

On Felt, Mice and Moths

Change and Permanence in a Work by Joseph Beuys

Tancredi Gusman
tancredi.gusman@uniroma2.it

In November 1970, Joseph Beuys and Terry Fox performed *Isolation Unit* in Düsseldorf in the cellar of the Kunstakademie, an hour-long performance in front of an audience of about thirty people. As in many of Beuys's performances, the relation with (live or dead) animals and the use of natural materials played a crucial role. This is evident by the title he later used for the work: *Action the dead mouse*. During this performance, Beuys wore, for the first time, the felt suit that would later become one of his most iconic art-objects. Felt, like fat, is one of those organic matters recurring in his actions and refers to the warmth of the body, the energy of life. Shortly after the performance, the *Felt Suit* was (re)produced as a multiple in an edition of 100 copies by the Galerie René Block in Berlin. This essay starts with *Isolation Unit* and analyzes strategies for dealing with the organic and inorganic transformations of the multiple that originated from it. In doing so, it investigates contemporary approaches to the preservation of 'ephemeral' works and performance remains and discusses their consequences for the epistemology and ontology of the arts.

Keywords: Joseph Beuys, Felt Suit, Ephemeral Art, Conservation

On Felt, Mice and Moths

Change and Permanence in a Work by Joseph Beuys

Tancredi Gusman
tancredi.gusman@uniroma2.it

With the emergence in the 1960s of dematerialized, process-oriented and performance-based art practices, the idea of the artwork as a material artifact to be collected, preserved and exhibited began to be challenged. Artists' performances shifted the focus from the object onto the action and event, thus radically placing the living body and its ephemerality at the center of artistic activities. Time and ephemerality also became essential for those artists who, in producing art objects, used materials that do not last "forever" and undergo processes of transformation and decay. The natural landscape and the urban environment became the setting of artists' interventions, and their documentation turned into a crucial means for their representation. The broad field of conceptual art, on the other hand, demonstrated how the idea was in fact more important than the material support that conveyed it, be it an artist's publication, a document or any object or media. The shift initiated by these practices and expanded by subsequent developments in contemporary arts has forced institutions, practitioners and art theorists to rethink the ontology of the artwork and, consequently, the epistemology underlying its preservation and care. Over the past two decades, these transformations have led museums to develop and implement new models and procedures to ensure the permanence and transmission of this art heritage, both tangible and intangible. In this essay I will analyze some of the key concepts that have characterized these new approaches by referring in particular to a work by Joseph Beuys and how it altered over time. In doing so, I will outline a possible way of imagining the artwork beyond the exclusive concepts of authenticity and originality.

1. “Action the Dead Mouse” and its remains

On November 24, 1970, at 7 p.m. Joseph Beuys and Terry Fox presented *Isolation Unit* in the cellar of the Kunstakademie in Düsseldorf, an hour-long performance in front of an audience of about thirty people. The action was originally conceived as a solo piece by Fox and only later did Beuys decide to join him. At the beginning of the performance, Fox painted a cross on the cellar floor with the gel used by American soldiers to ignite napalm and set it on fire. He then washed himself with soap and water and amplified the sound of this gesture through loudspeakers. In a corner a candle was burning behind a window frame which was leaning against the wall. On the other side of the room, Beuys carried a dead mouse gently in his hand, showed it to the audience and put it on a tape recorder reel. Then, while Fox struck two iron pipes together and against the window frame, Beuys ate a passion fruit. Following this Fox hit the iron pipes against the floor and Beuys spat the seeds of the fruit into a silver bowl, making this sound resonate against that of the two pipes¹. The actions and signs used by Fox seem clearly to refer to the Vietnam-War and its violence. Joseph Beuys, as Jennifer Mundy remarks in her book *Lost Art*, gave this performance a more general meaning and transformed it into a reflection on death and survival². It is probably for this reason, as Mundy suggests, that Beuys later renamed his contribution *Action the Dead Mouse* – as though it were a sort of requiem for the mouse he was holding during the performance and that had allegedly lived with him for a month³.

As in many of Beuys’ performances, the relation with animals – living or dead – and the use of natural materials played a crucial role in this particular instance. It was during this performance that Beuys wore, for the first time, the felt suit that would later become one of his most iconic art-objects. Felt, usually made of hare or rabbit hair, like fat, is one of those organic matters which recurs in his actions. It refers to the warmth of the body, the energy of life. Felt is an insulating material that protects against freezing and even death, and in the context of this performance it offers a symbolic counterpoint to

¹ This brief description of the performance is based on the reconstructions offered by two sources: U. M. Schneede, *Joseph Beuys, die Aktionen: kommentiertes Werkverzeichnis mit fotografischen Dokumentationen*, Gerd Hatje, Ostfildern-Ruit bei Stuttgart 1994, pp. 306-311, and H. Meister, *Die tote Maus des Joseph B. Eine makabre Zeremonie im Akademie-Keller*, in “Düsseldorfer Nachrichten”, 26 November 1970.

² J. Mundy, *Lost Art: Missing Artworks of the Twentieth Century*, Tate Publishing, London 2013, p. 198.

³ *Ibid.*

the imagery of death and the loss that permeates it, a meaning that is linked to a mythical episode in the biography of the artist. According to Beuys, during the Second World War, his military plane crashed in Crimea and he was saved by a group of nomadic Tartars who protected and treated him by covering his wounded body in fat and wrapping it in felt⁴. Although it has now been proven that this story is untrue and was invented by the artist⁵, it continues – as a myth of origin – to be significant for understanding the symbolic value of the materials he used.

Shortly after the performance, the *Felt Suit* was (re)produced as a multiple in an edition of 100 copies by the Galerie René Block in Berlin. Multiples have a crucial role for Beuys as they were a means of reaching a larger number of people with his work and ideas⁶. Moreover, in its character as an everyday object, the suit evokes another of Beuys' key topics, namely that everyone is an artist and that the human being is a creator. In 1981, the Tate acquired one of these suits for its collection. This item, however, was not destined to last. In 1989, while preparing it for an exhibition, the Tate's conservators discovered that it had been infested by clothes moths⁷. Richard Morphet, former Head of Collections at the Tate wrote a letter to then director Nicholas Serota, an excerpt of which was subsequently published in an essay by Alison Braker and Rachel Barker⁸. In the letter it was stated that the suit «has been eaten away extensively, with two principal results – the shoulders have largely gone, thus exposing the normally invisible white padding on both sides, and the body of the suit as a whole is copiously penetrated by small holes. The latter are readily visible close-to, though from a middle distance the majority of the surface of the suit gives the appearance of being intact, albeit with a strange change in overall texture»⁹.

⁴ See J. Beuys in C. Tisdall, *Joseph Beuys*, The Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum, New York 1979, pp. 16-17.

⁵ See B. H. D. Buchloh, *Beuys: The Twilight of the Idol*, in "Artforum" XVIII/5, 1980, pp. 37-38; and O. Laing, *Fat, Felt and a Fall to Earth: the Making and Myths of Joseph Beuys*, in "The Guardian", 30 January 2016, <https://www.theguardian.com/artanddesign/2016/jan/30/fat-felt-fall-earth-making-and-myths-joseph-beuys>, accessed 19 July 2022.

⁶ See J. Beuys, *Questions to Joseph Beuys*, interview with Jörg Schellmann and Bernd Klüser, in J. Schellmann (ed. by), *Joseph Beuys: Multiples*, Edition Schellmann, München and New York 1985.

⁷ See J. Mundy, *Lost Art: Missing Artworks of the Twentieth Century*, cit., p. 199.

⁸ A. Braker and R. Barker, *Beuys is Dead: Long Live Beuys! Characterising Volition, Longevity, and Decision-Making in the Work of Joseph Beuys*, in "Tate Papers", no. 4, Autumn 2005, <https://www.tate.org.uk/research/tate-papers/04/beuys-is-dead-long-live-beuys-characterising-volition-longevity-and-decision-making-in-the-work-of-joseph-beuys>, accessed 19 July 2022.

⁹ R. Morphet (1989), cited in *Ibid.*

The damage was so severe that the conservators – after fumigation with methyl bromide gas, which killed the moths – concluded that the suit could not be restored or conserved¹⁰. In a video produced years later as part of the project Gallery of Lost Art by Tate, ISO and Channel 4, Patricia Smithen, head of conservation at the Tate at the time of the recording, talks about the discovery of this damaged work with great emotion, almost as if it were the finding of a dead body: «I can't imagine what it would have been like to find that object. I can only imagine that they would have been shocked and devastated. [...] the idea that something would be destroyed like that...I'm actually shaking right now just thinking of it... It must have been horrible [...]»¹¹. Despite the impossibility of restoring the *Felt Suit*, the Tate – which later acquired another suit from this edition – did not remove or destroy it, as if reluctant to accept the 'death' of this multiple.

Braker and Barker have accurately reconstructed the history of this object within the Tate, relying on archival sources and documents¹². Their reconstruction yields substantial information for understanding the challenges this object posed to museum practices. Indeed, the Tate, although aware of the loss, immediately recognized the emblematic value of the suit, albeit reduced to a relic, and did not consider the option of destroying it. At the same time, since it could not be brought back to its original condition, its status remained ambiguous and difficult to define. This is by no means insignificant, because it is precisely such definition of status that governs the rules and procedures that determine the life of an art object within a collection and how it is preserved, accessed and displayed. A few years later, in 1994, artist Jana Sterbak's request to use the *Felt Suit* in an installation designed for an exhibition at the Tate prompted the museum to further clarify the status of this object. Consultation with Heiner Bastian, Joseph Beuys' former secretary, and Eva Beuys, the artist's widow and executor of his estate, led to the conclusion that the *Felt Suit*, as an artwork, had to be considered definitively lost¹³. Furthermore, Eva Beuys denied permission to display it publicly or to access it, even for study purposes, while at the same time emphasizing

¹⁰ *Ibid.*

¹¹ Patricia Smithen in *Lost Art: Joseph Beuys' Felt Suit*, Tate 2015, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wCOOHZENIfY&t=19s>, accessed 19 July 2022.

¹² The brief description of the history of the *Felt Suit* which follows is based on the reconstruction and the sources provided by A. Braker and R. Barker *Beuys is Dead: Long Live Beuys! Characterising Volition, Longevity, and Decision-Making in the Work of Joseph Beuys*, cit.

¹³ See Heiner Bastian (1994) and Eva Beuys (1995), cited in *Ibid.*

that the property had to remain in the possession of the Tate and continue to be registered as such¹⁴. Following this clarification, the Tate proceeded to de-accession the *Felt Suit*, that is to legally remove the object from the museum's collection. This, however, did not lead to its destruction, but to its transfer from the collection to the archive. The *Felt Suit* thus changed status from an artwork to an archival object, a document that provides information about the artwork. The suit is now no longer accessible and remains dormant, buried in an archive box protected from insect infestations. «So at the moment it just exists but doesn't [exist]», as Patricia Smithen sums up¹⁵.

Something similar happened, almost thirty years later, at the Neue Galerie in Kassel: moths damaged another of Beuys' *Felt Suits*, despite the pheromone traps used by the museum to control the environment¹⁶. This, of course, shows that this is not a coincidence, but has to do with the specificity of the living materials used by Beuys: they are organic and fragile materials in which his research on death, survival and the transformation of energy resonates. The transience addressed in the performance with Fox, permeates the very suit worn during the event. Beuys' investigation of the threshold between art and life is echoed in the alteration of the material of this work. In 1973, with regard to his sculptures, the artist stated:

My objects are to be seen as stimulants for the transformation of the idea of sculpture, or of art in general. They should provoke thoughts about what sculpture can be and how the concept of sculpting can be extended to the invisible materials used by everyone [...]

That is why the nature of my sculpture is not fixed and finished. Processes continue in most of them: chemical reactions, fermentations, colour changes, decay, drying up. Everything is in a state of change¹⁷.

How should a museum deal with living works of this kind which are ephemeral because they are *live* or because their own matter *lives*? How should it make sure that their life lasts but at the same time that they are protected from their own transience? How can

¹⁴ See Eva Beuys (1995), cited in *Ibid.*

¹⁵ Patricia Smithen in *Lost Art: Joseph Beuys' Felt Suit*, cit.

¹⁶ *Kleidermotten befallen Beuys-Filzanzug in Kassel*, in "Süddeutsche Zeitung", 11 January 2017, <https://www.sueddeutsche.de/kultur/museen-kleidermotten-befallen-beuys-filzanzug-in-kassel-dpa.urn-newsml-dpa-com-20090101-170111-99-839786>, accessed 19 July 2022.

¹⁷ J. Beuys, [Statement] (c. 1973), in K. Stiles and P. Selz (ed. by), *Theories and Documents of Contemporary Art*, University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles 2012, p. 745.

concepts such as authenticity and originality, which seem to be essential conditions for the recognition of art objects, be applied here?

2. Identity and change in the conservation of ephemeral works

One of the tasks that defines the mission of museums is the conservation of the objects they hold in their original material condition. To this end, and to allow for any restoration work, various procedures are in place which ensure that this original state is determined, and that any changes are tracked. The aim of conservation is therefore to stop the natural processes of transformation, to remove the work from its own temporality and guarantee that it remains unaltered. But how is it possible to preserve the original state of works that are intrinsically determined by their potential to change and unfold over time?

Over the last two decades, this issue has become increasingly urgent in the field of fine arts conservation since performance art pieces and relics, time-based media installations and ephemeral works have started to gain more and more importance in major international collections. This has stimulated a series of developments in both the philosophy and practice of art conservation. One of the essays that first laid the conceptual foundations for a revised understanding of the task and mission of conservation was ‘Authenticity, Change and Loss in the Conservation of Time-Based Media Installations’, published in 2006 by Pip Laurenson¹⁸. Here Laurenson introduced a new conceptual framework that proved to be highly relevant for this wide range of works and thus influenced the subsequent debate on the topic decisively. In her essay, Laurenson shifted the focus of conservation from the preservation of the physical *state* of an art object to the preservation of the artwork’s *identity*.

The concepts of authenticity and originality, in other words, are no longer bound to the material condition of the art object, but to a set of attributes, tangible or intangible, which determine what makes an artwork *what it is*, even when it is subject to transformation or interpretation in the context of re-performances, re-activations or new installations. Laurenson’s starting point for revising the idea of art conservation is the philosophy of music, particularly the work of Stephen Davies and the central role he

¹⁸ P. Laurenson, *Authenticity, Change and Loss in the Conservation of Time-Based Media Installations*, in “Tate Papers”, no. 6, Autumn 2006, <https://www.tate.org.uk/research/tate-papers/06/authenticity-change-and-loss-conservation-of-time-based-media-installations>, accessed 19 July 2022.

assigns to the score: «A performance instances the work if the musician successfully executes the work-identifying instructions (or, at least, succeeds in satisfying a sufficient number of them that the performance is recognizably of the work. [...] a performance of a given work is authentic if it faithfully instances the work, which is done by following the composer's work-determinative instructions as these are publicly recorded in its score»¹⁹. Authentic performances are therefore performances realised according to the artist's instructions and intentions, as they are delivered by the score. Applying this conceptual framework to Time-Based Media Installations, Laurenson introduced a distinction within the artwork itself between the work-defining properties laid down in the artist's instructions (or scores), on the one hand, and the performances and realisations of these instructions, on the other. The mission of conservation then is to ensure that what constitutes the identity of these works, as defined by the artist's instructions, are faithfully maintained through their various iterations or their unfolding over time. A crucial task for museums then becomes that of documenting and capturing, including through interviews with the artist, what the key properties of the work are, so as to assess what changes might erode its identity: «In this conceptual framework the reference 'state' of an object has been replaced with the concept of the 'identity' of the work, which describes everything that must be preserved in order to avoid the loss of something of value in the work of art»²⁰.

Despite major developments in museum practices and theories in recent years, the shift from “state” to “identity” continues to be paradigmatic for contemporary art conservation. Some examples of this are the methods of collection and preservation of performance art. As the essay by Joanna Phillips and Lauren Hinkson (2018)²¹, and that by Louise Lawson, Acatia Finbow and Helia Marçal (2019)²² attest, world-leading institutions such as the Guggenheim and the Tate base their strategies on identifying the essential properties of live works. Procedures are then developed to ensure that these properties are maintained in each new instance of the work while “acceptable” changes

¹⁹ S. Davies, *Musical Works and Performances: A Philosophical Exploration*, Oxford University Press, Oxford 2001, p. 207.

²⁰ P. Laurenson, *Authenticity, Change and Loss in the Conservation of Time-Based Media Installations*, cit.

²¹ J. Phillips, L. Hinkson, *New Practices of Collecting and Conserving Live Performance Art at the Guggenheim Museum*, in “VDR Beiträge zur Erhaltung von Kunst- und Kulturgut”, 1 (2018), pp. 124-132.

²² L. Lawson, A. Finbow and H. Marçal, *Developing a Strategy for the Conservation of Performance-Based Artworks at Tate*, in “Journal of the Institute of Conservation”, XLII/2, 2019, pp. 114-134.

are allowed. As Phillips and Hinkson write: «Just like in time-based media or other forms of variable contemporary art that rely on the interpretation of a work's score, the artwork's identity can be compromised through misinterpretation of the score»²³. Thus, the unit of measurement for determining whether an artwork is authentic and original is the artists' intention and the aesthetic experience they designed.

This conceptual framework allows for a certain degree of change and loss and thus could allow us to respond to the challenge posed by works such as Beuys' *Felt Suit*, which are inherently defined by their mutable nature. In order to measure which material transformations can be acceptable and which would lead to the loss of the work, we would need to capture the properties that make Beuys' *Felt Suit* what it is. However, when we attempt to define the identity of such works, a crucial problem emerges. For both ephemeral works and performance pieces, it seems highly questionable to prescribe from the outset which transformations or interpretations are to be considered as the legitimate unfolding of their "true" identity. Indeed, such a prescriptive approach could reproduce, albeit at a higher level, the very fixity from which it seeks to escape, freezing the ability of these works to generate new meanings and thus remain alive. In particular, if Beuys' *Felt Suit* acquires its significance from a potential negotiation with non-human agents – such as decomposition processes or cloth moths – and the indeterminacy of its outcome, then narrowly determining its identity seems contradictory.

Underlying this model is the idea of an artwork as something finite and complete. Its meanings are assumed to be already fully contained and revealed in the artist's original intention. For this reason, art conservation strategies based on this model highlight the importance of interviewing the artist in order to gather information that can guide institutions to address potential future challenges and scenarios. However, as Andrea Gyorodi observes in relation to Hannah Wilke's *Homage to a Large Red Lipstick* – a case very similar to that of Beuys' *Felt Suit* – the notion of artistic intention is highly problematic, particularly when appearance and intention «have a less straightforward relationship»²⁴ as in the case of works using ephemeral materials. What is more, in

²³ J. Phillips, L. Hinkson, *New Practices of Collecting and Conserving Live Performance Art at the Guggenheim Museum*, cit. p. 127.

²⁴ A. Gyorodi, *Resurrecting Hannah Wilke's Homage to a Large Red Lipstick*, in H. B. Hölling (ed. by.), *Object—Event—Performance. Art, Materiality and Continuity since the 1960s*, Bard Graduate Center, New York 2022, p. 199.

Beuys' case, as Braker and Barker point out, it is not possible to establish exactly what the artist's intention was: «[...]Beuys's position on decay, change, and damage varied from statement to statement, and from piece to piece»²⁵. This observation is also reinforced by Beuys' answer to the question of how one should take care of a *Felt Suit*: «I don't give a damn. You can nail the suit to the wall. You can also hang it on a hanger, ad libitum! But you can also wear it or throw it into a chest»²⁶.

It is clear, then, that in cases such as the *Felt Suit*, in which the artist left no specific guidelines on how to take care of the work, but explicitly stated that he did not «give a damn», it is very complex to determine which changes are consistent with the artist's intention and which might erode the identity of the work. To assess the “essence” of such artworks, it requires highly complex procedures of interpretation that are inherently contextual and contingent. While these procedures can be more or less successfully applied to contemporary works, where the artist participates directly in the process of acquiring the work, they prove to be extremely problematic for the reception of works and documents from the past, where these limits can be defined only after the fact and often only in cooperation with the artists' estates or their heirs. The process of determining the identity of the work and how to care for it becomes highly interpretative. The conservation and care of this artistic heritage can no longer be based on an objective knowledge of the authentic and original state of the artwork, but requires, from those in charge of it, an active approach and choice. As Hanna B. Hölling noted in her introduction to the cutting-edge volume *Object-Event-Performance: Art, Materiality and Continuity Since the 1960s*:

The history of conservation has been marked by taboos and restrictions, including restricting creative intervention. But conservators who interact with works created since the 1960s can no longer forgo creative intervention. Conservation has turned from saving properties and artifacts to preserving ideas and culture, no longer crippling the creative use of the past by turning objects into relics²⁷

²⁵ A. Braker and R. Barker, *Beuys is Dead: Long Live Beuys! Characterising Volition, Longevity, and Decision-Making in the Work of Joseph Beuys*, cit.

²⁶ J. Beuys, *Questions to Joseph Beuys*, interview with Jörg Schellmann and Bernd Klüser, cit.

²⁷ H. B. Hölling, *Introduction: Object—Event—Performance*, in Id. (ed. by), *Object—Event—Performance. Art, Materiality and Continuity since the 1960s*, Bard Graduate Center, New York 2022, p. 26.

This emphasis on conservation as a creative and participatory activity, on the one hand, and on the artwork as temporal relational and mutable, on the other, is crucial in the case of works such as Beuys' *Felt Suit*. But it raises a number of new questions. Hölling, in the conclusion of the introduction, acutely recognizes the need for a new approach to conservation that does not view objects and things as passive matter awaiting human intervention, but as entities with their own agency and generative capacity. On the basis of this understanding, she asks: «How is it being done? [...] Does conservation of agential objects mean allowing them to fully dictate their conditions of care? Would conservation shift entirely into a performative paradigm, leaving aside the dead matter of fixity and authenticity?»²⁸.

3. Identities in transformation: ephemeral works and their histories

It can now be seen that the challenge posed by these ephemeral works is to imagine their identity as the result of a negotiation between the different “actors” that shape their history – whether they are new performers re-enacting a script or, for example, moths inhabiting a suit. Their conservation therefore requires the introduction of an epistemological framework in which the concept of individual authorship is expanded and the ideas of authenticity and originality permit processes of negotiation and interpretation. The *Felt Suit* prompts us to consider the artist's work as the beginning of a trajectory whose subsequent unfolding cannot be fully prescribed from the outset. This does not mean ignoring the artist's original intention but accepting that the identity of the artwork is historical and temporal. The conservation of artworks such as Beuys' *Felt Suit* is thus faced with two seemingly contradictory tasks: on the one hand, making this artwork accessible to future audiences – ensuring that it remains “the same” – and, on the other, allowing it to live on as a generative and transformative force. It is not easy to choose between these alternatives, and the rethinking of this conceptual framework also requires the questioning of the legal frameworks in which intellectual property and the value of artistic productions are understood.

The Tate's decision to transfer the *Felt Suit* from the collection to the archive points us to a possible way for reconsidering the care of these works beyond the task of protecting their “true” original identity. By moving the damaged suit into the archive,

²⁸ Ivi, p. 27.

the Tate not only modifies the object's status, but indirectly underscores the new specific value of the suit. It is no longer the intact material site of Beuys' artwork, and yet it is an object that continues to be significant with reference to this work, as it documents its history and provides information about the nature of its subject matter. Indeed, the damaged suit arguably delivers more insights into Beuys' work than a perfectly intact suit. The damaged suit and the very history of its decay reveal the living substance of the material Beuys used, as well as its fragility and ephemerality. It also shows the interaction between human creativity and nonhuman entities. With respect to Beuys' work, then, this relic offers us crucial information that would not be provided by an otherwise undamaged *Felt Suit*.

The action of the Tate, of course, cannot offer a general solution or model for preserving this kind of artistic heritage. Many of the questions we have addressed remain open, chief among them whether to allow the artwork, once housed in the archive, to decay further or to freeze it at a particular point in time. However, what it does offer is a potential way of seeing the ontology and care of the artwork differently. Indeed, it shows that preserving the identity of a mutable artwork does not necessarily signify limiting its changes but also documenting them as they unfold a specific potential of the work. This shift enables us to look at the permanence of the *Felt Suit* beyond the concepts of authenticity and originality alone. By not destroying the work but rather considering it as a kind of document, the Tate allows the radical change that has occurred within it to generate knowledge about the work itself.

The instruction not to make this damaged work accessible to the public reveals the radical disturbance that this object can cause in the concept of the artwork as a unique creation. The work of art ceases to be considered simply as an individual, finite object and becomes a "history," a complex entanglement of agents, events, and materials. This work is no longer identified merely as a physical object but an intangible heritage that can be preserved and made accessible through an archive which collects documents generated not only by the artist but also by all those agents who relate to it over time, including conservators, curators and – cloths moths. The practical challenges of preserving these works are far from having definitive solutions, and issues such as those raised by Hölling are still open to being discussed. But the revision of the concept of artwork proposed here, in line with the findings of contemporary museum research, can

stimulate and encourage new approaches to the care and conservation of this artistic heritage.