The Art of Jacqueline Gallicot-Madar

Grégorio Rossi, critic, art historian

The encounter with Jacqueline Gallicot-Madar took place before the opening of the exhibition, so that together we studied the location of her painting.

Having met the artist allows me personally to better assess and understand her artistic research, obviously beyond simply observing her works.

The obstacle of language difference, although facilitated by the presence of an interpreter, was overcome by a particular form of understanding, which by a kind of magic, speaking of art, brought us in phase.

The painting in this unconventional exhibition represents the artist and therefore from a single work I must be able to grasp or at least get a sense of not of the painting's style, but also the spirit, the mode of impulse of its author.

This is a gray monochrome painting representing three women, which by its chromatic tone and by the long coats which hide the bodies' volumes, could make one think of a tragedy linked to our history. Indeed, in contrast to the liveliness and enthusiasm constantly observed during the days spent together. Then, looking at the faces of the three women, we see that the message is as solar as the artist.

In the art of the 20th century, there are two stylistic trends which almost always manifest themselves in encounters and confrontations. One aimed at extreme simplicity, the other at accidental disorder.

However, we must say that in Jacqueline although there is a simplicity, I think I can say that her own course is autonomous.

No doubt the encounter of the 20th century and its traditions is present and consolidated, which however does not detract from its originality.

If it is true that a painting must first of all touch, that is to say it must not be explained since everyone draws their own personal emotions from it, I can calmly describe that the work of this painter, in its essential, spoke to me in different ways, and sometimes, with unequal smiles and melancholy.

Works of art are essentially physical objects, that is to say that art is linked to perception, by intelligence, to sensation, this is a fact easily verifiable by those who seek to replace a concert by his storytelling. The object of a work of art certainly has something more than all other things, that extra and elusive character is due to the fact that it cannot be defined for the simple reason that its transmission is purely emotional.

This monochrome work of art offers a hidden story which can be personal, but which certainly finds a common thread in the tradition of painting.

Sometimes a painting manages to touch us, to surprise us, in dispelling the haze of habit so that we can see with our spiritual eye. This large painting cancels out categories and commonplaces by cultivating on the contrary a singularity and an inner vision just like the domain of the eye of the mind.

Children think via pictures before school gives words a leading role, so I advise standing in front of this painting, observing it as if we were about to taste a glass of wine; This is to say without thinking by examining the different peculiarities, on the contrary allowing this experience to remain in suspense in the mind without intervening either by analogy or by difference.

Take a pair of shoes that is of course used for walking as an example, this definition doesn't really make us understand which pair of shoes we are facing. On each occasion, different shoes are acquired.

Those of the peasants appearing in a Van Gogh painting are not real but painted; the painted work perhaps gives us a better understanding of how things really are in reality.

I find this idea in what Jacqueline has expressed. The representation is figurative, yet a bit close to abstraction, in an exhibition which is a march for peace, it expresses the contradiction given by the garments where the absence of color can convey the meaning of war, and the faces, even with their elevation and hope, as the precise message of the one to which one should aspire.

If I can refer to Martin Heidegger (*The Origin of the Work of Art*): a temple does not reproduce anything. It strengthens the statue of God so that the temple shines as a work of art, "it arranges and gathers around itself the unity of those lives and those relationships among which birth and death, misery and fortune, victory and defeat, survival and ruin define the strength and course of the human being and his desire."

Once again it demonstrates that it is the work that reveals how things are and not the other way around.

Also, beyond the stylistic beauty of Jacqueline's painting, I can say that it achieves the highest and noblest meaning of the work of art.