

## Showing more than the eye can see

*A conversation between Franz Gertsch and Gerd Woll*

**Gerd Woll** One question that interests me to begin with is the relationship between painting and graphic art – in our case, the particular issue concerning the role of the woodcut in an artist's oeuvre. First of all, we should note that both Gauguin and Munch created motifs and series of motifs in their woodcuts that cannot be seen in their painting. What about you?

**Franz Gertsch** In my case, it's different. Almost all of my woodcuts show motifs that I have also used in my painted works. But this doesn't mean that the painting always comes first; it can also be the other way round – like when I used a motif for a woodcut first and only later reworked it into a painting.

**GW** Is it right to claim that you already worked with woodcuts early on, right from the very beginning of your artistic career?

**FG** Yes, I made my first linear woodcut (ill. 2) at the age of 17 and continued working on woodcuts until I was about 25. I already tried to perfect the linear woodcut technically back then, working with very fine, thin lines. This deepened my understanding of the material; I learned about the nature and character of wood types. This was helpful when, many years later, I started working on woodcuts again – in an entirely different manner.

**GW** If I remember correctly, your first woodcuts were conceived as book illustrations, right?

**FG** In the broader sense, they were certainly poetic attempts, but more in the sense that the texts interpreted the woodcuts, not the other way round. I wrote the texts retrospectively to complement the woodcuts; all of them were initially only drafts. In the case of the first book, *This und Weit*, a narrative suddenly evolved, a love story.

**GW** A bit like Munch's *Alpha and Omega* series, which of course are lithographs, but Munch only wrote the text afterwards to explain the story.

**FG** The use of graphic prints in narrative and illustrative contexts can also be seen in Gauguin's art; we just have to think of the ten woodcuts in his suite *Noa Noa* (cat. 1–19) that were originally meant to illustrate the ten chapters of the envisaged book, *Noa Noa*. But there is something else that is more important. I see a mutual effort to enhance the



Ill. 1 Franz Gertsch and Gerd Woll  
during the conversation  
22<sup>nd</sup> October 2018, Bern

subtlety and sophistication of a work of art as much as possible through the woodcut, thus revealing the essence of pictures at the very same time as well.

GW And how exactly?

FG I believe that for most artists who considered the woodcut as important – German expressionists, for instance, such as Kirchner – the woodcut tends to embody something starkly rough, something shrill, something meant to produce a simplification and dramatisation of the picture. In the case of Gauguin and Munch, as well as in my own works, I see exactly the opposite: namely, a sophistication and differentiation in terms of artistic expression. Gauguin liked working with extremely fine lines, but also with cloudy and washed-out effects. Both the line and the surface are important for him. The result is a softness and quietness irrespective of the expressive concept.

GW Yes, although your work – which completely avoids any lines – goes beyond the tradition of the expressive woodcut in a very remarkable way. I read that Emil Nolde's oeuvre initially sparked your interest in the woodcut – his print *Prophet* (ill. 3), in particular, which you saw on a book cover. Do you still remember when you first discovered Munch's woodcuts?

FG What I know for sure is that I was already aware of Munch since 1947 at least. I had two teachers: Max von Mühlhelen, who represented abstraction, and then Rudolf Schwarzenbach under whom I studied and who represented realism. He was a true expert of old artistic techniques and had a huge library, which is where I basically studied art history. So I was most likely acquainted with Munch through one of the books in his library. In *This und Weit*, there is a woodcut (ill. 4) – the only one that is negative and in white lines – and I am sure that Munch was the inspiration behind it.

GW What about Gauguin?

FG I learned about Gauguin not until later on. I remember that I had first only seen a catalogue of his artistic work. Then, when I was lucky enough to see originals for the first time, I immediately picked up on the extreme differences in quality in the prints that Gauguin made himself and those produced by his printer and by his son. Indeed, Gauguin was noted not only as a woodcutter but also as a printer. The differences to be seen in his individual prints are enormous.

GW As we know, Munch knew about Gauguin's colour woodcuts. A number of American art historians believe that Munch directly adopted Gauguin's concept of the colour woodcut – which is actually something that I personally doubt.

FG Munch was undeniably the artist who first appealed to me directly; perhaps we both share a certain mutual melancholy. Gauguin is always more spirited and vivacious, even if his woodcuts express certain traits of the dark side of this temperament. In Gauguin's case,



Ill. 2 Franz Gertsch  
*Neujahrsblatt*  
1947  
Woodcut



Ill. 3 Emil Nolde  
*Prophet*  
1912  
Woodcut  
The Museum of Fine Arts, Houston



Ill. 4 Franz Gertsch  
*Wangen wärmen*  
1950  
Woodcut from the series  
*This und Weit*

the difference between woodcuts and paintings is perhaps starkest. Admittedly, his paintings are bright, colourful and sunny, while his woodcuts are often mysterious and gloomy in atmosphere. For the woodcuts of *Noa Noa* (cat. 1–19) as well as the *Vollard Suite* (cat. 24–38), he developed highly original stylistic forms very far removed from his painterly works.

**GW** I see a big difference between Munch and Gauguin. Munch in many ways is a realist.

**FG** Yes, but above all, I find the chromaticity in Munch's woodcuts much more delicate than in his paintings. In the woodcuts, he had to apply the colour onto surfaces, revealing a subtle sense for colour that I sometimes feel is lacking in his paintings. For me, too, that was a great challenge: to combine a realistic light drawing with a monochrome space. Printing with one colour only was also a considerable challenge in this respect. It forced me to develop an affinity for colour that has certainly grown over the course of these woodcuts.

**GW** For both Munch and Gauguin, the artistic technique of the woodcut is ultimately quite simple. It might have taken them one or two hours to make a woodcut. Your works, in comparison, reveal a highly individual, elaborate and complex technical language which – if nothing else – requires an immense amount of time and labour.

**FG** That is true, but I also see a kinship with Gauguin and Munch as individualists and specialists in the art of the woodcut, since all three of us have seemingly developed an entirely distinctive language when applying this technique. There is nothing similar or comparable in our three woodcut oeuvres; they are all somehow uniquely singular.

**GW** Indeed. Although there is something in Munch's work that has always been very important for the woodcut – or for all graphic techniques – and this is producing an entire edition from one motif in order to distribute it more widely. For you, Mr Gertsch, this aspect is certainly unimportant, isn't it?

**FG** In the case of Munch and particularly of Gauguin, I see a strong desire to make the woodcut into an autonomous work, and not just to regard it as a technical means of reproduction. To a certain extent, my woodcuts are monotypes, as there is always only one print in one colour. Each print is unique and one of a kind. As such, the current numbering within the editions is not quite right. As far as I know, Munch was rather negligent with his editions. Many of his woodcuts were not even signed or numbered, which is no longer important as far as the market is concerned. He also continued working on certain plates, thus printing different versions.

**GW** Gauguin experimented very freely in his woodcuts and was always trying out new variations to print; for Munch, too, the woodcut offered boundless opportunities for constant experimentation. You are different, Mr Gertsch, as you strictly obey a precise technique. Both Munch and Gauguin also valued the moment of chance or coincidence in the woodcut in that they liked integrating the wooden plate, its grain, into the pictorial work – using it as a central creative element.



Ill. 5 **Franz Gertsch**  
*Johanna II*  
1985  
Acryl on unprimed cotton  
Hess Collection, Bern/Napa (California)



Ill. 6 **Franz Gertsch**  
*Medici*  
1972  
Dispersion on unprimed linen-cotton blend  
Ludwig Forum für Internationale Kunst,  
Aachen



Ill. 7 **Franz Gertsch**  
*Gräser I*  
1995–1996  
Mineral pigments on unprimed cotton  
Museum Franz Gertsch, Burgdorf

*FG* In my woodcuts, the grain of the wood also comes to the fore at times, such as in *Schwarzwasser* (cat. 49–51). This was not necessarily my intention, but I will admit that there are areas in which the grain does play a part. Obviously not like with Munch, who certainly worked with it; a print like *The Kiss* (cat. 69, 71) comes alive thanks to the dynamics of the grain. I work with bonded lime wood plates; the problem here is that not all of them absorb the colour evenly. So when I print, I have to make sure not to create trails. This can't always be avoided, but the effect somehow animates the works. Interestingly, reproductions in catalogues and books always show these effects more strongly than when we look at the originals.

*GW* The format of your woodcuts is highly significant. They are monumental woodcuts, very rare. I actually don't know of anything comparable. Of course, the difficulties in creating them must be huge – not only the effort required when cutting, but also when printing, right?

*FG* Yes, and there are three answers I give when people ask me why I decided to make such monumental woodcuts. The more poetic answer is that Saint Luke always showed me the way to go when I was stuck. But there is also a somewhat longer answer or explanation. At the last exhibition of my paintings of large female portraits in Basel in 1986, I had the impression that I should try to cover things up more; the presence of the paintings was almost too much for me. I wanted something more subtle and gentler – and so the idea came to me to try the woodcut, which is actually not a very suitable medium for this kind of thing.

*GW* And what is the third answer?

*FG* That one is even more complicated and longer. As I mentioned before, it began with the exhibition of female portraits at Kunsthalle Basel in 1986 – with the portrait *Johanna* (ill. 5). I suddenly had the feeling that I had reached the end of a path that I couldn't take any further. And so I thought of the woodcut. The initial idea was to create a colourful picture using many colour plates. But I didn't find a satisfying solution, because the edge of a colour plate is always shown a bit stronger, and it wouldn't have been possible to run a side plate gently from light to dark without separating it through a contour from the background. As a result, I gave up working with woodcuts for the time being. Back then, I never intended to make woodcuts exclusively for a certain period of time. I was then urged by Jean-Christophe Amman and my gallerist to paint another female portrait, and off I went to New York where I thought I could surely find suitable models. That was a wrong decision. It was also wrong that Maria didn't come along as well, as she often chose the models. In New York, I took photos of two women, one of whom I had seen on stage. Seeing her up close and in front of me, it quickly became evident that she wasn't what I was looking for. Back home, I ended up photographing Natascha, a friend of my son Albrecht.

*GW* You took the photographs yourself?

*FG* Yes, always. I was able to take most of the photographic models of the portraits in Balthasar Burkhard's studio; on one occasion, he also assisted with taking pictures of Doris. Often I wasn't really happy with the results but, for once, with Natascha, the photos produced quite a few useful models.

*GW* As models for a painting? Or were you already thinking of a woodcut?

*FG* When I took the photos, I had a painting in mind – so I started on a big one, three by three metres, and got as far as half of it. In the meantime, the thought of a woodcut evolved, and I tried working on small plates with different tools like these small tracing wheels that tailors use to trace patterns for sewing. But I wasn't satisfied with the result, so I gave the woodcut up for a while. However, I already had three wonderful pear wood plates the size of *Natascha* and one day I projected onto it; I took a gouge with a U-shaped profile and began to cut out dots. I initially still used the old woodcut technique, working with hatchings. The first woodcut of dots was instantly sensational, and the result immediately effective.

*GW* And the print? Did you print it yourself?

*FG* I initially thought that I could print the woodcuts myself. Then Nik Hausmann became involved; I had already made two lithographs with him and he wanted to work with me again. He thought he should print these woodcuts, and so he became the printer who fed the colour into the roller right from the start.

*GW* So he was actually a lithographer. Did he print woodcuts with you for the first time?

*FG* Yes, both of us developed the printing technique together. Everything just fell into place. A carpenter with whom I had already collaborated for picture frames produced the lime wood plates. And Balthasar Burkhard was in Japan at that time, so I asked him to look for large sheets of Japanese paper. In the meantime, I had finished the plate for *Natascha* – 217 by 260 centimetres – and I began to cut the portrait. By mistake, however, I had given Burkhard a smaller format. He rang on Maria's birthday, saying he had found a papermaker who made such big sheets of paper. So Maria and I travelled to Japan where we met Heizaburo Iwano. I had taken a small woodcut of *Natascha* along, and he sent his craftsmen to fetch a large sheet of paper. It was incredible. An edge of 18 centimetres remained: the perfect, exact size.

*GW* These papers are very thick, aren't they?

*FG* Yes, they are rather thick. In Kyoto, we discovered a shop for colours, mineral colours and semi-chemical ones, a thousand different colours. That was where I chose the colours for the *Natascha* series, a series of eight rainbow colours. There is also a blue series ranging from light turquoise to dark ultramarine, also eight impressions.

*GW* What did you use to mix the pigments with – oil?

**FG** There is this so-called transparent white, a white glaze to mix and brighten print colours that lithographers also use: a honey-like, colourless substance. We found out that it is well suited for coloured woodcut printing. We then made the first print, *Natascha IV* (cat. 43). For the first try, I used a machine-made Japanese paper, which is very thin and which easily took up the colour. We had round bamboo rods clad in leather with which we wanted to make the print. Unfortunately, the result looked like a flaked fresco, with lots of empty areas and only occasionally a successful spot. We then decided to use magnifying glasses to manually press the paper onto the plate and that worked.

**GW** To begin with, you also worked with several plates, didn't you?

**FG** Yes, *Natascha IV* was printed using three plates: a first plate with the light drawing, then a second one with the same colour, but much more transparent, into which I cut the highlights, and another one for the silhouettes complementing the other two.

**GW** Were all cut with the gouge?

**FG** Yes, always the same size. I also wanted to continue in the same vein with *Dominique* (cat. 44) but it simply didn't work – until I realised that the first plate already says and encompasses everything. From then on, I always worked with one plate only. The perfect synthesis between light drawing and colour space already existed, which had been my wish in the first place. Only the woodcut allowed me to be successful in this way, not painting.

**GW** This delicate, matt and subtle sense for colour brings me back to Munch's woodcuts. We once checked out if he, like the Japanese artists, might have used water-based ink, but found that he most likely used ink diluted with turpentine. Have you ever worked with water-based ink for your woodcuts?

**FG** No, the paper is not suitable, as it would soften; and when rolling, a process that takes one whole hour for these formats, the watercolours would dry too quickly. The transparent white that I use is a kind of oil glaze. The advantage is that the oil is not squeezed out at the edges, as in some woodcuts by Baselitz, for instance.

**GW** Your woodcuts are also incredibly resistant to light, meaning that the first ones still look as though they were printed only yesterday.

**FG** Yes, I always have endless discussions on this with museum conservators. They simply don't want to accept that both the paper and the colours are incredibly stable. I have a woodcut that has been hanging in my conservatory at home for decades, exposed to direct sunlight in some seasons, and you can't see the slightest change in colour. The pigments are absolutely lightfast. And there isn't just a thin layer of colour on the paper; on the contrary, the colour has been rolled deep into the paper.

**GW** What a pity that museums don't know about this, otherwise your woodcuts would probably be displayed more often.

**FG** Fortunately, there are a few museums on an international level where the woodcuts are on display quite often if not permanently.

**GW** It's different with Munch and Gauguin. The quality of some of their papers is simply very bad. Munch always just used what he happened to have at hand and could purchase. But let me return to the motifs. We have already mentioned that, with Gauguin, there is a clear distinction between the motifs he used in his woodcuts and those in his paintings. Although one is certainly able to find certain similarities, parallels, etc., this does require some effort. But I do see a very important correspondence between Gauguin, Munch and Gertsch, especially in terms of the paintings of the 1970s: with all three artists, there is the element of narrative – we see people in a room, in a context, in an environment. The people are part of a narrative, and the relationship and the tensions between the people nourish the picture.

**FG** That's true, but dramaturgy, psychology and this kind of narrative were hardly of interest to me as far as the woodcuts were concerned. If anything, I tried to develop my pictures in the direction of timelessness. In the portraits, I gradually began to leave out attributes that would assign the models to a certain period. That had already been the case in the portraits of *Johanna*, and I then continued this in the woodcuts. In the woodcuts, you find portraits and landscapes; there is a nude and, in one single case, there are two figures in the landscape, *Saintes-Maries-de-la-mer*.

**GW** You initially transferred the female faces from the paintings to the woodcuts, didn't you?

**FG** Exactly, that was *Natascha* (cat. 43) and I continued with *Doris* (cat. 45). And then came *Rüschegg* (cat. 47–48), which was in fact my very first landscape. A landscape entirely in the spirit of the 19th century, *paysage intime*, there is no amplification, a sharpness ranging from the detail in the foreground right up to the sky. I exhibited the woodcut, together with the female portraits, at Musée Rath in Geneva for the first time in 1989 – and the criticism was fierce. The critics felt you couldn't do that, that it was romantic escapism and so on. Today it's different. These landscape woodcuts have increasingly been appreciated, especially by photographers such as Balthasar Burkhard. And Thomas Struth told me that they were influential for the development of his jungle pictures.

**GW** This leads us to another question: your work is largely based on photographic preparatory work. To what extent do you regard photography as an autonomous art? Did you ever play with the idea of making photographs into art works?

**FG** That is a difficult question. We have generally got used to the idea by now that photography is an art form. For me, a brilliant photo in a magazine is just as much 'art' as large-format works exhibited in museums. I once asked Balthasar Burkhard about the difference.

He said that if you claim it is art, then it becomes art [laughs]. I believe that a critical point of view will always be necessary.

**GW** Have you ever been interested in 19th-century photography, which is much gentler in its tonal gradation and subtlety than contemporary photography?

**FG** Yes, if you look at the originals, it's amazing to see the extent of tonal variations found in them.

**GW** But you always start with photos that you take yourself. Is there a fundamental ambition in your work, both in the paintings and the woodcuts, to outperform photography in the differentiation of the representation?

**FG** Yes, always, that's correct. Photography, which is considered as the most realistic form of representation, is actually quite clumsy and coarse. If you look at the photographic original for my large painting *Medici* (ill. 6), for example, and then compare it with the painting, you will see what I mean. Take the little wall at the side: on the photo, that's a grey area, but on the painting, the wall flickers in all kinds of colours. Or take the hair ...

**GW** In this respect, the label of 'photorealism' often associated with your work seems wrong, as your intention is not to attain photography.

**FG** To begin with, 'photorealism' is a dreadful expression – and whoever looks at the development of my work will immediately notice that the essential is not captured by the term. In your opinion, how did Munch do it, as he also made use of photography?

**GW** He said that the camera cannot compete with the brush and palette – as long as it cannot be used in heaven or in hell.

**FG** My use of photography has also developed. People still claim that I work with projections in the studio, but this has no longer been the case for some time now. In the beginning, I made a colour sketch using projection, and I then worked on it separately in natural light. From the *Jahreszeiten* [Seasons] pictures onwards, I exclusively used projection to make a linear preparatory drawing in coloured pencil. For the woodcuts, I also only sketch a white line under the projection, and then I use it to control the relationship or the values between light and dark.

**GW** So what would be a more accurate term than 'photorealism' to characterise your works?

**FG** The term 'magic realism' has also been suggested, which is of course another historic category that has already been allocated artistically. But it wouldn't even fit because, if at all, it is nature – the reality that I wish to depict – which is magical and mystical, and not the picture that I make of it. My contribution is to find models and templates that reflect it.

It might be due to my individual character that, during this process, something magical and mystical can then be found in the pictures.

**GW** Your relationship to nature is somehow also what establishes your affinity to Munch. For Munch, landscape is always more; it is an expression of atmosphere and emotion. We tend to underestimate just how important landscape subjects were for Munch. Perhaps he had an anticipation of what he wanted to paint; but the idea did not turn into a picture until he had found the landscape that could express what met his initial intuition to create the picture.

**FG** That is certainly true for me as well. As I said, it was very difficult to find the right models for the female portraits, but my wife Maria helped a lot with this. When I began to use photography for my art, I did this with the intention to detach the works from my very strong subjectivity. In comparison to my early works, this might have been successful. Of course, I also noticed that the moment you reach for the camera, you already release a chain of subjective motions. The objective lens, indeed, has a given objectivity. That is the reason why I reduced my subjects, the models for my woodcuts, to such a significant degree: you only have the women, the grass, the butterbur, the forest path and the Schwarzwasser. I didn't need anything else up to now. With the exception of the forest path that I came upon in Tuscany, all the other motifs are models that I found in the vicinity of my house. Harald Szeemann once said that the painter only had to step out of his front door, and there he would find the whole world.

**GW** But for you, details are important – in other words, the augmentation of reality does play a part.

**FG** Exactly. The grass, for instance, is in reality approximately 40 by 40 centimetres. I made a first enlargement, from which I then chose two excerpts for the painting. In the woodcut, interestingly, we have an enlargement that almost entirely corresponds to the faces, roughly ten times the size, which is the same with *Pestwurz* [Butterbur] (cat. 54). The latest painting that I finished shows only one leaf of it, roughly three by four metres.

**GW** Patience is essential for the enlargement process and is something that your method requires, especially for the woodcuts. How long do you work on one big plate?

**FG** The times when I don't work are also important for me – when I'm searching for and preparing the next picture. There are always periods of three or four months when I am not actually working, but am searching and making projections instead. Pictures from my archive, incidentally. I don't really take photos anymore and so I look at hundreds of pictures, some of them again and again, until I am convinced of a photo that it could be a model and would justify the work of one year. From 2000 onwards and up until today, I have been able to make just over one work a year, be it a painting or a woodcut.

**GW** Perhaps you might know that, in the past years, the Munch Museum in Oslo has held a series of exhibitions showing works of contemporary artists alongside works by Munch.

*FG* Really? Who were they?

*GW* I rather wanted to ask what it means to you to be exhibited together with Munch and Gauguin.

*FG* Above all, it is naturally a great honour. If someone would have told me when I was twenty years old that I would one day be exhibited alongside Munch and Gauguin ...

*GW* You are on the way to becoming a classic. I have heard that there are plans for the publication of a catalogue raisonné of your oeuvre.

*FG* Yes, actually two catalogues: the first on the graphic work is being compiled by Rainer Michael Mason, an eminent expert with whom I have often collaborated; and then there will be an oeuvre catalogue of the paintings published by Museum Franz Gertsch in Burgdorf in cooperation with the Swiss Institute for Art Research (SIK-ISEA). Splitting the project into two catalogues is in fact not necessarily ideal because, as we have discussed, the artistic development within my oeuvre always sways between painting and woodcut. You only understand the development when you see both. Woodcuts make way for paintings and paintings lead to woodcuts.

*GW* What are you working on at the moment?

*FG* I am working on a new painting, the fifth of the *Gräser* [Grass] pictures, but my approach is totally different this time. For me, every new picture has to be a new challenge; what is new now is the fact that I have sketched the whole picture in a linear style, following a detail in a poor-quality photo of *Gräser I* (ill. 7). I really had to work long and hard to obtain the geometric format. To sketch the entire picture in a linear style was a totally new way of working, and I then coloured all of the black background. Now I feel free to embellish the picture in terms of colour. Following this, I would like to make a picture using nothing else but blue – everything in lapis lazuli only.

*GW* What I am also interested in is the way that you alternate using tempera and acrylic in your paintings. Can you explain this?

*FG* You are right, I do switch between tempera and acrylic. Acrylic paint dries very fast, both an advantage and a disadvantage; it means that you can't change anything later. In *Frühling* [Spring] (ill. 8), I used tempera again. Tempera lets you dissolve the colour within two hours again in order to create a softer contour, for example.

*GW* But never with oil paint?

*FG* No, I wouldn't be able to use oil to paint onto the coarse cotton that I use. The cotton would become brittle. Of course, there is also a bit of oil in the tempera emulsion, but I ultimately prefer painting with water.

*GW* Let's return to your woodcuts; I was wondering if the grid pattern technique formerly used to reproduce photos was an inspiration for your unique woodcutting technique.

*FG* If you like, but the grid pattern technique is certainly not mechanical; it is done by hand. The great thing is that I only use a single instrument. There is only one decision: do I use one point of light or none. I also can't make any corrections, there are no pentimenti, every prick must be right.

*GW* And if you are unhappy with the result? Is it possible to cut out a part of the plate and replace it with another one?

*FG* No, that's not possible. Jean-Christoph Amman has occasionally asked me to exchange a part of a woodcut. When I told him that this wasn't possible, he said: OK, then it's a masterpiece with a flaw! You should know that the plate is not a negative, it holds a positive light drawing; but in the prints – that's what is so great – everything becomes much clearer.

*GW* I still have a slightly basic question. How do you prevent the woodcuts from rendering the reverse image of the paintings with the same motif?

*FG* [Laughs] Ha, that's easy. All I do is insert the slide laterally reversed.

*GW* One last question remains. In terms of your works, can we really speak of woodcuts – or are they more wood engravings, as some art historians claim?

*FG* Well, a wood engraving is when an etcher's needle is used on end-grain wood. That's how Gauguin worked. But as I have explained, I work with a gouge on long-grain wood – so you should subsequently speak of woodcuts.

*GW* And still one final question concerning genres. Why do we not find the genre of the still life in your work – as in Munch's, but unlike Gauguin's work?

*FG* I certainly understand your question, but for me the answer is simple: in this kind of enlargement, a jug, a bottle, a bowl of fruits or the like do not make any sense and are simply unattractive. It's about showing more than the eye can see, but only if there is more to see.

The conversation (held in German) took place in Bern on the 22<sup>nd</sup> October 2018.



III. 8 Franz Gertsch  
*Frühling*  
2011  
Egg tempera on unprimed cotton  
Collection of Dr. h. c. Willy Michel