

SS: The different elements of this sculpture seem to adopt anthropomorphic qualities in the way they interact with each other but in the same time they never give up their very clear objecthood. How do you keep this balance?

I think this comes from growing up with mass-produced knick-knacks as the only representation of art. Ceramic elephants, bronze ducks, piggy banks, generic landscape photos, etc... etc... all arranged on shelves together. I remember looking at them and constructing both narrative and non-narrative relationships between them. I assumed that they were, in fact, connected somehow but I was never certain so I would continue to go back and study them trying to uncover their connection. Certain themes would emerge-similar materials, forms – but other themes involved secret meanings; how do these objects relate? Are they culture signifiers or cryptic messages? It is very much like a theatre production in which characters all work off each other to create a tension that leads into a narrative, yet each character has an internal world that they individually occupy.

SS: What is the relationship between crafted objects and the insertion of ‘ready-mades’?

I guess I could argue that everything really is a “ready-made,” just that some are more manipulated than others. I use whatever materials or forms are necessary for the sculpture to work but I am also aware of the tradition of ready-mades and their relationship to popular culture, nature vs. culture. The natural vs. man-made contrast is a construct that feels very outdated.

Relatively recently, after having spent more time away from NY and in more rural environments, I have been interested in our relationship to landscape and seeing it also as ‘ready-made’ in how we experience it.

MDJ: What role does "utility" play in your sculpture?
Shelves, chairs, lamps, etc....?

Well first I should say that I've never liked the idea of art as something that exists "outside" of our lives, which is exactly what sculptures, paintings, drawings traditionally do.... so in various works over the past few years it seemed very logical to incorporate things that exist "inside" our lives into my work, like lamps and chairs. Then I began exploring the relationship between a shelf and the art object it holds... if the shelf is not part of the art, then it's a non-art object and exists inside our lives; if the shelf is part of the art, then its meaning exists outside of our lives again. So the furniture - or utility - in my sculptures exists in that space inside our lives. I know that sounds as though the sculpture is moving away from art, and I'm aware that there's a quandary there, but it's one I find thoroughly engaging.

MDJ: We have spoken about Theatre in relationship to your work. How important is the figure in your work?

I think I addressed this in Simone's first question, but specifically in regards to the figure it's something that also is relatively new to my work. I've been working off maquettes (architectural models) to explore space and scale, and when the figure is introduced, it really changes how we interact and understand sculptural space and scale. The figurative elements of Giacometti's *Palace at 3 AM* are a good example. If you could picture that sculpture without the bird form and the human form, it would completely alter not just the narrative meaning of the work, but our physical relationship to it. So with the furniture, or "utility" there is one level of understanding space and then with the figurative elements I feel there is another that almost cancels out the first level of understanding. Architectural models aren't things that exist within our lives-they are signifiers of something somewhere else, and of potential- while the "utilitarian" does the opposite, the figure turns both understandings of space around and towards the other.