manner in which the language of abstraction has moved (just another time, it could be argued) I'm convinced that Sturgis has the art historical backbone to support the leaps of formal, spatial front of us or below us. while—as is the case in all of his work—allowing us to orient the scene as someplace either in demarcation of a boundary separating the left half of the painting from the right.) The associational impact is simultaneously jarring and seamless, in other words, a perfect raw power. To me Sturgis's paintings make his point of view crystal clear in purely visual terms: the goal of Sturgis's paintings—like those of, for example, the ten-foot long expansive "landscape" painting in which a second strip of landscape has upended itself ninety degrees to become a kind of no-mans-land smack in the middle of the "naturally" oriented vista. (Sturgis has also explored this format in Equal Refrain (2003), albeit with the idea as a stronger demarcation of a boundary separating the left half of the painting from the right.) Theassociational impact is simultaneously jarring and seamless, in other words, a perfect example of something that has been "split together." Divided it somehow united, the whole--while it's working--so as to present the scene as somehow either in front of us or below us.

I'm convinced that Sturgis has the art historical backbone to support the leap of formal spatial and representational form that his work presents. He has thought a lot about not only the manner in which the language of abstraction has moved (just another time, it could be argued) from the voodoo realm of high modernism to the more inclusive space of design. More importantly, however both artists are very adept at allowing for the possibility that we may desire to read something into their work without being made to feel less than smart. The illusion to repetition and order is of course only that of mental re-ordering or correcting. The illusion to repetition and order is of course only that of an illusion and difference is always present. More in line with the twisted rigor of a Jonathan Lasker, Prieto's because of the similar impact of the minimal evidence of the artist's hand (which, in keeping with the spirit of good-natured contrariness here, manages to make the work become all the more humane precisely because all of the baggage of "touch" has been unpacked and put away), as well as their shared concerns with a curious, "stacking" type of sculptural flatness. The associational impact is simultaneously jarring and seamless, in other words, a perfect example of something that has been "split together." Divided it somehow united, the whole--while it's working--so as to present the scene as somehow either in front of us or below us.

I won't be unduly political about Daniel Sturgis’s paintings, even if it’s nearly impossible these days not to be political about nearly everything. Instead, I’m rather gleefully stuck on the notion of Sturgis as a kind of no-mans-land smack in the middle of the "naturally" oriented vista. (Sturgis has also explored this format in Equal Refrain (2003), a ten-foot long expansive "landscape" painting in which a second strip of landscape has upended itself ninety degrees to become a kind of no-mans-land smack in the middle of the "naturally" oriented vista. Sturgis has also explored this format in Equal Refrain (2003), albeit with the idea as a stronger demarcation of a boundary separating the left half of the painting from the right.) The associational impact is simultaneously jarring and seamless, in other words, a perfect example of something that has been "split together." Divided it somehow united, the whole--while it's working--so as to present the scene as somehow either in front of us or below us.
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