



Tate Research

The Studios at the Barbara Hepworth Museum and Sculpture Garden, St Ives

Developmental Seminar, 20–21 May 2013

Report

Introduction

The developmental seminar saw the launch of a Tate Conservation project, funded through the Esmée Fairbairn Collections Fund, with additional support from Friends of Heritage Preservation, to restore and preserve the plaster and carving studios at the Barbara Hepworth Museum and Sculpture Garden in St Ives.

The developmental seminar, overseen by **Nigel Llewellyn** and convened by **Helena Bonett** on behalf of Tate Research, was intended to tackle the various issues involved in intervening in such a space. The purpose of the event was not to make decisions about the conservation plan but to discuss possibilities and set out options for the project steering group. The main part of the seminar took place at Tate St Ives with time also spent at the Hepworth Museum viewing the studios.

After identifying the research questions and overarching themes for the seminar, participants from a wide range of disciplines were selected to address those themes.

Day One

The seminar began with an introduction from **Mark Osterfield** (Tate St Ives) on the significance of the Hepworth Museum to Tate, followed by **Nigel** and **Helena** on the seminar itself, and an introduction to the conservation project by **Deborah Potter** (Tate) and **Melanie Rolfe** (Tate).

Session One: Introduction and History

Sophie Bowness (Hepworth Estate) gave a presentation addressing the **history of the carving and plaster studios**. Through the use of archival photographs, Sophie provided an overview of the history of these two studios, as well as Trewyn Studio itself, both during Hepworth's lifetime and since.

Sophie traced Hepworth's working practice after she acquired Trewyn Studio in September 1949, and how her use of different areas at Trewyn evolved. Sophie argued that the carving studio and yard should be thought of together and were used consistently in a way that other studios at Trewyn were not.

Sophie showed the carving studio before it was redeveloped in 1957, at which time the roof was raised to the same height as the plaster studio and ten-foot doors with windows on the front were installed. At the end of 1960 Hepworth bought the Palais de Danse opposite Trewyn. After she broke her femur in 1967, Trewyn became again the centre of her creative life. She did no wood carving after 1969.

After Hepworth's death, in accordance with her wishes, Trewyn Studio was turned into a museum by her son-in-law Sir Alan Bowness. He wanted Trewyn to retain its atmosphere

of an artist's house and workplace rather than a museum. The display in the carving studio was kept as much as possible as it was when Hepworth died, specifically as a stone-carving space. Sir Alan Bowness shaped the look of the plaster studio more to make it coherent. A clear separation in terms of materials was made between the two studios to make for clarity of presentation.

There are two sets of photographs that record the studios shortly after Hepworth's death: Studio St Ives took a series in July 1975 and Sir Norman Reid took a series in early January 1976. Reid showed these photographs to the Tate Trustees on 15 January 1976 to report on progress on the setting up of the Museum (a set of these photographs is in the Tate Archive).

The July 1975 photographs reveal that the plaster *Delos II* was in the carving studio when Hepworth died and was moved into the plaster studio later in the year to form the centrepiece of that studio's museum display. Other carved stones were moved closer to one another in the carving studio arrangement.

A selection of stone-carving tools was placed by the window, for audience visibility. Hepworth's assistant George Wilkinson selected these under supervision from Sir Alan Bowness, and some tools were brought over from Hepworth's other studio, the Palais de Danse. Nothing was placed in the studios that had not been in them at some point in the past.

The plaster studio after Hepworth's death was quite empty. It was repopulated with a selection of tools placed in the window and unfinished plasters from different periods taken from the Palais store to join those already in the studio, therefore showing how Hepworth's working methods in plaster changed.

In the **response** afterwards, **Chris Stephens** (Tate Britain) highlighted how this case was different from the preservation of the Bacon or Brancusi studios in that the Hepworth Museum and the two studios are displays of her work that just happen to be there. **Helena** added that the studios are set up for an audience viewing them from the window, so *Delos II*, for instance, faces out of the window. Helena also added that as we will be thinking about replicas during the course of the seminar, it is worth remembering that Hepworth made replicas of her earlier work (although they were works in their own right), such as *Delos II* being a reworking of the wood carving *Oval Sculpture (Delos)* 1955, which was splitting. **Chris** noted the lack of didactic material in the Museum; how, for example, the complex physical history of *Delos II* is not explained, and how the objects we see have various roles and functions, but these are not explained.

Sara Matson (Tate St Ives) added that there were so many possibilities for interpretation in the Museum because visitors come with such varied expectations. Sara reported that she had asked the Visitor Services staff to ask for visitor feedback on the studios over the last week and that it had been difficult to find anything negative. Many visitors were surprised that the studios survive, as they anticipated that they were lost in a fire, and were also interested that Hepworth was involved with the curating of the space itself. When Norman Pollard (former employee of the Museum during the 1980s and 1990s) gave tours to visitors he was able to tell stories that linked back directly to the space when it was active, although some of these are historicised myths.

In Sir Alan Bowness's guide to the Museum there are quotations from Hepworth's will about how the Museum should be laid out. However, **Sophie** said this must be a document associated with the will because the will itself is less prescriptive. The will states that she wanted 'Trewyn to be used and enjoyed as a museum or showplace for

public exhibition, for education purposes of selected items that the Trustees select and any other of my works, tools or equipment suitable.'

Discussion

Anne Wagner (University of York) found it interesting that the studios were separated by medium, which takes away from the idea of process. She added that oral histories should be recorded now. **Sara** said there was the [Memory Bay](#) project, which records St Ives stories. **Martin Clark** (Tate St Ives) asked whether we are trying to tell the story of a twentieth-century woman sculptor, who works in plaster and wood and bronze and lived in St Ives, or are we trying to tell the specific story of Hepworth's working practice, rather than her as a symbol for something else? **Chris** noted that Hepworth might have wanted to preserve the quality of the place as well as the story of her working process. **Tim Edensor** (Manchester Metropolitan University) said we should encourage multiple narratives, so there is no 'official' narrative, and we should also not fix the spaces, to make them more fluid. It is also not possible to pin down the 'authentic'; there are multiple forms of 'authenticity'. **Anne** said that narratives are motivated by the tellers. Is the artist part of this? Do objects speak? **Martin** said that Hepworth was 'self-curating' during her lifetime and was concerned with how she was interpreted.

Melanie said she was interested in the relationship between the carving studio and the yard and how the garden has impinged upon the yard. **Claire Pajaczkowska** (Royal College of Art) said we should preserve the stillness of the space and try to unfold what constitutes the 'magic' of the space. The paradox is that the studios are about process, which Hepworth considered of great importance. The studios are liminal spaces between nature and culture, life and art. **David Paton** (University of Exeter) brings his carving students to the Hepworth Museum and finds that the studios emphasise both activity and stillness; the studios are quite small, but Hepworth's career was monumental. **Anne** found a contrast between the deadness of the studios as they are now and the aliveness of their past; what kinds of aliveness can they have now? **Jackie Heuman** (Tate consultant) said that audiences have an emotional, romantic response to the studios. **Martin** added that the studios were fixed but they were also decaying, so emphasising the sense of loss and death. **Tim** said that we should consider the agency of other materialities in the space, the effect of the walls and trees on the sound and how these things produce an atmosphere and sensuality.

Session Two: Status of the Studios

Focusing on the **status of the studios**, four participants gave presentations with four respondents on the following question: How should we treat and understand the studios – are they an **artist's installation**, an **archaeological site**, a **museum object**, **period room or archive**, or a **performative site**?

David Paton gave a multi-sensory presentation, in which he combined a film, speaking and stone carving to reflect upon the rhythms of the artist's workspace. **Albrecht Barthel** (Schleswig-Holstein State Office) responded to this with a presentation on artists' studios that have been considered as installations, including Brancusi's, over which he exerted posthumous control. Albrecht used Daniel Buren's article on 'The Function of the Studio' (*October*, 1971/1979) as a starting point, in which Buren argues that once a work moves outside of the studio it loses its authenticity. Albrecht noted that an installation inverts sculpture, as it envelops the viewer. Albrecht argued that Hepworth's studios should not be considered as an artist's installation, as they were preserved for biographical reasons rather than as a particular sculptural arrangement, in contrast to Brancusi's.

Riann Coulter (F.E. McWilliam Gallery & Studio) presented on her experiences with McWilliam's studio, which was moved from Holland Park in London to Banbridge in Ireland five years ago. The aim was to preserve, conserve and archive while still giving a sense of the artist's workspace and presence. The studio walls were given to artists to make work from. **Sebastiano Barassi** (The Henry Moore Foundation) reflected that preserved studios are like stages without actors and that by having elements of McWilliam's studio used by active artists you maintain a sense of presence and use.

James Dixon (Museum of London Archaeology) presented on archaeological practice and how it is inherently a destructive process that halts natural physical and chemical processes. The archaeological record is considered as equivalent to the actual object it has in some ways destroyed. Currently, there is still a sense of Hepworth's agency in her studios as the processes have not been interfered with. **Tim Edensor** responded through discussing the term 'place', stating that a place can never be static and is composed of elements from elsewhere and remade through ideas and objects. Reflecting on inventories, Tim felt that they flattened out the meaning of different objects making everything seem the same.

Mike Pearson (Aberystwyth University) discussed how the studios are a performance of the everyday. Drawing analogy with forensic analysis of a crime scene, where everything is of interest and there is an absence at the centre, how do you sort evidence from what is irrelevant? Through putting other objects in the space we might be able to see it more clearly. Are the detritus, cigarette packets and whisky bottles of equal interest for interpretation as the working objects? And can we indicate the passage of time through drawing attention to rusting, as a natural process? A performance might constitute an extended repertoire of engagement at the site or could be done online or using headsets to choreograph the spectator. **Claire Pajaczkowska** discussed the studios as a domestic space and argued that there was an embodied and manual presence and sense of the artist's agency through the agency of the sculptor's hand. The studio asks us to contemplate the agency of the artist and our own relationship with materials. The studios are liminal spaces between culture and nature.

Discussion

Anne agreed that the domesticity of the space had been lost somewhat as many of the domestic objects had been smoke damaged. **Nigel** brought up **James's** explanation of how excavation causes an intervention that ends Hepworth's agency, so destroying the site's authenticity and originality. **Anne** disagreed with **Tim's** disliking of lists, arguing that without inventory lists we would not understand an artist's process. Tim said the problem arises when an archival approach takes over to the exclusion of other modes of interpretation. Responding to Mike's discussion on performance, **Anne** argued that the problem with performances can be when the audience is not treated as a dignified subject but rather like a guinea pig. **Claire** noted how a site can become a monument through its documentation. **Tina Fiske** (University of Glasgow) argued that lists and the objects themselves mobilise the absence of the artist through their presence. Tina also argued that Hepworth's work and home should be considered as a continuum, but it was the legal document of the will that had altered the space into a museum instead of her family moving in and it continuing as a domestic space. **Kenna Hernly** (Tate St Ives) said that audience members respond to the domestic scale of the museum and do not like the 'Do not touch' signs because of this. Audiences also want to believe that the studios are as they were on the day Hepworth died. **Tina** said that the studios have their own authenticity as they are and we do not need to project back to the day Hepworth died to locate the authentic. **Rachel Smith** (Tate / University of York) responded to **Tim's** statement that a place consists of objects from elsewhere, suggesting that the tools and other objects have their own material history aside from Hepworth and could be grouped

together according to where they came from and who made them, which would also tell the history of the town. **Chris** said the question of how the studios relate to the recreated workshop space at The Hepworth Wakefield should be considered. **Mark** said that three elements should be considered: What's there and how can it be preserved? What's the narrative that has built up around the museum? How do you recapture the spirit of St Ives in the 1950s and 1960s, rather than the narrative that has built up in the last forty or so years, while also bringing in a contemporary element to juxtapose? **Tim** asked **Kenna** whether there were ways that the myths that audiences want to believe could be worked with rather than just dismissed; Kenna agreed that they could not be ignored.

The seminar having moved to the Hepworth Museum, **Sara** discussed how the Museum and Hepworth are considered as part of the Tate St Ives programme and what kinds of performances and events had taken place at the Museum with transitory interventions as well as daily tours. There are 50,000 visitors a year but there is a limit on the numbers allowed in at any one time. **Kenna** said the new galleries at Tate St Ives will have a permanent display about the St Ives modernists. **Sophie** added that there have been artists in residence at the Palais who have used blocks of marble that were left. **Melanie** and **Jackie** gave tours to participants of the carving and plaster studios respectively.

Day Two

The day began with an informal viewing of the studios at the Hepworth Museum, before moving back to Tate St Ives to continue the presentations and discussions.

Session Three: Experience and Narrative

Claire Pajczkowska spoke on **experience**, focusing on how the process of making is a silent, tacit, embodied knowledge in contrast to the finished art object, which is proto-social and is described using verbal, explicit knowledge. Likewise, Claire argued that the studios are transitional spaces containing transitional objects that are both private and hidden as well as having an interface, an outside. Hepworth described tools as being an extension of the hand, with meaning found in the interior of the process. The studios have a sense of an industrial, archaeological space, but are also domestic, describing the labour of the maternal, of caring. Claire focused in on three types of object in the studios as having particular meaning: the tools, the textiles and the containers. The tools are instruments that create work with no instrumentality. The textiles are not to do with the process of making, but yet they are workgear; they speak of the boundary of the body with the outside world. They are also the main source of pigment in the studios, punctuating the St Ives modernist monochrome. The containers speak of what is not known, what is hidden, what the artist does not know before the work materialises. The objects as a whole speak of the artist's embodied encounter with materials.

Anne Wagner spoke on **narrative** and how the word's etymological usage is related to legal documents. Anne cited the words quoted from the legal document of Hepworth's will (in Sir Alan Bowness's guide to the Hepworth Museum) as being its founding narrative. Referencing Akira Kurosawa's film *Rashōmon* (1950), in which different characters narrate their version of events before the bench, Anne emphasised how narrative is motivated by the speaker. Anne suggested that another important document was Jackie's report on the studios; in particular, how the project involves caring for the studios. Anne asked: what does it mean to care for this space? She argued that the Hepworth Museum should be maintained not as it was but as it is; in particular, the wordlessness of the space should be preserved and is part of its sparsity. The Palais de Danse should be used for narratives.

Discussion

Participants agreed that the wordlessness of the space should be preserved and that care was a key term. **Chris** agreed with Claire that the containers are mysterious because we do not know what is in them; we could envision a museum that explains everything about the objects, but it would ruin the character of the Museum as it is. There has been a benign neglect of the Museum, which has allowed it to retain its character. **Anne** added that it is up to the collection carers, the conservators, to decide on the best way of caring for the objects and the space. **Mike** said that the aural, the sonic, is lost; the sounds we hear now are not those we once heard. **Anne** responded that the workshops were both a space of noise and of silence. **Tina** referred to Claire's description of tacit knowledge, how the dialogue between the hand, the gesture and the stone is tacit. How is this knowledge disclosed in a non-tacit situation? Can objects speak? The tools are objects of repetition; the practice of repetition is sedimentary. **David** said this repetition is nuanced and non-linear. **Claire** added that for most visitors the tools are just there, in the same way as they can just sit and be in the garden, and this allows visitors to have an emotional experience. **Anne** said that the danger of museum culture is that the visitor is told how to feel or how to understand objects; a didactic curatorial approach at the Hepworth Museum would lose the silence of the space. **Mike** said the rate of decay of the different objects was interesting, such as with the textiles; the textiles should not be considered as only the background to the foreground of art objects. **Chris** said the space we are preserving is the 1976 arrangement; should we leave it as it is in perpetuity? Could there be movement of works? Hepworth did not say there had to be one particular arrangement. The space looks good now, but will it look more dated in 25 years' time? **Melanie** responded saying the continuity of experience can last a long time, such as with Matisse's or Watts's houses. **Chris** said the decay is part of the magic, charm and pathos of the space. **Melanie** added that the objects are decaying at different rates.

Session Four: Authenticity and Ethics

Tina Fiske spoke about her research into **conservation ethics**, and how the ethics of translation can be informative through thinking about the relationship between an original text and its translation. Tina reiterated Anne's question: do objects speak? What are their connections and interrelationships and what volition do they have? Tina argued that there is an internal structuring of the objects in the studios generated during the last 38 years, since Hepworth's death. If the conservators remove objects, what omissions are made and how does this impact upon the **authentic encounter** of the viewer's experience? Objects can disclose permanence and absence, including marginal objects, such as Hepworth's glasses. Walter Benjamin's definition of 'aura' describes it as an excess of presence; the presence of the original is the prerequisite for authenticity. Is Hepworth, in fact, a non-presence and do the objects have their own internal view, as suggested by the reflection on the lenses of a pair of Hepworth's glasses (which Tina illustrated)?

Nigel asked the conservators: what are the **core ethical codes**? **Jackie** said a guiding principle was to arrest deterioration using the most conservative means possible. **Melanie** said everything you do should be reversible and you should be able to justify everything you do. **Deborah** said conservators must think about what is the level of appropriate intervention and how this will impact upon the meaning of the object. What is the hierarchy of value of the objects involved, if any? **Jackie** said the artist's intentions are usually the focus, but with the studios there are things that perhaps do not need our attention and can be left to decay. Does the removal of rust make the tools lose their evocative power? **David** said tools start rusting in this climate after only a week. The rust tells the narrative of Hepworth's absence.

Sebastiano Barassi spoke on **value and replicas**, focusing on his experience as a curator at both Kettle's Yard and now at Perry Green, where the founders' intentions were very different. H.S. Ede asked that KY be preserved intact, while Henry Moore was not concerned about the spaces at PG. Consequently, there is more freedom at PG than at KY, the latter being a house as a work of art. However, there are still hierarchies of objects at KY: works of art are treated as with any museum, but visitors are allowed to sit on chairs and walk on rugs, and these are seen as replaceable. There is a pastiche of different time periods at PG where studios have been preserved to different time periods. Sebastiano then focused on Alois Riegl's attributions of value in *The Modern Cult of Monuments* (1903). With Hepworth's studios we are trying to retain *historical value*, in that the contents are seen as documents, as archival material. There is also *use value*, in that these studios were working spaces and we are trying to retain a sense of that, which is similar to KY. We also have *art value*, with the aesthetic value of the spaces, which is a sub-category of *newness value*, with the sense that the space might feel exactly as it did when Hepworth lived there. **Replicas** might address some of the problems, but would visitors welcome replicas? There is the issue of trust that a museum has with its visitors. Sebastiano does not like replicas; he feels disappointed when he realises he is looking at a replica (Walter Benjamin's notion of the 'aura' is useful here). A small study was conducted in Reading: 20 teachers were asked 'Does it matter educationally whether an object is real or a replica when teaching?' 55% said yes; 45% said no, although many added that as far as the children know it is real. Replicas are associated with fakes, but they can offer the opportunity of allowing visitors to interact with objects.

Discussion

James said he was interested in tools that we do not understand: how do audiences interpret them? Trying to understand a tool would be a sort of irreversible intervention. **Tina** said the relationship of trust that a museum has with the public was paramount. **Anne** said the issue of replication went to the heart of the sculptural process, where we are concerned with what is the original; replication would need to be communicated in order to maintain trust. **Mike** said audiences are used to suspending disbelief; theatre props are replicas, but we accept them as real and authentic things. **Georgina Kennedy** (Tate St Ives) said value and meaning are things that we attribute depending on our knowledge, so different audiences will have different understandings. **Chris** asked: what stories do audiences want to hear? The studios encourage the idea of the solitary artist, but the other story is of the assistants and the studios as a place of activity and management. **Tina** questioned whether we should always think that audience disappointment is a bad thing.

Session Four: Time and Legacy

Tim Edensor spoke on **time** and the complex temporalities of the studios and their surroundings. Are we talking about stillness or stasis? Brancusi's studio is divorced from touch, smell and sound. Hepworth's studios were in *continual emergence* – through routines, daily tasks, changes – but then this stopped and was arrested. In the last 38 years we have had the rhythm of *maintenance*, through which objects do not fall entirely into entropy. We should honour this maintenance rather than hide it. In contrast, fetishisation of the space, its authenticity, of Hepworth, can happen when time does not appear to flow on. Do we have anything of the original left? Fetishisation is similar to memorialisation or commemoration; but often memorials fade and descend into farce or hubris, producing their own obsolescence. Every single thing in the studios is constantly changing, even the blocks of stone that are more durable. The ways in which things change is specific to the place; here, the agency of the salt in the air is key. The beauty, or patina, of the ways in which the objects have changed conjures up rich sensations, giving a sense of the length of time that the studios have been abandoned, providing a

sense of loss and pathos for the visitor. If we arrest time, remove the rust, then we lose that evocative power. There are also *absent presences* in the studios: absence is revealed through the abandonment of the objects. To have a real sculptor working in the studios today would bring them back into the flow of time. Can we postulate possible futures through inviting artists and writers to imagine alternatives?

Riann Coulter focused on the issue of **legacy**, using Mary McGrath's questions posed in her article on Francis Bacon's studio (*Circa Art Magazine*, 2000) as a starting point:

- What exactly did the studio represent?
- Was it a collection of Art?
- Source material?
- The artist's materials?
- Was it an installation in its own right?
- Should it be kept intact?
- How could it possibly be displayed?
- Should it be displayed at all?
- How could it be documented?
- How could it be made available to scholars?
- How could its contents help us to understand the artist?

Riann argued that what was missing from these questions was the audience (the public rather than scholars): what are their expectations? The Bacon studio is quite frozen and mausoleum-like; having an artist in residence can be a way of activating studios. What period do you recreate it to? If we romanticise decay and let objects fall apart then we do not allow it to have a legacy.

Discussion

Tim said the issue of memorialising Hepworth is a problem, as it gives too much dignity and gravitas to the persona. **Sara** responded that the programme at Tate St Ives has often thought about Hepworth in a contemporary sense and showing her longevity and relevance today. The Hepworth Museum is a period house, but it does have the intervention of visitors, tours, talks, which disrupt that moment. The experience of coming to St Ives is as a retreat and visitors desire this particular experience. Rather than emphasising the domesticity of the studios, we should emphasise that they were a working space and also a commercial space where she entertained clients, and worked on an international scale. Sara also spoke about narrative and the precision of Hepworth's speaking voice and choice of language. Responding to Tim, **Claire** said that the time for dememorialising one of the only women modernist sculptors is not now; it is not that long since Virginia Woolf wrote *A Room of One's Own* (1929). Responding to Sara's comment about domesticity, Claire said that we should not emphasise the domestic over work, but that there is a sense of woman's work, of the maternal, that should be considered. Claire also disagreed with Tim that the studios should have an artist in residence; she thought this could be done elsewhere, but that the alternative did not mean that the studios would be a dead mausoleum. **Tina** asked: what part does The Hepworth Wakefield play in staging legacy, through the contemporary artists who respond to Hepworth there? **Sara** said it is something that still needs to be explored; there is still a gap between what is staged at THW and what is perceived as authentic at the Hepworth Museum/St Ives. **Chris** said the Hepworth Museum privileges one way of looking at the work, which is the importance of place. The sculptures are read in relation to St Ives, which reinforces the way we see Cornwall and the aesthetics of the place. **Tina** added that there is no rupture in context here. **Claire** returned to Tina's and Sebastiano's discussion about the contract of trust between the curator and the visitor and the idea of

maintaining the 'accuracy' of the space; is this accuracy scientific or is it about caring for a legacy? **Sebastiano** said this gets to the heart of it: what is our role as curators? Things need to be assessed object by object. He added that this can be an issue with replicas, as they have not aged with the other objects, so stand out. The main issue is what are we trying to preserve: is it the place as a whole, the atmosphere, the legacy of an artist, or individual objects as documents of a particular time and practice? It is impossible to do all of these things; something needs to be sacrificed. From **Melanie's** experience of doing conservation work in the garden, visitors enjoy seeing work being done. **David** said there are both one-off and repeat visitors: repeat visits add to a sense of work in the place and build a relationship with the space, experiencing it in different seasons and as part of events. **Rachel** said that it builds up a relationship with the local population, which was important to Hepworth.

Final conclusions and options for Steering Group consideration

The final discussions considered what the strategic approach and conservation policies to the conservation of the studios and their contents as an element in the Trewyn complex might be.

- **Tim** and **Rachel**: to foster contemporary and local engagement.
- **David**: keeping it as it is.
- **Mike**: non-intervention with interpretation, which could be performative. **Tina**: within this non-intervention, show the volition of the objects, which is part of Tate's trust with the audience after 38 years.
- **Sara**: to reveal and work with Hepworth's intentions and her interest in education.
- **Melanie**: retain a wordless space.
- **Sara**: the conservation activity has to have an interpretive strategy running alongside it.
- **Tim**: wait another 20 years and assess it again then (**Riann**: issue of collection care with this option).
- **Claire**: to show the working process of Britain's first international modern woman sculptor.
- **Albrecht**: remove the paint from the walls (which was added after Hepworth's death) and replace it with lime, which will age better.
- **Sara**: stabilise the roof and maintain the building structure, doing essential maintenance.
- **Sebastiano**: remove non-visible objects and make them accessible elsewhere, or make them visible through a virtual tour. **Tina**: leave the objects in the cupboards, which make it a real space.
- **Mike**: use remote, online delivery to capture the contents and allow access to the studios.
- **Albrecht**: allow visitors to enter the carving studio under monitored conditions. **Nigel**: create a path through the carving studio from the garden to the street through the large doors (this is currently the wheelchair access route). **Jackie**: this would be a strong intervention that would alter the character of the carving studio.
- **Melanie**: consider the stone yard and the summerhouse too (the greenhouse is already maintained).
- **Riann**: improve the climatic conditions. **Helena**: the doors of the studios have already been closed to viewers for the last six months, so climate control could be introduced.
- **Mike**: offer pluralities of interpretation or enhancements of presence (what did Hepworth listen to while she was making her work, for instance).

- **David:** a level of transparency from Tate and the Hepworth Estate to the audience, based on trust.
- **Chris:** a lot of the issues we have been discussing will not be able to be considered as part of this conservation project. The Steering Group should not work in isolation, but with colleagues in Curatorial and Learning, in particular.
- **Claire:** consider the idea of process in the Hepworth 2015 exhibition at Tate Britain.

Helena Bonett
June 2013



The end of the seminar on 21 May

Front row, from left to right: Helena Bonett, Sophie Bowness, Tim Edensor, Sara Matson, Ailsa Roberts, Jackie Heuman, Melanie Rolfe, Chris Stephens.

Back row, from left to right: David Paton, James Dixon, Nigel Llewellyn, Rachel Smith, Mike Pearson, Albrecht Barthel, Sebastiano Barassi, Deborah Potter.

A film created to complement the seminar and the conservation project is online here: <http://www.tate.org.uk/context-comment/video/studios-barbara-hepworth-museum-and-sculpture-garden-st-ives>

Appendices

Please see below for appendices comprising:

- The schedule for the seminar proceedings
- The list of participants and biographies
- Research questions for the seminar
- The contents of an online folder shared with participants before the seminar



Appendix 1

Tate Research

The Studios at the Barbara Hepworth Museum and Sculpture Garden, St Ives

Developmental Seminar, 20–21 May 2013

Monday 20 May

Participants arrive at St Ives and drop off luggage at their B&Bs. Come to the Courtyard at Tate St Ives.

The Courtyard, Tate St Ives

Introduction and history

- | | |
|-----------|---|
| 2.00–2.30 | Lunch |
| 2.30–2.40 | Introduction to the seminar – Nigel Llewellyn and Helena Bonett |
| 2.40–2.50 | Introduction to the project – Deborah Potter and Melanie Rolfe |
| 2.50–3.20 | History of the studios – Sophie Bowness with responses from Helena Bonett, Sara Matson and Chris Stephens |
| 3.20–3.45 | Discussion with key points listed |
| 3.45–4.00 | Break – tea/coffee |

Status of the studios

Four short presentations with responses offering views of what is being conserved at the studios, followed by discussion

- | | |
|-----------|---|
| 4.00–4.10 | Artist's installation – David Paton with response from Albrecht Barthel |
| 4.10–4.20 | Museum object / period room / archive – Riann Coulter with response from Sebastiano Barassi |
| 4.20–4.30 | Archaeological site – James Dixon with response from Tim Edensor |
| 4.30–4.40 | Performative site – Mike Pearson with response from Claire Pajaczkowska |
| 4.40–5.30 | Discussion: what are we conserving and what is its value? With key points listed |

Leave Tate St Ives and walk to the Hepworth Museum

The Studios, Barbara Hepworth Museum and Sculpture Garden

6.00–7.00 Informal viewing of the studios – led by Jackie Heuman and Melanie Rolfe

End of sessions – time to freshen up or go to The Sloop Inn, Back Lane

8.00– Dinner at Seagrass Restaurant, Fish Street

Tuesday 21 May

The Studios, Barbara Hepworth Museum and Sculpture Garden

8.30–9.30 Informal viewing of the studios

Leave Hepworth Museum and walk to Tate St Ives

The Courtyard, Tate St Ives

9.40 Coffee/tea

Experience and narrative

10.00–10.20 Claire Pajczkowska on experience and Anne Wagner on narrative

10.20–10.50 Discussion with key points listed

Authenticity and ethics

10.50–11.10 Tina Fiske on authenticity and ethics and Sebastiano Barassi on value and replicas

11.10–11.40 Discussion with key points listed

11.40–11.55 Break

Time and legacy

11.55–12.15 Tim Edensor on time and panel discussion on legacy

12.15–12.45 Discussion with key points listed

Key points

12.45–1.30 Bringing together the key points of the seminar overall

1.30–2.15 Lunch

End of seminar

Supported by the Esmée Fairbairn Collections Fund



Tate St Ives, Porthmeor Beach, TR26 1TG

Barbara Hepworth Museum and Sculpture Garden, Barnoon Hill, TR26 1AD

Museum Opening times
10.00–17.20, every day



Appendix 2

Tate Research

The Studios at the Barbara Hepworth Museum and Sculpture Garden, St Ives

Developmental Seminar, 20–21 May 2013

List of participants

Sebastiano Barassi, Curator, The Henry Moore Foundation, Perry Green

Albrecht Barthel, Schleswig-Holstein State Office

Helena Bonett, Hepworth Studio Developmental Seminar Convenor, Tate

Sophie Bowness, Art Historian and Trustee of the Hepworth Estate and member of the Steering Committee for the Hepworth Studio Conservation Project

Martin Clark, Artistic Director, Tate St Ives

Riann Coulter, Curator, F.E. McWilliam Gallery & Studio

James Dixon, Senior Archaeologist, Planning, Museum of London Archaeology

Tim Edensor, Reader, Cultural Geography, Manchester Metropolitan University

Tina Fiske, Lecturer, History of Art, University of Glasgow

Kenna Hernly, Learning Curator: Adult Programmes, Tate St Ives

Jackie Heuman, Senior Sculpture Conservator and member of the Steering Committee for the Hepworth Studio Conservation Project

Georgina Kennedy, Learning Curator: Adult Programmes, Tate St Ives

Nigel Llewellyn, Head of Research, Tate

Sara Matson, Curator, Tate St Ives

Mark Osterfield, Executive Director, Tate St Ives and member of the Steering Committee for the Hepworth Studio Conservation Project

Claire Pajaczkowska, Senior Research Tutor and School of Materials Research Leader, Royal College of Art

David A. Paton, Artist and PhD Researcher, School of Geography, University of Exeter, Cornwall Campus

Mike Pearson, Professor of Performance Studies and Leverhulme Research Fellow, Department of Theatre, Film and Television Studies, Aberystwyth University

Deborah Potter, Head of Conservation, Collection and Acting Director, Collection Care, Tate and Chair of the Steering Committee for the Hepworth Studio Conservation Project

Ailsa Roberts, Research Grants Manager, Tate

Melanie Rolfe, Sculpture Conservator, New Acquisitions, Tate and Project Manager of the Hepworth Studio Conservation Project

Rachel Smith, Collaborative Doctoral Student, Tate / University of York

Chris Stephens, Head of Displays and Curator of Modern British Art, Tate Britain and member of the Steering Committee for the Hepworth Studio Conservation Project

Anne Wagner, Distinguished Visiting Professor, University of York

Participants' biographies

Sebastiano Barassi is Curator at The Henry Moore Foundation, Perry Green. From 2001 to 2012 he was Curator of Collections at Kettle's Yard, University of Cambridge, and prior to that he worked at the Courtauld Institute Gallery in London. He has written extensively about early twentieth-century art and the history and theory of conservation. His publications include 'The Modern Cult of Replicas: A Rieglian Analysis of Values in Replication' (*Tate Papers*, 2007) and articles in *Nuova Museologia* on the ethics in conservation of contemporary art.

Albrecht Barthel was born in 1954, studied visual arts in Hamburg (under Franz Erhard Walther, Gerhard Rühm and Kai Sudek), was apprentice as a joiner, worked in a collective for 6 years, studied architecture in Hamburg (Diploma 1993), and worked as an architect in Hamburg and Kiel. Since 1995 he has been working in practical conservation for the Schleswig-Holstein State Office. In 2005 he began postgraduate studies as an architect at HafenCity University, Hamburg (Topic: Cultural Heritage Preservation of an Artist's home and studio: Wenzel Hablik (1881–1934) in Itzehoe).

Helena Bonett is Convenor of the Hepworth Studio Developmental Seminar, Tate. She is also Research Curator at the Royal Academy of Arts and Associate Lecturer at University of Kent. Publications include *The Camden Town Group in Context* (2012, edited with Ysanne Holt and Jennifer Mundy), *An Introduction to the Paintings, Sculptures and Works on Paper in the Collection of the Royal Academy of Arts* (2012), and educational guides for the RA exhibitions *Modern British Sculpture*

(2011, co-author with Jonathan Law) and *Wild Thing: Epstein, Gaudier-Brzeska, Gill* (2009). She has studied at Birkbeck College, the Courtauld Institute of Art and University of Birmingham. She is currently applying for a collaborative PhD with Tate on Hepworth's Trewyn Studio, which she hopes to start in the autumn.

Sophie Bowness is an art historian and a grand-daughter of Barbara Hepworth. She is a Trustee of the Hepworth Estate and was a consultant on The Hepworth Wakefield. She edited a book that accompanied its launch, *Barbara Hepworth: The Plasters* (2011). She is working on the revised catalogue raisonné of Hepworth's sculpture and planning a collection of Hepworth's writings.

Martin Clark has been Artistic Director at Tate St Ives since 2007. He was previously Exhibitions Curator at Arnolfini, Bristol (2004–7). A graduate of the Curating and Commissioning Contemporary Art MA at the Royal College of Art, London, Martin has curated over 30 exhibitions and projects, including solo shows by Simon Starling, Albert Oehlen, Lily van der Stokker, Alex Katz, Hans-Peter Feldmann, Heimo Zobernig, Dexter Dalwood, Carol Bove, Deimantas Narkevicius, Mark Titchner, Brian Griffiths and Lucy McKenzie, as well as group exhibitions that include: *The Dark Monarch: Magic and Modernity in British Art*, Tate St Ives (touring to Towner Gallery, Eastbourne), 2009, *Pale Carnage*, Arnolfini (touring to Dundee Contemporary Arts), 2007, and *The Hollows of Glamour*, Herbert Read Gallery, 2004. His writing has appeared in *Frieze*, *Flash Art*, *Mousse Magazine* and *Untitled*.

Riann Coulter is an art historian and curator specialising in twentieth-century Irish and British art. She has a PhD from the Courtauld and has held post-docs at the Paul Mellon Centre for British Art and Trinity College Dublin. Her curatorial experience includes positions at the Irish Museum of Modern Art and the National Gallery of Ireland. She is currently curator of the F.E. McWilliam Gallery & Studio, Banbridge.

James Dixon is an archaeologist with research interests in contemporary urban spaces, public art and historic buildings. His PhD (Creative Arts, University of the West of England, 2010) focused on investigating public artists' practice and how artworks made in response to particular times and places exist in the changing landscape. Recently he has chaired seminars in human creativity (OUCE/Pitt Rivers Museum) and the place of tradition in contemporary art (The Brewhouse Gallery, Taunton). In 2011 he co-curated an exhibition investigating the creative outputs of the Carpenters Road studios in Stratford between 1985 and 2001 (<http://greatlengths2012.org.uk/blog/about-the-uneearthed-project/>). He currently works in the planning section of Museum of London Archaeology.

Tim Edensor teaches cultural geography at Manchester Metropolitan University. He is the author of *Tourists at the Taj* (1998), *National Identity, Popular Culture and Everyday Life* (2002) and *Industrial Ruins: Space, Aesthetics and Materiality* (2005) and editor of *Geographies of Rhythm* (2011) and *A World of Cities: Urban Theory Beyond the West* (2011). Tim has also written widely on football, walking and driving, urban materiality especially stone, and is currently researching landscapes of illumination and darkness.

Tina Fiske is a Lecturer in History of Art at the University of Glasgow. She has a longstanding research and teaching interest in the conservation of contemporary art, specifically in supporting new debate around notions of authenticity or ethics. Recently she co-edited *Art, Conservation, Authenticities: Material, Concept, Context* (with Erma Hermens, 2009) and published an essay 'White Walls: Installations, Iteration and Difference' in *Conservation: Principles, Dilemmas and Uncomfortable Truths* (edited by Alison Richmond and Alison Bracker, 2009). Since 2007 she has also been Research Associate working with the museum partners involved in the National Collecting Scheme Scotland and is about to launch *Affiliate* – a new professional research programme that will support those collections curators in Scotland to develop their practice around contemporary art.

Kenna Hernly has been Learning Curator for Adult Programmes (job-share) at Tate St Ives since November 2012. She was previously part-time Assistant Learning Curator: Community Programmes at Tate St Ives. She studied History of Art and Mandarin language at St Mary's College of Maryland, USA, and Contemporary Visual Art at University College Falmouth. Kenna has worked independently in Cornwall as a producer and researcher since 2007. She co-founded FIELDCLUB, a collaborative art research project that investigates a hypothetical model of future land use and food production. She has also produced and curated events and exhibitions for the arts organisation and publishing company, Urbanomic.

Jackie Heuman is a senior sculpture conservator with a special interest in the materials and techniques of modern and contemporary sculptors including Barbara Hepworth. She left Tate as co-head of sculpture conservation section in 2011 and is now co-director of SculpCons Ltd. She has published widely on the conservation of contemporary sculptures including a recent contribution to *Barbara Hepworth: The Plasters* (edited by Sophie Bowness, 2011). Her interest in Hepworth's studios began over 20 years ago when she first joined Tate. She is a conservation consultant and member of the steering committee for the Hepworth Studio Conservation Project.

Georgina Kennedy has been Learning Curator: Adult Programmes (job-share) at Tate St Ives since November 2012, previously holding the post of Learning Programmes Curator at the Gallery since early 2008. Georgina's current post leads on adult learning and works closely with the Artistic Director on Residency and Research programmes. Her previous post looked after informal learning in the gallery, including family, community, young people, adult and access programmes. She is an Area Representative for Engage, the international membership association for gallery education. Georgina has led a variety of action research projects exploring best practice for galleries in working with audiences of all ages from early years children to adults with limited access to the visual arts. From 2006 to 2008 she worked as Interaction Programmer at ProjectBase, a Visual Arts commissioning agency, and prior to 2006 as a freelance Artist and Artist Educator involved in artist-led projects, community arts participation and gallery education.

Nigel Llewellyn came to Tate as the first Head of Research in 2007 having taught art history at the University of Sussex and served as Dean and Pro-Vice-

Chancellor. He also worked for the Arts and Humanities Research Council (AHRC) as Director of the Research Centres Programme. His areas of research interest include commemorative art, early modern Italy and the historiography and methodology of art history. The Research Department works across all Tate sites and divisions to lead and support scholarly research projects and publications in all aspects of collections research, heritage science, learning research and museology / cultural policy.

Sara Matson has been a curator at Tate St Ives since 2003. During this period she has curated and/or delivered numerous exhibitions, displays and accompanying publications, managed all national and international tours and run the initial residency programme at Porthmeor Studios from 2003–9.

Mark Osterfield is Executive Director, Tate St Ives. His role involves developing and realising Tate St Ives' vision, focusing on strategic planning, communications, fundraising, external advocacy and operational delivery. Previous to working at Tate St Ives, Mark was Project Manager, Kilburn Library, London Borough of Camden and Library Manager, Swiss Cottage Central Library, London. Mark was educated at Keble College, Oxford and subsequently studied Fine Art at Middlesex University. He worked in the area of community and mental health before joining the Camden Library Service in 1991.

Claire Pajaczkowska is Senior Research Tutor and School of Materials Research Leader at the Royal College of Art, London. She is the author of essays and books including *The Sublime Now* (edited with Luke White, Cambridge Scholars Press, 2009) and *Shame and Sexuality: Psychoanalysis and Visual Culture* (edited with Ivan Ward, Routledge, 2008). She is on the Editorial Board of *Textile: The Journal of Cloth and Culture* (Berg publishers), and *Fashion, Film and Consumption* (Intellect publishers).

David A. Paton is a visual artist with a specialism in stone carving. His public work includes the parkland development for *West Park* in Darlington (2005), alongside numerous privately commissioned sculptures sited nationally. He has been awarded a number of Arts Council England grants for artist-led projects, including *TEND* (2007), a year-long residency in a public garden in Cornwall. David is currently in his third year of a practice-based PhD in the School of Geography, at the University of Exeter's Cornwall Campus. His PhD is titled *The Quarry as Sculpture: The Place of Making*. His research is centred around a working dimension granite quarry in Cornwall, where he is investigating human/ matter relations through a range of creative, ethnographic and geographical practices. David has two articles currently in press: a book chapter for Tim Ingold and Elizabeth Hallam ('Growing Granite: The Recombinant Geologies of Sludge' in *Making and Growing: Anthropological Studies of Organisms and Artefacts*), and a paper for *Environment and Planning A (What are Surfaces? special issue)*. Both papers are centred around his PhD research in the quarry. A postdoctoral position is being developed within a cross-disciplinary, and cross-university, bioscience/ art/ geography project.

Mike Pearson studied archaeology in University College, Cardiff (1968–71). He was a member of R.A.T. Theatre (1972–3) and an artistic director of Cardiff

Laboratory Theatre (1973–80) and Brith Gof (1981–97). He continues to make performance as a solo artist and in collaboration with artist/designer Mike Brookes as Pearson/Brookes (1997–present). In 2010, he directed a site-specific production of Aeschylus's *The Persians* for National Theatre Wales (NTW) on the military training ranges in mid-Wales, and in 2012 *Coriolanus* for NTW, in collaboration with the Royal Shakespeare Company for the World Shakespeare Festival/London 2012. He is co-author with Michael Shanks of *Theatre/Archaeology* (2001) and author of *In Comes I: Performance, Memory and Landscape* (2006), *Site-specific Performance* (2010), and *The Mickery Theater: An Imperfect Archaeology* (2011); *Marking Time: Performance, Archaeology and the City* is forthcoming later in 2013. He is Professor of Performance Studies and Leverhulme Research Fellow, Department of Theatre, Film and Television Studies, Aberystwyth University.

Deborah Potter is Head of Conservation, Collection at Tate, focusing on acquisitions, collection care, storage, sustainability and preventive conservation, and has currently taken on the temporary role of Acting Director, Collection Care. Previous roles include: Conservation Manager at the National Army Museum; Senior Preventive Conservator at Glasgow Museums; Associate Tutor in Museum Studies at University of Leicester; Conservation Project Manager at the Linen Hall Library; and Curator at the Royal Naval Museum. Qualifications include: AMA for Associate Membership of the Museums Association; Masters in Museum Studies, University of Toronto; Master of Science in Information Technology and Archaeology, University of Leicester; and BA Hons Archaeology, University of Durham.

Ailsa Roberts is Research Grants Manager at Tate since 2009. Prior to this she spent over ten years working in universities, including the Royal College of Art, University College London, Imperial College London, and University of the Arts London.

Melanie Rolfe graduated with a BA Hons. in Art History from University College London. She went on to a diploma in Conservation from City and Guilds of London Art School where she also studied traditional sculptural techniques and learnt to carve stone. She has worked as a conservator for twenty years, in museums and private practice. She joined Tate as a Gabo Trust intern in sculpture conservation and carried out extensive research on Tate's bronze cast of Degas' *Little Dancer Aged 14*. She is seconded to the Barbara Hepworth Studio Project from her post as Sculpture Conservator for New Acquisitions. In this context she has interviewed many artists to better understand their practice, try to identify what is important to preserve and so establish conservation strategies for complex sculptures and installations.

Rachel Smith is in her second year of an AHRC-funded Collaborative Doctoral Award with Tate Britain and the University of York. The title of her thesis is *The International Context of the Art of St Ives, c.1948–60*. She completed a BA at Magdalene College, Cambridge and then an MA at the Courtauld Institute of Art, writing her MA thesis on Hepworth's work as seen from a phenomenological perspective. As part of her PhD research she is listing the Hepworth archive now held at Tate.

Chris Stephens is Head of Displays and Curator of Modern British Art at Tate Britain. He has published on and made exhibitions of a range of mid-twentieth-century British art. Exhibitions have included *Barbara Hepworth Centenary* at Tate St Ives (2003), *Henry Moore* at Tate Britain (2010) and *Picasso and Modern British Art* at Tate Britain (2012).

Anne Wagner, Distinguished Visiting Professor at the University of York, is the author of several books, including most recently, *A House Divided: On American Art since 1955* (2012). *Mother Stone: The Vitality of Modern British Sculpture*, which principally concerns the work of Barbara Hepworth, Henry Moore and Jacob Epstein, was published in 2005. With T.J. Clark, she is co-curator of *Lowry and the Painting of Modern Life*, which will open at Tate Britain in June 2013. A jointly authored book, which shares the exhibition's title, will be published to coincide with the show.

Appendix 3

Tate Research

The Studios at the Barbara Hepworth Museum and Sculpture Garden, St Ives

Developmental Seminar, 20–21 May 2013

Research questions

Status

- How should we treat and understand the studios – are they an artist's installation, an archaeological site, or a museum object?
- Are these three types of space different? How are they different? We might think of the studios as being situated at the centre of a Venn diagram between each of these three positions.
- What other types of space might the studios be? Could they also be considered a performative space: a stage-set that frames a biographical performance of Hepworth's working practice? Could they also be considered as an archive or period room?
- Key terms: status, space, fine art, artist, installation, archaeology, site, museum, object, performance, stage-set, archive, period room.

Value

- Should different objects in the studios have different values and thus be treated in a different way? For example, do the pieces of stone and plaster that Hepworth worked on in the studios have greater value and status than the tools and other materials? Might some things in the studios be considered waste to be disposed of or is everything of equal importance, including plaster or stone dust, for instance?
- What value do we ascribe to different types of objects? Is it possible to predict what value visitors or researchers will ascribe to the objects? Should we think of the objects in the studios as akin to Kurt Schwitters' conception of Merz, wherein all objects are of equal value?
- Key terms: value, worth, waste, dust, materials, objects, interpretation, archive, taxonomy, categorisation, cataloguing, index, public, private.

Experience

- Do audiences understand the previous function or use value of the various objects in the studios? In the future, these uses might become even more obscure. Are the studios and their contents experienced purely as an aesthetic arrangement, a general 'look', rather than as individual items that once all had a purpose?
- What are the sensory engagements that the visitor is expected to have? What are the environmental sounds and what are the smells of the studio spaces? Do these need to be preserved too? What of the studio spaces do visitors currently touch? Is this considered a valuable part of the experience? Or does the touching of the site exacerbate the problems that the conservators are facing? Should tactile elements be created? If so, what form would they take? What is the extent to which there is unauthorised incursion into the site, by visitors leaning in, but also by

animals and weather? In what ways might visitors be making decisions on their own sensory experience?

- Key terms: purpose, utility, experience, visitors, tactile, senses, smell, feel, taste, sound, look, boundaries, ontology, semiotic, sensual.

Narrative

- What do the studios tell us about Hepworth's practice? What are the limitations of the narrative that the studios tell? One failing might be that they suggest a solitary working practice, when in fact there was a workshop of assistants. Also, might stone-carving be emphasised over bronze-casting by the positioning of the stone vs the plaster studios?
- In what ways might this narrative be altered by our intervention? Do the studios tell the same narrative that they did in 1976 when the museum opened, or has this narrative in some ways changed over time? What might be lost in the translation?
- For what purpose do we preserve artist studios? And why, specifically, have some artists' studios been preserved, while others have not? Are there factors inherent in certain artists' work and/or practice that promote such an interest in studio preservation? And, if so, what are the implications of such factors in the re-presentation of specific studio spaces?
- Key terms: story, interpretation, narrative, historicising, preservation, change, translation, solitary, genius.

Authenticity

- The studios are currently unmediated spaces: they have no barriers except the original door, no labels, and are seemingly as they were on the day Hepworth died. Air and light permeate Hepworth's studios and are part of the same atmosphere that the audience experiences, arguably creating an authentic experience.
- How is this aura of authenticity constructed? What is it about the current set-up of the studios that generates such an experience? How might this sense of authenticity be lost through our interference in the studios? Walter Benjamin's notion of the aura of a work and issues of reproduction and replicas could be considered here, as well as Sigmund Freud's notion of the fetish object.
- Key terms: aura, sacrilege, fetish object, authenticity, atmosphere, experience, magic, mediation.

Ethics

- What are our key responsibilities as custodians of this site? What ethical obligations do we have and to whom?
- What are the ethical codes of the artist's installation, archaeological site, and museum object? Considering the site as an artist's installation, what is our ethical obligation to satisfy the artist's intentions into futurity (in a way that Brancusi's original vision was not)? An archaeologist working on an excavation might remove certain parts of an excavation to a museum/archive (such as ceramics) while leaving other parts at the original site (such as the walls and floor of a building); but is it ethically right to interfere with the site and remove objects? As a museum object

and/or archive, the custodians have an ethical obligation to the audience to maintain the space and also to be honest with the audience that an object is what we say it is (which raises issues of interfering with the site and also of employing replicas).

- How do questions of authorship come into this? Who is the author of the site? Hepworth, the Estate, Tate, or the audience? (Post-structuralist conceptions of authorship could be discussed here.)
- Key terms: ethics, authorship, responsibility, custodians, obligation, truth.

Time

- What are visitor expectations to artist studios and how are damage and the signs of ageing perceived and understood? To what extent should the spaces be allowed to degrade naturally? Could the studios be considered as a ruin that should be left to decompose? Does its ruination have a certain picturesque quality that visitors enjoy that would be lost through restoration?
- If the studios are to be restored, what time period would be recreated? There may be compelling practical and conceptual reasons for restoring the studios to their 1975 appearance, but what, precisely, are these? Why not their 1950s or 1960s appearance? How do the different zones of time represented in different parts of the museum relate to one another (the first-floor studio, for example, was restored to its 1950s appearance)?
- The restoration of an object moves it back in time. Therefore, if you want to restore the studios back to their 1975 appearance, then how often do you need to repeat the process of restoration? By 2023, ten years of post-conservation exposure to the elements might leave the site evoking the year 1985. Conceptions of time, such as Henri Bergson on duration or Julia Kristeva on women's time, might be useful to consider here.
- If you fully restore all the objects, removing all signs of ageing, the space might look retro owing to some of the objects in there, so creating a temporal barrier for the audience. If you do not want the space to look dated, would you remove the objects that look particularly 1970s (such as flowery tins)? Are there issues with this being a woman's space? Have 'feminine' elements been downplayed by the ageing process that might resurface once conservation has restored original colours and textures? Is this a problem?
- Key terms: feminism, women, gender, materiality, texture, colour, time, taste, trends, fashions, rust, damage, ageing, ruin, waste, clutter, abandoned, obsolete, restoration, temporality, entropy, excess, impermanence.

Legacy

- What might constitute the legacy of the project? How might the restored studios be maintained? Do we want the studios to remain as they are for the foreseeable future? If so, how can this be achieved? The paradox is that we need to intervene in order for it to appear as though it has been untouched.
- How much should be changed in the studios? Should the space be sealed in order to create a stabilised environment? Should the internal fittings of the building be improved to prevent the space being so exposed to its

external environment? By changing something such as the roof you would change the light in the space.

- Should selected works be treated then displayed on rotation to enable their long-term care, or should replicas be made of key items to allow originals to be archived?
- Do we need electric lighting in the space, for possible future late-night openings? What might happen if the door is opened at night (more exposed to the elements)?
- What is the legacy of such a project in terms of its relation with what is happening around it, such as the Tate St Ives redevelopment project, the future of the Palais de Danse, and the creative community of St Ives and its artist studios? What initiatives should coincide with this project, such as an oral history archive?
- Key terms: legacy, future, change, exposure, replica, original, community.

Appendix 4

Online Folder contents

Names highlighted in [blue](#) are people participating in the seminar.

Bacon studio folder

Blaze O'Connor, 'Dust and Debitage: An Archaeology of Francis Bacon's Studio', *UCDScholarcast*, series 2, autumn 2008, 8pp.

Christopher Turner, 'Bacon Dust', *Cabinet*, issue 35, fall 2009, 6pp.

Mary McGrath, 'A Moving Experience', *Circa Art Magazine*, no.92, summer 2000, pp.20–5

Brancusi studio folder

[Albrecht Barthel](#), 'The Paris Studio of Constantin Brancusi: A Critique of the Modern Period Room', *Future Anterior*, vol.3, no.2, winter 2006, pp.34–45

L'Atelier Brancusi, press release, 1997, 24pp.

Hepworth studio folder

Photos of studios – folder containing archival and recent photographs of the plaster and stone-carving studios, 1975 and 2010

Alan Bowness, *A Guide to the Barbara Hepworth Museum*, Trewyn Studio and Garden, St Ives, Cornwall 1976, 8pp.

Ann Hills, 'Barbara Hepworth Museum Opens', *The Burlington Magazine*, vol.118, no.879, June 1976, pp.451–3

Derek Pullen and Sandra Deighton, 'Barbara Hepworth – Conserving a Lifetime's Work', in Jackie Heuman (ed.), *From Marble to Chocolate: The Conservation of Modern Sculpture*, London 1995, pp.136–43

[Helena Bonett](#), *From Studio to Museum: Barbara Hepworth's Trewyn Studio*, paper delivered at the Barbara Hepworth Seminar, Tate Britain, 28 March 2013

[Helena Bonett](#), accompanying slideshow for the above presentation

Inventory – stone studio

Spreadsheet of contents, undertaken by [Jackie Heuman](#), Tate, 2010–11

Inventory – plaster studio

Spreadsheet of contents, undertaken by [Jackie Heuman](#), Tate, 2010–11

Jackie Heuman, *Project Outline*, report for funding, Tate, February 2011, updated by Melanie Rolfe, May 2013

The Studios at the Barbara Hepworth Museum and Sculpture Garden, St Ives: Restoration and Preservation, project description, Tate, March 2013

Other reading

Daniel Buren, 'The Function of the Studio' (1971), *October*, vol.10, fall 1979, pp.51–8

Julia Kristeva, 'Women's Time', *Signs*, vol.7, no.1, autumn 1981, pp.13–35

Michel Foucault, 'What is an Author?' (1969), in Paul Rabinow (ed.), *The Foucault Reader*, Harmondsworth 1984, pp.101–20

Mike Pearson and Michael Shanks, 'Theatre and Archaeology', *Theatre/Archaeology: Disciplinary Dialogues*, London and New York 2001, pp.68–130

The Nara Document on Authenticity (1994), drafted by the 45 participants at the Nara Conference on Authenticity in Relation to the World Heritage Convention, Nara, Japan, 1–6 November 1994, 3pp.

Penelope Curtis, 'The Hierarchy of the Sculptor's Workshop: The Practice of Emile-Antoine Bourdelle (1861–1929)', in Jackie Heuman (ed.), *From Marble to Chocolate: The Conservation of Modern Sculpture*, London 1995, pp.23–30

Pip Laurenson, 'Authenticity, Change and Loss in the Conservation of Time-Based Media', *Tate Papers*, issue 6, autumn 2006, 12pp.

Roland Barthes, *The Death of the Author* (1967), 6pp.

Sebastiano Barassi, 'The Modern Cult of Replicas: A Rieglian Analysis of Values in Replication', *Tate Papers*, issue 8, autumn 2007, 5pp.

Tim Edensor, 'Waste Matter – The Debris of Industrial Ruins and the Disordering of the Material World', *Journal of Material Culture*, vol.10, no.3, 2005, pp.311–32

Tim Edensor, 'Vital Urban Materiality and its Multiple Absences: The Building Stone of Central Manchester', *Cultural Geographies*, June 2012, 19pp.

Tina Fiske, 'White Walls: Installations, Absence, Iteration and Difference', in Alison Richmond and Alison Bracker (eds.), *Conservation: Principles, Dilemmas and Uncomfortable Truths*, Amsterdam 2009, pp.229–40

Walter Benjamin, *The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction* (1935), 15pp.

Seminar information folder

Hepworth Studio Seminar schedule

List of participants and biographies

Research questions

Seagrass restaurant menu

St Ives map

Selected further reading**Barbara Hepworth**

Bibliography available here: <http://barbarahepworth.org.uk/publications/>

Barbara Hepworth, *A Pictorial Autobiography*, Bath 1970; revised 1978 (now published by Tate Publishing)

Barbara Hepworth: A Guide to the Tate Gallery Collection at London and St Ives, Cornwall, introduction by David Fraser Jenkins, London 1982

David Thistlewood (ed.), *Barbara Hepworth Reconsidered*, Liverpool 1996

Anne M. Wagner, "Miss Hepworth's Stone Is a Mother", in David Thistlewood (ed.), *Barbara Hepworth Reconsidered*, Liverpool 1996, pp.53–74

Penelope Curtis, *Barbara Hepworth*, London 1998

Matthew Gale and Chris Stephens, *Barbara Hepworth: Works in the Tate Gallery Collection and the Barbara Hepworth Museum, St Ives*, London 1999

Miranda Phillips and Chris Stephens, *Barbara Hepworth Sculpture Garden, St Ives*, London 2002

Chris Stephens, 'Modernism out of Doors: Barbara Hepworth's Garden', in Patrick Eyres and Fiona Russell (eds.), *Sculpture and the Garden*, Aldershot 2006, pp.145–55

Sophie Bowness (ed.), *Barbara Hepworth: The Plasters*, with essays by Frances Guy, Gordon Watson, David Chipperfield, Sophie Bowness and Jackie Heuman, together with a complete catalogue of the plasters and a preface by Simon Wallis, Farnham, Surrey and Burlington VT 2011

Artists' studios

Giles Waterfield (ed.), *The Artist's Studio*, exhibition catalogue, Compton Verney, Warwick 2010

Jon Wood (ed.), *Close Encounters: The Sculptor's Studio in the Age of the Camera*, exhibition catalogue, Henry Moore Institute, Leeds 2001

Jon Wood, 'The Studio in the Gallery?', in Suzanne Macleod (ed.), *Reshaping Museum Space: Architecture, Design, Exhibitions*, Routledge, London and New York 2005, chapter 12

Films

Figures in a Landscape: Cornwall and the Sculpture of Barbara Hepworth, written, directed and photographed by Dudley Shaw Ashton for the British Film Institute, 1953. Words by Jacquetta Hawkes, spoken by Cecil Day Lewis. Music by Priaulx Rainier. Extract: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Qt9zRz-Jguc&feature=youtube_gdata_player

Barbara Hepworth, directed by John Read for the BBC, 1961, <http://www.bbc.co.uk/archive/sculptors/12804.shtml>