

2013 國立陽明大學  
視覺文化國際研討會

維納斯與麵包皮：從諷刺畫看 1863 年法國沙龍展

Venus and the crusts: The Salon of 1863 in Caricatures

發表人：楊尹瑄

內容摘要：

1863 年的法國官方沙龍展，在十九世紀藝術史上普遍被認為是「現代藝術」或「前衛派」與學院藝術傳統之間的衝突正式明朗化的一個重要事件。為了平息審查不公的爭議，拿破崙三世親自下令在該年破例舉辦了「落選沙龍展」，為落選作品另闢展場，和正選作品同時展出，「由觀眾自己來評斷其公正性」；落選作品中包括了被視為開啟現代藝術之象徵的 Edouard Manet 的《草地上的午餐》。然而當我們試圖回到 1860 年代的實際情境——藝評、社會評價與藝術市場等脈絡時，會發現到當時的藝評家所關注的焦點，顯然與今日不同。

本報告將試圖從 1863 年沙龍展所出版的報刊諷刺畫出發，來了解當時藝評界對這場展覽和作為對比性質（*contre-exposition*）的落選展所做出的回應。以 Bertall 在《滑稽報》（*Journal amusant*）上刊載的諷刺畫系列所呈現的內容為例，一方面顯示出沙龍展本身充斥著迎合布爾喬亞品味的折衷主義，大量理想化的、充滿情慾色彩的裸女圖的出現，引起許多藝評家的反感；另一方面，品質良莠不齊的落選展也被諷刺畫家比喻為「沙龍的地下室」，其作品被形容為無味的麵包皮。諷刺圖像為我們提供了一個新的角度，來觀察當時複雜紛擾的藝術氛圍：學院藝術表面上正蓬勃發展，卻面臨商業化與貧乏的危機；而在落選展中所謂的「前衛

派畫家」和投機者也同樣難以分辨。此外從展示活動的權力關係這個角度來看，沙龍展所具有的官方正統性與落選沙龍被賦予的「次等」、「失敗」等意涵，兩者間原本所具有的優劣對比關係，是如何在藝術史論述中被轉化為前衛藝術家對學院藝術的反抗，也是一個值得再深入探討的問題。

The official Salon of 1863 is generally considered to be one of the most important events in nineteenth-century art history, which marked the beginning of the conflict between “modern art” or, “avant-gardes”, and the Academic tradition. To appease those who protested against the jury who had rejected more than 3,000 works, Napoléon III decreed that the rejected artists could exhibit their works in the same time in an annex to the regular Salon, at Palais de l’Industrie, in order to “let the public judge the legitimacy of these complaints”. In this “Salon des Refusés” was included the famous painting of Edouard Manet, *Déjeuner sur l’herbe*, which ushered in “modern art”. However, Manet’s contemporary art critics apparently had different opinions.

This paper reviews the reception of both Salon of 1863 and its “counter exhibition” from the point of view of caricatures. Take Bertall’s caricature series, published in the *Journal amusant*, for example, most of the critics, like the caricaturist, were tired of the piles of idealized and erotic female nudes at the Salon, and frowned on the eclectic tendencies among the artists who catered to the bourgeois taste. On the other hand, the Salon des Refusés was caricatured as “the basement of Salon” and its exhibits, judged negligible for the most part as “the crusts”. Through these caricatures we can detect the confusion circulating among the art critics at this time: the works of “decadent” taste enjoyed great and official success at the Salon, while the avant-gardes were

indistinguishable from the opportunists. Besides, the official Salon was seen by the public as legitimately superior to the whole Salon des Refusés which was composed of rejected and “inferior” works. But how did the art historians subsequently transformed this display of power relationship into a symbolic event in which the avant-gardes rebelled against the Academy is another intriguing question that deserves further inquiry.

2013年「視覺文化的表演 / 宣成」 國際學術研討會