

Chapter 1 : Han van Meegeren | Revolv

*Han van Meegeren's Mansion Primavera in Roquebrune Cap Martin. It was here, in , that Van Meegeren painted his forgery Christ and the Disciples at Emmaus, which later sold for about \$, Forgers, by nature, prefer anonymity and therefore are rarely remembered.*

I have encountered what seems to me to be resistance from people who might have clues to the solution of this puzzle. I believe that the answer is dependent upon the willingness of sources to share what they know. Needless to say, the personality and character of Van Meegeren is still a question of interest to scholars quite as much as the techniques he used to create passable art forgeries. In his second book, Van Meegeren: Did others assume that his close relationships with them were evidence that he shared their outlook? That he was not known personally to utter anti-Semitic words yet allowed others to do so in his name De Kemphaan and that he did not join any political party or movement yet was viewed as in agreement with what he observed – a passive onlooker and also an active commercial trader in art the Nazis wanted for themselves – does not relieve him of the responsibility of his own actions on behalf of those he worked closely with and helped to support. A moral and ethical man would have turned away from years of obnoxious and vicious propaganda in revulsion. Han van Meegeren turned his Nazi associations into profit. Any summing up of his behavior would place him among those with no moral compass, no ethical commitment, no firm grounding as a sympathetic and far from an empathetic human being. His portrait of Jopie Breemer is not offered as evidence of documentation that he saved Jopie from deportation and death in a concentration camp. If that is so, where is the evidence? Jopie Breemer might have been one who knew. Or his son may have known. Would new evidence explain if not absolve Van Meegeren of the worst aspects of his political behavior? We cannot say absent compelling evidence. These were critical parental losses for Breemer. Did these holes in their emotional lives bring Van Meegeren and Breemer together in some sort of bond or solidarity? Did Han van Meegeren view Jopie Breemer as someone he was sympathetic to because of some shared life experiences? One can only hope that this sliver of evidence has emerged to cast Van Meegeren in a better light.

Bibliography Archieven en Collecties at [http: Centraal Bureau voor Genealogie](http://Centraal Bureau voor Genealogie) English version at [http: Digitale bibliotheek voor de Nederlandse letteren](http://Digitale bibliotheek voor de Nederlandse letteren) at [http: A searchable database of Dutch literature, language and culture, which includes literary texts, secondary literature, biographies, portraits and hyperlinks.](http://A searchable database of Dutch literature, language and culture, which includes literary texts, secondary literature, biographies, portraits and hyperlinks.) Begraafplaatsen, Kerkhoven, en oorlogsmonumenten at [http: Haagse Kunstkring](http://Haagse Kunstkring) at [http: Koninklijke Bibliotheek, Historische Kranten](http://Koninklijke Bibliotheek, Historische Kranten) – Nederlandse dagbladen uit de 17e, 18e, 19e en 20e eeuw. Articles researched in 20th century Dutch newspapers, The database consists of selected newspapers; the latter date is as far as the database reaches at this time. The Meegeren Website at [http: Militia records](http://Militia records) at [http: The entries are for those who served in the Dutch militia between and They also confirm year of birth. Database van Verdwenen Molens in Nederland](http://The entries are for those who served in the Dutch militia between and They also confirm year of birth. Database van Verdwenen Molens in Nederland) at [http: National Archives of the Netherlands](http://National Archives of the Netherlands) at [http: Netherlands Civil Registration-Vital Records](http://Netherlands Civil Registration-Vital Records) at [http: Rijksbureau voor Kunsthistorische Documentatie](http://Rijksbureau voor Kunsthistorische Documentatie) at [http: Stadsarchief Amsterdam](http://Stadsarchief Amsterdam) at [http: University of Amsterdam Library](http://University of Amsterdam Library) at [http: Wie Was Wie](http://Wie Was Wie) at [http: World Vital Records](http://World Vital Records) at [Page 1](http://Books and articles Anderson, Anthony. Holland Under the Third Reich. Nederlands Letterkundig Museum en Documentatiecentrum, A View of Delft. Natuurwetenschappers over Hun Rol in en Moderne Maatschappij, Genius, Discovery, and the Unknown Apprentice. Complete Edition of the Paintings. With contributions by Rob Ruurs and Willem L. Brandhof, Marijke van den. Een vroege Vermeer uit Onder talk van Z. Catalogue of the Important Sale By Auction. Property of the Dutch Painter H. Introduction by Gerrit Komrij. The Low Countries as a Refuge for the Spirit. Edited by Gordon Stein. The Cambridge Companion to Vermeer. Cambridge University Press, Godley, John Raymond [Lord Kilbracken]. Henri Friedlaender en Paul Urban. Duitse grafisch vormgevers in het Nederlandse exil Vrouwen in de vormgeving in Nederland Peter Lang, , 2 vols. Nazi Rule and Dutch Collaboration: The Netherlands Under German Occupation, Translated by Louise Wilmot. Arend Hendrik , Jr. Henricus Han Antonius van Meegeren Japi en Bavink en de doorbraak van de moderne kunst. Het vroege proza van Nescio in een cultuurhistorische spiegel. Kraaijpoel, Diederik and Harry van Wijnen. Han Van Meegeren en zijn Meesterwerk van Vermeer. Han van Meegeren Revisited.</a></p></div><div data-bbox=)

Life and Works of Han van Meegeren. Followed by Subjects for Further Research. Voor en achter het voetlicht: Musici en de arbeidsverhoudingen in het kunst- en amusementsbedrijf in Nederland, The Clandestine Book The Thyssen Art Macabre. Deutsche Buchgestalter in den Niederlanden Gouda Quint BV, The Man Who Made Vermeers: Edited by Alexander Klein. Pages , no illustration. A seven-part series about Han van Meegeren. Gesprekken met vertegenwoordigers van de nieuwere richting in onze literatuur; tevens een enquête naar enkele beginselen in ons nationaal geestelijk leven. Pas, Wim van der. Theo van der Pas Een leven met muziek. Theo van der Pas Stichting, De Bezige Bij, A Plea for an International Perspective. Ribbens, Arjen, Jopie Breemer en het Jopiehol. Vermeer ; Veiled Emotions. Der Fall Van Meegeren. A Study of Vermeer. University of California Press, Oxford University Press, The Case of Arthur Van Schendel. Thesis, University of Birmingham,

Chapter 2 : Han van Meegeren - Wikipedia

*Table of Contents: Han van Meegeren fecit / Hope B. Werness ; What is wrong with a forgery? / Alfred Lessing ; Forgery and the anthropology of art / Leonard B. Meyer.*

He was the son of Augusta Louisa Henrietta Camps and Hendrikus Johannes van Meegeren, a French and history teacher at the Kweekschool training college for schoolmasters in the city of Deventer. He was often forced by his father to write a hundred times the phrase "I know nothing, I am nothing, I am capable of nothing. Korteling had been inspired by Johannes Vermeer and showed the young Van Meegeren how Vermeer had manufactured and mixed his colours. Korteling had rejected the Impressionist movement and other modern trends, as decadent, degenerate art, and his strong personal influence probably later led van Meegeren to rebuff contemporary styles and paint exclusively in the style of the Dutch Golden Age. During his studies, van Meegeren easily passed his preliminary examinations, but because he did not wish to become an architect, he never took the Ingenieurs final examination. This building still exists and has been designated a protected monument. On 18 April, van Meegeren married a fellow art student, Anna de Voogt, who was expecting their first child. In the summer of, van Meegeren moved his family to Scheveningen. In March, his daughter Pauline later called Inez was born. Van Meegeren undertook numerous journeys to Belgium, France, Italy and England, and acquired a name for himself as a talented portraitist. His clients were impressed by his understanding of the 17th century techniques of the Dutch masters. Throughout his life, van Meegeren would paint pictures to which he would sign his own signature, which differed greatly from the marks he used on his forgeries. Van Meegeren now dedicated himself to portraiture and began producing forgeries to increase his income. Jo had previously been married to art critic and journalist, Dr. Hertje and Straatzangers were particularly popular. Between April and March, and together with journalist Jan Ubink, he raged against the art community, and in the process, lost any sympathy with the critics. He moved with his second wife, Jo, to the South of France and began preparations for this ultimate forgery, which took him six years, from to Vermeer had not been particularly well-known until the beginning of the twentieth century; his works were both scarce – only about 35 had survived – and extremely valuable. In October, Dr. Abraham Bredius published an article about a recently discovered Vermeer which he described as a painting of a Man and Woman at a Spinnet. Van Meegeren bought authentic 17th century canvas and mixed his own paints from raw materials such as lapis lazuli, white lead, indigo, and cinnabar using old formulas to ensure that they were authentic. In addition, he used badger-hair paintbrushes, similar to those Vermeer was known to have used. He came up with a scheme of using phenol formaldehyde to cause the paints to harden after application, making the paintings appear as if they were years old. Later, he would wash the painting in black India ink to fill in the cracks. Van Meegeren did not sell these paintings; both are now at the Rijksmuseum. Van Meegeren gave the work to his friend, the attorney C. Boon, telling him it was a genuine Vermeer, and asked him to show it to the famous art connoisseur and Vermeer expert, Dr. Abraham Bredius, who was living nearby in Monaco. Bredius examined the forgery in September, [21] and despite some initial doubts, he accepted it as a genuine Vermeer and praised it highly. In, the piece was highlighted in a special exhibition at the Rotterdam museum along with Dutch masterpieces dating from In the "Magazine for [the] History of Art", A. Feulner wrote that "In the rather isolated area, in which the Vermeer picture hung, it was as quiet as in a chapel. The feeling of the consecration overflows on the visitors, although the picture has no ties to ritual or church. On the walls of the estate hung several genuine Old Masters. He remained at a hotel in Amsterdam for several months and in moved to the village of Laren. Throughout, van Meegeren issued his designs, which he published in as Han van Meegeren: Teekeningen I Drawings nr I a large and luxurious book. On 18 December, he divorced his wife, but this was only a formality; the couple remained together, but a large share of his capital was transferred to her accounts as a safeguard against the uncertainties of the war. He chain-smoked, drank heavily and became addicted to morphine-laced sleeping pills. Fortunately for van Meegeren, there were no genuine Vermeers available for comparison, since most museum collections were in protective storage as a prevention against war damage. On 17 May, Allied forces entered the salt mine, where Captain Harry Anderson

discovered the previously unknown "Vermeer". On 29 May, he was arrested and charged with fraud and aiding and abetting the enemy. He was remanded to Weteringschans prison. As an alleged Nazi collaborator and plunderer of Dutch cultural property the authorities threatened Van Meegeren with extensive prison time. I painted the picture! Van Meegeren was released from prison in January or February. The public prosecutor, H. Wassenbergh, brought charges of forgery and fraud and demanded a sentence of two years in prison. The commission included curators, professors and doctors from the Netherlands, Belgium, and England and was led by the director of the chemical laboratory at the Royal Museums of Fine Arts of Belgium, Dr. With the help of the commission, Dr. He found that van Meegeren had prepared the paints by mixing them with the plastic bonding agent Albertol, a phenolformaldehyde resin. The matter found in the craquelure appeared to come from India ink, which had accumulated even in areas that natural dirt or dust would never have reached. The paint had become so hard that not only alcohol but also strong acids and bases did not attack the surface, a clear indication that the surface had not been formed in a natural manner. The craquelure on the surface did not always match that in the ground layer, which with a natural craquelure would certainly have been the case. Thus, the test results obtained by the commission appeared to confirm that the works were forgeries created by van Meegeren, but their authenticity would continue to be debated by some of the experts until and, when new investigative techniques were used to analyze the paintings see below. On 12 November, the Fourth Chamber of the Amsterdam Regional Court found Han van Meegeren guilty of forgery and fraud, and he was sentenced to a minimal one year in prison [38]. On 26 November, the last day to appeal the ruling, van Meegeren suffered a heart attack and was rushed to the Valeriuskliniek hospital in Amsterdam. He was pronounced dead at 5: His family and several hundred of his friends attended his funeral at the Driehuis Westerveld Crematorium chapel. In, his urn was buried in the general cemetery in the village of Diepenveen municipality of Deventer. In December, van Meegeren had filed for bankruptcy. On 5 and 6 September, the furniture and other possessions in his Amsterdam house at Keizersgracht were auctioned by order of the court, along with other pieces of furniture and works of art, including numerous paintings by old and new masters from his private collection. The house was auctioned separately on 4 September. Together with the house, estimated to be worth 65, guilders, the proceeds of the sale amounted to, guilders. A large part of his considerable wealth had been transferred to her when they were divorced during the war, and the money would have been confiscated, if she had been ruled to be an accomplice. To all authors, journalists and biographers Van Meegeren told the same story: Some biographers believe, however, that Jo must have known the truth. Jo outlived her husband by many years, always in great luxury, until her death at the age of Decoen went on to state that conclusions of Dr. Paul Coremans publicly admit that he had erred in his analysis. The court found in favour of Coremans, and the findings of his commission were upheld. Under the direction of Dr. Robert Feller and Dr. Bernard Keisch, the examination confirmed that several of their paintings were in fact created using materials invented in the 20th century. This confirmed the findings of the Coremans commission, and refuted the claims made by M. Thus, modern white lead differs greatly from the white lead Vermeer would have used, both in the isotope composition of the lead and in the content of trace elements found in the ores. Dutch white lead was extracted from ores containing high levels of trace elements of silver and antimony. To determine the amount of Pb, the alpha radiation emitted by another element, polonium Po, is measured. In contrast, the white lead found in Dutch paintings from had polonium values of 0. The conclusions of the commission were again reaffirmed and upheld by the Dutch judiciary system. Legacy Van Meegeren played different roles, some of which were shrouded in fraudulent intentions, as he sought to fulfill his goal of besting his critics. Indeed, recent works question many of the existing assumptions about van Meegeren and the motivations for his career in forgery. With Han van Meegeren, everything was double-edged and his character presents itself as fragments rather than unity. After van Meegeren was released, he continued to paint, signing his works with his own name. His new-found popularity ensured quick sale of his new paintings, often selling at prices that were many times higher than before he had been unmasked as a forger. Van Meegeren also told the news media that "he had an offer from a Manhattan gallery to come to the U. List of known forgeries by Han van Meegeren: Lady Playing Music - unsold, on display at the Rijksmuseum. Portrait of a Man - in the style of Gerard ter Borch unsold, on display at the Rijksmuseum.

Woman Drinking - unsold, on display at the Rijksmuseum. In interviews with journalists, [61] regarding discussions with his father [62] Jacques van Meegeren suggested his father had created a number of other forgeries. Some of these paintings include: The Frans Hals catalogue by Frans L. Dony [63] mentions four paintings by this name attributed to Frans Hals or the "school of Frans Hals", one of these could easily be by Van Meegeren. It was attributed to Theo van Wijngaarden, friend and partner of Van Meegeren, but may have been painted by Van Meegeren. Its present whereabouts are unknown. Original artwork Van Meegeren was a prolific artist, and produced thousands of original paintings in a number of diverse styles. This wide range in painting and drawing styles often irritated art critics. Some of his typical works are classical still lifes in convincing 17th century manner, Impressionistic paintings of people frolicking on lakes or beaches, jocular drawings where the subject is drawn with rather odd features, Surrealistic paintings with combined fore- and backgrounds. Other works include his prize-winning St.

Chapter 3 : Han van Meegeren "Fecit", "Fecit"

Werness, Hope B., "Han van Meegeren fecit," in Denis Dutton, ed., *The Forger's Art: Forgery and the Philosophy of Art* (Berkeley: University of California Press, ).

For definitive version, see *British Journal of Aesthetics* 45 , Appropriation and Authorship in Contemporary Art Sherri Irvin Abstract Appropriation art has often been thought to support the view that authorship in art is an outmoded or misguided notion. Through a thought experiment comparing appropriation art to a unique case of artistic forgery, I examine and reject a number of candidates for the distinction that makes artists the authors of their work while forgers are not. This responsibility is constitutive of authorship and accounts for the interpretability of artworks. Far from undermining the concept of authorship in art, then, the appropriation artists in fact reaffirmed and strengthened it. Introduction What it is that makes an artist the author of an artwork? The appropriation artists, beginning with Elaine Sturtevant, simply created copies of works by other artists, with little or no manipulation or alteration, and presented these copies as their own works. The work of the appropriation artists, which continues into the present, might well be thought to support the idea that the author is dead: I will begin by providing a brief overview of practices in appropriation art to provide some historical grounding. I will then construct a thought experiment comparing appropriation art to a highly unusual case of artistic forgery. Consideration of several possible candidates for the relevant difference between appropriation artist and forger, the difference that makes artists authors of their work while forgers are not, will shed light on the nature of authorship in contemporary art, and in art more generally. Appropriation Art In art of the last several decades, practices of radical appropriation from other artworks are common. Of course, appropriation in art is nothing new. Borrowing from the work of other artists has been a time-honoured practice throughout much of art history: Sturtevant, however, took appropriation to a new extreme. Even when Marcel Duchamp brought ready-made objects into the gallery and Andy Warhol appropriated from popular and consumer culture, they had to decide to treat certain objects as art. But Sturtevant eschews even this level of decision: Sherrie Levine, perhaps the best known appropriation artist, produced a substantial body of radical photographic appropriations during the 1980s. For these works, she sought out reproductions of well-known works by artists such as Walker Evans and Alexander Rodchenko in art history books and catalogues, photographed the reproductions, and presented the resulting photographs as her own work. In addition to the photographic series, she created paintings and sculptures based on well known artworks. She often produced these works in a medium different from that employed by the original artist: In none of these works is there any attempt to deceive; indeed, the name of the original artist is often acknowledged within the title of the work. In the late 1980s, Glenn Brown took liberally from the works of other artists of 4 diverse styles and historical periods, such as John Martin, Frank Auerbach and Salvador Dali, to create a body of work that has no unified stylistic marker: Finally, to bring the movement full circle, in Michael Mandiberg created a web site, AfterSherrieLevine. Our traditional conception of the artist holds artists responsible for every aspect of their creations: And this seems to be what makes artworks interpretable: Seeking after the meaning of an artwork is, according to many philosophers, reconstructing what the artist meant by making a work with just these features, or at least what it would be reasonable to infer that the artist meant in making such a work. By including other artworks virtually unaltered within their own work, they substitute the voices of others for their own. The work of the most radical appropriation artists has been accepted as art, and they have been accepted as artists, receiving every form of recognition for which artists and artworks are eligible: Levine has works in the collection of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, Glenn Brown has been short listed for the Turner Prize, the appropriation artists have been discussed in *Artforum*, *Art in America*, *Flash Art* and other major art criticism venues, and so on. Moreover, the kind of recognition the artists have received suggests that the art world takes them seriously as the authors of their work. If Brown were not considered responsible for his works, however derivative from Dali and John Martin, what would be the point of considering him for a prestigious award? If Levine were not taken seriously as an author, what would be the point of interviewing her in major art magazines? But if we wish our theories to be responsive to

artistic developments, rather than exceedingly revisionist, we must acknowledge that appropriation art is, indeed, art, and that those who practise it are the authors of their works. The question becomes, what constitutes the authorship relation an artist bears to a work, when on one reading the artist may have created little of its content? To put it differently, in the one case, we accept that there is an artist who has created an artwork, and it is her own artwork; she is the author of that work. In the other case, we do not accept that we have an artist, an artwork and an authorship relation that connects them. In probing this distinction, we will come to a set of insights about what characterizes authorship of artworks in a contemporary context. As we shall see, despite the tenuous appearance of their authorship status, the appropriation artists are, in fact, authors in the full sense of the word. The reasons for this will shed light on authorship in non-appropriation art as well. A Thought Experiment I propose a thought experiment that invites us to compare the case of the appropriation artist, who has a genuine if minimal authorship relation to her work, and a case of artistic forgery, where that authorship relation is absent. The thought experiment involves a very special kind of forgery, one that to my knowledge has never been carried out in the history of art, and that would have been unthinkable until rather recently. Forgeries have traditionally fallen into two categories: But the forger I have in mind creates neither copies nor pastiches. She is a forger of contemporary artworks by artists who are still living and working, even as she is producing her forgeries. How might the forger go about this? Well, she will use whatever techniques seem likely to promote success. She will identify trajectories in the current body of work and will learn, from any available source, what the victim has said about the work. She may recreate existing works by the victim so as to gain insight into the processes, both material and intellectual, that gave rise to them. She will, perhaps, immerse herself as deeply as possible into the kind of context in which the victim is immersed, so as to have the same kinds of thoughts and ideas the victim has. In any case, let us suppose that the forger has at least one spectacular success: We will assume, further, that the forger somehow manages to pass her product off as a work by the original artist. Perhaps she has a shady intermediary who trades the work in an art market where procedures for checking provenance are a bit lax. Perhaps it never occurs to anyone in the transaction that someone would have enough chutzpah to blatantly rip off the work of a living artist in this way. In any case, the work is successfully passed off as that of the victim. The two works are visually more or less indistinguishable, providing the viewer with no reason to choose one as the work of the original artist and regard the other as inauthentic. On one way of looking at things, the forger and the original artist have done almost exactly the same thing: In this way, the case differs markedly from classic cases described in the philosophical literature on forgery. But in the special case of forgery we are now considering, the situation is quite different. If the forger has no compensating bag of tricks derived from historical advantage, her task is obviously quite challenging, and success represents real achievement. The upshot, for our purposes, is that to say the artist has achieved more than the contemporary forger, or done something more difficult in the creation of this particular work, seems implausible. A difference in level of achievement will not serve to distinguish the artist from the forger. Probing the reasons for this may lead us to some helpful insights. The appropriation artists are an example of this: Such artists work in related series, and elements of the work are repeated throughout the series. Prior to the advent of appropriation art, we might well have been tempted to suggest that innovation makes for the critical difference between artist and forger. Kant was an early proponent of the view that innovation is essential to art: The history of art may be described as the forging of master keys for opening the mysterious locks of our senses to which only nature herself originally held the key. Of course, once the door springs open, once the key is shaped, it is easy to repeat the performance. Perhaps when Sturtevant produced her first radical appropriation work, a substantial innovative leap was made. But Levine is at best the second appropriation artist, not the first; and by the time she has appropriated ten or twelve Walker Evans photographs, there seems to be no warrant for saying that further Evans appropriations are innovative. Unless we want to build in some kind of halo effect or afterglow from the first work produced which would warrant calling the whole series innovative, it seems we must deny that innovation is necessary for artistic authorship though innovation might still contribute to the value of artworks, as John Hoaglund suggests. Artistic Motives We are in need of another proposal to explain why the artist is an author of her work while the forger fails to be an author. But in fact, the line between deceptive and

non-deceptive activity does not track the distinction between authors and non-authors. Deceptiveness is not what prevents the forger from being an author. Art students who produce meticulous copies of great artworks fail to be authors for the same sort of reason as the forger does, though they do not attempt to deceive anyone into thinking their products are original artworks. And artists who deceptively present their works as having been produced by someone with a different identity—someone older or younger, living in a different country, of a different gender, and so forth—need not for that reason cease to be the authors of their works. Indeed, the fact that he remains the author is a large part of what makes the deception objectionable. The forger, we might say, cares about the wrong things, or fails to care about the right things. The artist, on the other hand, has true artistic motivations: Artists act out of all sorts of motives, some artistic, some not. Sherrie Levine stopped using the photographs of Walker Evans, and started copying photos not protected by copyright within the U. This circumstance played a strong role in her decision to base some of her works on the photographs of Rodchenko, since Soviet material was not then protected by copyright within the U. Warhol was, by his own report, obsessed with achieving fame. But even if every artistic decision he ever made was driven by this goal, he would still count as an artist. Other artists may be obsessed by jealousy or admiration; and their obsessions may lead them to focus on some other artist with the same intensity our forger displays in focusing on the victim. But this fact alone does not rule them out of account as artists. We might want to think that some form of authenticity, purity of motive or freedom from instrumental concerns is an ideal for artists; but it would be implausible to claim that lack of authenticity prevents one from being an artist at all. Someone may be the author of an artwork despite failing to produce an innovative product. Artists may be deceptive without failing to be authors, while copyists, whose activity and products are very similar to those of the forger, may fail to be authors despite their honesty; thus deceptiveness is not the dividing line between authors and non-authors. Finally, artists and forgers alike may be driven by non-artistic motives. However, the last of these proposals requires further consideration. We entertained and rejected the possibility that the forger fails to count as an author of an artwork because she takes artistic considerations into account only instrumentally, all her activity being driven by a non-artistic motive. Artists may do just the same thing: Thus the nature or content of their ultimate motives and objectives cannot distinguish the artist from the forger. Rather than supposing that the artist has an artistic motive with particular content that accounts for her being an author, we might think the artist need only have a minimal intention that is constitutive of her authorship: After all, there is little in the notion of a mere intention to produce artworks that allows us to account for the authorship relation. Simply to say that artists are the authors of their work because they have an intention to produce artworks, without further detail, would be to propound an empty view, one that does no philosophical work in helping us to understand the nature of authorship. Thus we must ask, what is it in the formulation of such an intention that could transform the situation, so that the artist goes from simply being the maker of a product to being its author?



**Chapter 4 : The Forger's art : forgery and the philosophy of art in SearchWorks catalog**

*Van Meegeren's fake Vermeers on Arttube (Museum Boijmans) The Meegeren website with many examples of van Meegeren's own paintings, as well as updated information regarding his personal and professional life, compiled by Frederik H. Kreuger.*

Early years[ edit ] Han a diminutive version of Henri or Henricus van Meegeren was born in as the third of five children of middle-class Roman Catholic parents in the provincial city of Deventer. He was the son of Augusta Louisa Henrietta Camps and Hendrikus Johannes van Meegeren, a French and history teacher at the Kweekschool training college for schoolteachers in the city of Deventer. His father often forced him to write a hundred times, "I know nothing, I am nothing, I am capable of nothing. Korteling had been inspired by Johannes Vermeer and showed van Meegeren how Vermeer had manufactured and mixed his colours. Korteling had rejected the Impressionist movement and other modern trends as decadent, degenerate art, and his strong personal influence probably led van Meegeren to rebuff contemporary styles and paint exclusively in the style of the Dutch Golden Age. He easily passed his preliminary examinations but he never took the Ingenieurs final examination because he did not want to become an architect. On 18 April , van Meegeren married fellow art student Anna de Voogt who was expecting their first child. Jacques van Meegeren also became a painter; he died on 26 October in Amsterdam. In the summer of , van Meegeren moved his family to Scheveningen. In March , his daughter Pauline was born, later called Inez. He undertook numerous journeys to Belgium , France, Italy, and England, and acquired a name for himself as a talented portraitist. His clients were impressed by his understanding of the 17th-century techniques of the Dutch masters. Throughout his life, van Meegeren signed his own paintings with his own signature. He now dedicated himself to portraiture and began producing forgeries to increase his income. Johanna was also known under her stage name of Jo van Walraven, and she had previously been married to art critic and journalist Dr. She brought their daughter Viola into the van Meegeren household. He raged against the art community together with journalist Jan Ubink between April and March , and he lost any sympathy from the critics in the process. He moved with Jo to the South of France and began preparations for this ultimate forgery, which took him from to Vermeer had not been particularly well-known until the beginning of the twentieth century; his works were both extremely valuable and scarce, as only about 35 had survived. In October , famous art connoisseur and Rembrandt expert Dr. Abraham Bredius published an article about a recently discovered Vermeer which he described as a painting of a Man and Woman at a Spinnet. Inventing the "perfect forgery"[ edit ] In , van Meegeren moved to the village of Roquebrune-Cap-Martin with his wife. There he rented a furnished mansion called "Primavera" and set out to define the chemical and technical procedures that would be necessary to create his perfect forgeries. He bought authentic 17th century canvases and mixed his own paints from raw materials such as lapis lazuli , white lead , indigo , and cinnabar using old formulas to ensure that they were authentic. In addition, he created his own badger-hair paintbrushes similar to those that Vermeer was known to have used. He came up with a scheme of using phenol formaldehyde Bakelite to cause the paints to harden after application, making the paintings appear as if they were years old. Later, he would wash the painting in black India ink to fill in the cracks. Two of these trial paintings were "Vermeers": Van Meegeren did not sell these paintings; both are now at the Rijksmuseum. He gave it to his friend, attorney C. Boon , telling him that it was a genuine Vermeer, and asked him to show it to Dr. Abraham Bredius in Monaco. Bredius examined the forgery in September [28] and he accepted it as a genuine Vermeer and praised it highly. The painting was purchased by The Rembrandt Society for fl. In , the piece was highlighted in a special exhibition at the Rotterdam museum, along with Dutch masterpieces dating from 1600-1700. Feulner wrote in the "Magazine for [the] History of Art", "In the rather isolated area in which the Vermeer picture hung, it was as quiet as in a chapel. The feeling of the consecration overflows on the visitors, although the picture has no ties to ritual or church. On the walls of the estate hung several genuine Old Masters. Two of his better forgeries were made here, Interior with Cardplayers and Interior with Drinkers, both displaying the signature of Pieter de Hooch. He remained at a hotel in Amsterdam for several months and moved to the village of Laren in Throughout , van

Meegeren issued his designs, which he published in as a large and luxurious book entitled *Han van Meegeren: Teekeningen I Drawings nr I*. On 18 December, he divorced his wife, but this was only a formality; the couple remained together, but a large share of his capital was transferred to her accounts as a safeguard against the uncertainties of the war. He chain-smoked, drank heavily, and became addicted to morphine-laced sleeping pills. Fortunately for van Meegeren, there were no genuine Vermeers available for comparison, since most museum collections were in protective storage as a prevention against war damage. On 17 May, Allied forces entered the salt mine where Captain Harry Anderson discovered the previously unknown "Vermeer". On 29 May, he was arrested and charged with fraud and aiding and abetting the enemy. He was remanded to Weteringschans prison as an alleged Nazi collaborator and plunderer of Dutch cultural property, threatened by the authorities with the death penalty. I painted the picture! Van Meegeren was released from prison in January or February. Wassenbergh brought charges of forgery and fraud and demanded a sentence of two years in prison. The commission included curators, professors, and doctors from the Netherlands, Belgium, and England, and was led by the director of the chemical laboratory at the Royal Museums of Fine Arts of Belgium, Paul B. With the help of the commission, Dr. He found that van Meegeren had prepared the paints by using the phenolformaldehyde resins Bakelite and Albertol as paint hardeners. This chemical component was introduced and manufactured in the 20th century, proving that the "Vermeers" and "Frans Halses" examined by the commission were in fact made by van Meegeren. The matter found in the craquelure appeared to come from India ink, which had accumulated even in areas that natural dirt or dust would never have reached. The paint had become so hard that alcohol, strong acids, and bases did not attack the surface, a clear indication that the surface had not been formed in a natural manner. The craquelure on the surface did not always match that in the ground layer, which would certainly have been the case with a natural craquelure. Thus, the test results obtained by the commission appeared to confirm that the works were forgeries created by van Meegeren, but their authenticity continued to be debated by some of the experts until and, when new investigative techniques were used to analyze the paintings see below. On 12 November, the Fourth Chamber of the Amsterdam Regional Court found Han van Meegeren guilty of forgery and fraud, and sentenced him to a minimal one year in prison. During this last month of his life, he strolled freely around his neighborhood. His family and several hundred of his friends attended his funeral at the Driehuis Westerveld Crematorium chapel. In, his urn was buried in the general cemetery in the village of Diepenveen municipality of Deventer. Van Meegeren had filed for bankruptcy in December. On 5 and 6 September, the furniture and other possessions in his Amsterdam house at Keizersgracht were auctioned by order of the court, along with other pieces of furniture and works of art, including numerous paintings by old and new masters from his private collection. The house was auctioned separately on 4 September, estimated to be worth 65, guilders. The proceeds of the sale together with the house amounted to, guilders. Van Meegeren told the same story to all authors, journalists, and biographers: Some biographers believe, however, that Jo must have known the truth. Jo outlived her husband by many years, always in great luxury, until her death at the age of. Decoen went on to state that conclusions of Dr. Paul Coremans publicly admit that he had erred in his analysis. The court found in favour of Coremans, and the findings of his commission were upheld. The examination confirmed that several of their paintings were in fact created using materials invented in the 20th century. They concluded that the "Vermeers" in their possession were modern and could thus be Van Meegeren forgeries. This confirmed the findings of the Coremans commission, and refuted the claims made by M. Dutch white lead was extracted from ores containing high levels of trace elements of silver and antimony, [58] while the modern white lead used by Van Meegeren contained neither silver nor antimony, as those elements are separated from the lead during the modern smelting process. To determine the amount of Pb, the alpha radiation emitted by another element, polonium Po, is measured. In contrast, the white lead found in Dutch paintings from 1600 had polonium values of 0. The conclusions of the commission were again reaffirmed and upheld by the Dutch judicial system. The question "what was his character" cannot be answered unequivocally. Indeed, recent works question many of the existing assumptions about van Meegeren and the motivations for his career in forgery. With Han van Meegeren, everything was double-edged, and his character presents itself as fragments rather than unity. His extensive research confirmed that van Meegeren started to

make forgeries, not so much by feeling misunderstood and undervalued by art critics as for the income that it generated, income which he needed to support his addictions and promiscuity. Van Meegeren continued to paint after he was released from prison, signing his works with his own name. His new-found popularity ensured quick sales of his new paintings, often selling at prices that were many times higher than before he had been unmasked as a forger. Van Meegeren also told the news media that he had "an offer from a Manhattan gallery to come to the U.

**Chapter 5 : Han van Meegeren : definition of Han van Meegeren and synonyms of Han van Meegeren (Ital**

*Bibliography Bibliography: p. Contents. Han van Meegeren fecit / Hope B. Werness; What is wrong with a forgery? / Alfred Lessing; Forgery and the anthropology of art / Leonard B. Meyer.*

The British Journal of Aesthetics 19 Awkward as it is, critics have heaped the most lavish praise on art objects that have turned out to be forged. The suspicion this arouses is, of course, that the critics were led to praise the forgery for the wrong reasons in the first place. Since the aesthetic object as perceived is no different after the revelation that it is forged, the implication to be drawn is that it has previously been critically valued not for its intrinsic aesthetic properties, but because it was believed to be the work of an esteemed artist. As natural as this suspicion is, it represents a point of view I shall seek to discredit in the following discussion. Everyone recognizes that the proper identification of an art object as genuine or forged is crucial as regards monetary value, that forgery has moral implications, that there are important historical reasons for wanting to distinguish the genuine from the faked art object. But there are many who believe as well that when we come down to assessing the aesthetic merits of an art object, the question of authenticity is irrelevant. In this respect, the Han van Meegeren episode is an excellent test case. Han van Meegeren Christ and the Disciples at Emmaus The van Meegeren episode is just one example of the general problem of forgery in the arts. The problem may be stated quite simply thus: A painting has hung for years on a museum wall, giving delight to generations of art lovers. One day it is revealed to be a forgery, and is immediately removed from view. The discovery that a work of art is forged, as, say, with a van Meegeren Vermeer, does not alter the perceived qualities of the work. Hence it can make no aesthetic difference whether a work is forged or not. At least this is how one approach to this question goes, an approach that has had such able defenders as Alfred Lessing and Arthur Koestler. Thus the individual who pays an enormous sum for an original but who would have no interest in a reproduction which he could not tell from the original perhaps a Picasso pen-and-ink drawing , or worse, who chooses an aesthetically inferior original over an excellent and superior forgery or reproduction , is said to be at best confused and at worst a snob. While I will argue that in certain respects this distinction itself is dubious, as regards the possibility of forgery it is surely misleading. Truly an electric performance! Or to be more precise, it was electronic. He recorded the music at practice tempo and the engineers speeded it up on a rotating head recorder. But really, ought it to? The distinction between so-called creative and performing arts has certain obvious uses: And yet this distinction often employed invidiously against eh performer can cause us to lose sight of the fact that in certain respects all arts are creative, and correlatively, all arts are performing. It is this latter fact which is of particular relevance to understanding what is wrong with forgeries. When we speak of a performance we usually have in mind a human activity which stands in some sense complete in itself: Moreover, as these examples also indicate, performances are said to involve some sense of accomplishment, of achievement. As objects of contemplation, art works stand in differing relations to the performances of artists, depending on the art form in question. On the one hand, we have such arts as the dance, where the human activity involved in creating the object of contemplation and the object itself are one and the same thing. In such a case it would be odd to say that the object somehow represents the performance of the artist, because to perceive the object is to perceive the performance. On the other hand, we have painting, where we normally perceive the work of art without perceiving those actions which have brought it into being. In fact, the concept of performance is internal to our whole notion of art. Every work of art is an artifact, the product of human skills and techniques. If we see an actor or a dancer or a violinist at work, we are constantly conscious of human agency. Less immediately apparent is the element of performance in a painting that has hung perhaps for generations in a museum, or a long-familiar musical composition. Yet we are no less in such cases confronted with the results of human agency. As performances, works of art represent the ways in which artists solve problems, overcome obstacles, make do with available materials. The ultimate product is designed for our contemplation, as an object of particular interest in its own right, perhaps in isolation from other art objects or from the activity of the artist. But this isolation which frequently characterizes our mode of attention to aesthetic objects ought not to blind us to a fact we may take

for granted: We begin to see this more clearly when we consider our aesthetic response to natural beauty. But aspects of the object which we had previously assumed to be expressive will no longer be understood as such: We could continue to enjoy the object, but we would no longer find ourselves admiring it in the same way: Contrast this with another object of aesthetic appreciation. Let us take as an example one which we do not usually think of in terms of performance: But it is surely more than merely a pretty piece of music sprung from the mind of someone on an autumn afternoon in In all of these considerations, we treat the composition of the music itself as a performance, as an activity involving human intention. There are theorists who would of course insist on our distinguishing the song as an object of aesthetic attention from the circumstances of its origin. That such distinction is possible is self-evident. That we do not, and ought not, completely divorce these elements of appreciation is also clear. It is this pretty sonic experience, certain words strung together and sung in certain tones to piano accompaniment, and we can talk endlessly about the beauties of that aural surface just as we could talk of the appealing properties of the piece of driftwood. Again, in order to grasp what it is that is before us, we must have some notion of what the maker of the object in question has done, including some idea of the limitations, technical and conventional, within which he has worked. But it is far from irrelevant to know that the artist may be working within a canon as, for example, fifteenth-century Italian artists did according to which the robe must be some shade of red, and the cloak must be blue. Before we can determine whether or not a particular artistic performance can be said to succeed or fail, we must have some notion of what counts as success or failure in connection with the kind of artistic performance in question. The attitude we properly take toward any artistic performance varies enormously, depending on the nature of what confronts us. There are many elements that go into a performance of a Liszt study according to which we assess it. Speed and brilliance may be important considerations which is not to say that the faster or most brilliant performance will be the best. Of course, I am not saying that the assessment of success or failure in piano performance need necessarily be the way I describe it. We can well imagine different manners of going about producing the aural experience to which we attend. There might come a time, for instance, when electronically produced accelerandos will become accepted procedure of what will count as achievement in a recorded piano performance. Until I know this, I cannot understand the nature of the achievement before me. Here is where the electronic accelerandos and the van Meegeren fakes have the ability to betray us, and where forgery in general misleads. In the most obvious sense, a forgery is an artifact of one person which is intentionally attributed to another, usually with the purpose of turning a profit. It is essential that forgeries be understood as a subset of a wider class of misrepresented artistic performances. In my example of the piano recording, Smith brings to his experience certain expectations regarding what is to count as achievement in the art in question, and these expectations are not met. The fundamental question, then, is, What has the artist done, what has he achieved? The question is fundamental, moreover, not because of any contingent facts about the psychology of aesthetic perception, but because of the nature of the concept of art itself. Still, the achievement of an engineer is not the achievement of a pianist, and the achievement of van Meegeren, however notable it may be, cannot be identical with that of Vermeer. Thus I can believe that the painting before me is a Vermeer instead of a van Meegeren, and adjust my perception accordingly. But I cannot similarly believe that it makes no difference whether it is a Vermeer or a van Meegeren, not at any rate if I am to continue to employ the concept of art in terms of which we think about Vermeers, van Meegerens, piano virtuosi, and the rest. Nor is it merely a cultural question. Cultural considerations can influence how we talk about art, can alter in various ways our attitude toward it. It is frequently pointed out, for instance, that criticism as customarily practiced in the European tradition places great emphasis on the individual artist in a way that art and criticism in the Orient traditionally do not. Modern critics in the Occident tend to care deeply, perhaps sometimes excessively, about who created a work of art. But this does not mean that, say, Chinese critics have been unconcerned with the origins of art works: To be sure, culture shapes and changes what various peoples believe about art and their attitudes toward it. This may be strikingly different from ours, as in the case of the elaborately carved Malagan of New Ireland, which is unceremoniously discarded after its one-time use. Thus the concept of art is constituted a priori of certain essential properties. This whole issue is what gives the problem of forgery such central philosophical importance: To the contrary, they attack the very

idea of art itself. Let us take stock of what I have so far argued. In emphasizing the importance of the notion of performance in understanding art, I have centered attention on the extent to which works of art are the end-products of human activities, on the degree to which they represent things done by human agents. In this way, part of what constitutes our understanding of works of art involves grasping what sort of achievement the work itself represents. This takes us, then, to the question of the origins of the work: But now it must be stressed that our interest in origins, in the possibility or actuality of human achievement, always goes hand-in-hand with our interest in the work of art as visual, verbal, or aural surface. Both of these positions in their more extreme and dogmatic forms constitute a kind of philistinism. The more familiar sort of philistinism the sort against which Koestler and Lessing react has it that if a work of art is a forgery, than it must somehow be without value: Both positions are properly called philistine because both fail to acknowledge a fundamental element of artistic value. In developing a view which finds the aesthetic significance of forgery in the extent to which it misrepresents artistic achievement, I have hitherto avoided discussion of a concept often contrasted with the idea of forgery: It is of course easy to say that originality is a legitimate source of value in art, that forgeries lack it, and that they therefore are to be discredited on that account. This seems true enough as far as it goes, but the difficulty is that it does not go far enough. Here there is room for originality. In fact, we must remind ourselves that stripped of its pretensions, each of the van Meegeren Vermeers is an original van Meegeren. For what it is worth, each of these canvases is in that sense an original work of art: A crux here is that an artistic performance can be perfectly original and yet at the same time share with forgery the essential element of being misrepresented in terms of its actual achievement. The concept of originality is important in this context because it emphasizes the importance of the origins of the work of art: But even where all aspects of the performance in question did in fact originate with the single individual who is credited with it, even where the performance is in that sense pluperfectly original, it is possible for it to share with forgery the essential feature of misrepresentation of achievement. Consider an instrumental performer who announces he will play an improvisation and then proceeds to play a carefully premediated composition of his own creation. Still, even though its status as composition or improvisation is indifferent to the fact that the same person is performing, origins remain important: And just as there can be cases of misrepresentation of achievement which do not, strictly speaking, involve any misunderstanding of the identity of the individual with whom the art object originates, so there can be misattributions of origin which do not entail significant misrepresentation of achievement. There are stanzas counting as decent Keats which would not have to be radically reappraised in terms of the artistic achievement they represent if they were discovered to have actually been written by Shelley.

*Han van Meegeren (10 October in Deventer, Overijssel - 30 December in Amsterdam), born Henricus Antonius van Meegeren, was a Dutch painter and portraitist, and is considered to be one of the most ingenious art forgers of the 20th century.*

At no point did he inquire further about the legitimacy of his adoptee. Suitably, the postcard he had appended to the painting was printed for the National Gallery of London, where the painting it featured had hung for many years: Whether brushed aside as a mere copy of the original or condemned as a forgery, the result is the same; the general public accepts the verdict of institutional authority without question. Sixty years ago when the experts accepted the Vermeer forgeries by Han van Meegren as genuine, everyone immediately accepted their validity. Tell the average person that he is confronted with the work or utterance of an esteemed author or artist and he will accord it reverence. Undoubtedly the task has fallen largely to managers. Why has so often a curatorial-expert who is allied with a bureaucracy, estate, or business been given the prime authority to judge authenticity of artwork? Surely, many of these people are qualified, but again, there is no guarantee as to how well qualified. It is true that art has become integrated with mass culture, and thus, for sake of sheer volume and control over what has in many cases become little more than merchandize, such administrative-managers have become prevalent. There are two elements that these managers hold dear: On both levels—the artistic, and the commercial levels—political biases and commercial interests affect day-to-day decision making, including; decisions over whether or not to support the authenticity of a work of art. Bredius, and over a hundred generous donors. But what options are available to help with making these oft-times onerous decisions more reliable. One seldom hears that historical research must always be grounded in scientific analysis, although scientists, themselves, often times subject their analyses and conclusions to a higher standard of care. In this undisputed painting by Murillo, note the brushwork of the hair, and ear and compare these qualities to those of the above images. The two styles were disparate and the psychological connection between the two youngsters was not successful. The boy had an air of mischief and his expression was not imbued with innocent sincerity like that of the girl. This frightful engraving by J. Firstly, the freakish nature of the print captures in its worst aspect, the wry spirit of the National Gallery Boy. In addition one can see the way in which the engraver has repeated the mistake made by the copyist who painted the National Gallery picture. In turn the engraver has reproduced this unintended deformity, and in doing so has made the mistake even more apparent than in the National Gallery picture. The following e-mail is to the person from whom the print was purchased: I am very pleased with the Murillo print that I recently received from you. Do you have any reference to indicate its age? I assumed that because the painting was etched after it was reportedly donated to the National Gallery by Zachary in that the print would have been done after that date. The print indicates that the painting was already in the national collection before it was made. Was there any indication from the book or portfolio that it originated from to determine the exact age? I hope this helps. This did not make sense. The following is the provenance of the painting as given in the catalogue Murillo: Zachary; donated to the National Gallery. Exhibitions; British Institution, London ; London , no 23, pl. Michael Zachary was an active collector years earlier than the date given here. Anyone trying to nose through the available information about the National Gallery Peasant Boy would likely smell an aging fish. The confusion over titles, provenances, and pendant pairing is bewildering. And could this have been part of the reason why Murillo was forgotten for nearly a century? Copyists have been known to leave their copies in the gallery, and carry away the originals. Only a few months ago a valuable St. However, Angulo , 2, p. During its early years in France the painting was probably copied as a matter of course. The demand for Spanish paintings was great and the size of the boy was perfect for the cabinet-room. If this is true, there is probably another girl floating around in the world of Murillo copies without her suitor also; in fact, that suitor might be the one in the National Gallery of London. The question of copies and how they relate to the original is complicated. It has been discussed at least as early as the 17th century. Giulio Mancini was the first to discuss the problem of literal copies as it concerns painting. In his *Considerazioni* c Mancini cautioned prospective buyers that it is

most important to determine whether a painting is an original or a copy. Like Vico, Mancini directed the search for authenticity to the examination of characteristic details. A collector first had to ask whether a picture was executed at the level of perfection customary to the master under whose name the picture was being sold. Ringlets of the hair, if imitated, will betray the laborious effect of the copy and if the copyist does not want to imitate them, then they will in that case lack the perfection of the master. The same can be observed in those spirited passages and scattered highlights that a master renders with one stroke and with a touch of the brush that is inimitably resolute; as in the folds and highlights of drapery, which depend more on the fantasy and resolution of the master than on the verisimilitude of the thing being represented. The quick impression that he makes with his custom-tailored brush may take a copyist many careful strokes to imitate, thus eliminating the freshness and virtuoso detailing of the original. On this basis it would be fair to cautiously say that the one in the National Gallery might be an honest yet summary copy of the Guernsey Murillo. It would be stretching it to consider either of the works to be an outright forgery meant to deceive regardless of authorship. Another fair description of the difficulties involved with the copying process was given by Rudolf Arnheim: The result can be quite similar. Every stroke of the brush swings in the flow of the total movement. In consequence, the pattern as a whole looks incoherent. Only when the copy is a product of interpretation rather than a stroke-by-stroke imitation does he accept the emotive potential of such works: Good copies are never attempts at exact imitation; on examination we find always enormous differences between them and their originals: The power of creating significant form depends, not on hawk like vision, but on some curious mental and emotional power. There is no mistaking them for those of anyone else—“an infallible test of excellence in a painter. It does feel somewhat later in style than that of the Baroque era. The confident gaze of the young suitor is met by the equally open affection of the young Girl Raising the Veil. It can be assumed that at some point throughout their history that the moral values of the day would have disapproved of this overt show of affection. For moral reasons might the two have been banished to separate walls. To take this one step further: It is easy to be spellbound by this fable when the Guernsey Murillo image is seen next to one of the girl in the Carras collection. Which of the above four pictures is most likely wrong An obvious mistake made on the picture at the National Gallery and one that Murillo was unlikely to make himself is the ineffectual placement of reflected light upon the sill. In the Guernsey Murillo the reflected light from the hand matches that on the sill precisely, whereas in the National Gallery picture this natural effect is replaced with illumination from an unknown source. The Print takes this error in an even more gruesome direction. Guernsey Murillo, note the subtle reflection from the hand upon the sill there is slight damage to the canvas beside the third finger Looking at the Guernsey Murillo in purely physical terms one is drawn to contemplate the state of preservation. At the extreme edge of the canvas, on three sides, it is evident that the picture has been reduced in size. To what degree will probably never be known, but if this were done in the process of separating a larger work into smaller more saleable parts, it might have been done for financial gain. When a larger picture is separated into several parts, which are then sold off individually, the aggregate value is usually enhanced. Could such an unconscionable act be the cause of the separation of these two portraits—“severed for the sake of greed? In Otto Kurz wrote: Outsiders hardly realize how many masterpieces of old painting are thus being sacrificed and sold piecemeal every year. The reasons for this barbarism are obvious. It is almost impossible to find buyers for the mythological canvases of the late Renaissance and the Baroque, which are too large for the average modern room. But such a canvas may contain figures of elegant Venetian ladies which, when cut out, fit into the modern rooms and satisfy the taste of the modern collector. Single portraits find a readier market than large portrait groups, which however, lend themselves easily for cutting up— Usually single heads or figures are cut out and the rest of the picture, having become unusable, is then destroyed. Although the Guernsey Murillo is effectively the same size as the one in the National Gallery, the Guernsey Murillo has been cut down on three sides! When looking at this painting compositionally, the boy seems somewhat cramped within the picture space, as is the girl. Could the sinews of his canvas, at one time been connected with those of the young maiden, in turn, providing them both more room to breath? Apparently, in England in years gone by, and even in the Royal collection, there was very little concern over re-sizing a canvas merely to fit a new location. The cutting down and enlarging of



pictures has persisted throughout the history of the collection. Even in modern times a superintendent did not scruple to slice a large piece off the top of a group by Zoffany or to reduce a large pair of Winterhalters so that they would fit better into a room at Balmoral. The patination of an illegible inventory label on the strainer exhibits honest atmospheric degradation of great age. Now, what if both paintings were painted by the same artist - one being the replica of the other? Several years ago, Professor Guin Moriz had corresponded with the Prado over the relationship of the two pictures and the term replica was used. A replica and other replicas of the same work, in all important respects are considered to be the equal of the original. A replica today is deemed relatively worthless. We should ask, as a challenge to this arbitrary edict: This must be true; otherwise, the art-world is destructively faced with the faulty concept that: Execrably, in economic terms this could mean the difference of 10, versus 10,, dollars with a commiserate amount of admiration given to each artwork. Authentic early examples are even more luminous with the inclusion of a subtle nimbus as is seen here with the infant Christ. Joseph Holding the Enfant Christ; The Pushkin Museum of Fine Arts, Moscow Fatefully, there is a great disparity in modern attitudes towards the exact copy, even if the original creator of the image did it. Not considered a work of art, the copy is virtually abandoned. As mentioned before, could the reason for this be political?

**Chapter 7 : Han van Meegeren's Fake Vermeers**

*Han van Meegeren fecit / Hope B. Werness --What is wrong with a forgery? / Alfred Lessing -- Forgery and the anthropology of art / Leonard B. Meyer -- Art and authenticity / Nelson Goodman -- Originals, copies, and aesthetic value / Jack W. Meiland -- The aesthetic status of forgeries / Mark Sagoff -- Art, forgery, and authenticity / Joseph.*

Henricus Antonius "Han" van Meegeren Dutch pronunciation: Art critics, however, decried his work as tired and derivative, and van Meegeren felt that they had destroyed his career. He so well replicated the styles and colours of the artists that the best art critics and experts of the time regarded his paintings as genuine and sometimes exquisite. His most successful forgery was *Supper at Emmaus*, created while living in the south of France. This painting was hailed as a real Vermeer by famous art experts such as Abraham Bredius. Bredius acclaimed it as "the masterpiece of Johannes Vermeer of Delft" and wrote of the "wonderful moment" of being "confronted with a hitherto unknown painting by a great master". This would have been an act of treason carrying the death penalty, so van Meegeren confessed to the less serious charge of forgery. He was convicted on falsification and fraud charges on 12 November, after a brief but highly publicised trial, and was sentenced to a modest punishment of one year in prison. He was the son of Augusta Louisa Henrietta Camps and Hendrikus Johannes van Meegeren, a French and history teacher at the Kweekschool training college for schoolteachers in the city of Deventer. His father often forced him to write a hundred times, "I know nothing, I am nothing, I am capable of nothing. Korteling had been inspired by Johannes Vermeer and showed van Meegeren how Vermeer had manufactured and mixed his colours. Korteling had rejected the Impressionist movement and other modern trends as decadent, degenerate art, and his strong personal influence probably led van Meegeren to rebuff contemporary styles and paint exclusively in the style of the Dutch Golden Age. He easily passed his preliminary examinations but he never took the Ingenieurs final examination because he did not want to become an architect. On 18 April, van Meegeren married fellow art student Anna de Voogt who was expecting their first child. Jacques van Meegeren also became a painter; he died on 26 October in Amsterdam. In the summer of, van Meegeren moved his family to Scheveningen. In March, his daughter Pauline was born, later called Inez. He undertook numerous journeys to Belgium, France, Italy, and England, and acquired a name for himself as a talented portraitist. His clients were impressed by his understanding of the 17th-century techniques of the Dutch masters. Throughout his life, van Meegeren signed his own paintings with his own signature. He now dedicated himself to portraiture and began producing forgeries to increase his income. Johanna was also known under her stage name of Jo van Walraven, and she had previously been married to art critic and journalist Dr. She brought their daughter Viola into the van Meegeren household. He raged against the art community together with journalist Jan Ubink between April and March, and he lost any sympathy from the critics in the process. He moved with Jo to the South of France and began preparations for this ultimate forgery, which took him from to Vermeer had not been particularly well-known until the beginning of the twentieth century; his works were both extremely valuable and scarce, as only about 35 had survived. In October, famous art connoisseur and Rembrandt expert Dr. Abraham Bredius published an article about a recently discovered Vermeer which he described as a painting of a Man and Woman at a Spinnet. Inventing the "perfect forgery" In, van Meegeren moved to the village of Roquebrune-Cap-Martin with his wife. There he rented a furnished mansion called "Primavera" and set out to define the chemical and technical procedures that would be necessary to create his perfect forgeries. He bought authentic 17th century canvases and mixed his own paints from raw materials such as lapis lazuli, white lead, indigo, and cinnabar using old formulas to ensure that they were authentic. In addition, he created his own badger-hair paintbrushes similar to those that Vermeer was known to have used. He came up with a scheme of using phenol formaldehyde Bakelite to cause the paints to harden after application, making the paintings appear as if they were years old. Later, he would wash the painting in black India ink to fill in the cracks. Two of these trial paintings were "Vermeers": Van Meegeren did not sell these paintings; both are now at the Rijksmuseum. He gave it to his friend, attorney C. Boon, telling him that it was a genuine Vermeer, and asked him to show it to Dr. Abraham Bredius in Monaco. Bredius examined the forgery in September [28] and he accepted it as a genuine Vermeer

and praised it highly. The painting was purchased by The Rembrandt Society for fl. In , the piece was highlighted in a special exhibition at the Rotterdam museum, along with Dutch masterpieces dating from 1660. Feulner wrote in the "Magazine for [the] History of Art", "In the rather isolated area in which the Vermeer picture hung, it was as quiet as in a chapel. The feeling of the consecration overflows on the visitors, although the picture has no ties to ritual or church. On the walls of the estate hung several genuine Old Masters. Two of his better forgeries were made here, Interior with Cardplayers and Interior with Drinkers, both displaying the signature of Pieter de Hooch. He remained at a hotel in Amsterdam for several months and moved to the village of Laren in . Throughout , van Meegeren issued his designs, which he published in as a large and luxurious book entitled Han van Meegeren: Teekeningen I Drawings nr I. On 18 December , he divorced his wife, but this was only a formality; the couple remained together, but a large share of his capital was transferred to her accounts as a safeguard against the uncertainties of the war. He chain-smoked, drank heavily, and became addicted to morphine-laced sleeping pills. Fortunately for van Meegeren, there were no genuine Vermeers available for comparison, since most museum collections were in protective storage as a prevention against war damage. On 17 May , Allied forces entered the salt mine where Captain Harry Anderson discovered the previously unknown "Vermeer". On 29 May , he was arrested and charged with fraud and aiding and abetting the enemy. He was remanded to Weteringschans prison as an alleged Nazi collaborator and plunderer of Dutch cultural property, threatened by the authorities with the death penalty. I painted the picture! Van Meegeren was released from prison in January or February . Wassenbergh brought charges of forgery and fraud and demanded a sentence of two years in prison. The commission included curators, professors, and doctors from the Netherlands, Belgium , and England, and was led by the director of the chemical laboratory at the Royal Museums of Fine Arts of Belgium , Paul B. With the help of the commission, Dr. He found that van Meegeren had prepared the paints by using the phenolformaldehyde resins Bakelite and Albertol as paint hardeners. This chemical component was introduced and manufactured in the 20th century, proving that the "Vermeers" and "Frans Halses" examined by the commission were in fact made by van Meegeren. The matter found in the craquelure appeared to come from India ink, which had accumulated even in areas that natural dirt or dust would never have reached. The paint had become so hard that alcohol, strong acids, and bases did not attack the surface, a clear indication that the surface had not been formed in a natural manner. The craquelure on the surface did not always match that in the ground layer, which would certainly have been the case with a natural craquelure. Thus, the test results obtained by the commission appeared to confirm that the works were forgeries created by van Meegeren, but their authenticity continued to be debated by some of the experts until and , when new investigative techniques were used to analyze the paintings see below. On 12 November , the Fourth Chamber of the Amsterdam Regional Court found Han van Meegeren guilty of forgery and fraud, and sentenced him to a minimal one year in prison. During this last month of his life, he strolled freely around his neighborhood. His family and several hundred of his friends attended his funeral at the Driehuis Westerveld Crematorium chapel. In , his urn was buried in the general cemetery in the village of Diepenveen municipality of Deventer. Van Meegeren had filed for bankruptcy in December . On 5 and 6 September , the furniture and other possessions in his Amsterdam house at Keizersgracht were auctioned by order of the court, along with other pieces of furniture and works of art, including numerous paintings by old and new masters from his private collection. The house was auctioned separately on 4 September, estimated to be worth 65, guilders. The proceeds of the sale together with the house amounted to , guilders. Van Meegeren told the same story to all authors, journalists, and biographers: Some biographers believe, however, that Jo must have known the truth. Jo outlived her husband by many years, always in great luxury, until her death at the age of . Decoen went on to state that conclusions of Dr. Paul Coremans publicly admit that he had erred in his analysis. The court found in favour of Coremans, and the findings of his commission were upheld. The examination confirmed that several of their paintings were in fact created using materials invented in the 20th century. They concluded that the "Vermeers" in their possession were modern and could thus be Van Meegeren forgeries. This confirmed the findings of the Coremans commission, and refuted the claims made by M. Dutch white lead was extracted from ores containing high levels of trace elements of silver and antimony ,[58] while the modern white lead used by Van

Meegeren contained neither silver nor antimony, as those elements are separated from the lead during the modern smelting process. To determine the amount of Pb, the alpha radiation emitted by another element, polonium Po, is measured. In contrast, the white lead found in Dutch paintings from 1600 had polonium values of 0. The conclusions of the commission were again reaffirmed and upheld by the Dutch judicial system. The question "what was his character" cannot be answered unequivocally. Indeed, recent works question many of the existing assumptions about van Meegeren and the motivations for his career in forgery. With Han van Meegeren, everything was double-edged, and his character presents itself as fragments rather than unity. His extensive research confirmed that van Meegeren started to make forgeries, not so much by feeling misunderstood and undervalued by art critics as for the income that it generated, income which he needed to support his addictions and promiscuity. Van Meegeren continued to paint after he was released from prison, signing his works with his own name. His new-found popularity ensured quick sales of his new paintings, often selling at prices that were many times higher than before he had been unmasked as a forger. Van Meegeren also told the news media that he had "an offer from a Manhattan gallery to come to the U. Van Meegeren remains one of the most ingenious art counterfeiters of the 20th century.

**Chapter 8 : Murillo expert ise copy**

*Rob Scholte Museum. Sp S on S so S red S Werness, Hope B. "Han Van Meegeren fecit." Denis Dutton, editor. The Forger's Art: Forgery and the Philosophy of.*

In he married Anna de Voogt. His artistic talents were recognized when he soon after won first prize and a gold medal from the General Sciences Section of the Delft Institute of Technology for a drawing of a church interior. He agreed to sell this drawing, but was discovered by his wife making a copy of it to sell as the original. She dissuaded him from carrying out this small swindle, but the incident is the first evidence of an interest in faking, even if in this case the artist was merely forging his own prize-winning work. Van Meegeren moved with his wife to The Hague where he received his degree in art in For the next ten years he was able to sell work and to support himself by giving drawing lessons. He held exhibitions in and which were fairly well received. In he divorced Anna and took up with Johanna Oerlemans, the estranged wife of the art critic Karl de Boer. They were married in The artistic style of van Meegeren was then as later essentially conservative: His political outlook was Catholic, anti-Semitic, and conservative to the point of fascism. He was opposed to all modernist tendencies in art. This was authenticated by an expert and fetched a good price at auction, but was detected as a forgery some months later. From this episode van Meegeren learned lessons that helped him succeed in his first Vermeer forgery, *Lady and Gentleman at the Spinet*, which was produced in and praised by the eminent art historian, Prof. Abraham Bredius, as a very fine Vermeer. The same year he left Holland and went with his wife to live in southern France. For the next four years he supported himself by painting portraits. All the while he was, however, studying formulae for seventeenth-century paints and experimenting with ways to produce a pigment surface which had both the hardness of old paint and at the same time displayed craquelure, the system of cracking normally found on the surface of old paintings. Using volatile flower oils, he managed to perfect a technique he employed in his greatest Vermeer forgery, *Christ and the Disciples at Emmaeus*, which he painted in Though most extant Vermeers were small paintings of interior domestic scenes, in some of his early work Vermeer had produced large religious paintings. Bredius had theorized in print that other large early Vermeers on religious themes might yet turn up. Other art historians had also suggested that Vermeer had early in his life traveled in Italy, and on this count too the Emmaeus canvas, which showed possible influence of Carravagio, seemed to confirm an academic conjecture. Van Meegeren invented a story about a destitute Italian family which had owned the painting for generations and which did not want its identity revealed; he then set out to dispose of it through the Dutch dealer G. Van Meegeren received about two-thirds of this amount. From this point Van Meegeren, who now had much more money than ever before in his life, began heavily to use alcohol and drugs, becoming a morphine addict. Though he had originally entertained the idea of confessing his forgery in order to humiliate the critics who had lauded it, he decided to forge yet another Vermeer, and then yet another through the war years. In order to save himself from serving a long sentence for collaboration with the Nazis, he pleaded guilty to the lesser crime of forgery. A scientific commission was set up, however, and van Meegeren himself proposed that he paint a new Vermeer while in jail awaiting trial. The resulting painting, *The Young Christ Teaching in the Temple*, was clearly by the same hand as all the other fakes. His trial received international coverage. Van Meegeren portrayed himself as a man who loved only to paint and whose career had been ruined by malicious critics. Indeed, having made fools of so many eminent scholars and curators, he became a sort of folk hero. The court treated him leniently, sentencing him to the minimum sentence of one year in prison on November 12, When we look today at the van Meegeren forgeries, it seems almost impossible to imagine that they were mistaken for Vermeers. The faces have a quality suggestive of photography. The sentimental eyes and awkward anatomy are more reminiscent of German expressionist works of the s and 30s than they are of the age of Vermeer. In the Emmaeus painting, there is even a resemblance of one of the faces to Greta Garbo. The first major forgery, *Emmaeus*, was also, for all of its faults, closer to Vermeer than any of the others. The last of the fakes, *The Adultrous*, is very far from Vermeer, but once scholarship had accepted its predecessors, it was but a small step to validate it as well. The van Meegeren case, with its elements of vanity, gullibility,

artistic skill and curatorial detection, greed, malice, and even fun, perfectly captured problems which haunt the art world to this day. Han van Meegeren may not have been a great artist, but he made people think much harder about what they value in art and why. A Hardy and C. The Art of Detection Berkeley: University of California Press, Tietze, Hans, Genuine and False London: Forgery and the Philosophy of Art Berkeley:

Chapter 9 : Denis Dutton on Han van Meegeren

*Henricus Antonius "Han" van Meegeren (Dutch pronunciation: [ˈɛːnˌrɪkɛjʊs ˈvɑːn ˈmɛːgəˌrɛːn]; 10 October - 30 December ) was a Dutch painter and portraitist and is considered to be one of the most ingenious art forgers of the 20th century.*

To je materijal od koga su se radili stari radioaparati i fenovi za kosu. Ta vrsta smole bi se oblikovala prema svakom kalupu. Sada je bilo neophodno uveriti sud da je prodao falsifikat i samim tim prevario naciste. U periodu od jula do novembra je, uz prisustvo novinara kao svedoka, naslikao svoj poslednji falsifikat Mladi Isus u hramu. Odveden je u bolnicu u Amsterdamu. The Oxford handbook of aesthetics. Literatura[ ] Kreuger, Frederik H. Han van Meegeren Revisited. Quantes Publishers Rijswijk, Delf. Henricus Han Antonius van Meegeren " Documents betreffende zijn leven en strafproces. Cahiers uit het noorden 20 , Zoetermeer, Huussen Arend Hendrik Huussen Jr.: Cahiers uit het noorden 21 , Zoetermeer, Huussen The story of Han van Meegeren. Een vroege Vermeer uit The only scholarly biography of van Meegeren. An English-language summary is offered by Werness Godley, John Raymond Lord Kilbracken Thomas Nelson and Sons, Ltd. La Doppia vita di Vermeer. Hemmets och familjens veckotidning 69 38 , 3, Life and Work of Han van Meegeren. The Van Meegeren mystery; a biographical study. Denis Dutton , . University of California Press. Novel and His Real Life. Jan Botermans and Gustav Maguel Fritz Kirchhoff director The Ray TV series. Ghost in the Light [Play].