

EARLY MODERN BOOKS

1031

FAKING IT BY U. N. OWEN

U. N. OWEN

FAKING IT

FORGERY AND FABRICATION IN EARLY MODERN
AND
LATE MEDIEVAL CULTURE

*

EARLY MODERN BOOKS

Early Modern Books Ltd, Great Snoring, Norfolk

—

This collection first published 1947

Published in Early Modern Books, 1954

Reprinted 2019

Made and printed in Sweden

by Reprocentralen

Gothenburg

CONTENTS

15 AUGUST

09.30 REGISTRATION AND COFFEE (RECEPTION AREA)

10.30 WELCOME SPEECH (T302)

11.00 KEYNOTE LECTURE (T302)

Ingrid Rowland (The University of Notre Dame),
Forgery as conceptual art, from Curzio Inghirami to Ai Weiwei
Chair: Per Sivefors

12.00 LUNCH (RECEPTION AREA)

13.00 PANEL 1/2 (T302 & T307)

14.30 COFFEE (RECEPTION AREA)

15.00 PANEL 3/4 (T302 & T307)

16.30 BREAK (RECEPTION AREA)

16.45 KEYNOTE LECTURE (T302)

Earle Havens (Johns Hopkins University), *Forgery's Valhalla:
Epic lies and heroic liars in the Bibliotheca Fictiva*
Chair: Rikard Wingård

17.45 RECEPTION (RECEPTION AREA)

16 AUGUST

09.00 PANEL 5/6 (T302 & T307)

10.30 COFFEE (RECEPTION AREA)

11.00 KEYNOTE LECTURE (T302)

Patricia Pires Boulhosa (University of Cambridge),
Medieval manuscripts as authentication – then and now
Chair: Philip Lavender

12.00 LUNCH (RECEPTION AREA)

13.30 PANEL 7/8 (T302 & T307)

15.30 COFFEE (RECEPTION AREA)

16.00 KEYNOTE LECTURE (T302)

Christopher Wood (New York University),
The tablets of San Cataldo, 1492
Chair: Alexandra Fried

17.00 BREAK (RECEPTION AREA)

18.30 DINNER (GUNNEBO HOUSE. DEPARTURE FROM OLOF
WIJKSGATAN, IN FRONT OF THE CONFERENCE BUILDING)

17 AUGUST

09.30 PANEL 9/10 (T302 & T307)

11.00 COFFEE (RECEPTION AREA)

11.30 KEYNOTE LECTURE (T302)

Görel Cavalli-Björkman (Swedish National Museum of
Fine Arts), *False originals and true copies*

Chair: Cecilia Rosengren

12.30 LUNCH (RECEPTION AREA)

14.00 PANEL 11/12 (T302 & T307)

15.30 FAKE CHAMPAGNE AND ADIEU (T302)

PANELS

15 AUGUST

PANEL 1: ALL THAT GLITTERS IS NOT GOLD

ALCHEMY AND FAKE GOLD

13.00 Federica Boldrini & Maria Cristina Ganga (University of Parma), *Faking luxury: False and forgery in Early Modern statutes of Italian guilds of art*

13.30 Sophie Pitman (Aalto University), *Mock velvet and fake gold: Renaissance fashion among the lower classes 1550–1650*

14.00 Curtis Runstedler (University of Tübingen), *Transmuting chaos: Alchemy and the counterfeiters in late Medieval poetry*

Chair: Philip Lavender

PANEL 2: BREAKING THE LAW

FORGERY AND CRIME

13.00 Tabea Hochstrasser (KU Leuven), *Popular criminals: Forgery of currency in 18th century Lowland broadsides*

13.30 Helen Hughes (Monash University), *Forger–Convict–Artist: The criminalisation of forgery and colonial Australian art, 1788–1868*

14.00 Kathleen Christian (The Open University), *Credit: The nexus between bankers, antiquaries, and forgers in Early Modern Rome*

Chair: Britt-Marie Karlsson

PANEL 3: TRUE OR FALSE?
FAKES AND THEIR FUNCTIONS

15.00 Barbara Furlotti (Courtauld Institute of Art), *“Try it with the tip of a knife”: Looking out for fake antiquities in Early Modern Italy*

15.30 Brian Boeck (DePaul University), *How Ivan IV became terrible before he was born: A Russian political forgery devoted to explaining autocratic evil*

16.00 Benjamin Binstock (The Cooper Union), *Vermeers faking it*

Chair: Alexandra Herlitz

PANEL 4: UNDERSTANDING THE SPURIOUS
METHODS AND CONCEPTS

15.00 Camilla Russo (University of Trento), *Towards an archive of the Italian literary fakes: Methods, problems and case-studies*

15.30 Andreas Bassett (University of Washington), *“I pray thee, who gave thee that name?”: Shakespeare and Loctrine’s “W.S.”*

16.00 Geoff Brewer (Saint Louis University), *Forgery, counted. W.H. Ireland’s Vortigern and Henry the Second*

Chair: Rikard Wingård

16 AUGUST

PANEL 5: A SPURIOUS CLASSIC

ANNIAN EXCHANGES

09.00 Benjamin Braude (Boston College), *Fraternal fraudsters: Annian antiplatonism and Panofskyan neoplatonism*

09.30 Giuliano Mori (University of Milan), *Historical forgery and historical method in fifteenth-century Italy*

10.00 Lorenzo Paoli (University of Tours/University of Bologna), *Re-forging a forgery: Annius's Antiquities and its French editions*

Chair: Cecilia Rosengren

PANEL 6: FAKING THE NORDIC

09.00 Michael Lerche Nielsen (University of Copenhagen), *Runic forgeries and the Danish and Swedish fight for hegemony in the seventeenth century*

09.30 Philip Lavender (University of Gothenburg), *Forging medieval sagas in Early Modern Scandinavia*

10.00 Bernhard Schirg (Gotha Research Centre), *Faking Swedish antiquity: Forgeries in the service of the Swedish empire (1650–1720)*

Chair: Per Sivefors

PANEL 7: CONJURING ILLUSIONS

TRUTH AND FALSITY ON THE STAGE

13.30 Cecilia Lindskog Whiteley (University of Uppsala), *“Illusions, fruits of lunacy”*: *Fake in Doctor Faustus and forgery as social commentary*

14.00 Jillian Luke (University of Edinburgh), *“God has given you one face and you make yourself another”*: *Faking blushes on the Early Modern stage*

14.30 Harry Langham (University of Oxford), *Coining words: Timon of Athens and counterfeit speech*

15.00 Jacqueline Hylkema (Leiden University), *Of fake advertisements and theatrical deceptions: The great bottle hoax of 1749*

Chair: Per Sivefors

PANEL 8: FAKES, FORGERIES, AND THE TRUTH OF GOD

13.30 Johannes Huhtinen (Åbo Akademi University), *Pseudo-martyrs: Debating the Jesuit mission in seventeenth-century England*

14.00 Simen Kallevik-Nielsen, (University of Cambridge), *“Forging a language of lies”*: *Reformation theology, iconoclasm and falsehood in Early Modern England*

14.30 Eveline Szarka (University of Zurich), *Faking the dead: Fantasies, fraud and the “reality” of ghosts in post-reformation Switzerland*

15.00 Ioannis Siopis (Aristotle University of Thessaloniki), *“Omologia Pisteos” of Kyrillos Loukaris: A real or falsified work?*

Chair: Britt-Marie Karlsson

17 AUGUST

PANEL 9: FORGING TRADEMARKS

9.30 Santiago Villajos (Autonomous University of Madrid), *Offfakes and authenticity in Early Modern Spain: The portrait of Cervantes*

10.00 Marcela Vondráčková (National Gallery of Prague), *The reception of Norbert Grund's work: Copy or fake?*

10.30 Ksenija Tschetschik-Hammerl (Humboldt University), *Hans Hoffmann and other cases of forging Dürer's monogram in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries*

Chair: Philip Lavender

PANEL 10: FORGING AUTHENTICITY

CONCEPTIONS OF REAL AND FAKE

9.30 Brian Madigan (Wayne State University), *The parameters of authenticity in numismatic studies in the sixteenth century*

10.00 Charlotta Krispinsson (Humboldt University), *Painted copies and views on authenticity in seventeenth century Sweden*

10.30 Christopher Yates (Brown University), *Poetry on demand: Imitation, authenticity and verbal usury in the works of George Gascoigne*

Chair: Alexandra Fried

PANEL 11: FAKE IMPRESSIONS
AND FRAUDULENT PRINTING

14.00 Jan Hillgärtner (Leiden University), *Forgery in the world of periodicals: Forged and satirical newspapers and the road to peace in seventeenth-century Germany*

14.30 Selene Maria Vatteroni (The Free University of Berlin), *Vernacular books and religious Nicodemism in Early Modern Florence: A survey of the Ahmanson-Murphy Aldine Collection at UCLA*

15.00 Drew Thomas (University of St Andrews), *Fraud and authenticity in Reformation printing*

Chair: Rikard Wingård

PANEL 12: EXPOSING THE FAKE

14.00 Adam Eaker (New York Metropolitan Museum of Art), *The misdeeds of Margareta Haverman*

14.30 Ivan Boserup (Royal Library of Copenhagen), *Coming to grips with the Collezione Miccinelli in Naples*

15.00 Lorne Darnell (Courtauld Institute of Art), *The Barberini landscape: An archaeological hoax at the heart of Baroque Rome*

Chair: Alexandra Herlitz

ABSTRACTS

Andreas Bassett (University of Washington), “*I pray thee, who gave thee that name?*”: *Shakespeare and Loocrine’s “W.S.”*

One of the first plays in the Shakespeare apocrypha to appear in print, *Loocrine* (1595), is mysteriously assigned an obscure “W. S.” as its author-like figure on the Q1 title page. Since its inclusion in the Third Folio and its subsequent exit from the canon sixty-five years later, *Loocrine* has been invariably viewed in (dis)connection to Shakespeare, forever cast in his shadow and riding his coattail. The most recent scholarship concerning *Loocrine* admirably engages attribution studies in an attempt to isolate the play’s true non-Shakespearean dramatist(s). However, the unavoidable “W. S.” attribution is rarely explicated and has yet to be resolved; this is the underlying objective of my paper. Furthermore, though the unidentified “W. S.” is still assumed by many to be a spurious pseudo-Shakespearean attribution on the part of mercenary publisher and printer Thomas Creede, nothing in Creede’s repertoire suggests that he ever used such tactics to swindle readers into purchasing blatantly misattributed play quartos. I argue that *Loocrine’s* “W. S.” authorial marker is genuine and may have suggested an element of Shakespearean involvement at the time, and more saliently, it signalled and perhaps played a part in the recent disputes between the University Wits and the actor-playwrights. My paper addresses this issue by investigating parallel texts (Robert Greene’s *Selimus*, Edmund Spenser’s *The Faerie Queene* and *Com-*

plaints, Henry Willobie's *Willobie His Avis*) and using linguistic analysis and visualization tools in an effort to shed more light on *Lochrine*'s anomalous existence.

Benjamin Binstock (The Cooper Union), *Vermeers faking it*

Johannes Vermeer's interiors portray rooms of his house, including paintings, with astounding fidelity. He depicted Dirk van Baburen's *Coupler* in different frames and conceptions, one of which was likely Vermeer's copy and earliest extant painting, long mis-identified as Baburen's original, later copied by forger Han van Meegeren. Grandson of a counterfeiter, Vermeer thus lay the foundation for his appropriative vision.

Vermeer's gradual painting-by-painting development can be established only after a fifth of these are re-assigned to a follower. This could have been his eldest child Maria, since he had no official student. He depicted her in *Girl with a Pearl Earring*, and she responded by depicting herself in *Girl in a Red Hat*. Her *Girl at a Virginal* was later rejected, even called a forgery, before technical examination proved this was painted on the same canvas as his *Lacemaker*, occasioning its lucrative rehabilitation as Vermeer by Sotheby's, itself a fake. Other examples were forgeries. Vermeer died leaving many debts, the largest of which, to the baker, was settled by trading him two paintings, depicting "two persons, one of whom is sitting and writing a letter" and "a person playing a cittern [a kind of lute]." In the first, the Frick's *Mistress and Maid*, his—precisely for this purpose—secret apprentice substituted a brown curtain for her father's light-filled interiors. In the second, *Girl with a Lute*, she achieved a slightly darker interior, without perspective, yet left the tablecloth unfinished, to suggest her father's last painting. Maria Vermeer was faking it.

Brian Boeck (DePaul University), *How Ivan IV became terrible before he was born: A Russian political forgery devoted to explaining autocratic evil*

This paper demonstrates that even though official court chronicles fell silent as a result of the violent and destructive years of Ivan the Terrible's privy court/*oprichnina* (1564–1572), historical appraisal of Ivan's reign nevertheless continued. This paper focuses on a prominent political forgery devoted to the 1525 divorce of Vasilii III (Ivan's father) called the *Second Marriage Tract* [henceforth the *Tract*]. This source has not been closely studied or accurately dated. I argue that it was created in the course of political struggles of the 1580s. The text mobilized memories of the fertility crisis of Vasilii III in order to address the most significant political controversy of the post-Ivan era. In the mid-1580s the dynasty became threatened. Ivan's son, tsar Fedor, lacked offspring. This became the most pressing concern of both the church and state. Open conflict over the tsar's procreative future even divided the court. The *Tract* was therefore fabricated to address the central issue of the post-Ivan era: should the *tsaritsa* Irina Godunova be locked away in a monastery so that tsar Fedor could marry a more fecund woman? I argue here that the *Tract* is a deliberate, later political forgery. It employed historical analogies to speak to contemporary political struggles and was designed to stoke fears that a second wave of terror would result from the calls for tsar Fedor to divorce his wife.

Federica Boldrini & Maria Cristina Ganga (University of Parma), *Faking luxury: False and forgery in Early Modern statutes of Italian guilds of art*

This paper aims to explore the various forms of falsification as described in the statutes of the guilds of arts and crafts of Early Modern Italy, with special reference to artisans of fashion like goldsmiths and tailors.

The statutes of these Guilds include norms against two different kinds of falsification: one related to the technical manufacturing process of the products, and the other concerning the forgery of the distinctive signs (trademarks) used by the most established artisans.

Concerning material falsification, the statutory norms explicitly evidenced the methods used for this purpose, sanctioning deceitful conducts like the gold pouring of silver or the setting of false precious stones passed for authentic.

As far as forgery of trademarks is concerned, this conduct came into prominence during the Late Middle Ages, as an effect of the diffusion of the concept of fashion trend: luxurious dresses and jewels represented useful elements to distinguish the social extraction of those who wore them, and were often chosen and commissioned for the authentic skill of the craftsman who made them. For this reason trademarks acquired the greatest importance in city markets and Guilds enacted norms to counteract their forgery.

The impact of these phenomena on the economy of early modern Italian cities was so deep that the *fraude* (trade of the false) became the subject of the reflections of legal scholars and moral theologians who in their treatises described the various forms of fraudulent sale configuring a primitive example of protection of intellectual property.

Ivan Boserup (Royal Library of Copenhagen), *Coming to grips with the Collezione Miccinelli in Naples*

Since the late 1980s, the authenticity of the “Miccinelli documents” have been questioned by renowned academic scholars and defended by their private owner and her *porte-parole*, recently deceased Professor at the University of Bologna, Laura Laurencich-Minelli. Her defense was published in more than 20 papers in Italian or Spanish and a final edition with bilingual translations (Bologna: CLUEB 2007). Most importantly, the “documents” *redefine* the authorship and radical political aims of one of the most spectacular manuscripts of Det Kgl. Bibliotek in Copenhagen: the illustrated autograph *Nueva corónica y buen gobierno codex* by the Andean Indian Felipe Guaman Poma de Ayala (GKS 2232, completed in 1615). Sceptical scholars have accumulated very much *circumstantial evidence* against the authenticity of the documents, but no “smoking gun”. In 2012 and 2015, however, my colleague Mette Kia Krabbe Meyer and I have reported about our thorough graphic and palaeographic investigation of a specimen of the ca. 20 separate parts of the “Miccinelli documents”. We believe to have *proved materially* that it had been forged not earlier than 1936, probably in the 1990s, as a “confirming” addition to the previously published or described entities that had come under unexpectedly heavy fire from the international scholarly community. Other current criticism will be discussed, as well as the challenging issue of the role played in the “prehistory” of the recent forgeries by the early modern “star” (inventor, alchemist and freemason) Raimondo di Sangro, 7th Prince of Sansevero (Naples, 1710–1771), and his stupendous anti-clerical *Lettera apologetica* (Naples 1750).

Benjamin Braude (Boston College), *Fraternal fraudsters: Annian antiplatonism and Panofskyan neoplatonism*

This proposal links Erwin Panofsky's seminal *Studies in Iconology* with Annius of Viterbo's notorious *Antiquities*. Through multiple reprintings and translations, the Viterban's 1498 work, modeled upon the respected Marsilio Ficino's 1472 pseudepigraphical *Hermetic Corpus*, pervaded western European culture for centuries. My book in progress, *Michelangelo and the Sistine Ceiling: Abrahamic Foundations in the Chapel of the Palace*, argues that Annian fabrications, drawing upon Muslim and Jewish themes, shaped the chapel's program. Annius opposed Neoplatonic Hellenism. Panofsky powerfully asserted the pervasiveness of Neoplatonism, despite the paucity of clear visual evidence. What little he found had to play a crucial role for his case. Its rhetorical structure dramatically showcased a detail from an obscure painted fragment from a lost work. In Germany, remote from the Florentine intellectual avant garde, around 1530 Lucas Cranach the Elder created *Cupid Removing his Blindfold*. Two words, "opera Platonis", inscribed on the tome supporting Cupid offered "eloquent proof for the widespread popularity" of the Platonic theory of love in the early sixteenth century (*Iconology*, NY, 1962, p. 128, figure 106, p. 129). Thereupon Panofsky felt encouraged to impose Neoplatonism on Michelangelo. However, those two words were a forged addition, covering the artist's signature, overpainted, conceivably as late as the nineteenth century. Since this discovery in 1973, its significance has received little attention. For centuries the case against and for Renaissance Platonism has depended on fraud, Annius wittingly and Panofsky unwittingly. Renaissance as well as ancient pseudepigraphy deserve serious attention. Fraud is all pervasive.

Geoff Brewer (Saint Louis University), *Forgery, counted. W.H. Ireland's Vortigern and Henry the Second*

The best forgery is never exposed. Yet the study of forgery is effectively limited to works which have been outed as fraudulent, and when a forgery is exposed, it becomes difficult to view it independent of its authentic analog. The features which announce a work as spurious, or the circumstances of its fabrication and reception, become the focal point, and consideration of the work itself is eclipsed. This trend is particularly true for the study of literary forgery. Need it be? This paper argues for the application of stylometric analysis on works of literary forgery as a measure of a forgery's lexical success, inverting the impulse to dissect a spurious work by its fraudulent features. The forged Shakespeare plays of W. H. Ireland, *Vortigern* and *Henry the Second*, will act as case studies for how we may begin to count forgery, not for its shortcomings but its strengths.

Kathleen Christian (The Open University), *Credit: The nexus between bankers, antiquaries, and forgers in Early Modern Rome*

In my paper I would propose to explore the relationship between bankers, antiquaries and antiquities forgers in Early Modern Rome, with a focus on the relationship between Michelangelo, Jacopo Galli and Cardinal Raffaele Riario. Of late the role of merchant-bankers in the trade in antiquities and other objects has been a focus of increasing attention: bankers kept treasuries of gems, jewels, cameos and other such valuables as collateral for loans. The authenticity of these objects was a matter of great anxiety, considering their role as providers of “credit”. At a time when most large states (including the papacy) ran on credit, running up vast debts, expertise in judging authentic from fake became a matter of increasing importance. In this sense the ability to judge authenticity was one that bankers were keen to develop, which put them in ever closer rapport with collectors and sculptors (who were “experts” in distinguishing authentic objects from forgeries). Focusing on the concept of “credit” and drawing upon unpublished documents related to the Galli-Balducci bank, I would propose to explore the importance of authenticity and credit in the nexus that bound together the Galli (who traded in small antiquities and were experts in judging their value), Michelangelo, an antiquities expert as well as a “forger”, and Cardinal Riario, who was treasurer of the papacy. The relationship between Giovanni Ciampolini, the Medici, the Medici bank will provide further context to this discussion.

Lorne Darnell (Courtauld Institute of Art), *The Barberini landscape: An archaeological hoax at the heart of Baroque Rome*

In May of 1629, an antique Roman painting was allegedly discovered at the construction site of the Palazzo Barberini. Though it was said to have quickly disappeared when exposed to light, it had been copied first by a painter in the Barberini employ, the obscure Giovanni Franchione. This copy too is now lost, but drawings and a painting after it survive by Claude, Pietro Testa, and possibly Poussin, so that we can triangulate its composition. It depicted a large rock arch with temples and springs, later identified by Rubens as a nymphaeum.

The lost Roman painting is known as the Barberini Landscape, and its fame now stems from what Anthony Blunt, among others, has argued for its influence on Rubens, Poussin, and Claude. But what I will attempt to demonstrate in my paper is that it was in fact a hoax, and that Franchione's copy was an original work of art. The composition makes highly specific, unmistakable references to sixteenth-century landscapes by Netherlandish painters, and thus could not be ancient. Though the details of his life are otherwise lost, Franchione is indeed recorded in the Barberini inventories as "*pittore fiamminghi*." His "copy" duped some of the greatest intellects of the time, including Rubens, Nicolas Peiresc, and Cassiano dal Pozzo; while the alleged lost model is still considered the earliest discovered Roman landscape painting. After the initial exposition of the hoax, I will consider who perpetrated it and why, and how it managed to succeed.

Adam Eaker (New York Metropolitan Museum of Art), *The misdeeds of Margareta Haverman*

Accusations of forgery have dominated the reception of the Dutch flower painter Margareta Haverman (1693–?). Praised in her lifetime for an uncanny ability to emulate her famously secretive teacher, Jan van Huysum, Haverman was accused, after her death, of having passed off Van Huysum's work as her own. According to these tales, repeated in biographical dictionaries and museum catalogues despite having no documentary basis, the Royal Academy in Paris expelled Haverman when it discovered her deception of adding her signature to Van Huysum's work. Because only two of Haverman's signed paintings are known to survive, there has been little research to clarify the truth of this anecdote. Recently, however, a painting by Haverman was the subject of extensive technical analysis at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, accompanied by renewed scrutiny of the documentary sources from her own lifetime. This paper presents the findings of this research to argue that the forgery anecdote was itself a historiographic fiction, concocted to make sense of the brief and truncated career of an exceptionally gifted woman artist. The anecdote functions in this interpretation as a symptom of the discomfort engendered by both female painters and by the illusionism of still life, a genre whose practitioners were praised for their deceptions.

Barbara Furlotti (Courtauld Institute of Art), “*Try it with the tip of a knife*”: *Looking out for fake antiquities in Early Modern Italy*

In 1565, the collector and art adviser Girolamo Garimberto congratulated Cesare Gonzaga on the recent acquisition of a series of ancient heads. In Garimberto’s words, what made this purchase so extraordinary was the “presence of an emperor [Geta] so rare, with his wife and two children, that, to tell the truth, this is an extremely rare and impossible occurrence, difficult to be arranged in any century, if not by sculpting them *ex novo*.” While approving the acquisition, Garimberto was voicing a deep concern: collectors’ high demand for “rare and impossible” works was encouraging the creation of forgeries. During the sixteenth century, for instance, the growing request for ancient coins with unusual reverses fostered a flourishing production of skilfully made fakes, which dealers were not ashamed to bring to the market that were still scorching hot. In such a competitive context, it was crucial to learn how to recognise an original coin from a fake, for instance by scratching the metal with the tip of a knife or hitting it to check its sound. As the market for antiquities boomed, so did the production of fake coins, sculptures, gems, inscriptions.

This paper investigates the production of fake antiquities in Italy during the Early Modern period. Through the discussion of some sixteenth-century forgeries, it addresses the following questions: by whom and how were fake antiquities produced? How and by whom were they sold to collectors? What kind of expertise was required to identify forgeries? Were printed books on ancient coins and antiquarian collections useful to assert the authenticity of a piece?

Jan Hillgärtner (Leiden University), *Forgery in the world of periodicals: Forged and satirical newspapers and the road to peace in seventeenth-century Germany*

In 1641 a pamphlet appeared in Germany, curiously titled *Immerwerende Neue Politische Postzeitung Auß Macrocosmia*. It comprised seven fictitious reports from across Europe. The typography and style of the text closely resembled that of an actual newspaper; a genre that at this point had been established about 30 years prior in Germany. The item contained a report from *Friedens-Fels* (Peace Mountain) in which the contemporary setting was transposed into the classical world and where Apollo expressed his wish to pacify Sweden and Germany and to stop Karl Gustav from turning his army against other Christians. What followed this primer was a deluge of pamphlets that all mocked the conventions of conventional newspapers of the time.

The anonymous authors of these items almost invariably had higher goals than simply using such pamphlets to mock the newspapers with their occasionally false reporting. After 1648, “fake” newspapers conveyed fictitious stories of the horrors of the Thirty Years War. Those stories often were entertaining and of high literary quality. They blurred the lines between factual reporting and political pamphleteering. The stories drew parallels between the current state of the duchies and provinces in Germany and petitioned the political elites to abstain from any involvement with the wars. The genre of satirical newspapers again began to change at the end of the century when authors began mixing in factual news to their fictitious accounts and thus furthermore made fact and fiction harder to distinguish.

This paper seeks to uncover the reasons behind publishing this unknown type of print and trace its development over a 60-year period. It is based on the inspection of just under 100 such items, printed in Germany between 1641 and 1700.

Tabea Hochstrasser (KU Leuven), *Popular criminals: Forgery of currency in eighteenth-century Lowland broadsides*

This presentation will take a closer look at how forgers of currency were represented in Scottish broadsides during the whole of the eighteenth century. Broadsides were a prominent type of Early Modern, popular printed culture: single, inexpensive sheets which circulated throughout Europe ever since the introduction of the printing press (broadsides, Flugschriften, feuilles volantes, hojas volantes, vlugschriften ...).

Criminal broadsides were a particularly long-lasting genre. They reported on sensational, usually capital crimes and vilified or made fun of convicted criminals. In Scotland, they often consisted of reports of executions, preceded by criminal confessions and information on the capital crime committed. In the case of eighteenth-century Scotland, a notable crime was the forgery of currency; several criminal broadsides of that kind have been preserved.

They will serve as case studies for this presentation, in particular those that can be complemented with surviving court cases. A modest comparison between popular and legal descriptions can thus be made, shedding a small light on how eighteenth-century print production contributed to popular perceptions of forgers of currency.

Helen Hughes (Monash University), *Forger—Convict—Artist: The criminalisation of forgery and colonial Australian art, 1788–1868*

Over half the artists who arrived in Australia on the First Fleet in 1788 had been convicted of forgery. As moral panic around the crime—and the subsequent persecution of forgers—escalated across Great Britain in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, so too did colonial Australia’s artistic population swell through the process of convict transportation. Convicted forger Thomas Watling was the first professional artist to arrive in Australia in 1789, and executed the first oil painting of Sydney in 1794. By the 1820s, thrice-convicted forger Joseph Lycett was producing popular lithographic prints of New South Wales for consumption back in Great Britain. Meanwhile, convicted forgers like Thomas Griffiths Wainewright, Charles Constantini, and Richard Read began to service the emerging middle classes of Hobart and Sydney with their portraiture practices, while the convicted forger Francis Greenway would become the inaugural Government Architect of NSW under Governor Macquarie. Though the crime of forgery was fraying civil society in Great Britain, undermining trust in the verisimilitude of both people and money, the skillset of forgers was seen by the colonial administration to be increasingly useful to the development of the penal colonies.

This paper explains the significant contribution that convicted forgers made to the visual iconography of early colonial Australia, focussing on its art while also noting its architecture, decorative arts, and, ironically, the design and manufacture of financial currencies. It analyses the criminalisation of forgery in Great Britain in the eighteenth century, examining the changing sentence for the crime and the related development of an expanding capitalist credit system.

Johannes Huhtinen (Åbo Akademi University), *Pseudo-martyrs: Debating the Jesuit mission in seventeenth-century England*

The gallows is known as a place where the state puts harsh punitive policies into practice. In early modern England, it also was an important venue for the interplay between real and fake: some people ended their lives as common criminals and others as celebrated martyrs. The status of these individuals depended much on how they behaved on the gallows and how they dressed up their actions with religious veils and pious postures. Indeed, when an executed felon walked like a martyr and talked like a martyr, the natural conclusion to draw was that what had taken place was, indeed, a martyrdom. It is highly significant that more and more people were identified as martyrs at the end of the sixteenth century, when Queen Elizabeth's government executed Roman Catholic missionary priests for treason. Much of the success of the Catholic cause in England depended upon whether contemporaries believed that the executed Romanists were common criminals or martyrs. To the governing circles, in turn, those missionaries martyred on English soil represented a formidable challenge since their presence served to limit monarchical power and sovereignty. What constituted a real martyr?

In this paper, I focus on the literary techniques Early Modern writers employed to authenticate and falsify potential martyrs. It explores the writings of hired pens like John Donne, the author of *Pseudo-Martyr* (1610), who wrote against "corrupt desire of false-Martyrdome," and whose task was to make sure that the line between a martyr and a seditious person remained remarkably clear. In addition to the government-sponsored program to falsify the Catholic victims of the gallows, it pays close attention to the Jesuit efforts to authenticate martyrdoms with

the help of signs, wonders, and miracles, as well as their literary responses to the derogatory rhetoric.

Jacqueline Hylkema (Leiden University), *Of fake advertisements and theatrical deceptions: The great bottle hoax of 1749*

On 11 January 1749, an advertisement appeared in the *General Advertiser*, promising a spectacular performance at London's New Theatre in which a grown man would jump into a small tavern bottle. The performance sold out but when neither man nor bottle appeared, the audience realized that the advertisement had been a fake and took revenge by destroying the theatre. The aftermath of the Great Bottle Hoax, as the event became known, was marked by an abundance of prints and pamphlets, some of which related the deception of the fake advertisement to the make-believe of the stage. In this paper, I will argue that these prints and pamphlets are part of a crucial Early Modern debate: the relationship between actual deception and artistic illusion, in which the viewer experiences, however briefly, a work of art as that which it represents.

This holds particularly true for George Bickham the Younger's print *The Bottle Conjurer, from Head to Foot, without Equivocation*, which elaborates on a particular seventeenth-century tradition of comparing the deceptive qualities of the arts to forgery and engages with discussions on artistic deception in the work of art theorists such as Roger de Piles and Jonathan Richardson and the emerging genre of drama theory. What, Bickham asks, sets the fake advertisement and the deceptions on the stage of the New Theatre apart, and his answer draws distinct lines between artistic illusion and forgery – and redefines both in the process.

Charlotta Krispinsson (Humboldt University), *Painted copies and views on authenticity in seventeenth-century Sweden*

The research on forgeries, fakes, copies, replicas, facsimiles, substitutions, appropriations and imitations in pre-modern times is now a growing field of research in art history, and as shown the difference between these concepts is anything but clear (Heisterberg, Müller-Bechtel & Putzger eds. 2018; Cupperi ed. 2014; Wood 2008).

The aim of this paper is to look at the artistic production of painted portrait copies in seventeenth-century Stockholm and the Svealand area during the seventeenth-century, a period when Sweden was an economic and political empire, but it lacked a strong artistic centre. This made it an art historical periphery even if the inflow of money generated a growing demand for paintings – including copies and replicas. Copies and replicas were chiefly commissioned from painters who worked within the inherited guild system, where copying was considered manual labour. Previous art historical research has tended to focus on court painters considered original or as responsible for importing new stylistic impulses and artistic skills from the cultural centre in Europe at the time. This paper, however, will look at the increasing number of less successful, “second-rate” painters in the seventeenth-century who earned their living by painting copies. The paper will also take into consideration questions regarding changing ideas about authenticity and questions artistic centres and art as imitation in the peripheries.

The paper will present preliminary results from the ongoing post-doc project “Copies and Replicas in Seventeenth-century Northern Europe: Image, Medium, and Practice”, combining theoretical perspectives from media studies and visual studies.

Harry Langham (University of Oxford), *Coining words: Timon of Athens and counterfeit speech*

Despite Elizabeth I's well propagandised currency reforms at the start of her reign, vast amount of counterfeit coins remained in circulation – a hangover from her father, Henry VIII's series of debasements – leaving confidence in the value behind the nation's currency – in the real substance of its coinage – irreparably damaged. Significantly, it is out of this economic context, that the word "coin" in its verb form, begins to take on two new meanings, firstly pertaining to the act of counterfeiting, and secondly, to that of linguistic invention. Given the concurrency of these semantic developments, the latter was often implicitly coloured by the depreciative connotations of the former, "as if," as the OED suggests, "the process were analogous to that of the counterfeiter" ("coin, v.1"). This elision of metalanguage and the language of financial criminality, results in an implicit alignment of the profligate speaker/writer with the counterfeiter, one which cannot help but destabilise the illusion of language's fundamental attachment to meaning. If words, like coins, can be counterfeited, and thus, be representative of a certain value without truly possessing it, then the implications for language as a viable means of communication, are severe. It is along these lines that I wish to present a reading of Shakespeare's *Timon of Athens* (c.1605–06), interpreting the play's critique of the financial practices of the Athenians, as a paradigm through which Shakespeare attempts a more fundamental, self-reflexive and strikingly modern critique on language itself.

Philip Lavender (University of Gothenburg), *Forging medieval sagas in Early Modern Scandinavia*

The Icelandic sagas are often lauded as one of the great cultural contributions of the European Middle Ages, if not as an example of praiseworthy “world literature”. They tell stories of ancient Scandinavia, kings and heroes and the settlers and descendants of the settlers of Iceland. They thus straddle a border between fiction and history which has been the source of much debate. In this paper I intend to give a brief overview of the theoretical questions raised by the Early Modern antiquarian interest in Icelandic sagas and their historicity. The production of saga forgeries lies at the centre of these questions: if a forgery is a text intended to deceive as regards its origins, and one which stands apart from an authentic object, in what ways can sagas fit this mould and challenge it? What is an authentic saga, bearing in mind that these texts were anonymous and fluid, changing freely in the process of manuscript transmission? How did forged sagas differ from other sagas, written in an archaic style and circulated amongst Icelanders throughout the Early Modern period?

Michael Lerche Nielsen (University of Copenhagen), *Runic forgeries and the Danish and Swedish fight for hegemony in the seventeenth century*

The seventeenth century both saw the establishment of Runology as a scientific discipline and at the same time a wide range of runic forgeries in Denmark and Sweden. The struggle for supremacy between the two kingdoms and attempts to locate the cradle of the Scandinavian tribes mentioned by Greek and Roman historians were the main reason behind these forgeries. The seventeenth century both saw a runic saga from Uppland, Sweden, runic coins issued by legendary kings and a Gotlandic historic account in runes stating that Denmark was the true homeland of the Goths. As a direct response, a fabricated runic stone in Östergötland apparently documented that the first settlers on Gotland came from Sweden. Some of the forgeries are the work of young scholars in an attempt to please their benefactors. In a few cases, however, the faked runes seem more officially initiated.

Cecilia Lindskog Whiteley (University of Uppsala), “*Illusions, fruits of lunacy*”: Fake in “*Doctor Faustus*” and forgery as social commentary

Early modern theatrical performance was anti-illusionist, characterised by conscious non-realism and metatheatricality. In a dramatical tradition that differs greatly from our own, it revelled in showcasing illusions as fake. This paper aims to examine how the deliberate display of forgery destabilises genre, narrative and religion in Marlowe’s *Doctor Faustus*, implicating the audience in this process.

I argue that Marlowe, himself notoriously living a life of lies and forgery, revels in foregrounding the fake on stage in *Doctor Faustus* in a manner that undercuts stability of meaning. The most famous line is illustrative of how the dialogue invites the audience to recognise and participate in this multi-layered illusion. “Was this the face that launched a thousand ships?” asks Faustus. This question would very likely have prompted an audience response: “No!” The discrepancy between the most beautiful woman in history and the male actor playing her would have been evident, at the very least, and perhaps also a deliberately discordant moment of dramatic irony and comedy. By phrasing Faustus’ reaction as a query, Marlowe foregrounds the forgery of the play. In this illusion of an illusion, the devil, religion, salvation, all are exposed as forgeries, no more real than the tragical history of the protagonist, which, arguably, is no tragedy at all.

In this paper, I discuss *Doctor Faustus* as one of the clearest and best-known instances of the fake on the Early Modern stage, and the implications of this in a society in which religious symbolism and identities were being actively re-examined and re-formulated.

Jillian Luke (University of Edinburgh), *“God has given you one face and you make yourself another”*: Faking blushes on the Early Modern stage

It is well established that in the Early Modern period, people were very concerned about how the inside and the outside of their bodies related to one another. They were anxious that you could behave in a way that was good and chaste and pious on the outside, but harbour all kinds of bad or lustful or heretical thoughts on the inside - and that no one could ever know.

Blushing was seen as an unusually honest metric by which a person's private, hidden emotions were displayed to the view of the outside world. For a time, the blush was the hallmark of emotional honesty because it could not be faked and it could not be hidden. However, the increasing popularity of make-up in the Early Modern period meant that a pretend blush could be faked, or a real blush could be hidden, under layers of paint. The new technology led to accusations of forgery, fakery, and deceit, and a renewed anxiety about the abilities of the skin to tell the truth, or to lie. This paper will consider both the practicalities of faking a blush on the early modern stage, and undertake a series of close readings of blushes in early modern plays to think more about how people in the Early Modern period could authenticate a blush, and, once they'd established that it's the real deal, how they went about interpreting its meaning.

Brian Madigan (Wayne State University), *The parameters of authenticity in numismatic studies in the sixteenth century*

The collecting and interpretation of the material remains of Antiquity is an aspect of Early Modern intellectual history where the issue of authenticity was critical to the larger enterprise of understanding the past. The first publication of ancient images (in the form of coins), Andrea Fulvio's *Illustrium imagines* (1517), acknowledged in its preface that the problem was of particular concern to antiquarians when it assured the reader that only genuine ancient coins were used in the study. This profession of the importance of authenticity was vital because in this book Fulvio was attempting the first publication to construct history using ancient artifacts to confirm, amend or amplify the history provided by surviving ancient texts, that were known to harbor contradictions, errors and corruptions. Fakes threatened the value of objects as sources of information to construct that history.

Fake and authentic are relative terms, and assessing their roles in antiquarian study of coins needs first to determine the attitude with respect to the authentic in the understanding and publication of these artifacts. This paper will examine the degree to which the concepts of authentic and fake played out in Fulvio's publication, and in the responses to it by others interested in ancient coins. Selected examples will be used to examine the ability to recognize and the attitude towards the genuine with which Fulvio and other antiquarians labored, and where pragmatically the parameters of fake and authentic lay.

Giuliano Mori (University of Milan), *Historical forgery and historical method in 15th century Italy*

A main concern for Italian Humanists was to disengage history from the notion of divine providence. To this end, humanists such as Bruni, Bracciolini, and Facio found inspiration in the Ciceronian tradition, which defined historical veracity as the persuasive but impartial account of events as they had *actually or verisimilarly* taken place. Other humanists, however, cited Thucydides and Lucian, defending the equation of historical and factual truth.

The clash between these historiographical currents poses some questions concerning the relationship between authority, critical method, historical verisimilitude, factual truth, and historical forgery.

I will argue that the insistence on factual truth favoured the emergence of a conception of history that aimed at listing *all* events without omissions. Towards the end of the fifteenth century, this conception had produced accurate histories of the “antiquarian” kind, such as Pomponius’ or Fiocchi’s. However, the same current also favoured Anniius of Viterbo, who condemned “verisimilar histories” as unreliable while publicizing a collection of forged archaic annals that he had allegedly discovered.

Pomponius and Anniius represent the opposite effects of the same cause, namely the rejection of verisimilitude as a criterion of historical veracity. In order to explain this paradox, I argue that historical verisimilitude implied the ability to distinguish between different degrees of historical probability, thus fostering the formation of a critical historical method. Sixteenth-century antiquarianism embraced this method as well, but until then the veracity of histories grounded in factual truth mostly

relied on the implicit authority of an all-inclusive catalogue of facts, and thus on the honesty of its redactor.

Simen Kallevik-Nielsen, (University of Cambridge), *“Forging a language of lies”: Reformation theology, iconoclasm and falsehood in Early Modern England*

The English language contains a plethora of words denoting and connoting material production – designations of Man as maker: Making, creating, fashioning, forging, fabricating, authoring, realizing, producing, generating, manufacturing, constructing, and so on. This catalogue of relative synonyms has, however, radical historical and internal differences of inflection and valence and surrounds the Early Modern nomenclature of “making” with unstable and ambiguous significations. As a phenomenon too frequently taken for granted in narratives of material and visual culture, “making” makes up a nexus of multiple and polysemous tensions in Early Modern language and thought. In particular, I intend in this paper to engage with the construction of “making” as a category embedded within theological discourses of “real” and “fake”, “prototype” and “copy”, “authenticity” and “forgery”, in Early Modern England. Using the disputes of religious imagery and representation as a case in question – personified by figures such as William Perkins and John Jewel – I will especially seek to elucidate how the religious visual topography became a space for contention and negotiation, of anxieties related to fact and fiction, truth and falsehood.

Pamela Smith has been among a few to highlight issues of “making” in historical scholarship, mainly however in the frame of its relationship to science and by extension the development of two different epistemic and representational regimes of knowledge. My focus will be the realm of the religious, where very little thorough work has been done, and how a visual lan-

guage of ontological legitimacy is forged within the conceptual framework of “making”.

Lorenzo Paoli (University of Tours/University of Bologna),
Re-forging a forgery: Annii's Antiquities and its French editions

The *Commentaria [...] super opera diversorum auctorum de antiquitatibus loquentium* has been one of the greatest editorial successes of the sixteenth century: first published in 1498, the opus presented itself as an in-folio collection of fragmentary works of several ancient authors, edited and commented by the Dominican friar Annii of Viterbo (1437–1502). These *Antiquitates* weren't just an ordinary compendium of philological erudition, but “a forged text that [...] perverted the early histories of every country in Europe” (Grafton, 1990) which “had an enormous influence on the thinking of Europeans between 1498 and roughly 1750” (Stephens, 1979).

The way this forgery was created, the reasons of its success as well as its influence and reception in the literature and historiography of various European countries have already been (and are still being) extensively studied: but how did this forgery actually spread?

While the French fortune of Annii still holds some interest amongst scholars (Rothstein, 2018), there hasn't been yet any specific study concerning the history of the material reception of the *Antiquitates* texts, their manuscript diffusion, re-editing, and reading among the French public. Furthermore, most of the contemporary research is based on the *editio princeps* and the 1512–1515 Josse Bade Parisian edition and therefore often avoid any material and textual issues.

Still, the textual manipulation by the editors, the paratexts of the various editions, the insertion of spurious materials and the omission or modification of Annii's commentaries need to be inquired. Therefore, we propose to partially investigate these

material and textual aspects in order to better understand the French circulation and reception of the *Antiquitates*.

Sophie Pitman (Aalto University), *Mock velvet and fake gold: Renaissance fashion among the lower classes 1550–1650*

The Early Modern period is often characterised as an era of sumptuous luxury, with rich velvets, shining pearls, and gold ornament. Fashions were extreme - yards of lace-trimmed ruffs, exaggerated padded shoulders, and elaborately under-propped skirts. But what did those who were not elite enough to afford such luxuries do to achieve fashionable styles?

Looking at mock-velvets, imitation beaver hats, fake gems and gold jewellery, and pieced scraps, this paper will argue that many iconic Renaissance fashions did not rely on the most sumptuous materials, but instead utilised innovative fabrics and techniques to imitate luxury materials. Skilled craftsmen used ingenious techniques to provide the non-elite with fashionable dress within their budget and in line with sumptuary laws that often restricted the use of fine materials. What did early modern people think about these substitute materials? Were they considered duplicitous fakes or desirable alternatives? And how were fakes and imitations influenced and spurred on by sumptuary legislation?

Using examples of surviving clothing alongside reconstructed objects, this paper will also suggest how historians can recover the fashionable clothing worn by the lower-classes, and witness the efficacy of some of these substitute materials, in spite of a paucity of evidence.

Curtis Runstedler (University of Tübingen), *Transmuting chaos: Alchemy and the counterfeiters in late Medieval poetry*

In the late medieval Europe, alchemy was often challenged in poetry and literature for its alleged fraudulence yet praised elsewhere for its potential for successful transmutation. In his poem *Inferno*, Dante Alighieri casts the alchemists alongside the counterfeiters in the deepest depths of Hell. Yet what is the relationship between the two in this context? Why are they condemned to the final circle of Hell? And how does their fakery and forgery draw from actual decretals at the time?

In this paper, I argue that Dante's vision shows that alchemical fraudulence is a disease that contaminates society and thus he reserves a place for them in the final circle. This sickness is characterised by their physical and mental afflictions, living in eternal torment and tearing at wounds that never heal. I will also explore how Dante draws from real life alchemists and condemnations, notably Pope John XXII's decretal against alchemy. Dante's alchemists not only fail in life for their fraudulence but suffer for eternity.

This paper aims to illustrate the relationship between alchemy and falsehood in late medieval poetry as well as its influences in decretals and real-life figures. The fate of Dante's alchemists is characterised by their deceit and thus Hell is their eternal suffering place. For Dante, alchemy apparently has no value; it is a practice for charlatans and deceivers. Dante's fate of the alchemists indicates one that is problematic and ill-fated and in which the practitioners are punished for their fabrications.

Camilla Russo (University of Trento), *Towards an archive of the Italian literary fakes: Methods, problems and case-studies*

Despite the growing attention to the phenomenon of literary forgery, especially after the publication of the essay by Anthony Grafton on *Forgers and Critics* (1990) and the increasing debate on fake news and post-truth, an overall study of the forgery in Italian literature is still lacking. In order to fill this gap, the first research project aimed at creating an Archive of the Italian Literary Fakes (ArFLI) was undertaken at the University of Trento. Partly inspired by similar initiatives in the Anglo-Saxon area, such as the *Bibliotheca Fictiva* by Arthur Freeman, it is focused at the moment on the texts in the vernacular presented by forgers as written in the early centuries (XII-XV), but is conceived to accommodate, in the future, even the fakes of the following centuries, including those in Latin. It is composed of several files articulated in many sections, which give information on the most relevant aspects of each forgery: the long/short duration, the critical debate, the forger's *modus operandi* and his motives. Such an instrument constitutes a helpful work-platform to study the common trends of fakes of all time and to analyze the phenomenon of forgery from different points of view: among the most interesting trends there is the one, for example, of working from existing material, which can be observed in the case of some poetry by Girolamo Baruffaldi or the translation into the vernacular of Petrarch's *Sen. XI 11*, considered until now a fake by Anton Francesco Doni. At other times we can grasp the dialogue between different *media*, as in the case of the *Iscrizione degli Ubaldini*, which inspired the famous print by Jan Van Der Straet.

In the first part I will focus on the illustration of the database; in the second one I will try to demonstrate its function by crit-

ical perspective, through a selection of examples still under-investigated by scholars.

Bernhard Schirg (Gotha Research Centre), *Faking Swedish antiquity: Forgeries in the service of the Swedish empire (1650–1720)*

My paper focuses on the role different forms of forgeries played in the period of Swedish academic history now described as Rudbeckianism. Following Olof Rudbeck's monumental *Atlantica* (4 vols, 1679–1702), dozens of scholars made their careers by buttressing and expanding Rudbeck's lofty ideas that millennia ago, Scandinavia had been the cradle of European civilization. With his narrative of an early Swedish high civilization that brought culture to the Mediterranean regions, Rudbeck filled the void of early Swedish history at the time of the nation's peak of power in Europe. As historiographical sources were lacking, this narrative built on a systematic appropriation of classical mythology (Scandinavia featured prominently in classical myth and Sweden was tantamount to Plato's Atlantis), of Icelandic sources and of material evidence, either unearthed in archaeological fieldwork or re-interpreted from antiquarian publications.

Already the critics of the *Atlantica* in Sweden and abroad noted the spurious nature of some of the pillars on which the Rudbeckians had erected their cathedral of thought. In my paper, I will briefly introduce Rudbeck and the *Atlantica*, and present cases in which he and his acolytes operated with various forms of forgeries: manuscript material that was conveniently invented, letters of manuscripts that were altered on the parchment to fit the interpretation, or artifacts that were produced according to the antiquarians' intellectual and social requirements. Each of these brief episodes will provide insights into the intellectual climate in which Swedish scholars operated, and into the reverberations their ideas sparked in national and international discourse.

Ioannis Siopis (Aristotle University of Thessaloniki), “*Omologia Pisteos*” of Kyrillos Loukaris: A real or falsified work?

The ecclesiastical area produces a large number of theological works and administrative documents and letters, which regulate ecclesiastical life. However, it is a particularly useful field for cases of forgery and questioning the authenticity of each author. The motivations that lead some persons of the clergy to fall into this kind of “illegality” serve personal or collective aspirations and circumvent the strict ecclesiastical teachings of Christian morality.

A remarkable case of impeachment ecclesiastical writings that shook the Greek Orthodox space in the seventeenth century is the book (a faithful Confession) of the Orthodox Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople Kyrillos Loukaris, which is called *Omologia pisteos*, which was published firstly in Latin in 1629 and reissued in other languages six more times. Loukaris, one of the most prominent Patriarchs of the Ecumenical Throne, who had introduced typography to Constantinople, with his faithful Confession sets out his views on ambiguous theological issues related to the Reformation. His views approximately reflected the Protestant perceptions on several issues and triggered the violent reaction of Orthodox ecclesiastical circles. Loukaris neither denied the Confession nor formally accepted that it was his own.

According to Orthodox theologians and historians, Loukaris’s Confession is considered to be falsified or alternatively is a result of pressures because of the difficult historical circumstances that the Ecumenical Patriarchate was facing in the 17th century.

Eveline Szarka (University of Zurich), *Faking the dead: Fantasies, fraud and the “reality” of ghosts in post-reformation Switzerland*

With the Protestant abolition of purgatory in the 16th century, authorities considered it impossible for the souls of the dead to wander the earth and haunt the living as ghosts. All apparitions of spirits were rather understood as diabolical delusions, frauds or ‘mere fantasies’ of a deluded mind. According to Swiss Pastor Louis Lavater (1527–1586), the devil, who is capable of transforming himself into an angel of light (2 Corinthians 11:14–15), attempts to lead the faithful astray under the delusive similitude of the dead. He does this by either corrupting the mind or the sensory perception of women and men. The continued popular belief in ghosts led to many conflicts with clerical and secular authorities who, on the other hand, emphasized that people were in fact dealing with deceptions of the devil and his human servants – witches. But why did Protestant authorities insist so heavily on diabolical delusions and fraud when it came to the apparition of spirits? The aim of this paper is to examine to what extent diabolical delusions, fantasies and fraud were discussed in Post-Reformation Switzerland by contrasting scholarly treatises with court documents that address alleged ghosts. It will be argued that in spite of the prominence of deceptions in theological treatises, authorities commenting on apparitions were not so much concerned with the ontological nature of a spirit but rather how people reacted to deceits. Moreover, this study vividly demonstrates a fundamentally different understanding of ‘reality’, ‘fantasy’ and fraud in Early Modern conceptions of the (supernatural) world.

Drew Thomas (University of St Andrews), *Fraud and authenticity in Reformation printing*

During the Protestant Reformation, more books came off the press by Martin Luther than any other author. Within only a few years after publishing his famous Ninety-Five Theses, Luther became the most published author since the invention of printing. However, much of this success was due to fraud. Although many printers in cities outside Luther's hometown of Wittenberg re-printed his works, many printers went a step further by stating that their books were printed in Wittenberg. Others also copied the intricate woodcut title page borders adorning the covers of Luther's works. Hundreds of counterfeits were printed in every major print centre in the Holy Roman Empire. Readers wanted books from Wittenberg, as they were guaranteed of their accuracy and authenticity, having passed under Luther's watchful eye.

Printers knew this and adapted accordingly. Although some printers listed false imprints to avoid local prohibitions against Luther's works, many printers continued the practice even after their towns adopted the Reformation. In an effort to combat these counterfeits, Wittenberg's printers developed a logo, a white rose flanked by Luther's initials, as a mark of authenticity. With this sign, readers could differentiate between authentic Wittenberg imprints and their false counterparts. However, counterfeiters, eager to profit from Luther's popularity, also copied this logo. Although scholars have known about false imprints in Luther's works for some time, this is the first time the practice has been systematically investigated. This bibliographical analysis offers a bold re-interpretation of printing during the Reformation, Europe's first mass media event.

Ksenija Tschetschik-Hammerl (Humboldt University), *Hans Hoffmann and other cases of forging Dürer's monogram in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries*

At the end of the 16th century Hans Hoffmann (c. 1540–1591) enjoyed a truly successful artistic career. He managed to advance to the position of the court painter of Rudolf II in Prague with a constant salary and once even got an additional payment for an eccentric painting he contributed to the emperor's *Kunst-kammer*. Nevertheless, in the modern art historical literature the artist is regarded as the first known forger of the works by the famous Albrecht Dürer. Indeed, the artist's legacy consists to a substantial part of the copies and imitations made after Dürer's drawings. But the main reason for these accusations of forgery are the false "AD"-monograms that Hoffmann put on several of his drawings. In my presentation I would try to argue that the artist not only forged works by the acclaimed German painter for monetary reasons, but also shaped and articulated his artistic personality through deception and forgery. I would also like to present for discussion the observation from my latest research, that Hoffmann's forging of Dürer's monograms shows formal and functional similarities with imitations of the powerful "AD"-signature done by such early modern artists as Albrecht Altdorfer, Heinrich Aldegrever, Antonio Abondio, and Ambrosius Boschaert.

Selene Maria Vatteroni (The Free University of Berlin), *Vernacular books and religious Nicodemism in Early Modern Florence: A survey of the Ahmanson-Murphy Aldine Collection at UCLA*

The sixteenth century was a period of tumultuous religious change in Europe, a period when movements for reform and counter-reform reflected and affected shifting religious sensibilities. Italian Cinquecento culture was profoundly shaped by these currents, especially due to the close connection between the rapid growth of the new literature in the *volgare*, pouring from the presses all over the peninsula, and a reform-flavored spirituality, built around the doctrine of justification by faith alone. Printed vernacular texts soon came to represent an excellent vehicle for spreading dissenting doctrinal messages to the largest possible audience, often resorting to Nicodemite stratagems; but they became a powerful weapon of the Roman counterpart as well.

In my paper, I will outline a survey of the remarkable Ahmanson-Murphy Aldine Collection, held at the Charles E. Young Research Library at UCLA, focusing on Italian vernacular works printed between the 1540s and the 1580s, hence very much alive to the dissemination of “heretical” messages as well as to the Roman doctrinal counteroffensive. I shall consider three aspects of the history of Italian print as related to the Cinquecento religious turmoil: the resort to Nicodemite strategies and their effectiveness; the role of Petrarchist poetry as a privileged conduit for evangelizing dissenting doctrinal contents; and the development of (para)textual apparatuses intended for instruction and guidance to the reader – something which testifies to an increasingly widespread practice of private and domestic devotion relying on vernacular religious books.

Santiago Villajos (Autonomous University of Madrid), *Of fakes and authenticity in Early Modern Spain: The portrait of Cervantes*

In 1613 Cervantes wrote that the Spanish poet Juan de Jáuregui had depicted him to include his portrait on the front of his *Exemplary Novels*, but the image could not be engraved, so he portrayed him with words instead. One century later, even though the writer had become worldly known after the success of *Don Quixote*, no real images of him were known to the public, so William Kent created a fake portrait in 1713 after some paintings in Seville. Then, Kent's portrayal of Cervantes started being massively reproduced in engravings on many editions of *Don Quixote* throughout Europe to the point that fake images started appearing with authenticity claims after his design. It has thus indeed inspired a series of fakes.

In 1854, however, a new portrait appeared with authenticity claims in London. It was engraved on the front cover of *The Wonderings of Persiles and Sigismunda*. The translator Louisa Dorothea Stanley stated that it was an original brought one year before from Madrid to London by the British ambassador Sir Arthur Aston, who was a collector of Spanish art. The Persiles's is unlike the other fakes. It has different facial and clothing features, but the head position is the same. In fact, a sort of missing link with the series of fakes started by Kent is revealed after morphologic analyses that trace the connection back to a 1605 painting by Juan Pacheco in Seville. That invites us to reconsider the question of the fake as a foil to the authentic in parallel to mechanical reproduction.

Marcela Vondráčková (National Gallery of Prague), *The reception of Norbert Grund's work: Copy or fake?*

In my presentation, I would like to focus on Rococo painter Norbert Grund (1717–1767) who was active in Bohemia during the second third of the 18th century. The artist's thematically rich output, distinguished by the spontaneous use of the brush, a luminous palette and confident compositional solutions, embraces all fields of painting, except for still-life themes. In terms of motifs and style, he drew inspiration from a variety of sources. The artist transposed stimuli from Dutch and Flemish genre painting, impulses from Italian landscapes and models of French gallant companies into small-format pictures and adapted them into an idyllic and playfully relaxed idiom. Grund worked predominantly for the art market and only seldom on commission. He produced a great number of cabinet paintings, which enjoyed considerable popularity, especially among members of the cultured middle class. The popularity was reflected in numerous variants and copies of his works produced by his followers and later copyists. Sometimes it is rather difficult to distinguish between the original and the copy. To complicate the matter even further, Grund's paintings were reproduced in prints by graphic artist Johann Georg Balzer (1734–1799) in response to the painter's popularity. Balzer's prints may have served as a model for 19th century copyists as well. My paper will concentrate on several cases of reception of Grund's work and will attempt to specify the differences between the workshop copy and the intended fake/forgery.

Christopher Yates (Brown University), *Poetry on demand: Imitation, authenticity and verbal usury in the works of George Gascoigne*

One of the earliest adopters of the sonnet-form in English, George Gascoigne framed the “Hundredth Sundry Flowres” (1573) as a poetic bouquet, “gathered partly (by translation) in the fyne outlandish Gardens of Euripides, Ovid, Petrarch, Ariosto and others.” Perhaps the best known segment of the work is the “Adventures of Master F.J.,” in which the eponymous “F.J.” courts the aristocratic Lady Elinor with an elaborately-ritualized exchange of Petrarchan love-poems. Suspicious of Lady Elinor’s close relationship with her male secretary, F.J. concludes that her letters, full of cunning poetic conceits, were “not penned by a woman’s capacity” and that he has likely been discoursing with his own romantic rival, to whom the duty of letter-writing had been outsourced in his professional capacity as a secretary. F.J.’s anxiety regarding the deceitfully “borrowed” nature of Lady Elinor’s letters is ironically undercut by his own plagiarism of continental poems within the tale, and by the very form of Gascoigne’s work, which alternates between “original” Petrarchan compositions, translated works, and *Imitatio*, and which repeatedly invokes the question of its own future reproduction (authorized or unauthorized). My paper hopes to consider a bundle of interrelated questions concerning “authenticity” and the emergent marketplace for professional (or “mercenary”) writing: what does it mean for Gascoigne to imagine a courtly world in which men and women seduce each other with the words of others - with “counterfeit” or mediated letters? What kinds of artistic and sexual anxieties accompanied the widespread courtly practices of poetic translation and imitation, and what relationship do these “authorized”

forms of literary production have to the commodified writing of the literary marketplace?

THE EARLY MODERN SEMINAR

The Seminar for Early Modern Studies is an interdisciplinary seminar at the Faculty of Arts, University of Gothenburg, regularly organizing lectures and conferences concerning aspects of the Early Modern period. The organizing committee for the conference *Faking It* consists of Post-doctoral researcher Philip Lavender (Comparative Literature), PhD student Matilda Amundsen Bergström (Comparative Literature), Senior lecturers Alexandra Fried (History of Art), Alexandra Herlitz (History of Art), Britt-Marie Karlsson (French), Cecilia Rosengren (History of Ideas), Per Sivefors (English), and Rikard Wingård (Comparative Literature).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The organizing committee would gratefully acknowledge our funders Riksbankens Jubileumsfond, Wenner-Gren Foundations, and the following departments at the University of Gothenburg: Department of Literature, History of Ideas and Religion; Department of Historical Studies; Department of Languages and Literatures; Department of Cultural Sciences; Department of Swedish.



UNIVERSITY OF GOTHENBURG
LITERATURE, HISTORY OF IDEAS, AND RELIGION



UNIVERSITY OF GOTHENBURG
DEPT OF HISTORICAL STUDIES



UNIVERSITY OF GOTHENBURG
DEPT OF SWEDISH



UNIVERSITY OF GOTHENBURG
DEPT OF LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES



UNIVERSITY OF GOTHENBURG
DEPT OF CULTURAL SCIENCES

Tidigmoderna seminariet
THE EARLY MODERN SEMINAR



UNIVERSITY OF GOTHENBURG



WENNER-GREN FOUNDATIONS
WENNER-GREN STIFTELSENA



RIKSBANKENS
JUBILEUMSFOND

THE SWEDISH FOUNDATION FOR
HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

