

**1a) Fake and Forgeries as False Identification:**

Replicability of Objects	1. Doubles	2. Pseudo-Doubles	3. Unique Objects with Irreproducible Features
	«A physical <i>token</i> which possesses all the characteristics of another physical <i>token</i> [...], insofar as both possess all the essential attributes prescribed by an abstract <i>type</i> »	«[...] a single <i>token</i> of a type acquires for some users a particular value»	«There are objects so complex in material and form that no attempt to reproduce them can duplicate all the characteristics acknowledged as essential. [...] In such case a unique object becomes its own type»
<b>Characteristics</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>not identical (in the sense of indiscernibility)</li> <li>objects considered to be interchangeable</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>temporal priority</li> <li>legal priority</li> <li>evident association</li> <li>alleged association</li> <li>pseudo association</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>concept of <i>authorial authenticity</i></li> </ul>
<b>Forgeries and False Identification</b>	<b>NB:</b> «From a legal point of view, even doubles can be forged. But forgeries become semiotically, aesthetically, philosophically, and socially relevant when they concern irreproducible objects and pseudo-doubles»	«The <i>necessary</i> conditions for a forgery are that: (i) given the actual or supposed existence of an object Oa, made by A (be it a <b>human Author or whatever</b> ) under specific historical circumstances t1 (ii) there is a different object Ob, made by B (be it a <b>human Author or whatever</b> ) under circumstances t2 (iii) which under a certain description displays strong <b>similarities to Oa</b> (or with a traditional image of Oa). The <i>sufficient</i> condition for a forgery is that it be claimed by some <b>Claimant</b> that Ob is <i>indiscernibly identical</i> with Oa»	
<b>Cases excluded from a topology of False Identification</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>pseudonymity</li> <li>plagiarism</li> <li>aberrant decoding</li> <li>historical forgery</li> </ul>	
<b>Counterindications</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>«the question whether B, the author of Ob, was guilty of <i>dolus malus</i> is irrelevant (even when B is a human author). B knows that Ob is not identical with Oa, and he or she have produced it with no intention to deceive»</li> <li>«however, not even Claimant's <i>dolus malus</i> is indispensable, since he or she may honestly believe in the identity he or she asserts»</li> </ul>	
<b>Judge, Claimant, Authors</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>«[...] a forgery is always such only for an external observer, the <b>Judge</b>, who, knowing that Oa and Ob are two different objects, understands that the Claimant, whether viciously or in good faith, has made a false identification»</li> <li><b>N.B.:</b> «The <b>Judge</b>, the <b>Claimant</b>, and both <b>Authors</b> are abstract roles, or actants, and it can happen that the same individual can play all of them at different time»</li> </ul>	

**1b) Categories of False Identification and (Philological) Proofs of Authenticity:**

	(1) Downright Forgery	(2) Moderate Forgery	(3) Forgery Ex-Nihilo
<b>Definitions</b>	«the Claimant claims, in good or in bad faith, that <b>Ob is identical with Oa</b> , which is known to exist and to be highly valued»	«the Claimant does not claim that [ <b>Oa and Ob</b> ] are identical but claims that they <b>are interchangeable</b> , since for both the Claimant and the addressees the lines between identity and interchangeability are very flexible»	«the Claimant claims in good or bad faith that Ob is identical with Oa. [...] The Claimant <b>falsely attributes Ob to a given author</b> »
<b>Assumptions</b>	«We must presuppose that <b>Oa exists</b> somewhere, that is the <b>unique original object</b> , and that <b>Oa is not the same as Ob</b> (we are dealing with what the Claimant knows, and we must take such knowledge for granted)»	«We assume that <b>Oa exists</b> or existed in the past, and the Claimant knows something about it»	«We must assume that <b>Oa does not exist</b> or, if according to uncertain report it existed in the past, it is by now irremediably lost"; one must know of a set 'a' of different objects (Oa1, Oa2, Oa3 ...) all produced by an author A who is famous and well regarded»
<b>Additional requirements:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the Claimant knows that Oa exists and knows or presumes to know (on the grounds of even a vague description) what Oa looks like;</li> <li>Claimant's addressees must share a more or less knowledge of Oa</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the addressees know that Oa exists, or existed, but not necessarily have clear ideas about it;</li> <li>the Claimant knows that Oa and Ob are different but decides that in particular circumstances and for particular purposes they are of equal value"</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>From the whole set <i>a</i> can be derived an abstract type, which does not take into account all the features of the individual members of <i>a</i> but, rather, displays a sort of generative rule and is assumed to be the description of the way in which A produced every member of <i>a</i></li> <li>Since Ob looks as if it has been produced according to this type, it is claimed that Ob is a previously unknown product of A.</li> </ol>
<b>Categories:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>deliberate false identification</li> <li>naive false identification</li> <li>authorial copies</li> <li>alteration of the original</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>confusional enthusiasm</li> <li>blatant claim of interchangeability</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>diplomatic forgery</li> <li>deliberate ex-nihilo forgery</li> <li>false ascription in error</li> </ul>
<b>Criteria for Acknowledging Authenticity</b>	«It seems that the crucial problem for a <b>semiotics of fakes</b> is not the one of the mistakes of the Claimant, but rather of a list of the criteria by which the Judge decides whether the Claimant is right or not. [...] The task of the Judge (if any) is to verify or falsify the claim of identity made by the Claimant ( <b>as if [the object] were a document</b> )»: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>proofs through <b>Material Support</b></li> <li>proofs through <b>Linear Text Manifestation</b></li> <li>proof through <b>Content</b></li> <li>proof through <b>External Evidences</b> (Referent)</li> </ol>		

from Eco 1990, "Fakes and Forgeries", in *The Limits of Interpretation*, Indiana University Press, chapter 12, pp. 174-202  
 in preparation for Crisci F. (2017b), «Fakes and Forgeries in Consumer Research: "Coping with the Past", between Material Culture and Digital World», *forthcoming*