AURA, PROVENANCE, FAKES & FORGERIES

EXPLORING THE PITFALLS OF PROVENANCE AND HOW THIS CAN ENHANCE THE AGENDA OF FAKES AND FORGERIES IN THE ART WORLD

Aimee Murphy
University of Glasgow
aimeeloumurphy@gmail.com

PROVENANCE
FAKES
AURA
WALTER BENJAMIN
PERCEPTION

The provenance of a work of art, that is, the documentation of its ownership history, is a vital tool in determining authenticity and legitimacy. Deriving from the French provenir meaning 'to come from', a sound provenance record functions as a prerequisite for authenticating a work; without one, the likelihood of it being accepted by any reputable collection or dealer is improbable. What happens, however, when a fake work of art is accompanied by a fake provenance record?

This essay shall take the 'master scam' conceived by John Myatt and John Drewe, notorious for infiltrating some of the world's largest museums and galleries with fake artworks and provenance records, as an example to aptly illustrate such pitfalls of provenance. Emphasising seminal theories of aura and authorship through an analysis of the work of Walter Benjamin and Michel Foucault, it is argued that knowledge of such provenance holds the capability of psychologically altering the viewers perception of the work itself. Subsequently, utilising provenance in this way can enhance the agenda of fakes and forgeries circulating in the art world, highlighting the need for stronger institutional methodologies in relation to authenticity.

INTRODUCTION

The ownership histories of objects and works of art possess the capability of altering the viewers perception of the object through knowledge of object biographies and provenance information. Knowledge of such information is consequently vital in comprehending the object in its entirety. Through an exploration of Walter Benjamin's concept of the aura (Benjamin, 2002), it is argued that provenance information, as a unique entity, possesses an aura of its own, relational to that of the work of art. Being aware of this aura can further alter the way in which the object is viewed and understood, bringing about a more thorough understanding of its object biography. This essay will analyse the case study of the 'master scam' conceived by John Myatt and John Drewe as an example to aptly illustrate the dangerous aspects of provenance and the consequences that arise when knowledge of how to create a provenance record falls into the wrong hands. Considering fake works of art in this way brings about a fundamental argument and theory of object biographies. That is, understanding the aura of provenance and the details of the works object biography is capable of psychologically altering the viewers perception of the work itself.

BENJAMIN'S AURA

Walter Benjamin (1892-1940), an eminent philosopher, essayist and critical thinker from Germany, first delved into the notion of aura in March 1930, where it is mentioned in an unpublished report of one of his hashish experiments (Hansen, 2008). Initially, Benjamin used the word in its most literal sense; that is, to describe a certain atmosphere surrounding a person or thing. The use of the term, however, evolves throughout his writings to subsume a more theoretical position in relation to art, which is how aura will be characterised in this essay. Aura's most substantial analysis occurs in *The*

Work of Art in the Age of its Technological Reproducibility (2002), wherein Benjamin deliberates the auratic mode of the work of art: that of the original's unique presence in space and time. For Benjamin, aura is an exclusive semblance within the works presentness, igniting specific reactions and feelings in the observer when standing before it. Tyrus Miller (2014) encapsulates this characterisation, stating: "Benjamin calls the sacredness attached to such ritually situated images 'aura': a sort of halo around the work that evokes a spiritual realm foreign to that of work and everyday life" (p. 42). As original works of art are distinct and unique to themselves, the original is consequently placed in its own exclusive category, perceived as superlative to reproductions and other, non-original, works. It is worth noting that the discussion surrounding aura and originals here refers exclusively to perceptions of the West: a larger space would be needed to consider the role of aura in Eastern perceptions, as in some instances the reproduction can be perceived as having equal value to the original.

The reproduction of artworks is a common-place sight in our current, image-saturated epoch, with reproduced images appearing on merchandise, in books, and on the internet, to name but a few. In the 1930s, when Benjamin was contemplating aura, this notion of reproduction was beginning to take place on a larger scale than previously seen. This large-scale reproduction, Benjamin asserts, threatens originality, as the semblance which is particular to originals becomes jeopardised due to the use of mechanical reproduction and the aesthetic human experience. This act of reproduction strips the uniqueness from the works originality. Benjamin (2002) states, for instance, that "[i]n even the most perfect reproduction, *one* thing is lacking: the here and now of the work of art – its unique existence in a particular place" (p. 103). Thus, a copy or reproduction of an original can never attain the same status as the original, as the aura is altered to such a degree that the perception of it can never be equivalent. Although a reproduction possesses the benefits of trav-

el and disseminating to a wider audience simultaneously, for Benjamin the same auratic sensation cannot be felt before a reproduction as it does not maintain the aura of the original.

Benjamin's aura, then, is found exclusively in originals, and consequently cannot be felt in a reproduction. However, the somewhat conflicting approach to aura should also be underlined, as Benjamin often shifted his stance between the negatives and positives of aura, causing an inconsistency surrounding his theories. This indicates that the concept of aura is also in flux and subject to interpretation. Dependent upon personal positions or even specific situations it could be perceived as either positive or negative to have the aura stripped from the work. An assumption that the waning of aura is positive, however, is an oversimplification of the auras unstable character, thus demanding a more nuanced, circumstantial reading. Benjamin often indicates that aura is malleable in its interpretation. In his Technological Reproducibility essay, for instance, Benjamin (2002) states that "for the first time in world history, technological reproducibility emancipates the work of art from its parasitic subservience to ritual. To an ever-increasing degree, the work reproduced becomes the reproduction of a work designed for reproducibility" (p. 106). This infers a sense of affirmative willingness in regard to stripping the work of its aura, thus becoming 'emancipated' – a term which indicates that the loss of aura brings about a sense of liberation. Contrarily, in *Little History of Photography* (1999), Benjamin asks "What is aura, actually? A strange weave of space and time: the unique appearance or semblance of distance, no matter how close it may be." (p.518). The sentimentalised wording here highlights an amalgamation of the spatial and temporal, emphasising the importance of the individual situation in which the original finds itself. Beatrice Hanssen (2006) further contemplates Benjamin's inconsistent stance on aura, stating that: "Benjamin often withdrew into the self-enclosure of melancholy, for example in the photography essay, where he lamented the disappearance of aura, whose fleeting presence occasionally shone forth from the photographed face, captured in old daguerreotypes" (p. 81). It

is therefore not clear in which light the stripping of aura should be understood, however it can definitively be said that aura is a concrete philosophy which surrounds the original work. It can also be proposed that aura, as a cultural construct, is one which emerges through a dualism of space and time and can be perceived in many differing situations. Benjamin (2002) states that "[t]o follow with the eye –while resting on a summer afternoon– a mountain range on the horizon or a branch that casts its shadow on the beholder is to breathe the aura of those mountains, of that branch" (p. 105). This example is utilised here to exemplify the experiential nature of aura and how it can be encountered within the realm of the natural. It is therefore again indicated that aura consists of a nuanced constitution and can be employed in various situations. Here, aura shall be discussed exclusively in terms of the work of art, and how the application of this theory can be translated to notions of provenance. As Benjamin (2002) affirms: "It is this unique existence –and nothing else– that bears the mark of the history to which the work has been subject" (p. 103). Acknowledging that the history of the work forms a segment of its originality, the aura and sensation felt when perceiving an original could hypothetically translate onto the study and display of provenance. Benjamin (2002) acknowledges that the ownership history of the work forms a segment of the aura, stating that "changes of ownership are part of a tradition which can be traced only from the standpoint of the original in its present location" (p. 103). Accordingly, provenance has been directly linked to aura, with Benjamin contending that ownership histories form a part of the unique semblance of the work. As the concept of aura is a malleable phenomenon, this could be elaborated further to denote that provenance, as its own entity, could also possess a unique aura, relational to the work of art.

FUSING AURA WITH PROVENANCE

Provenance, as a standard methodology for recording the ownership history of an object or work of art, becomes

a vital aspect of the object itself. The research into and understanding of provenance information has seen a continued growth in importance, with researchers and institutions contemplating the significance of understanding their collecting histories. It is, too, equally crucial to comprehend the influence that provenance has on objects in their respective sociopolitical climates. The ownership histories of objects can indeed alter the meanings and interpretations associated with them, as they migrate through different situations and become subject to alternate modes of display. It is this aspect of provenance –the discussion of the life-narratives of objects– that arguably enhances the understanding of objects within the framework of this little-known facet of art history.

Benjamin discusses aura in relation to the work of art, however due to its malleable characteristics, it can be argued that provenance can also possess a unique aura of its own, as the ownership history of a work is inextricably bound to the original. This sentiment is also acknowledged by Michel Foucault in his text *What is an Author?* (2009). Here, Foucault discusses the reverential qualities a text can possess due to the reputation of the author, as "[a] text has an inaugurative value precisely because it is the work of a particular author, and our returns are conditioned by this knowledge" (p. 332). Translating this Foucauldian perspective onto that of provenance, it is conceivable that when a work of art is in possession of a 'pedigree' provenance –perhaps previously being owned by a distinguished member of society– the viewers perception of the work could subsequently be altered due to the assertion of this knowledge. Sophie Raux (2012) illustrates such conceptions when deliberating the value of eighteenth-century auction catalogues: "Mentioning previous owners, especially if they were famous for the distinction of their choices, indicated that the painting had already gone through several selection and ratification processes, thereby building a consensus on the painting's value and enhancing its prestige" (p. 100). This presumption is indicative of a sometimes lack of further research, as an object from a prestigious collection can hold

preconceptions of being sound, when in reality it should not be taken as fact until independent research has been conducted. Consequently, it is sometimes the reputable nature of the collector/collection which can hold precedence. Analogous to Foucault's discussions on public conceptions regarding famed authors, previous collectors and owners could also hold the same considerations and authority as the author, thus inferring a sense of aura. As Johannes Gramlich (2017) contends: "if an artwork has been in a prestigious collection or exhibition, this was an indication of authenticity as well as elevated aesthetic quality" (p. 3). This indication, however, should not be taken as blind fact, as errors and forgeries are a potentiality, thus leading to incorrect provenance information which emboldens the forgery in regard to the object and its evidence.

These notions of authorship proposed by Foucault can, therefore, equally be translated onto notions of provenance, as it is the distinct qualities of provenance which depict the works history and narrative, thus imbuing it with a sense of authorial authority. As aura has been explored in terms of the original, it is therefore possible to combine the thought of Foucault and Benjamin, bridging the gap between the two theories, with the authorial nature of provenance akin to a sense of aura: the auratic authorial. It is subsequently established that ownership histories can correspond to notions of aura, with their own unique presence similar to "the here and now of the work of art" (Benjamin, 2002, p. 103). But what happens when the provenance of the work of art is fake? Or if the artwork that the provenance is validating is fake? This illuminates some contentions, as Benjamin's predominant assertion with his theory of aura is that it is the original alone which can possess aura, and that this same sensation cannot be felt when perceiving a copy. Arjun Appadurai (1986), touches upon this concern in his seminal text *The Social Life of Things: Commodities in Cultural Perspective*, where he discusses how the value of commodities is generated through the act of exchange. According to Appadurai, objects have lives

of their own and, when broken down into phases, can subsume a plethora of commodity categories. The moveability of objects and the transactions that create value therefore form the basis for comprehending the commodity status of objects and their own unique trajectories. If it is the act of exchange which generates value in objects, ownership histories can subsequently place objects in many different commodity categories, highlighting their object biographies through the value of exchange. Following this trail of thought, Appadurai then mentions the theory of aura, stating that "copies, forgeries, and fakes, which have a long history, do not threaten the aura of the original but seek to partake of it" (p. 45). Alluding to the concept of originality, which is bound to the aura, surely it depends upon the nature of the copy, forgery, or fake, when establishing what transpires with the aura. This is therefore an oversimplification of auratic qualities, and it cannot conclusively be said that the aura is not threatened by such acts. Aura can be perceived as a malleable concept, which in turn denotes that its analysis is dependent upon the specific situation. The narrative of Myatt and Drewe is a fitting example with which to explore such contentions.

THE JOHN MYATT AND JOHN DREWE MASTER-SCAM

John Myatt, a former art teacher and a single parent, began earning some extra income by advertising his 'genuine fakes' –copies of 19th and 20th century paintings sold as reproductions of originals at a significantly lower cost. However, events soon took a different turn when one particular customer kept coming back– professional con man John Drewe (Sims, 2019). Drewe then convinced Myatt to sell his paintings as authentic, reaping a much larger reward. Myatt's role in this scam, which deceived the art world for thirteen years, was to produce works that fit into an artist oeuvre, creating paintings in their respective styles and filling gaps in their portfolios. He painted a plethora of paintings in different

styles, such as Braque, Matisse, and Giacometti. However, the true genius behind this scam was the product of Drewe, who infiltrated some of the world's top art archives. Through his connections and the creation of a bogus persona which allowed him to illegally penetrate the art world, Drewe was able to change the provenance records of authentic paintings, establishing a lineage for Myatt's forgeries, essentially altering the history of a multitude of object biographies (Landesman, 2020). The element which made this scam so believable was not the quality of the fakes, which were decidedly quite poor in comparison to the originals, but the insertion of false provenance information. This provenance created a false history for the works to such an extent that, for quite some time, it was not doubted by professionals in the field. As provenance is linked to originals, possessing knowledge of how provenance operates and how to successfully create a disingenuous provenance record forges a history for the fake work, allowing it to be perceived as genuine. To ensure this, "Drewe then placed his forged letters, receipts, and inventory notices relating to this apparently undiscovered work into the archives of such venerable cultural institutions as the Tate and the Victoria & Albert Museum" in London (Phaidon, 2020).

This example stands apart from other forgery scams as it highlights the fundamental importance of provenance, as discussed by Rodney G. S. Cater (2007): "Unlike most art forgers, who direct their energies and talents in creating impeccable forgeries, Drewe realized that paintings of even poor quality could be passed off as authentic as long as a convincing paper trail was in place" (p. 79). The Myatt and Drewe case, then, underlines the tendency to believe provenance records, and the artworlds somewhat over-reliance on them as a means of authentication. Although these types of scams are relatively uncommon in comparison to other types of cons, Myatt and Drewe are by no means the only people to have figured out provenance's predominant pitfalls. There have also been similar cases throughout history where criminals have taken advantage of provenance and archival mate-

rial, for example the Greenhalgh Family scam and the Getty Kouros (Sladen, 2010). This type of provenance forgery, it would seem, is on the rise, calling for a more systematic and thorough methodology in regard to authentication, increasing the level of due diligence conducted and utilising numerous facets of authentication –such as connoisseurship and methods pertaining to technical art history– in order to be more confident in decisions. It is important to note, however, that this is ostensibly contingent upon the resources available to each individual institution. Funding for the Arts and Culture sector have seen massive cuts over the past ten years, with the UK seeing almost £400m in local authority spending stripped (The Guardian, 2020). The lack of funding in this area and the effects that this has on institutions will need to form the basis for a whole other discussion: here, it is simply highlighted as an effect which may prevent more thorough investigations into authentication from being completed. As provenance is seeing a continued growth in importance, it is nonetheless vital that steps be taken to safeguard this means of authentication, and that it is realised that not all provenance should be directly taken as fact without first conducting further research.

Returning to the notion of aura and authenticity, as of June 2020, "[0]f the approximately 200 'masterworks' Myatt painted and Drewe sold, the police have located only 73." This still leaves several Myatt fakes either in private collections or public museums. Indeed, it has been estimated that between 10 and 40 percent of artworks produced by significant artists on the market are in fact fake, and further to this, it is possible that as much as 60 percent of Giacometti's that appear on the market are bogus (Landesman, 2020). Does the aura felt when perceiving an 'original' work of art then disappear when it is found to be fake? The work itself has not changed, only the knowledge of its creation. The fake works of art and their forged provenance information, then, have been designed to reinforce their own acceptance in the art world. These 'original' works would have initially been considered to have an

aura, as they were originals situated in their own time and space, with provenance information therefore being used in opposition to the art world, deceiving professionals into considering them 'legitimate' works of art. Take, for instance, a comparison between a Myatt 'Giacometti' and an original Giacometti (Figure 1). Presented as both being Giacometti's, before being outed as a fake, Myatt's Giacometti was accepted as genuine and therefore possessed an aura of its own. What then happens when this authentic label is stripped? To aid comprehension of this dilemma, Nelson Goodman's *Languages of Art: An Approach to a Theory of Symbols* (1976) can afford an understanding of the differences in aesthetics regarding originals and fakes. Goodman hypothesises that there is a distinct disparity in aesthetics between a forgery and an original, even if it is not immediately obvious which one is which. For Goodman, there is an inherent epistemological facet to aesthetics which is foregrounded in a symbolic, and at times iconographic, methodology, linking directly back to the role of authenticity and intrinsic artistic value. When contemplating perceiving a forgery and an authentic work of art, he states:

> Nothing depends here upon my ever actually perceiving or being able to perceive a difference between the two pictures. What informs the nature and use of my present visual experience is not the fact or the assurance that such a perceptual discrimination is within my reach, but evidence that it may be; and such evidence is provided by the known factual differences between the pictures. Thus the pictures differ aesthetically for me now even if no one will ever be able to tell them apart merely by looking at them. (pp. 105, 106)

The ability for authenticity to alter perceptions, then, is highlighted through this cognitive shift in which the aesthetics of a painting are modified through the knowledge of their falseness. Goodman hypothesises that when perceiving a forgery and an original, there is an inherent aesthetic difference even if the two images appear to be identical. This difference may not always be apparent from the outset,

Fig. 1 Image showing Myatt's fake Giacometti (left) next to a genuine Giacometti (right).

however, as Goodman (1976) argues: "My knowledge of the difference between the two pictures, just because it affects the relationship of the present to future lookings, informs the very character of my present looking" (p. 104). This awareness, he affirms, forces him to perceive and acknowledge the two images differently, even if their physical qualities are the same. Subsequently, it is indicated that it is not the physical images which are bound to alter, but that there is a psychological shift which takes place in the mind of the perceiver when standing before a known fake. Correlating to notions of the auratic authorial and the importance of authenticity, it would seem as though perceptions are subject to alter upon knowledge of the works legitimacy. With Myatt's Giacometti fake, then, it is hypothesised that the painting is still in possession of its own aura as the painting itself is still an original. Whereas if the fake work of art had been copied exactly from another original, the fake would not possess an aura as it is not unique. It is therefore the perception of the Myatt fake that has been altered, as it is now considered disingenuous.

Contemplating Goodman's theory, there have been numerous psychological studies that delve into the understanding of perception and aesthetics when considering fakes and originals. For instance, Helmut Leder discusses an experiment which delved into the effects of artistic appreciation. Participants perceived both original and fake Van Goghs in order to investigate the effects of authenticity and how this pertained to familiarity, appreciation and by extension, aura. (Wolz & Carbon, 2014). There were five studies carried out with this goal, the results of which are thus:

> Studies 1 and 2 revealed that positive correlations existed for liking and familiarity ratings even when it was possible that some of the stimuli seen were not original paintings. The correlations were significantly reduced when the beholder was told that all stimuli were fakes of van Gogh paintings (study 3) and that they were fakes or non-van Goghs (Study 4). In Study 5, the correlation was reduced when inspection time was increased, thus, simple familiarity-liking relations are weakened by knowledge and are greater in spontaneous judgements. (Leder, 2001, p. 201)

This experiment proved its hypothesis to be correct, with the copies of paintings categorically devaluated in comparison to the originals. Without delving too far into the realm of psychology, which is not the aim of this study, it is apparent that perceptions do alter when perceiving a known fake. Equally, "[w]hen depictions of paintings were labelled as 'copies', participants showed a decreased appraisal on variables concerning cognitive as well as emotional dimensions, despite the fact that the 'copy' and the 'original' were physically identical" (Wolz & Carbon, 2014, p. 472). This links directly to Benjamin's aura, as it is the concept of originality which possesses the status of aura. When perceiving a work that is known to be fake, the aura could hypothetically become stripped from the image as it is perceived in a divergent light. Perceiving a fake consequently alters the perceivers perception of the object as it is no longer considered to have the aura of an original, reiterating the concept of the artist as

genius and Foucault's discussion regarding famed authors. As Josh Sims (2019) illustrates: "Psychological studies suggest we value the original over the identical forgery, less because of the art itself, but because we appreciate the originality of the artist's idea and have some gut sense of a connection to their creative process." It has been established, then, that the original work of art alone can possess an aura. If this aura is connected to the original and is consequently also attached to the provenance and object biography of said original, then Drewe's ability to forge a fake history for Myatt's work intensifies the importance of the symbolic value embedded in originality. The Leder experiment compliments the theoretical underpinnings explored here. When put to the test, it is apparent that it is not simply the physical qualities that contribute to artistic appreciation, but that "the symbolic value [which] is increased by a famous artist's name and the artist's association with the concept of 'the great genius'" also plays a significant role in artistic appreciation (Wolz & Carbon, 2014, p. 467). Ultimately, when perceiving a work that is known to be inauthentic, as Goodman stipulates, there is a cognitive shift which takes place in the mind of the perceiver, forcing them to view it differently now that they are aware of its falseness. It is knowledge of the works history, provenance, and object biography that brings about this awareness to the lack of authenticity, highlighting the fundamental intrinsic nature of provenance and how when taken into the wrong hands, it can be utilised as a vehicle for manipulation to create a false lineage, altering the history of works of art.

Subsequently, when Myatt's paintings were found to be fake, there would have been a shift in cognitive perception when viewing the work, its aura stripped as it is discovered that the painting is pretending to be something which it is not. This large-scale infiltration of the art world has highlighted many pitfalls: predominantly, a lack of skepticism and further research when it comes to provenance. Carter (2007) suggests that there are three predominant tools that should be utilised when dealing with authentication and attribution

of artworks: namely connoisseurship, scholarly documentation (including provenance) and physical and technical examinations (p. 84). By utilising a triad of due diligence methods, the opportunity for fakes to pass through the artworld to be considered as genuine is lessened, creating a larger opportunity for unveiling fake works of art and stripping them of the aura with which they falsely intended to imbue.

CONCLUSION

From analysing Benjamin's aura, it is argued that provenance information can also possess an aura of its own, relational to the work of art. As object biographical information is unique to the specific object in which it is related, it can be denoted that this information has its own semblance surrounding it. Combining this theory with the thought of Foucault and Goodman, it is also ostensible that knowledge of this information can alter perceptions of works, as has been evidenced by the Leder experiment. Equally, one of the predominant pitfalls of provenance information is its sometimes lack of authentication. When an object is from a prestigious collection it can be relatively easy to accept the information as fact without conducting additional provenance research as it stems from a seemingly reliable source. This danger of provenance needs to be acknowledged, as aura can be utilised to enhance the objects life-narrative but can also be employed as a vehicle through which to deny the truth of the object. It is therefore paramount that professional research is conducted into the biographies of objects and that nothing is taken as fact without verifying this information. In order to decrease the possibility of similar scams occurring in the future, a triad of due diligence should be employed to bring about a more thorough investigation into the works in question. As has been mentioned, however, this is ostensibly dependent upon funding and resources. The example of Myatt and Drewe highlights this pitfall of provenance, as

their infiltration of the art world proved successful to such an extent that many more unfound Myatt fakes are still in circulation today. Deliberating fakes and forgeries therefore brings about a new dimension to the debate. These objects have tales of their own, which illustrates how each and every object possesses a unique narrative; it is apparent, however, that perceptions of fakes are subject to alteration upon discovery of their inauthenticity. While this reiterates notions of aura and the artist as genius, this is not to say that fakes absolutely cannot possess their own aura: indeed, as aura pertains to originality, biographies of objects possess auras that are unique to them, irrespective of whether they are considered legitimate works or not.

REFERENCES

Appadurai, A. (1986). Introduction: Commodities and the Politics of Value. In A. Appadurai, *The Social Life of Things: Commodities in Cultural Perspective* (pp. 3-63). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Benjamin, W. (1999). Little History of Photography. In M. W. Jennings, H.Eiland & G.Smith (eds.). *Walter Benjamin: Selected Writings, Volume 2, 1927-1934* (R. Livingstone trans.) (pp. 507-530). Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press. (Original work published 1998).

Benjamin, W. (2002). The Work of Art in the Age of Its Technological Reproducibility: Second Version. In H. Eiland & M. Jennings, *Walter Benjamin: Selected Writings, Volume 3, 1935-1938* (E. Jephcott & H. Zohn trans.) (pp. 101-133). Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press. (Original work published 1935).

Carter, R. (2007). Tainted Archives: Art, Archives, and Authenticity. *The Journal Of The Association Of Canadian Archivists*, *63*, 75-86. Retrieved from https://archivaria.ca/index.php/archivaria/article/view/13128/14369

Butler, P. (2019, January 28). Councils Say More Arts Cuts Inevitable Amid Rising Social Care Need. *The Guardian*. Retrieved 22 March 2021, from https://www.theguardian.com/society/2019/jan/28/councils-say-more-arts-cuts-inevitable-amid-rising-social-care-need

Phaidon Foiling the Forgers with Noah Charney - Giacometti. Retrieved 29 March 2021, from https://uk.phaidon.com/agenda/art/articles/2015/may/22/foiling-the-forgers-with-noah-charney-giacometti/

Foucault, M. (2009). What is an Author? In D. Preziosi (ed.). *The History of Art History: A Critical Anthology* (pp. 321-334). Oxford: Oxford University Press. (Original work published 1969).

Goodman, N. (1976). *Languages of Art: An Approach to a Theory of Symbols*. Indianapolis, IND: Hackett. (Original work published 1968).

Gramlich, J. (2017). Reflections on Provenance Research: Values - Politics - Art Markets. *Journal For Art Market Studies*, *1*(2), 1-14. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.23690/jams.v1i2.15

Hansen, M. (2008). Benjamin's Aura. *Critical Inquiry*, 34(2), (pp. 336-375).

Hanssen, B. (2006). Benjamin or Heidegger: Aesthetics and Politics in an Age of Technology. In A. Benjamin (ed.). *Walter Benjamin and Art* (pp. 73-92). London, GB: Continuum. (Original Work published 2005).

Landesman, P. (2020). A 20th-Century Master Scam. Retrieved 15 February 2021, from https://www.nytimes.com/1999/07/18/magazine/a-20th-century-master-scam.html

Leder, H. (2001). Determinants of Preference: When Do We Like What We Know?. Empirical Studies of the Arts, *19*(2), 201-211. Retrieved from https://journals-sagepub-com.ezproxy.lib.gla.ac.uk/doi/pdf/10.2190/5TAE-E5CV-XJAL-3885

Miller, T. (2014). *Modernism and the Frankfurt School* [Ebook]. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. Retrieved from https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.3366/j.ctt1g0b175

Raux, S. (2012). From Mariette to Joullain: Provenance and Value in Eighteenth-Century French Auction Catalogs. In G. Feigenbaum & I. Reist (eds.). *Provenance: An Alternate History of Art* (pp. 86-103). Los Angeles, CA: The Getty Research Institute.

Sims, J. (2019). Art Fakes, Fraud and Forgery: John Myatt and John Drewe's Con on the Art World. Retrieved 26 March 2021, from https://www.esquiresg.com/features/art-fakes-fraud-and-forgery-john-myatt-and-john-drewes-con-on-the-art-world/

Sladen, O. (2010). Faking History: How Provenance Forgery is Conning the Art World. *Journal Of Art Crime*, *3*, 47-60. Retrieved from https://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/jartcrim3&id=51&collection=journals&index=

Wolz, S.H. & Carbon, C.C. (2014). What is Wrong with an Art Fake?: Cognitive and Emotional Variables Influenced by Authenticity Status of Artworks. *Leonardo*, *47*(5), 467-473. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press. Retrieved from https://muse-jhu-edu.ezproxy.lib.gla.ac.uk/article/555677/pdf

Article available at

DOI: 10.6092/issn.2724-2463/12651

How to cite

as article

Murphy, A. (2021). Aura, Provenance, Fakes & Forgeries. Exploring the pitfalls of provenance and how this can enhance the agenda of fakes and forgeries in the art world. *img journal*, *4*, 224-241.

as contribution in book

Murphy, A. (2021). Aura, Provenance, Fakes & Forgeries. Exploring the pitfalls of provenance and how this can enhance the agenda of fakes and forgeries in the art world. In M. Ghizzoni, E. Musiani (Eds.), *img journal 04/2021 Copy / False / Fake* (pp. 224-241). Alghero, IT: Publica. ISBN 9788899586195