

國立臺灣師範大學 101 學年度碩士班招生考試試題

科目：專業英文

適用系所：藝術史研究所（西方藝術史組）

注意：1.本試題共3頁，請依序在答案卷上作答，並標明題號，不必抄題。2.答案必須寫在指定作答區內，否則依規定扣分。

I. 請依照題目之要求，以中文或英文解釋下列各專有名詞。（共 24 分）

1. Divisionism（以中文解釋名詞，並舉例說明）（4分）
2. Lithography（以中文解釋名詞，說明出現的年代，並舉藝術家與作品之例）（4分）
3. Psalter (answer in English)（4分）
4. Mannerism (answer in English)（4分）
5. Basilica (answer in English)（4分）
6. Pietà (answer in English)（4分）

II. 將下列這段文字翻譯成中文，並加以評述。（26分）

“We do not explain pictures: we explain remarks about pictures—or rather, we explain pictures only in so far as we have considered them under some verbal description or specification. [...]

Every evolved explanation of a picture includes or implies an elaborate description of that picture. The explanation of the picture then in its turn becomes part of the larger description of the picture, a way of describing things about it that would be difficult to describe in another way. But though ‘description’ and ‘explanation’ interpenetrate each other, this should not distract us from the fact that description is the mediating object of explanation. The description consists of words and concepts in a relation with the picture, and this relation is complex and sometimes problematic. [...]

[...] ‘Description’ covers various kinds of verbal account of a thing, and while ‘firm design’ is a description in one sense—as, for that matter, is ‘picture’—it may be considered untypically analytical and abstract.

There is much to be said, if one wants to match words and concepts with the visual interest of pictures, for both being and making clear—as Libanius and Kenneth Clark make clear—that what one offers in a description is a representation of thinking about a picture more than a representation of a picture. And to say we ‘explain a picture as covered by a description’ can conveniently be seen as another way of saying that we explain, first, thoughts we have had about the picture, and only secondarily the picture.”

(Michael Baxandall, *Patterns of Intention: On the Historical Explanation of Pictures*, Yale University Press, 1985, Fourth Printing 1989, pp. 1- 5.)

國立臺灣師範大學 101 學年度碩士班招生考試試題

- III. Elaborate and describe the two antithetic currents at the beginning of the nineteenth century, named in the text, on the background of art history. How does the author, Richard Shiff, distinguish them? Quote examples to specify the contrast. Use your own words without repeating Shiff's text (answer in English). (25 分)

“The question of originality becomes a matter of what people at a given time believe, why they believe it, and how they express their belief. By the early nineteenth century Western culture appears to have shifted from a predominantly classical attitude to a predominantly modern one, if only because European romantics proclaimed this momentous event, arrogating originality as their own [...]. Given their stress on individual experience, romantics regarded classicism as a thing of the past for two reasons, one related to its normative values, the other to its communal identity. In its first capacity, as the bearer of order and hierarchy, classicism tended to regularize and restrain. It thus interfered with precisely those forces that constituted modernity and its particular originality—the private citizen's free movement and personal growth [...] and the open-ended social evolution fostered by an emerging industrial economy. In its second capacity as a marker of community, classicism promoted the spiritual and social harmony so difficult to maintain in the wake of modernity's transformations of the social order. In this respect, the loss of classicism was mourned as much as celebrated by nineteenth-century theorists.”

(Richard Shiff, Originality, in: Robert S. Nelson and Richard Shiff, Critical Terms for Art History, Chicago–London 1996, p. 104.)

- IV. Read the two descriptions of the same painting (right-hand wing of the Merode Altarpiece painted by the Master of Flémalle). Compare how Meyer Shapiro and Erwin Panofsky interpret the same details. Comment the differences in each description and interpretation. (answer in English). (25 分)

1) “In the Mérode altarpiece by the Master of Flémalle, the figure of Joseph appears in a wing beside the Annunciation as an artisan who fashions mousetraps. Not only is the presence of Joseph in the context of the Annunciation exceptional in Christian art; we are surprised also that his craft of carpentry should be applied to something so piquant and marginal in his *metier*. [...]

I believe that this detail of the mousetrap is more than a whimsical invention of the artist, suggested by Joseph's occupation. It has also a theological meaning that was present to the minds of Christians in the Middle Ages, and could be related by them to the sense of the main image of the triptych. St. Augustine, considering the redemption of man by Christ's sacrifice, employs the metaphor of the mousetrap to explain the necessity of the incarnation. The human flesh of Christ is a bait for the devil, who, in seizing it, brings about his own ruin [...]. The image of the mousetrap was only one of several metaphors of deception by which the theologians attempted to justify Christ's incarnation and sacrifice as the payment of a ransom

國立臺灣師範大學 101 學年度碩士班招生考試試題

owed to the devil, who held man prisoner because of the sin of Adam and Eve.”

(Meyer Schapiro, "Muscipula Diaboli," The Symbolism of the Mérode Altarpiece", in *The Art Bulletin*, Vol. 27, No. 3 (Sep., 1945), pp. 182-187.)

2). “The right-hand wing, on the other hand, gives us a glimpse into the workshop of St. Joseph overlooking the market square, and the iconography of this apparent genre scene is no less remarkable than that of the principal event.

St Joseph has manufactured two mousetraps, one on his work table, the other displayed on a window shelf for customers to see, and this has been brilliantly explained by Meyer Schapiro as an allusion to the then well-known Augustinian doctrine of the *muscipula diaboli* according to which the marriage of the Virgin and the Incarnation of Christ were devised by Providence in order to fool the devil as mice are fooled by bait. For the time being, though, he is engaged in producing what I believe to be (on the strength of Vermeer’s “Milkmaid”) the perforated cover of a footstool intended to hold a warming pan. But be that as it may, the very fact that he is shown as a carpenter, obvious though it seems, proclaims a fundamental change in social outlook.

(Erwin Panofsky, *Early Netherlandish Painting*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1964, vol. I, p. 164.)