

**AUTHENTICATION
IN ART**

Dear Madam/Sir,

Please find below the conclusive program of the interactive working conference that the Authentication in Art Foundation (AiA) is organizing on May Wednesday 7 to Friday 9 in The Hague, entirely dedicated to painting authentication.

Authentication in Art (AiA) comprises a group of prominent international art world professionals who have come together to create a forum that can act to catalyze and promote best practices in painting authentication. AiA provides leadership and shapes dialogue, develops sound practice and liaises with the wider art community including international collectors, art historians, art market professionals, financial institutions, legal advisers, trust & estate practitioners and other stakeholders in the international art market.

- Wednesday May 7 -

08:30	Registration at the AiA hospitality desk
09:00	Welcome by Mr. Michael Bock , Director Mercedes-Benz Classic CEO Mercedes-Benz Museum GmbH, Daimler AG
09:30	Keynote speaker (to be announced)
10:20	Prof. dr. Martin Kemp - FBA, Emeritus Professor in the History of Art Trinity College, Oxford University: 'It doesn't Look Like Leonardo' The state of methods and protocols used in attribution is a professional disgrace. Different kinds of evidence – documentation, provenance, surrounding circumstances of contexts of varied kinds, scientific analysis, and judgement by eye – are used and ignored opportunistically in ways that suit each advocate (who too frequently has undeclared interests). Scientific evidence is particularly abused in this respect. The status of different kinds of evidence is generally not acknowledged, particularly with respect to falsifiability. It is generally true to say that the most malleable of the kinds of visual evidence are those that bear in most specifically on issues of attribution (e.g. the individual artist and precise date), while those that are least malleable (e.g. pigment analysis) are only permissive (i.e. nil obstat) rather than highly specific. I will attempt to bring some systematic awareness into this area, which is a necessary first step in establishing some rational protocols. The case studies will be drawn from Leonardo.
11:10	Coffee / Tea
	Historical Developments in Painting Authentication
11:40	Dr. Margaret Dalivalle James M. Osborn Fellow in English Literature and History, Yale University: 'Picturarum verè Originalium: Inventing originality in early modern London' A 1691 London auction catalogue claimed the pictures it advertised were truly original, but how could such assertions be substantiated? What was the 'Intrinsic Worth', or distinguishable property, of an original painting? This problem spurred the

	pens of Matthew Prior, Joseph Addison, Bernard de Mandeville and Jonathan Richardson, resulting in the invention of the idea of artistic originality at the turn of the eighteenth century.
12:10	<p>Dr. Dietrich Seybold – independent scholar, conducted research on the history of Leonardo da Vinci-scholarship and on the history of connoisseurship: ‘A More of Certainty. Giovanni Morelli (1816–1891) or The Quest for Scientific Connoisseurship’</p> <p>In confronting some common ideas about Morelli with some rather unknown facts the presentation discusses the relevance of Morelli today. It shows that, beyond raising the fundamental question if connoisseurship could be turned into a science, Morelli's working methods (which encompassed more than the notoriously famous Morellian Method) raise a large number of questions, theoretical and practical. The presentation chooses to discuss some of them under a contemporary perspective, thereby showing how a historical approach to connoisseurship, which aims at exploiting historical experiences of all kinds, theoretical and practical, and thereby taking a perspective from within, might be fruitful given the contemporary situation in the field.</p>
12:40	<p>Prof. Frank James – Professor of the History of Science, Head of Collections and Heritage, the Royal Institution, London: ‘Davy and Faraday: The early analysis of pigments’</p> <p>This talk will examine the contexts in which Humphry Davy both (1778-1829) and Michael Faraday (1791-1867) used chemical techniques to understand, conserve and record archaeological and artistic objects. Instances include pigments from vases excavated at Pompeii and the Lewis chess pieces as well as attempts to read the text of the Herculaneum papyri and understanding the state of the Elgin marbles.</p>
13:10	Lunch
14:00	<p>Dr. Lynn Catterson – Art Historian, Columbia University: ‘Stefano Bardini & the Art of Crafting Authenticity’</p> <p>On the basis of much recently discovered archival material in the state archive of Stefano Bardini in Florence, this presentation examines dealing practices in the late 19C specifically with respect to the complex ways in which authenticity was crafted and marketed to potential buyers. Bardini's business model included among other things, formulaic staged “discoveries,” the use of texts such as Vasari's Lives to strengthen the case for authenticity, constructed provenances which involved ancient noble names and properties, as well as outright fabrications made to order according to the taste of the buyer which, in reality, was a taste that had been carefully cultivated by Bardini. By putting so many Bardini-branded objects into a concentrated circulation, Bardini created what would become the comparanda, and this in turn had an enormous effect on attribution, perceived authenticity and the development of connoisseurship to this present day.</p>
15:00	<p>Prof. John Brewer – Eli and Edye Broad Professor, Humanities and Social Sciences, California Institute of Technology: ‘Berenson and the connoisseurs in the Duveen trial of 1929’</p> <p>The trial of Hahn.v.Duveen of 1929, over a disputed version of Leonardo's Belle Ferronniere, saw the expert testimony of connoisseurs such as Berenson, Venturi, Roger Fry and others rejected by a New York jury. Why did this happen, and what does it tell us about the relationship between connoisseurship and the burden of proof as understood in a court of law?</p>
15:30	Coffee / Tea
16:00	<p>Evan Hepler-Smith – Historian of modern science, doctoral candidate Princeton University, History of Science: ‘Remaking the x-ray as an instrument of authentication’</p> <p>Beginning in the mid-1920s, a new means of examining paintings rose to prominence in America and Europe: the x-ray shadowgraph. In this presentation, I will describe how art historian-turned-technical expert Alan Burroughs refashioned</p>

	the x-ray to fit the material, intellectual, and social contours of authentication and connoisseurship.
16:30	Questions & panel discussions
17:30	Close

- Thursday May 8 -
Painting Authentication – current state

08:30	Registration, coffee & tea
09:00	<p>Dr. Ella Hendriks – Senior Paintings Conservator, Van Gogh Museum, Amsterdam and Muriel Geldof – Conservation scientist, Cultural Heritage Agency of the Netherlands:</p> <p><i>'Evaluating technical and analytical studies of Van Gogh's paintings in support of attribution'</i></p> <p>This presentation contemplates the role of art-technological studies in the process of attributing and authenticating paintings by Vincent van Gogh in terms of consistency of the materials and techniques used, also leading to improved connoisseurship by informing and therefore refining our perception of the artist's changing styles and techniques.</p>
09:30	<p>Dr. Louis van Tilborgh – Senior Researcher, Van Gogh Museum, Amsterdam and Teio Meedendorp – Researcher, Van Gogh Museum, Amsterdam:</p> <p><i>'Van Gogh and his oeuvre: the attribution process evaluated'</i></p> <p>There is nothing new about intense discussions of authenticity concerning Van Gogh's oeuvre. These date from the very first beginnings of Van Gogh studies – namely, Baert de la Faille's oeuvre catalogue of 1928 -, and since then the toing and froing never stopped. Confusion had been being sown, and it had its impact on all connoisseurs, curators and conservators dealing with attribution problems in Van Gogh's oeuvre. In our presentation we will give an overview of the complicated history of the attempts to define his work, as it is common knowledge that the present generation of scholars has inherited something of a muddle. But we do not despair. Especially in the last decades substantial progress has been made. Nowadays we have developed a greater awareness of both the strength and limitations of the various scholarly tools at our disposal, and we will discuss the different elements of the attribution process, taking a contemplative approach. First of all, what is the value of provenance? Can it be decisive in particular cases? It is always believed that Van Gogh's letters could help to establish whether a particular work is authentic or not, but to what extent is this true? Can they indeed 'be used to support an aesthetic judgment and convince anyone who might still be wavering', as Scherjon wrote in 1930? Furthermore, we will also focus on style and technique and address the issue of the contribution of technical research in relation to traditional connoisseurship. To what extent can this kind of research be decisive, or does it support rather than prove? And we will end with the real question lurking behind it all: does a standard solution for the attribution process really exist?</p>
10:00	<p>Dr. Ellen Landau – Professor of Art History Department of Art History and Art Case-Western Reserve University: <i>'Conservation as a Connoisseurship Tool: Jackson Pollock's 1943 Mural for Peggy Guggenheim, A Case Study'</i></p> <p>Because his subject matter is located in innovative facture, Jackson Pollock provides an especially pertinent example for procedural examination. Using as its primary example the joint analysis of Pollock's 1943 painting Mural recently undertaken at the Getty, this presentation examines the value to connoisseurship of close collaboration between art historians, conservators and conservation scientists. While experts in these disciplines might speak disparate languages and focus attention differently, results of the Getty Mural project indicate the critical difference that weaving facts and perceptions from different disciplines can make.</p>
10:30	Coffee / Tea

11:00	<p>Prof. Robyn Sloggett – Director, Centre for Cultural Materials Conservation (CCMC), University of Melbourne and Vanessa Kowalski – Paintings Conservator, Centre for Cultural Materials Conservation (CCMC), University of Melbourne: <i>‘Building evidence for use in criminal cases – standard practice and Methodologies – A case study in Australia’</i></p> <p>In criminal and civil investigations relating to art fraud the question of how evidence is gathered in conservation laboratories is as relevant as the question of what is gathered. Additionally, sharing of information between professionals, such as curators, gallerists and art historians is minimal and restricted due to the sensitive nature of the material. The lack of integrated analytical and investigative methodology in this area has hampered investigation in the past, making conviction difficult. On the other hand assertions of art fraud have been met with legal action for libel. Much of the art historical evidence given is subjective in nature and cannot be verified against properly referenced data, while the materials analysis data can be open to varied interpretation. Conservation is seen to provide ‘objective’ scientific data, however, interpretation remains the critical issue. Drawing directly on case studies from the University of Melbourne’s Centre for Cultural Materials Conservation this presentation discusses the development of standards, methodologies and guidelines for data collection strengthen prosecution procedures and meet the evidentiary requirements of the courts, and explains why conservation does provide the critical and objective procedures useful in bringing forward a successful prosecution for art fraud.</p>
11:30	<p>Colette Loll Marvin – Founder and director, Art Fraud Insights: <i>‘The Utilization of Forensic Science Principles and Microscopic Trace Evidence Techniques’</i></p> <p>a case study that details the 20 year journey towards authentication of Jackson Pollock’s last work with the most recent breakthroughs employing unique crime-scene forensic science and trace evidence techniques.</p>
12:00	<p>Prof. dr. Gunnar Heydenreich – Full Professor for Conservation of Modern and Contemporary Art, Cologne Institute of Conservation Sciences / University of Applied Sciences (CICS): <i>‘Campendonk – or not? Collaborative studies on paintings by Heinrich Campendonk within the context of the Beltracchi forgery scandal.’</i></p> <p>When in the case of one of Germany’s greatest art scandals, the Beltracchi forgery case (2012) the Cologne District Court emphasized that the auction house had to reimburse the buyer of a forged Campendonk because the authentication relied on connoisseurship only and no “scientific analysis” of the painting was undertaken, it became clear, that there is still the need to define what “scientific analysis” means today in this context and what it may contribute in the complex authentication processes of modern and contemporary art. This paper discusses possibilities and limitations of art technological studies and material analysis of paintings by Heinrich Campendonk and of forgeries.</p>
12:30	<p>Prof. dr. Jørgen Wadum – Director, Centre for Art Technological Studies and Conservation (CATS): <i>‘The Eye or Chemistry? Connoisseurship and Technical Art History for Authentication’</i></p> <p>Within the field Technical Art History the scientific study of artworks currently have gained firm ground and contribute in an increasing scale to our understanding of the materials and techniques of art works. However, in order to advance the field of interdisciplinary collaboration the art-connoisseur will benefit considerably from understanding the possibilities and limitations of (scientific) examination of materials and techniques applied in paintings and eventually the employment of technological (non-invasive or micro invasive) investigative analyses. By engaging an extensive range of tools available within technical art history and conservation science alike to the valuation of paintings, we will not only foster mutual understanding between related fields within the cultural sector, the work of collectors and the appreciation of collections at large will benefit greatly from this. This presentation will briefly present past analytical achievements and future strategies fostering collaboration between connoisseurs, conservators and</p>

	conservation scientists.
13:00	Lunch
14:00	<p>Dr. Heike Stege – Head Scientific Department, Pigment Analysis, Doerner Institut, Bayerische Staatsgemäldesammlungen: 'Authenticity expertises at the Doerner Institut – a look on current practice and future necessities with focus on organic pigment analyses'</p> <p>The contribution aims to briefly discuss the institute`s general approach towards authenticity expertises (i.e. the choice of applied imaging and analytical methods) as well as our policy on reports and information handling. In focus will be the actual state of pigment analyses, especially the state of art in the identification of synthetic organic pigments by Raman spectroscopy and thin-layer chromatography. The numerous modern organic pigments, that were introduced successively in artist`s paints since the late 19th century, offer a close-meshed and conclusive dating framework. The extent of accessible Raman databases as well as research into the history and use of synthetic dyestuffs and pigments is constantly growing, however, a broader exchange of data, findings in art works and the widespread meta-information among experts would help to use this rich pool of evidence for authenticity questions more efficiently.</p>
14:30	<p>Elke Cwiertnia – Phd Student, Northumbria University, Newcastle: 'Examining artworks attributed to Francis Bacon (1909-1992) to aid authentication'</p> <p>The Francis Bacon research project at Northumbria University is an example of a multidisciplinary collaboration between art historians and art technology researchers for a catalogue raisonné. In the last 45 years a few of the paintings in the previous catalogue raisonné (1964) have been destroyed, while some early works have reappeared which had been omitted or were believed to have been destroyed. Since many of these paintings are entirely or partly undocumented the present research project has been deemed especially helpful, by the authors of the catalogue raisonné, in terms of providing terminus dates and in the accurate description of media. The presentation will illuminate the practical approach during the project from the viewpoint of the art technological examiner and analyst and the framework under which examination of paintings and analysis of samples were carried out. The importance of the contextualisation of the analytical results will be highlighted.</p>
15:00	Questions & panel discussions
15:30	Coffee / Tea
16:00	<p>Panel discussion: 'The Economic Impact of Authenticity Issues on the Art Industry'</p> <p>This moderated discussion will focus on the impact on the market of the current state of the authenticity issue and, alternatively, if the market becomes better able to opine on this question through combined scientific and observational expertise and opinions that are more digestible by the market and courts internationally, drawing on multiple perspectives ranging from those of the legal and academic communities to market economics.</p> <p>Panel: Dr. Friederike Gräfin von Brühl, William Charron, Randall Willette, Dr. Jeroen Euwe and Dr. Anna Dempster, chaired by Lawrence Shindell.</p>
17:30	Summary and closing remarks
18:00	Transfer to <i>Gemeentemuseum</i> for an exclusive visit of the exhibition: 'MONDRIAN AND CUBISM – PARIS 1912-1914' (in partnership with MoMA, New York) and a special presentation by Hans Janssen, curator at large for modern art.

- Friday May 9 -
Future developments and improvements

08:30	Coffee & tea
-------	--------------

09:00	Introduction presentation – brief summary day two -> process day three
09:30	<p>Dr. Nicholas Eastaugh – Co-founder and Director of Research, Art Access and Research London: <i>'A Materialist Perspective: Developing a theoretical framework for technical art history's role in authentication'</i></p> <p>One of the most significant shifts in perspective on authentication over the recent past has been the increasing acceptance and integration of the study of artworks as physical objects. While there is a long history of investigative research into material structure, only during the last couple of decades can it be fairly claimed that such approaches have reached any point of de facto parity with more 'traditional' methods. At the same time it has to be recognised that the framework of technical art history and materials analysis – the techniques and the methods of interpretation used – are largely an ad hoc assembly without any truly coherent guide as to how to use them or judge their validity. Some scholars, notably those most comfortable with the image, frequently give primacy to evidence from image-based techniques such as X-ray and infrared. Others, perhaps coming from the 'hard' sciences, promote purely analytical solutions to problems. This paper will however argue instead that to move forward constructively it is necessary to develop a clear framework in which the field can operate, drawing on the existing approaches but forming a sounder theoretical basis. Technical art history and materials studies must now move beyond being seen as an exercise in advanced documentation to engage coherently with fundamental epistemic problems regarding the creation of art using the strong objective tools it has at its disposal.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Plenary presentation by congress theme followed by interactive Q & A panel sessions</p>
10:00	<i>'Common terminology and understanding'</i> - Panel: Dr. Jilleen Nadolny – Dr. Daniela Pinna – Iris Schaefer – Dr. Eddy Schavemaker
11:00	Coffee / Tea
11:30	<i>'Standards for scientific research and technological research'</i> - Panel: Dr. Nicholas Eastaugh – Dr. Jilleen Nadolny – Iris Schaefer – Dr. Henk Tromp
12:30	Lunch
13:30	<i>'Education and training'</i> Panel: Prof. dr. Gunnar Heydenreich – Prof. dr. Christoph Krekel – Dr. Jane Sharp – Prof. Robyn Sloggett – Prof. dr. Jørgen Wadum
14:30	<i>'Cataloguing and publishing'</i> Panel: Vivian Barnett – Dr. Ella Hendriks – Katy Rogers – Dr. Eddy Schavemaker – Dr. Chris Stolwijk – Marije Vellekoop
15:30	Coffee / Tea
16:00	<i>'Art & Law'</i> - Panel: Dr. Friederike Gräfin von Brühl – Dr. Anna Dempster – Milko den Leeuw – Filippo Petteni – Lawrence Shindell
17:00	Final plenary discussion, conclusive outcome and proclamation - a conclusive statement of intent towards the development of guidelines and protocols
17:30	Closing ceremony
18:00	Festive reception

Please visit our [website](#) to read all about the AiA foundation, its mission, its partners and recent Art Market News.

We hope that we may welcome you in May.

To register please go [HERE](#).

Please feel free to share this AiA Newsletter with your colleagues and friends.

Kind regards,

the AiA congress team

www.authenticationinart.org

congress program subject to changes without notice



You are receiving this message as part of your subscription to AiA publications.

To change or cancel your subscription, [click here](#).