Lemoîne, the directors of *Houselife*, explicitly propose “to ‘give life’ to one of these architectural masterpieces that we can see everywhere without never being able to see them how they ‘really’ are in everyday life” , banishing the iconic and idealized regard of architecture and “demonstrating its vitality, fragility and vulnerability” . While this is seemingly true, by watching *Houselife* we are presented with a filtered and different perspective of the house, down to its last detail, sublimated, a guided tour of the house not far from what anyone would intend to do “in vivo” .

So, visual production and media are here connecting kinds of artistic work, something that cannot exist without such a media. There are no longer appropriate or non-appropriate subjects for art, as the rules for appropriateness between particular forms and specific subjects vanished. We live in a kind of representative regime where,

话的有形“真实”。经典的空间正遭受着这种侵袭，就如同杰夫·沃尔（Jeff Wall）在巴塞罗那的密斯展馆所做的几近激进与煽动性的转变。

这两个例子呈现了一种看待建筑的新方式，毫无疑问地扩大了它们的表现范畴。对于“扩大表现范畴的理解”意味着提供一种新兴且与众不同的角度来看这幢住宅和展馆。这与人们已经熟悉的透过大众消费媒体摄影所带来的宣传作品有所不同。很奇怪的是在《住家生活》里，清洁工兼助手的瓜达卢普对这幢建筑（而不是户主）的解读扩展了我们的描述范畴。通过那些知道住宅秘密的人，这个住宅显示了它的“存在”。因此，“追随并和瓜达卢普互动，关于建筑结构的一种非同寻常和无法预测的观点就展现在我们眼前。这就好像是通过看电影，我们就都成了瓜达卢普，见证了这幢住宅的完整解剖”。

《住家生活》的导演伊尔·帕卡（Ila Bêka）和露易斯·雷默（Louise Lemoîne）明确提出，要

somehow, *Société de l' spectacle* has now been replaced by the society of the non-extraordinary. The non-extraordinary has become the only possible, as every single frame of our every-day is uploaded online for global webcasting, in an exaggerated example of “the result gets bigger than the action” . There are, by the way, hundreds of examples of multi documentation of the whole daily life, getting terabytes by multi reproducing non-special actions for the whole world but also for nobody. What is quite clear is that both aesthetical theory and artwork production at a crossroad. And this is not necessarily marked by conflict between disciplines, but by the necessity of defining new spaces and contexts, in and out the arts, exploring new media and expressions.□

Ruben A Alcolea, PhD, architect, is both a scholar and a practising architect. He is currently vice dean of the School of Architecture of the University of Navarra, Spain, where he teaches both design and architectural theory. Specialized in photography and modern architecture, got his PhD with a research on Architecture, photography and the myth of industry in Richard J. Neutra, that has recently been published as the book “*Picnic de Pioneros/Pioneer Picnic*” . He has also published several articles, read papers and given

给这些建筑精品赋予生命，这样我们就能观赏各种地方，而无需担心看不到它们在日常生活中的真实样子。通过这种方式，既可以远离对理想化建筑的偶像崇拜，又可以证明其活力和脆弱性。通过观看居家生活，呈现在我们视野当中的住宅是经过过滤且视角独立的，即使它的最后细节，也是经过升华的，这似乎很真实。关于这个住宅的指南性游览，距离人们意欲身临其境的那种真实住宅并不遥远。

所以，此处，视觉产品和媒介及多种艺术作品之间存在关联。如果没有这种媒介，这些作品将无法继续存在。随着特定形式和具体主题之间的适合度规则消失，艺术的主题不再会有什么合适或不合适之分。我们生活在这样一个代表性王国中，此处不知何故，《景观社会》（*Société de l' spectacle*）已被稀松平常的社会所代替。稀松平常变成了唯一的可能，正如我们每日的单一模式就是上网看网络直播，夸张的说法就是“结果变得比行动更强大”。顺便说一句，这里有成百种关

lectures in different international workshops and cultural associations. Now combines teaching architecture and organizing cultural events with developing his own professional practice, where has gained several prizes in architecture competitions.

NOTES

- ① Walter Benjamin, *The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction* (London: Create Spaces, 2009).
- ② Paul Valéry, “La Conquete de l' Ubiquite” , *Oeuvres, tome II* (Paris: Pièces sur l' art, Bibl. de la Pléiade, 1960), pp. 1283–1287.
- ③ Jacques Rancière, *The Future of the Image* (London and New York: Verso, 2007), p. 8–10.
- ④ Beatriz Colomina, “Enclosed by images: The Eameses' Multimedia Architecture” in Tanya Leighton (ed.), *Art and the moving image* (London: Tate Publishing, 2008), p. 75.
- ⑤ Hal Foster, Rosalind Krauss, Yve-Alain Bois and Benjamin Buchloh, *Art Since 1900: Modernism, Antimodernism, Postmodernism* (London and New York: Thames and Hudson, 2005), p. 561.
- ⑥ Peter Wollen, “The Two Avant-gardes” , *Studio International*, vol.190, no.978, November–December 1975, pp. 171– 175.
- ⑦ Jeff Wall, “Marks of Indifference” , in: Ann Goldstein and Anne Rorimer (eds.), *Reconsidering the Object of Art: 1965–1975* (Los Angeles, Cambridge, Mass and London: The MIT Press, 1995), pp. 246–267.
- ⑧ Gregor Stemmerich, “White Cube, Black Box and Grey Areas: Venues and Values” , in: Tanya Leighton (ed.), *Art and the moving image*, op. Cit., p. 439.

于日常生活纪录的事例。对全世界而言，有数以太兆的非典型行为通过各种方式加以复制；但对个人而言，却不存在这种现象。显而易见，审美理论和艺术作品的创作正处在一个十字路口上。我们不必非得在学科间引起冲突来标明它的存在，但在艺术创作之内和之外，界定新空间和新语境，探索新媒体和表达方式却是很有必要的。□

作者简介：鲁本·A·阿尔克莱，博士，建筑师。他身兼学者与执业建筑师双重身份，目前为西班牙那维尔大学建筑学院副院长，教授设计与建筑理论课程。专长为从事摄影与研究现代建筑，他过去跟从理查·纽特拉进行摄影与工业神话的研究而完成博士学位，之后出版了一本书，名为《先锋者的野餐》。他经常发表一些文章，喜好阅读文献及在不同的国际工作坊有一些讲授的课程和文化交流协作的工作。现今，他常结合教授建筑与组织发展自己的专业实践文化活动，同时在建筑设计竞赛中也获得过一些奖项。

收稿日期 2009-12-28