

Interview between Elisabeth Delin Hansen and Jytte Høy, Tuesday, November 19, 2002.

EDH: Characteristically, when reading your catalogues, one finds that several of the texts deal with your works only indirectly. One could say instead that these texts are written parallels to your visual works. You say yourself that The Museum of Thought is about translating from one dimension to another. One gets the impression that the concept of translation is central to you.

JH: This is because I am always on the hunt for certain kinds of spaces-in-between. When one translates, one has the place one translates from, together with the place one translates to. The interesting thing, for me, is that something is the same in its point of departure but the next turn around it becomes something different. It gives a certain kind of space-in-between. I would be tempted to postulate that this space is V-formed. — Earlier we talked about the title of one of the scenarios, “The Lost and The Forgotten”. The title mimes the content of the scenario itself. This is also a translation. The consequence of the two terms is the same, but the point of departure is different. This is also a V-formed space-in-between, which faces the opposite compared to the one mentioned before.

EDH: So this is a way to structure the surroundings or consciousness?

JH: It is looking at the world in a special way. For example looking through things instead of looking at things. Just like when you walk along the street, you can choose to focus on the houses or on the space in between the houses. I like to set my focus on different aspects of the pictures one can develop from reality.

EDH: What I hear you say, is that it is important for you to investigate how things are related to one another. After all, this is what creates a space in between.

JH: I heard some music by Anton Webern on the radio. The way he let each note unfold, stand there in its own value and enter into fragile communion with the other notes was incredibly spatial. It was like hearing a sculptor create music. I am a sculptor, I work with space. And with the space in between. Especially with the space-in-between.

EDH: And not just visually, but also abstractly, as for instance here in The Museum of Thought, where you deal with concepts and the different units of language in relationship to each other.

JH: I am interested in structure, the inner logic of things and in construction. The construction of meaning. Possible meaning.

EDH: But is this really about language and the attempt to encompass abstract relationships?

JH: It is an attempt to encompass the anti-mass of visuality.

EDH: You speak both of the space in between in general terms and also about the clash between sense and non-sense. How do these two concerns relate to each other?

JH: If I now say that spaces in between can be seen, that a space-in-between can be experienced through the senses, and that the place where "sense" and "nonsense" bump into each other can be made intelligible and understood, then I have displayed a palette of various "possible meetings" and "spaces in between", each with their own distinct differences. I have given myself some material to work with, or some positions to work from.

EDH: Do you then think there is a certain "space-in-between", a special relationship between phenomena that arises from the relationship between incommensurable elements? The one gives no meaning in relation to the other, but you keep them there in a paradoxical relationship?

JH: I have worked a lot with the paradox as a state. This is a potent field, with the possibility of pointing in all directions. In my best work I manage to get the work to bridge the gap between the contradictions and place itself right between them. I like things that look like something they aren't.

EDH: I think our discussion reflects very well that some of these conditions can be put into language, while many cannot. In some of your works you talk about relationships in a visual language, because this is the language which can illustrate precisely these relationships. But when we try to put this into words, we try to push our way, a little askew, into something which exclusively implies something visual. We use visual terms about it, "to encompass something" or "to contain" and those kind of words. But we can't get anywhere, seemingly, because verbal utterances cannot deal with these things. Wittgenstein says somewhere: "Was gezeigt werden kann, kann nicht gesagt werden". Isn't this exactly what you do in your works of art?