

**Julie:** Hello, basically I'm going to summarize the exchanges that we've had with the working group, and when I'm finished the panel members will come up for discussions and questions. Sorry, I didn't get a clicker tutorial yet. I suppose it's just the red one? Oh, okay. Let's see. Maybe. Yes.

Okay, so we wanted to find out what we could about language and how we use it, and common understanding and terminology, and what we realized is that we have a huge problem in having a very unsubtle language for very subtle things that we want to express. Essentially, what we're talking about when we're investigating the field of authenticity and inauthenticity, and forgeries and originals, and defining things, we're talking about several issues. Some of the most important are, what the actual intent -- sorry, I'm just going to set up my phone so I have a timer, so I don't go too long -- what the actual intent of the artist is in making an object -- because of course, objects are creations of people; paintings don't have intents, so paintings don't set themselves up to be authentic or fakes or forgery. There's an intention of their maker, which largely in historical context we can't know.

And then we have basically -- the other thing we want to express is what we know about such objects. We have a tension between what we'd like to know, the intent, and what we actually know, and how do we express that? On top of this, we have -- it was nicely shown earlier in the seminar with the discussion on the development of the use of the word 'original'. Language changes its meaning hugely over time and place. It changes over different languages, and what we basically want to do with this talk is make a few suggestions, things we might think about because it would be impossible to tell you all how to speak, and we'd like to make you aware of the problems that we've encountered so that hopefully by thinking about them we'll counteract them. Like with addiction, the first thing is admitting you have a problem if you're going to solve it.

So first, authentication versus authenticity, and we all really like Martin Kemp's idea about the historical identification, especially in cases where you cannot ultimately come to an author if you're working with earlier paintings in the period before the great names, or even paintings, minor painters in the period of the great names. It's a much more useful definition of what we're trying to accomplish, historical identification rather than authentication. And authenticity is a reflection of this process -- to authenticate, especially in the conversation technological field has a very significant history, because it was used to something to describe intrinsic property of materials that we very much wanted to preserve. So I thought I'd run through that to make a very active illustration of some of the problems we have with this terminology.

If we're talking about authenticity, what aspects are we actually trying to describe? And one is the author who actually made the thing in question. One is the visual appearance. Does the object look as it would have when it left the artist hand, which is what is defined as visual authenticity? And then there's material authenticity; is the material substance of the object still the same material that we would have seen, had we'd been able to see it when it left the author's hand? And of course, again, as has been seen by the Mondrian we saw yesterday, all sorts of alterations can happen; restoration can add or take away

or cleanings materials from the object, so it's important to define between the different categories. And like many things, we value objects in different ways; values are culturally addressed and they're more or less important in different cases because objects have different meanings within cultures.

So authenticity and conservation has mainly centered around the two aspects of authenticity of appearance and material authenticity, which we immediately see that there's a stress. If you want something to look as it did when it left the artist hand, and materials age as now has now been aptly demonstrated -- it's quite hard or impossible to maintain a visual appearance that's as authentic as an unchanged degraded object. The material authenticity may stay, but the visual authenticity will be impaired. And basically, what conservatory stores do is a very tricky balancing act, trying to decide which of these important aspects we're going to prefer. So an example of this, just to demonstrate quickly, is the Harvard Murals which were painted by Rothko in '62 using a fugitive red pigment.

They were exposed in the sun, which totally bleached out the foresaid red pigment. And on the top, we have an example of a photograph of what they looked like before they were exposed to the sunlight. On the bottom, after they were exposed. And as we can see, these are paintings about color, and as the color has been bleached out, one might argue that their visual authenticity is hugely compromised. In fact, they were taken away and stored because I wasn't quite sure what to do with them. Obviously again, because of the respect for the material object, conservers didn't want to just paint back the color because it's a much of an impossible thing to do; to get the subtle surface. Now, the recent suggestion has been to try to restore the visual authenticity at least to some degree, by trying to display them especially made colored lights to reinstate the color in a non-permanent way on the original object, which will be interesting to see how that might work.

Now, authenticity and conservation first begins in official way in 1964, with our international groups such as this gathering, people coming together and wanting to try and solve a problem, and the Venice Charter, which was put together by a group of professionals, The International Council on Monuments and Sites, decided that authenticity should be based on respect for the original material, and authentic documents, and it most stop at the point where conjecture begins. Now again, we sense immediately this stress between the visual and the material authenticity, and in fact this is exactly what led to later revisions. Such as the 1994 Nara Document on Authenticity by an even more international group of experts, which was revised when conservation in Japan was taken into context.

Because there were all sorts of complex issues which differed very substantially from the European models of how objects were valued and the intrinsic worth of an object, very different, culturally based. The concrete example is temples. In Europe, we would prefer the original material the temple that was built, let's say in 600 -- in Japan, the appropriate way to deal with that would be to rebuild the temple so that it retained its purity of form and expression over preferring the preservation of the original material of the older object. So you can see, again, there's a very strong cultural stress -- trying to have one important

point on one side, another on the other side. They can't always be made to meet, which is a difficulty of what we do often times in conversation.

And it's proceeded further attempts to define authenticity and conservation by a conservational/cultural property edict issued in 2012, which listed the words for authenticity in several European languages and defined as the extent to which the identity of an object matches the one ascribed to it. Now, if you think about that, it says actually very, very little. It's a qualifier. In the example that -- it might be easy to use with paintings let's say -- we say something's a titian. If we say it's an authentic titian, does that mean it's anymore a titian? Not really, it's like putting 'very' in front of the word. It's just a strengthener; an implication that we've hopefully done our due diligence in our scholarship and we really know what we're talking about. The concept of authenticity should not be confused with the concept of originality.

Now, the word really died a great death in a presentation, the keynote speech of a conference on authenticity and conversation by Salvador Muñoz Viñas, who's a Spanish conservator and conservation historian. And as he pointed out, it's a tautology much as the titian, authentic titian, like an example that I gave before, everything is authentic whatever it is. A Ruinous painting, whose condition is Ruinous and restored, isn't authentically Ruinous and restored painting. We're just talking ourselves in circles a bit. This caused a bit of a fuss, because a lot of the conservators in the audience said, "Oh my god, that means we can't restore anything anymore." And his point was, "No, what it means is simply that we can't assume there's some rule, that every time we do something we need to think about it. Which value are we promoting? Which one are we taking as more important?" Conservation does not pursue authenticity. It pursues an understanding in a transmission, and a responsibility to care, accept some values society needs.

And as he says in lower quote, "The role of authenticity is a core value of conversation, maybe fictional but this is not necessarily a criticism. Fictions may be useful or even necessary. But we, those who sustain the fiction, need to be aware that it is a fiction, or at the very least, that the meaning we confer to the notion of authenticity has important peculiarities." And so basically, it's a good idea to be very careful with the term. There will be situations where it may be useful, but it's generally more of a modifier or a strengthener, a way of saying we've done our due diligence, we've done our process, rather than something that holds real meaning in many groups.

Now, we go into lots of subsidiary words that circle around the idea of authenticity and the original being the idea of the first object, the first particular composition by a particular artist, made of a particular theme or subject. And what was really very interesting, and we would have liked to have given out this international vocabulary chart that we've been compiling, it was just too confusing. We couldn't quite get into an order that we wanted to share with everyone yet. The interesting thing was, we did survey some people, different linguistic groups in Europe, and we found situations often like this, where a word of -- you'd recognize it as copy -- exists in many different languages. However, the subtle meanings are very different, and sometime they're very different within single languages

as well. And again, as mentioned earlier, very different if we start to go back to different historical contexts.

So sometime, 'copy' will imply authorship by the artist within the studio; sometime 'copy' is very specifically in certain languages indicative of something that was done as an academic exercise in the artist's training. It is something, this multi-varied meaning of word, to something that we really need to be very careful of. And when we're using these terms if possible, to include a short definition of how this works. And I just wanted to show an example of problems that artists have themselves in expressing these ideas. Because as there is no set terminology, people will use what's available and manipulate it. A nice example is Edvard Munch's *The Sick Child* which was done in 1885-1886, it was something that -- again, it's an interesting object because it's hard to speak of the original. He worked it up over a long period of time. It was exhibited. He changed it again before it became a static object, so to speak at least, free from his hands/intervention although clearly time has had its way with it.

What he didn't like about this picture, which became very famous when it was exhibited, it was very controversial and won him a lot of acclaim, he described the color palette as leaden. He was always in search of a particular combination of expression and color is a means of bringing that through, and he didn't feel he'd quite gotten the color right. So what he did over the next decades, is produced a row of what he actually called experimental copies -- in Norwegian -- of this particular work. And when he was asked, "Oh, but you've copied yourself." He's, "No, no, no. It's not a copy. It's an experimental copy, because I was trying to get the picture to express what I wanted the first one to express but couldn't manage."

And what I think is also extremely interesting about this example, is if we think about authenticity and we think of -- there's been a lot of apologizing for science for some reason, I think in this conference. I think I'd have to agree with \*. I think we just all need to relax about it. [laughs] We have many tools to study art. We need to use those which are appropriate; often the eye is not enough. Provenance on itself is not enough. Each case requires different input, and if we think of these examples without the provenance, without knowing that Munch actually painted them, I think a lot of people probably would just have assumed that later ones are bad copies of a Munch. They don't look anywhere near the expression of the original painting, but they're all documented, they're all by the hand of the artist and it was something that he was deliberately trying to achieve.

Then we get into this other interesting new world. The Belgian conservator Joseph Van der Veken, has been accused of doing something that the French have gloriously called hyper-restauración, which I like very much, and recently I became acquainted with the English term 'restorgery', which is a nice conflation of restoration and forgery, and just a few examples of Van de Veken on the right and our recent media darling of the overpainted wall painting in Spain on the left. And in thinking about these issues, we realize there's no consistent vocabulary for defining or even a way to think about, when does an artwork become null and void as an artwork because it's restored? And there was a lawsuit one in England where this point was discussed, and would 80% be okay

over painting? Would 85% over painting and be okay? And the judge tried to find out by interrogation, "When would we stop?" "When would we not sell this as a work by this particular artist?" We also have the problem that nowadays in the market, with insurance, we have works that are decommissioned, "dead art" is my prosaic term for these, and there's a number of examples that have been published.

What do we call these things, and how do we define their resurrection? There's been cases of art being consigned to the insurance, taken off the market because they've been declared non-functional i.e. dead, and then they've been resurrected. They've had treatments that have made them commercially or visually viable again. We have no real way to talk about these objects or to quantify what we mean, and which level of condition we find acceptable or not.

So now, we move onto the glorious area of forgery and fake, which for me the most important point is intent. What is not a forgery? Lots of things; copies, improvements, additions, misattributions, conversation, but we don't really have much of a vocabulary at all. We start talking about all these subtle subclasses. This is what we'd like to propose, this is some small suggestions. The words for "forgery" and "fake" exist in most languages in different forms, but the meanings aren't locked in, and if we could just make a little bit of tightening on how we use them, we could quite easily bring about a better precision of language.

'Forgery' are objects that are strongly suspected, and I've used 'suspected' here on purpose here you'll see, to have been made with deceptive intent. They're trying to take on the guys, the author that wasn't the author of the work. Generally, they're signed but not always. Now, this is an area of object which we don't know the intent, we suspect the intent. There's a strong suspicion that this object was made by these means, and I think it's actually quite important to distinguish between the suspected ones – and the, I'm not sure what we should call them -- confirmed, attributed forgeries, where we know who the maker was; there's no doubt, we know that these objects are made by that man, Mr. Beltracchi, in order to make lots of money and play the art market. It's not subtle. [laughs] This is our provenance distributed, authenticated; these are authenticated forgeries but we have a problem. We can't use the phrase 'authentic forgery' because it'd be very confusing, I think.

So if we move on from there, forgeries can also be pasticcios, Mr. Beltracchi work, illustrate it again nicely, taking motifs from various paintings, combining them to make a work that's plausibly by a painter by using elements from different works, rather than copying an extent original, and these are the best kinds of forgeries because they don't set off the alarm bells right away. "Oh, it's something we've not seen before."

Now, this is one I've borrowed from Martin Camp again, thank you again Martin; retrospective forgeries. We all agreed we liked this one, an object made without deceptive intent and then later becoming a forgery. Now, that's not quite so simple here, but initially the forger and what's known as an Knoedler case, was commissioned to produce works of art. I'm sorry, this is not something he's made, I described it off the internet, and the

signatures were added, and the patinas. So this man initially was not making forgeries, he was making what we would like to call fakes. He was making works in the style of another. They're sort of copies. They're not made to intentionally deceive, and I think that's an important point especially if we go to court. It's the actor who has put in the intent where, and in this case initially the actual maker of the objects was not working with bad intent. His objects were taken from him, signed, patinated, and then passed off without his knowledge initially, for gain and profit. So they did not start off their life as forgeries per se.

Fakes, as I just mentioned, it would be nice to have some word that would define our gray area of knowledge; things we don't know. They were not made -- they were made as intentional fakes, but not with deceptive intent. There's lots of people who, in the exercise of learning, go ahead and try and learn by recreating works of the old masters or earlier masters. There's, as we saw yesterday with the Mondrian's, people who make objects so they can have a copy, so they can enjoy them themselves. This deception is not involved; the intent is different, and it would be fair and more historically accurate if we could describe that. Fake is a word that exists, it's got a derogatory implication, but if we don't know what the intent is and an object strongly looks like something, and it's more likely that it's not an intentional forgery. It's nice to have the distinction between the words so as not to smear things with the tar brush, that don't necessarily deserve smearing.

Then we get to the problem of the actors in the community. This is our proposed diagram that we have for the conference. We'd like to make a couple of adjustments to that, because I'd like to talk a bit about the idea of disciplines and professions. One of the big Achilles' Heels of science in the art world is that it's seen as an interloper, it's seen as this new outsider. And I think that by calling it art science, recognizing that there are specialists; these are not people who are just dragged in out of the nuclear laboratory with no idea of an art object. We have education programs, we have people who spent decades of their lives studying art and science at the same time. It's quite fair to recognize their knowledge and expertise in the same way we say art historian, we say art conservator, art scientist -- and we'll think, "Yes, bone for that" because we discussed that recently at the Oxford Conference that we had which was discussing similar issues around the more focused target of Russian paintings -- we were discussing what might we call ourselves, and it's quick, it's short, it's not overly laden, so we've agreed we might like to suggest that.

Also, technical art historians, I will go into the discipline or profession thing to explain that a bit more, conservation is often a forum for technical art history, but they're not necessarily the same thing. And this is just a definition I grabbed off the web. Disciplines and professions, which are distinct entities. A discipline or specialism is knowledge or concentration in an academic field or study, while a profession is a vocation founded upon specialized educational training. Now, you can have a profession as one thing and have among your tool box or your skill set, competence in other related areas and that's very much what happens in our fields. They're very interdisciplinary. They're very rich, and we get this different mixed sets of skills and tools that people bring to our field, that allow for rich inter-disciplinary cooperations.

And just to review a tiny bit, 'technical art history' isn't a new term. It was suggested in English by David Bomford in 1995, but the concept existed for quite a long time previously in German in the form of the word 'kunsttechnologie', which is the study of the technical aspects of art. In 2005, Manfred Koller unsuccessfully tried to introduce the term 'technische kunstgeschichte' which is a literal translation of 'technical art history' into German, which is a nice illustration of the perils of trying to push a new vocabulary into a language where there's already an established tradition of language. It didn't really catch on; it's a few people who use it, but more or less people still say kunsttechnologie.

I have a few colleagues who describes themselves as kunsttechnolog. It's the English equivalent, it hasn't really translated over, and in fact in most other languages, this expression doesn't exist as such; it's not an accepted formulation which oftentimes English will be used when talking about conferences, and we have conferences and they're very international. Unfortunately, again, the main language is English, and words for technical art history and technical art historian haven't developed naturally in many of the related European languages. And these are just some of the examples. Again, the Dutch is very similar, on a limited basis, occasionally people talk about kunsttechnologie also in Dutch, but there's no known counterpart for the technical art historian. Again, in Italy where there's also a tradition of this kind of study, 'historia técnica del arte' is used to a limited extent, but it's not in the same way as English because we had this defined introduction and it's something that has been very much picked up upon in the different academic working groups.

To come back to conservation restoration, this is basically the profession that technical art history grew out of, which is why talking about it, we agreed that not all -- definitely not all, because there are people who have come to the field with a historical background -- but people who do object-based technical art history by and large, not with that inception, but by and large are conservators because it requires a strange mix of intimacy with the physical object; having stared at the physical object under magnification over a long period of time, many, many objects, seeing these physical phenomenon which then allows you to translate into understanding scientific results which helps you to understand historical texts; and technical art history grew out of the fact that over years and years and years, conservators were working on objects, investigating them, producing analyses and publishing.

And what we needed to really have the field of technical art history is this data. We've been talking about data all the time, and science loves data; we can quantify things with data. We have a better overview, a deeper insight if we have data. And because conservation produced this data, it reached the critical point where there is enough data and enough scientific analysis of objects that all of a sudden certain practitioners also trained in linguistics and historical treatises and paleography, started to look at the sources, the source material on technology is quite rich. It varies from artist contracts, guild ordinances; all kinds of documents related to art production, trade of materials -- The technical vocabulary was neglected over years because art historians didn't know how to translate these words. They're specialist words, they don't appear in etymological dictionaries, and was with this mixed insight that history brought us to in this point of

development, that now people -- we have a working group where we study historical texts, and are making new gains all the time in understanding this kind of historical literature.

Now, conservation restoration itself is problematic from the terminological standpoint, because traditionally the word 'restore' developed for someone who physically cares for art objects. But then in the 19th century, with all the crises and conflicts that went on over restoration that was felt to be too extensive, conservation was developed as a term to counteract the negative implications of restoration. But as has been recognized, conserving isn't the same as restoring. They're actually two different acts; one looks at preservation, one looks at filling loss, making thing more visually unified. It's a physical manipulation that doesn't necessarily have to do with the long-term preservation of the physical object. We've now have somewhat unwieldy double-barreled recommendation by certain professional groups that we should call ourselves not one or the other but both, we're conservator restorers if we're working in this field.

And it's not an ideal solution, and the problem is in many language groups, the two words don't exist. We still have 'restore', but we don't have the conservator cognate. In fact, often it's taken by a designation for a professional working in a museum, much like a curator in English. So even within the field of conservation restoration, we have our own terminology problems that we're trying to solve. So if we go into art science, again so we've imagined a world where art technology has grown out of art conservation; some conservators practice technical art history as part of what they do. Not everyone does. It's, again, part of the toolkit and how each person identifies their own skill sets. If you look within the field of art science, conservation science, and I was listening to how people were using these terms over the course of the conference, many said conservation science, some just said scientist; science, plain old.

We would prefer art science for people who are actively continually involved in this field, with a basis of training or experience within it, have developed themselves intentionally to deal with the problems of art objects. And within that, again, we have a spectrum. On the one side, we have the conservation scientist, and they obviously work for solutions for better conservation, better adhesives, better consolidants; better ways for taking care of the physical object. On the other side, we've actually come up with this appellation recently to describe what we do, because I call myself a technical art historian, I have some science and I use science as part of my discipline toolkit, but I don't have a scientific degree.

\*, my colleague who spoke earlier today, does, so we like to call him an art technology scientist because in our business, our daily practice, we don't do anything that relates directly to conservation. The science we do is employed to learn more about the history and materiality of objects, which may later be used by conservators, but equally may be used by art historians. And this is the diversity that I like to express that exists within the field. In the middle, our esteemed colleague Yap would probably fall into something in the middle. There's even more middle-ground for specialists who examine deterioration. Again, it could feed into either side of the spectrum, but we'd have a hard time imagining how an art historian would really become deeply interested in new glues to repair joints,

but we can imagine someone becoming interested in the other side. We have our gray scales in our spectra within our own specialties, and I think it's actually quite important to talk about this, because for us art science isn't science; it's science that comprehends and takes into account art technology, technical art history.

And we encountered this in a problematic way recently in a court case, where \* was working on a court case trying to defend what we believed was an authentic early 20th century Russian painting that had been disparaged as, even though it's signed and dated, actually is a copy. And when the art historian for the other side made comments that, "Well, this evidence that's been presented that there's material similarity between this painting and other paintings by the artist, this is rubbish because we know the artist all went to the academy, and they all learned the same techniques, and they had the same shops where they went, and we wouldn't expect to find any material differentiation." And we could only sit there because we weren't allowed to respond, because the argument went, "Well, these are scientists. They don't know about art. They can't testify in this." The defense would be getting a two-for-one, if they were allowed to pine on these kinds of subjects. So if we call ourselves simply scientists, we're basically shooting ourselves in the foot because it ignores a very large and very important part of our competence, and the part that allows the data that we generate to be meaningful.

So to summarize, it's not a lot we can order anyone to do. We just wanted to bring these topics up for discussion, and each linguistic group has to make their own decisions. If we can make a few suggestions, historical identification would be a nice thing to bring, maybe even alongside authentication, especially when you have little doubt of finding unknown author. 'Authentic', perhaps try to avoid or use in a very knowing way. Remember that the term's 'original copy', 'replica' may be universally present in European languages, but their actually meaning shifts hugely and their meaning is not fixed to any single definition, in almost any of the language groups. It would be very nice to try and develop the use of vocabulary for forgery that would include confirmed forgery for cases like van Meegeren, Beltracchi to forgery, where we suspect the intent of forgery but we can't ultimately prove it, and to fake where things are more likely to be misunderstood. Something that's workshop is not a forgery, it's something that happens to look like the work of an artist who's better known, and it would be useful to be able to convey some of the uncertainty.

And finally, to attempt to talk about the art sciences in a more nuanced manner; recognizing the spectrum of professionals working in this field, also in imaging as we saw today, which concern both art history and art technology. There are people who combine things, and this is why having an umbrella profession, art science, is a lovely thing. And within that profession, we have our spectrum of different disciplines which have different aims and different focuses that can contribute in different ways to our understanding of the objects we're studying. So just to conclude, our thanks to the following people who generously answered our questionnaire on what do you understand by these terms, and eventually it would be nice if we could finish whipping it into shape and publish it somewhere, because it was quite a fun exercise to see how the vocabulary differs over time, space and language group.

So now, if we could ask the rest of the group up to the stage. We'll have a short panel discussion and some questions if anyone has them.

**[applause]**

**Julie:** Actually, just so we're staying on time, when is our cutoff?

**[Speaker 1 inaudible 00:38:45]**

**Julie:** We'll try to be good if you give us a -- But we'll allow it if you tell us. We've got permission to ramble on for a really long time. [laughs] No, I know. Okay, that I can live with.

**Speaker1:** 14, actually.

**Julie:** So we're going to shoot for 12:30 then. Yes, excellent. Digital clock. So basically, one of the nice things about our panel is we're from different countries, we're from different areas of specialization, and we thought we could each bring a little something of our particular background to the discussion. So if we could start with Iris. We've been talking a bit about the difficulties of the dichotomy, the conservator-restored dichotomy, and as that is Iris's main profession at the museums in Cologne, we thought she could valuably say something about the German experience on the subject.

**Iris:** Thank you, Julie. Yes, I can add that the German term 'conservator', we have it 'conservator' is not only the name of a professional or an art historian in cultural heritage or care for cultural heritage, but also, it's the term for a level of carrier in a museums. So we have 'conservator' in a museum, German museums, who is an art historian or even a scientist, it could be a conservator, but I don't know about many conservators, paintings conservators, which have the level of a conservator. So it's really difficult, and we should take care with terms in that field.

**Julie:** And you've, as a conservator in the museum, you've been involved with a number of wonderful projects on impressionism and on medieval art, that have very much the technical art, historical studies. How do you describe those when you've been working on them? How do you convey the kind of study you're doing? Do you use kunsttechnologie, or...?

**Iris:** Yes. The name of our department is Department of Art Technology and Conservation, and we use the term kunst technologie very regularly in Germany, yes. Not

as much as you mentioned, the technische kunstgeschichte, but kunst technologie is very common.

**Julie:** And Eddy, we thought you could perhaps say something about authenticity and your experiences of using that relating to objects in various conditions and various states of attribution within your work as an art historian?

**Eddy:** Yes. Well, the term authenticity doesn't occur that often in my daily practice. I consult almost every day auction catalogues as well as art historical scholarly literature, and the terms that's pertained to authenticity, and it's variations, seems to be that they are used in very careless ways normally. Yesterday, there have been some examples of auctioneers making careless use of different terms. For instance, the term 'copy' is hardly ever used there, and many copies around that comes at auction it's mostly called circle of -- suggesting that it's from the direct surroundings of the artist and possibly maybe even from the studio. And there is, I think, a lot of intentional abuse there. But if we leave aside the auctioneers, and not point fingers but look at the scholars there, there's some room for improvement as well, especially terms as 'attribution' are often used without explaining what is meant with it, and repeated.

There's of course a huge percentage of scholarly literature that is intended for a wider audience, such as the entries in exhibition catalogues, and it seems as if our art historians writing texts for a broader audience don't use the same standards for correct and precise use of terminology, and then you have the problem that a lot of these exhibition catalogues get translated because the exhibitions travel from one venue in a certain country to another, and there are very few specialized translators around who are able to -- if the original is accurate and precise, and in terminology to bring it over to other language.

I think that has to do with a lack of awareness of the importance of the use of accurate terminology, and of course art history is not even a soft science, it's a soft discipline, very interpretative. By tradition, there are also literary conventions at play, and some art historians would like to produce a piece of literature rather than accurate texts, very precisely explaining what is on their plate in terms of what kinds of problems are to be treated and explained. And so, I think to move forward to a recommendation, I think we have to look at the universities, where in the training there should be more attention in the courses that devote attention to writing skills for accurate use of terminology.

**Julie:** That's a good suggestion. I'm sorry, I should have done a brief introduction. Eddy Schavemaker is an independent art historian, and Iris is a museums conservator, and filling out our range here, Daniel Lapina is an art scientist with a biological specialization working in the Officio de Pitadore in Florence, and we've discussed about this, particularly language and culture-based problem, a very precise usage of words, and maybe you could say something about -- because it really does have an extensive tradition of thinking and conservation, and maybe some of your experience as an art scientist dealing with specialists in the art history areas. Where have you found areas that you might think that a better terminology might help in communication?

**Iris:** Well, I think what you presented is absolutely very important, and about -- I just want to focus on the terms about the professionals, and actually, initially, we don't have any term which is useful to assess the profession of a technical art historian. We just have a term, as you said before, about the discipline, but initially, art historians are more involved in other traditional works, and they work -- the activity about the study of materials of art are made by scientists in almost all public laboratories like [unintelligible 00:47:54] but also in other kind of laboratories.

So yes, there are some differences between European countries, but I think that this kind of differences may be good in the future to assess better this term, because I think that terminology is absolutely a very important, a very relevant issue in authentication, but not only authentication, also in conservation, also in studies about works of art.

**Julie:** I think it's essential to communicate to that dreaded public what we actually do, especially because in so many contexts we're actually a bit dependent on public goodwill for our funding to do our work and get money, and political support for the projects we engage in. Because we're pressed for time. We've now got four minutes left, and if there are any questions, I'm sure that we'd be happy to answer them. Up in the back?

**Speaker2:** Yes, I have a couple of specific questions which related to a more general one. The first is that I'm not very happy about the idea of using intention. It's rather bizarre in what you're doing there. I mean, you also say workshop pieces are fakes.

**Julie:** No, I was saying that's what we want to avoid; tarring them with that brush.

**Speaker2:** Oh, I'm sorry. I mistook to what you--

**Julie:** We'd like to have a subtle vocabulary to express intention.

**Speaker2:** Right. But I mean, it's not intention that's really important here in terms of the designation of the descriptor, it's the context; it's the circumstances in which -- there's nothing that inheres in the picture, and you have that -- let me finish, you have that in your sense of retrospection, but I think that somehow that needs -- in a way, you're almost pandering too much to the notion that what really counts is this notion of single authorship, and that probably is because it's a kind of market context.

Anyway, I see that you're not going to agree with that at all, that's fine.

**Julie:** I could explain a bit why we found it important. Because if you're studying artworks from a material standpoint, things that are made with intent to deceive will involve an entirely different set of materials and techniques that can be best studied if they're recognized and distinguished. Also, the other intent in trying to stimulate the discussion. Because, to understand a fake, you have to recognize it as forgery, you have to recognize it as such, and if the language is cloudy, we can't make these distinctions between the works that were put together in order to fool, and the works that were put together by

someone trying to create a work of art; they're two very different beasts from the material standpoint. And I can see what you mean, by that absolutely wasn't the idea behind it.

It was a useful tool from a particular practical standpoint, and what we also wanted to do is -- again, I said at the beginning, I hope that came across -- it's a very sticky situation. It would be nice to have a non-judgmental way to express our lack of knowledge about who to ascribe a certain artwork to. And all too often, things that aren't well attributed are called fakes or forgeries because people simply don't -- they're misattributions, but they get lumped into those unsubtle derogatory categories, and that was the point that we were trying to make.

**Speaker2:** Okay, all right. I think probably misunderstood what you were saying, but I also think this question of context is crucial. But the other thing is that I was interested in this question about -- you're talking about professional descriptors, but I've noticed there are institutional configurations, those seem to be very different in the museum or in an art history program, in a university, which in turn is different from a consulting firm which has a kind of group of people who are working together -- to my mind, what goes on in the politics of these things, particularly in institutions like museums, are crucial, and those descriptors also -- it's not simply a question of a dispassionate description, it's also that these terms carry weight because they also carry authority and power.

**Julie:** The museum world actually reflects that there's training programs now for technical art historians, conservation science is a recognized field. There's been attempts to establish training programs more or less successfully to train people in that. Again, we're attempting to respond to evolution, that's clearly in progress and not necessarily fully formalized, and I welcome discussion of it because I hope it comes across, and I'll repeat it as many times I need to; we weren't entirely sure. This was the result of our discussion, and some of the points we wanted to raise and the reasons behind why we thought these things might be necessary.

**Speaker3:** I would just contribute something to this idea of intention, as for the artist, is a very good term that Michael [unintelligible 00:53:57] has coined, 'the artist's brief' -- which is also contextual -- brings in things and which takes off the deliberateness which is often associated with intention. So I just want to --

**Julie:** How would you define the brief, then?

**Speaker3:** The brief is things that not necessarily is deliberate, in the sense that he actually precisely knows what he wants to do. This would be narrow in many cases, but it's linked to the authorship which has also unconscious motives and things that come into the process, but which are part of the works, it's in the patterns of intention.

**Julie:** Robin, up this way.

**Robin:** This is working? Yes. Thank you for this very interesting lecture, and thank your panel of course. But many of the things were addressed already 20 years ago, and I don't see any output here. Why is that? What is the reason for that?

**Julie:** Things were addressed 20 years ago?

**Robin:** The discussion with conservation--

**Julie:** They're not resolved.

**Robin:** Well, this was the challenge, wasn't it?

**Julie:** But what are we going to do? Proclaim that each nation has to sit down and the government should sit down and -- you can't do that.

**Robin:** No, maybe suggestions that are not repressing, but steering--

**Julie:** We did make suggestions, actually. We made suggestions by making the audience, I think, aware of the problems that exist, but we can't dictate to different countries how they should use their language.

**Robin:** It's not about dictation, it's maybe about giving suggestions, and I hardly see that.

**Julie:** I find that we made suggestions, so I'll agree to disagree on this one, I think. The idea of structure is--

**Speaker3:** One thing. For example, in the French language, it's very difficult to distinguish between forgery and fake. A fake is a forgery, and a forgery is a fake, so we would have maybe to invent a word.

**Julie:** We had a discussion on this with Terry Linnen who was a group member, who left the conference and he also felt that was a useful distinction between forgeries and fakes, because his recent book on forgery was written in English, although he's Belgian and a French speaker, and David Scott reviewed his book, and raised this issue that, in English often we use 'forgery' in a specific way, and 'fake' in a less intentional way. This, again, is something that we wanted to highlight in this, but there's massive issues and it needs to be dealt with per language group, but that's the situation in most languages and English. It's a tradition of use, but it's not a consistent use. Some of us use it that way, but not everyone.

**Speaker3:** So the Belgian French speaker didn't actually have an answer?

**Julie:** Again, it's such a detailed discussion, you would have to get consensus within native speakers of each group; what they would like. He suggested much as in English, that we could identify terms perhaps already in use, and try to lock-in their meaning, was

his suggestion. Much as we've suggested here, that we try to lock in the meaning of forgery as something deceptively made and fake -- that was a--

**Speaker3:** That would be in English. I think in English, it's very clear.

**Julie:** That was the main suggestion, that perhaps in each language group, this process might be undertaken but as we're all one person from different language groups, it would be a bit much of us to say which word, it's a discussion that we think should be undertaken in each country.

**Speaker3:** Yes. In French, we would say pastiche for fake.

**Julie:** But each fake isn't a pastiche, that's a problem. It's the general terminology that needs to be developed.

**Speaker4:** May I ask something? One of the problem of terminology, is that, for example, in Italy, there is not guidelines for terminology, neither in authentication nor in conservation. There is just the terminology, document on terminology, about conservation of **[unintelligible 00:58:43]** because over time scientists are restorers and architects work together to have this guideline [sic]. So the suggestions are not so easy to give because the suggestions are what -- basically, what Julie said, are based on a gathering of terms in each countries and for some countries that there are not an established terminology, there is not a term which identified with -- in an absolute meaning -- something.

**Julie:** To conclude, because we've gone overtime now, we agreed as a panel of -- a small group -- that we would attempt as we've done to make suggestions which we thought were appropriately structured, and we do welcome further discussion. Thank you.

**[applause]**