

Answers

I started taking pictures when I was eleven. It was better than playing the piano, as I did not disturb the neighbours with it. They were always saying, stop this, it's too loud. I think my childhood was revolving around not disturbing anyone. I was very lonely, and I hid behind the camera; it was for me like a playmate, a dog.

Later it became a video camera. The sound allured me to the movie video camera. I got one so I could use music.

In my childhood dreams, spaces moved, shrunk, pulled apart. There was one dream, when I am running in the Trousseau street, in Paris, and after the corner, I am in Nádudvar. And everybody is near, everybody is at hand, immediately. I do not see space even today, awake, completely as it is in reality, because I hardly see in three dimensions for a defect of one of my eyes. So I always have to find out how things are there. I know, for example, that the dog is behind the table now, because that is logical at the moment. I would say, 'I see in layers'. For me reality is what really happens, what we think is happening, and what happens in our memories. So these three layers are mixed, in a Cubist way.

This morning, in the kitchen, I suddenly saw from the corner of my eye that something was moving. I got very frightened, because a cat was there. Then I realized it wasn't a cat, because only its movement, the type of the movement was similar to a cat. It was the steam coming from the bread I got out of the stove before. I would also call this a misunderstanding, although this word is not fitting enough. The point is the way how I analyse the movement of things. For me, the cat and the steam can be the same, I can replace, substitute things to express something, either this or the other plays a part: they mean the same to me. Because of the identity of the movement.

I do not set out to work that I have an idea that I then realize. I record the material, but the real job, the build-up begins at editing. Then I am looking for what is it I will recognize. I import the material to the computer and start experimenting. I try everything that comes to mind, without censoring. Then I analyse, and so on... So I much more recognize things than I would know what I want. This is why it takes six-eight months for me to make a video, because I have to read a dreadful amount of books to recognize things. I can read anything about anything. Even things that are very far from me. Scientific works, because it intrigues me how others lead a thought to its end, what parameters they talk about, and it tells about the way they think. Or, I can read the technical documentation incomprehensible for me of a complicated machinery. Misunderstanding, that I misunderstand things, is very-very important to me.

Let's say I read a book on neurology, which is not written in my language, but in a very accurate and coded language, from which I hardly understand anything, and certain things I probably misunderstand.

It may seem that now I am talking about only misunderstandings or situations where something, which is known, becomes momentarily unknown, what's more, it is common; so about unexplainable, moreover, about things unrelated to my work. Now, it may have something to do with seeking, interpreting a movement.

I also include with misunderstanding an 'error' like once I wanted to cross the street in Bordeaux and was waiting for the light to change to green. I turned slightly to the right and saw a pregnant woman standing beside me. Then I turned back and suddenly heard a baby cry. I got frightened: how could I hear the baby crying in her belly? I did not realize that there was a baby behind her. The 'error' was that for a moment I thought that the crying from the belly could be heard.

I always work on what I do not yet know, what more I could find out. Something I could see differently. So, I do not remain in a known form, but always try to add one or two things. For me art is being a perpetual student and teacher. For me it's about learning and transmission, passing things on.

I think I do not want to communicate anything with my videos. I am not in a register from which I could send concrete messages. Rather, I want to open spaces for the thoughts of the viewer. I would like questions to be born in the viewer that would then become tools. It doesn't matter, what kind of tools, just tools that can be used for something.

When I was a little child, either my mother practiced or my father, so I had to have fun with what I could, and at most of the times that was sound. I listened and drew pictures one after the other while my mother played the trombone. Or I sat on the windowsill and listened to the trolley bus. I don't think that was dullness, it was searching, how one can entertain the self when almost everything is beyond their reach. And that didn't disturb anyone, listening didn't. Things had to be done quietly.

I feel myself much more a researcher than an artist. I rather search than send messages.

I would like to demonstrate that thinking can be done differently, at a different pace. Experimenting is important for me: exploring new areas of perception. I really feel that there exists a chain in explorations, and if I can become a link in

that, that would be enough for me. I still cherish the illusion that there may be a better world.

Someone told me about one of my videos that it was good, but too long, and stopped paying attention it in the middle. Maybe something is needed there, as a little bell in the Buddhist monasteries which is moved by the master so the monks do not drift away during meditating. I said: I trust the viewer, I trust that they can tinkle that little bell for themselves. That is, something suddenly jerks them back. I am also interested in that something that jerks them back. What is that density that persuades the viewer to stay. Like suspense in the Hitchcock movies. You can learn very much if you watch the viewers how they watch the videos.

The pace of watching can also be changed by getting the viewer in another physical position. Because one thinks differently while laying, running, sitting or standing. Consequently, the speed can be different when watching something vertically or horizontally.

Whether music is necessary for my movies, I decide on the information content and the space density of the images. Sometimes even that may be tiresome for the viewer that their eyes understand what they see, and music would just make understanding more difficult, while in other cases it would overdramatise the sight.

I make black-and-white videos, and even if there are colours, the movies look monochrome. When colours appear, they distract me, and I cannot compose. I cannot read space, I do not understand it. Information abounds. It is all too chaotic for me. So I have to simplify the sight for myself that I can understand it, only then can I begin something. Just as a proportional reduction equally reflects the difference and the sameness, sight will have to be compatible with that my brain can bear. For example, I can enjoy Rothko because even though it is in colour, his surfaces alloy a proportion of difference and sameness by which I can understand colours.

Colours call something very different to my mind. Let's say, I always loved to sing, but I was terribly shy, and still am, so I never sing in front of others. On the other hand, when I edit, and do not sing, I cannot get hold of the rhythm of the editing. So colours would mean this to me. Singing. Or the movement, gesture, rhythm. I conduct in the editor room when I am seeking when the next image should come. Or breathing, because I also use this, as one breathes so I try to edit the film.

When I think about colours, that is, compose with colours, and not with forms, then always some kind of a cliché comes out of it. Colours are so tempting that importance melts, disappears in them. I try to steer clear of everything tempting. So is swiftness, and so is narration.

My dreams are not colourful, either. Occasionally they are coloured, though, like movies, but I only see if the picture is close or far. I see the camera movements, because it is always 'filmed' what I dream.

Even in my memories, not colours, but much more sounds come forward, sounds are recorded. The accent. How people speak. And the faces. Micro-movements. I am very susceptible to micro-movements. The way an eyebrow raises then descends.

On a video, everything is visible. Not only the picture, but how I breathe in, which muscle I stretch. And all this has to be learnt. Just like a pianist to practise scales. Precisely learn the instrument.

When alone, I speak to myself. The book that I read serves that the written sentences resonate with my own sentences. So I recognise my thoughts in the thoughts of others, and continue building this way.

The works that I like most of the time I like because they raise thoughts in me, and not because they are good. A poor piece of work can also assist me in starting in a direction.

When I hear or read words that I do not know or do not know exactly their meaning, then, automatically, images appear for me. This happens mostly when I even cannot explain that word to myself with other words. But by the images created in this manner, useful material is born for me.

I always work on three-four projects simultaneously, because the question thrown up by one of the films may be answered by the other. Or, gives birth to additional questions.

Questions take you further than answers. And unanswered questions beget subsequent questions, and again, subsequent thoughts. The answer terminates. With an answer one stops. The road is interesting.

Whom to film is determined by who is that I would like to spend time with. Most of the times the style of the video comes from the individuality of the person whom I am portraying. More precisely, from what I imagine the person to be. I try to 'tailor' the film to this person.

When I shoot, it does not matter what will be on the picture, it will be when two dancers move together. A duet. Making a film is very intimate. When I dance with the camera, I can use my movements, my body, my sensuality. The camera begins in my feet, as they touch the ground, and I make the film with my whole body, my breathing. Most of the times my hand knows how to move, it is not me 'giving the orders'. It is much faster, when my hand already feels what to do, than me thinking something over, that is, respond with my whole body to what's happening. But it is also possible that while the body is in the present, then the brain is in the future as it foresees.

I think I tried to insert the third dimension, spatial depth, I my films by music, as for me everything happens in two dimensions because of the defect of my eyes. Usually my father makes the music for my films. Most of the times it happens that I tell him over the telephone what there is on the image, and he instantly knows what density is needed in the music. He does not see the film, but feels what it's about. It also happens that he improvises watching the film, like in the case of *Meet Me (T)here*. We started working together with this work on the application of movement-intelligence, that is, the knowledge of the body, the memory of the body in creation. He had long been in the research of movement-intelligence via the design of digital musical instrument, and I tried to respond with movement to what was happening in front of the camera. We met in the processing of time. This video is totally our joint work.

Meet Me (T)here was also an experiment, experiment at trying the 'intelligent coincidence'. We discussed with the dancer before the shooting that I prepare a ten-minute empty camera movement, and he a ten-minute dance, to see what happens when these two things meet. When two people 'know' their body very well, one a dancer in dancing, the other a filmmaker with the camera, how could that be reached that they forget automatism, that new things arise. So, how automatic things can be played down by placing intense concentration somewhere else than it usually is. For example, if I make a ten-minute empty camera movement, and then do it all over, then I do not concentrate on what the camera is filming, but on making the planned movement correctly. This way the picture will have a totally different content. Here, in front of the camera coincidence prevailed, while later at the editing, the consequence stemming from this coincidence.

Motion for me is a change in condition. Perhaps that how elements add together. Or how they cover each other. Blurring. Or something of the kind. And that something happens between two points. It seems, it is close to what I think about time. Motion is close to time.

What I like in time is that there are so many different things in it. The presence of simultaneity and consequentiality. In time, things can be moved in all directions.

I sort of feel that, maybe because I am very timid, maybe because I remember having that said to me in my childhood, that I mustn't speak too loud, either say what I think, in my videos, because I speak about time, or because something resembling this happens, on account that I can talk about things so anonymously, I can and I do tell what I have on my mind. Because time does not have a face.

For me the language of love is Hungarian. I read literature in French. I can speak about my work, art the best in English, even if I use the language incorrectly. I think, now there is not a language I could properly speak.

Things always change, and the way we think about them also changes. This is good, too, this movement.

(The answers were responses to Judit Scherter's questions, who then translated them from a nonexistent language. Simon Molnár translated from that to English.)