

ON PATERNITY AND FILIATIONS

Carlota Beltrame

It is curious that in the local art scene, the debate continues over the validity of our late modernity and the ideologeme of the "*maestro*" as if it were a protective casing against an "other-art". In this way, it seems we are more faithful not only to a certain type of practice but to the individuals who embodied that figure. We forget that, as the avant-gardists they were, those masters took on narratives of emancipation, not isolation, stories of the excluded who fought for their place in the world, thinking that if the dominant aesthetic ideas of their predecessors were not flexible enough to admit new forms, then those convictions had to change. Indeed, amidst great certainties, a "master" knows themselves by heart. They introduce a difference into a regulated context to leave their "style mark," printing an unequivocal subjectivity they cultivated to define their seal, never abandoning it because it represented and distinguished them before their peers, spectators, and disciples.

However, since the late 1980s, information began to circulate with such speed that the most distant places and events drew closer, enabling an exchange of ideas, forms, images, and imaginaries. In no way alien to this phenomenon, the field of visual arts was revolutionized by the powerful Duchampian wake, completely re-signifying itself to settle definitively in a world already without gods. Its "de-divinization" gave way to the precarious, the vulnerable, the small, to uncertainty, and to the contingent. This radical change allowed for the overcoming of the criterion of truth traditionally attributed to the fine skills with which a work of art was constructed, focusing instead on the modes of being of art. Indeed, when aesthetics emerged as a discipline, it did so over the already ailing body of mimesis, as it postulated interpretation; subsequently, other branches of thought (semiotics, linguistics, psychoanalysis) reinforced it, providing increasingly sophisticated instruments that placed the concept in a privileged position.

The contemporary artist works with a method that allows for fluctuations and sometimes radical changes in their body of work, as it is based on an idea that conditions their work mechanics and the elements with which they will create different pieces. In opposition to those of the master, each piece can be very different from the previous one, linked to it only by a "family resemblance". Even so, among the most common strategies for interpreting the present is the invocation of the past in an eagerness to access what has truly happened, to overcome all uncertainty and know if it is definitively closed or if, perhaps under other forms, it remains alive. Consequently, we conceive the individual talent of the artist as something that unfolds within a historical sense, implying the perception not only of what is extinguished in the past but also what remains unfinished. There is no

way for the former to be isolated from the present, as past and present inform each other, coexisting. It is difficult to imagine an artist who, by themselves, possesses a complete meaning.

If we can understand that the rupture of current art took place not only against certain aesthetic convictions but thanks to them, the perplexity of a spectator—whose interpretation does not "clash" with God, the paradigm to which all signs in past artworks perhaps refer—might also dissipate somewhat. Indeed, in the minimal histories of our contemporary artists, those narratives of the emancipation of modernity still resonate, and new forms of exclusion become visible in the work with the unstable and the contingent; for it is clear that if the son rebukes the father, it is undoubtedly because the father has conceived him.