



# META- RELATIVIST AGENDA IN CONTEMPORARY VISUAL ARTS THEORY AND PRACTICE

CSCSTI 02.61.31  
UDC 18 (7.01)  
DOI 10.47940/cajas.v6i1.349

Marat Khassanov<sup>1</sup>,  
Vera Petrova<sup>1</sup>,  
Assiya Khassanova<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Al-Farabi Kazakh National University (Almaty, Kazakhstan)

**Abstract.** The borders of visual art on the eve of the 20th-21st centuries are being extremely expanded both at the empirical and theoretical levels and so is the agenda of contemporary philosophy of art. Is the unprecedented polyphony of discourses a methodological drawback or is it a heuristic opportunity that can help to broaden our knowledge about the essence of art and the notion of a work of art? What is visual art and what is artwork speaking the 21st century language?

The study examines the current trends and innovations in the visual arts field and how they can be interpreted. Authors come to conclusion that the times of normative or negativist approaches are over. The plethora of transformations is a value-in-itself and can be seen as a legitimate methodological situation, namely, as a meta-relativist turn. Examples that are presented in the paper deal with different sides of “a work of art formula”: span of discourse, artist, audience, art space, art market, new technologies, etc. Those cases demonstrate the ambivalence of current visual art practices that can be interpreted either as complete negation of the preceding standards or as new discourses that are equally legitimate with the older ones. Meta-relativist approach treats all existing discourses and practices as equally legitimate and thus provides the method to broaden our understanding of the essence of art and definition of an artwork. The study suggests that it is a contemporary tool for further intra- and inter-disciplinary dialogue.

**Keywords:** philosophy of art, work of art, visual arts, meta-relativism, levels of discourse.

**Cite:** Khassanov, M., Petrova, V., Khassanova, A. (2021). “Meta-relativist agenda in contemporary visual arts theory and practice”. *Central Asian Journal of Art studies*, 6(1), 39–53. <https://doi.org/10.47940/cajas.v6i1.349>

## Introduction

I  
ntellectualization of discourse, the social  
turn in the arts, politics of aesthetics,

aesthetics economy, artistic values,  
aesthetic hierarchism, metamodernism,  
decolonization, freeportism, ghost  
museums, zombie formalism, curatorship

as fine art, aesthetics of ugliness, everyday aesthetics, aesthetics of atmospheres, cultural property, normative justification, critique of critique<sup>1</sup>... All these are names of bits and pieces of contemporary philosophy of art and its neighboring fields of study terminology and discourses. What this sample list demonstrates, besides drawing attention to the significance of various approaches, phenomena and debates, is simply that the agenda of contemporary philosophy of art is quite long and still growing.

The situation of surfing along the multivoice mosaic of topics has been presciently described by G. Lubbe back in the 1990s: the German philosopher substantiated that due to the expansion of individual perceptual abilities a person's chances to adequately respond to the compression of cultural innovations are very small [1]. Today, almost thirty years later, we see this problem aggravated – both on empirical and theoretical levels. The ever increasing expansion of the subfields and consequences of this process for our ability to reckon with and continue hearing each other is gradually becoming a major methodological problem. Continued attempts to present an exhaustive interpretation of the essence and borders of the philosophy of art synchronized with the ongoing quest for the novel readings of “an artwork” produce less and less chances of arranging a mutual understanding in the field.

We trust that without conventional methodological foundations contemporary philosophy of art is prone to remain more like a conglomerate of discrete critical studies rather than a joint field of research. In this paper we turn to the problem of modern framework for agreement about the meaning of the concept of a work of art as the end point of the dispute. We concentrate our study within the visual arts field and address some schematic empirical examples in order to demonstrate that the current situation is a heuristic opportunity to deepen our understanding

about the borders of visual art and the definition of a work of art. We suggest that while neither of the existing normative or negativist approaches can be accepted, the polyphony of trends in visual arts research is not a methodological problem if we could justify it as a legitimate meta-relativist turn. We conclude that acknowledgement of the expansion of the art field as a key characteristic of the current state of things and convention that it is crucial to distinguish between the levels of discourse can eliminate designated methodological inconsistency. Inducing from the field of visual arts to a greater scale, we could claim that relativism appears as both the current agenda and the meta-approach in contemporary philosophy of art.

The discussion is laid out in five steps, mainly: (1) a brief historiography of visual art followed by presentation of (2) some schematic examples of the uncharted trends of the 21st century and (3) introduction of discourse sensitive meta-relativism as a prolific approach to the current agenda of the philosophy of art, in the Results section, (4) assessment, in the Discussion, section of alternative methods of interpreting the essence of art and the notion of a work of art and (5) final remarks, in the Conclusion, regarding the restatement of the main question of contemporary aesthetics and meta-relativist turn as a method of addressing that challenge.

## Methods

Analysis of the current agenda of contemporary visual art field was designed

<sup>1</sup> Samplings of research on these topics include Peters J., Roose H. [8, pp. 952–969], Frey B. [31, pp. 141], Golazewska M. [29, pp. 25–42], Zahradka P. [26, pp. 578–579], Vermeulen T., Akker R. [28, pp. 1–13], Heindrich [13], Shepard W. [14, p. 192], Hegenbart S. [32], Ventzislavov R. [30, pp. 91–101], Medvedev A. [33], Bohme G., Thibaud J.-T. [34] and other authors.

as a study of transformations that are taking place on both the empirical and the methodological levels. We reckon that this topic is under-researched in Kazakhstan's philosophy of art and thus requires a thorough literature study and examination of empirical data. Sociological surveys, intelligence and art market reports, professional network information and critical opinions of the art cluster participants, museum reports as well as economy of culture/art politics case studies had been used as sources of empirical data analysis. International and domestic literature review approach included the study of a broad range of sources, including research volumes, textbooks, articles, dissertation autoreferats, thesis reviews, visual arts research platforms articles and interviews, etc.

The study employed historic analysis, logical analysis, systemic approach, induction and deduction, description, comparative studies, generalization and other classical methods as well as multidisciplinary approach in order to evaluate the current state of things in the visual arts theory and practice.

## Results

### Visual Arts in a Historical Perspective

Depending on the adopted methodology, centuries of visual art history can be reviewed from a variety of angles. Thus, history of visual arts can be schematically described as graduate shifts in the dominant aesthetic principle from cosmoanthropic in the Antiquity to theoanthropic in the Middle Ages, to anthropocentric in the Renaissance, to object oriented ontology of our times [2, pp. 133–152]. Alternatively, history of art can be described as a timeline with benchmark points tagged at “before” and “after” domination of the mimesis principle, modernism and the post-modernist turn. It can as well be seen as a straight line that refracted around the 19th century towards

the development of two major brands in Western aesthetics: the normative-rational and the irrational-spiritual accounts of art [3].

Notably, regardless of the founding analytical principle debates, the amount of artistic innovations in the visual art field continues to grow following the exponential curve of scientific and technological progress. Thus, H. R. Jauss's calendar of art epochs demonstrates that while, during half a century from 1850 to 1900, there were distinguished seven significant styles in the visual arts – from realism to secessionism, the decade between 1960s and 1970s gave twice as much directions from magical realism to environmental art [1].

Progress inevitably multiplies the amount of cultural forms. From mid-20th century on the modernist splash of negation and innovation in fine art's aesthetics agenda was followed by an unparalleled “geometric progression” of post-modern discourses and modes of interaction between art and society. As writer and literature critic N. Sarrot has put it, the intensity of life has shifted far beyond its traditional forms and thus the art in mid-20th century had stepped into the “era of suspicion” [4, pp. 195–201]. In other words, technological development has rather disarmed than enforced people; the degree to which the irrational factors rule the world and underlie the existence has increased dramatically [5, Ch. 35].

By the beginning of the 21st century the postmodern agenda has almost exhausted itself, but remarkably, the older school art practices continue to coexist alongside the most recent trends. Artists and institutions that promulgate the art of mimesis are in demand along with modernist and technical mastery art, digital art, virtual reality galleries or crypto-art market. Notably, traditional gallery sales, the 20th century art auction practices, art policies based on the merger of curatorship and cyclicity of major international exhibitions like artfairs/

biennials and the 21st century liberating blockchain infrastructure technology today are functioning side by side. We witness that art borders are being extremely expanded and phenomena from different dimensions coexist as equally eligible. This diversity cannot be reduced to a single aesthetic principle and needs to be studied as sheer polyphony of trends that establish themselves across empirical and theoretical levels.

### The Uncharted Trends of the 21st Century

Turning to contemporaneity as “the moment of truth” we will now seek to highlight some of the important trends, situations and convolute transformations that could sharpen our understanding of the essence of visual art. As J. McMahon observes, “The twenty-first century has seen the artworld dissolve into a plethora of practices” [6, pp. 7–17]. The totality of innovations is irreversible since all parts of the older work of art discourses are being challenged and updated at the empirical level.

*Endeavor.* One of the most distinct shifts in visual arts and quite a long-standing one is the switch from homogenous to heteronomous discourses [7, pp. 305–307]. As was demonstrated in recent analysis of visual artists topic models of the last twenty five years, not merely aesthetic or romantic justifications of artists’ compulsive desire to make art but engagement with “social/political issues, academic methods and terminology, and an entrepreneurial spirit” are shaping contemporary art field [7; 8, pp. 952–969].

The social turn and the political turn are among the must-haves of most countries’ contemporary art scene: the long list includes national and ethnic identity, feminist, ecological, anti-globalist and other issues. Most recent examples are “Black Lives Matter” (BLM) initiatives in the West<sup>2</sup> and “You can’t run from the truth [in Russian]” sort of art activism in Central

Asia. As K. Khalykov points out, we are talking about the place and role of art in the syncretic collective experience of mankind, in the development of feelings and social culture [9, p. 9], we could anticipate that global vulnerability and pandemic aftermath topics will become artists’ new inspiration in the coming years.

Contemporary artists’ pursuit often becomes subject of a separate study since today art is often understood as a statement on a topical issue but the ambiguity of these heteronomous endeavors “leaves open the possibility that art operates either as mere stimulation to private reverie or... as propaganda” [6, pp. 7–17].

*Artist.* Changes in terminology also cannot go unnoticed: artists by no means just “create” – they “examine” or “study” certain issues, problems and phenomena. The result of their activity is not just the “oeuvre” but “research” and that is what the art cluster considers the most significant input in the field. The external translation of spirit, content and guiding principles of visual arts is provided not by the author but by a whole cluster of actors. The classical model “artist-work of art-audience” has been displaced with a longer chain of art world industry professionals. Contemporary art universe includes such compulsory actors as art scholars, critics and curators who produce agenda, texts, “initiate” the audiences and mediate current themes in art to the audience.

Even more so: the function of an artist is sometimes displaced by the work of other agents like curators. As S. Spaid points out, “shortly after the work of an art curator has being established in its own right as an integral part of the contemporary art process, it was already nominated equal to the work of an artist, despite radically different products result from artistic and

<sup>2</sup> In 2020 British magazine Art Review Annual has ranked BLM most influential in art.

curatorial work” [10, pp. 87–91]. In other words, borders are fading and in some people’s opinion, curatorship is being equated to fine art.

*Audience.* Another realm that resembles the difference between the “old” and contemporary times concerns people’s viewing habits, especially at international exhibits of scale, to grasp multiple meanings of the artworks [6]. We could generalize that throughout history the mission of an artwork was realized in the moments when “art meets its audience”, i. e. at home, at the gallery or museum, and that it presumed some sort of communion with the artworks. Nowadays international art fair or biennial formats provide a different kind of communication – grandeur of the artspace, experience of atmospheres and that special feeling of overabundance when “audience meets the art”. Art is no longer conceived as exclusively individual piece of work: “visitors simply immerse themselves in images, videos or environments which strike them as evocative”, very similar to the staging of the musical concerts or theater performances [6, pp. 7–17]. Plentifulness and excess have become an inalienable part of the global art societies experience. That background “noise” of the plethora of art is part of the new formula of its comprehension. Okwui Enwezor, one of the most influential curators and artistic director of major international cyclical exhibitions<sup>3</sup>, once commented, “I’ve often said that one doesn’t see the Venice Biennale, one scans the Venice Biennale” [11].

The rhetoric question that follows from this brief discussion is whether the audience still appreciates visual art institutions as the locus of masterpieces or “the art-gallery-museum takes its place as one of many public spaces with occasion

experiences of entertainment, reflection and communication about a range of topical issues” [12, pp. 77-85]? What is prevailing, the form or the content?

*Art Space.* The twisting nature of contemporary visual arts field and the changing essence of a work of art can be discussed through such opposite but equally distorting examples of institutionalized art spaces as freeports and ghost museums.

Freeportism is the term introduced by S. Heidenreich to pinpoint and analyze the “invisible art” – millions of highest quality and high demand art works that will never meet the audience precisely because of their high value. They are stacked as duty and tax free art at freeports in Geneva, Singapore and other places in order to minimize the risks for those who play on the art market. The truth is that the function and the destiny of true masterpieces (both, old and contemporary) nowadays has nothing to do with the function of cultural heritage. The higher the artistic and commercial value of an art piece, the greater the chance that they will “remain hidden, all enclosed in disenchanted wooden boxes, suspended in a permanent circuit of exchange” [13]. Walking in those huge secured halls among works of art that are at arm’s length but unapproachable as hostages that “sit and wait for their price to rise or fall, or to be shipped to an auction or to another Freeport” [13] is probably an epic kind of experience. Artist’s creative process, professional ambitions, aspirations, exhibits, provenance, well-deserved PR and popularity of an artwork all fade in view of the final destination for the best artifacts of human genius.

Another paradox of art economy that triggers our understanding of the essence of an art work and the art-audience relations is the so called “ghost museums” phenomenon in contemporary China. Unlike in freeportism when there are millions of artworks that cannot be

<sup>3</sup> O. Enwezor curated Documenta in Kassel in 2002 and the Venice Biennale in 2015.

displayed, China, the successor of one of the oldest civilizations and “victim” of the 20th century Cultural Revolution, has got thousands of massive beautiful visual art museums filled with nothing. As stated in the review dedicated to peculiarities of China’s development model where “cultural facilities are an important part of the identity creation and branding” and “new cities and districts must be created to fund existing cities and districts”, the country is an example of an ambiguous state of things [14]. While many cities (and of course countries) in the world<sup>4</sup> are striving to implement at least one contemporary art space project, China’s number of museums already exceeds 5,000. However, these ghost museums are meant to remain empty from the very beginning due to lack of content, curators, professional museum staff, etc. The “iconic cultural buildings” become a “conspicuous paradox of modern development” and “a toxic example of art spaces without art and art policy” [14].

*Art Market.* The final case that we wish to bring up deals with a well-studied and broadly discussed art market bubble phenomenon that was fervently entitled Zombie Formalism. Zombie Formalism is a contemporary simulacrum of abstract expressionism style that “arose at the precise moment that the global economy witnessed a level of wealth disparity and private-sector advantages unseen since the Gilded Age” [15]. Its meteoric rise and fall within the 2010s is already an encyclopedic example of how financial institutions and mechanisms of the art market attribute aesthetic value through raising the work’s commercial value.

Zombie Formalism phenomenon is one of the many examples that demonstrates that creation and legitimization of an artwork’s aesthetic value is no longer the prerogative of art critics, curators, art institutions or the audience. In case of big money projects it is the market forces and they “shape the

contemporary artworld dysfunctional and unhealthy” [13].

To a great extent, rigid institutionalization of visual arts hits at the very essence of philosophy of art and brings up the new challenge: can this perversion of the arts through financial values be confronted, and should it? Will any of the visual art cluster agents, starting with the artists themselves, be ready to dismiss of the big money status of this sector of the economy and quit the game? “Sad to say, cautioned artist and art critic W. Robinson that coined the phrase “Zombie Formalism”, the notion that there is a genuine, pure, sincere, and deep art that can be set in opposition to a compromised, mercenary, dishonest, and shallow one is romantic piffle” [16].

### **Methodological Relativism**

Contemporary art community has grown into a flourishing brand of economy and continues to build itself up following some new, previously uncharted recipes. It has become unprecedentedly crowded with many new actors as compared to the times when the initial philosophy of art notions had been introduced. Modern contributors and stakeholders of the visual arts universe, besides the artists and the audience, are art critics, curators, museums, galleries, art dealers, auction houses, biennals and art fairs, government agencies, private foundations and so on [17].

Remarkably this set of things is being already challenged by the new wind crypto-art and blockchain technologies that are about to change the whole balance between visual arts stakeholders. Decentralization

<sup>4</sup> One of the most recent examples is the city of Coventry, UK, initiative to turn a former IKEA building into one of the biggest cultural hubs in the world and place thousands of national collection art pieces, that have previously been stacked in repository, on display [35].

of authentication, provenance tracking and collection management of both digital and non-digital art is expected to take away “the power from middlemen and gatekeepers in the art world ... returning autonomy to artists and collectors” [18].

Situations that were discussed above are examples of impetuous fading of the former standards in the field of visual arts. The art cluster faces an ever changing tasks agenda. Epochs change and so evolves the question of what and why should be considered a work of art. The new extreme can be described as complete negation of everything that once was shaping the whole creative activity discourse, like in “The author is dead” [19] formula: no artist, no aesthetic questions, no audience, no artspace, no material mediums, no veracious value indicators. Some philosophers of art have already announced that it is time for advancing a new paradigm that would revise the old methodological foundations and promote a new intra-field dialogue.

What is art and what is artwork speaking the 21st century language? That is the key question because, as R. G. Collingwood put it, “no one can define a term in common use until he has satisfied himself that his personal usage of it harmonizes with the common usage” [20, p. 26]. A theoretical convention about new ways of dealing with the notions of art and artwork is crucial for conducting successful heritage, local and global art field studies.

We reckon that the current state of things should be viewed from a meta-relativist perspective and any standard is acceptable and valid by virtue of its existence at the empirical level. Theoretical meta-relativism presumes that art is an open concept and any definition of an artwork is viable as long as it is shared by a certain community or fits a certain discourse. As O. Naukkarinen argues, “there are phenomena in contemporary aesthetics that are fairly global or very wide-spread ..., some that are culture-

dependent, and some that are very local, even individual. All of them have their place in the totality of the contemporary situation and we should be sensitive to all these levels” [21]. In other words it is a crucial characteristics of the current state of the visual arts agenda that there are different levels of discourse that are not reducible to each other. The prefix meta- in the case of empirical and theoretical relativism is proposed as a heuristic way of approaching the main question of the philosophy of art and exemplifies that this state of things should be accepted as sheer, unconditional and enduring.

Meta-relativist vision of the problem is a contemporary alternative to single-feature-biased theories and attempts to eliminate the main question of the philosophy of art as irrelevant. Meta-relativism implies that while no comprehensive interpretation of the essence of art or definition of an artwork is possible, any empirical phenomenon and any theoretical account should be admitted as relevant and legitimate as a value-in-itself. A convention to imply a discourse level sensitive relativist approach is a liberating and productive method of intra- and inter-field dialogue.

## Discussion

The 20th century gave us a pool of aesthetic theories that can be united under the umbrella of a positivistic assumption that the meaning of art can be defined. These approaches have been scrupulously examined by philosophers of art such as N. Carrol, R. Stecker and others. Thus, N. Carrol in his notable volume “Philosophy of Art” particularly provides a meticulous analysis of the long history of debates about the essence of art and the notion of a work of art. N. Carroll indicates the shortcomings of representationalism, institutionalism, formalism, neo-formalism, neo-Wittgensteinism, aesthetic and historical approaches from the “necessary and sufficient conditions” perspective

[22]. The study elicits that no matter how well-grounded the approach, it can never provide an exhaustive definition that is sufficient for the intra-field dialogue. Another comprehensive critique of contemporary methodological approaches, from essentialism to constructivism, that can be utilized as example of exhaustive appraisal of those theories' shortcomings is presented in R. Stecker's volume "Aesthetics and the Philosophy of Art" [23, p. 5]. We maintain the consonant conclusions of both philosophers that any normative theories of art can already be reckoned as outdated. Empirical observations give a clear signal that something is going beyond those theories' horizon. As A. Kudryashov points out, nowadays the very essence of the main question of the philosophy of art has changed and modern aesthetic theory should inquire not about the essence but about the acceptable and non-acceptable ways of using the word art [24].

A more radical way of assessing the main question of the philosophy of art is presented by M. Weitz. He asserts that aesthetic theory is wrong in principle and no definition of a work of art is possible. In his highly influential volume "The Role of Theory in Aesthetics" M. Weitz insists that a true definition of art simply cannot be maintained "neither by philosophers, nor by art critics and even by artists". He argues: "Formalism, Voluntarism, Emotionalism, Intellectualism, Intuitionism, Organicism"... all of it is wrong in principle [25, p. 27].

In objection to these negativist type of arguments, we adhere to the meta-relativist position and contend that on the contrary, it is essential that aesthetic theories exist "since the beginning of time" and that is a historical fact. The question is not that they cannot provide a comprehensive account of art or that "the main question of the philosophy of art has changed" [24], but that they treat the notion of a work of art as a closed concept. However, it is still a

methodological question of consenting on the fact that any theory or judgement is equally viable as long as it is shared by a certain community of people (scientists, art professionals, etc.). The neo-Wittgenstenian "meaning as a use" outlook is a much closer approximation here since it implies that a convention about the meaning of a notion within a certain community is a sufficient foundation for accepting a definition. Community is the locus of ideology, convictions and beliefs which in turn can exist as long as they are shared within a certain group of people. From there we could draw a parallel with the explanation provided by proponents of institutional theory who argue that aesthetic or artistic properties may not at all be a criterion for something to be qualified as a work of art. Instead, it is solely the conferment by representatives of the art world of "the status of candidate for appreciation" upon an artifact [26, p. 579]. In other words, verification of the status of a work of art is left to the agents of the art cluster.

Combining these two guidelines we would like to stress that in all cases the most important factor would be the meta-relativistic awareness about the level of discourse. In contemporary visual art practice there is no point in arguing whether or not something/someone is a true work of art, artist, audience, art space or veracious value indicator. Any empirical phenomenon/relationship or theoretical definition/notion should be considered legitimate by virtue of the very fact of their existence and differentiated by their levels of discourse. This point will be further addressed in the Conclusion section of the paper.

## Conclusion

Creative activity is probably one of the major functions of culture because its products – works of art/masterpieces are those artifacts that make possible the appreciation between different generations and civilizations, cultures and individuals.



In the end, ability to produce artifacts distinguishes humanity from other species because we can generate something other species cannot. In a way, history of humanity can be seen as history of art and its “ever-present changes and novel creations” [25, p. 32]. The expansive, adventurous character of art is what makes it an open concept.

The speed of transformations that are taking place in the field of contemporary visual art resembles the galloping pace of scientific, technical, social progress. Perhaps we do not possess enough time or the necessary degree of detachment to immediately grasp the essence of those transformations. But at least we can be aware that “art and ideas alike have always responded to their conditions of encounter, to how they are exhibited, inscribed, perceived, bought, and sold, adapting to whichever is dominant among their various modes of representation” [13]. In a situation when immediate theoretical apprehension of a phenomenon may be precipitant it is possible to at least work out a convention about general methodological foundations of the studies. As A. Karabayeva notes, “contemporary society and its cultural institutions actualize the problem of comprehending a new scientific “methodology” and research approaches, along with solving the problems of adaptation of a modern person to a new socio-cultural space” [27, p. 31].

Some philosophers of art prefer to assess the current period of time from a cultural progress perspective. They assert that we have already passed the era of post-modernity and denote the new age as metamodernism. Thus, Vermeulen T., Akker R. note that “the postmodern years of plenty, pastiche, and parataxis are over giving way to metamodernism, a new discourse which is characterized as oscillating between a modern enthusiasm and a postmodern irony” [28, p. 1]. We insist, however, that the demarcation should be made along different criteria. The most important characteristic of contemporaneity is the meta-relativist turn while metamodernism is one of its many empirical and theoretical manifestations.

To be sure, the question about the essence of art and possible definitions of an artwork must not necessarily be central for each and every kind of the philosophy of art debate. However, drastic changes in art practices and forms of communication between art and society are highly conducive to updating our outlook. Meta-relativist approach allows taking time and accumulating knowledge about the plethora of contemporary visual art manifestations. We would like to finalize our discussion with an opinion of A. Kudryashov that today is the moment when it is highly important to demarcate between art and non-art and contemporary aesthetic has modified its main question to what the borders of art are [24].

### **Авторлардың үлесі**

М. Ш. Хасанов – зерттеу тұжырымдамасын әзірлеу және қалыптастыру; зерттеу әдістемесін жасау; ғылыми әдебиеттерді талдау; мәтінді сыни тұрғыдан талдау; қорытындыларды тұжырымдады.

В. Ф. Петрова – зерттеу мәселесін тұжырымдау; ғылыми әдебиеттерді талдау; мәтінді сыни тұрғыдан талдау және пысықтау; қорытындыларды тұжырымдады.

А. М. Хасанова – зерттеу мәселелерін тұжырымдау; шетелдік дереккөздермен жұмыс; мәтіннің зерттеу бөлігін дайындау және пысықтау; жобаның орындаушысы.

### Вклад авторов

М. Ш. Хасанов – разработка и формирование концепции исследования; разработка методологии проведения исследования; анализ научной литературы; критический анализ текста; концептуализация выводов.

В. Ф. Петрова – постановка проблемы исследования; анализ научной литературы; критический анализ и доработка текста; концептуализация выводов.

А. М. Хасанова – постановка проблемы исследования; работа с зарубежными источниками; подготовка и доработка исследовательской части текста; исполнитель проекта.

### Contribution of authors

M. Sh. Khassanov – development of research concept; structuring of research methodology; scientific literature analysis; critical analysis of the text; conceptualization of research findings.

V. F. Petrova – statement of research problem; scientific literature analysis; critical analysis and revision of the text; conceptualization of findings.

A. M. Khassanova – statement of research problem; work with foreign literature; preparation and finalizing of the research part of the text; project executor.

### References

1. Lubbe, G. "V Nogu So Vremenem: Sokrashchennoye Prebyvaniye V Nastoyashchem" [*In Step with the Time: The Abridged Presence in the Present*], *Ruthenia*. – URL: [http://ruthenia.ru/logos/personalia/plotnikov/transitions/01\\_zugzeit.htm](http://ruthenia.ru/logos/personalia/plotnikov/transitions/01_zugzeit.htm) (accessed on 11.12.2020).
2. Lemke, T. "Materialism Without Matter: The Recurrence of Subjectivism in Object-Oriented Ontology", *Distinktion: Journal of Social Theory*, 2017, Vol. 18, No. 2, pp. 133–152.
3. Blazhnov, A. "Iskusstvo v Strukture Tzennostei: Ontologicheskii I Gnoseologicheskii Aspekty" [Art in the Structure of Values: Ontological and Gnoseological Aspects], *dissercat.com* – URL: <https://www.dissercat.com/content/iskusstvo-v-strukture-tzennostei-ontologicheskii-i-gnoseologicheskii-aspekty> (accessed on 12.12.2020). (In Russian)
4. Sarrot, N. *Tropizmy. Era Podozreniya* [*Tropisms. Era of Suspicion*]. Moscow: Polinform Taburi, 2000. p. 448. (In Russian)
5. Krivtun, O. "Estetika" [Aesthetics], *gumer.info* – URL: [https://www.gumer.info/bibliotek\\_Buks/Culture/Krivcyn/\\_35.php](https://www.gumer.info/bibliotek_Buks/Culture/Krivcyn/_35.php) (accessed on 03.12.2020). (In Russian)
6. McMahon, J. "The Ancient Quarrel Between Art and Philosophy in Contemporary Exhibitions of Visual Art", *Curator: The Museum Journal*, 2019, Vol. 6, No. 1, pp. 7–17.

7. Roose, H. et al. "Trends in Contemporary Art Discourse: Using Topic Models to analyze 25 years of Professional Art Criticism", *Cultural Sociology*, 2018, Vol. 12, No. 3, pp. 303–324.
8. Peters, J., Roose H. "From Starving Artist to Entrepreneur. Justificatory Pluralism in Visual artists' Grant Proposals", *The British Journal of Sociology*. 2020, Vol. 71, No. 5, pp. 952–969.
9. *Khalykov, K.* "Өнер философиясына кіріспе: R. Eldridzh zhәне avtorlar өнер syny men teoriyalary turaly" [An Introduction to the Philosophy of Art: R. Eldridge and Other Authors about Theory and Criticism of Art], *Central Asian Journal of Art Studies*, 2020, 5(4). (In Kazakh) <https://doi.org/10.47940/cajas.v5i4.286>
10. Spaid, S. "Revisiting Ventzislavov's Thesis: Curating Should be Understood as a Fine Art", *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, 2016, Vol. 74, No. 1, pp. 87–91.
11. Luke, M. B. "Okwui Enwezor on making sense of a global landscape that again lies shattered and in disarray archive", *The Art Newspaper*. [<https://www.theartnewspaper.com/interview/okwui-enwezor-on-making-sense-of-a-global-landscape-that-again-lies-shattered-and-in-disarray/>, accessed on 15.03.2019].
12. Hein, H. "The Authority of Objects: From Regime Change to Paradigm Shift", *Curator: The Museum Journal*, 2007, Vol. 50 (1), pp. 77–85, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2151-6952.2007.tb00251.x>.
13. Heidenreich, S. "Freeportism as Style and Ideology: Post-Internet and Speculative Realism", *e-flux journal*, 2016, Vol. 71 [<https://www.e-flux.com/journal/71/60521/freeportism-as-style-and-ideology-post-internet-and-speculative-realism-part-i/>, accessed on 02.02.2021].
14. Shepard, W. "Why China Has Hundreds of Empty 'Ghost' Museums", *Forbes*, June 20, 2019 [<https://www.forbes.com/sites/wadeshepard/2019/06/20/why-china-has-hundreds-of-empty-ghost-museums/?sh=6f8f24ec6f39/>, accessed on 12.12.2020].
15. Schneider, T. "Who Survived the Zombie Formalism Apocalypse? We Surveyed the Wreckage of the Last Great Art-Market Fad", *Artnet magazine*, October 31, 2019 [<https://news.artnet.com/market/survivors-of-the-zombie-apocalypse-1383025/>, accessed on 15.01.2021].
16. Wiley, C. "The Toxic Legacy of Zombie Formalism, Part 2: How the Art System's Entropy Is Raising the Political Stakes for Culture", *Artnet magazine*, 30.07.2018 [<https://news.artnet.com/opinion/the-toxic-legacy-of-zombie-formalism-part-2-1318355/>, accessed on 15.01.2021].
17. *Yemelyanova, M.* "Strategiya Iskusstva po Bodriyaru" [Strategy of Art According to Baudrillard]. *CyberLeninka*. – URL: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/strategiya-iskusstva-po-bodriyaru> (accessed on 09.11.2020). (In Russian)
18. Nair, S. "Blockchain and crypto art for dummies". *STIR world*, 04.20.21 [<https://www.stirworld.com/think-opinions-blockchain-and-crypto-art-for-dummies/>, accessed on 12.02.2021].
19. Barthes, R. "The Death of the Author, 1977", *TUFTS* [<https://sites.tufts.edu/english292b/files/2012/01/Barthes-The-Death-of-the-Author.pdf>, accessed on 04.01.2021].

20. Collingwood, R. G. *The Principles of Art*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1945. 324 p.
21. Naukkarinen, O. "Contemporary Aesthetics: Perspectives on Time, Space, and Content", *Contemporary Aesthetics*, 2014, Vol. 12, 11 p.
22. Carrol, N. *Philosophy of Art: A Contemporary Introduction*. Routledge, 1999, 273 p.
23. Stecker, R. *Aesthetics and the Philosophy of Art*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2005. 329 p.
24. Kudryashov, A. "E lucevan le stelle. Kratkoe vvedeniye v Estetiku" [E lucevan le stelle. Brief Introduction to Aesthetics]. *Sigma*. – URL: <https://syg.ma/@insolarance-cult/e-lucevan-le-stelle-kratkoie-vviedieniie-v-estietiku/> (accessed on 18.11.2020).
25. Weitz M. "The Role of Theory in Aesthetics", *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, 1956, Vol. 15, No. 1, pp. 27–35.
26. Zahradka, P. "A Critique of Aesthetic Hierarchism and its Consequences for the Theory of Art, Art Criticism and Aesthetic Axiology", F. Dorsch D. Raitu (eds): *5th Proceedings of European Society for Aesthetics*, 2013, pp. 576–595.
27. Karabayeva, A. "Formirovanie innovazionnoi kultury kak faktor modernizazii sovremennogo obshestva" [Formation of Innovation Culture as a Factor of Modernization of Contemporary Society], *Vestnik KazNU*, 2018. No. 1-63, pp. 29–38 (In Russian).
28. Vermeulen, T., Akker, R. "Notes on Metamodernism", *Journal of Aesthetics and Culture*, 2010, Vol. 2, pp. 1–13.
29. Golazewska, M. "Artistic and Aesthetic Values in the Axiological Situation", *Philosophica*, 1985, Vol. 36, No. 2, pp. 25–42.
30. Ventzislavov, R. "The Curator as Artist. Reply to Sue Spaid", *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, 2016, Vol. 74, pp. 91–101.
31. Frey, B. *Arts & Economics: Analysis and Cultural Policy*. Berlin: Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg GmbH, 2002, p. 141.
32. Zombie Formalism or How Financial Values Pervade the Arts. *Aesthetics for Birds* [<https://aestheticsforbirds.com/2019/07/31/zombie-formalism-or-how-financial-values-pervade-the-arts/>, accessed on 30.11.2020].
33. Medvedev, A. "Estetizatsiya bezobraznogo v art-praktikakh postmoderna" [Aesthetisation of the Ugliness in Art Practices of Postmodern], *dissercat.com* – URL: <https://www.dissercat.com/content/estetizatsiya-bezobraznogo-v-art-praktikakh-postmoderna/> (accessed on 23.10.2020). (In Russian)
34. Bohme, G., Thibaud, J.-T. *The Aesthetics of Atmospheres*. London: Routledge, 2018. 230 p.
35. Ikea: Former Coventry store to become arts venue. *BBC NEWS. Coventry & Warwickshire* [<https://www.bbc.com/news/uk-england-coventry-warwickshire-56181683/>, accessed on 25.02.2020].

**Марат Хасанов, Вера Петрова, Асия Хасанова**

Әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университеті  
(Алматы, Қазақстан)

## ҚАЗІРГІ ЗАМАНҒЫ БЕЙНЕЛЕУ ӨНЕРІНІҢ ТЕОРИЯСЫ МЕН ПРАКТИКАСЫНДАҒЫ МЕТА-РЕЛЯТИВИЗМ

**Аңдатпа.** XX–XXI ғасырлардағы бейнелеу өнерінің эмпирикалық және теориялық шекаралары қазіргі заманғы өнер философиясының күн тәртібі сияқты өте кеңейді. Дискурстардың бұрын-соңды болмаған полифониясы әдіснамалық мәселе ме, әлде бұл өнердің мәні мен өнер туындысы туралы білімімізді кеңейтуге көмектесетін эвристикалық мүмкіндік пе? XXI ғасыр тіліндегі бейнелеу өнері дегеніміз не және XXI ғасырдағы өнер туындысы деген не?

Зерттеу бейнелеу өнері саласындағы қазіргі тенденциялар мен инновацияларды және оларды түсіндіру жолдарын қарастырады. Авторлар нормативтік немесе теріс көзқарастардың уақыты өтті деп тұжырымдайды. Болып жатқан өзгерістердің жиынтығы тәуелсіз құндылық болып табылады және оны табиғи әдіснамалық жағдай ретінде, атап айтқанда мета-релятивистік бұрылыс ретінде қарастыруға болады. Мақалада келтірілген мысалдар «өнер туындысының формуласының» әртүрлі аспектілеріне жатады: дискурстың ауқымы, суретші, аудитория, өнер кеңістігі, өнер нарығы, жаңа технологиялар, және тағы басқалары. Бұл мысалдар бейнелеу өнерінің қазіргі тәжірибелерінің қосарланғандығын білдіреді, оларды алдыңғы стандарттардан толық бас тарту немесе жаңа және ескі дискурстардың түбегейлі эквиваленті ретінде түсіндіруге болады. Мета-релятивистік тәсіл барлық қолданыстағы дискурстар мен тәжірибелерді тең деп санайды және осылайша өнердің мәні мен өнер туындысын анықтау туралы түсінігімізді кеңейту әдісі болып табылады. Зерттеудің қорытындысы – бұл одан әрі ішкі және пәнаралық диалогтың заманауи құралы деген болжам.

**Тірек сөздер:** өнер философиясы, өнер туындылары, бейнелеу өнері, мета-релятивизм, дискурс деңгейлері.

**Дәйексөз үшін:** Хасанов, М. Ш., Петрова, В. Ф., Хасанова, А. М. Қазіргі заманғы бейнелеу өнерінің теориясы мен практикасындағы мета-релятивизм. *Central Asian Journal of Art Studies*, 2021, 6(1), 39–53. <https://doi.org/10.47940/cajas.v6i1.349>

**Марат Хасанов, Вера Петрова, Асия Хасанова**

Казахский национальный университет им. аль-Фараби  
(Алматы, Казахстан)

## МЕТА-РЕЛЯТИВИЗМ В СОВРЕМЕННОЙ ТЕОРИИ И ПРАКТИКЕ ИЗОБРАЗИТЕЛЬНОГО ИСКУССТВА

**Аннотация.** Эмпирические и теоретические границы изобразительного искусства рубежа XX–XXI веков чрезвычайно расширяются, как и повестка современной философии искусства. Является ли беспрецедентная полифония дискурсов методологической проблемой или это эвристическая возможность, которая поможет расширить наши знания о сущности искусства и понятии произведения искусства? Что такое изобразительное искусство и что такое произведение искусства на языке XXI века?

В исследовании рассматриваются текущие тенденции и инновации в области изобразительного искусства и способы их интерпретации. Авторы делают вывод, что времена нормативных или негативистских подходов прошли. Тотальность происходящих преобразований является самостоятельной ценностью и может рассматриваться как закономерная методологическая ситуация, а именно как мета-релятивистский поворот. Примеры, представленные в статье, относятся к различным сторонам «формулы произведения искусства»: диапазон дискурса, художник, аудитория, арт-пространство, арт-рынок, новые технологии и т. д. Эти примеры подразумевают двойственность нынешних практик изобразительного искусства, их можно интерпретировать как полное отрицание предшествующих стандартов или как принципиальную равнозначность новых и старых дискурсов. Мета-релятивистский подход рассматривает все существующие дискурсы и практики как равноправные и, таким образом, представляет собой метод расширения нашего понимания сущности искусства и дефиниции произведения искусства. Выводом проведенного исследования является предположение, что это современный инструмент для дальнейшего внутри- и междисциплинарного диалога.

**Ключевые слова:** философия искусства, художественное произведение, изобразительное искусство, мета-релятивизм, уровни дискурса.

**Для цитирования:** Хасанов, М. Ш., Петрова, В. Ф., Хасанова, А. М. Мета-релятивизм в современной теории и практике изобразительного искусства. *Central Asian Journal of Art Studies*, 2021, 6(1), 39–53. <https://doi.org/10.47940/cajas.v6i1.349>

**Авторлар туралы мәлімет:**

**Сведения об авторах:**

**Authors' bio:**

**Марат Шамуратович Хасанов** — философия ғылымдарының докторы, Әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университеті философия кафедрасының профессоры (Алматы, Қазақстан)

**Марат Шамуратович Хасанов** — доктор философских наук, профессор кафедры философии Казахского национального университета имени аль-Фараби (Алматы, Казахстан)

**Marat Sh. Khassanov** — Doctor of Philosophical Sciences, Professor at the Department of Philosophy, Al-Farabi Kazakh National University (Almaty, Kazakhstan)

ORCID ID: 0000-0001-8248-0383  
email: hasanov.marat.41@mail.ru

**Вера Филипповна Петрова** — философия ғылымдарының докторы, Әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университеті философия кафедрасының профессоры (Алматы, Қазақстан)

**Вера Филипповна Петрова** — доктор философских наук, профессор кафедры философии Казахского национального университета имени аль-Фараби (Алматы, Казахстан)

**Vera F. Petrova** — Doctor of Philosophical Sciences, Professor at the Department of Philosophy, Al-Farabi Kazakh National University (Almaty, Kazakhstan)

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-9339-3389  
email: verapetrova50@mail.ru

**Асия Маратовна Хасанова** — Әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университеті философия кафедрасының докторанты (Алматы, Қазақстан)

**Асия Маратовна Хасанова** — докторант кафедры философии Казахского национального университета имени аль-Фараби (Алматы, Казахстан)

**Assiya M. Khassanova** — PhD student, Department of Philosophy, Al-Farabi Kazakh National University (Almaty, Kazakhstan)

ORCID ID: 0000-0003-1220-2745  
email: a.khasanova.kaznu@gmail.com