



Title of the work: **Roses**
Author : **Alain Boyer dit Stinckwitch**
Size : **50 x 70 cm**

Roses

There are two ways of approaching *Roses* from a critical point of view. The first, purely immanent, will undoubtedly see it as a kind of pleasant living still life decorated with delicious pop colours. Like rectangles of purely accessory tissue paper from which floral confections are extracted, to be consumed with moderation because of their limited number. Is the artist stingy? Or does he not love nature enough, a crime of ill-thought?

In this school, the whole thing is based on a decorative logic that can be reduced to wallpaper. This would mean that the artist would have gone to a lot of trouble to not even manage to cover a wall. But the joke would then be in the criticism and not in the work.

The second way of looking at Roses is to read this Stinckwich through the prism of the most current art practices. And everything changes, because the painting is no longer seen in a self-referential way but as a very contemporary attempt to break the screen by organising a learned struggle for the conquest of the foreground. And by seeking an original way to express the heterogeneity of today's world.

The eye then focuses on the diagonal break between light on the left and shadow on the right, which underlines the border between motifs left out of the limelight and a self-sufficient background that is thus designated as deserving our attention more than the main motif itself. Strange.

But the usurpation knows no bounds, for this background itself has a background in both the left and the right part. And these dark, masked silhouettes could well be floral where the canvas background reigns without competition. Worse still, this almost cartoonishly abstract background moves into the foreground on the right as well in order to insolently colour the petals of the roses themselves. Does painting in its most geometric ease triumph over its subject? What meaning, then, can be given to this bouquet, which is shown to us only to be better hidden from us? Why do the opposing meanings here seem to overlap, the better to blur the tracks leading to any possible reference? Because we are in a painting of today.

This is why we will give a zero to yesterday's critics who would estimate this painting by Stinckwich a little hastily and out of step with the times as many 50s as there are roses. And we will take this zero and add it to the total that their myopic and uneducated reading could only reach.

Estimated value of the artwork : **2 500€.**

Expert opinion : **Éric SEMBACH for ARTactif.com - 30/09/2020**



ARTactif