



Cristina MORARU

Assistant Professor, George Enescu National University of the Arts, Iași

PhD in Critical Theory, Faculty of Philosophy and Social Political Sciences, Alexandru Ioan Cuza University, Iași

Third Seminar (May 25 – June 2, 2021)

*Expanded Art History “After the Global”*

One of the most prominent questions today concerning the current state of art history in East-Central Europe is how should contemporary art be historicized “after the global”? The paradigm changed since 2006, when James Elkins asked “Is art history global?” – There is no longer a question if the methods, concepts, and purposes of Western art history are suitable for art outside of Europe and North America. Nowadays, we see art history expanding through the emerging paradigms of curatorial studies and exhibition histories. Reformers within art history had firstly implemented a disciplinary expansion of the art historical methods by shifting the interest from the hegemonic institutional discourse of the museum to the immanent historicity of the art practice itself. Furthermore, a geographical expansion – evidently supported by the art market – determined a decentralization of the monolithic power of the West, while all the meta-narrations that functioned as a canon of integration in the established structure of the art history – which was dominant, vertical and hierarchical –, disappeared, materializing other alternative structures – subversive, active and aggressive – that were proposing a series of micro-narratives which could act as resistance models, generating counter-narrativity and self-legitimacy.

An aspect that remains problematic is the overriding role of the Nation as a determinant of authority in the art historical narrative of the east-central Europe, where art historians had received international consideration do to their expertise on particular national questions, while the art that has received scholarly attention was usually inscribed in national-institutional frames. As Matthew Rampley pointed out, art history was shaped by the politics of national identity and the division of art into “national schools” became fixed at an early stage in the history of the discipline. Therefore, the history of contemporary art “after the global” must overcome this tendency for considering national framings by advocating the role of the independent curator – which, as Patrick D. Flores mentioned – remains international, but not post-national, his role in

constructing new historical narrative being both “affirmative and deconstructive” with respect to the nation. Furthermore, contemporary art should be historicized “after the global” by reconsidering the role of each agent in the field – artist, curator, art critic or art historian – that could sustain an indeterminacy of (un)becoming global.