

## "The Manhattan Art Review"

*Kritic's Korner*

Key

\*\*\*\*\* Great

\*\*\*\* Good

\*\*\* Okay

\*\* Bad

\* Awful

Jeremy Glogan - Leanings - [Jenny's](#) - \*\*\*\*

The press release, an intelligent piece of writing for once, correctly argues that binary of figurative and abstract painting is a false dichotomy. That's particularly true today when almost every painter is working somewhere near the middle of that spectrum, as if there's still a frisson in crossing a line between two camps that's long since been erased. The text goes on to claim that, "In actuality, the divide in painting is, and has always been, between paintings which actively skirt their constitutive series of nows and those which ignite upon them." I'm not entirely sure what that means, but I don't necessarily disagree. The idea of "igniting upon a series of nows" definitely refers here to Glogan painting from life, but I also suspect "post-painterly abstraction" skirted its nows whereas "action painting" ignited upon them, so it's complex. Where would Cubism fall? Or, say, Andrea Mantegna? I ask that rhetorically, it's fine that a thorny concept wasn't expressed fully in the space of an elliptical press release. So, the paintings themselves. Instead of punching up figuration with abstraction, Glogan takes the course of photorealism plus distortion. Heads inflate or squish like something out of a video game or a '90s Hype Williams video, eyes bug out like cartoons, straight lines are squiggled until flat details like a wall or a bottle become complex granular surfaces. The scenes themselves are quotidian, friends and family at bars and houses, cluttered tables like something out of Mike Leigh, but as the press release claims, he manages to "ignite" these commonplaces by a simultaneous faith in representing the real subject and an acceptance of the unavoidable mediation of that real in painting. Bringing in Cézanne might be a little over the top, but inasmuch that the venerable old crank is the emblem of the inexhaustible struggle to translate life into a painting I think the comparison is earned; there's even a superficial resemblance between Cézanne's modulated hatch marks and Glogan's acid-fried fractalizing of every object and plane. But the more important accomplishment is that, unlike artists stuck rehashing historical references in the figurative-abstract loop, he's found a way to paint the world anew, to engage with the subjects of real life in a language that isn't reducible to the achievements of past painters. I did make those media comparisons, and a friend of mine thought he was copying a TikTok filter, but those referents aren't at all determinant to his end results as painting. They're their own thing.