

Da jeg var barn spiste vi til dagligt på et bord dækket med en småternet voksdug, hvis mønster var som et svagt modificeret grid. Kiggede man længe ned i bordet var det som om mønsteret bevægede sig. Stadig dukker bevægelsen i dette mønster ofte op når jeg lukker øjnene, som var det lagret på min nethinde.

Sidst i 1960'erne, fik vi et mere stort mønstret voksdug med store, svagt orange, nærmest superellipseformede rammer, på en brunlig baggrund. Dette mønster er ikke, på samme måde som det første, lagret på nethinden, men blev ikke desto mindre tydeligt kaldt frem af min erindring, da jeg i 2002 så nogle malerier af Bodil Nielsen på udstillingen 'On a Clear Day' på Sophienholm (som hun også var med til at tilrettelægge). Lignende former og mønstre var her, som noget hverdagsagtigt konkret tidsligt, skudt ind foran noget helt abstrakt, som synes at være det grundlæggende, selve grund-laget.

I andre af Bodil Nielsens malerier træder dette grundlag frem i mere ren form, som det f.eks. skete på separatudstillingen på Galleri Specta i 2005. Lodret orienterede lærreder opdelt vandret i felter eller striber af forskellig farve.

Tilsyneladende var disse malerier helt abstrakte og ved første blik tilsyneladende rundet af 1960'ernes minimalisme. 'Rene malerier' befriet for illusioner og henvisninger. Malerier som rene objekter. Men, sådan er det netop ikke helt med malerierne fra Specta. De lodrette, tavleagtige formater og de vandrette stribers forskellige højde introducerer et hierarki og en, omend svag, relation til det menneskelige legeme og landskabet. Eller måske rettere en skæring mellem statuen og landskabet. Formelt set tangerer malerierne altså billeder af statuen, landskabet og disses reduktion til det absolut minimale. Faktisk bærer de også titler, hvis første ord er fx. *Pacific*, *Daylight*, *Morning*, efterfulgt af farvekombinationen, eller *Sunset*, *Sunrise*. Disse træk er formodentlig udtryk for et forsøg på at inddrage beskueren i maleriet og dets mulige rum, men opbygger tillige antydningen af en essens. At en morgen fx. kan renses og reduceres, så at sige indampes, til tre farvefelter; deres udstrækning, proportion og indbyrdes relation. En sådan forestilling om, og længsel efter, en sandhed bag fremtrædelserne er kendetegnende for ikke mindst traditionen (jfv. Rosenblum) fra romantikken og frem til den abstrakte ekspressi-

# Latenser

Notater angående Bodil Nielsens malerier / Kjeld Vindum

onisme, eksempelvis Mark Rothko (som også nævnes fordi hans værk udgør et pejlemærke i Nielsens univers). Det som kendetegner forsøgene på i maleriet at vække beskuerens følelser og bibringe hende/ham en særlig oplevelse af dybde, af en autencitet inde i billedet, bag dets overflade, som derved netop opfattes som overflade, en slags gardin. Malerierne fra Specta er på den led billeder.

I forhold til tilbøjeligheden mod billedet sætter Bodil Nielsen imidlertid farverne, hvis artificielle, og temmelig profane, 'pang'-karakter og uortodokse konstellationer nærmest får maleriernes felter til at selvstændiggøre sig som planer og således modarbejder tilløb til forestillinger om rum, helhed og bagvedliggende autenticitet. Farverne nedbryder forestillingen om delenes indbyrdes relationer i forhold til opbygningen af en helhed. Ikke blot fordi det profant 'dekorative' annullerer ophøjetheden. Som et maleriets andet lag, der undsiger det førstes antydning af betydning. Men, også fordi farverne i visse tilfælde får os til at se felterne som svagt forskudte i dybden. Nok er malerierne (også, og først og fremmest) malerier, objekter, men de antyder samtidig og vedholdende muligheden for eksistensen af

noget andet bag lærredets overflade. Og dette samtidig med at de klargør, hvorledes denne overflades fremtræden afhænger af sansningen, oplevelsen af den.

Men, tilbage til voksdugene og Bodil Nielsens øvrige malerier. I mange af disse optræder et nyt væsentligt aspekt i det maleriske univers, nemlig det banale.

I det hele taget synes hendes billeder bestandigt at svinge mellem det ophøjede og det banale, henvisningen og tingene som de er, evigheden og hverdagen.

Det banale repræsenteres ved hvad man kunne kalde vage former. Eller måske stiliseringens former. En formverden vi kender fra decorationen og/eller ornamentet. Hvis vi ser på former i det hele taget og som sådan, og ordner dem i en slags spektrum, så har vi på den ene side de former vi kender fra minimalismens reducerede formelle repertoire, nemlig fortrinsvis kvadratet og rektanglet, men også eksempelvis polygoner. Dvs. rene, abstrakte, geometrisk bestemte former. Eller: generelle, ikke-designede former, netop: ikke-former. Overfor disse står de specifikke, stærke former. Eksempelvis former der er bestemt af en kontekst, er designe-

de og evt. illuderende/henvisende i forhold til bestemte ting.

Et ornament vil således ofte henvises til naturen og i sig selv være en stilisering af måske en bladranke, hvis svingninger gøres regelmæssig, ligesom bladene forenkles med henblik på gentagelsen. Sideløbende med billedkunstens udvikling mod abstraktion i det 20. århundrede, blev også ornamentet og decorationens former udsat for en forenkling og geometrisering på bekostning af henvisningen. Således udvikledes der, tydeligst i 1970'erne og givetvis under påvirkning af minimalismen, sådanne hybrider mellem de helt geometrisk bestemte ikke-former og de stærke former: det vi her kalder vage former. I Bodil Nielsens repertoire optræder eksempelvis de såkaldte ballonformer, som er noget i retning af tilspidsede cirkler, nogle gange afsluttet i en ret vinkel (måske som en hilsen til netop denne forms 'opfinder' billedkunstneren Ib Geertsen), eller de superellipse-agtige former, der sammensmelter ellipse og rektangel, eller cirklerne med bølgekant, som på én gang er én og mange cirkler.

Disse formers rolle i malerierne er flere. I forhold til et minimalistisk udgangspunkt er de forurenende.

Selvom de er svage og generelle er de nemlig belastede af deres henvisning til et kommercielt orienteret dekorationsvokabular (det som Pernille Albrethsen i en tidligere katalogtekst om Nielsens arbejder, har kaldt 'en folkelig funktionel genre'), som ovenikøber er stærkt tidsbundet. Disse former henviser i kraft af deres udredelse til en bestemt tid (deres storhedstid), jævnfør min voksdugshenvisning, en tid som tilmed var rammen om Bodil Nielsens egen barn- og ungdom, hvorved der indtræder et biografisk aspekt, en henvisning til kunstnerens egen erfaringsverden. Hertil kommer deres forbundethed med det banale i og med ovennævnte dekorationsvokabulars enorme udbredelse på allehånde hverdagsprodukter fra boligtekstiler, tapeter, sengetøj til lampeskærme og altså voksduge. Deres henvisning til hverdagen.

Der er altså i disse sidste tilfælde tale om en slags slidtage, eller forurening gennem brug, som klæber til disse former og ikke kan henhøres til, eller hidrører fra formerne selv.

Netop i kraft af de vage formers åbning mod det subjektive og narrative virker de i malerierne som det Bodil Nielsen kalder 'beskuerens allierede'. Det man som beskuer let-

test og umiddelbart kan forholde sig til. Det som får én til at se på maleriet fordi det lader sig relatere til ens verden og ikke blot distancere sig fra den som noget andet, hvad det naturligvis også er, men ikke kun.

Men, hvad med disse formers rolle i forhold til det vi tidligere har kaldt maleriernes grund-lag, de monokrome farvefelter? Nogle gange er de som små forstyrrende gespenster. Andre gange mere integrerede i maleriet som primære elementer. Atter andre gange dominer de helt. Også i forhold til maleriets lag, hvor de dels ligger øverst, underst eller skærer sig ind i. Med andre ord, synes de ofte at have fundet sig en rolle der er ligeværdig med felternes, idet de, mere eller mindre, fletter sig ind imellem disse.

Og alligevel. I løbet af de seneste ti år har Bodil Nielsen begået en række malerier, der udelukkende eller overvejende er opbygget af cirkulære felter, evt. kantet med en lille bølgekontur a la dækkeservietter, på en hvid eller monocrom bund (hvilket undertiden kan fremkalde associationen til spiseborde under dækning, set oppefra). Cirkelformerne er arrangeret på fladen i en slags orden, et system som

styrer deres position og indbyrdes relation, men på en sådan måde at de kan danne eller antyde figurer og tegn. Lidt svarende til den måde hvorpå prikkerne i blindsskrift eller pærerne/dioderne i en lysavis, danner bogstaver, bortset fra at maleriernes cirkler også kan glide over i hinanden og nogen gange afvige fra det cirkulære.

Cirkelfelterne har farver, forskellige farver, og synes ofte nærmest at blinke som trafiklys. Endvidere synes farveskiftene, såvel som formændringerne, til en vis grad at unddrage sig dannelsen af faste strukturer og/eller tegn, idet de tilsyneladende følger andre regler eller fordeler sig arbitrært. Som en lyssavis der er gået agurk, eller måske set så tæt på at bogstaverne/tegnene netop fortegner sig. Set således antyder disse malerier en slags tegnenes krise eller sammenbrud, men optimistisk i den forstand at nye konstellationer svangre med nye betydninger hele tiden opstår. Som endnu ikke læselige tegn og alfabeter, beriget af farvens mere eller mindre latente betydning. Som hvis fx diodepanelernes bogstaver og tal muterede til nye fluktuerende tegn overlejret af farvernes skiftende konstellationer, idet diodernes orange suppleredes med adskillige andre.

I disse malerier er anvendelsen af de førnævnte svage former, tilløbende til det ornamentale og den dermed forbundne tidsfæstelse, så godt som elimineret. Til gengæld er såvel svagere, bløt-agtige, som stærkere, symbol/tegn-agtige, former, eksempelvis stjerner, dukket op.

Og langsomt begynder formerne/tegnene at gruppere sig på de hvide lærreders felter i centrerede, symmetriske, undertiden næsten dobbeltsymmetriske, formationer.

Mens gentagelsen/spejlingen, strukturen, peger mod ormanentet peger centreringen mod tegnet.

Farveformerne synes at svæve over den hvide baggrund, det grundede lærred, men i forskellig højde, idet nogle dækker delvist for andre,

hvorved figur-grund relationen og illusionen om rummet, er

(gen)introduceret. Nogle gange er formerne translucente, hvorved deres indbyrdes relation i dybden er ubestemmelig. De hænger foran vores øjne i et uendeligt hvidt rum.

Og de bevæger sig. Deres centrumsøgende formationer virker alt andet end stabile, men nærmere som pludseligt opståede, flygtige tegn-agtige ordener i en evig flyden.

Som drev formerne mod og tiltrukket af det samme felt eller punkt, som de straks efter at have nået,

spredt sig videre ud fra. En tilstand som kan minde om et vi kan se på ydersiden af det organ hvorved vi ser, øjet.

Måske fremlægges hermed et forsøg på at få os til at se, at vi ser. At vi også ser i lag og ikke altid og nødvendigvis ser fokuseret og lige ud, så at sige. At vi også, og måske nok så meget, ser som hovedpersonen i Georges Perec's bog "En mand der sover", som her er på vej til at gøre netop det: "Du lukker øjnene, du åbner dem. Viruslignende eller mikrobeagtige former glider langsomt ned over indersiden af dine øjenlåg eller på din hornhinde, forsvinder, kommer pludselig frem igen på midten, næsten som før, cirkler eller bobler, små grene, sammenfiltrede tråde der tilsammen danner noget der kunne ligne et fabeldyr. De forsvinder for dig, dukker op igen; du gnider øjnene og trådene eksploderer, breder sig." Sådan er det, eller kan det være, og hos mig dukker den ternede voksdug stadig op imellem alt det andet.

Således kan disse malerier muligvis skærpe vores bevidsthed om hvordan vi ser.

Men de antyder også vedvarende forestillingen om et centrum, en midte, eller en særlig tæthed. Men

en slags flygtige tætheder hvis tilsyneladende opbygning af tegn og latente figurer allerede peger mod disse opløsning og spredning. Som fluktuerende antydninger af mulige glimtvis betydninger.

Med de her omtalte malerier fremlægger Bodil Nielsen forsøg på en fortolkning af verden og den måde vi ser verden på, som muligvis rummer aspekter af sandhed, vel at mærke uden at prætere at gøre det, hvilket er afgørende for vores interesse. Malerierne gør op med forestillingen om en særlig virkelighed, en særlig autenticitet bag overfladerne, men uden at eliminere forestillingen om sådanne som sådan. I stedet foreslår malerierne, at der er tale om flere sandheder eller essenser, og at vi opfatter disse som sammenflettede med de øvrige lag som vores opfattelse af verden er opbygget af, banaliteten inklusive. At ting og aspekter af tilværelsen i vidt omfang eksisterer i relation til andre og vi ikke længere kan have nogen forventning om én sandhed bag overfladerne som åbenbarer sig bag en spalte i disse, men derimod nok om, at én blandt flere sandheder eller betydningsopbygninger måske åbenbarer sig som glimt i spillet mellem mange mere eller mindre fluktuerende lag.

Kjeld Vindum / profession ...

While I was growing up, we ate our everyday meals at a table covered with a small-checkered oilcloth, the pattern of which was something like a pale modified grid. When you squinted your eyes and peered all the way down into the table, the pattern seemed to be moving. Frequently, the movement in this very pattern still looms up before me, as if it had been stored on my retina.

At the end of the 1960s, a larger-patterned oilcloth turned up on the dining-room table inside our home. This one had large, pale orange and almost super-elliptically formed frames appearing against a brownish background. This pattern has not been stored on the retina with the same clarity as the first oilcloth, but in any event it was quite distinctly called forth from the reservoir of my memory in 2002 when I saw a number of Bodil Nielsen's paintings at an exhibition that was called 'On a Clear Day' at Sophienholm (an exhibition for which she was also one of the co-arrangers). Also on view were similar forms and patterns that had the effect of something everyday-like, concrete and temporal, interposed in front of something completely abstract which appeared to be the fundamental, to be the very *ground layer*.

In other paintings by Bodil Nielsen, this fundamental ground layer emerges in a more unadulterated form, as was manifest at her solo exhibition at Galleri Specta in 2005. Vertically oriented canvases divided horizontally into fields or strips of different colors. Apparently, these paintings are completely abstract and at first glance, evidently descended from the minimalism of the 1960s – paintings as pure, un-referential *objects*.

But still, this is not *really* the case with the paintings from Specta. The horizontal stripes' different heights and the vertical tabular formats introduce a hierarchy and a relation, albeit a vague one, to the landscape and the human body – or to put it more precisely, an intersection between the statue and the landscape. Formally speaking, the paintings consequently border on pictures, of figures and landscapes, respectively, although they have been boiled down to an absolute minimum. As a matter of fact, they are endowed with titles where the initial word (for example, *Pacific*, *Daylight*, *Morning*) is followed by a color combination or by *Sunset*, *Sunrise*. What these features supposedly express are an attempt to involve the viewer in the painting and its potential space while also building up the

# Latencies

Comments on Bodil Nielsen's paintings / Kjeld Vindum

suggestion of an essence. For example, that a morning can be reduced, can be evaporated, as it were, into three color fields, their extension, proportion and internal relations, which for the viewer conjures up a sensation of presence, of something genuinely morning-like.

This kind of conception and this kind of yearning for a truth behind appearances is especially characteristic of the tradition (cf. Rosenblum) that wends its way from the Romantic era up into abstract expression, as exemplified by Mark Rothko (who must be mentioned here because his work constitutes a pivot point in Nielsen's universe). That which embraces the attempts in the painting to arouse the viewer's sensations and feelings and to convey to her/him a special perception of depth, a singular experience of the authenticity inside the picture and behind its surface which, on this account, is perceived quite precisely as being a surface, as a kind of curtain. In this way, the paintings at Specta are *pictures*.

With respect to this inclination toward the picture, however, Bodil Nielsen applies colors whose artificial and somewhat secular amalgamation of refreshingly bold colors and unorthodox constellations almost causes the paintings' fields to emancipate themselves as planes and consequently work counter to any attempts to manifest conceptions about space, wholeness and authenticity in the work. The colors undermine any notion about the parts' mutual relations in connection with the construction of a totality – not only because the secularly

'decorative' cancels out the sublime sense of loftiness – like a painting's second layer that renounces the first layer's suggestion of meaning – but also because the colors, in certain instances, make the fields appear as being ever so faintly displaced in depth.

As the paintings are (also *and* first and foremost) paintings, objects, however, they intimate at one and the same time – and they do so persistently – the possibility of the existence of something else behind the surface of the canvas. And at the same time, they clarify how this surface's appearance is contingent upon the sensory process, upon the perception of the surface itself.

But let's get back to the oilcloths and to the rest of Bodil Nielsen's paintings. In many of these works, there is a new and important aspect that turns up in the painterly universe, namely the banal. By and large, her paintings seem to be oscillating constantly between the lofty and the mundane, between the reference and the things as they are, between eternity and everyday life.

The banal is represented by what could be called 'vague forms'. Or you might call them forms of stylization: a world of forms known from patterns and ornaments, from the domain of decoration.

If we look at forms on the whole and as such and we arrange them into a kind of spectrum then, on the one side, we have forms that are familiar to us from minimalism's reduced formal repertoire, represented primarily by the square and the

rectangular, but also including forms like other polygons, that is to say, pure, abstract and geometrically determined forms. Or, you might say, generalized *non-designed forms* and even more precisely, *non-forms*. In direct contrast to these are the specific strong forms: for example, forms that are determined by a context, that are designed and, as they case might be, illusionary/referential in relation to particular figures and objects. Accordingly, an ornament will frequently refer to nature and will in itself be a stylization of what might be a leafy vine, the serpentine oscillations of which are rendered regular, just as the leaves are simplified for purposes of repetition. In parallel with visual art's progressive development toward abstraction in the twentieth century, the ornament and decoration's forms were subjected to a simplifying and a geometricization that was effected at the expense of the illusionary. In continuation of this, what started to emerge, and it emerged most clearly in the 1970s, were certain kinds of *hybrids*, not merely among geometrically defined non-forms and strong forms but also between different non-forms. It is these kinds of hybrids that we are here calling 'weak forms'.

What appear in Bodil Nielsen's repertoire, for example, are the so-called 'balloon forms', which can be described as something along the lines of pointed circles, terminating sometimes in a right angle, whereby they amalgamate circle and square (perhaps by way of paying homage to this particular form's 'inventor', the artist Ib Geert-

sen), or the super-ellipse-like forms that amalgamate ellipse and rectangle, or the circles with arched contours, which partly amalgamate one large and many small circles and partly constitute a reference to flowers.

The roles that these forms play in the paintings are manifold. In relation to a minimalist point of departure, they are polluting factors. Even though they are weak and general in character, they are in fact laden with their allusion to a commercially oriented decoration vocabulary (that which Pernille Albrethsen, writing in an earlier catalogue text about Nielsen's works, has labeled 'a populist functional genre') which, moreover, is intimately bound up with time. By virtue of their use and their dispersion, the forms refer to a particular time (i.e. their heyday) – think about my alluding to the oilcloth – a time which was actually the frame around Bodil Nielsen's own childhood and youth, whereby a biological aspect sets in, a reference to the artist's own world of experiences. Let's also consider the forms' interconnectedness with the banal as evinced by the aforementioned decoration vocabulary's enormous propagation onto all sorts of everyday products, ranging from residential textiles, carpets and bedclothes to lampshades and even oilcloths: the forms' reference to everyday life. It can be said that these forms have been subject to a kind of wear and tear or even more correctly, a kind of pollution through use, which is attached to them as a layer of meaning.

It is precisely by virtue of the weak forms' opening toward the subjective world of experience and narration that they are operating effectively in the paintings as what Bodil Nielsen herself calls 'the viewer's allies' – that which one, as a viewer, can most easily and immediately relate to, that which incites you to look at the painting because it relates to one's own world and does not merely distance itself from it as something else.

But what about these forms' roles in relation to what we have previously called the ground layers of the paintings, the monochrome fields? Sometimes they are like small bothersome ghosts. At other times, they are more integrated into the painting as primary elements. Then again, at still other times, they dominate completely. Also in relation to the painting's layers, where the forms sometimes lie on top, sometimes on the bottom and sometimes pierce their way in between. In other words, the forms often appear to have established themselves in a role that is equal to that of the fields, inasmuch as they more or less weave themselves in between them.

And even so. In the course of the past few decades, Bodil Nielsen has executed a number of paintings that have exclusively or predominantly been built up of circular fields and, in some cases, trimmed with diminutive wave contours in the manner of place mats, on top of a white or monochrome ground (which might sometimes elicit associations with a dining table all

decked out for service, as seen from above). The circle forms have been arranged on the surface in a kind of order, a kind of system that appears to reinforce their position and their mutual interrelationship in such a way that they can form or adumbrate figures or signs, corresponding somewhat to the way in which the dots in Braille, or the bulbs/diodes in an illuminated sign, form letters, aside from the fact that the paintings' circles can also glide over into each other and can sometimes deviate from being entirely circular.

The circular fields have colors, different colors, and often they almost seem to be blinking, like traffic lights. Moreover, the color-shifts, as well as the changes in form, appear to a certain extent to be eluding any potential formation of firm structures and/or signs, since they are evidently following other rules or distributing themselves in what seems to be an arbitrary fashion, like an illuminated sign that has gone haywire or is perhaps being viewed from such close range that the letters/signs actually dissolve. Regarded in this manner, these paintings suggest a crisis or dissolution of signs, in a certain manner, but nonetheless in a rather optimistic way in the sense that new constellations that are pregnant with new meanings are always cropping up. As signs and alphabets that cannot be read as of yet, enriched by the color's more or less latent meaning – as if, for example, the diode panel's letters and numbers were mutating into new fluctuating signs superimposed by the color's shifting constellations, seeing that

the diodes' orange is being supplemented with a great many other hues.

In some of Bodil Nielsen's latest paintings, the employment of the aforementioned 'weak forms', and the concomitant tendency towards the ornamental and the dating connected with this have all but been eliminated. On the other hand, there are even weaker blob-like and also certain stronger symbol/sign-like forms that have cropped up: stars, for example.

And slowly, the forms/signs start to group themselves around the white canvas's fields in centered, symmetric and sometimes almost double-symmetric formations. While the repetition/mirroring and the structure, point toward the ornament, the centering points toward the sign.

The color forms appear to be hovering above the white background, the primed canvas, but at differing heights, seeing as some are partially covering up others, thus (re-)introducing figure-ground relationships and the illusion of space.

Sometimes the forms are translucent. Consequently, their reciprocal relations in the depth are hard to determine. They hang there in front of our eyes in an interminable white space. And they are moving around. Their center-oriented formations appear to be anything other than stable but more like suddenly supervening transitory sign-like sequences of order within a never-ending flow, as if the forms were drifting toward - and were attracted by - the same field or point

from where, immediately after the forms have reached it, they spread themselves out even further, a condition that can serve to remind us of what we see on the exterior side of the organ with which we see: the eye.

Perhaps what is being set forth with this is an attempt to get us to see that we are seeing; that we are, in fact, seeing in layers and not always or necessarily looking in a focused way and straight ahead, so to speak - that we actually - and perhaps just as much - are seeing in the manner of the chief protagonist in Georges Perec's book, "A Man Asleep". In this passage, he is in the process of doing just this: "You close your eyes; you open them. Virus-like or microbe-like forms slowly glide down over the inner side of your eyelid or on your cornea, disappear, suddenly make their appearance again in the center, almost like before, circles or bubbles, small branches, entangled threads which altogether form something that could resemble a fabulous creature. They disappear one by one, turn up again: you rub your eyes and the threads explode, spreading out." That's the way it is or the way it can be. And, in my mind, the checkered oilcloth continues to turn up among everything else. In this way, these paintings have the capacity to potentially sharpen our consciousness about the manner in which we see.

However, they are also constantly intimating the notion of a center, a middle or a distinctive density, al-

beit they are transitory densities of a kind whose apparent construction of signs and latent figures already points toward their own dissolution and spreading as fluctuating insinuations of possible meanings apprehended in glimpses.

With the paintings that have been discussed here, Bodil Nielsen is presenting her attempts at coming forth with an interpretation of the world and of the way we see the world, which possibly contains aspects of truth, and what is more, without claiming or pretending to do so, a point that is crucial to our interest. Bodil Nielsen's paintings are settling accounts with the notion of a special privileged reality, a special authenticity dwelling behind the surfaces, but they stop short of totally eliminating the notion of such things as such. Instead, her paintings are suggesting that what we have are *several* truths or essences and that we apprehend these as being intertwined with the rest of the layers from which our perception of the world is constructed, including the banal. They are suggesting that elements and aspects of life exist, to a great extent, in relation to others and that we cannot continue to harbor expectations about one single truth beneath the surfaces, which will come to reveal itself behind a fissure in these surfaces but that, on the contrary, it is more likely that one among several truths or constructions of meaning might just come to reveal itself as a glimpse in the ongoing interplay among many more or less fluctuating layers.

Kjeld Vindum / profession ...