

About the authenticity question  
the  
**Holbein's Madonna.**

Discussion and files  
from  
**Gustav Theodor Fechner.**

**Leipzig,**  
Printing and publishing by Breitkopf and Härtel.  
**1871**

**Foreword.**

It may be strange to some, to the treatment of a seemingly so small question, as is shown here, to see so much room devoted to what the scope of the work has claimed, and as much diligence as the content of it may betray; - the question has no religious, political, social or scientific interest. But in its apparent limitation it has a not insignificant art-historical and artistic, at the same time I would like to say national, national interest; and even this, the peace of the world with its interests not disturbing interests, a place may well be granted, after the larger world interests have left room for it again.

It is a major work, if not the main work of German painting, at the same time a favorite image of the German nation, whose authenticity it is and disputes. The fame of the artist, in a certain sense German art is involved. A recent copy threatens to ruin the fame of the well-known, the pride of the Dresden gallery, the German rival of the Raphael Sixtina, by denying its claims with its own claims to authenticity and the associated claims of beauty. This is not indifferent to the history of art, nor indifferent to the appreciation and impact of the work. Yes, may a second-hand picture still appeal to the first hand? Weird question, and yet! ...

Needless to say, to prove the interest of the question only in detail after it has been sufficiently proved by the amount and zeal of the negotiations that have already been conducted. On the one hand, these negotiations are so scattered, on the other hand, they are so very different from each other, and the whole question is so difficult and complicated that the situation threatens to become confusing, and it would be a pity if the duplication of the negotiations were successful self-destructed. In addition, many of these negotiations have been so unilaterally disregarded for opposite reasons that

they may well be parties but can not justify a valid judgment. So it seemed useful Once the files about the question in the utmost completeness zusammengeheftet presented and after so much for or against the pros and cons to face and discuss as impartially. This is the task of this font.

It is undeniable that in the negotiations so far it has not yet stopped, but, after the exhibition of the Darmstadt copy in Munich (1869) had proved itself fruitfully, the forthcoming compilation of both copies in Dresden (of the Aug. 15 to Oct. 15, 1871) is expected to bring a new episode of the same. And perhaps the future negotiations will be less divergent if the compilation of the preceding offers the conviction that the possible ways of divergence are already exhausted. In any case, it is not necessary to go to the new investigation without knowledge of what the earlier investigations have brought. So I offer this compilation not just to take note of the previous, but also as a basis for the negotiations still to be expected of those who do not want to give themselves the trouble of the decline on the original investigations and their detailed comparison. The thought and desire to provide some services in this capacity has even been the determining reason for having them appear now, otherwise it would have been better to wait for a moment when the negotiations after the exhibition would be if not one, ever Hard to expect, conclusion, but rest found.

Finally, there may be a formal interest in it, which can easily surpass the materiality of the question itself. Here we have an example of a major work, from which it is easier to get to know the state of today's art judgment in a historical-critical, artistic, and aesthetic sense, rather than from any general characteristic. If the same thing has not been done on any object more than on it, there should be no more versatile and interesting specimen for the proof of it. If the result of a summary view of the successes, as they are here, on the whole is not very pleasing, it is nevertheless an instructive and many things to think, which I leave to the expert.

I give myself only to a lover of art, who is grateful to the connoisseurs for the willingness with which they have granted the information and enlightenment which he has often used, and which is not influenced by any personal passion in the discussion of foreign views His own judgment only falls insofar as he believes he has the preconditions for this in sufficient preliminary studies, which is not the case in many respects, such as the so important, but at the same time Holbein's, difficult question of the artist's manner of painting. <sup>1)</sup>In general, however, I am not concerned either with championing one's own opinion, which, in the main, amounts to a probable verdict [cf. p. 30], as representing the still undecided struggle of opinions so that each one can form his own judgment.

<sup>1)</sup> But is there already enough preliminary studies in this regard? Compare the 4th and 5th sections.

This task could not be fulfilled in a short presentation; but those who find it too long to follow the discussion of the thoroughness and the series of acts that seemed to be necessary for completeness and control, may refer to the discussion at the end of the discussion (in the ninth section) , Resume the main points and go from there after the instructions of the references as far as the detail as he likes. Hereby I hope to have

made it comfortable enough for the reader, though I can not satisfy even those who would have preferred a short aperitif held in a gentle stream. But such things are not lacking at all; they can be found in the files, and I have previously given a shorter and more fluent account of the question in the messengers of the border (II. 1870). which can be regarded as a preliminary excerpt from this text, but with the feeling of not having done enough for those who rather want to know what the question is, than how one and the other, who shot me in, set it up. Whoever wants the purpose must also want the means.

No less controversial than the authenticity relationship of both copies of our picture is the beauty relation of the same and the interpretation of its content, according to which it would have to be treated besides the question of authenticity also a question of beauty and question of interpretation. This, however, is not dealt with in much detail in this work, as they are connected with the question of authenticity. It is undisputed that the beauty ratio of both copies in the forthcoming compilation should claim an equal and, with the larger public, probably even greater interest than the authenticity ratio; but in the end the subjective impression will remain crucial for everyone. Had the other hand, the interpretation of all their pages, If turns and phases are to be accorded the same degree of independent treatment as the question of authenticity, the scope of this document would have grown considerably. The question of authenticity, however, not only seems more important in itself, but also comes more directly to the fore in the forthcoming compilation, since the interpretation of a direct confrontation of the two copies does not need it at all. In the meantime, in my opinion, the question of beauty has been so much mixed up with the question of authenticity that it had to be applied to it in the discussion, while the question of interpretation intervenes only at one point in the question of authenticity, according to which Cape. VIII is said about sufficient for orientation and utilization for the purpose of this font appeared. It will seem too much to some.

The whole typeface is divided into two main sections entitled Discussion and Files. In the discussion, after the preliminary discussions necessary for the general knowledge of the question, the compilation and weighing up of the reasons for and against, which play a role in our question, is given; in the files, the negotiations conducted by the authors are as literal as possible. Anyone who seriously approaches the question will easily feel the benefit of supplementing both departments with one another's need. However, as I already liked to refer to the author's own words in the discussion wherever it was reasonably appropriate, shorter passages of the kind are repeated in the context of the record,

There are several references in this document to a historical treatise earlier published by me in several sections of Naumann-Weigel's archives, some of them also in a separate copy, which is described in greater detail in Acts 9. Here are all the old news about our picture (by Fesch, Sandrart, Patin, Wright, Algarotti, Walpole, the Abrégé, Ochs, the Amsterdamer catalog) reproduced in a verbatim print what seemed to repeat here as an unnecessary burden of writing , as apart from the ones in Ch. VI, and the Amsterdam catalog communicated by Woltmann, which can be found in Acts

8, the rest by a conscientious consideration, which will not be missed in the historical (6th) section of this document,

Where in literal quotations of this writing from other authors occur between parentheses, they stem from the authors themselves, while those are inserted between square brackets of mine. Quite so are quotes of page numbers in parentheses for the original font in question, in square brackets for this font.

After this another request. The composition of the negotiations given here, which preceded the Dresden confrontation of the two copies of our picture, may yet be supplemented by a compilation of those who owe their origin to this confrontation, and perhaps it will still be allowed me to do so. Supplementing it, I ask on the condition that it will not be dispensable from my side by a sufficiently complete or resounding work from other side, in advance those who will take part in those negotiations, especially if it happens elsewhere than in German art magazines to send me, if not a special imprint, a note about the location of their meeting. <sup>2)</sup>With regard to the negotiations that have been conducted so far, I have not made any diligence in giving this book the greatest possible completeness, but in the fragmentation of contemporary literature I can not count on having fully achieved the goal; and make sure, in particular, that one or the other may have escaped from the discussions produced by the Munich exhibition of the Darmstadt specimen. Considered to be those of C. (Crowe), E. Förster, K. Förster, Th. Grosse, Br. Meyer, W. Schmidt and Woltmann. If there are any other meetings than are found in the file, or if you miss something else in completeness, I would like to be made aware in private or in public, in order to add to the consideration in the intended supplement.

<sup>2)</sup> Address: Prof. G. Th. Fechner. Leipzig, Blumengasse no. 1.

Finally, the following correction. The year of birth of Holbein, in Chap. I. to 1495 or 1498, is now accepted by Woltmann to 1497, after the 1495 speaking inscription on Anna Selbdritt in Augsburg recently proved to be falsified, of which the note has come to me after printing the above statement.

Leipzig, July 24, 1871.

**G. Th. Fechner.**

## **Content.**

### **First department.**

#### **Discussion.**

##### I. entrance.

##### II. Differences between the two specimens.

##### III. Historical development of the question of authenticity in connection with the question of beauty

##### IV. The contradictions between the connoisseurs.

V. General negotiation. Artistic and aesthetic reasons.

VI. Historical reasons.

VII. The question of authenticity of the Darmstadt specimen in particular.

VIII. The question of authenticity of the Dresden specimen insbesondre.

IX. Resumé.

**Second division.**

**Files.**

## **First department.**

Discussion.

### **I. entrance.**

The picture, the authenticity of which is here to be referred to as "our picture" in the future, is known to exist in two copies, which are distinguished according to their permanent sites as Dresdener and Darmstädter copy. One, the Dresdener, bought for Dresden in the year 1743 as Holbein's painting in Venice, has since become known under the name of Holbein's Madonna, and of all the German Madonna pictures the only thing that is more general than that of the art public interest in it, and how in the rooms of the Dresden gallery dared to face the walls of the rooms of the Raphael Sixtina. The other, the Darmstädter, has not turned up until less than 50 years ago, and has remained quite unknown to the larger public until very recently; From the very beginning, however, it has engaged the attention of art historians and connoisseurs with an interest which is growing, and finally the Dresden specimen almost overwhelming, and finally attracting a wider audience, and thus increasing its interest more and more, by becoming more and more determined as Rival of the Dresdener, and now faces it as a truly dangerous rival in beauty and genuineness. Also, it shows with substantial agreement in the main content so many and so significant deviations in the execution of the Dresden picture that the dispute over the preference of one or the other thereby receives the most fertile points of attack. From the very beginning, however, it has engaged the attention of art historians and connoisseurs with an interest which is growing, and finally the Dresden specimen almost overwhelming, and finally attracting a wider audience, and thus increasing its interest more and more, by becoming more and more determined as Rival of the Dresdener, and now faces it as a truly dangerous rival in beauty and genuineness. Also, it shows with substantial agreement in the main content so many and so significant deviations in the execution of the Dresden picture that the dispute over the preference of one or the other thereby receives the most fertile points of attack. From the very beginning, however, it has engaged the attention of art historians and connoisseurs with an interest which is growing, and finally the Dresden specimen almost overwhelming, and finally attracting a wider audience, and

thus increasing its interest more and more, by becoming more and more determined as Rival of the Dresdener, and now faces it as a truly dangerous rival in beauty and genuineness. Also, it shows with substantial agreement in the main content so many and so significant deviations in the execution of the Dresden picture that the dispute over the preference of one or the other thereby receives the most fertile points of attack. Finally, the Dresden copy was almost overgrowing interest and thereby finally interested a wider audience and this increased interest more and more by the fact that it has always been more decisive than Rival of the Dresdener, and now as a really dangerous rival in beauty and authenticity facing it. Also, it shows with substantial agreement in the main content so many and so significant deviations in the execution of the Dresden picture that the dispute over the preference of one or the other thereby receives the most fertile points of attack. Finally, the Dresden copy was almost overgrowing interest and thereby finally interested a wider audience and this increased interest more and more by the fact that it has always been more decisive than Rival of the Dresdener, and now as a really dangerous rival in beauty and authenticity facing it. Also, it shows with substantial agreement in the main content so many and so significant deviations in the execution of the Dresden picture that the dispute over the preference of one or the other thereby receives the most fertile points of attack. and now as a truly dangerous rival in beauty and genuineness faces the same. Also, it shows with substantial agreement in the main content so many and so significant deviations in the execution of the Dresden picture that the dispute over the preference of one or the other thereby receives the most fertile points of attack. and now as a truly dangerous rival in beauty and genuineness faces the same. Also, it shows with substantial agreement in the main content so many and so significant deviations in the execution of the Dresden picture that the dispute over the preference of one or the other thereby receives the most fertile points of attack.

The main content of both copies is that the founder of the picture, who in the last half of the 15. and the first half of the 16th century, living Basel Mayor Jacob Meier, with his family in a reverent attitude before the, holding a naked child in the arms, Madonna is depicted; according to which, not infrequently, both pictures are collectively grouped together under the name of Meier's Madonna, in contrast to so many other Madonnas that Holbein has drawn and painted, but of which only the connoisseur knows something. And one wonders whether the larger public would know more about the Darmstadt image if the connoisseurs had not made it a rival of the Dresdener. But of course contributes to the greater unfamiliarity with the Darmstädter pictures,

The question of authenticity has to refer to the one like other copy, but will occupy our attention more with respect to the Dresdener than Darmstädter copies, since it is considered more decisive regarding Darmstädter than with respect to the Dresdener, for this more pros and cons to weigh and more general interest of the question turns more of itself to the Dresden specimens more. When Darmstädter specimens only asks: Is there an outrageous image of Holbein; By the Dresdener, was not the authenticity and beauty of the picture, which was once considered to be the most authentic and beautiful of Holbein, indeed beyond him, a crude deception? Anyway,

one of them has to be real, it just asks, which and if not both? That is the short formula of our question.

Now countless pictures have been attributed to this artist, which do not belong to him, because there was a time when an old German picture of undetermined origin had to choose almost only between Holbein, Dürer and the Cranach's <sup>1</sup>, whereas now a reaction is under way which leaves hardly any or the other of the pictures under Holbein's name untouched, so that our Dresden Madonna, who used to be the chorus-leader of all Holbein's pictures, shares only a more general fate in the temptations to which she is now subject.

<sup>1</sup>) In his monographic work on Holbein (p.45) Wornum gives a list of no less than 17 artists "besides some others", of which pictures are attributed to our Holbein, and the "some others" just might amount to that much. Kinkel (in the Zeitschr., Picture K. 1867, p. 167) says: "the large exhibition of pictures in South Kensington near London, which took place in the summer of 1866, did not less than 63 so-called Holbein's, some of them numerous private collections, which were otherwise not easily accessible, and at least offered a rare opportunity to compare what had been pushed with what was genuine, the sighting was terrible, for among the 63 pictures, of which there was much trash, no more than nine could really have been written by Holbein'

Since the knowledge of the Darmstädter picture is even less common than that of the Dresdener, so I think to the orientation of a further audience over something must send ahead what the connoisseur may easily skip.

The picture unexpectedly came to light in the first half of this century. by a Parisian art dealer Delahante brings the same to Berlin for sale, without knowing how it came into his hands. <sup>2</sup>)Only one can note from the note written on the back of the picture with a hand from the beginning of this century: "No. 82 Holy Family Portraits DD" that at that time it belonged to an English gallery; and a double coat of arms attached in the picture above has provided a starting point to follow the history of the picture until an earlier date, which will be discussed later. In Berlin around 1822 it was either bought by the art dealer Delahante himself by 2500 or, according to another statement, by his brother-in-law Spontini for 2800 Taler by Prince William of Prussia for his wife, and was initially placed in Berlin, was therefore also initially the Berlin copy until it moved in 1852 to Darmstadt. Shepherd was, who in 1830 first drew the attention of the art public to the picture, and at the same time emphasized the great importance which it can claim towards the Dresdener. It is not disliked to find the beginning, which makes it one of the many discussions that followed later, here as an entrance to ours. He says:

"Both paintings are so excellent that it would be hard to give preference to one over the other, and thus to consider one to be the copy of the other, and only a replica of the same master can be imagined, but which of the painting is the copy The only thing we would like to notice is that the painting in Berlin was treated more freely and in some minds, especially the women's group, more forcefully than at Dresden We also believed in our appearance this year again to notice. "The customer review has been automatically translated from German.

2) I myself have had inquiries made in Paris, but Delahante was dying, and it was said that otherwise I would not get any information, even though I think there should be a note in his books of action.

Now the picture is in the possession of the daughter of the high purchaser, the wife of Princess Carl von Hessen and by the Rhine in Darmstadt; has its permanent place in a living room of the high owner, and is accessible to every art lover daily in the hours of 12 to 3 o'clock, thanks to the liberal privilege of the same. During the summer and autumn of 1869 it was exhibited in the Munich exhibition of old pictures, and occupied itself there by the opportunity offered for comparison with the neighboring best replicas of the Dresden specimen (the Steinla engraving and the Brockmann photograph after Schurig ) the attention of art lovers and connoisseurs more than any other picture. But since a comparison of two pictures by means of transmission by replicas always remains imperfect, Thus all comparisons made in Munich, as before in the permanent places of both pictures, made the desire ever more urgent, that once a direct combination of both should come to pass. This wish would have been met sooner if the Munich Exhibition had not come in 1869, and in 1870 the war had come. Now we gladly welcome the grant for this year (from the middle of August). It will not fail to meet the most general interest, and to increase interest in our own question. Certainly, that pilgrimage of artists and art lovers, which, according to Algarotti's reports, took place when, after his purchase in Venice, the picture of Dresden still stood with him, the mediator of the purchase, will be repeated on a larger scale and with the participation of a larger audience in celebration of the reunion of the two tall figures separated by centuries, who after the first sister salutation will wrestle eye to eye around the palm of beauty and genuineness that they already have argued from afar. In any case, some points of comparison between the two pictures, which were not quite clear so far, will stand firm and the quarrel, albeit with little chance of being decided or compared, will give it a firmer stance and a more secure foundation. who after the first sister's salutation will wrestle, so to speak, eye to eye around the palm of beauty and genuineness, about which they already argued from a distance. In any case, some points of comparison between the two pictures, which were not quite clear so far, will stand firm and the quarrel, albeit with little chance of being decided or compared, will give it a firmer stance and a more secure foundation. who after the first sister's salutation will wrestle, so to speak, eye to eye around the palm of beauty and genuineness, about which they already argued from a distance. In any case, some points of comparison between the two pictures, which were not quite clear so far, will stand firm and the quarrel, albeit with little chance of being decided or compared, will give it a firmer stance and a more secure foundation.

Of course, with the immediate composition of both pictures, not all the difficulties of their comparison will be lifted. For it is indisputable that there is no clear comparison to be made when two figures contemplate one through the open air, the other through a clouding glass; and, if not the same, but something similar exists here.

As early as 1830, Hirt occasionally says of his comparison of the two pictures: "Meanwhile, the Dresden painting is also at a disadvantage because it has become cloudy, and would very much require a cleansing and a new varnish." But this disadvantage has now been reversed, since the Dresden copy, restored in the year 1840 by Inspector Schirmer, shines almost in the brilliancy of a new picture, while the Darmstädter is still covered with a varnish that has turned yellow by age, which not only the overall tone changes the image and erases some differences in the color tones <sup>4)</sup>but also the certainty of art-historical conclusions, which one wants to pull out of the coloring, and has drawn many times recklessly on the varnish, breaks off, at least receives the Darmstädter picture after a main view in incomparable condition with the Dresdener. However, this coating of varnish can be taken advantage of the Darmstädter picture in so far as it contributes significantly to the somewhat glaring contrasts of the Dresdener, to give the color of Darmstädter the soothing uniform attitude that one can not avoid, really as one of its advantages For this reason, in a conversation with him, Prof. Felsing explained to the Dresdener that he did not want to miss the varnish coating at all costs. But not only The fact that its favorable overall influence, especially in the first impression due to the unfavorable nature of the dark coloring which the varnish imparts to the whole picture, has been outweighed even by some connoisseurs, and that the essential details of the picture are particularly affected by this (v Most of the connoisseurs prefer to see the picture with its innate advantages with the Dresdener in the barriers to stand in the barriers, so much so as to hope that by a restoration of the Darmstadt specimen by no means the strong contrasts of the Dresdener would occur. Because one sees a natural flesh coloring for the striking brown blush in the face and hand of the founder and the middle woman of the Dresden picture in the Darmstädter picture,

<sup>3)</sup> If one regards the image of Darmstadt as a whole, one does not notice the influence of the varnish, but attributes it to the texture of the color itself, which has been done by more than one appraiser. Now, however, the varnish has broken off in a few places on the dress of the white girl, giving opportunity to perceive at the same time its great thickness and the difference it makes in the coloring. One is amazed at the contrast in which the whiteness of the dress in the non-firing positions appears against the yellowish-brown of the other most flamboyant dress. Also on the edge of the picture, a few non-firing spots of the sky background allow the original blue to be perceived as gaps in the otherwise greenish sky.

<sup>4)</sup> For example: Scales (a Bem.) Finds the treatment of the head of Mary as well as the other figures (with the exception of the mayor) in the Dresden picture "tender and more detailed" than on the Darmstädter, and ties to it even assumptions about the different determination of both pictures, meanwhile v. Zahn probably finds that the varnish has only blurred the "differences in color hues of the original color [in the Darmstadt picture].

How beautiful and instructive it would then be to see the Darmstadt only in its present, and after recorded protocol, again assembled in its new, much more ancient, state with the Dresdener; and, what v. Tooth of the "exceedingly beautiful" original effect of his once bright blue, now in the bluish green faded garb, supposes to find the whole picture proven and restored.

But it would be immodest on our side to want to express more than one opinion in this regard.

Insofar as a comparison can ever be made of replicas, one will have to adhere to the well-known Steinla's engraving or the no less well-known Brockmannian photograph after the drawing of Schurig as to the Dresden copy, but not yet for the Darmstadt copy. For a long time the photograph was available after Felsing's drawing; for the most general compositional conditions of both pictures, the compilation of their outline drawings is also preserved in a special printed book from the Naumann-Weigel archive. Zahn's (the Darmstadt copy of Holbein's Madonna, Lpzg., L 865) is a useful clue, which contains not only the most detailed and profound pamphlets, which so far exist on the comparison of the two pictures,

It is much to be regretted that neither the Dresdener nor the Darmstadt specimens have original photographs which, much as they may wish to leave for the layman, are not to be replaced by a copy or photograph after a copy for the connoisseur. In our question too, however, the greatest caution is required to judge the latter.

It is completely forbidden, as far as I know, to refuse to take original photographs from pictures of the Dresden gallery. I do not know for what reason, since other galleries, under appropriate restrictions, grant permission to do so. Although there are a few original photographs of the Darmstädter copy which are accessible only by private favor, very imperfect, very black, and, undoubtedly because of false shading, do not properly reflect the expression of the Madonna and Child, which may have been the reason a duplication of the same. Perhaps they would succeed better after removing the yellow varnish.

According to Hirt, the discussions on the authenticity and beauty of both copies after the series took part in the discussion: Kugler, Waagen, J. Hübner, Schäfer, v. Zahn, Woltmann, Wornum, Fechner, Kinkel, E. Förster, W. Schmidt, Crowe, K. Förster, Br. Meyer, for which I still have private written judgments by Felsing, H. Grimm, Th. Grosse and v. Liphardt present. An overview of the passage, which the negotiations of the same took, will follow in the third sections.

## **II. Differences between the two specimens.**

Without wishing to enter into a descriptive comparison of the two pictures in all relations and in every detail, which would exceed the purpose and limits of our task, we must remember some of the principal differences that are generally considered in the question of authenticity, and in part details which intervene with particular weight in the same. The only apparent difference, which causes the old varnish cover of the Darmstädter picture and the stronger darkening of some parts of the Dresdener between both, is already thought in the previous sections.

The Darmstädter picture is in all dimensions somewhat smaller and thereby relatively lower than the Dresden picture, without the figures, apart from a small shortening after the height, which most have experienced, are substantially smaller, so that the whole contents of the picture only. The proportions of the latter seem to be pushed closer together, and their proportions seem more depressed to their detriment,

which will be discussed in more detail later. Substantial changes in the architecture between the two pictures are connected with this. The slightly slimmer figure of the Madonna of Dresden wears a dark green dress, whereas the Darmstadt is originally light blue, now bluish green due to the influence of the varnish. <sup>1)</sup>The facial expression of the Dresden Madonna by the majority of previous votes, which I own beige selle, by virtue of a penetration of majesty and sweetness - for which, of course opponents of the same recently looking for other expressions <sup>2)</sup>- winning, and rests on a finer and more noble architecture of trains. In contrast, the expression of the Darmstadt Madonna is sometimes referred to as a greater majesty, dignity, sublimity, severity, austerity, decisiveness, character, serious, grandiose solemnity, religious consecration, expressions which I indeed all use, but at least tenacity and severity find too much said; it contradicts the yet friendly move around the mouth. On the other hand, however, in the Darmstadt Madonna, instead of a grandiose solemn "an ordinary unattractive appearance" is seen. Well, one will be able to form one's own judgment when both images are next to each other, and a repeated return to the contemplation ensures the final impression. Anyway,

<sup>1)</sup> Schäfer's statement that the dark green color of the robe of the Madonna of Dresden stems from an overpainting which allows an underlying pattern to show through, is described by v. Chr. Tooth decisively contradicted; rather, "the decidedly original fine sections of hair are painted over the dark tone". According to him, "under the gray-green tone of the mantle of the Darmstadt Maria, a red underpainting, perhaps originally calculated on the typical colors of the Marian apparel," is located there.

<sup>2)</sup> Comp. the 3rd section.

On the other hand, in the characteristic and vivid expression of some secondary figures, especially the middle and youngest female figure, as well as in the execution of some details, especially the headdress of the kneeling girl and the carpet, the Dresden picture is back against the Darmstadt. The mayor, too, has a more pronounced expression in the Darmstädter picture, while, moreover, he is affected by clumsy retouching [p. below] appears in bad luck. One of the most interesting differences, however, is that the child of the Darmstadt Madonna smiles when the kindred Christ child appears, whereas the Dresdener has the familiar appearance of a sick child, so that the two specimens fall into the two views that exist about the child. seem to have shared.

Comparing the manner of painting of both pictures, it is difficult, in the case of so different a judgment on the part of the connoisseur, and the great difficulties which the yellow varnish coating of the Darmstädter picture on the one hand, the strong darkening of some parts in the Dresden picture, on the other hand, to judge and compare the picture opposes original coloring, to say something quite free of throw-in and sharply correct. For the account of the Varnish-to return to this with a few words-the warmer, more brownish color of the picture of Darmstadt, in particular, should be written, to which some lay special stress as characteristic of Holbein; also the greater breadth of conduct that scales of the Darmstädter picture noticed, perhaps only seemingly so far in<sup>3)</sup> If such were to occur, then both images would have to be

painted in part with different dyes, and this deserve sympathy when considering whether they originate from the same author. However, in this regard, a closer expert investigation is still needed.

<sup>3)</sup> In general, the usual red does not have the property of darkening; but who can know which dyes the artist has used to paint or underline the red. In any case, it seems to me difficult to imagine that the Mayor's natural flesh color on the face and hands, which the Darmstädter picture shows, was intentionally turned into a brown-red in the Dresden picture as a second-painted, which seems to represent the complexion of a fire worker, Holbein himself or a foreign artist to be the author of the Dresden picture.

To say a word of differences in the style of painting, which can not be written on previous circumstances, according to Waagen's printouts, the Darmstadt painting is "painted in a very solid impasto", while the Dresdener after Carl Förster's expression, the color of the Darmstädter picture even a "heavy, tormented" calls, a "light, almost breathed Touche" reveals, Th. Grosse but the color technique of both pictures apart from Spezialitäten at all almost coincidentally finds. Anyone who wants to learn more about the information provided by the authors will find the literal citation of them in the files, a compilation about them in the 4th section. But it will be best, according to the, by the previous removal of both copies excusable to some extent, contradictions in this information, a final verdict on the relationship of the style of painting of both copies to point to their confrontation.

In 1840, the Dresden picture was defeated by a restoration that was considered to be very cleverly recognized, but it was not known to me that any single disturbing retouching was noticed. None of the earlier observers, Hirt, Kugler, Waagen, v., Also mentions the Darmstadt picture. Tooth, wornum to have found such, which may depend on the fact that no one may have directed an investigation on it expressly; Woltmann, however, expressly states under the most favorable conditions: "he has not noticed the slightest retouche, the preservation is perfect," and Bruno Meyer agrees with him after careful examination: "The picture is wonderful intact".

However, we have to register with these authorities: Liphardt, who, on a first visit to the picture, believed the whole picture to be untrue, but on a second visit convinced himself that "what once bothered him in the mind, namely that of the mayor, was the result of bad retouching be." Hereby quite unanimously, although quite independently, the artist Th. Grosse, who writes that "strange hands seemed to have come over the head of the mayor," continued W. Schmidt, who "here and there a few holes clumsy stuffed" finds. At last Crowe, an artist and a connoisseur at the same time, according to which, in the table which, by the way, is in an "impeccable state", unfortunately rubs off and retouches, as moderate as they are, just where they cause the most delicate disfigurement. The forehead and the hair of the Virgin are damaged, the shadows around the eyes and nose have been passed over, the head and armpit of the Christ Child freshened up in the dark parts, the ear of it mutilated to the utmost, and the mouth and chin of the kneeling girl on the right not unaffected. "

So some retouching and hereby some things that are not from Holbein, there will probably be in the Darmstädter picture; only that retouching a real picture does not make it the same.

Of more important concern for the question of authenticity are some deviations between the two pictures in trivialities, which promise or give information especially for the question of which of the two pictures is the first painted, and which we cite here only after their facts, in order later [Section 5] to refer back to it.

1) The lower naked child shows in the Darmstadt picture a peculiarity lacking in the Dresden picture, which to my knowledge was first emphasized by W. Schmidt as follows.

"Oddly enough, in the Darmstadt example, the right hand of the naked boy has one finger too far down inasmuch as the thumb is covered by the youth's hand, and yet five other fingers become visible, an offense that the master probably feels, but hardly the copist, if he did not find him in the original, would have allowed. "

Since I did not notice this trifling matter when looking at Darmstädter 's picture, nor did I find a trace of the surplus finger in either the outline of Zahn or the photograph of Felsing' s drawing, I have mentioned it in my essay in Border messengers have added a question mark, in the thought that there might have been a trifle on the boy's sleeve, the boy's sleeve, the deceptive appearance of a sixth finger only just above it, for that seems to portray it. But not only that according to Schmidt also Crowe and Br. Meyer commemorate the sixth finger, I therefore receive the following information from my request to Prof. Felsing:

"The seemingly sixth finger had been known to me long before I made my drawing, without bothering me at least, or wanting to find another motive for or against the priority of our picture in it drawn in a way that the first upstanding finger could have been meant as a thumb, and got in the elaboration the place of the index finger. There is thus nothing to prove.

E. Forster seems to grasp his forefinger only as a registered thumb, thus omitting the sixth finger, saying: "the thumb of the right hand of the child is much too large and otherwise recorded (so that it seems to have six fingers ). "

Against this Br. Meyer sums up the matter: "The little boy's right hand has five fingers, none of which is a thumb, because the erect index finger is added and the small one is not accidentally eradicated."

2) In a letter to me, J. Hübner mentions a "pentimento on the right hand of the boy on the breast of a standing child" discovered by him in the Dresden picture, without, however, describing it more closely.

3) Over the entire face and the front part of the hood of the oldest female figure running in Darmstadt image of a dark, sharply defined shadows <sup>4)</sup>, in its place is found in the Dresden picture only a weaker, less sharply defined shading <sup>5)</sup> and the main limitation of that shadow seems to be to complete the visible part of the outline of the Madonna's sleeve (hiding behind the head of the ancients), except that, as far as I could tell, there is a continuation of the shading above and below the chin goes, which agrees with the extent of the Dresden shading. Now Suermondt has first of all set up a view that has a lot to look upon, the dark sleeve of the Madonna was first painted and only permeated by the face and head cover of the ancients, who were

later painted over it. Woltmann (Südd. Pr.) Has accepted this view and, in addition to a related pentimento (correction of the image by the author himself), asserted as a reason for the priority of the Darmstadt painting, whereas W. Schmidt contradicts this, so that only the more detailed examination in the future compilation must teach whether it remains in the right. The negotiations so far s. in the following activation.

4) In the photograph after Felsing too bright.

5) What is said in the Banners is that the face of the Madonna of Madonna is held in full light, but rather Steinla's Stich and Brockmann's photograph give evidence of the opposite can, the original in this respect again.

Woltmann in d. Südd. Press: "An interesting pentimento has also emerged from the Darmstädter picture: From the beginning, one was embarrassed by the dark tone in the woman 's face, first of all the Madonna, some of whom wanted a shadow in the same, others a streak in the varnish Suermondt has recently discovered the right thing in an investigation in Munich: the figure of the ancients was only painted in later, and the blue sleeve has grown through the face painted above, hence this tone, which looks like an unmotivated shadow, with a second pentimento In Context: The contour of the pillar's capital did not originally spring out so much, one recognizes an earlier outline a little further to the left, and below that the vertical end of the shaft, which is now covered by the headscarf of the older woman. [After this the motivated remark that the old woman was indisputably one who had already died in the foundation of the picture, the younger woman next to a then still living wife of the founder]. Only during the work may the founder have come to the idea of instructing the blessed one in the picture. Originally the composition does not count on them, the mayor, on the other hand, corresponds to the middle woman - one sees it at the height of the head - and the young girl to the two boys. Firstly, the insertion of the older woman caused the two other figures to be pushed to the edge, and secondly, it also crowded the figure of the Madonna. The copyist noticed this and gave the main character more room. " The old woman was indisputably one who had already died in the foundation of the picture, the younger woman next to it was a still-living wife of the founder]. Only during the work may the founder have come to the idea of instructing the blessed one in the picture. Originally the composition does not count on them, the mayor, on the other hand, corresponds to the middle woman - one sees it at the height of the head - and the young girl to the two boys. Firstly, the insertion of the older woman caused the two other figures to be pushed to the edge, and secondly, it also crowded the figure of the Madonna. The copyist noticed this and gave the main character more room. " The old woman was indisputably one who had already died in the foundation of the picture, the younger woman next to it was a still-living wife of the founder]. Only during the work may the founder have come to the idea of instructing the blessed one in the picture. Originally the composition does not count on them, the mayor, on the other hand, corresponds to the middle woman - one sees it at the height of the head - and the young girl to the two boys. Firstly, the insertion of the older woman caused the two other figures to be pushed to the edge, and secondly,

it also crowded the figure of the Madonna. The copyist noticed this and gave the main character more room. " Only during the work may the founder have come to the idea of instructing the blessed one in the picture. Originally the composition does not count on them, the mayor, on the other hand, corresponds to the middle woman - one sees it at the height of the head - and the young girl to the two boys. Firstly, the insertion of the older woman caused the two other figures to be pushed to the edge, and secondly, it also crowded the figure of the Madonna. The copyist noticed this and gave the main character more room. " Only during the work may the founder have come to the idea of instructing the blessed one in the picture. Originally the composition does not count on them, the mayor, on the other hand, corresponds to the middle woman - one sees it at the height of the head - and the young girl to the two boys. Firstly, the insertion of the older woman caused the two other figures to be pushed to the edge, and secondly, it also crowded the figure of the Madonna. The copyist noticed this and gave the main character more room. " Firstly, the insertion of the older woman caused the two other figures to be pushed to the edge, and secondly, it also crowded the figure of the Madonna. The copyist noticed this and gave the main character more room. " Firstly, the insertion of the older woman caused the two other figures to be pushed to the edge, and secondly, it also crowded the figure of the Madonna. The copyist noticed this and gave the main character more room. "

Now, of course, it may be incomprehensible to the first sight that the artist, out of the symmetrical arrangement as it appears now, wished to omit from the beginning a main link; If one thinks oneself of the old one, then the whole composition is so out-of-the-way that one can not trust Holbein the same from the outset; and I've heard hard expressions from artists about Woltmann's premise. But the view becomes possible if one thinks, as Woltmann also thought, that the artist wanted to balance three figures on a male side with two figures on the female side, and that he finished the Madonna in this thought, but before he came to the female group, changed the plan, and this is now applied to three male figures on the male side, perhaps because he felt that he was less well off with two figures than three; but also the two younger female figures moved slightly differently than previously intended, only with the greatest possible retention of their height position. But that really old artists tried to get along with two to three in similar cases, I can prove myself from an example of Breviario Grimani, No. 91, written in the same way as in the general arrangement, written on Memling, where on one side of Maria two on the other kneel three holy women; Holbein himself, in a hand drawing, has added four musings to Apollo, depicted as the great lord, on one side, and five on the other; so that the observation of a fixed number symmetry in the same cases can not be considered binding. In the meantime more probable than Woltmann's view would seem to me that Holbein laid out the plan from the outset on the three female figures we now see in the picture, but the old woman just so far to the right (for subj. Standp.) Of the fully painted sleeve the Madonna wanted to move back when the old man stood to the left of it, which seems to be the most natural thing from the outset; but, because he found that then with the space for the female figures in the whole not to get along, the old woman has now moved over a piece of the sleeve out. On the condition that Suermondt is right. Meanwhile Schmidt contradicts the opinion Suermondt's and Woltmann's in d. Zeitschrift. f. image.

"That the deceased is subsequently painted in over finished parts, even though Holbein himself, as W. thinks, and that the shadow on her face and headscarf is caused by the overgrown blue of the sleeve, does not quite make sense to me If the part in question is painted as pastus as the others, but not over the already finished sleeve, which would have produced a double commission, but quite uniformly, and then the same shadow of the flesh and the head-cloth is found with the same nuance the other figures and the other parts of the head in question, where there are shadows,

if the blue had grown through, the tone would be different. since the woman furthest back from the sleeve of the Madonna can very well receive one, and the shadow also bestows on the dead, probably intentional, distinguished prestige ".

I myself would like to ask why the blue dress of the Madonna should not have grown through the dress and hand of the ancients, rather than the sleeve through the hood and the face of the same, which shows nothing; By the way, make the decision, hoping that the future composition of both pictures will bring a new thorough investigation with one.

4) Prof. Felsing has given me the following remark in the interest of the priority question.

"As is well known, in the Basel drawings of the three heads, the daughter's hair disguised in the white dress has no pearl-rich headdress, and just as far as the disintegrated hair in the drawing, a reddish tone shimmers under the color of the middle woman's dark dress that it must be inferred with certainty that the daughter's reddish hairs were falling in the first picture, as painted in the study of nature, and only afterward, with great love and execution, was the pearl-jewelery put in place. "

5) Next must not be ignored: The above-mentioned difference between the smiling expression of the Darmstädter and tearful expressions of the Dresden child; - the quiet lower chin, missing in the picture of Darmstadt, which is added to the Madonna in the Dresden picture; - and the head-covering of the oldest female figure, which is already extensive in the Dresden picture, in the form of a Darmstadt image, as well as the different manner in which it combines in both pictures with the head-sheath of the middle woman.

6) According to a comment made by the court painter Otto Heyden in Berlin, the Darmstadt copy is painted on canvas and only glued to a wooden plaque; However, the Dresdner picture is known to be painted directly on wood. (First supplement for the Berl. Nachrichten von Staats- und scheinbaren Sachen, 1870. No. 271.)

### **III. Historical development of the question of authenticity in connection with the question of beauty.**

As long as the Dresden copy is already known, there is nothing known about a question of authenticity regarding the appearance of the Darmstadt copy. His authenticity was rather out of the question. Was it bought in Venice as Holbein's picture of Algarotti? It had come to Venice from Amsterdam, to which old news a picture originating from the donor family Meier came from its place of origin Basel, without fitting on any other than our picture. However, the fact that the execution of Holbein's picture was not worthy or that Holbein's character was inappropriate, as it now is, not merely as a reservation, could not be so much the case as the picture itself for the prototype and summit Holbein's art, and not yet, as today from its falseness on his worthlessness had to close. So where would a doubt come from? Never did the

genuineness of an old picture for external and internal characteristics appear more certain.

This changed when, in 1830, Darmstädter's image entered the scene through the first note that Hirt gave of it, and immediately put him in check with the Dresden picture, by immediately claiming authenticity against it. Inviolability of the Dresden could no longer hold. Initially, it was (the Darmstädter copy) content to be able to stand only sisterly next to the Dresden copy; Above all, it had to defend its own authenticity; but, after having gained some certainty in it, it began, or - to speak rather - began to assert its claims at the expense of the Dresdener, spoke in this with increasing certainty first of secondary characters, the perfection of the same parts in the Darmstädter picture, Holbein off, then even the main character, the Madonna, found too bad for Holbein; and after Woltmann's recent discoveries that the Darmstadt picture came so well as the Dresden artist from Amsterdam, and in the coat of arms on his frame, offered direct links to the old history of the original of Basel, and thus also the historical proof of the Dresdener. If, indeed, it seemed to turn against it, there was nothing good enough left for Holbein in it, and the old beauty had been cut off from the whole picture. There remained only a very moderate copy teeming with misunderstandings of the original. Not, that this conception would have won the victory; yet there is no lack of those who rave about the picture of Dresden like an old palladium; but you have to confess that the attack calls of the opponents, the Wornum, Woltmann, Kinkel, Crowe, Meyer, and so many who attuned privately to their public reputation, almost drowned out the voices of the faithful.

In retrospect, however, nothing seemed more remarkable to me than the solidarity in which, through all of them, the question of beauty with the question of authenticity has held itself; and it's probably worth the effort to linger. From the outset, one might ask: does not an image in the true sense remain the same if it stays the same, and what can the question of authenticity as a source question change? But now it turns out that, on the other hand, beauty depends on authenticity. After a master has been praised only by some works, then the name of the master praises his works, and the master falls, the praise falls, and from then on take evidence against the genuineness of the work to take the outlet of a lack of its beauty, which owe their origin to the view of its illegitimacy. And strangely enough, it was precisely the picture of Dresden that formerly praised Holbein'n over all his other pictures, so that now that it is no longer supposed to be by Holbein, it is now to be denied that it is too small for him.

In fact, so long as the Dresden picture was still regarded as the undoubted work of our Holbein, all the native and foreign voices united in admiration of it, and especially in relation to the main character sought to outdo in expressions which gave the living and profound impression to describe their beauty and loveliness. No sooner was the admiration of the whole here and there mixed with a restrictive statement; on the contrary, sides or parts of the picture which might well give rise to it or exceptionally gave rise, especially some qualities of color, indifferent or dry expression Nebenfiguren, commonly drawn into the vortex of enthusiasm for the whole with euphemistic expressions. Hirt says of the picture, " - Aliens by Algarotti, Wright, Blake, Mrs. Jameson, Blanc; - yes, who knows and names the names of all -

have expressed themselves in the same sense with loving engagement in the merits of the picture, but above everything about the impression of the Madonna. I know no exception whatsoever to an opposite view throughout the earlier time, to the point where the authenticity claims of the Darmstadt Madonna begin to outstrip those of the Dresdeners, and I can speak of them after I have read as much as possible all that is written about the picture Service. But how has that changed from that same moment on? Immediately, according to Bruno Meyer's hard but striking expression, the Dresden picture was begun from below on wheels, from the carpet to the head of the Madonna, and beyond, even to the vaulting of the niche;

As for the Darmstädter picture; In the same way, the recognition of his excellence in the main issue went hand in hand with the recognition of his authenticity, and on the other hand he went on the hardest attack, which was raised against his authenticity, to a diminution even of such parts of the picture (Nebenfiguren) in relation to the Dresden pictures, in which otherwise all the world recognizes the preference of the Darmstadt. Just as little Bruno Meyer still has a good head on the Dresdener, Karl Förster leaves such a picture in the Darmstädter picture. But when such extremes fight, they are at the same time directed.

After that, let's take a closer look at the course of the negotiations, where the evidence of the past will find itself.

Not only Hirt (1830), also Kugler (1845), Waagen (1853 f.), V. Zahn (1865 f.), Woltmann (1866 f.) Declared himself from the outset, according to his own examination, to be in agreement with the authenticity of the Darmstädter picture, and asserted great, indeed eminent, advantages of it as an indication of the great master. A not motivated designation of the picture as repetition or old good copy of the picture of Dresden by E. Förster (1852, 1859), to which he later did not give a consequence, a later also no longer recorded doubt of J. Hübner (1856), a more serious one but Schafer's (1860) footing attack on the painter Grüber's own view of the painting was not easily defeated. But apart from the cautious hint of a doubt on the part of Kugler (1845), the authenticity of the Dresden picture of at least its main inventory, and the high beauty of at least its main character after still held and only the priority (with some complaint on the part of Hübner) along with many benefits of execution awarded the Darmstadt picture. Thus, on account of the totality of these investigations and discussions, the view had begun to consolidate more and more; and finally seemed through v. Zahn's Examination (1865) and Woltmann's Essential Approval (1866) Thus, on account of the totality of these investigations and discussions, the view had begun to consolidate more and more; and finally seemed through v. Zahn's Examination (1865) and Woltmann's Essential Approval (1866) Thus, on account of the totality of these investigations and discussions, the view had begun to consolidate more and more; and finally seemed through v. Zahn's Examination (1865) and Woltmann's Essential Approval (1866)<sup>1)</sup> came to a sort of conclusion that both copies were authentic to the main stock, but the Darmstadt was the first one to be painted, and true to its whole content, while in the second-painted Dresden the artist was the main character (which Woltmann did not want to accept).

and the proportions of the picture content over the Darmstler copy raised in terms of the expression of several minor characters and trivia (carpet, head dress of the kneeling girl) but lagged behind, so that in these parts even the participation (Libra, v. Tooth) or even sole Work of an assistant (Woltmann) believed to have to see.

1) Deviating from the fact that Woltmann from the outset did not want to see the main character of Dresden above the Darmstadt, but only like her, and more decidedly declared the whole lower group to be the work of an assistant.

Then the Englishman Wornum (Inspector of the National Gallery of London), praised as the clearest connoisseur, first appeared in his monograph on Holbein's Life and Works (1868) with the hitherto unheard-of assertion that the whole picture of Dresden was outrageous, and at the same time with the former Judgment on the controversial claim that the head of the Madonna, otherwise generally regarded as a miracle of German art, is one of the "weakest parts" of the picture, is "deprived of natural strength and weakened by the endeavor to embellish it (weakly) idealized". Similar reproaches extended to the child in the arms of the Madonna, who looked so sickly only out of "clumsiness" of the copyist. Holbein could not have painted something like that, Rather, one sees here the work of a "subordinate (inferior)" artist towards "the ordinary superiority of a great master," which is proved in the Darmstädter picture. He also does not find the style of the Dresden painting appropriate. He admits only the improvement in the proportions of the image content by the copyist. He also looks for the confusion that exists in the old news about our image and he still increased by a few false data<sup>2)</sup>, to the detriment of the Dresden copy, and suggests that a pupil of the master may copy the real picture for another branch of the family than possessed the archetype, or even an art dealer or other owner of the picture in much later times most likely in the Netherlands and by a Dutch artist, have had a copy made of it, which, in the absence of the true image, took on the rank of the same.

2) Kinkel, by adhering to Wornum, may at least ask Patin if he accuses him of a leisurely levity for an allegation that Patin has not made at all, but only lets him do Wornum, that is, if it had been Lössert which sold a copy of our picture, which came to him through Leblon, to Maria de Medicis, since on the contrary Patin, just like his informant Fesch, passes the picture directly from Leblon to Maria de Medicis and neither knows nor names Lössert. C. in the Border Messengers Kinkel follows again. Thus fate, to which our picture is inferior from the beginning, that false historical information about it passes from one secondary source to the other, still continues today; and I thought so that I literally faithfully reproduced all the original sources so far in my historical treatise. Wornum himself, of which Kinkel says that "his incorruptible eye was the sharpest in the entire documentary examination," did not look at least at the original documents at the time. The second incorrect statement of this is that the Dresden picture came from the bankruptcy of Lössert'schen house to Venice, which is indeed in Dresden catalogs, of which but not only in the original documents is nothing, but what the recent historical discoveries Woltmann even can not be.

It is not without interest to compare Wornum's aesthetic conception of the Dresden picture with the concept of an English connoisseur and an English connoisseur, still influenced by no authenticity doubt, whose judgment dates not much earlier than that

of Wornum, but that of the existence of the Darmstadt Picture did not seem to have known anything at all; and it would be of no lesser interest, except that this interest can not be satisfied to know how without the suggestion which this knowledge given to Wornum's ingenuity would deny the genuineness of the Dresden picture its aesthetic judgment would have arisen about it.

Blake, the English connoisseur, says in the description of his art trip through Europe (Galleries, London 1858, p. 51) on occasion of the visit to the Dresden gallery: "This is the artist's masterpiece." The coloring of wonderful care ... the Madonna is the most beautiful face ever devised by a German artist, not excluding the Van Eyckian Madonna, so sweet, so clear, so regal and lovely (benign) ". Concerning the attitude in the colors and the true-to-nature conception of all subordinate figures, with the conclusion: "It is the one of the few pictures in which the most careful execution in trifles does not detract from the power of the whole".

Mistress Jameson, the English connoisseur, in her great work of the Madonna (1st Ed., 1852, p. 111, 3rd ed., 1864, p. 102): "On purity, dignity and humility, and intellectual grace this excellent exquisite Madonna has never been surpassed, not even by Raphael. <sup>3)</sup> saw the face once, it does not come again from memory (haunts the memory) ".

<sup>3)</sup> A similar artistic judgment was already made by the Englishman Wright in 1723 after a view of the picture in Venice of the lower naked boy: "the little naked boy would hardly have been outdone (by Raphael himself) ".

Now Wornum's attacks would have left us with hardly any other impression than the astonishment that he may have regarded the little point above the i as a spot above the i, which still suspects, if not touched by, the whole handwriting Woltmann's recent historical discoveries would add to the suspicion of illegitimacy a new reinforcement and the assertion of a new important representative.

Dr. Woltmann (now a professor in the art field at Karlsruhe) - a vigorous researcher who received a most conspicuous monographical work on Holbein (2 Tle. 1866), which appeals to Wornum's work, and whose appeal is outrageous; and 1868 <sup>4)</sup>, who now leads the main voice in Holbein's stuff, which we will therefore have to take into account mainly, represented in the first part of his work the genuineness of the Dresden picture according to its main stock, ie the conception of the whole, Madonna and Child, only that at that time he already remarkably assigned "the whole lower group and all accessories" to Holbein's assistant than his predecessors did. But after the discoveries he published in connection with the second part of his work (1868) aroused suspicion which, independent of Wornum, entered into his conception, he found himself making new comparisons of the two images, which made him new, convincingly suspicious reasons led him to say that he was in different places. the acts] decidedly pronounced the falseness of the whole picture of Dresden. And with the authenticity, at the same time, the magic and beauty of our image disappeared more and more. No one before him described the beauty of the Madonna in Dresden (without forgiving the Darmstadt artist) more attractively and enthusiastically than he did. It was genuine to him: "the supreme transfiguration of German femininity, a phenomenon which has impressed itself on every German heart ... an appearance of

light and clearness ... full of unutterable gentleness and sweetness ... with a head of delightful soulful loveliness "; and at the first appearance of suspicion, he still declared her to be "too beautiful" to be fake. Well, after he considers her untrue, she is still "beautiful,

4) An English translation (by Bentley in London) of this work has now been published, but, as far as I have been able to ascertain, it has not yet really appeared, in which, according to a note by Woltmann himself, the article on our Madonna is completely redesigned and very much expanded. It would be regrettable to be unable to use this article, which undoubtedly contains Woltmann's new views on the question of the authenticity of our picture, if not the same from the Südd. And in the national newspaper, which will be referred to as follows.

Kinkel (Professor in the art subject to Zurich) 5) has in a display of Holbein monographs by Wolmann and Wornum in Lützow 's Zeitschr. (1869) tries to give her conclusions an even stricter version of the falseness of the Dresden exemplar, and that C (Crowe), recognized as a thorough connoisseur and co-author of one of the most treasured works on Italian art, 6in the Border Messengers (1869), after examining the Darmstädter Bild at the Munich exhibition, he joined him with some even more aggravating reasons; but both, K. and C., do not express themselves with equal decisiveness as Wornum and Woltmann, and in particular C provokes, with regard to a definite decision, the future composition of both copies. But even the less authentic copy is considered to be the less beautiful one.

5) Author of a "history of the picture K. among the christian peoples from the beginning of our time till the present 1845."

6) Great Britain General Consul in Leipzig; even artists themselves.

Finally, Bruno Meyer has 7) in the Hildburghausen supplement to the knowledge of the present (1870), by accepting the new view of Woltmann and all its conclusions, and by a remark of J. Lessing's on the character of the changes in the carpet of the Dresden image, He expressed himself much more abruptly than all his predecessors about the artistic and aesthetic drawbacks of the Dresden picture against the Darmstadt, and of course found that his view was not a reversal of an earlier view; she grew up in the new atmosphere.

7) art writer, of which to my knowledge the articles signed with BM in v. Lützow's Zeitschr. arises.

detected. Against the grandiose solemnity and the truly religious consecration of the Darmstädter head he does not arrive remotely. , , , The picture of Dresden is, without any question, a later copy, without a stroke of Holbein's hand, and, let us add, a very modest copy. "- For this, explanations that can be found in the file and will be taken into account.

In contrast to these temptations, since the shock which the view of the genuineness of the Dresden picture by Wornum and Woltmann experiences, I find the authenticity

of it only v. Tooth in a handwritten Exposé communicated with *privatim*, which I extract in the archive f. sign. K., by Ernst Förster in an essay of *Augsb. Gen. Newspaper* and by Karl Förster<sup>8)</sup> in the *Dioscuri* with resoluteness in defense, for which I have written remarks of H. Grimm, Th. Grosse and J. Huebner in the same sense to commandments that will be found literally in the files. The silent and verbal defender of the same, there are still many.

<sup>8)</sup> Herzogl. Council in Meinigen, art dealer, art auctioneer and art restorer, has recently published a pamphlet against Pettenkofer's Restoration Method, formerly another small font "Reflections on Picture Galleries" (1866).

Having arrived at the Darmstadt picture, since then, apart from the retouching noted by several [cf. Cape. II.] Karl Förster with a decisiveness which does not yield to the resoluteness of the opponents of the Dresden picture, declares the whole execution of the Darmstädter picture unreal and Holbein's unworthy, and Ernst Förster some parts of it (children's hands and feet) for the same reason for the account of one Mate wrote. In the meantime, K. Förster is not disinclined to accept the design and background of the Darmstädter picture for Holbein's work at all - the execution is said to have come from a far smaller artist 80 to 100 years later - and E. Förster den not only leaves the entire main composition of the picture untouched but Holbein vindicated so one may say that, at least as far as public voices are concerned, there is no equally decided opponent of the authenticity of the Darmstadt picture as of the Dresden picture. E: Förster, in particular, thinks this way: "The Darmstädter picture is the original, painted directly after nature." During the execution of this Holbein recognized the disturbing effect of the picture, it began anew with the help of the first and its studies ( found in the Basel Museum) and left the completion of the original painting to other hands, perhaps also in his workshop. "

In order to finally say a few words about our own position on the question, I followed the negotiations attentively to what was up to the Munich exhibition about it in my historical treatise in Naum. Weig. In the last year an account of the question in the border messengers was given, and, as is still the case, after summing up all the reasons, I explained myself to the overwhelming probability of the authenticity of both copies. But I do not refuse to make a final decision at all, as I do not yet have sufficient documentation.

#### **IV. The contradictions between the connoisseurs.**

Before we try to sort out the issues in our own way, let's first look at their fuss. Is there nothing solid, generally conceded, what the question is? One would like to say: No, in this respect we go through the judgments of the connoisseurs about the various points which are considered in the question, beginning with the most general and

progressing to the most specific. It is necessary to gain a view of the state of the question at all before approaching it more closely.

Woltmann has already at the time, as he still considered the Dresden copy after his main inventory (in his Holbein) explained that he, fresh from Basel to Darmstadt coming, "the fullest match" of Darmstadt image "in the whole and individual" found with the Holbein pictures in Basel, which "does not show the Dresden painting to such a degree" and, after being turned around, with reference to his later investigation of the Darmstädter picture in the Munich exhibition (Südd. Pr.); "He had repeatedly seen and tested each of the two works, and it had become a certainty for him: Darmstädter Bild had all the characteristics of the original, the Dresdener not." No less, Br. Meyer, with the assistance of well-known connoisseurs of art - in Munich Woltmann's himself - he had thoroughly examined both pictures so briefly and frequently, under such favorable circumstances and with such a wealth of individual observations and notes, as he still did "No one had occasion to do so", and the conclusion he draws from it is that the Darmstadt picture is a valuable original, that the Dresden picture without any question is a later copy," without a stroke of Holbein's hand "we have [Ch. III].

are steeped in the same view, louder men of proficient skill and rich, matured experience. Holbein does not know a greater part of the picture, or even completely ascribes it to him. "On the contrary, the picture of Dresden expresses the art and the spirit in its totality, as well as in its most minute detail, only by the great master Unknown with the works of Holbein or the vain addiction to make a dissenting opinion that might affect the originality of the picture. To anyone who really knows the artist, it will come to mind, where the truth almost tangibly meets us, with hypotheses and hovering assumptions against a certainty of wanting to fight a firm conviction. " loud men of proficient skill and rich, mature experience. Holbein does not know a greater part of the picture, or even completely ascribes it to him. "On the contrary, the picture of Dresden expresses the art and the spirit in its totality, as well as in its most minute detail, only by the great master Unknown with the works of Holbein or the vain addiction to make a dissenting opinion that might affect the originality of the picture. To anyone who really knows the artist, it will come to mind, where the truth almost tangibly meets us, with hypotheses and hovering assumptions against a certainty of wanting to fight a firm conviction. " loud men of proficient skill and rich, mature experience. Holbein does not know a greater part of the picture, or even completely ascribes it to him. "On the contrary, the picture of Dresden expresses the art and the spirit in its totality, as well as in its most minute detail, only by the great master Unknown with the works of Holbein or the vain addiction to make a

dissenting opinion that might affect the originality of the picture. To anyone who really knows the artist, it will come to mind, where the truth almost tangibly meets us, with hypotheses and hovering assumptions against a certainty of wanting to fight a firm conviction. " Holbein does not know a greater part of the picture, or even completely ascribes it to him. "On the contrary, the picture of Dresden expresses the art and the spirit in its totality, as well as in its most minute detail, only by the great master Unknown with the works of Holbein or the vain addiction to make a dissenting opinion that might affect the originality of the picture. To anyone who really knows the artist, it will come to mind, where the truth almost tangibly meets us, with hypotheses and hovering assumptions against a certainty of wanting to fight a firm conviction. " The picture of Dresden, so decidedly expressed by the great master of the art and the spirit in its totality as in its most minute details, shows that only ignorance of Holbein's works or the vain addiction to establish a dissenting opinion could attack the originality of the picture. To anyone who really knows the artist, it will come to mind, where the truth almost tangibly meets us, with hypotheses and hovering assumptions against a certainty of wanting to fight a firm conviction. " The picture of Dresden, so decidedly expressed by the great master of the art and the spirit in its totality as in its most minute details, shows that only ignorance of Holbein's works or the vain addiction to establish a dissenting opinion could attack the originality of the picture. To anyone who really knows the artist, it will come to mind, where the truth almost tangibly meets us, with hypotheses and hovering assumptions against a certainty of wanting to fight a firm conviction. " could attack the originality of the picture. To anyone who really knows the artist, it will come to mind, where the truth almost tangibly meets us, with hypotheses and hovering assumptions against a certainty of wanting to fight a firm conviction. " could attack the originality of the picture. To anyone who really knows the artist, it will come to mind, where the truth almost tangibly meets us, with hypotheses and hovering assumptions against a certainty of wanting to fight a firm conviction. "

Wornum, like Woltmann in the Darmstädter picture, sees "one of Holbein's best and most characteristic colored works," according to Schäfer's report, the Dresden painter Grüder, "who copies the Dresden picture twice, the works of the father Holbein and his sons, Hans and his brother Ambrosius Holbein, and with the previous knowledge that granted him the study of the Dresden picture, went to Darmstadt in order to subject the picture there to a similar study, has made a not insignificant statement, "that the picture of Darmstadt is not by Hans Holbein 's May be younger, that it is definitely a more than replica-treated copy whose color and brushstroke, by the way, are very reminiscent of Ambrose Holbein, but possibly painted under the eyes of Hans Holbein "against which judgment Woltmann goes in strong remarks<sup>1)</sup> , but this does not prevent K. Förster from finding again anything of the character and advantages of Holbein's style of painting in the Darmstadt picture.

<sup>1)</sup> "Herr Grüder has probably said this in conversation and without further reflection, without knowing that he would be publicly cited as a guarantor." This is the only way to explain this, with reference to the three rather insignificant, quite pleasing ones It is impossible for an art-loving glance after a real examination to find a resemblance to this coloristic masterpiece, if Herr Schäfer had known the picture in Darmstadt as the pictures in Basel did beware of pronouncing something equally as dirty as groundless "(Woltmann's Holbein IS 322).

Kugler finds the painting style of the Dresden picture after certain relationships, H. Grimm in certain parts, Wornum even deviating from Holbein, K. Förster finds them at all consistent with Holbein.

In any case, according to the appraisals of Waagen, Wornum, Woltmann, Br. Meyer, one should think that the technique of color in both pictures is very different, whereas Th. Grosse puts them in the main point. the files] in both pictures agree.

Waagen (on the subject of Bem) claims for the Dresden picture the similarity of his coloring with the same Holbein's portrait of Bonifacius Amerbach as characteristic, with which Wornum (p.164 of his work) rather finds the similarity of the Darmstädter significant; v. Zahn does not allow the conclusions drawn from the brownish tone of the Darmstädter picture for its preferential authenticity to the Dresden artist, since this tone depends essentially on the darkened varnish.

Algarotti praises the "Truth of Color" in the Dresden picture in 1751, and finds "carpet, robes, ornaments" so elaborated, "that one of these side-things alone would suffice to make any painting valuable." Against this Meyer (1870) finds the fabrics in the same picture "unclear and indistinctly painted" and the carpet "really miserable". Fr. v. Schlegel enjoys (1802) the "simple pure color chords" in the picture as "an imprint of Holbein's own power and masculinity", while according to Meyer "the whole makes the feeble impression of a pastel image and lacks the harmony that characterizes the original". The old art connoisseur Walpole finds (1762) the coloring of the Dresden picture "indescribably beautiful", in particular " and, according to K. Förster, it shares "the dazzlingly clear, luminous color" of Holbein's other pictures; whereas Meyer calls the color "dry, dusty, chalky," but Hirt excludes from the other advantages of the picture the somewhat "licked brush," which "behaves much in the work of the free and the light." Against this K. Förster again finds "the light, almost touched Touche Holbein's" in the picture, after Algarotti had already listed the treatment reproached by Hirt for the merits of the picture, and Schäfer had kept the picture against Hirt's reprimand. and, according to K. Förster, it shares "the dazzlingly clear, luminous color" of Holbein's other pictures; whereas Meyer calls the color "dry, dusty, chalky," but Hirt excludes from the other advantages of the picture the somewhat "licked brush," which "behaves much in the work of the free and the light." Against this K. Förster again finds "the light, almost touched Touche Holbein's" in the picture, after Algarotti had already listed the treatment reproached by Hirt for the merits of the picture, and Schäfer had kept the picture against Hirt's reprimand.

Kugler finds the coloristic treatment of the Darmstädter picture of the epoch of Holbein's artistic activity around 1529 accordingly; Wornum goes back further by claiming it for the period around 1526, continuing Woltmann further, by holding it in full accordance with the last years before Holbein's first journey to England around 1526, and v. Tooth even further, according to him the overall impression of the color of the Darmstädter picture on the closest to the color effect of Holbein's youth work

in Augsburg and Munich followed, which ended, as we know in 1516. Woltmann depicts the Dresden picture after his manner of painting after 1529, scales decided before 1529, about 1524 or 1525; Shepherd even believes that it is safe to date before 1521.

Otherwise all the world, even Wornum, finds the proportions of the pictorial content in the Dresden picture more favorable than in the Darmstadt, only Woltmann and Bruno Meyer vice versa; Woltmann himself found it earlier more advantageous, now vice versa.

Kugler does indeed find Holbein's hand in the minor figures in the picture of Dresden, but less in the Madonna with the Child; Scales and v. Tooth just the other way around. Grosse answered my question, whether there was any reason to deny the secondary characters in the Dresden picture after their painting style Holbein, with a decided no.

After Hübner and v. Zahn was the artist when transgressing from the Darmstädter to the Dresden specimens in the representation of the Madonna surpassing himself and improving to the pinnacle of German painting art ascended, after Wornum and Meyer the copyist in it descended deeply among the original artist. Wornum finds the Dresden Madonna too weak to trust Holbein. Woltmann once thought her too beautiful to be untrustworthy to Holbein, and now she finds it less beautiful after he no longer trusts her Holbein.

Wornum counts the expression of the Christ Child in solidarity with that of the Madonna to the greatest weaknesses of the Dresden picture and finds much more character in the heads of both in the Darmstädter picture; whereas v. Zahn finds "a certain amount of laxity and lack of individual expression" in the image of Christ in the Darmstädter picture, and Grosse finds the head of Darmstadt's Madonna and child "technically far less secure", indeed, as far as he remembers, "blurredly glazed together" ,

Woltmann admits, under very general agreement, that the portrait heads of all minor figures in the Darmstädter picture are admired as the most expressive vitality, "striking sharpness and subtlety" in the Dresden picture in which, under Br. Meyer's special approval, they are all "lifeless and hard in comparison ", " appear dry and wooden, "whereas Algarotti heard some time ago exclaiming an Italian painter before the dry and wooden heads of the Dresden picture:" this is life, we paint nothing but masks, "and K. Förster says:" the Heads [in the Darmstädter picture] are of very material conception, without the fine characteristics of Holbein and without his artistic understanding, "great on the other hand"believed that the heads of a portrait in the Darmstädter picture were painted in front of nature, sometimes not without effort, "while in the Dresden picture they were all safer and calmer, but also a little colder and smoother than in the Darmstädter Even the head of the mayor bows "shapeless" positions, just as K. Förster finds this head "deviant in the painterly treatment of the great expense of modeling Holbein's great simplicity".as K. Förster finds this head "deviant in the painterly treatment of the great expense of modeling Holbein's great

simplicity." as K. Förster finds this head "deviant in the painterly treatment of the great expense of modeling Holbein's great simplicity."

Woltmann says: "Like most heads, the hands of Darmstädter are also more articulate and lifelike, and the treatment of the hands is always a test for Holbein." In this respect, the Dresden copy is the least ", and he continues to do so in the manner noted below. <sup>2)</sup> On the other hand, when Grosse responded to my express question whether he finds the female hands in the Dresden copy "imperfectly" painted in the Darmstadt, answered again with a decisive "no", and says in his written note: "the hand of the poor is really weak and empty [Darmstadt] Madonna ". K. Förster, however, expresses himself: "The hands [in the Darmstädter picture] show neither the feeling for natural truth nor the fine elaboration of Holbein."

<sup>2)</sup> "Even if no second copy were to be kept, doubt would have to be raised against Holbein's hand-written execution." The master is always recognizable by the incomparable fineness with which he lets female hands peep out of his cuffs. "But the hand of the young girl in the Dresden picture is It will be impossible for any artistically educated eye to paint the same artist's hands on this painting and the portrait of Morret hanging next to it, and the latter may fall later. "There could be no more dangerous neighborhood for the Madonna."

v. Tooth calls at all "all hands and feet in the picture of Darmstadt completed beautiful and educated" and in particular "the right foot of the Christ child with a lack of skin wrinkles in the Dresden picture <sup>3)</sup> a miracle of natural truth" and also Woltmann expects (Südd Pr.) The feet of the Christ child in general to the excellently price-worthy parts of the Darmstädter picture. Against this E. Förster explains: "the left hand of the lower naked child [in this picture] is much too large and otherwise recorded (so that she seems to have six fingers <sup>4)</sup> "Out of proportion, and very much, both hands of the upper child and his right foot are downright clubfoot." Violations which, according to him, can not be found in the Dresden picture, and his view that these parts derive from the hand of an assistant. reasons. but, after the E. Förster the right feet of the upper child called a clubfoot in Darmstadt image without touching the left, called K. Förster "the right feet of the child expertly painted, the left contrast stümperhaft in drawing and embodiments <sup>5)</sup> . And unfortunately one must add to the latter little example what plays between two connoisseurs of art: ex ungue leonem, that is, from the nail of art criticism at the foot of the child one can recognize the whole lion of the same, namely a lion, which tears itself apart.

<sup>3)</sup> This seems to me to be only slightly weaker in the picture of Dresden, not on the sole, but on the ankle.

<sup>4)</sup> Comp. on this chap. II.)

<sup>5)</sup> The contradiction is not resolved by the fact that, for example, the objectively right little foot of the child is on the left for the observer, and accordingly only the designation of the same foot is contradicted by both judges, but according to the position which the child has in the picture Feet, which is the right for the child, also for the viewer on the right. Of course, it is not possible to judge whether the one assessor did not confuse the memory with the minutes; but one need not presuppose it with the other contradictions.

Finally, Woltmann concedes to the copyist of the Darmstädter Bild (Südd. Pr. And Nat-Ztg.) That he is "an artist full of spirit, taste and understanding of the role model", an artist "full of great insight and skill" was, "who in the treatment of the Vorbilde with the greatest possible fidelity and even where he changed, not fell off the roll"; but, of course, according to Wornum, and indeed after Woltmann as well, out of "mere clumsiness" from the smiling child of the original, he made a sickly-looking man who, according to Woltmann (but probably out of lack of insight) mistook the Madonna's dress color and a thorough "misunderstanding" proved the architectural conditions, according to Kugler, who has (but probably for lack of taste) the proportions of the original "" with the intention of improving them "" deteriorated ", and is not free from " Zoppeln "; after which, however, it is difficult to say how in addition spirit, taste, understanding of the model, insight, skill, and fidelity could be praised; hence Br. Meyer, who is no longer bound by any piety for an earlier exalted work, contains all those praising epithets for his artist. who has (but probably for lack of taste) the proportions of the original "" with the intention of improving them "" deteriorated ", and is not free from " Zoppeln "; after which, however, it is difficult to say how in addition spirit, taste, understanding of the model, insight, skill, and fidelity could be praised; hence Br. Meyer, who is no longer bound by any piety for an earlier exalted work, contains all those praising epithets for his artist.

Now one has to say well: It was idle to enumerate the contradictory voices next to each other; rather, it was a matter of urgency to critically review the judgments and to adhere to the best authorities and best reasons, but not to respect the bad ones. Yes, if only we were given the principle of this sighting. None of the previous authorities allows the other to continue to apply, as it itself agrees with it, that is, to apply only to itself, and where is the authority that decides between all? And as far as the reasons are concerned, they rest for the most part in *Aperçus*, of which indisputably some are more important than the others, without being able to be brought to objectively convincing characteristics, and thus without any other means of reliance than the authority to which they are attached to support themselves, to offer.

If we consider the expression of our own security, we should trust Allen Woltmann, Br. Meyer, and K. Förster; but they only balance each other in the power of their opposite conviction. - On purely external grounds, on the other hand, we should prefer Allen Wornum's and Woltmann's judgment. They, the Holbein monographs, had more than any other opportunity and occupation to get acquainted with Holbein's composition and painting style, and Br. Meyer at least claims to have been in the most favorable circumstances of judgment; but K. Förster also claims it and can base his work on it [cf. Cape. III. Note], and v. Zahn is allowed to claim it at least as well as anyone. And what weight can be put on the most favorable circumstances and the greatest diligence of the investigation, if it is not guaranteed that it is employed in an ingenuous way rather than from a preconceived point of view in order to find what one wants to find? but the suspicion that this was more or less the case with Wornum's, Woltmann's, Meyer's, as K. Förster's investigation, arises from the fact

that each of them finds only one side of the reasons, the doubt, which plays such an important part in this question has no room, and makes the judgment of authenticity in a manner dependent on the beauty judgment, which contradicts a proper conception of the question. Add to that the strong contradiction of an artist, like Grosse, who also did his part to give the best possible security to the comparisons of both images. concerning the manner of painting of the same against the previous ones [s. the files] and the oversight of retouching by Woltmann and Meyer. If we finally consider the authority of the names, for example, Libra, who, on the basis of an earlier careful comparative examination, has written to me on occasion occasionally before his death that he records the authenticity of the main picture of the Dresden picture, is less than To hear Woltmann and Wornum? Yes, what gives us in Woltmann the assurance that he now correctly denies the Dresdener picture the authorship of our Holbein, as he has previously attributed to the Augsburg pictures such. who, on the basis of an earlier careful comparative examination, testified to me on occasion occasionally before his death by letter that he held to the authenticity of the main stock of the Dresden picture, less to hear than Woltmann and Wornum? Yes, what gives us in Woltmann the assurance that he now correctly denies the Dresdener picture the authorship of our Holbein, as he has previously attributed to the Augsburg pictures such. who, on the basis of an earlier careful comparative examination, testified to me on occasion occasionally before his death by letter that he held to the authenticity of the main stock of the Dresden picture, less to hear than Woltmann and Wornum? Yes, what gives us in Woltmann the assurance that he now correctly denies the Dresdener picture the authorship of our Holbein, as he has previously attributed to the Augsburg pictures such.

As unfruitful as the previous compilation of positive results is, after all, it can have a twofold benefit, if one only wants to draw it from it: First, to teach caution, not to hold it as agreed in our question, what is agreed upon by this or secondly, to draw attention to points which, in the composition of both specimens, are intended chiefly to be envisaged, as long as they are subject to the dispute.

But for us it will have the particular benefit of making it easier in the ensuing discussion of the points in our question to ignore those which are still too much in dispute to influence the decision so far. With regard to many points, criticism will be practicable; and as far as we can, we will try.

## **V. More general negotiation. Artistic and aesthetic reasons.**

The reasons which are considered in the question of authenticity are partly external, in particular historical, partly internal, that can be taken from the consideration and comparison of the two pictures themselves. Among them are the historical ones, which, without being incomplete in their incompleteness and contradictory nature, are to be treated with special importance and care, because they have recently been

unilaterally turned against the Dresden copy, whereas after thorough investigation it has to be said that they On the other hand, they contain moments of suspicion, which are compensated by favorable moments, if not outweighed. Among the inner reasons there are those which are quite decisive for the priority and thus authenticity of the Darmstädter picture, without proving against those of the Dresdener.

The historical reasons I will treat in the following sections, as it is probably not possible otherwise unseparated with respect to both copies, but then refer back to each copy its special section. Before that, however, it is still necessary, in the light of a number of reasons, which have already been raised in the preceding discussion because of their contradictory nature, to fully resign themselves to being overruled by a later detailed consideration of them, that of the Painting style and aesthetic reasons.

Of course, as far as the reasons for the painting are concerned, it seems natural from the outset to give them primary attention first of all for historical reasons, and so it has been done by almost all the authors who have dealt with our question. In a way, the painting style of an image can be compared to an author's handwriting; From the manuscript one can recognize the author and Karl Förster refers expressly to this comparison. But even if the author's handwriting is erroneous, the evaluation of the manner of painting of our pictures in the same respect is much more difficult because of the combination of several circumstances. First and foremost, the question of authenticity extends from our pictures, it is fair to say, to most of Holbein ' s name going pictures [comp. Cape. I.], so that for this very reason it may become doubtful to consider what is really Holbein's style of painting; and once the Dresden picture was regarded as the undoubtedly true main picture of Holbein, it could easily happen that one took just its painting style as the main stop in the assessment. This would be according to what is stated in chap. IV, especially on Grüder's assertion that the copy of Darmstadt is not in line with Holbein's style of painting; but Karl Förster also leaves us in the same, more decisive, assertion and appeal to his "very intimate, special knowledge of the master" important doubts whether they rest on more durable records. Förster himself mentions that he " Of course, many of the pictures do not pass through rapidly, but the correspondence articles on which basis the author bases his intimate knowledge of Holbein; but what the author points out would rather be apt to belittle the confidence than justify. Of course, many of the pictures do not pass through rapidly, but the correspondence articles on which basis the author bases his intimate knowledge of Holbein; but what the author points out would rather be apt to belittle the confidence than justify.

While going through the exhibition of old pictures in Munich, he points to the epitaph picture with the mayor Schwartz, the Augsburg portraits of the patrician Mörz and his wife and the male portraits in possession of Suermond as Holbein'sche Werke with the explanation that a master, the painted these works, impossible to have executed the Darmstädter picture. From the Schwartzian epitaph picture it can now be regarded as decided that it belongs to the older than younger Holbein, and the portraits of Mörz and Frau can, according to Wolt- mann's remark <sup>1)</sup> already for the historical reason that according to inscription on the back in J 1533, not from Holbein, since at that time it was "notorious" (Woltmann) in England <sup>2)</sup>, Also agrees with Woltmann W. Schmidt <sup>3)</sup> and Crowe <sup>4)</sup> (whether completely independent or determined by Woltmann?) That these pictures can

not be derived from Holbein according to their style of painting <sup>5)</sup>, but to be attributed to Amberger. In any case, the historical reason seems to be enough to deny the Moerz pictures to our Holbein. And now it is alarming to find them listed as examples of how Holbein can be measured.

<sup>1)</sup> south d. Pr. 1869. No. 185.

<sup>2)</sup> However, a certain date was interpreted as indicating a return of Holbein to Basel in 1533, but this, according to His-Heusler's remark (the most recent research on H. Holb Interpretation demands, and nothing else to support for itself.

<sup>3)</sup> Lützow's Zeitschr. 1869, p. 359.

<sup>4)</sup> Border messengers. (1839 No. 40. p. 22)

<sup>5)</sup> They are - says Woltmann - very yellowish, overly warm in tone, effective, but without that extraordinary fineness in drawing and elaboration, which shows Holbein - you need to look only the hands by name. "- The other judges give their judgment without Motivation.

We must indeed confess that in this respect the judgments of Wornum, Woltmann, and Meyer, which most sharply contradict those of Grüber and K. Förster, are not subject to any particular external grounds of suspicion; but after the remarks in chap. IV., Just as little afford the assurance of impartiality, and in regard to the Dresden picture come into conflict with the judgments of scales and other connoisseurs, who claim the same confidence as themselves.

Another difficulty, no less important, which complicates itself with the previous one, is that Holbein's style of painting has not always remained the same, so that one can not disregard the incongruity of an image with the manner of painting of certain real Holbein pictures To be able to conclude further on his illegibility; it would be necessary to consider the epoch of its creation; but most of Holbein's pictures, including the two copies of our picture, do not exactly know the time of their origin, but rather they seek to determine the content of this or that otherwise attributed to him from the composition and painting style there is no lack of strong differences between different connoisseurs [cf. Cape. IV.] And circular conclusions are difficult to avoid.

Finally, the old yellow varnish cover, with which the picture of Darmstadt is still afflicted, and which it indisputably shares with many other Holbein pictures, while others are liberated, adds to this difficulty one more difficulty, by giving the impression of color is essentially changed by the fact that it would be difficult to produce by abstraction of it the original impression in the imagination.

A thoroughly comparative examination of the manner of painting of both pictures with other Holbein's works, which takes into account the previous difficulties and reasons of uncertainty, is not even present, but only rhapsodic comparisons and more or less indeterminate, if determined enough, Apercus quarreling with each other. In the meantime, the forthcoming compilation of both pictures, since it is to be

combined with a compilation of as many other Holbein pictures as possible, will provide an opportunity to study the question of color from the given points of view, and through the opportunity at the same time for the connoisseurs to associate with each other to hear about it, perhaps to a greater agreement of the same.

How the aesthetic question intervened in the question of authenticity has been generally discussed in the third and fourth sections, from which it has been seen that nothing else has come of it, as contradictions between different times, different authors, and even different periods of time author. In my opinion, however, even with greater agreement on the fact of the advantage between the two images, than really takes place, nothing substantial could be found for the decision of whether the one copy as a whole, or also for one or the other, is too good for a copy of a foreign one Hand or too bad for an original by Holbein. If a copyist copies a work with alterations, and there are any changes between the two copies, he will, of course, seek to do so in the sense of improvement; and even if it always remains awkward for the opponents of the Dresden picture, that they can not show anybody to whom they can dare the improvements that are found in the Dresden picture, it is neither absolutely excluded, - only unlikely - that there is one which one just can not guess at, nor that it is impossible to deny the fact of the improvements themselves, as they have done. Thus, no matter how firm a conviction of the excellence of the Dresden picture, nothing is objectively won for its authenticity. On the other hand, it is equally possible for an artist to no longer bring to his own copy of his picture the same freshness as for the first work, or, in the case of an increased impulse, to the greater perfection of main things more neglected, no less, that the other purpose of the copy or replica gives occasion to treat some parts more negligently, which makes everything think in our picture. Thus, even with a lesser excellence of the Dresden picture as a whole or in parts, it is not yet decided for its falseness as a whole or parts without further ado. Even though only the lower child is so well-painted in the Dresden picture as in the Darmstadt, and never before have I found the Dresdener in the Darmstädter in this respect, this sufficiently proves that the artist of one picture suits that of the other (at least as far as he is concerned) of execution), if not identical with it; completely, if, as in our case, and even Wornum admits, at least as far as the proportions are concerned, far more than that of the main character, that in some other parts it has surpassed Darmstadt's image. But even parts of a picture can not be denied to an artist for remaining among the most perfect achievements by which he is most characteristically characterized, but only when one finds that he has remained there in all his other past and simultaneous achievements, In this respect too, the composition of the two copies with many other Holbein pictures may help. With fragmentary comparisons or comparisons to indefinite memory, there is little, if nothing else, to do. Woltmann looks away from the hands in the Dresden picture on the hands of Morrett. If this were now z. If, for instance, the best hands were painted by Holbein, there would have to be even lesser painters painted by him, and whether they are painted worse than better in the Darmstadt picture than in Dresden is still disputed after the above contradictions. But now Woltmann, with whom we have to speak chiefly in this field of the question, but we find only its echo in Meyer, not

merely as to the hands, but in general for the internal reasons, preferably on the aesthetic-artistic advantages of the one picture in front of the other. What he finds worse in one image than in another is not to him from Holbein. Conversely, he finds it worse, which does not seem to him Holbein for external reasons, even if he found it better in the past, because he still considered Holbein'isch, and then counts this wickedness among the internal reasons not to keep it from Holbein. I do not want to offend Woltmann in his certainly sincere position on the question, but I can not help but summarize here the impression that his reasons here have left me, in whole or in part, against the genuineness of the Dresden picture. But let yourself judge. As for the Madonna and the minor figures, we heard him in earlier sections. Now let's talk about proportions and architecture. By the way, if one wishes to overturn this whole negotiation with him, one will not lose anything; but I was able to support her by the weight of his voice,

In his Holbein monograph (1866) Woltmann says that the genuineness of the Dresden picture was still acknowledging and explicit (p. 317) of his consent to v. Zahn (p. 322): "The Dresden specimen is evidently the later one, and the deviations in proportions, especially in the relation of the architectural framing, stem visibly from the fact that the artist had the Darmstadt picture in mind, freeing himself with the critical eye and felt clearly in which way it was to be improved. " He explains this (p. 318): "The supporting stones, here much heavier and more massively shaped, begin immediately above the heads of those kneeling below, and on the right the woman's headdress already cuts into one while in the Dresden picture the pillars, from which the stones run out, are still visible at a head height. In the Darmstädter picture, the vaulting of the niche begins at the level of Maria's shoulders and closes very close to her crown, whereas in Dresden she begins only at the level of her chin and then remains an important space up to the apex of the arch. The whole situation is freer and more pleasing through this well-calculated improvement. "

But after Woltmann inspired by its historical discoveries on suspicion of our image, the same under the influence of this mood again taken (in September 1868) in inspection, he writes (1 March 1869) to Kinkel: <sup>6)</sup> "increasing the Niche is not an improvement, but a worsening of conditions In the Darmstädter the composition fits wonderfully into the closely adjoining frame, the bust of the Madonna being placed in the upper semicircle, while in the Dresden picture the diameter, above the the arch rises, just ugly enough to cut her chin. "

And finally, after Woltmann again subjected the Darmstädter painting to a repeated exact examination at the Munich exhibition of old pictures, <sup>7)</sup> he affirms the previous verdict with a few more details, as follows in the following way:

<sup>6)</sup> Lützow's Zeitschr. 1869, p. 173.

<sup>7)</sup> In the German press 1869th no. 181st August 6th and very similar in the national newspaper 1869. no. 357. 4 Aug.

The busts of the Madonna and Child are just effective in the semicircle of the final shell, and are composed with the finest sense of space. Like a ray-glory, the channels of the shell depart from the head of Mary; on the Dresden picture, on the other hand, unsightly enough, the lower boundary of this semicircle cuts straight the chin of the Blessed Virgin. "

How conspicuous this complete reversal of the view may be, it would have to be acknowledged if it were a reversal to the more substantial. But I think I can show, firstly, that most of what Woltmann, according to Holbein's new view, wishes to deny as worthless in the Dresden picture, is found in a similar composition, and thus in Holbein's composition, which is more suitable for comparison. Second, that Woltmann's earlier aesthetic-artistic judgment is, on the whole, more durable than its reformed, if we adhere to the general judgment.

On the other hand, I refer to a hand drawing of Holbein's, which Woltmann herself sets before the creation of our picture, that is, the hand drawing no. 65 of the Basel Museum (No. 34 in the Braun Collection of Basel Photographs), of which I want to say a few words in connection here and there, as a basis for coming back to it several times in the future. <sup>8th)</sup>

<sup>8)</sup> It is not impossible that this hand-drawing is a first sketch for our picture itself, then of course very much modified later. In any case, there are some probable reasons for this, which I emphasized in Naumann-Weigel's Archive XII, 12. But since they are nothing less than resounding, I put no weight on it here.

Here we see a crowned Madonna surrounded by swordlike rays, similar to our picture, in a niche overhanging a half-dome clad with a shell, but in a much more developed Renaissance architecture than ours or the Darmstädter picture shows, is installed. The Madonna holds a naked child in her arms, in whose left arm she pinches a crooked finger, while the child betrays displeasure or pain through the lowered corners of her mouth and twisted eyes; and in front of the Madonna kneels a knight or a citizen, who expresses astonishment by the direction of the wide-open eyes on the miracle of salvation, evidently here on a sick little arm, through open mouth and raised arms.

This hand-drawing has been uncomfortable to Woltmann before in another respect [ie concerning the question of interpretation of our picture]; but we need not quarrel about this <sup>9)</sup> here again; since it is not the interpretation of the drawing that he disputes, but the clear way in which it is composed.

<sup>9)</sup> Fechner in the Naumann-Weigel Archive XII. 1st and v. Zahn's Jahrb. Jahrg. I. 1866. 136; - Woltmann in s. Holbein II. Suppl. 446.

In this drawing, then the room light of the whole composition, the free position of the Madonna in a wide niche fits, the height of the dome curvature above the crown <sup>10)</sup>, the intersection of the Madonna head by the lower limit of the semicircle

(only that the end cut instead of the chin The point of the column above the head of the knight or citizen kneeling before the Madonna, together with some points of architecture to be brought up later, is just as much in agreement with the picture of Dresden as it deviates from the Darmstadt, so that rather against this a suspicion, not to be really Holbeinisch, could grow out of it.

<sup>10)</sup> In order not to charge for my part the reproach of a lack of prudence, I would like to note that in some of Holbein's small woodcuts (in Woltmann's Holbein II, 250, 376) there are Old Testament figures in two side niches (without a shell) of a middle picture the head protrudes just as high into the vault as in the picture of Darmstadt, except that it has no analogy with our Meier picture and the hand drawing no. 65 have. So, at least in this respect, Holbein soon did so, and nothing can be left for or against this circumstance alone.

It is true that there are other pictures of Holbein in which many figures are so closely packed or even more closely packed than in the picture of Darmstadt. For example, his Passion designs for glass paintings (de Mechel or Braun or Woltmann's Holbein); but they are pictures in which it is a throng to represent. On the other hand, where there is a picture of the Madonna with secondary figures of him, which betrayed the principle of maximum space exhaustion claimed by Woltmann for Holbein. Look at the fountain of life, the Solothurn Madonna, the Madonna of the Organ Wings and the other Basel Madonna drawings. How beautiful are the figures in the Totentanze (reproduced by De Mechel among others). In the rest of Old German art, of course, the principle of packing was common enough, so that it might find less offense than now; but since we do not find it in Holbein's Madonna pictures, this could only reinforce the suspicion that an old copyist had made himself of the picture of Dresden, and found no hesitation in putting the figures together in a narrower space. But how one can conclude from this against the genuineness of the Dresden picture is not well understood. We will have occasion to come back to this in a later section.

As far as the aesthetic point of view is concerned, it should be admitted that, if one looks at the Darmstadt and Dresden pictures explicitly, as Woltmann has done, in which of the two the space is more artistically filled, one gets the feeling of an incomparable advantage of the Darmstadt before the Dresdener Has copies. But can the same advantage that applies when stuffing the clothes into a suitcase also apply to the arrangement of living figures in the context of a composition? Rather, in this respect one will have the equally decided feeling that the space in the Dresden picture is incomparably more artistically fulfilled than in the picture of Darmstadt. As for the position of the head of the Madonna in the niche vault, which finds Woltmann so much more exquisite in the Darmstädter than the Dresden pictures, Of course I can not prove for general reasons that Woltmann's, with Br. Meyer in it, connoted taste is not the best-for how can such evidence ever lead? - but probably that he is a lonely man and will remain. After v. Zahn, Wornum, and formerly Woltmann themselves as connoisseurs of art in the opposite sense, I have, to add a complete lay judgment, occasionally after each other a pastor, an officer, a bookseller, a lawyer, a philosopher, three professors of medicine, a professor of jurisprudence, a language teacher, a drawing teacher, two architects, two students, a pupil and eleven ladies,

presenting part of the two v. Zahn's outlines, some of the photographs after Schurig and Felsing, partly at the Munich exhibition after comparing the original from Darmstadt with the Steinla engraving, without somehow preoccupying it, whether the Madonna, especially the head of the same, seemed to be more beautifully composed into the niche in one way or another; and without exception received a verdict in favor of the Dresden copy, and in part, especially on the part of some ladies, strong expressions of astonishment are heard that someone else could grasp it.

The fact that the ideal diameter, defined by Woltmann as the lower limit of the semicircle and ending in the lower half of the dome, cut the Chin of the Madonna of Darmstadt, seems, according to the above experience, less unfavorable than the wide insertion of the head of the Darmstadt Madonna into the vault. It is not necessary to deliberately think of a cutting, which is less the occasion than to follow the eye of its own accord instead of the merely ideal transverse diameter, following the arcuate line of the architrave, which, starting from the limit points of this diameter, goes below that Chin lowers. On the other hand, the circumstance that the head of the Madonna of Dresden stands in the ideal center of the half-dome circle imagined, should contribute to the immediately agreeable impression of the position. and it is almost exactly the upper (objective right) eye of the slightly inclined Madonna's head, which occupies this position; whereas the eye of the Darmstädters, so to speak, does not know where it stands in the vertical direction, while in the horizontal direction it is also very close to the center of the vault.

Incidentally, both the cutting of the head of the Madonna by the basic diameter of the curvature, which Woltmann finds "ugly," as the connected position of the head in the center of the curvature, I do not know whether before Holbein, because I have no examples of this, at least according to Holbein. To this day, the classical rule has remained in the arrangement of figures in niches; for not only have I got this out of the mouth of two knowledgeable architects, but I can prove it by my own view of the examples belonging to it in the Basilica Vaticana (Roma 1845) and Basilica Liberiana (Roma 1839).

As Woltmann could come to this and Meyer agrees with him to assert, under the merits of the Darmstadt specimen before the Dresdener, that in that "the channels [fan beams] of the shell emanate like a ray of glory from the head of Mary", I am quite clear puzzling, since, conversely, the preferred circumstance finds itself in the Dresdener than Darmstädter copy. For in the case of the Dresden specimen the fan-shaped rays of the shell diverge only from the crown, head, and neck, so that the head in fact seems to be surrounded by the shell filled with fan-beams, as though from a broad halo, to which the lowest at the beginning of the Neck incipient fan beams bend upwards from their rooting in the center of the architrave, and thus close the outline of the shell (not exactly, of course) to an elliptical shape. Also, I believe all the more that this was in the motif of the presentation, as in the hand drawing no. 65 (Basel), the lowest, strongly upwardly bent, fan beams with complete detachment from the architrave immediately at the head of the Madonna (at eye level) use, which puts the memory of a halo even closer, but may have been left by the artist in the Dresden pictures, because it looks really unattractive. The lowermost fan-shaped rays

on the chest of the Madonna appear in the Darmstadt picture. Fan beams with complete detachment from the architrave directly at the head of the Madonna (at eye level), which puts the memory of a halo even closer, but may have been left by the artist in the Dresden picture, because it really looks ugly. The lowermost fan-shaped rays on the chest of the Madonna appear in the Darmstadt picture. Fan beams with complete detachment from the architrave directly at the head of the Madonna (at eye level), which puts the memory of a halo even closer, but may have been left by the artist in the Dresden picture, because it really looks ugly. The lowermost fan-shaped rays on the chest of the Madonna appear in the Darmstadt picture.

Afterwards we turn to the reasons which Woltmann takes from the changes in architecture, and above all let him speak for himself in the following intervention:

As strong as possible and on them rests at first a two - membered cover plate, which runs around the whole niche, it closes under the approach of the vault and on each side reaches to the frame, while in the Dresden picture the projection is reduced, between Kragsteinen and Frame an empty space remains and the cover plate is completely omitted. The volute shape of the Kragsteine, which can be motivated only by a load resting on it, ends quite freely, without carrying anything, and is therefore inappropriate. In the Darmstädter picture the niche wall is formed by an architrave which ends directly in the corbels, and in these the volute approach is a double one, corresponding to the two layers of the architrave, the upper projecting slightly above the lower one. The author of the Dresden painting, however, treated the corbels as if they were capitals, although their form does not fit well with them, so they did not grow out of the wall directly, but only ascend over narrow pilasters placed in front of the wall. He did not know what to do with the lower volutes and shrank them into a mere expiration of the shaft. For such a form its shape is now almost plaited, the beautiful relationship between upper and lower volutes, which we perceive in Darmstädter image, is disturbed. In general, the forms are more pompous and unprincipled - one recognizes this in the formation of the volutes, in the shape of the shell, which does not form a pure hemisphere, but is exaggerated by more than one-eleventh of its diameter, finally in the baroque motif, that the cladding of the upper half-dome at both corners bent like a leaf from the architectural core. In the Darmstädter picture we see the style of German early Renaissance, as the painters introduced him at that time, at a time when the architects were still building Gothic; Much of our feeling is crude and squat, but everything has hand and foot, nowhere does the organic context be absent. But this is not present in the Dresden picture in which the forms are arbitrarily stacked together. " but everything has hand and foot, nowhere does the organic context be absent. But this is not present in the Dresden picture in which the forms are arbitrarily stacked together. " but everything has hand and foot, nowhere does the organic context be absent. But this is not present in the Dresden picture in which the forms are arbitrarily stacked together. "

"Finally, the author of the latter has met with a perspective carver: the rolled up ribbon, from which the lower volutes are made in the Darmstädter painting, is not rectangular but sharpened, and therefore they become somewhat narrower in the front for perspective view, wanted to reconcile the view of the upper volute with it, and presented the Kragstein on the left side of the viewer in a perspective that lets him fall out of the rest of the picture. " -

"One can know the picture for a long time without realizing it, but once it has been noticed, it is impossible that the Dresden picture is still believed to be a work of Holbein's hand or Holbein's workshop." Such misunderstandings unequivocally prove that we are to have a later imitator. "

These two remarks by Woltmann I have submitted in succession to two thorough architects, well-known in the conditions of the Renaissance style, recognized as writers in the building, presenting the photographs of both pictures and the

engravings after some other Holbein's drawings of developed architecture. Both found it quite independent of each other and yet quite unanimous with each other, whimsical that such reasons could be asserted in the question. To make the changes in architecture in the Dresden picture of a misunderstanding of the copyist is no reason. The artists, painters and architects, at Holbein's time would have taken the greatest arbitrariness and freedom in handling the Renaissance style, and a secure architectural understanding was not to be found in them, so not to be expected even at Holbein, and really just to find the made templates so little. So is in the hand drawing no. 65 a Renaissance capital as a pedestal, conversely on the taunting of Christ (No. 41 Basel) a Romanic pedestal related as a capital; on the execution of Christ one sees a capital, which has nothing to bear; on Christ before Caiaphas (No. 39 Basel) places that can not be well translated into the physical. Even J. Hübner praises the architecture in the recently acquired for Dresden Holbein'schen works only with the remark 65 a Renaissance capital as a pedestal, conversely on the taunting of Christ (No. 41 Basel) a Romanic pedestal related as a capital; on the execution of Christ one sees a capital, which has nothing to bear; on Christ before Caiaphas (No. 39 Basel) places that can not be well translated into the physical. Even J. Hübner praises the architecture in the recently acquired for Dresden Holbein'schen works only with the remark 65 a Renaissance capital as a pedestal, conversely on the taunting of Christ (No. 41 Basel) a Romanic pedestal related as a capital; on the execution of Christ one sees a capital, which has nothing to bear; on Christ before Caiaphas (No. 39 Basel) places that can not be well translated into the physical. Even J. Hübner praises the architecture in the recently acquired for Dresden Holbein'schen works only with the remark<sup>11)</sup>"that Holbein, in contrast to this, has often harmed his historical compositions by a cumbersome architectural equipment based on misunderstood antiquity, as is the case, for example, with his beautiful drawings on Passion." So what Meyer supports the statement he made, "Holbein understood the architecture better than the simultaneous master builders in Germany," is difficult to say. On the whole, I heard from the experts, may the architecture of the Darmstädter picture be more easily credited with an architect, that of the Dresden picture more easily with a draftsman; architecturally unmotivated arbitrarinesses are here and there; in the Darmstädter picture the descentless departure of the architrave into the central memberless Kragsteine; in Dresden the way, how the capitals, which take the place of the corbels, are related. Also already called v. Zahn the Kragsteine in the Darmstädter picture as "not very happy and formed without understanding of the antique model".

<sup>11)</sup> Feuilleton of the Dresdener Journal 187 a.

For me, the main difference between Darmstadt and Dresden architecture seems to be a simplification from first to last. The double architrave has been replaced by a simple one, the double cover plate of the architrave omitted, the double corbelled stone transformed into a substantially simple capital, although the volutes have received a less pleasing form. Holbein has already exquisitely simplified the architecture, which has been extraordinarily developed in the manuscript no. 65, on the later picture of Darmstadt, and if the Dresden picture is really later than the Darmstädter, it has only advanced in the same direction.

Woltmann, of course, explains the architecture of the Dresden picture as more sultry than that of the Darmstädter picture. But if it were so, this would prove more for than against the Dresden picture, for if one wants to see examples of a bombastic architecture, one can find them in Holbein's several-mentioned drawings on the Passion of Christ. Woltmann particular is the cant of the mussel or hemisphere by more than  $\frac{1}{11}$  their diameter as puffy; this is a matter of subjective taste. To arrive at the fact, one must admit that it is unusual; but it is all the more conceivable that a foreign copyist might have fallen for it. Against this, it can once again be proved by hand drawing no. 60 that Holbein did not adhere to the rule of pure hemispherical curvature, for while in the Dresden picture the curvature over the hemisphere is considerably exaggerated, it is considerably undercut in the hand drawing, and corresponds in the Darmstadt picture, it is almost exactly the hemisphere, so that here, too, an advance in the same direction is visible. In fact, the height of the vault to half the basic diameter in the hand drawing behaves like 1 : 1,192, in the Darmstadt pictures like 1 : 1.020, at the Dresden picture like 1 : 0.875.

If, as Woltmann finds, a "Baroque" motive really lies in the fact that the shell clothing bends at the ends of the pad, then one would even, instead of one more reason against the genuineness of the Dresden picture, become one of the simplest for the most striking reasons, because - and again I have to come back to that drawing which suddenly precipitates a whole host of counter-reasons - because, as I say, this baroque motif is even more pronounced in hand drawing no. 65, while it would be very unlikely that a copyist should have just come across the same Baroque motive; I also believe that it at least counts something in support,<sup>12)</sup> without believing that one really has to see a Baroque motif in the turn. At least in the illustration of the tombs of the Cardinals Amboise to Rouen, which is given in Gailhabaud's monuments T. IV, I find in the shells of the ornamentation pyramids of the coronation of the tomb a similar turn of the lower fan beams from the base, and so it will be well otherwise occur.

<sup>12)</sup> According to the examples I have just given in the Basilica Vaticana and Liberiana, which was thought above, also the details Pl. 11 to the Chateau de Chambord (begun in 1523) in Gailhabaud's Denkm., And a Holbein's example to Christ before Caiaphas.

## **VI. Historical reasons.**

It is known from the Dresden picture that it was bought for Dresden in 1743 in Venice, but after Venice it came to 1690 from Amsterdam from the bankruptcy of a local banker. At least the agent of the purchase of Algarotti was said to be so, without there being any certainty for it, just as little as a reason for the doubt. It was bought in Amsterdam as Holbein's picture without any objection to its genuineness, so it has its own tradition. However, the exact knowledge of its content was lost because in Venice the family Meier depicted in the picture was thought to belong to the family of the English Chancellor Thomas More, probably by being confused with another Holbein's picture which really represents this family.

From the Darmstädter picture up to the repeatedly touched discoveries of Woltmann (1866) only the [Ch. I.] specified ratios of his last purchase known. But with these discoveries, which are connected with more recent data and have become fatal to the Madonna of Dresden, of which the whole uproar against them now depends (the literal one in Woltmann's case), it is this:

In the frame of the Darmstädter picture there is a double coat of arms, from which the hope could be attached from the beginning, it could refer back to an earlier possession of the picture, therefore I gave a drawing in my historical treatise over the Holbein'sche Madonna, and, as already before me v. Zahn, much trouble in inquiries with experts lost to which family it would like to belong. Woltmann was happier than we were, by bringing out by him one of the two arms of the Dutch family Cromhout; and coincidentally he received from Mr. Suermondt in Aachen the note that a Holbein'sches Madonna picture with several kneeling figures in an Amsterdam auction catalogs of Messrs. Cromhout and Loskart of 1709 occurs, which therefore can only be the Darmstädter picture.

Briefly, the Darmstler copy was in Amsterdam in 1709 in possession of a Loskart associated with Cromhout. By the name Loskart but the bridge is beaten to an older message, which comes from the well-known artist and art writer Sandrart. He reports (1675) that his relative and friend, the Amsterdam artist and Kunstmäler Leblon (Leblond), with whom he lived together for a long time in Amsterdam, from which he could have received exact notice possessed a Holbein'sches Madonna image, whose short Description of our or the Darmstädter picture fits and that Leblon this long before he himself (Sandrart) said farewell to him, (which happened around 1645 or 1646) to an accountant Lössert "on whose earnest request" for 3000 gulden have sold.<sup>1)</sup>, one has to assume that it was the image of Darmstadt, which the Amsterdam Leblon had in his hands, and sold to Lössert. To be sure, the Lössert, on which this sale took place for years before 1645, can not coincide with the Loskart of the catalog of 1709, but certainly with an ancestor of the same, who inherited the picture from him; from which no objection to draw.

<sup>1)</sup> How great this was can be deduced from my compilation of the various spelling of the names which are at all present in the history of our picture, in my histor. Depend on in the naum. Weig. Arch. XIV.

The name Leblon finally links Sandrart's message with the oldest we have of the picture, a message that comes from the place of origin of the picture, Basel itself. It originates from the Basel scholar Remigius Fesch (born in 1595, died in 1667), who reports that one, about three Ulnas basilienses, both width and height measuring picture in which the Meier family before an altar (falsely instead: before a Madonna ), was in the possession of his grandfather, the mayor of Basel Fesch (born 1541, died 1610), who sold it to the Basel councilor Iselin, from whose estate it the Amsterdam artist Leblon about 163, (which year not tendered) bought at 1000 Imperiales, and sold for three times the purchase price. Recent genealogical research, mediated by Mr. His-Heusler, has yielded the interesting result that the grandfather of

the rapporteur, Mayor Fesch, owner of the picture, had a granddaughter of mayor Meier himself, pictured in the picture, according to which the picture is indisputably inherited had come into his possession from the family of founders. However, the rapporteur Fesch himself could not have seen the picture of his grandfather's sale to Iselin when he was only 11 years old, or even spoke of it only vaguely because he describes the picture very poorly and inaccurately. He does not even mention that a Madonna is included in the picture, but instead, remarkably, kneels the figures in front of an altar, which does not appear in the picture, and the dimensions given are not exact, and one might therefore doubt whether his statements refer to a copy of our picture, unless he expressly states that it is the Meier family that is portrayed in it, and the transition to Leblon did not agree with Sandrart. Fesch also mentions that he has the copies of two figures from the picture made by Joh. Ludi in Belgium. It may also be remarked that the above sum of sale of the picture by Leblon and Sandrart is correct, provided that, according to a description and discussion of Algarotti's Imperial, quoted in my hist. Abh., It is not to be translated by Reichstaler but by Reich guilders. if his details refer to a copy of our picture, if he does not expressly state that it is the Meier family represented therein, and the passage to Leblon did not agree with Sandrart. Fesch also mentions that he has the copies of two figures from the picture made by Joh. Ludi in Belgium. It may also be remarked that the above sum of sale of the picture by Leblon and Sandrart is correct, provided that, according to a description and discussion of Algarotti's Imperial, quoted in my hist. Abh., It is not to be translated by Reichstaler but by Reich guilders. if his details refer to a copy of our picture, if he does not expressly state that it is the Meier family represented therein, and the passage to Leblon did not agree with Sandrart. Fesch also mentions that he has the copies of two figures from the picture made by Joh. Ludi in Belgium. It may also be remarked that the above sum of sale of the picture by Leblon and Sandrart is correct, provided that, according to a description and discussion of Algarotti's Imperial, quoted in my hist. Abh., It is not to be translated by Reichstaler but by Reich guilders. Ludi in Belgium had copies of two figures from the picture. It may also be remarked that the above sum of sale of the picture by Leblon and Sandrart is correct, provided that, according to a description and discussion of Algarotti's Imperial, quoted in my hist. Abh., It is not to be translated by Reichstaler but by Reich guilders. Ludi in Belgium had copies of two figures from the picture. It may also be remarked that the above sum of sale of the picture by Leblon and Sandrart is correct, provided that, according to a description and discussion of Algarotti's Imperial, quoted in my hist. Abh., It is not to be translated by Reichstaler but by Reich guilders.

After this there is reason to refer the statements of Fesch and Sandrar to the same picture; and since the picture that came to Leblon was, according to the summary of Sandrart's information with Woltmann's discoveries, the Darmstädter, the return of this picture to the family of founders, and thus the direct historical proof of its genuineness, seems to have been completely successful. For to sum up the previous one: According to Fesch, a copy of the picture (about 163rd) from Iselin's estate goes to the Amsterdam Leblon and is sold to Sandrart (long before 1645) at Lössert. The

same picture can be found later (1709) in the possession of a Loskart associated with Cromhout, which is considered to be the descendant of that Lössert;

The historical data of Algarotti and Sandrart on our picture can be found literally in my historical essay; but they are sufficiently covered by the above. The message of Fesch I follow because of their special importance and peculiarity to their words. (The one on the left of the vertical stroke is undeniably added to the main text on the right, marginal note of the Feschish manuscript.)

Tabula haec fuit avi nostri A °. 163. Suprad. pictor Le Bloud hic Remigii Faeschii Consulis, a vidua et haerdibus Iselii a S. Martinum and Lucas Iselius eam im- tabulam ligneam trium circiter Ulnarum Ba petravit pro legato Regis Galiliensium tum in altitud. tum in longitud. liar. uti ferebat, et persolvit in qua adumbratus praedictus Jac. Meierus pro ea centum coronatos au consul ex latere dextro and cum filiis, ex reos solares anno circ. 1606.- opposito uxor cum filiabus omnes ad vivum	
haso	depicti ad altare procumbentes, unde
Ludi	exempla filii et filiae in Belgio a Joh.
is	pictore ex ipsa tabula depicta. Solvit
Imperiales et	Le Bloud per hac tabula 1000
Medicae	postea triplo majoris vendidit Mariae
Lud. 13	Reginae Galliae, viduae Regis
etmortua.	matri, dum in Belgio ageret, ubi
	Quorsum pervenerite, incertum.

This message is contained in a manuscript set up in 1628 and continued until shortly before the death of the author, in a special section of the same (Pictoria) which lists and briefly discusses a series of Holbein works; but it can not be written until 1631, after a previous date of the manuscript itself (in the Pictoria entrance), where Fesch was no longer exactly familiar with the circumstances of the sale to Leblon in 163. The vagueness of the year 163, which is not written out, for the date of sale, may simply derive from an indistinct recollection which can be explained by the above interval, but the determinateness, as far

as it still takes place in the last digit, in the following, also in other respects notes of interest here, find their explanation. Purchase of famous, in particular Holbein's paintings sent around, to Lyon for 100 crowns around 1633 bought, as the royal council Mr. Monconius (Liergaus) in his letter of 7 Jan. 1638 [has reported to me <sup>2)</sup>.] "In the fourth paragraph it is further stated that the same Leblon had bought the Holbein 's portrait of Erasmus in Basel, in the fifth paragraph the portraits of Meier and Frau von 1516 are discussed, and finally in the above 6th paragraph of the From this, it seems to conclude that this copy of Leblon was either actually bought on the art trip made for the duke, or that Fesch presupposes it, and therefore the year 163 for Basel of the year In 1633, at which time, in 1633, he later arbitrarily transferred Patin, who is based on Fesch, to Basle, but this year, 1633, can not even be accepted for Lyons, and less so for Basel, when Leblon's purchases for the Duke of Buckingham happened<sup>3)</sup> because he was already murdered in August 1628, so all the purchases made for him, including ours, would have been postponed to an earlier date, and would have been due to the fact that he might have been murdered at about the time of purchase, explain why it had not come into his hands but been kept back by Leblon. On the other hand, 163. also agrees very well with the date that Iselin, from whose estate Leblon is said to have bought the picture, died in 1626, and was put on the order of his estate of widow and heirs in 1630, whereupon Fesch could well establish the hypothesis it had come from this rebate. Quite the existing lack of clarity will not be clarified.

<sup>2)</sup> This conclusion is missing in the manuscript.

<sup>3)</sup> That this has really been the case is partly confirmed by the fact that according to Walpole there were really Holbein's pictures in the Duke's gallery, partly according to Sandrart's Acad. P. 382, as according to Sainsbury's Papers pp. 64, 70, 103, Leblon had to procure the purchase of the great Rubens Cabinet and its dispatch to the Duke of Buckingham in the years 1625 and 1627, and thus really acted as agent.

So far, everything seems clear and firm for the one, the Darmstädter image to stand, and of a second specimen, which one could think of the Dresdener, this is not mentioned. But we have not yet considered two notes in Fesch's reports that suggest the existence of such and throw uncertainty into the whole historical side of the question. Fesch first of all makes the picture of what Iselin's estate at Leblon has come to him not so much as Sandrart von Leblon passes over to Lössert, of whom we know that he had possession of the picture of Darmstadt, but of Leblon to the French Queen Maria of Medicis, while she was in Belgium, to be sold. So the context of the previous chain of data does not want to last anymore. Maria de Medicis was the result of conflicts with her son Louis XIII. and his minister Richelieu fled to the Netherlands on July 18, 1631, and remained in precarious conditions in Brussels, until she went to England in 1638 and finally died in 1642 in Cologne. From the

sadness of this contradiction, now between Fesch and Sandrart, that the one whom Leblon had the painting passed into his hands sold to Queen Maria, the other to an accountant Lössert, the reason was sought to elude the genuineness of the Dresden picture now starring, and which we now have to consider more closely. until she went to England in 1638 and finally died in Cologne in 1642. From the sadness of this contradiction, now between Fesch and Sandrart, that the one whom Leblon had the painting passed into his hands sold to Queen Maria, the other to an accountant Lössert, the reason was sought to elude the genuineness of the Dresden picture now starring, and which we now have to consider more closely. until she went to England in 1638 and finally died in Cologne in 1642. From the sadness of this contradiction, now between Fesch and Sandrart, that the one whom Leblon had the painting passed into his hands sold to Queen Maria, the other to an accountant Lössert, the reason was sought to elude the genuineness of the Dresden picture now starring, and which we now have to consider more closely.

As long as one only knew of one specimen, one sought to solve the contradiction by the fact that Lössert only acted as agent of the queen in the purchase of these. But after Woltmann's discoveries showed that the picture bought by Lössert remained in his family, Woltmann and Kinkel came to the following conclusion, which Crowe favorably took up, giving a similar view of Wornum, however, according to Woltmann's discoveries can be considered antiquated. <sup>4)</sup>

<sup>4)</sup> By a modification of Woltmann's view by Br. Meyer later.

The real copy, which came from Basel into Leblon's hands, has doubled under his hands; he had a copy made of it, the real picture there, the copy sold there; these are our two copies. Now, of course, one wonders from the beginning: Did Darmstadt, who had come to Lössert, or the one who had come to Maria, presumably Dresden, be the real one. Woltmann seemed from the beginning to consider the first proved by his discoveries; but Kinkel has objected to the fact that, from a purely historical point of view, just as well could be the last; only on grounds of priority reasons can one opt for the Darmstadt. On the other hand, Fesch, on the contrary, makes the image of Leblon, which originates from Basel, pass to Maria rather than to Lössert; this would be the Darmstadt, rather the leaky copy. However, Woltmann undeniably retains the right to a certain point. The picture which has come from Basel into Leblon's hands will really have been the Darmstadt, not the Dresdener; and even if this does not make it improper, we must first of all give the Darmstädter picture its right, and let the suspicion which arises therefrom against the Dresden provisionally persist, indeed strengthen the exhaustion of the counter-arguments in some points. Namely: for the time being, and even to strengthen the exhaustion of the counter-arguments in some respects. Namely: for the time being, and even to strengthen the exhaustion of the counter-arguments in some respects. Namely:

1) Was one of them the original, the other the copy, so only the first painted can be the original; However, there are far-reaching internal reasons, of which the following sections will be discussed, to consider Darmstädter's painting as the first one to be painted .

2) Fesch says, of course, that the Basel painting was sold by Leblon to Queen Maria, where it could not be Darmstadt, who had come to Lössert. But Sandrart had to know better than Fesch, to whom Leblon sold the real picture. For it can not be assumed that Leblon had deceived his friend and cousin Sandrart by stating the sale of a copy instead of an original to Lössert. On the other hand, Fesch could not know so well in Basel, to whom Leblon in Amsterdam had the original and to whom he sold the copy, as indeed his statements are very inaccurate.

3) In itself it is not unlikely that Leblon had a copy made of the real picture. Holbein's pictures were very much in demand, as is clear from the statements in both Fesch's manuscripts and Sainsbury's Papers, at the time when the purchases and sales of our pictures are playing, and Leblon's character is not suspect-free. For if Sandrart already has a great deal on him, and calls him, among other things, the "Maecenas of all virtue," then this Maecenas of all virtue in Sainsbury's Papers (p.296) is called a mercenary swindler in art-trading matters and gives him an "Amsterdamlike carriage." accused of appearing that Amsterdam was notorious for fraud in the art world. Kinkel also claims that it had to be easier for Leblon

4) Fesch's statement that the picture taken from Iselin's estate to Leblon measured both width and height of "about 3 Ulna basilienses", that is, was quite square, is not exactly correct for one or the other specimen, but better for Darmstadt as a Dresdener. Namely according to the dimensions (here reduced on pr. Foot) v. Zahn's is apart from the attached narrower arch around the width of the Darmstadt copy in the light 3,109, height 3,392 feet, the width of the Dresdener 3,170, height 3,770 feet. Only the former, not the latter, can be considered as equality. In any case, Ulnas must be translated by foot instead of by Ellen.

5) Kinkel still asserts that the oldest news in Fesch and Sandrart only knew of a single genuine specimen, and in the case of the Dresdener even the knowledge of the family represented in it was lost.

Hereby the cause of our Dresden Madonna seems completely lost. Now we are looking for you to win again step by step.

Above all, we do not forget that, if one wishes to adhere to the direct information of Fesch, the picture from the donor family, which in any case is genuine, is not that of Leblon to Lössert, but that which Leblon transferred to Queen Maria, hence the Dresdener is, if that is the Darmstadt. But if one has just cause to mistrust Fesch's direct information in this respect, one has no less just cause in other respects, and hereby we come to points which are sensitive to the view of the adversaries.

If we look back, the main argument of the opponents rests in the fact that, after collecting Fesch's and Sandrart's news, Leblon must have sold one copy of our picture to Lössert, another to Maria de Medicis, and to have been in possession of two copies, of which but only one could be regarded as genuine, in order not to be based on the very unlikely hypothesis that he owned two genuine specimens. But only the first painted one, which is acknowledged to be the Darmstadt, could be the real one.

But what if the whole statement of Fesch, who had been ill-informed everywhere, that the queen in the Netherlands bought one of the copies of Leblon, would be historically unacceptable; then the whole foundation of the hypothesis that the picture had doubled under Leblon's hands coincided, and put other possibilities, indeed probabilities, in the place with which the existence of two genuine specimens still quite agrees. But that's the way it is. The queen may really have bought a copy, just different from Leblon's and at other times when she was in the Netherlands, because there are reasons of negative and positive side together. The thing is that:

After her escape from France during her stay in the Netherlands, where she was supposed to have bought the picture for 3,000 guilders, Fesch, Queen Maria had been so greatly burdened by such great financial embarrassment and political activity that she did not think so well she has had the image to buy a price so dear at that time the means and the interest, an earlier one emphasized by Schäfer, and in my historical treatise with quotes from a life story of the queen as well as from Sainsbury's Papers of Rubens proved circumstance, which is ignored by the opponents in their hypothesis.

Immediately after their escape from France in July 1631, their estates and their body groups were drafted (according to Vie de Marie by T. Arconville III, 355); as early as September, 1631, she (according to Sainsb. Papers p. 161) gave her jewels to bring together means of war against France; It is said (ibid., 168) in a letter, dated July, 1632, of a "daily growing pitiable state" of the same; In 1633, she had to send back a part of her domestics, which had followed her from France, and since she finally did not know how to stay in the Netherlands, she went to England in 1638 to her son-in-law Charles I, without that her state of emergency diminished, and died in 1642 in Cologne in the greatest misery. As long as these points are not refuted historically, Fesch's statement that the Queen in the Netherlands bought an expensive picture from Leblon must be beaten to Fesch's other inaccuracies, which must be invoked by the opponents, if they reject the picture from the family of the founder, contrary to Fesch's explicit statement. from Leblon to Lössert rather than to Maria. If, therefore, the statement that a copy of our picture has ever come to the queen should not be fictitious, which she probably was not, then it must have come to her before her flight, where she was indeed the means and that he might have been interested in his purchase, for it is read (in Sainsb. P.) that she wanted to pay 15,000 pounds for statues in 1630, that is, in the year before her escape. that the queen in the Netherlands bought an expensive picture from Leblon, and was beaten to Fesch's other inaccuracies, to which the opponents also have to invoke, if, contrary to Fesch's explicit statement, the picture from the family of founders is rather borrowed from Leblon to sell as to Mary. If, therefore, the statement that a copy of our picture has ever come to the queen should not be fictitious, which she probably was not, then it must have come to her before her flight, where she was indeed the means and that he might have been interested in his purchase, for it is read (in Sainsb. P.) that she wanted to pay 15,000 pounds for statues in 1630, that is, in the year before her escape. that the queen in the Netherlands bought an expensive picture from Leblon, and was beaten to Fesch's other inaccuracies, to which the opponents also have to

invoke, if, contrary to Fesch's explicit statement, the picture from the family of founders is rather borrowed from Leblon to sell as to Mary. If, therefore, the statement that a copy of our picture has ever come to the queen should not be fictitious, which she probably was not, then it must have come to her before her flight, where she was indeed the means and that he might have been interested in his purchase, for it is read (in Sainsb. P.) that she wanted to pay 15,000 pounds for statues in 1630, that is, in the year before her escape. to which the opponents also have to invoke, if, instead of Fesch's explicit statement, they let Leblon sell the picture from the family of founders to Lössert rather than to Maria. If, therefore, the statement that a copy of our picture has ever come to the queen should not be fictitious, which she probably was not, then it must have come to her before her flight, where she was indeed the means and that he might have been interested in his purchase, for it is read (in Sainsb. P.) that she wanted to pay 15,000 pounds for statues in 1630, that is, in the year before her escape. to which the opponents also have to invoke, if, instead of Fesch's explicit statement, they let Leblon sell the picture from the family of founders to Lössert rather than to Maria. If, therefore, the statement that a copy of our picture has ever come to the queen should not be fictitious, which she probably was not, then it must have come to her before her flight, where she was indeed the means and that he might have been interested in his purchase, for it is read (in Sainsb. P.) that she wanted to pay 15,000 pounds for statues in 1630, that is, in the year before her escape.

Anyway, there has been confusion in Fesch's news. Fesch evidently knew positively only of the existence of the one image inherited from the family of his ancestors, and even of that nothing exact, but they both heard something, one from Leblon, the other from Queen Mary He came, and threw both together, by bringing the thing that had reached Leblon to Maria, whom he knew to be in the Netherlands, where he was an indifferent one; - again a proof of his lack of exactness - also lets die. So instead of a doubling of the one picture by Leblon a collapsing of two pictures by Fesch. But the acceptance of such a collapse is supported by

It should not be forgotten that during her stay in the Netherlands the Queen lived not in Amsterdam but in Brussels; so the copy had to be sold to Brussels; but the picture of Dresden, which is supposed to represent this copy, has come from Amsterdam to Venice, and the opponents' hypothesis demands the new hypothesis that the copy has returned from Brussels to Amsterdam. But a hypothesis loses its hold the more it needs new hypotheses to support it. And if Kinkel argues that "it was easier for Leblon in Amsterdam to attach the copy [for which he keeps the picture of Dresden] of the Queen, who resides in Brussels, than to a Dutchman who lived at Amsterdam, so to speak," So this remark turns only in favor of the Dresden picture, when the same thing with the Darmstadt remained in Amsterdam at the same time. In fact, it had to be hard to hang such a dissimilar copy as an original in the same place where the original was.

Not enough, the second note in Fesch's reports (belonging to the marginal note), which has so far remained unconsidered, also gives us a positive reason for the overwhelming likelihood that the picture from the family of the benefactor was

already in use before the Queen's stay The Netherlands, not at all by Leblon, has come to them, so a doubling by this did not take place. The easiest way to understand this is to look at this note in the context of the notes here from Fesch's reports, for which some of what has already been mentioned must be recapitulated.

The main text of Fesch's, as I said, is sold 163 by the widow and heirs of Lucas Iselin to Leblon, and to Mary, by the donor's family Meier, although Fesch does not even mention that this plaque is in the Own his grandfather. The indisputable later, after later obtained notes of the rapporteur added, marginal note first says, this panel had his grandfather heard, "from which they Iselin according to his (*uti ferebat*) for the Messenger of France about 1606 for the price of 100 gold crowns" , [S. the Latin text above]. Here we have the own statement Iselin's, with which Fesch's statement in the main text is in contradiction, if, according to Iselin, the picture of Iselin himself was obtained during his lifetime around 1606 for the ambassador of France, whereas, according to Fesch's main text, it was not until Iselin's estate at 163 that he had come to Leblon. But Iselin, from whose papers the information could later have been drawn, had to know better than any one for whom he had obtained the picture; and if Fesch proves to be suspicious by the manner in which it is led ("*uti ferebat*"), such a thing was of course very natural for him precisely because of that contradiction with his formerly differently drawn statement. Although the simplest solution to this contradiction seems to lie in it, - and I used to look for it myself, as is still the case with my opponents, with less keen scrutiny, - that the picture sold by Grandfather Fesch to Iselin did not really come to the ambassador of France, for whom it had been obtained by Iselin, but had gone into the estate of Isselin, from which it later acquired Leblon. But I do not want to dispute how probable this view may seem at first sight- and that it remains possible-it is unlikely to do so for the following reasons. If that were the case, Fesch would have found no occasion in the note he received to use the decisive word "*impetravit pro legato*"; indeed, he would have ignored the whole note that the picture should have come to the ambassadors of France, but had not come, or had expressly added the latter to the first,<sup>5)</sup> without him releasing it. According to which one must believe that Iselin really made the statement, and Fesch did not know how to combine it with his earlier statement. This statement, however, can not, according to Fesch's uncertain knowledge of the facts, as an expression of a self-evident hypothesis, be alienated if he considers the picture of Leblon to be the same as that which he knew came from his grandfather to Iselin. and from the purchase of Holbein pictures in Basel by Leblon about 163. from other side had knowledge [s. above], because he could not cope with this any other way than that the image of Leblon was purchased from the estate of Iselin, who died in 1626. For that very reason, the fact that the time of Leblon's shopping in Basle can be traced back to the time of Iselin ' s death is close to true [s. ob.] not as proof of the validity of the statement that Leblon received his copy from Iselin's papers.

<sup>5)</sup> It is not disputed that Patin also became aware of this contradiction, and therefore, when using Fesch's manuscript, leaves the reference to Iselin quite at once.

Note, therefore, that the refutation of the hypothesis that the picture doubled under Leblon's hand is by no means simply based on the evidence of the queen's inability to buy him a copy at an expensive price during her stay in the Netherlands, against which one could still say : "Well, the queen was not able to buy an expensive picture, but reckless and vivacious as she was, she bought it anyway", but can also say against: "A reckless person only wastes, if they something to wastes, and leaves an old interest over a powerful new impetus "; the great improbability of the purchase in question will always persist. But the incompleteness of the refutation based on it alone, it complements itself by relying on Iselin's own statement, on the confusion proved by stating an equal sales price for two ostensibly different purchases, and on the origin of the Dresden copy of Amsterdam instead of Brussels; because all that does not fit the hypothesis.

If the correctness of Fesch's statement in the main text, that the description of Iselin's indulgence came from Leblon, is at least in very strong doubt, there is no other direct indication of his origin in the family of founders and, therefore, one could, from a purely historical point of view, still doubt this origin cheaply, if the note were not available from another side [cf. o.] that Leblon really bought Holbein's pictures in Basel, of which the Darmstädter may have been, and did not prove the authenticity of the Darmstadt copy from other points of view. That the statement about the dimensional relations of the picture in the main text of Fesch's is better suited to the Darmstadt than the Dresden specimens can,

Finally, the following two main views contrast with the historical relationship between the two images. After the opinion of Woltmann and Kinkel <sup>6)</sup> is the image inherited from the Meier family to grandfather Fesch, and thus directly attributable to the family of the founder, the Darmstadt; this was bought from the Fesch by Iselin in 1606 for the ambassador of France, but did not come to it, but later to 163. from Iselin's estate to the Amsterdam Leblon, who sold it to the accountant Lössert, and later reappeared around 1709 in an Amsterdam auction catalog of Messrs. Cromhout and Loskart, of which last to regard as a descendant of that Lössert. The picture of Dresden, however, was made under Leblon's hands as a copy of the Darmstadt, and sold to Queen Maria of Medicis, for whom it had been intended before, while she was in the Netherlands, but later transferred to Venice. Fesch's confusion lies only in

<sup>6)</sup> I can not speak of C.'s (Crowe's) view, as it seems to be a mistake to say: "Lössert's picture is that of the Dresden gallery"; if indeed the Darmstädter picture by the name Loskart in the Amsterdam auction catalog is linked to the former buyer Lössert.

After another, here not as certainly but as probably represented view, the picture inherited from the founding family Meier to Fesch, sold by this to Iselin, is rather the Dresdener. This passed to Queen Maria as early as 1606 by the French ambassador from Iselin, while she was still in France, and from there onward, unknown by any means, to Amsterdam and on to Venice. The other, no less real, specimen, the Darmstädter, was acquired by the Amsterdam Leblon some years before 1630 on the occasion of his purchase of Holbein 's pictures from an unknown Basel property,

made for the (already in 1626) murdered Duke of Buckingham Sold Lössert, then continue as in the previous view. But Fesch's confusion lies in

I gladly leave it to each one to judge the likelihood of the two views according to the most complete documentation available here; I admit that the view put up by me can be a historical novel, but I think the other one is an unhistorical novel.

Of course, the fact that Maria could not have bought a copy of the picture of Leblon did not exclude the possibility that Leblon or his consignor Lössert had arranged a copy which passed into other hands and finally from Amsterdam to Venice; and to admit that the outcome of a genuine original and a copy made therefrom by the same place (Amsterdam) has the likelihood of a causal connection, whereas the outcome of two genuine copies from a place other than the common origin has only the possibility of a coincidental coincidence; the reason for suspicion arising from this is not to be underestimated. In particular, in this regard, a hypothesis is to be taken into account which, knowing the Darmstadt specimen, where it was still thought it was the copy of Dresden, which came into Lössert's hands, was set up in relation to this by Hübner and then also accepted by Woltmann, but has now been taken up again by Bruno Meyer in the following way with regard to the Darmstadt copy. The same was bought by Lössert actually for the Queen, but, when in 1638 left the country and died in 1643, has been kept by him to himself. Thus it can be explained that von Fesch and Sandrart quote the same purchase price for the picture sold after them, respectively, to Maria and Lössert, since both essentially mean the same sale, and one does not need any deceptive doubling of the picture by Leblon, nor at all formation of the picture to assume already around the middle of the 17th century,

If we correct, for the time being, the hypothesis that Lössert retained the picture for himself, not because the queen left the Netherlands, but because the queen could not afford it, but for which nothing matters, it must be acknowledged that in fact, the statement of the same purchase price on the part of Fesch and Sandrart by Meyer's hypothesis as well as by ours stated that this hypothesis is not denied by any decisive counter-reasons, but with considerable probable reasons to put emphasis on it.

It is unlikely that Lössert ever bought the picture for the Queen. Firstly, she simply did not want to buy it after the situation in which she was in the Netherlands; secondly, Sandrart says that Lössert received it from Leblon "on earnest request," which implies Lössert's own interest in the picture; third, Queen Mary is not thought of in Sandrart's account; but Leblon, from whom Sandrart received his information, was not as well aware of the sale of the painting as Fesch, who was far off the mark, that Lössert bought the picture for the Queen, if it was really bought for her, or his friend Sandrart rather, he called the mediator of the purchase the actual purchaser of the painting, especially since he had to know

The statement by Algarotti [s. ob.], as the report of Wright, who saw the picture as early as 1723 in Venice as a traditional Holbeinian picture, about which to compare my historical treatise.

If we finally reduce the opponent's hypothesis to the most general point of view, that only a copy of the real picture has been made in Amsterdam at all, then the following is to be considered: Be it coincidental that once two real copies of our picture have met in Amsterdam, it is the possibility that this coincidence has arrived, not even the slightest fact on the contrary; on the contrary, he could well enter a city that was so art-loving and busy with art, as Amsterdam at that time seemed to have been.

Probably both pictures have been together in Amsterdam for a long time; because the Darmstadt comes to Amsterdam around 163rd through Leblon and finds himself again in 1709 in Loskart's possession in Amsterdam; In 1690, however, the Dresdener transferred from Amsterdam the bankruptcy of a banker to Venice. But expensive pictures are not bought shortly before bankruptcy, but in prosperous conditions; So the Dresden picture was probably in Amsterdam long before 1690.

Next: At least as likely as the emergence of two copies as an original and a fake copy is the emergence of two genuine copies from the following points of view. Our image is by its nature a votive image, what its destiny for the church, at the same time a family image, which claims its purpose for the house. Nothing more natural, then, than that one copy was ordered for the church, another for the house, and nothing more obvious than that both were given to the same artist. Holbein went in 1526 for lack of acquisition of Basel to England; Proof enough that there is not too much employment at the time in which the genesis of both specimens is likely to occur (between 1520 and 1530). why should he have left the repetition to a copyist? Also, some modifications between the two specimens are more easily explained by the presumption of a different determination of two genuine specimens than by the hypothesis that one is a spurious copy of the other. From another point of view, instead of a twofold provision for church and house, one could think of a provision for two different branches of the family; We have also thought of this as well as that, emphasizing the following in favor of the latter view: Already in 1516, before the emergence of our two paintings, Holbein painted a double picture of the founder and his wife, which can be found in the Basel Museum, and of what "simultaneous" (Hübner) or "apparently not much later" (Woltmann) copies exist in the same museum, which originate from the originals from the Fesch collection, and give the assumption that they were intended for two branches of the family; only that, of course, one would ask what brought them together in the same collection. Apart from that, one can believe that the copy to Mayor Fesch was inherited by the daughter Meier's Anna, pictured in the picture, and that the less so would not have been the opposite male offspring of the family without a copy of the family portrait.

However, one might think that the second specimen was later painted for a second purpose by Holbein, who was perhaps no longer present; but, there is no student of Holbein or any other Basel artist known to whom the copy can be trusted, so that such a presumption remains empty.

That in the oldest message in Fesch the knowledge betrays only a genuine copy, can not be noticed, even if there were two. Fesch wrote about a century later, when the pictures, at least the archetype, had been made; only one had passed on to his grandfather, and so it is not surprising that he lost the positive knowledge of the

existence of the other. Or rather, he had knowledge of both, and merely mixed the news of both.

If Kinkel asserted against the authenticity of the Dresden painting, even the correct knowledge of the family represented in it had been lost to Venice, I would not know why it would be more difficult to get rid of a genuine picture that had gone through different hands than a copy issued for it ,

## **VII. The question of authenticity concerning the Darmstadt copy, in particular.**

The fact that the authenticity of the Darmstadt copy of at least its appendix and its main inventory can now be regarded as generally accepted is already discussed in the third section. But what are the reasons on which this consent can be based and supported?

First and foremost, these are historical reasons, if not entirely self-evident. For the direct reduction of the Darmstädter picture to the donor family, which one I thought that I had shown in the previous section that I had achieved this by combining Woltmann's discoveries with the old statements of Fesch and Sandrart, and that it is still very problematical and possibly even transferable to the Dresden copy. at the same time, however, that even with the concession of this transfer, there are still historical notes left, which speak for the purchase of the Darmstädter Bild by Leblon in Basel itself. [Cape. VI.] The Darmstadt copy can no less be called tradition than the Dresdener, as long as it is listed in the Amsterdam auction catalog of 1709 as Holbein's picture.

Secondly, the majority and preponderance of the connoisseur's voices (Hirt, Kugler, Waagen, v. Zahn, Wornum, Woltmann, E. Förster) speaks for the correspondence between the painting style of the Darmstädter painting and the painting of real Holbein pictures, and if a few exceptionally Voices (Brothers K. Förster) have explained themselves in the opposite sense [ch. IV.], It may well be in this and in the previously emphasized and not sufficiently contemplated difficulties of the appraisal that the question be thoroughly examined again from this point of view, but without the objections raised against the validity of the opposing voices [Cape. V.], with the probable expectation of a result different from what has been prevalent so far.

However, the most convincing evidence of the authenticity of the Darmstadt specimen is the reasons for its priority, in which, among many things which are still questionable or only probable in this respect, there are some things that allow a rather certain conclusion.

First and foremost, those who recognize the preference of the Dresdener for the Darmstadt protagonist, which is not the case on all sides, can already find here a considerable probability for the priority of the Darmstadt copy. For it seems to be so easy to let say, in order to copy the Darmstadt copy: the copyist in Darmstädter was not able to achieve the advantage of the Dresdener as: he has improved in the

Dresdener over the original. In fact, however, it is easier to accept the last than the first, since the advantages which the Madonna of Dresden shows before the Darmstadt people are partly due to indeterminable traits, which can not be missed by clumsiness; how such an awkwardness does not prove itself in the rest of the picture.

In the meantime, even more convincing for the priority of the Darmstädter picture appear the differences of arrangement and proportions between the two pictures, provided, in turn, that one recognizes therein an advantage of the Dresdener before the Darmstadt. If we stand before the originals, or even stick to the photographs that are quite sufficient for this comparison, we see from the Darmstadt to the Dresden specimens passing, the Madonna to say so from a room in which the ceiling almost on the crown, enter into such a blanket with a free and high ceiling, and the donor and the founder, kneeling below, relieved of the fear of stinging the support stones (corbels, consoles) hard over their heads at the slightest erection. The Madonna now finds room with both arms in the recessed niche, but before that she could not place one arm in it and pushed it against the supporting stone of the next pillar. Her figure has become slimmer and thus more graceful, and the heads of the figures proportionate to the figures; The mayor, who had crouched earlier, half raised himself and emphasized his folded hands behind the back of the boy kneeling in front of him, and his fur and youthful hair, which had previously flowed together, broke away. In all, however, the advantage is so much on the part of the Dresden specimen that it is difficult to imagine that the artist or copyist had interchanged his relationships with those of the Darmstadt copy, in order to pass from the better to the worse.

Of course, we come here into a peculiar conflict with Woltmann and Meyer, who take the alterations of the proportions in the Dresden picture rather than improvements as deteriorations, and yet draw no less an argument against priority and genuineness of the Dresden picture, if the copyist intention the improvement had turned into the opposite. But they become according to what is stated in chap. It is not easy to find sympathy in it, but rather to reverse one of the reasons for the priority of Darmstadt's image, which otherwise seems palpable to all the world, by reversing it in the opposite direction. But there is another possible objection to commemorate.

In the foregoing we presupposed merely artistic motives for the changes made; but one can ask whether the artist or if it was a foreign copyist, determined it alone. Rather, it is not possible that with the inner proportions of the image content the outer dimensions and proportions of the image have been changed <sup>1)</sup>to almost assume that external motives have at least been effective. In fact, the idea that the painter has enlarged the Dresden picture as a second painting in order to make room for the more advantageous proportions, counteracts the other possibility that he has reduced the image of Darmstadt to the second in a more limited place or to make room. If this was an image for the church that destined the other for the family, then such a need could easily occur in such diverse conditions of space. Well, one thinks well, the purpose could have been achieved without detriment to the proportions by proportionate reduction of all parts of the picture content; but if v. Tooth suspected, the artist had wanted to take advantage of the old carton in the transition

from Darmstädter to the Dresden picture, so of course such a motive of comfort could also be decisive in a transition in the opposite direction. In addition, a uniform reduction in all directions could not be carried out, since the image of Darmstadt, possibly again out of spatial considerations, is more reduced in height than in width by the Dresdener. And if no artist of the modern age could be found who shares Woltmann's and Br. Meyer's taste in favor of the closer assemblage of figures in the Darmstädter picture, then it is nevertheless after what already in the chapter. V. was not accused of claiming to be of any old artist, as close-packed figures appear in so many old pictures,

1) After v. Zahn's determinations in the Darmstädter picture are 1.01 meters in width, 1.12 in the height to the horizontal end, and 1.44 in the apex of the pure semicircle, while in the Dresden picture the corresponding measurements are 1.03; 1,245 and 1.59.

In this regard, let us look once more at the drawing no. 65 (Basel), which we described in Chap. V., it is indeed difficult to ward off a suspicion of the Darmstädter image, and not at the same time to find an aid for the Dresden image in it. For let us remember: high as in the Dresden picture, the dome towers over the crown of the Madonna, and the niche has the full breadth to fully grasp its figure and its surrounding rays. The Madonna stands there free, even slimmer than in the Dresden picture, perhaps depending on the model, which still seems to be the subject of the drawing. Even the knight or citizen has the capital of the pillar in front of which he kneels, high above him. So it is indeed hard to say how Holbein should have come to In his proportions, Darmstadt's picture shrinks between the two pictures with so much freer proportions, ie, the earlier drawing and later the Dresden picture, according to Woltmann, and, as was already noted in V., it is easy to think an old copyist who had not had Holbein's fine sense in this respect, had no conscience to bring the whole composition of the Dresden picture into the Darmstädter. While we also want to note that not only the priority of the drawing in front of the Darmstädter picture is not proven; but that Holbein himself seems to have loved earlier shorter proportions, at least in his characters, more than later,

In any case, I would not like to find the differences in the proportions between the Darmstadt and Dresden pictures on their own quite striking for the priority of the Darmstadt. If the contrary possibility lie further and are less likely to be found, it certainly exists, and will be taken into account in a complete consideration of the pros and cons. The fact that I am not the only one who is not yet able to place any unconditional confidence in the above-mentioned priority grounds for the copy of Darmstadt is proved by the following statement by Hübner after a survey of the Darmstädter picture in 1861: "The Hypothesis that Holbein's painting of this picture first has much to do with impartial examination.

Although there is a little noticed in this respect, yet very noteworthy trivial matter, which seems one to the priority of the Darmstädter picture. Compare the system of the adjoining white head covers of the oldest and middle woman in the Darmstadt

and Dresden pictures. In Darmstädter's picture, the head of the eldest woman is extended so far backwards that it presupposes a huge back of the head of the woman, and that both women's head-sheaths flow together by an almost continuous pull of the boundary into an informal lumpy mass. In the Dresden picture, the head of the old woman, which is still extensive, is reduced to a tolerable level, and gracefully settles against the neighbor's headgear.

In fact, for a long time I was inclined to attach to this triviality, as no other interpretation capable, a much greater weight in the priority question than all the distinctions between the two pictures hitherto touched on. But just that incomprehensibility - just look at the head of the ancients - still gives rise to a completely different idea.

How, if the painter had misconceived the concept of the whole in his attempt to misrepresent the area of the ancestral bonnet in the details of architecture, he would have encountered a so-called *pentimento*<sup>2)</sup>, and he wanted to cover up the mistake briefly and well by extending the hood. Even in the photograph (according to Felsing), which for the time being stands only for comparison, one believes that one can still see the old contours of the same with the Dresdener within the surface, and the extension only as one shaded Paragraph different approach added. Also, by cutting the extension of the hood into the supporting stone above, the symmetry with the mayor's head, which remains slightly below the supporting brick, is penalized. Perhaps a closer examination of the original refutes the view set out here of the covering of a fault by the extension of the hood; then I like to drop her; for now there is still a possibility and is supported by the fact that there seem to be still other *pentimenti*'s around the same place, although these too still demand control, as already stated in Chap. II. Is spoken.

<sup>2)</sup> Perhaps the second *Pentimento*, whose Wollmann in Ch. II. Commemorative, referred to here; but it is not very clear to me after the description and without the view of the picture.

At the same time, however, we can see from the foregoing that of *Pentimenti*, who find themselves in the Darmstädter picture, there is no conclusive conclusion as to their priority, since it is just as probable that a copyist will attempt to shift the content of the picture together, to change the proportions accordingly, or to make something new in a certain sense from the picture, to provide itself at the beginning and then to improve it, rather than that the original artist himself has corrected himself. Since, according to Hübner, a *pentimento* (as yet unspecified) can also be found in the hand of the half-kneeling youth in the Dresden picture [compare chapter II.], One could just as well infer the priority of the Dresden picture from it. But the peculiar nature of a *pentimento* might allow a binding conclusion. And in this regard, Felsing's remark seems to me that the blond hair falling down in the sketch to the white girl in the picture of Darmstadt, under the overpainting, still shines through as a reddish tone [cf. II.], Of very special importance; it will only require a more general statement of the unambiguity of this *pentimento*; for I know of no hypothesis,

however constrained, which refers to it differently than to Holbein himself, and could be explained otherwise than by the precondition of the priority of the Darmstädter picture. Rather still, but only very much obliged to the otherwise unchanged form of the child, one might imagine that the sixth finger on the one hand of the lower naked child [cf. II.

It has still been counted among the priority reasons for the image of Darmstadt that the livelier, more characteristic portrayal of several secondary characters in the Darmstädter picture, especially of the mayor, the middle and younger female figure, reveals a fresher conception, as expected in a first-painted picture, and the In the Darmstadt picture it is easy to interpret the more perfect execution of the rug and the side-things in such a way that someone does not like to take twice the effort of detailed execution of side-things, which do not need too much, or the copyist has not mastered them. Possible that one is right in that; but again not relieved of a different view. In particular I have to contradict those who say that the above figures in the Darmstadt picture are closer to the sketches or study drawings of Holbein's own hand, which are still to be found in the Basel Museum, than in the Dresden picture. In both they are idealized in a sense; in Darmstädter but even more than in Dresden. And so one might also think that the artist or copyist in the second picture takes in this respect only more freedom than the first shows. But the more complete execution of the by-products could be attributed to secondary motives related to the different definition of the two copies, or to the fact that the copyist was strong in this respect. in Darmstädter but even more than in Dresden. And so one might also think that the artist or copyist in the second picture takes in this respect only more freedom than the first shows. But the more complete execution of the by-products could be attributed to secondary motives related to the different definition of the two copies, or to the fact that the copyist was strong in this respect. in Darmstädter but even more than in Dresden. And so one might also think that the artist or copyist in the second picture takes in this respect only more freedom than the first shows. But the more complete execution of the by-products could be attributed to secondary motives related to the different definition of the two copies, or to the fact that the copyist was strong in this respect.

Finally, it may be admitted that each of the historical, artistic, and priority grounds presented here for the authenticity of the Darmstadt specimen, taken alone, still lacks some of the absolute probative value that can not be found otherwise than in a direct and incontestable historical testimony ; but since, in particular, there is already a considerable probability preponderance for each of the three sides, and probabilities in the same direction increase even more than summation, one can confidently consider the authenticity of the Darmstadt specimen justified, and that, very exceptionally by Grüder and Karl Förster against the genuineness of the coloristic execution, raised by Ernst Förster against the genuineness of some parts of the picture,

### VIII. The authenticity issue of the Dresden copy in particular.

The most important objections which can be raised against the genuineness of the Dresden picture presuppose the recognition of the genuineness of the Darmstadt specimen, by allowing themselves to be formulated in this way: if that is genuine, then it can not at the same time be genuine. If the authenticity of the copy of Darmstadt after all that has been said in the previous section is still to be subjected to any doubt, and if absolute certainty can not yet really be settled, it would be a weak and ineffective defense of the Dresden specimen to refer to the doubtfulness of the authenticity of the Darmstadt specimen. Its genuineness, on the contrary, is now to be regarded as generally accepted, and so, too, we submit the condition of the same to the following, which allows us to give weight to many objections that they would not otherwise have and, in the event of an upheaval, lose sight of the Darmstadt specimen, which was not to be expected. Incidentally, it is not the certainty, but only the predominant probability of the authenticity of the Dresden specimen, which we try to emphasize by weighing the following reasons and counter-reasons.

Historically speaking from the outset the tradition in favor of the Dresden specimen; only tradition is no proof; on the historical side, the objection discussed in the sixth section remains that the Dresden picture came from Amsterdam just as the Darmstädter did, and that it is easier to imagine that it was made in Amsterdam as a copy of the true Darmstadt than as accidental two real copies met there. In the meantime I have already stated that such a coincidence has nothing improbable, that the creation of two genuine specimens has at least as much probability as that one is a fraudulent copy of the other, and that the closer discussion of the historical data makes a direct reduction of the Dresden picture to the family of the founders even more likely than that of the Darmstädter, to which I do not return here. On the historical grounds, therefore, the Dresden picture is not only not at a disadvantage against the Darmstadt, but would remain in favor against the Mitzuzieh the priority reasons, which give the historic reasons for the Darmstadt only the support.

Approaching the manner of painting of the Dresden picture, I do not know what emerges from the hitherto contradictory judgments of the same. 4] had pointed out striking against the authenticity of the Dresden picture. For the time being, one can only find it questionable that there seems to be a great difference between the painting of both pictures, if we follow the judgments of Waagen, Grüder, Woltmann, Wornum, Karl Förster, Bruno Meyer, and afterwards ask if that Dresden image can still be attributed to the hand of the same artist, as the Darmstadt. But firstly, some of the differences are only apparent, depending on the existence of the Vistula in the Darmstädter picture. Second, Grosse, a professional artist, certainly does not disparage his judgment. the color technique between the two pictures is not so different as it should be considered after those authors; thirdly, the differences between the more heavily stained color and the more laborious treatment of the Darmstadt picture compared with the freer, easier treatment in Dresden, which surely can not be removed, are due to a greater ease which the artist has acquired in the meantime between the emergence of both pictures , perhaps informally enough

explain; and even a different definition of both pictures for church and house could influence the treatment. Whether the more exact investigation of the color ratios to be expected at the Holbein exhibition will not aggravate or even weaken the above doubts must be shown by the sequence. when they should be kept after those authors; thirdly, the differences between the more heavily stained color and the more laborious treatment of the Darmstadt picture compared with the freer, easier treatment in Dresden, which surely can not be removed, are due to a greater ease which the artist has acquired in the meantime between the emergence of both pictures , perhaps informally enough explain; and even a different definition of both pictures for church and house could influence the treatment. Whether the more exact investigation of the color ratios to be expected at the Holbein exhibition will not aggravate or even weaken the above doubts must be shown by the sequence. when they should be kept after those authors; thirdly, the differences between the more heavily stained color and the more laborious treatment of the Darmstadt picture compared with the freer, easier treatment in Dresden, which surely can not be removed, are due to a greater ease which the artist has acquired in the meantime between the emergence of both pictures , perhaps informally enough explain; and even a different definition of both pictures for church and house could influence the treatment. Whether the more exact investigation of the color ratios to be expected at the Holbein exhibition will not aggravate or even weaken the above doubts must be shown by the sequence. thirdly, the differences between the more heavily stained color and the more laborious treatment of the Darmstadt picture compared with the freer, easier treatment in Dresden, which surely can not be removed, are due to a greater ease which the artist has acquired in the meantime between the emergence of both pictures , perhaps informally enough explain; and even a different definition of both pictures for church and house could influence the treatment. Whether the more exact investigation of the color ratios to be expected at the Holbein exhibition will not aggravate or even weaken the above doubts must be shown by the sequence. thirdly, the differences between the more heavily stained color and the more laborious treatment of the Darmstadt picture compared with the freer, easier treatment in Dresden, which surely can not be removed, are due to a greater ease which the artist has acquired in the meantime between the emergence of both pictures , perhaps informally enough explain; and even a different definition of both pictures for church and house could influence the treatment. Whether the more exact investigation of the color ratios to be expected at the Holbein exhibition will not aggravate or even weaken the above doubts must be shown by the sequence. which, in the meantime, the artist has acquired, perhaps unconstrained enough, between the creation of both images; and even a different definition of both pictures for church and house could influence the treatment. Whether the more exact investigation of the color ratios to be expected at the Holbein exhibition will not aggravate or even weaken the above doubts must be shown by the sequence. which, in the meantime, the artist has acquired, perhaps unconstrained enough, between the creation of both images; and even a different definition of both pictures for church and house could influence the treatment. Whether the more exact investigation of the color ratios to be expected at

the Holbein exhibition will not aggravate or even weaken the above doubts must be shown by the sequence.

In this investigation, of course, it would be important, by comparison with other Holbein pictures, to know exactly the time in which the first copy was made and the interval between the origin of both pictures; but already in the IV. is the contradictions that exist between the authors; without a decision in between. <sup>1)</sup> In this regard, it seems to me to be an important suggestion to compare the appearance of the mayor's old age in Holbein's portrait or the drawing of it from 1516 with its aging appearance in the drawing to our picture (all still present in Basel), according to which I, like Wornurn, a time around or just before 1526, when Holbein first went to England <sup>2)</sup>, as the most probable date of origin of the first copy hold. As Holbein later returned to Basel several times for a longer or shorter stay, namely in 1529 (from the beginning of September 1529 to October 1531) and (probably for a shorter time) in 1538, during one of these periods of residence in Basel he may well be the second After painting, his painting style had time to change.

<sup>1)</sup> I have a compilation of the views of these authors with their motives in my historical treatise in Weigel's Arch. XII. 247 (Separatabdr. P. 56).

<sup>2)</sup> If Woltmann is right against Grimm, who has 1524 for it.

While in the portrait as well as in the drawing of the man of 1516 the sharp firm features still have the appearance of a strong manhood, the man of the drawing to our Madonna-picture in his more hazy features already bears the stamp of an incipient old age <sup>3)</sup> so that, while I appraise the man of the drawing and the painting from 1516 to 46 to 50 years, I would not like to estimate the man of the drawing for our picture under 58 to 60 years, which lay the first origin of our picture between 1524 and 1530 which would be considered unlikely, according to the mode of extremes. According to the portrayal of the mayor in our picture itself, one should not judge here how scales do it; on the contrary, the drawing alone can be authoritative for the nature against which the man in the picture seems to be greatly rejuvenated, and that is what I have been able to judge, in the Darmstädter a little more than in the Dresdener.

<sup>3)</sup> This is to be judged quite well, even after Braun's photographs, which, according to a comparison made in Basel by myself with these photographs, seem to correctly reflect the age relationships.

If the deviation between the manner of painting the two pictures in relation to the probable intermediate time of their creation should be found too great to attribute both pictures so easily to the same artist, I mention for the purpose of weakening a reservation that is to be taken from me (hand in hand) note that within a few years Albrecht Dürer has so completely changed the treatment in his engravings that without historical assurance and the underlying drawings one could not believe that they stem from the same master; and thus, according to Holbein, an artist so

thoroughly versed and through such changing circumstances of life, something similar could have happened as to his mode of painting.

First, Kugler asserted in the child's body as well as in the Madonna of Dresden's picture of undermining greenish semitones, which do not occur in the Darmstädter picture, as not being in tune with Holbein. In the meantime, one would first have to be able to state to which artist they are better off before arguing against Holbein. Who can know if Holbein did not even want to produce a special effect with it? Even Waagen commemorates it without making an argument against Holbein.

Schafer thinks that it must not be discounted that the Carnation shades of the picture, which was originally reliably painted in tempera, may have been given a more thorough appearance by later, so-called varnishes, which they did not originally have ... Even the white, partly Linnenen, partly veiled garment parts and the delicately treated fur work was probably also involved in the effect, also be thereby the touched by Kugler "" cool reddish light parts in the Carnation "" only emerged ".

In the meantime, Schäfer's view of the Dresden picture as a tempera picture in general was v. Tooth has been found unsustainable, and no one else has sought from the previous judges the reason of the above peculiarities in a change through the varnish - I miss myself every judgment in this regard, - Schäfer's view on this very problematic, but one expressly directed refutation be desired.

With regard to the proportions of the content of the picture and the treatment of architecture, I believe to have shown in (in the fifth section) that the objections drawn by Woltmann and Br. Meyer have no weight, and that the comparison with other Holbein's Madonna pictures especially with the Holbeinian hand drawing No. 65 of the Basel collection, which is analogous to our picture, and which rather comes to terms with the authenticity of the Dresden copy than it contradicts. Holbein, in his Madonna pictures, does not like the depressed conditions that we find in the Darmstädter rather than the Dresden pictures; and if one can expose this and that to the architecture in the Dresden picture, other pictures give Holbein's reason to stress even more.

In the view of the Madonna of Dresden Kugler misses the "energetic" character and Wornum the "natural force" which one has to expect from Holbein in presenting it ; the latter finds them "weakly idealized" and Woltmann recently "somewhat softened".

In the meantime, one only has to look around among the other Madonna pictures of Holbein's to find himself surprised by the fact that, although Holbein's Christian children are generally gay and energetic, Holbein's Madonnas are by no means all, but not a few, a sad one , almost whiny creature, in which respect I refer in my own opinion to the original sketch from Basle to the (now overpainted) organ grand pianos (Basel No. 76. Braun No. 32. 23), the Basel hand drawing No. 30 (Braun 58), the title page to the Freiburg city rights and the two Madonnas on the double image in the Freiburg Munster refer.

There is more to it if one finds the idealistic grace displayed by the Dresden Madonna not quite in the character of Holbein's representations, indeed, according to Kugler's, accepted by Woltmann and Meyer, the term relatively "modern". In fact, one rarely encounters the character of graceful beauty otherwise in Holbein; but that

he was not incapable of expressing it is proved by the charming sketch and the portrait of Frau Meier of 1516 (Basel No. 6. 14. Braun 46. 132), and the Venus with Amor known well reproduced by Weber's engraving Portrait of the Offenburger from the year 1526 (Basel No. 23. Braun No. 135<sup>4)</sup>), which latter also v. Zahn in this respect claims to look over his remarks in the file. In these cases real figures were lost; but also the depiction of our Madonna will have been replaced by a living model, only idealized by Holbein. It has even been suggested several times, a supposition, which I certainly do not share, that the Offenburg woman herself had been this model.

4) However, according to Braun's photography, which, for once, is not enough, it is difficult to judge.

The expression as well as the impression of the modern is too vague at all to draw a sharp inference in our question. Let it be admitted that the head of the Dresden Madonna really has a more modern character than the Darmstadt, but who wants to say, whether too modern for the much-traveled Holbein. Which, after all, weakens even the objection, and does not hold it upright, inasmuch as the manner of depiction of the Madonna of Dresden must, in a certain sense, be counted among the exceptions for Holbein.

Against this v. Tooth [s. The papers emphasize the fact that in the Dresden Madonna, for whom he designs a model other than the Darmstädter, the essential merits of the "Darmstadt" and the "most characteristic facial features" are more pronounced than in the Darmstädter Holbein had gone beyond his predecessors and contemporaries, united with a German character which had been relied upon by his followers, who were more of an Italian type, and thus could not be called a contemporary to whom we had that higher artistic level nor are they entitled to deny Holbein's authorship of the Dresden picture, nor deny the preference of the latter for the Dresden picture. "

If there is nothing in any of the above that is striking against the genuineness of the Dresden picture, it could be sought in the following detail, which Woltmann really asserted in this sense with the consent of Meyer.

The dress of the Darmstadt Madonna was originally light blue, but has become bluish green due to the yellow varnish. The Dresdener is also after the liberation of old varnish (by restoration in 1840) green. How should this "contrary to tradition" color of the Madonna dress have arisen, if not the copyist from misunderstanding the green color of the dress from the original in his copy taken over. And no obstacle to thinking it; for at Leblon's time, in which, if not later, the copy may have originated; About 100 years after the origin of the archetype, the varnish must have experienced its change long ago. The suspicion occasionally voiced and motivated by Prof. Hübner against me, but that the dress of the Madonna of Dresden had originally been greenish blue and only turned green by a change of the dye, has proved untenable after a later communication by a more recent investigation. [S. Hübner in the files].

Let us also admit its weight to this objection, and recognize Woltmann's ingenuity in having set it up, but give her the right to counter-considerations.

For the first, the dress of the Darmstadt Madonna is comparatively light bluish green, but the Dresdener is completely and purely dark green; rather, the copyist would not have copied the color, and thus the whole objection seems to be falling apart from the beginning. Against this it may be remarked that the darkness of the green in the Dresden picture may have been created only by darkening, and that the copyist in the bluish green of the original could have found the occasion to paint the dress green at all, but now that he was not at all strictly adhered to the original, immediately pure green painted. But why, if the copyist did not strictly adhere to the original, he did not prefer to go all the way blue, since to such a trained artist the typical color of the Madonna's dress, which, 100 years after Holbein, may well be considered stationary, but could not be unknown. Is not it much more likely that the original artist himself had a motive to make the dress blue and the other green? and it will be easier to think of such a thing, as at Holbein's time the convention regarding the color of the Madonna's gown was not so firm. For far away that it was always painted blue, one finds it in pictures from that time also red, also knows, also goldbrokaten At the time the convention regarding the color of the madonna's gown was not so firm. For far away that it was always painted blue, one finds it in pictures from that time also red, also knows, also goldbrokaten At the time the convention regarding the color of the madonna's gown was not so firm. For far away that it was always painted blue, one finds it in pictures from that time also red, also knows, also goldbrokaten<sup>5)</sup>, and the fact that green had been excluded from the colors of the Madonna's gown would certainly still have to be proved. By the mere inspection, one can even find enough green Madonna dresses from that time; Visit only in this regard the old German rooms in the Dresden and Leipzig Museum; indeed, in a picture of our Holbein himself, the Freiburg double image, even both Madonnas wear a green dress; only that, of course, there is the suspicion that the green in all these cases was first formed from blue by a yellowed varnish or a voluntary change of color, for which it can be stated by name that the green, at least in most (not all) )<sup>6)</sup>Cases, still showing a sting in the blue; but I do not find a thorough investigation of it (taking into account, in particular, the color of the sky) from either Woltmann or elsewhere, and only such an argument could support it.

<sup>5)</sup> Evidence of this can be found, inter alia, in Förster's monuments. Although the coat was mostly blue in a non-blue dress, that too was not always the case. So the Maria in the Rosenhag sits by Martin Schongauer to Colmar in a red coat and light red dress there. Therefore Riegel rightly adds in his German Art Studies (p. 245) to an example (on the Bosweiler altar in Speyer), where the Madonna wears a golden dress with a green coat over it, the remark: "and we have another new one here Proof to the innumerable earlier that the old masters painted according to their artistic feeling, but not according to arbitrary church regulations. "

<sup>6)</sup> So I remember a picture of an unknown old German master in a corner of the Dresden gallery (No. 1830), where the Madonna wears a very black green dress without a trace of blue.

Be that as it may, Holbein was, as Woltmann himself admits, certainly not the man to be bound by a convention which, at least in his day, was not very binding, if he had a special motive, green instead of blue for dress to apply Mary in one of the two pictures, and I have already said that one thinks of it.

Verily, in his Madonnas and holy women, Holbein often depicted personalities in which, according to age, physiognomy, and (at least in one example) secular clothing, one can see nothing but women or daughters of the orderers or founders of the picture (such a Madonna, Basel No. 41, Brown No. 64. and St. Elizabeth, Basel No. 35); Brown No. 63); and it is all the more likely that a similar case will exist in our Meierian Madonna image, as it enters into an interpretive view likely from other reasons. Looks still the portrait-like still through the features of our Madonna, and the already emphasized similarity of the same with the kneeling below adolescent youth or boy <sup>7)</sup> speaks also for the fact that a female member of the family is represented in her idealized. But after this it is very conceivable that Holbein, in one of the pictures of the Madonna intended for the church, gave her the more usual blue dress, and in the other, the picture of the house, the green state dress which the person in question wore. In fact, according to Holbein's Basel costume figures (Basel No. 49-34, Braun 27-32, also by de Mechel), the parallel-folding garb, which wears the Madonna, was a Basel women's costume of the time <sup>8)</sup>, while at least in a similar regularity otherwise not to be found in Holbein's Madonnas and holy women.

<sup>7)</sup> In a previous treatise (Naum, Weig., Arch., XII, 19), I noticed that the resemblance in question appeared even more conspicuously in the Darmstadt than in the Dresden pictures. This judgment, based on the idea of an imperfect original photograph of the Darmstädter picture, I would not like to represent according to the original.

<sup>8)</sup> However, the dress in the Holbein costume figures generally appears of lighter material, all the kind of pleating which matters here is, in particular, essentially the same in one of the ladies of Basel as in our picture.

If one considers all this too farfetched, then the very simple hypothesis stands to bid, Holbein had, after he first tried the red of the belt around on a blue dress, meant the Dresdener, the red would like even better on a green (here without his dimming to be presented) except dress and before the prohibition of today's art archaeologists back then had no fear.

Can I not say that Woltmann's suggestive objection is downcast, because he is still possible to persist, and I believe I can say that afterwards he can no longer be regarded as resounding. And could not somebody now, as they say, reverse the tables and say: Holbein has his good motive to give the Madonna, who should not even imagine a mere Madonna, a green dress: a copyist, however, meant to correct the master and how he made of the dull child of the Madonna, for which Holbein also had good cause, a smiling Christ child, because he thought that no other would send

himself to a Madonna, and for the same reason a blue one for the green dress of the original given. In short, a pure misunderstanding of the artist's intention.

I would indeed say so, if not positive reasons outweigh in favor of the authenticity of the Darmstädter picture. But even with respect to the Dresdener predominate such.

To conclude the series of objections raised against the Dresden specimen, the following must be remembered, Br. Julius Lessing (art writer in Berlin) raised comment.

"The Dresden carpet shows the Persian pattern pervaded with rounded patterns that have nothing to do with the character of the whole, but rather belong to the Renaissance and have occurred in this form at the earliest in the second half of the 16th century a thoroughly faithful copy of a genuine Persian rug, a new, certainly surprising, proof that the Dresden Madonna derives from a careless and stylistically unprepossessing copyist.

Now that I no longer stand before the originals, I can not find any striking difference in the predominance of round patterns between the two, on the mere comparison of the carpet in the photographs of both pictures; but the difference may be clearer in the originals or clearer to others, and so Lessing's remark would merit attention if one knew on what evidence of the comparison of rugs of the time before, around, and after Holbein's time his remark rests; but what does one do with such a fleeting remark, which gives no assurance that the investigation was not as fleeting as the remark, and what the pertinence of the inquiry will even be to make the objection fully valid, if it were already admitted that such roundish patterns are to be found as early as the second half of the sixteenth century, whereas the genesis of the Dresden picture, assuming its authenticity, is to be sought in the first half of this century. So let's wait and see if the objection can be justified even better than before.

By the foregoing, I believe I have taken account of all the opposing points, outer and inner, which have been raised against the genuineness of the Dresden picture, and the result of this is that there were some reasons for doubting the genuineness of it, but not for denying it. If such exist, they must still find each other; and when Br. Meyer said that the Dresden picture was "without any question later copying, without a stroke of Holbein's hand," he did not ask for much about what counts in the question.

Let us now attach to the grounds of probability, which were already asserted against the authenticity of the Dresden picture for the same reasons, some noteworthy reasons, even if for their part they are not completely convincing.

From the beginning is of scales, v. Zahn, Hübner, even Woltmann, against the possibility of seeing a copy of the Darmstädter in the Dresden picture, had been asked that no copyist would have allowed such great changes as the Dresden copy shows against the Darmstadt. Of course, this reason can not simply be considered binding, since old painters, as well as engravers, often allowed for very significant changes to the pictures on whose copy they were involved, as is known, inter alia, from Rubens; or at least it is unthinkable that a great artist of an original character, who was reluctant to keep himself anxious about the original, sought to do something from the Holbeinian basis which he liked, something he liked even more. In the

meantime it was indisputable not to deceive in all of the examples given here - whoever wants to spend a false cash register, does not intentionally do it wrong - and thus the recklessness comes against the original, with which the alterations in the Dresden specimens happened, albeit in the most abrupt way Against the view that the copy of Dresden was a copy made by a fraudulent art dealer, but in particular after a remark made earlier against the main hypothesis of the opponents, that the copy was made in Amsterdam. For, as the Dresden picture with the Darmstadt artist at the same time remained in Amsterdam, and, as it seems, for a long time. VI. Ch.], The fraud could either not happen from the beginning or not go undetected. In general, however, the changes between the Darmstädter and the Dresdener pictures are such that they are rather for the independent interest and love of an artist who seeks to surpass himself in resuming the same task than for the profit-seeking intention of an art dealer or the adoptive Interest of a foreign artist seem to speak. Before a foreign artist makes such changes, he prefers to paint a new picture. Even Woltmann himself did not change that in the past. seem to speak for the profit-seeking intent of an art dealer or the adoptive interest of a foreign artist. Before a foreign artist makes such changes, he prefers to paint a new picture. Even Woltmann himself did not change that in the past. seem to speak for the profit-seeking intent of an art dealer or the adoptive interest of a foreign artist. Before a foreign artist makes such changes, he prefers to paint a new picture. Even Woltmann himself did not change that in the past.

If, on the other hand, our picture is a copy of the Darmstadt made in the Netherlands, then a Dutch artist would have to be trusted to trust it, since it is the source of all that in which it reaches the Darmstadt, and in which it surpasses it a significant and independent artist's greatness, which could not easily have been hiding; but she has remained in hiding. As little as in Basle can one find in the Netherlands, or find any other artist than Holbein himself, on whose account the Dresden picture could be written with any probability; in vain did his opponents look around for it in all the halls of art history; and now it is very difficult to claim a significant effect without being able to find the operative. The embarrassment of the opponents in this respect is best shown by the fact that Wornum, of whom one can not deny a comprehensive knowledge of art, has been able to guess at none other than Ludi or Lodi, who according to a statement in the Fesch's manuscripts copied two figures of the picture for Fesch, since it was still in the Netherlands; and why should not Wornum, if he thought the picture was unreal, make a guess about this external circumstance? Also, Wornum seeks to vindicate this Ludi his place in art history (see Wornum under the files). However, Mr. His-Heusler writes that this assumption is "ridiculous", those copies of Ludi are still present in Basel, but "a very small piece of work", as Woltmann (Holbein II. 393) commemorates them as "very mediocre copies". Although this can not err, but rather reinforces Wornum, since he also explains the Dresden picture only for the machinations of a copyist of subordinate rank; but others would like to be wrong. But Woltmann himself admits frankly, "that we still have no trace of copyists who were able to paint a pasticcio of this excellence, which deceived the public for years, to the present day."

Finally, two little things, one of which seems remarkable, the other important.

The chin of the Darmstädter Madonna in Dresden picture a quiet doubling, a lower jaw added. What could cause a copyist to do it? But Holbein himself also has two Madonnas with lower jaw, once the Solothurn Madonna and secondly the Madonna of the Baseler Handzeichnung no. 64 Braun 81, both cases where the lower chin has gone from a living model to the representation of the Madonna; for in Solothurn's Madonna, according to Woltmann's valid remark, Holbein's own wife is recognized again, and the hand-drawing no. 64 portrays a solid, friendly, decent woman of some 60 years as a portrait of Madonna and Child. Now you can either imagine or it was only added to the model of Holbein to emphasize the motherly character of the Madonna all the more. However, it is at least unlikely that a foreign copyist in this peculiarity happened to meet Holbein. It would be even more unlikely if Madonnas with lower jaws were absent except Holbein; but after a long look around I found one of Rubens and one of Albrecht Dürer. After all, there are rarities.

<sup>9)</sup> In this sense, v. Tooth in his written expose (sd files) the chin claimed.

The other trifle, which I attribute much greater weight, is this:

The child of the Darmstadt Madonna smiles, the Dresdener makes a gloomy face. What on earth could induce a copyist to turn the smiling Christian child into a sad, ill-looking child. Wornum says it happened because of the clumsiness of the copyist. This is impossible because the difference in appearance depends on palpable undisputed features. The most important of these is that the corners of the mouth of the Darmstädter child are upwards, those of the Dresdener downwards, both only softly but firmly; besides, this one has a natural, this one morbidly distributed flush of the face; Also, the eyes of the Darmstadt child seem to be more open.

v. Tooth notes, of course, that the question as to whether an original difference of color in the head and body of the child exists on both specimens can not be decided in the present state of the Darmstadt specimen, in view of the obscuring varnish, and doubts that such to accept. But the different distribution of redness of the face, as I believe I have found it, can be judged without regard to the darkened varnish.

While the Darmstädter child gives the impression of blushing a healthy child, the face of the child in the Dresden copy gives the impression of being red-stained for the first sight. I tried to make myself more certain of what this impression depended on, and found that the blush had withdrawn partly more about the eyes, partly more on the lateral parts of the cheeks, leaving the greatest curvature of the cheeks free. And that I am not mistaken in regard to this abnormal distribution of flushing, it proves that a doctor, dr. Br., Who independently gave me the remark of the same as a sign of a sickly appearance, after having looked more closely at the picture, without, however, drawing any particular attention to this sign, which I had previously noticed. Here, so to speak, a medical diagnosis of a sickly condition, which seems all the more striking, if one compares the healthy flushing of the lower child in the same specimen with it. In the meantime, since in view of the difference of the upper children of both specimens in this respect the control by the direct comparison and side of others, which I expressly provoke, is still wanting, and one sees only too easily what one wishes to see I weight less until this is confirmed by others. Maybe I was mistaken about a difference between the two in this respect. The difference between the upper and lower child of the Dresden specimen, however, about which I can not have been mistaken,

Several, with whom I have spoken independently of each other, still want to find a wistful train through the smiling expression of the Darmstadt child; It is possible, but I think that it is no more so than I myself, because of my previous acquaintance with the view of the sick child, to be sufficiently impartial to make a judgment in this regard. It would be quite unimaginative to ask.

Now no bungler can miss the direction of the corners of the mouth, let alone a master who has been able to reproduce the lower child in such fidelity and perfection. So a definite intention must have been undermined by the change of expression. Every impartial will admit that. But one is simply not to be found in a foreign scribes, however, it is easy to find at the original artist if you do not want to close on purpose when you search only the eyes. Wornum also wrote down what he wrote only because he knew nothing better and did not examine the nature of the change in more detail. But do the other opponents, Woltmann, Kinkel, Crowe, Meyer, know something better? I have found nothing. In part, they reflect Wornum's view in other words, partly they ignore the objection. But is he less present?

If at least one of both pictures is a copy of someone else's hand, then only Darmstädter can be this copy, because a copyist's copy is quite well the child of the Dresden Madonna too sickly for a Christ child, but not the child of the Darmstadt Madonna too little sickly for a Christ child could appear. Yes, I would here see an almost stringent proof of the priority of the Dresden picture, given the change in the color of the Madonna's gown from one picture to the other, if not the interpretation of the child, which is so probable for other reasons sick child or in the double role as Christ child and sick child would stand at bidding, which the opponents may accept no more than some representatives of the authenticity of the Dresden picture; but it would be necessary to remember that they thus resist the strongest objection to the possibility of maintaining the priority of the Darmstädter picture and give room to the strongest suspicion against its authenticity. Against this it can be said that the change in the expression of the child gives proof of the genuineness of the picture of Dresden and its interpretation, because a plausible account of it can only be given by the solidarity of the two.

In fact, if the picture is a votive picture for the Madonna's healing of a sick child, and in the child in her arms that sick child either par excellence, or, according to Holbein's otherwise proven inclination to double roles, the Christ Child with the features of the sick one Child, for whom the picture has been endowed, where I have the choice, so Holbein could well once the expression of the delightful healing care of the Madonna in the smile of the child, even in the Darmstädter picture still miserable and depressed enough child, to prefer a second time to the expression of the miserliness of the child to the laughing expression of the child dismissed below as healed; and since the artist could not present both at the same time in the same picture, he allowed both images to complement each other. On the assumption that there is a double role, it could also be assumed that the artist once rather made the character of the Christ child, the rest of the sick child, stand out. whereas, if one wants to touch the genuineness of the Dresden picture or that interpretation, one can not give an account of the change of the smiling Christ child into a sick child at all.

The view of the sick child (of others, rather than dead, taken) appears in various modifications. Some speak only of the upper child as a sick child at all, to which reference, here is basically sufficient, but one can also make the more specific conjecture that in the picture the healing of the sick little arm caused by the Madonna takes place twice. As the same left arm, which is shortened from the upper child, is even stretched out with dull glances in the Dresden specimens (which contradicts the customary interpretation of a blessing hand), it is equal to the lower, equally naked, held in the same privileged light curly-haired, same-blond, alike the halo, but healthy and full-looking children are stretched out with their fixed glares. This is the interpretive view, at least in part three times independently of one another, namely, that of Mrs Jameson, Blake, and Jacobi, which I myself, as the most probable - for certainty should not be talked about in these matters - have represented only with the modification.<sup>10)</sup> that, according to analogous examples of double roles in ancient art and Holbein in particular, I have the possibility of a double role of Christ child and sick child (the Christ child in the form of the sick child, for whose healing the picture has been donated) and of Madonna and mother of the child<sup>11)</sup>. The fact that in v. Ch. the short described Holbein's drawing no. 65<sup>12)</sup> that a miracle of salvation on the left arm of an ill-looking child is effected by a Madonna in a niche with shell curvature, suggests from another side that she is a preliminary sketch of our picture, without much of it, as I have already remarked Weight put. But the appeal to the fact that it is the old art, at all remote, to put a sick child in the arms of the Madonna, is refuted in any case, since here even an example of Holbein's hand is present<sup>13)</sup>; and the comparison of the upper child, be it in the Dresden or Darmstadt pictures with other Holbein's Christian children, whom Woltmann himself calls restless little boys, makes it difficult to see a Christ child in it. That the same person appears twice in the same picture is very common in ancient art, and Holbein himself gives some other examples of it. That the lower child appears a little larger than the upper one can be considered a realistic and stylistic expression for the meantime of healing.

<sup>10)</sup> Cf. above Naum.-Weig. Arch. XII. P. 1. XIV. P. 71. XVI. P. 35 and v. Zahn's Jahrb. 1st year 1868. p. 142. 156.

<sup>11)</sup> Why what o. Is said is true. One would see a daughter of Meier's from a previous marriage in the Madonna, - as Meier had been married several times, according to recent investigations by His Heusler, - in the child, therefore, a grandchild of Meier's.

<sup>12)</sup> Please pay attention to this drawing (under No. 34 of the Braun Collection of Basel Photographs) at the forthcoming Holbein exhibition, as it is of interest here for other points of view that were previously asserted.

<sup>13)</sup> The really very peculiar interpretation of the drawing, which Woltmann in s. Holbein II. 446, on the contrary, I believe in v. Zahn's Jahrb., 1868, 139.

Occasionally the remark that I can not share the opinion of those who regard the question of interpretation as indifferent as to the aesthetic-artistic judgment of the picture. If the upper child is a sick child, it is an admirable masterpiece in regard to its successful characteristics, which in its kind offers the child only a contrary pole to the Sixtina; if it is to be a Christ child and nothing more than such, it is at the same time a weak work, in view of its very misleading characteristic, as well as the characteristic of the other Christian children of Holbein's completely contradictory, that is, also historically unexplainable

character. This is true of the Darmstadt child, despite his smile, in regard to his whole habitus and depressed being, scarcely less than by the Dresdener, which at least pre-empted the advantage of a uniform realization of the characteristic missing in the whole. Yes, the judgment about the whole composition of the picture must change after the interpretation. According to the old view held by the opponents, they can only be found to be tricky, capricious, and incomprehensible, according to the preceding, in view of the fact that the double representation of the same person in the same picture did not offend Holbein's time, of witty invention and apt execution. But those who have claimed the strangest and most forced explanations, especially for the purpose of the lower picture, it looks like it fits the body. Yes, the latter interpretation would not be the right one—and one can not swear by it without direct historical proof—that would be Mrs. Jameson, Blake, and Jacobi, who defeated her composition (of which, by the way, only Blake's illness was expressly to the poor more witty than Holbein himself has been. At least that's how it seems to me, and it may seem to others who want to look at the comparison of composition in both interpretations with an unbiased eye. (of which, by the way, only Blake expressly refers to the child's illness) has been more witty than Holbein himself. At least that's how it seems to me, and it may seem to others who want to look at the comparison of composition in both interpretations with an unbiased eye. (of which, by the way, only Blake expressly refers to the child's illness) has been more witty than Holbein himself. At least that's how it seems to me, and it may seem to others who want to look at the comparison of composition in both interpretations with an unbiased eye.

Of course, I must refrain from returning to the question of interpretation in detail, which is all the less necessary, since it is always unthinkable to interpret it, which is rather important for the genuineness of the Darmstadt copy than for that of the Dresdener that a foreign copyist should have misinterpreted the smiling Christ child of the Darmstadt copy by striking features in a gloomy, while the reverse seemed very conceivable. Only I can not help expressing on this occasion my amazement that the opponents of the genuineness of the Dresden picture, all at the same time opponents of the interpretation of a sick child, (Wornum, Woltmann, Kinkel, Crowe, Meyer <sup>14)</sup>) all like a man find the triumph of the refutation of this interpretation in the smile of the Darmstadt child, which is rather the drastic expression of the Dresdener - and together with it one has to contemplate it - is the most binding affirmation of this interpretation, because both are just two explained together only after this interpretation.

<sup>14)</sup> Among the representatives of the genuineness the views for and against the sick or deceased child are divided.

Of course, one sees nothing but the smiling face of the Darmstädter child - and the opponents really do not look at anything else - how can one think of a sick child? But does one not have to look for more, apart from the already striking comparison with the child of Dresden, not the rest of the body and the rest of the child, not his relationship to the lower child,

nor his relationship to the others Holbein'schen Christ children, not in particular to his relationship to the child in that related Holbein's drawing no. 65. In fact, if a certain thoroughness should be applied to the question, I believe that I must support the interpretation of the picture in all this; but on the part of the opponents it has been found too spacious and uncomfortable, to respond to it; and so, since the appeal to the old tradition no longer wants to hold its own, I am only concerned with the simple handling of the view and its representation as "absurdity", as "old fad", as "brain-burned hypothesis", as "broad-gauge" talk, as "tricky paper's" met, which is simple enough and very precipitous for me as the other complicit in the view, but in which I still miss the refutation completely. My further thoughts on this treatment of the matter and question I leave aside.

In trifles are often the strictest criteria, and so I confess that, as many probabilities exist for the authenticity of the Dresden picture and are emphasized by myself, I could raise no objection only against the binding force of this trifle. But I do not want to put the whole gravity of the question on such a fine tip. Even more unbiased opponents of the genuineness of the Dresden picture than I see before me may say: "one can not know," and so I have just said with the above, that so far nothing has been found against this triviality; At the same time, however, we must remember that the details which seem to prove the priority and thus authenticity of the Darmstadt specimen most sharply the sixth finger and the reddish tone, of which II. chap. there was talk, saying the same thing, "but one can not know".

If we conclude, we find some grounds for suspecting the genuineness of the Dresden specimen (derived from its origin in Amsterdam, the not insignificant difference of its manner of painting from the Darmstädter picture, the modern expression of the Madonna and the green dress of the same), although not completely finished in the previous, but sufficiently attenuated, in order not to be regarded as resounding, and considerably outweighed by positive probabilities of authenticity. A more detailed examination, which is to be expected in the future compilation, in particular of the painting style of the picture, gives hope that the decision will be brought closer to safety.

## IX. Resumé.

Since the oldest news which intervenes in our question, that of Fesch and Sandrart, refers to a Holbeinian Madonna picture originating from the Meier family of foundations, without fitting any other known image than our two specimens Basically, at least one of the two, questionable at first, which is considered genuine, that is, originating from the younger Holbein. But both could also be genuine, for the possibility and even probability of a double true origin can be categorized as a votive image for the church, as a family image for the house, or merely as a family image for two different branches of the family [Cape. VI]. while on the other hand the

possibility to consider that one of them is a fraudulent copy of the other, organized by a mercenary art dealer [Ch. VI.], Or even a copy of a foreign hand ordered by the purchaser or a later owner to fulfill the dual purpose without the intention of deception.

Now the incompleteness and contradictory nature of the historical documents [ch. VI.], The hitherto unexpressed, often un-felt, difficulty of judging their authenticity according to the method of painting of both pictures [ch. V.], the usual indiscriminate mixing of the question of beauty with the question of authenticity [ch. III.], And finally the almost free choice, only dependent on the subjective discretion, of opposing views or assumptions that are relevant here [chap. IV.], The unbiased spectator still just doubt whether a completely safe decision on one side or the other in the whole question is already to be made, but the most probable possibility of the authenticity of both copies arises through the most complete and impartial compilation and consideration of all the reasons for and against. [Cape. VII. And VIII.]

The authenticity of the Darmstadt specimen is due to the following reasons:

1) The direct reduction of the image of Darmstädter to the founding family, which has been attempted to combine the historical discoveries of Woltmann with the news of Fesch and Sandrart, is very problematic because of the contradictory nature of the data and seems even more likely to transfer the Dresden copy [ch. VI]. However, historical data are left over from the other side, which can be asserted for the origin of the Darmstadt image from Basel. [Cape. VI.] And even if it were possible to think of the above-mentioned possibility that the picture in Basel itself was a copy of the authentic archetype by a stranger's hand, not only no historical clue can be found for the probability of it but no artist can be exhibited in Basel or otherwise, to whom the picture could be trusted as a copy, if not Holbein himself. A tradition of the origin of Holbein can be asserted no less for the Darmstadt than Dresdener Bild [Ch. VII.].

2) There are internal reasons for the priority of the Darmstädter picture; but the authenticity follows from the priority [ch. VII.]. In particular, it seems difficult to reconcile with the precondition of the priority of the Dresden picture that the proportions of its content are so much more advantageous than those of the Darmstadt [Ch. VII]; that they really are, however, is well maintained against Woltmann and Meyer, who see a deterioration in the copyist's ability to keep them upright. V.] There is still the possibility that the dimensions of the Darmstädter picture are shortened from those of the external view of the room, and that the content of the picture is pushed together to the detriment of the proportions. VII., The possibility of this not being disputed; however, the first view retains a greater likelihood of preference. To this end, although some Pentimenti's in the Darmstädter picture, which has been interpreted in favor of the priority of Darmstädter image, according to cap. VII. Also turn to the other side, but there are certain trivialities (sixth finger on the hand of the lower part of the boy, red tone in the background of the garb of the middle woman); II. Is left over, which can only be interpreted in the sense of the priority of the Darmstädter picture, hereby count among the most

important proofs, whereas the comparison of the Madonna and the secondary figures in both pictures according to Chap. VII. Less certain conclusions in this regard. s in the Darmstadt picture, which was interpreted in favor of the priority of the Darmstädter picture, according to Chap. VII. Also turn to the other side, but there are certain trivialities (sixth finger on the hand of the lower part of the boy, red tone in the background of the garb of the middle woman); II. Is left over, which can only be interpreted in the sense of the priority of the Darmstädter picture, hereby count among the most important proofs, whereas the comparison of the Madonna and the secondary figures in both pictures according to Chap. VII. Less certain conclusions in this regard. s in the Darmstadt picture, which was interpreted in favor of the priority of the Darmstädter picture, according to Chap. VII. Also turn to the other side, but there are certain details (sixth finger on the hand of the lower part of the boy, red tone in the background of the dress of the middle woman); II. Is left over, which can only be interpreted in the sense of the priority of the Darmstädter picture, hereby count among the most important proofs, whereas the comparison of the Madonna and the secondary figures in both pictures according to Chap. VII. Less certain conclusions in this regard. red clay in the background of the dress of the middle woman), whose in the Chap. II. Is left over, which can only be interpreted in the sense of the priority of the Darmstädter picture, hereby count among the most important proofs, whereas the comparison of the Madonna and the secondary figures in both pictures according to Chap. VII. Less certain conclusions in this regard. red clay in the background of the dress of the middle woman), whose in the Chap. II. Is left over, which can only be interpreted in the sense of the priority of the Darmstädter picture, hereby count among the most important proofs, whereas the comparison of the Madonna and the secondary figures in both pictures according to Chap. VII. Less certain conclusions in this regard.

3) The majority and the added weight of the connoisseur's votes finds Holbein's style of painting decidedly different in character and excellence in the Darmstadt picture [Ch. VII]; the contradiction raised by some sides Grüder, K. Förster against it is contrary to cap. V. is not deprived of the suspicion that he is not resting on the right documents, and that he must first prove himself in the future composition of the two pictures with each other and with other Holbein pictures by reconciling the prevailing expert judgment to claim for weight close.

4) Retouching in the Darmstadt picture are, contrary to Woltmann and Meyer, according to Ch. Although in the Darmstadt picture it is true to recognize that whole parts of the picture should have been painted by someone else's hand if the main content is genuine, only the verdict of a single voice has up to now been heard by E. Förster [cf. the files].

For the genuineness of the Dresden picture, and against the suspicion of the same the following reasons are counted.

1) Historically, the Dresden picture has not only a more outdated tradition for itself than the Darmstädter copy, but it appears after sharpest examination of historical data, the direct reduction of the Dresden specimen on the donor family even more

probable, than that of the Darmstadt specimen, if it can already be recognized that it remains subject to considerable uncertainty because of the contradictory nature of the old news (Chapter VI).

2) The recent hypothesis of Woltmann, Kinkel, Crowe, that the Darmstadt picture as the only real one had doubled under the profit-making art dealer Leblon hands, and the Dresdener as a fake copy to the Queen of Medicis during their stay in the Netherlands of he was sold to him, while the real one, the Darmstadt, came to Lössert, has against himself that Queen Mary, while she was in the Netherlands, was not at all in a position to buy an expensive picture, that a confusion of information on which the hypothesis is based, is demonstrable, and that the Dresden picture did not come from Brussels, where the queen was staying, but from Amsterdam to Venice. More likely than that the one image doubled under Leblon's hand is that two real specimens have confusedly merged in Fesch's reports, and that the picture of Dresden came directly from Basel to the Queen while she was still in France [Ch. VI.]. It must be acknowledged that the modification which Meyer has made from the above suspicious view [ch. VI.], Raises essential difficulties of the same, while against it other difficulties remain contrary.

(3) The suspicion that arose against the Dresden copy, that it actually came from the same place in Amsterdam as the true Darmstadt, can not in itself be denied, insofar as the priority and authenticity of the Darmstadt copy are proved has to look at; but it is also no obstacle to think that both genuine specimens once met in such an art-loving city [ch. VI.].

4) Just as little as for the Darmstadt artist has an artist been found for the copy of Dresden, whom it can trust as a copy, and an attempt made in this respect has been completely destroyed [Ch. VIII.]

5) A copy based on deception would probably be slavishly adhered to the original, as have allowed such significant changes, as the Dresden picture against the Darmstadt shows, even in Amsterdam, where one seeks their genesis, not without discovery of cheating with the original of Darmstadt [Ch. VI., VIII.].

6) As to the question of whether the painting style of the Dresden or Darmstadt picture is more in keeping with Holbein, there are so hair-raising contradictions between the connoisseurs that until now no sure objective result can be drawn from it. It is certain that before the appearance of the Darmstädter image no one has come to find the style of painting the Dresden picture with Holbein incompatible. A doubt drawn in particular from the difference in the manner of painting between the two pictures in general and the greenish semitones on the Madonna and Child of the Dresden picture must be admitted without being able to be considered resounding. A safer judgment is yet to be hoped for by more thorough investigations at the upcoming Holbein exhibition.

7) The difficulties which one has sought in the fact that the character of the depiction of the Madonna in the Dresden specimen lacks the energy to be expected of Holbein, is too modern for him, bears too much the impression of soft grace, are partly lacking in the reasoning [Ch. VIII.]. but inasmuch as they are to be recognized,

they lack the force of power, like all others, and a suspicion drawn by J. Lessing from the comparison of the carpets in both pictures [Ch. VIII.] Has yet to give his justification.

8) The reasons which Woltmann, and with him Meyer, draws from the alterations of proportions and architecture in the Dresden picture against the genuineness of it, would be, according to Chap. V. better left unassembled; On the contrary, the picture of Dresden in its reduced proportions more closely resembles the other Holbeinian Madonna pictures, and in particular a somewhat analogous, undoubtedly genuine Holbeinian hand-drawing (which may even be a first sketch of our picture), as the Darmstadt, while changing from the architecture of Chap. V. can not conclude anything decisive.

9) Die von Woltmann aufgestellte Ansicht, daß das ursprünglich blaue, durch den Firnis bläulich-grün gewordene Kleid der Darmstädter Madonna im Dresdener Bilde durch Mißverstand des Kopisten grün nachgemacht worden sei, hat zwar für den ersten Anblick eine bestechende Wahrscheinlichkeit, die sich aber durch die dagegen zu Gebote stehenden Gründe so abschwächt, daß sie die schlagende Kraft, welche ihr von Woltmann beigelegt wird, völlig verliert [Kap. VIII.].

10) There are two small details in the Dresden picture, of which one, the lower chin, which is added to the Madonna, according to Ch. VIII. The authenticity of the Dresden copy favorable, the other, the change in the expression of the upper child against the Darmstädter picture, almost resounding for it seems to have at least one other explanation than in the sense of the genuineness of the Dresden picture.

11) The view repeatedly held that at least certain parts, especially secondary figures and secondary objects, betrayed the hand of an assistant in the Dresden specimens, can not be regarded as refuted, nor as proved, by asserting the assertion in this respect partly more general reasons , V.], partly certain counter-statements [Ch. IV.].

12) Finally, one has to say that, although not all grounds for suspecting the genuineness of the Dresden copy are completely settled, they are outweighed by contradictory probabilities and positive reasons.

## **Second division.**

### **A k t e n.**

#### **I) Aloys Ludwig Hirt** Professor in Berlin (1830).

In his essay: "Art Notes on a Voyage via Wittenberg and Meissen to Dresden and Prague, Berlin 1830", Hirt mentions in a remark p. 16 on the occasion of the consideration of the Dresden copy of the Darmstädter, then still Berliner, with the following words: " The very similar picture was brought a few years ago from France to Berlin for sale, where Sr. Royal Highness, Prince William, brother of the King, it

was purchased. " After that literally the already in the Cape. I. Reported remarks by the author.

## 2) Franz Theodor Kugler Professor in Berlin (1845. 1847).

The author was on a short visit to Dresden in 1844, and "immediately after the return from there and with the fresh impression of the picture there, hastened to the Berlin copy." The results of this comparison are in a special essay in *Cotta's Kunstblatt* 1845. 8 and from it reprinted in *Kugler's "Little Writings and Studies for Art History"* 853 <sup>1)</sup> as follows:

combined with the cool reddish parts of light in the same parts of the Carnation, this treatment makes an impression which, in a certain sense, already reminds one of the imitators of the Italians in the sixteenth century. - . , I found myself extremely surprised not to notice anything of what I had strangely opposed to the Dresden copy. The Berlin picture appears to the full extent as a whole of a cast. Treatment is one and the same everywhere; instead of those greenish shades of shadow and the reddish-white parts of light, in the Carnation here, though modified according to the character of the individual figures, appear only the full, deep shades of color, which assume a warm-brownish character in the shade, and which, as we know, for the period of artistic activity *Holbein's*, in which the execution of this composition falls - the time around the year 1529 - are so characteristic. To the same degree the mode of feeling which permeates the picture is perfectly uniform in the mental expression placed in the persons represented; In particular, instead of that softer grace, the head of the Madonna has something loftier, more dignified, which in fact seems to be more in keeping with the overall character of the picture and, in general, the strength of the master. According to this, remarks on the use of gold in the Darmstadt picture as peculiar to it, but not lacking in the Dresdener as well.] In the whole and in every detail the Berlin picture bears the stamp of the most decided mastery, and at the same time has the great merit that it as much as I could at least perceive in his present lineup,

<sup>1)</sup> Here with the addendum that Prof. Felsing shares the view of the priority of the Darmstädter picture; whereas Prof. Felsing occasionally, in a letter addressed to me (June 8, 1866), "claims the priority of the opinion on the originality of the Darmstädter Bild, based on the Kontourveränderungen in the second, the Dresdener"; how it was given the same letter by "Waagen, Kugler, Hübner".

According to these observations and to the whole of the impression which an artistic masterpiece produces on us, but which is so hard to reproduce, I can only explain that the Berlin picture is the original copy and, as such, one of the greatest masterpieces of the great German is the artist. As hereafter behaving with the Dresden picture, I dare currently not decide outright. So little is *Holbein's* Although I do not necessarily want to acknowledge it in the Madonna and Child, I do not want to deny it in my kneeling portrait-figures. For the time being it may therefore be

assumed that Holbein made the repetition with other aid - a procedure which would only be entirely natural in the case of such a busy master. "-

In the 2nd edition of *Kugler's Handb. D. G. d. M.* 1847, 282 essentially sums up the same verdict, which states: "Perhaps, however, this [the Dresden] copy is merely the later, albeit one-handed, repetition of another [of the Berlin] copy."

**3) Ernst Joachim Förster,**  
painter, professor in Munich (1852. 1859. 1869).

The author calls in a note of his *Gesch. d. K.* (1852. II. 235) the Darmstädter picture simply "a repetition" of the Dresdener, and in its monuments (1859. v. V) "an old very good copy" of the Dresdener without motivation of its conception.

After the exhibition of the Darmstädter picture in Munich, however, he comes in the *hatchet. z. Augsb. general time.* 1869. Aug. 29 241. S. 3729 (still without name signature) on both copies under mention that a compilation of both pictures in Dresden is in the works, with the following back:

"What I believe to be inevitable in such a compilation is the remark that the overall impression of the Dresden picture is freer, more attractive, and more beautiful, while the Darmstadt picture bears heavy pressure, but in the Darmstädter picture there are places that are none other As for Holbein, of course, it may have been painted directly next to those which can not possibly be laid to his charge. "The Dresden picture, from top to bottom, is of one piece, of perfectly harmonious impression, free, light, and secure in treatment, while in the Darmstädter's paintings are predominantly careful and diligent in performing. " [Known about the difference of proportions in both pictures.]

"If the overall arrangement in the Dresden picture is absolutely to be recognized as more beautiful and artistically significant, and thus a shadow on the Darmstädter picture falls, then it nevertheless has places of so extraordinary beauty and mastery, of so decidedly *Holbein's* character, that In this I count the whole group of women, the heads, the garments, the jewelery, everything, and not only the technique, but also (where it can emerge) the sensation, and also the older boy with his unclothed one Brotherchen denies only here and there *Holbein's* art, such as For example, in the far too large left hand of this child, in which also too large and otherwise recorded thumb of his right hand (so that it seems to have six fingers). Both hands of the sick child are completely out of proportion and very marked in the arms of the Madonna, and his right foot is downright clubfoot. These violations are impossible on *Holbein's* bill can not be found in Dresden pictures. The face of the Madonna is in both images of soulful beauty and purity, and yet the Dresdener (which I myself once copied in oil and therefore have looked at very closely) stands in my memory with a deeper and more secure expression of heart-winning intimacy. The greatest difference appears in the portrait of the mayor and that of the sick child. The latter has a wistfully painful expression in the mouth and refractive eyes, in the Darmstadt picture open eyes and a smiling mouth. The mayor on the latter has almost different traits and forms than on the Dresdener, is much fuller in the cheeks and deviates in the painterly treatment by the great expense of means for modeling so much of *Holbein's* great simplicity in the

execution that one only needs to look at the women' s heads opposite (or the patrician head from St. Anna in Augsburg, which is almost erected) to recognize the basic difference.

Can one of both pictures be a copy? Are both originals? Which one is the earlier? ... [Historical notes on the Dresden picture after Hübner] ... Can the Dresdener be a copy "I believe that if there is no authentic work by a painter that proves to be completely equal, or until documents have been found by which the copyist is irrefutably proved, the question must be answered with the most decided no, for what is better in it is as in the image of Darmstadt, can only come from the master himself, or from an artist who stands above him, and history does not yet know the story is the Darmstädter image a copy as well as *Holbein's* hand on it is unmistakable! So maybe it's a repeat? Again this must be denied, for in a repetition the master would not bring errors as those are designated by me. Thus, in my opinion, only left to assume, the Darmstadt image. , , [etc. discussion chap. III.] Workshop. Thus the relation of these two masterpieces to each other seems to me, both of which are to be counted among the greatest treasures of German art. "

The previous article has an attack by Woltmann in the *hatchet*. z. *Augsb. general* time from 9th Sept. 1869 no. 352 p. 3894. Woltmann reproaches the ignoring of his new historical discoveries and explanations about the Madonna of Darmstadt, comes back to these remarks concerning the differences in the proportions and the architecture in both pictures, reproaches an erroneous statement of *F. 'S* on the architecture in the Dresden picture, which after making engravings of the picture, but does not fit the original, and accuses him of mistakenly writing the mortar head of the *Mörz* on *Holbein*, since it is the same after the inscription 1533 on the reverse, where *Holbein* was notorious in England, and after the painting style, the rather *Ambergerwise*, could not *stem* from *Holbein* .

*Förster* (with name signature) replicates vividly in supplement no. 261 to *Augsb. general* time. 1869 18 Sept. p. 4035, accusing Woltmann of a presumptuous self-overestimation and continuing to insist on his view of the authenticity of our pictures, without, however, bringing up any new moments.

**4) Gustav Friedrich Waagen,**  
painter, gallery director etc in Berlin (1853. 1858. 1866).

To a note to J. Felsing in Darmstadt directed to me by this note of 1853 on the purchase of the Darmstädter picture in Berlin, the author adds: "Incidentally, I was immensely pleased, the calamity, which I have about the relationship This painting, which I had made in Dresden, was to be seen in great detail by such an excellent artist as you, and I based my opinion chiefly on the fact that, immediately after my return from Dresden, I found it in the living-room of the Princess subjected the image to a close examination. "

"It is even more characteristic of *Holbein's* treatment in the broader and more pithy recitation, and certainly the first of the two, which was originally in a church in Basel."

This is followed by a few notes after *Fiorillo* and *Hegner* in support of the view that the Dresden copy was, however, in possession of the family.

The author describes the subject in more detail in his booklet: "Some Remarks on the New Arrangement, Illumination and Cataloging of the Royal Picture Gallery for Dresden, Berlin, 1858". First, he expresses the "conviction": "that this image [the Darmstädter] originally by the mayor Meyer bei *Holbeinas* a votive painting for a church or chapel dedicated to the Virgin Mary, but then the master has been induced to repeat the same for the mayor's house, preferably in its meaning as a family portrait, "he motivates this conviction by the zealous Catholicism of the founder on the one hand and the character of the image as a family image on the other, and continues: "The special peculiarity of each of the two images corresponds to this conjecture immensely. The picture in Darmstadt is very even in a very solid impasto with great freshness in a graduated in the individual figures, but consistently warm brownish tone of the meat parts, with uncommon mastery, but performed in relation to that in Dresden with a certain width. The head of Mary has in relation to the picture in Dresden something more serious, yes Herberes. Different deviations, z. For example, a strong drop shadow on the middle of the face of the mother Meyer completely exclude for anyone who has closely compared the pictures, the assumption of Mr. Hübner that the same is a copy after the copy in Dresden. Everything in the Darmstadt picture is calculated to have a powerful effect at a certain distance, as it brings with it the place on the altar. This includes the application of gold in the garments, as emphasized by Kugler. On the other hand, there are such changes in the Dresden picture which make it particularly suitable for a close examination, as it takes place in a room. The head of Mary is in the expression lovelier and milder in the treatment, in less impasto, more tender and more detailed. A similar thing can be seen in the other figures, with the exception of the mayor, who is a bit emptier and harder. The head of the woman is here, probably at her instigation, since the women usually love as little shade as possible in their portraits, taken in the full light. Although Kugler is quite right in saying that the greenish halftones in the flesh are in the pictures *Holbein* 's are very unusual, so I have the conviction that this magnificent image is also consistently from the hand of *Holbein* .

Finally, "only the foot rug [in the Dresden picture] a little considerable object, seems to me to him [Holbein] too fleeting and mechanically treated, too heavy in tone, and may have been left by him to an assistant."

As a possible objection to his view, *Libra* (p. 46) states that "such a great artist as Holbein does not want to have decided to repeat a picture of such a considerable size." Such an objection, however, could only find a place if *Hegner* and *Kugler* assumed the execution of the Dresden picture in *Holbein* 's visit to Basel from England in 1529, whereas he asserted various external and internal reasons. "Quite different, however - he continues - is when *Holbein* painted this picture before his departure for England in 1526. From a still existing letter, which his patron, Erasmus of Rotterdam, gave him to his friend, Petrus Aegydius in Antwerp, it is clear that *Holbein* decided on this journey for lack of acquaintance. But

who can doubt these circumstances? that he will have taken on the task of a person as respected as Mayor Meyer, to make a repetition of that picture. , , , That conviction that *Holbein*The Dresden painting before 1526 is based primarily on the great similarity in conception and color with the 1519 designated portrait of Bonifacius Amerbach in the Museum of Basel, and the moderate difference in the age of Meyer and his wife on the Dresden picture those on the portraits designated 1516, which are also in the Museum zu Basel. "

As I found in the *Dioscuri* (1866, p. 181) an indication of *Schasler* , according to which *Libra* would have expressed in a meeting of the Association for Art of the Middle Ages and modern times of May 20, 1866, "one will not fail, if one in see an altar-leaf in the Darmstädter picture, in the other [Dresden] on the other hand presupposes a depiction reproduced by a pupil and intended for the decoration of a room, "and since I could not reconcile this with the views contained in the preceding one, I turned to one by letter Ask for clarification, therefore, on *Libra* , from whom I received the complaisant reply (of the 18th of February, 1868): "it never occurred to him to make such an utterance," as he was told. *Schasler* attributes, but the same is a pure "invention". Here are the following remarks:

"On the contrary, I have always maintained that both pictures are mainly based on *Holbein's work* , and that in the Dresden copy Maria even has a nobler and more idealistic character, whereas the portraits on the Darmstler copy are partly inspired by the The hand of an assistant, as I have long ago found the mayor's head a little dry, as you yourself state, but even the parts of the portraits by *Holbein*It is understandable that, as copies, they are not as vivid and witty as the originals. Certainly the family members in the year 1529-1830, in which the picture of Dresden falls, did not sit again; So there was nothing left for him but to render it as he saw it on the copy of Darmstadt, while he had more freedom with Maria. My long-cherished conviction that the Darmstadt copy was intended for the church, but I would like to make it even clearer in such afar that I, with Dr. Ing. *Woltmann* , think of an epitaph. Nor can I stand by the reasons according to which in the Dresden copy I recognize a family portrait painted for the house. "

One can not help but find a contradiction in the assumption of the date of origin of the Dresden picture of 1529-1530 with the supposition of "1526" contained in the above, which is probably based only on volatility.

### **5) dr. Julius Hübner**

Painter, Prof. u. Gallery Director in Dresden (1856. 1861. 1869. 1870. 1871).

In a note in his list of the Dresden Gemäldegalerie (1st edition, 1856, p. 16, 2 Ed., 1862, p. 19), the author describes the Darmstädter picture as "an excellent simultaneous repetition" of the Dresdener, and expresses himself there as follows against *Kugler* 's view of the priority of the painting: "With all respect for the famous art historian, however, we can not find his reasons for the claim sufficient." Of course there was not enough space for motifs in the catalog. After this, however, the

following note, written down in the year 1861 after a renewed examination of the Darmstädter picture, is reported by *Hübner*'s hand in *v. Chr. Zahn's* pamphlets p. L 4.

"The Darmstädter picture is certainly not a copy, but rather of the opinion of the same master, because such a change would have dared no copyist, neither in one copy nor the other, but he would in the completion of those parts which in Darmstädter image are more accomplished than in the Dresdener, have not been able to go further than the master. "

"The hypothesis that *Holbein* first painted this picture has a lot to do with impartial examination, if at the same time the first copy is not the better of both , as *Kugler* does, because that is definitely not the case the main character of Mary in their proportions not as ideal by far, as the Dresden, not so sure and decisive drawn, though perhaps completed almost tedious. *Holbein* could have thus made improvements only in the Dresden picture, but I must confess in all this, that in some probability of this hypothesis, there is something in it which does not entirely satisfy my sense of the facts. "

"One would probably do best to leave this puzzle unresolved for the time being, and try to establish only the characteristics of both images more and more independent and unprejudiced, but in the last analysis only a confrontation of both images next to each other would be the right means and otherwise In my opinion, the Dresden picture will not lose much of its essential advantages, and Darmstadt will always prove to be significant as a dangerous rival in many other respects, such as the preservation of colored Mary's robes, etc. "

Finally, I owe the author the following occasional correspondence notes:

Of April 25, 1869: "When reading your essays, it occurred to me why, as far as I know, no one has asserted the analogy that simultaneous and good replicas of the youthful portraits of Meyer and Frau exist (thus also For the simultaneous existence of the two great pictures a reason must have been present in about two branches of the family. The copies, if one wants to call them that, of the youthful portraits are such that on one of my visits to Basel I prescribe the direction of the museum Attention was drawn to how one had numbered one as original and *vice versa* , which is what they call *Ambrosian H.* But they were made around 1516, but surely under the direct influence of *HH* .

On April 13, 1870, a suggestion that the green color of the dress of the Dresden Madonna may have arisen by altering a cheap substitute of the genuine Ultramarine, which had come into use around *Holbein*'s time, together with the following remark: "Then we shall possess To our [Dresden] image was a decidedly unequivocal pentimento on the boy's right hand on the breast of the standing child, which, as far as I know, no one has ever noticed. "

Of the 9th of February, 1871. Withdrawal of the above conjecture by the following note: "I would like to mention that after the purification of our picture last summer, once a yellowed varnish was taken from the air, it was a splendidly mild, but much more decidedly blue In contrast, the green color of the Madonna's gown has turned

out to be completely real and so painted, not as counterfeit or dark as I once assumed the green, as such, have darkened somewhat, as did the same color in the morris background, since both are now the most powerful tones in both images. Have you not seen our image since then, so you will see it in terms of the colored appearance with new enjoyment. "

Scales 1858 s. No. 4th

**6) dr. Wilhelm Schäfer**  
in Dresden 1860

The author opposes in the third part of his three - volume work: "The Royal Picture Gallery in Dresden" 1860, p. 787 in detail against *Kugler*'s and *Waagen*'s view of the priority of the Darmstädter picture, but without having seen the latter himself, what his opposition makes it all the more weightless, as he erroneously refers to a comment by *von Waagen* on the execution of the rug in the Dresden picture on the Darmstädter and supports his judgment thereupon. He considers it probable "that the brother, *Ambrosius Holbein* , painted the picture of Darmstadt only after *Hans Holbein*'s departure from Basel in 1526", *Grüder* , which together with *Woltmann*'s objection already in the chapter. IV. Was communicated.

The fact that the Queen Maria de Medicis was able to buy a copy of our picture during her stay in the Netherlands is already contested by Schafer because of the insufficiency of her means.

Hübner 1861 s. No. 5th

**7) Dr. Albert v. Zahn**  
Hofrat in Dresden (1865. 1867).

From the year 1865.

v. Zahn made a comparison of the two specimens in 1865, the result of which is the most in-depth and thorough account of the relation of both that we have so far contained in an essay by Naum-Weig. Archive 1865. XI. P. 42; also reprinted under the title "The Darmstadt Specimen of Holbein's Madonna, Lpz. 1865". For this purpose he had been permitted a special set-up of the Darmstädter picture in a favorable light and the removal of drawings, after which the outline of his picture is made out of an outline of the Dresden picture. Immediately before and after the investigation of the Darmstädter picture a visit of the Dresdener and closer examination of the same was made.

By overriding most of the descriptive detail, insofar as the question of authenticity is touched upon in a general or distant sense, we highlight the following passages.

P. 3. "One and the same Carton seems to have served to record both images, shifting individual figures, altering the architecture, and continually modifying the drawing - indeed, it requires only a superficial consideration to perceive the Dresdener Copy with full awareness of the favorable view was part of. "

P. 5. "The result of this investigation, directed on the arrangement and relations of the figures, can be summed up in the fact that in the Darmstädter picture there is a continuously more depressed relationship of the composition, at first conditioned by the lower space, but then by the tendency of the artist altogether."

"The color of the Darmstädter picture is difficult to judge because of the dark yellow varnish coverings. The brightest lights on the kneeling girl's dress are very tawny, and all shades of white - with the exception of a single point on Mary's sleeve thrust - in brownish Shades - whose original texture, as can be seen on some of the varnish bared patches, has been much closer to the fine gray tones of the Dresden picture than it now seems. "

"It is precisely this varnish coating that has probably in a similar manner in the flesh tones of the five youthful figures, all of which are consistently bright in the Dresden picture, whose light color with the whitish reddish lights, greenish transitional tones, and light-warm shadows differs there so substantially from the brown-reddish incarnate of the three older persons blurring differences in the color hues of the original color and giving the whole impression of a uniform, brownish-warm modeling. "

P. 6. 7. In the detail of the individual figures and other parts, differences in color between the two paintings were pursued, with the following conclusion: "It will be clear from these hints how completely different the two pictures are in their colored impression, there the effective contrasts of the deep dark , large robes, in which a modeling is barely visible, with the brightly colored, even hard contrasted color tones of the flesh and the bright robes, here a much calmer and more unified attitude, whose original effect can hardly be presented by the beholder, the overall impression but in the closest to the color effect of *Holbein* The youth work in Augsburg and Munich follows, while in the Dresden picture a completely peculiar play of colors, which probably has no effect on any well - known group portrait of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, is effective only in *Holbein* 's later portraits of his peers Has".

P. 7 and 8. Differences between the two pictures with regard to the depiction of the Madonna, with emphasis on the merits of the Dresdeners, and the following conclusion of the judgment concerning the Darmstadt: "In spite of all dignity and a somewhat more ideal expression, the Madonna-face of the picture lacks the "Affable" ", and we do not look at it with the feeling that we are facing a single creation of a great master in every respect . "

P. 8. Differences of the two pictures concerning the upper child, as to the remarks in this discussion [Chap. II., IV. U. VIII.], With the following conclusion: "Cut out of the composition, the two heads [of the Madonna and the Child in the Darmstädter copies] would perhaps be denied to the master; on closer inspection and in comparison with the other parts of the picture can be found on the Do not doubt execution by one hand, as well as the surface of the paint does not seem to confirm the slight suspicion of damage, and in general, when viewed near, both heads gain greatly. "

P. 8 u. 9. Differences between the two pictures concerning the expression and the execution of the heads of the secondary figures, of the garments and trifles (headdress, carpet), in which the Darmstadt picture is generally given preference over the Dresdener.

Finally, the author concludes, pp. 9-41: "When considering the details just described, it must become a definite conviction, as already suggested by the comparison of the arrangement and proportions, that the Darmstadt copy is an original picture of *Holbein* and that it was before the Dresden picture was created. "

"The hand *Holbein* In the masterful execution of so many parts, no one who misinterprets the Darmstadt picture should be misunderstood, and if tradition or designation can not be aided by documentary evidence, the inspection must in this case be undoubtedly the justification of the opinion expressed , But if the stamp of originality unites with the peculiar relation of unfavorable arrangement and proportionality to a second copy, we can not conclude that there is any other connection than that in the Dresden picture we have before us an improved repetition of the Darmstadt copy whose characteristics are almost entirely derived from a conscious critical process of the artist. As for the inner progress of the Master, *Holbein* 's Baseler stay present authentic news probably just as little as the specific time of execution. But there is no great loss to art history here which, by and large, is not in the dark about the development of the Master. Touched by the formal principle of the Renaissance already in the time of his early Augsburg youth work, with the completion of the Dresden picture he marks the climax on which German art was able to arrive under its promoting influence, and there is at least the probability of a sufficient explanation the so lovingly executed replica in the circumstance that *Holbein* urged on by some occasion to repeat his picture (but probably not one for the church to paint one for the house), with the particular consciousness of being able to surpass itself. It will already be seen from the comparison of the small outlines how the exaltation of the frame, the rising of the praying father, the delightful increase in position and movement of Mary, had to renew the joy of creation to the master, as it came to be - perhaps Utilizing the impression of a certain personality - first in the head of Mary embodied a newly won ideal, and one will understand just as well, *Ambrosius* ?). "

From year 1867.

*Wornum* 's attack on the authenticity of the Dresden Madonna was (1867); he follows. In the course of a conversation about it with v. Tooth. He declared that, in the absence of decisive historical notes, internal features seemed sufficiently to speak for the genuineness of the Dresden specimen in its main inventory, in order to calm oneself, and at my request he developed his views on them in a synopsis (of June 18, 1867). which I have summed up according to its main points of view, and to which I attach the following essential comments, regretting that I can not completely exhaust the wealth of clear comparative remarks about old masters.

The author begins: "For the authorship of *Holbein* at the Madonna in Dresden, I consider not only the undoubted improvements in the proportions of the picture, but

especially the changes in the head of the Madonna proving, for the following reasons."

Compare only the certainly not idealized fine head of the younger woman with the - albeit also by the absolute proportions disturbing features of the Madonna! The eye-parts are completely motionless, the inclination unmistakably stiff, and in addition a trained male chin - these features in their entirety give the impression of an indifferent personality from the circles of ordinary life, respectable, orderly and just as "heard" drawn and painted, but without every trace of further understanding".

"Certainly, the painter of the Dresden painting has created something completely new from these features, to which we must not withhold the merit of greater beauty, if we want to apply this predicate in the visual arts in general."

"To know what they are based on, let us recall the peculiarities of *Holbein*'s conception of nature."

"The fact that *Holbein*'s and *Durer*'s name are based on the fame of calling a new stage in the development of art after a series of honorable but not epoch-making masters owes them primarily to the fact that they revive the organism of the To express nature in their works of art, so that they not only, as the *Eyck* They had already done so in a higher degree of perfection, but fixed the reflection on the surface, as it were, in an intensified colored light and with all the charms of the material as pictorial reproductions, but the unity of the parts by emphasizing the connection between the rhythm and the proportions proper to the higher organisms What is meant by this is the conscious or unconscious knowledge of the plastic-anatomical structure which is important for the art of the picture, of the laws of statics, of vegetable characteristics, and so on; - everything projected correctly onto the surface with the help of the artistically worthless perspective process. But while *Dürer* These elements of artistic creation are essentially used to increase the vital expression, and to infuse his figures with the mere drawing of some of the overflowing vital force which *Rubens* achieves through the interplay of the most moving drawing and the most juicy of color in a world of increased physical power. is content *Holbein*(we are only talking here of portraiture portrayals) with the painterly picture of the traits perceived in the characteristic expression of their overall appearance, which he now, with much greater devotion to the peculiar nature of the sitter, and with far more unbiased observation of the - usually rendered in the mildest lighting - Kolorits describes. He is therefore the great Dutchman (I have portraits of the *Eyck*'s and their best students, among which the most outstanding in this respect *Antonello da Messina*, in the sense) very close; yes he should be her only to surpass him in that he possesses the organic features of the cranium and the most descriptive parts of the face; of whom, in their cautious approach to nature and always somewhat anxious, those old men leave out a trace from which there are many, without ever caricaturing them; For this he gives for the first time again the attitude based on the observation of the cold midtones (analogy of the illusory effect, not this self), which probably have the *Eyck*'s and *Antonello*, but not the other pupils, and of whom this boast only exceptionally can. "

"All of these benefits, as I next *Holbein* knew appropriating any others, I find now the head of the Dresden Madonna combined to represent a personality whose traits, in contrast to the indifference of the Darmstadt Mary, and the ugliness of most (? V. Zahn) other *Holbein* 'Madonnas or female saints, a conscious formation of graceful-beautiful face shapes perceived as carriers of the divine Mary nature.

The Au. Then developed further, as in the art of before *eyck* 'rule Middle Ages and the *Eyck* rule' school itself sought and the Netherlands up in later time into saving Graceful-Beautiful face education female ideal figures than on a Connections to certain These were the types of masters most completely lost to those masters who took it most seriously by penetrating the natural organism, the Upper German, *Durer*, and *Holbein* even; therefore one finds "the ideal saint-type of the large facial ovals, round foreheads, delicate nostrils and lips with the soft-wavy formation of the large eye-parts, between which the flat root of the nose seems more connecting than dividing", otherwise not exactly in *Holbein's case* , and especially Darmstadt Madonna "as far away as possible". He admits that this is an objection to *Holbein's* authorship It can be asserted on the Dresden Madonna, which nevertheless shows "an individual culture closely related to that type of extremely attractive character". But he now refers to the time of his creation (1526), probably in accordance with the image of the Offenburg woman, who is about the same time as the Madonna of Dresden, in which the character of graceful beauty likewise expresses itself so decidedly. As a characteristic, however, that even with the Dresden Madonna a graceful-beautiful model of reality gives the hint for its realistic rendering, he claims the (the Darmstädter Madonna missing) lower chin of the Dresden Madonna, which certainly no artist without such a model of Madonna would have borrowed.

Finally, he brings the German character of the Dresden Madonna representation to the fore:

"And to attribute such a nature to an image of the Madonna, in which all graceful beauty of Germanic idealism is revived with such independent power, that not even the slightest move of the Holbein but probably well-known Italian women's beauties from the Umbrian or Tuscan-Lombard None of *Holbein* 's contemporaries, let alone a seventeenth-century copyist , seems to me capable of bringing in school , as *Wornum* babbles. "

Oral Dr. *v. Tooth* raised against me how German artists, after *Holbein* 's time, sought to achieve the graceful beauty in the depiction of their Madonnas by connecting them with Italian types, so that no one could be imagined to be such a depiction as the Dresdener Picture within the purely German character shows, could trust.

### **8) Dr. Alfred Woltmann**

Professor in Karlsruhe (1866, 1868, 1869).

*Woltmann* 's earlier point of view , in which he regards the copy of Dresden as genuine in its main inventory , can be found in the text he wrote for *Schauer* '

s *Holbein* album in 1866, and in more detail in the innermost part of his *Holbein* monograph ( *Holbein* and his time 1866 S. 315ff.) represented.

From this the following.

*Holbein* 317: "Dr A. v. Zahn has recently done extensive research on the Darmstadt specimen and has communicated the surprising results to which he has come in. In most and most important respects I can certainly agree with him, because partly my perceptions are correct with his own, partly his careful examination has convinced me, where I disagreed. "

"What he says is decisive in the question: he has proved what *Kugler* and *Waagen* suggest that the Darmstadt specimen is the original one." When I confronted this picture myself, I knew what the two famous art researchers said about it Nevertheless, the impression was quite surprising for me: Fresh from Basel, I found here with the best of the pictures there the fullest agreement in the whole and individual, which does not remove the Dresden painting in such Grade shows. "

[Hereinafter follow details about the differences between the two pictures, with recognition of the improvement of proportions, in the Dresden picture, to compare in discussion, but also highlighting the more complete expression in the heads of the lower group and the more complete execution of the side-things in the Darmstadt picture.]

"If we try to draw the sum from what has been said, the following points result as a sure result:"

"First, neither of the copies is a copy of someone else's hand, and no copyist would have allowed such major changes."

"Secondly, the Dresden copy is evidently the later one: the deviations in the proportions, especially in the relation of the architectural framing, stem visibly from the fact that the artist had the Darmstadt picture before his eyes, with a critical eye he freely posed it and clearly felt it which way it was to be improved "

"Third, only the Darmstädter picture is painted throughout by Holbein himself, whereas in the Dresdener the whole lower group and all accessories are work of an assistant, albeit one of the most excellent and well - trained, and *Holbein* 's own master hand is only in the Madonna with the child, both of which have been significantly changed, revealed "

Fourth, while the treatment of the Darmstädter picture corresponds to the last years before *Holbein* 's first trip to England, the gray shadows in the picture of Mary and the Christuskinde of the Dresden picture point to the time after 1529, so that this repetition is in the years before his second English trip, 1529-1531 or 32, must fall "

"It is not improbable that *Holbein* took on the task of such a repetition at the time: despite many orders from the Council, it may have looked rather unpleasant for the arts in the years following the wild iconoclasm of 1529. He would hardly have otherwise leave home for the second time "

"He also did the repetition as we expect him to do, and we have seen many times that he is interested, after the completion of a work, to behave critically against his own creation, to recognize what could be better and Now, with mature power to do the same task again, he does so here too, at first in the change of proportions, but there was still a special reason for the width and squatness of the first copy, which was lost in the second In the time of the iconoclasm, painted alone for the house, the former, in its content and size, was decidedly a church picture and probably intended for a higher location. As in the case of the organ doors, the figures are also seen perspectively from below. *Holbein* then created something completely new in those parts in the second picture; which was possible at all. He changed the Madonna and her child, and replaced here the former appearance, in its heavier size and serious majesty, by the purest and loveliest of the mothers, who ever saw one eye. "

"But with this kind of work it is not only explicable, but almost self-evident that in the minds of the family, where he did not have to adhere to the earlier painting, he does not return to life after several years but, as in the past and in his age, had to cling to his own image, he did not feel inclined to carry out his own work, but left it to an assistant, though certainly to one he was sure of, albeit under his constant guidance. "

Pp. 324. 333. Remarks on this, first of all, that the two specimens may have been intended for two branches of the family, furthermore, that the picture may in general be an epitaph without the contradiction existing between the two views being conveyed. <sup>2)</sup>

<sup>2)</sup> After the later change of view, both views are indirectly withdrawn, the first by the fact that the Dresden picture is declared to be a late copy, the second by the fact that the oldest woman of the picture is considered one against the initial intention is considered later in the picture taken figure.

*Woltmann's* view of the aesthetic relationship of the main characters of both pictures in his early point of view can be found in the *Holbein* - Album 1866. 28 and *Holbein* 1866, I. 319, from which, besides the already mentioned p. 27, 27, the admiration of the Dresden Madonna is enough However, I do not want to give preference to the Dresden Madonna's Face as much as *Zahn* does, *because* the wonderful sovereignty of one head is almost as beautiful and just as justified as the other's delightful, soulful loveliness. "

Afterwards: "In all the minds of the lower group, however, the Darmstadt image is visibly superior." Once you have seen this, the faces of the Dresden specimen are all lifeless and hard to compare. " [See execution.] Only with the heads of the Darmstadt work do the three colored sketches, sketched after life, which are preserved in the Basel Museum, agree in their striking sharpness and fineness; Father like mother and daughter. , , , Just like most heads, the Darmstadt picture also makes the hands more talkative and full of life. The treatment of the hands is always a touchstone for *Holbein* . To this the already given the discussion execution.

Every one of the paintings has its own special advantages, its peculiar beauties. But in the Dresden picture the higher proportions may also be a visible advance, and even if the artist does not like the new Marian visage, the artist may be more mature. After all, Darmstadt deserves the prize, it is the original among the originals, it shows the master's own hand all the time, it is and remains the first fresh litter, which is why this alone has the full unity and the full magic of color. which makes it the most beautiful thing we have of German painting. "

The historical discoveries of *Woltmann* on the Darmstädter copy can be found in the Supplement to the 2nd Parts of his *Holbein* 1868 p. 452 communicated as follows.

"Mr. *B. Suermondt* in Aachen read the following note to the author: Hoet, *Catalogus van Schilderyen*, Hague, 1752, contains the " *Catalogus van Schildery van Jacob Cromhout, en van Jasper Loskart*, c. 8 May 1709, in Amsterdam. "Here comes:

24 Een Kapitaal stuccoed, with twee Deuren, entrusting Maria met Jesus op hair Arm, met verscheyde kneeling Bulden <sup>3)</sup> with Leeven van Hans Holbein. , , Fl. 2000. According to the description no one will doubt that this was one of the specimens of Meyer's Madonna, which went away at a high price; a large altar piece by *Rubens* brought in only 1000 guilders in the same auction. Nor will it be denied that the name of one of the two owners, Loskart, is identical with Lössert, that the specimen of 1710 still on Amsterdam and sold there is the same, which, according to Dr. Fesch, Remigius Fesch, husband of Jacob Meyer's granddaughter, for 100 gold crowns to Lucas Iselin and this to 1000 Imperiales (imperial guilders)<sup>4)</sup> in the thirties of the 17. Sold century Le Blon to Amsterdam, which Le Blon also soon <sup>5)</sup> desisted to 3000 guilders Lössert as Sandrart indicates ".

<sup>3)</sup> D. h. Characters.

<sup>4)</sup> Not Reichsthaler. See Fechner, archive for the z. K. XII. P. 223.

<sup>5)</sup> "Long before," says Sandrart, ie before his departure from Amsterdam, which, like Fechner aa 0. p. 210f. executed, falls around 1645.

while it would be quite probable that there were originally doors for closing the painting and adorned with coats of arms and inscriptions. Perhaps these were especially kept and sold at the time of the auction. "

Afterwards to the turns of *Woltmann* 's judgment. In the Supplement to the *Holbein* (1868, 453: "Although the discoveries made make the formerly so sure held origin of the [Dresden] painting to a highly dubious, the author can not immediately decide, the work for a later copy of other hand The Madonna herself by name is too beautiful for that, but now a new and sharper test is needed. "

In a letter to *Kinkel* dated March 1, 1869 (*Lutzow's Zeitschr.* 1869, p. 173), which occasionally agrees with occasional remarks by *Woltmann* in a letter to me dated March 13, 1869: "I have once again reproduced the Dresden picture ( in Sept. 1868):

the lower heads and hands were dry and hard in proportion, the Madonna's head was beautiful, yet modernized and somewhat softened, the green dress (contrary to all tradition and custom) only a misunderstanding of the copyist, in the Darmstädter Image is the dress of the Madonna blue, only through the yellow varnish it shimmers blue-green, like many original blue background., Maybe *Algarotti's* note correctly, the Dresden specimen also comes from Holland, is one there then, before the end of the 17. Century made copy. , , The elevation of the niche in the Dresden picture is not. , , an improvement, but a deterioration of the conditions. In the Darmstädter the composition fits so wonderfully into the closely connected frame. The bust of the Madonna is placed in the upper semicircle, while in the Dresden picture the diameter over which the arch rises is just ugly enough to cut the chin. "

In the south German press 1869. No. 181. 185. 6th and 11th of August, included in a judgment of the Munich exhibition of old German pictures of 21st July, and very similar in the *Nationalzeitung* 1869. no. 357. 4 August.

According to historical notes: "The first impression of the Darmstädter picture is perhaps not quite as favorable as one would expect, by the heavy yellowish-shimmering varnish covering it, but if the hand of a skilful restorer removed it, the work would become to see in his old splendor, for in the most exact examination we have not noticed the faintest retouching, the preservation is perfect, it must be examined in the sharpest detail in all details with the magnifying glass in order to become aware of its full beauty. Consistent in all parts, it is of a perfection, a plastic effect at the same time a genuinely painterly feeling and a sensation of nature, which with the most beautiful portraits of *Holbein's* hand on the same level. Look at the heads of all the persons who appear dry and wooden against the picture of Dresden, the hands, especially those of the Blessed Virgin, the two child-bodies, and especially the feet of the Christ-child carrying Mary in her arms. In front of the Darmstädter picture, those attempts at interpretation that had hung on the Dresden picture would never have appeared. The boy is not of ideal shape, but completely painted after life, but far more perfect in form. There was no reason to think of a sick child. It does not make that whiny face, but smiles mild, childlike and friendly. And just as great is the superiority of the Darmstadt copy in all incidental parts. "

"I have repeatedly seen and tested each of the two works, and it has finally become a certainty that Darmstädter Bild has all the characteristics of an original, the Dresdener not."

"This is demonstrated not only by the difference in treatment and execution, but also by a number of differences in composition, all of which are such that one realizes that the changes in Dresden have been made with the intention of improving the composition."

For this, the memory of known factual differences between the two images, and especially the new assessment of the proportions of the image content, which has already been communicated in the discussion.

"For a long time I resisted looking at the Dresden picture for a copy by another hand, especially the charm of the Madonna's head, which is not more beautiful, but

softer and milder than the head in the other copy, too captivating It was the one who made a modern impression on *Kugler* decades ago. The latest examination of the Dresden picture, which I made last fall, proves to me that not *Holbein* Even the Dresden copy has repeated and that it has emerged only at a later time. For all the reasons that the treatment provides, there is a very striking addition that is almost obvious. The dress of the Blessed Virgin in Darmstädter copy is blue. Only by the changes which the blue-blue is always exposed to, and by the yellowish varnish does it have a greenish tone, which, however, is not different from the original air-blue background. Only through the misunderstanding of a later copyist, the decided green in the dress of the Dresden Madonna may have originated, which contradicts all tradition at this point. "

"In the Darmstädter picture also an interesting pentimento has been found ... [etc] Discussion, chapter II. ... wider.]"

"In general, the copyist was an artist of great insight and skill." <sup>6</sup>In treatment he conformed himself to the model with the greatest possible loyalty, and did not fall out of the role even where he changed. It is interesting to ask in what time, for example, the afterimage could have arisen. If the Dresden picture came from Amsterdam at the end of the seventeenth century, it is probable that it was made during the period in which the painting was in Holland. It has been pointed out that there is a note in the history of Meier's Madonna, which seems to speak for making a copy, even a fraudulent one, in the first half of the seventeenth century. After Sandrart Le Blon had sold the Madonna picture to Lössert, after a note by Remigius Fesch but to the Queen Maria de Medici. If Fesch was well informed, then Le Blon had to s possession have doubled the picture. We know from this time works like the Galleriebilder of *David Teniers* , in which he paints the galleries of galleries and strives to give a miniature copy of extraordinary fidelity in each of the suspended pictures. But we do not have any trace of copyists who were able to paint a pastecio of this excellence that has deceived the public for centuries, to this day. "

<sup>6</sup>) After the Nat. Time. "full of spirit, taste and understanding of the role model".

" *Holbein* 's Darmstadt Madonna is a work of which one can find no end in study and admiration." Often and often one can have seen the picture, believe it entirely, and yet one discovers beauties that one has once again, with renewed contemplation When I went deeper into it, I perceive new advantages in the face of the Dresden picture. A few days ago I met with my friend [Br. Meyer], who took over the paper on the [with the exhibition of old paintings at the same time] International Art Exhibition for these pages , in front of the painting ... In comparing it with the engraved *Steinla* 's copper engraving and the photograph after *Schurig*In the drawing of the Dresden picture we came to look in the eye at the changes made in the architecture of the niche; one word gave the other, and suddenly a point had become clear to us which we did not think before and in which one can carry out the comparison of the Dresden picture, even if it does not stand in the way, since his two faithful and completely identical reproductions suffice for this purpose. The deviation

in the architectural - this is the new result - is in every way that they arise from a misunderstanding of the original. "

"We have already seen ..." [etc] Discussion, Chapter V.).

A reply from *Woltmann* against *E. Förster* in the matter of our picture is under no. 3 thought.

### **9) Dr. Gustav Theodor Fechner.**

Professor in Leipzig (1866. 1868. 1870).

I myself have in one, in three parts in the Naumann-Weigel archive f. sign. K. 1866 XII. 58. 193 and 1868 XIV. 149 (with subsequent correction 1869 XV. 97), which is briefly cited in the discussion as a historical essay, at the same time referring to the question of authenticity, and after a lecture held in the Leipzig Kunstverein in April 1870, a resuming essay on this question in the *Grenzboten*, 1870. II. 41 published. From the historical treatise in the N.-W. Archive, the first two parts have also appeared in separate print. The first (Arch. XII.58), which gives the first complete reprint of the historical data of Fesch, together with a treatise on the Baselsche Handzeichnung no. 65 (Arch. XII.1) under the title: To the question of interpretation and history of the *Holbein*'Madonna. Lpz. R. Weigel, 1866; the second (Arch. XII 193), which gives the remaining historical sources about our picture literally until the year 1866, under the title: The Historical Sources and Negotiations on *Holbein* 's Madonna. Lpz. R. Weigel, 1866. The third (Arch. XIV. 149), an addendum to the two previous parts, which contains the recent *Woltmann* discoveries, the *Wornum* attacks, etc., did not appear particularly.

It is not necessary to return in detail to the content of the above-mentioned essays, since what we put into our question has been substantially extended and modified into this text only modified by minor relations. Only the following is likely to be noticed.

The *Woltmann* 'rule historical discoveries I used (Arch. XIV. 152) even considered more conclusive for the reduction of the Darmstadt copy of the founding family, when I can look for sharper Watching now, but also according to these findings, the overwhelming likelihood of Authenticity of the copy of Dresden (without claiming a certainty), essentially for the same reasons, as brought up in this document again, taken into protection. In the treatise in the border messengers one can still miss the consideration, to *Bruno Meyer* , to be made aware of its treatise I an occasional letter note of Mr. *Woltmann*owe. The Darmstädter Bild I have (after briefly previous consideration of the Dresdener) first in August 1867 in the studio of Professor *Felsing* ; when he made his drawing by way of photographing it, then twice, in August and September 1869 at the Munich exhibition, subjected to consideration.

Scales 1866 s. No. 4th

### **10) Ralph Nicholson Wornum**

Gallery Inspector in London (1867).

The author comes in his book "Some account of the life and works of Hans Holbein, London 1867" by p. 164 to speak of the Darmstadt copy and continues after descriptive consideration of the same:

"This picture is commonly taken to Holbein's masterpiece, but the world is in the process of making a copy of it.", In the Dresden Gallery, by the name of Hanfstaengl.

especially in the head-dress of the daughter, and in the carpet: the ordinary superiority of an original, over the copy by an inferior painter: the weakest part of the of the Madonna and the expression of the child in her arms. The Madonna, in some attempt to beautify her, has been deprived of natural force, and weakly idealized, and the happy child of the original, has, through incapacity more than anything else, been rendered so void of childlike expression, as to have been pronounced sick or even dead, by some, even though this is in the nature of its extended arm is absurd enough. " The weakest part of the Dresden The head and neck of the Madonna. The Madonna, in some attempt to beautify her, has been deprived of natural force, and weakly idealized, and the happy child of the original, has, through incapacity more than anything else, been rendered so void of childlike expression, as to have been pronounced sick or even dead, by some, even though this is in the nature of its extended arm is absurd enough. " The weakest part of the Dresden The head and neck of the Madonna. The Madonna, in some attempt to beautify her, has been deprived of natural force, and weakly idealized, and the happy child of the original, has, through incapacity more than anything else, been rendered so void of childlike expression, as to have been pronounced sick or even dead, by some, even though this is in the nature of its extended arm is absurd enough. "

p. 167. "Further, the proportions of the back-ground details have been changed in the copy, the Darmstadt picture has certainly a somewhat cramped or stumpy effect, the niche presses too close on the head of the Virgin, and this defect has been remedied in the Dresden picture. [Follow dimensional relations] Of these two picture that at Dresden is shown to the utmost advantage, while that at Darmstadt is seen to the utmost disadvantage. "

"The picture at Dresden has not the peculiar coloring of Holbein of this lime, while that at Darmstadt is one of the best and most characteristically colored of all his works, he did not improve in coloring in later years" etc.

p. 169. Here Wornum commemorates the confusing information about the sales relations of the painting after Fesch and Sandrart, with the false statements noted in the discussion on page 24 undermining, and continues afterwards:

while the copy is substituted for it is still treasured as an original; I now cases in point, and I believe the "Meyer Madonna" history is of a very similar nature; and in its result identical."

p. 170. "From a letter written from the Hague, in June 1621, by Sir Dudley Carleton to Lord Arundel (famous collector and admirer of the works of Holbein), we learn that there is a picture by Holbein at Amsterdam which the earl but desired

which Sir Dudley could not succeed in procuring. "He says -" Having said lately on y<sup>e</sup> K. and Q. of Bohemia to Amsterdam I there saw y<sup>e</sup> picture of Holbein's yor L<sup>d</sup> desires; but can not even obtayne it, though my indévové warte on it, as they still shall do. " 7)

7) See a further quotation of this letter in Ch. XV. It is published in Sainsbury's Papers on Rubens pag. 290.

There is no reason why the above abstract should be read in Basel, 1621; it can not, However, Iselin's copy may have been sold in his own lifetime, though this does not agree with the tradition. "

p. 171. After quoting the passage of Fesch's manuscript, which refers to our picture: with Saints Carlo and Antonio Abate below '. Lodi may have communicated to Fesch the de facto sale of the picture to Maria de 'Medici. "

V. Zahn 1867. p. No. 7th  
Fechner 1868. s. 9th

### **11) Carl v. Liphardt** in Florence 1868.

v. *Liphardt* , a highly esteemed private art connoisseur, did not speak publicly about the question of authenticity, but v. *Zahn* informed me that, after an earlier fleeting visit to Darmstadt, he declared himself against the authenticity of the Darmstadt; but, after a recent visit to the picture, recognize the same, as can be seen from the following passage from a letter v. *Liphardt's* to v. *Tooth* (from January 1868) occupied.

"With regard to the Darmstadt *Holbein*, I too am now completely convinced of its originality, having seen it again under the most favorable conditions." It took a struggle before I could change my opinion, but on one occasion there are the almost external reasons (much less Grouping, which corruption could not applaud a so clever copyist - much more understood detail: carpet fold <sup>8)</sup> etc.) striking, then I convinced myself that what bothered me in the minds, namely in that of the mayor, consequence of bad retouching is. "

<sup>8)</sup> It is not clear to me in what respect this is thought here. F.

### **12) Dr. med. Herman Grimm** in Berlin (1869).

After taking note of *Wornum* 's and *Woltmann* ' s challenges to the Madonna of Dresden, Grimm wrote to me in a letter of 3 April 1869.

I can not understand how the Dresden painting could be attributed to someone other than Holbein: I was in Darmstadt three times last fall, hours before the work there, I

had a photograph of the Dresden Madonna in hand to compare line to line On the line in the individual outlines as well as in the grouping, one can see progress toward the higher, say, more ideal, which could only be done by the master himself.the improvements are often so subtle and delicately felt that one goes beyond the ones pressing into each individual Astonished care Holbein may have carried the whole thing in the soul to produce it again. "

"On the other hand, last spring I examined the Dresden Madonna very closely, and in many places this work can not, at least not from Holbein, but from the master, not in other places, on the same board The provisional assumption must therefore formulate itself, it seems to me: Holbein made a new box, had the work partly painted by his pupils and did so much to himself as he needed ".

### **13) Gottfried Kinkel** Professor in Zurich (1869).

The author has written in a display of *Wornum* 's and *Woltmann* 's Holbein monograph, in the Lützow-Seemann'sche Zeitschr. f. In the first place he gives the historical data of Fesch and Sandrart, who can be considered as known here according to Section 6, under reference to *Wornum* . s and *Woltmann* 's communications, and, after pointing out the contradiction, that Fesch wants to buy our picture of Leblon to Maria de Medicis, who had already bought it by her ambassador (around 1606), but Sandrart to Lössert sell, so on:

6) "Godfather, whose life appeared to *Holbein* 's before the release of Erasmus's Praise of Folly in 1676, knew both details.He had notoriously known and written out Fesch's manuscript, Sandrart's first volume had appeared a year before.Patin, whose work [...] is foolishly fabricated without contradiction, looks for the divergence of the two messages in Fesch and Sandrart, and solves this divergence comfortably by saying: Le Blond sold the picture to 1000 Gulden to Lössert <sup>9</sup> , this around 3000 to Maria von Medici, who does not see that this is a temporary help? Le Blond, a speculator in pictures, bought the picture in Basel for 1000 gulden, and should have given it to Lössert for the same price so that he can sell it to Maria von Medici by three times the sum! "

<sup>9)</sup> Comp. on this the note of the discussion p. 24.

"It is clear that while Le Blond owns the picture, it doubles in size." The tradesman sells two copies, one to Lössert, one to Maria de Medici, and the suspicion arises that a copy was made at that time, but - and here if there is a gap in the family tree - whoever received the original, Lössert or the Medici, can not be determined from the external evidence. "

"And who was the scribe? *Wornum* seen its incorruptible eye sharpest throughout the documentary, directed the suspicion of those John Ludi, who just then copied two figures out of the picture for the younger Remigius Fesch. It would then probably Giovanni Battista Lodi from Cremona, of which there is still an altarpiece in

Cremona ( *Wornum*, p. 171), but Dawidowicz says that the two copies of this Ludi ordered by Fesch, which are still in Basel, are said to be quite mediocre. "

"It is also clear that now the further pedigree for the question of the authenticity of one of the pictures is worthless, if *Woltmann* in the second volume (p 452, from an Amsterdam auction catalog of 1709 and one of the coats of arms on the Darmstädter framework proves the proof That the picture sold to Lössert is identical to the Darmstädter remains interesting, but it is no longer decisive, because whether Lössert or Maria bought the real picture of Le Blond, that is what the pedigree leaves undecided. "

"If, however, according to the judgment of all connoisseurs, the Darmstadt picture is the original, and if it proves to be from Lössert's family property, we shall say that the copy made by Le Bland was sold to Maria de 'Medici This is more likely in itself, it was easier to attach the copy of the queen residing in Brussels than to a Dutchman who lived at Amsterdam, that is to say, in the square itself, and from this again arises a strong suspicion against the Dresden picture which the Elector of Saxony and King of Poland from the possession of the Delfino family bought in Venice in 1743, and whose family tree was unknown there, otherwise one would have had to know who it was, but still in 1741, two years before the purchase, it looked like it for the family portrait of Thomas More, and probably only Walpole the owner has opened his eyes (Walpole at *Wornum* ), p. 174f. So it seems that the Dresden picture is just the copy made by Le Blond and sold to the Medici. "

"Against this conviction instantly gained by *Wornum* , *Woltmann* still resisted when he published the list of *Holbein* 's works, and now, after a further examination of the Dresden copy, declares that it is later copied and not under *Holbein* ' s supervision .  
" 10)

<sup>10)</sup> For this the under no. 8 quoted place of *Woltmann*.

In Darmstadt, the child does not look sick on the arm of the Madonna, but looks healthy, yes, it smiles, and of the sick or secluded little child who carries the Madonna in her arms So for *Holbein* 's view no longer be a speech.

#### **14) Wilhelm Schmidt** in Munich (1869).

In a "Munich at the end of August" a discussion of the Munich exhibition of old pictures in the Lützow-Seemann'sche Zeitschr. 1829, No. 2, pp. 388, the author ponders first of all the recent opinion of *Woltmann* of the falseness of the Dresden specimen, and of the sixth finger on the right hand of the naked Knablein, about which his remark is already given in the discussion, and drives then: "the [Darmstädter] picture is painted with the most solid impasto, and quite evenly, the execution of the hair, of the gold decoration, of the carpet very carefully, though not with Dutch fineness." Incidentally, it should not be denied that the lecture duller and less witty than on the portraits *Holbein*'s (from the years 1533 and 1541), which Mr. *Suermondt* had presented to us. In addition, harms the very yellow varnish, here and there a few holes have been clumsily clipped, but this does not affect the

effect. *Woltmann* makes three new statements in that essay, two, as I think rightly, the third with injustice. The one behind the wife of the mayor, Anna Tschekapürilin, kneeling, however, seems, as *W.* notes, to be a deceased former spouse. He is also right in asserting that the character of the architecture of the Darmstadt copy is more fully understood and corresponding to the Renaissance. But that the deceased later still. , , [etc. discussion chap. II.]. "

### **15) Theodor Grosse**

painter and professor in Dresden (1869).

The Dresden artist Grosse, to whom the loggia of the Leipzig Museum owes its beautiful frescos, after examining the Darmstädter painting very closely at the Munich exhibition, and immediately after his return also subjected the Dresdener to a new comparative examination Weeks after that, please tell me (Sept.

"First of all I must state that the picture of Dresden seems decidedly more beautiful to me." The first striking difference is the color, which in the Darmstädter picture appears very yellow under the old varnish, but can be seen in some flaky places on the white robe of the kneeling front As regards the higher figure of the Madonna in the Dresden picture and the other persons, as well as the related extension of the architecture, *v. Zahn* about it the exhausting one said. In the Darmstadt picture it is especially noticeable that the head of the Madonna, in its perfect form and expression, remains so far behind the Dresdener, that one misses even the outward similarity of the features; the same is true of the child on the arm of the Madonna, who does not have the wistful expression of the Dresdener. Technically, both heads, and also the shape of the child, are presented much less surely, indeed, as far as I can remember, they are glazed together somewhat blurry. Almost weak and empty is the hand of the Madonna. Everything else is done almost with the same technique as the Dresdener picture. Garments and ornaments just as completed. To the portrait heads in the Darmstädter picture I think that they are painted before nature, sometimes not without effort; In the head of the father are places that are in turn like the Madonna's head formless, it seems there stranger's hand over it. In the Dresden picture, all these portrait heads are safer, calmer, but also a little colder and smoother, which is quite good *Tooth*'s assumption fits. Thus, the Madonna in Dresden, a hand-written repetition with a matured sense of beauty, in the Madonna and the child in her arms, only when the painter has achieved his intention. In summa the Dresdener appears to me the most excellent. "

Some verbal utterances of Grosse's are already p. 34 and 36 thought.

### **16) Joseph Archer Crowe**

Painter and Consul General in Leipzig 1869.

In the *Border Messengers* 1869 2nd semester no. 40 is an article signed with C., inscribed: "The exhibition of paintings of older masters in Munich *Holbein* and *Dürer* ", as the author of which the above-mentioned very esteemed connoisseur has been known. The following is included here.

"The fact that we have an original in the Darmstädter picture exhibited here, which originated quite some time before the Dresdener, may well no longer be regarded as controversial." The questions on which there are still considerable differences of opinion are Drawing, arrangement and types are superior to the counterpart in Dresden and 2) whether the Dresden picture is a replica of *Holbein* 's own hand or of one of his pupils or finally a later copy? "

"It is pointed out on several pages that the lines of the architecture, as well as the faces of the Madonna and the Child, which are different on the two copies, are more excellent on the Dresden than on the Darmstadt." We on our part are of the opposite opinion and provoke a confrontation the picture that is promised, and which we are convinced will prove us right. The point that demands the most considerate consideration is the Technik, depending on the verdict that is won over it. The claim that *Holbein should be* the master of both paintings, but here too it is best to wait for the direct comparison. "

Afterwards various remarks about the composition of the Darmstädter picture, which are somewhat remote from our question <sup>11)</sup> and which are discussed earlier [discussion ch. II.] Over several retouches in this picture. Then further:

"We see in this masterpieces of art Johann's *van Eyck* matured under the influence of the progress of the 15th and 16th century. It combines the realism of the old Home Services with the harmonious unity of structure and coloration that is peculiar to the later artists. *Dürer* 's severe severity and profound knowledge *Holbein*not, but it enchants us by the silent consecration of his personalities and their gentle expression, by the softness of his modeling, and the fullness of his notes. Although it performs to a degree which hardly permits any increase, yet all keeps bodily mass; Light and shadow are distributed in the most effective way, the whole thing with rich order and uncommon cleanliness in cast. The sun of Italy is in the picture, one believes to stand before the masterpiece of a second Leonardo. A little peculiarity is therefore the more conspicuous. One can not look at the picture without admiring the skill with which the shortenings of the hands are drawn, and the loving elaboration; nevertheless, on the hand, which places the naked child standing on the rug on the boy's kneeling kneeling behind him, in a supernatural way 5 fingers instead of 4 visible. Otherwise the treatment is normal. "

<sup>11)</sup> Among the following, peculiar to the author: "can the assumption, accepted by many critics, according to which the lower naked child is to present the youngest offspring of the Meyer's house, be truly valid?" Many things can be said against us, especially the question Why is one bypassing the obvious interpretation that nobody else is to be found in this little box than the young Baptist? It must not be forgotten, however, that in the absence of halos, the ideal figures are not so recognizable here as elsewhere. "

"The origin and history of the painting and its re-enactment in Dresden have been thoroughly informed lately, and the facts as taught by *His-Heusler* , v. *Zahn* , *Woltmann* , *Fechner* , have been united in the following summary by *Gottfried Kinkel* , that we will leave for now. [This is followed by Resumé, whose rendering by No. 13 is dispensable, with the reinforcement of *Kinkel* suspicion directed against

Leblon, the passage drawn on p. 65 verbally communicates the character of Leblon from Sainsbury's Papers After that:]

and he himself has not laid his hands on the boy's shoulder. Furthermore, the female figure, first attached to Mary, does not kneel in the shadow of the saints, but receives full light on the profile. The niche consoles begin a few inches above the heads and the bow itself is stretched substantially high so that it no longer forms a semicircle; the carpet is much shorter and has fewer colors. But the biggest deviation lies in the face of the baby Jesus. This has such a sickly color and so melancholy appearance in Dresden that one can well understand the emergence of the well-known idle legend, according to which the Madonna should have put her own child on the floor and teased the sick youngest Meyer. If the Darmstädter picture had only one merit,

### 17) Karl Förster

Herzogl. Council in Meiningen, etc. (1869).

A correspondence article of the author on the Munich exhibition of old pictures in the Schasler Dioskuren 1869 no. 35. P. 272 contains the following regarding our question:

"If, on a superficial level, I want to fight ... [see discussion of Chapter IV]."

"There is another with the picture in Darmstadt, for here, as I have said, I can only admit that the first draft and background are *Holbein's* work, whereas nowhere else in his is his hand recognizable here is weak, not worthy of the great master, the composition compressed, the heads are of very material conception, without the fine characteristic *Holbein's* and without his artistic understanding in execution. The realistic direction of the master is shown in the Dresden picture in its noblest training, especially in the already more ideal figure of the "virgin". The features of the face are of great loveliness, noble, feminine and mild, and the figure has the character of a quiet, simple highness; the very lively and individually rendered heads of the figures grouped around them in a kneeling position have a speaking expression of true, deeply felt piety. The Darmstadt picture offers nothing of the Allen. "

"Even more than these obvious weaknesses and mistakes in drawing and composition, for me, the color technique is convincing, this is what I call the master's handwriting, here I look for its characteristic features, here I must recognize him in its peculiarity Here one seeks the light, almost breathless *Touche Holbein's*, his brilliantly clear, brilliant color of the finest impasto, whereby he nevertheless achieves the greatest effect through the simplest means through his mastery. "Here the color is a heavy, tormented, so heavily impastated we neither at *Holbein*It can still be found throughout the period of the art, but belongs to a much later period. This circumstance has also led me to the certain conviction that this picture, as already sketched by *Holbein*, was executed only perhaps 80 to 100 years later by a much lesser artist. The heavy, heavily imprinted paint is too weighty proof of that. "

"One sees the painter unsuccessfully trying to reproduce *Holbein*'s art, to capture his delicate, masterful contours, and to reproduce the forms with the understanding that *Holbein* has had attained to such a high degree of education." -

"If one were to object that a thick, dull varnish conceals the beauty and splendor of the picture, it must be replied that, though account is taken of this circumstance, it is not difficult for a true connoisseur well versed in technology It must be judged to what extent the varnish damages the image's image. "

"Another proof of my assertion is the inequality in the technical treatment of colors: for example, the right foot of the child, which Mary wears on her arms, is masterfully painted, while the left one is highly deficient, indeed bumbling in drawing The hands show neither the feeling for natural truth nor the fine execution of *Holbein* nor the head of the female figure kneeling on the right in the picture, but the head of the mayor completely lacks artistic understanding of the subject Modeling In support of my view, I refer to two hand-drawn drawings in Basel, they are study heads, one of which is the portrait of Mayor Meier *en face* the other shows him looking up, as here in the picture. The royal Kupferstich-Cabinet in Munich has two very faithful, very beautiful photographic images. "

"Even in the event that I was quite isolated with my claim, I would insist immutable, because I am too deeply penetrated by the correctness of my intuition and the strength of my arguments, to waver even for a moment As far as the picture is concerned, I notice that during my twelve-year stay I studied it thoroughly in every direction. "

"In addition, in a following number of the Dioscuri judgments on some other, *Holbein* attributed images of the same exhibition, the Cape V is thought.

E. Förster, 1869, p. No. 3.

F. Hübner, 1869, p. No. 5th

### **18) Bruno Meyer**

art writer in Berlin (1870).

In an article of the Hildburghausen supplementary sheets to the knowledge of the present 1870 H. 1 u. 2, which life and works of our *Holbein* discusses the , is, after some historical and descriptive remarks on the two copies of our picture, which are of no concern here, the following, which concerns us more closely.

The author asserts first of all that, according to *Woltmann*'s discoveries, the reduction of the Dresden picture to the founding family no longer holds its mark, the superiority in the execution of the Darmstadt painting "von Allen", which was seen, was the shadow on the Face of the ancients as a result of a through-grown underpainting and the sixth fingers on the one hand of the lower naked boy prove the priority of the Darmstädter picture, and one then seriously had to ask "whether the Dresden picture could even have come from the *Holbein*'s studio', for which 'essentially and apparently soundly to argue, a copyist would not have allowed such deviations; and the Dresden Madonna's head is too beautiful, an original creation

and *Holbein* 's alone worthy. "The refutation of this appearance is introduced by the author as follows:

"At this point, the undersigned is permitted to submit his observations and views on this question, and he believes that he is entitled to do so, since he is assisted by well-known connoisseurs of art in both places - in Munich *Woltmann* 's himself - 'As long and frequently, under such favorable circumstances, and provided with such wealth of individual observations and notes, has investigated how no one else had been given the opportunity before.'

As a first suspicion, the author then asserted the green Madonna dress of the Dresden painting, first emphasized by *Wollmann* in this regard, by declaring the Darmstädter painting "wonderfully intact" and, despite the fact that he was everywhere else [even by *Woltmann* ] The Darmstadt Madonna is described as "bluish green", says: the dress looks so decidedly green that a well-known Munich artist recognized it as green ". "Green, then," he continues, "as it seems, one may well suppose that the author of the Dresden picture saw the dress, and therefore painted it the way he did." Then on: "Now it is a question of how those two objections stand."

The Dresdener does not even protrude with her whole head in the unlovely and without necessity about an eleventh of the diameter of excessive vaulting, the child remains outside, the room is empty, the connection with the shell shape is lost, the added round does not capture a picture , But as the whole room was raised, the copyist had to rely on his own invention, for he had to show pieces of architecture that Holbein had not imagined for him. While in this everything statically impeccably correct thought is, the consoles evolve projecting, a cover sheet - in the original also runs over the consoles - completes the articulated structure, the details grow in a clearly recognizable structure, all that is so in the Dresden picture wild, so contrived with all the healthy architectural sense of style, that it is impossible to blame Holbein, who understood architecture, better than the simultaneous master builders in Germany. He would not have created something like that under his eyes; and it was only possible at a time when one was not able to compose architecturally simple and large, but at most to invent an inorganic, frizzy, though admittedly inexperienced, eye-catching detail. Thus, with the whole elevation of the room, nothing more is gained than that the mayor can straighten up a little more freely, but on the other hand he loses a great deal and much more important things, but this is certainly not too difficult a play for a copyist. He would not have created something like that under his eyes; and it was only possible at a time when one was not able to compose architecturally simple and large, but at most to invent an inorganic, frizzy, though admittedly inexperienced, eye-catching detail. Thus, with the whole elevation of the room, nothing more is gained than that the mayor can

straighten up a little more freely, but on the other hand he loses a great deal and much more important things, but this is certainly not too difficult a play for a copyist.

"Now let's examine the second objection: the Dresden painting has been slowly torn apart, so to speak, from the bottom up, first the carpet was carried out miserably, then the kneeling figures painted coldly, dull and dry, without them. But soon the associated hands and heads were no longer considered *Holbein's* own's work. To save the garment of the Madonna, the myth of an unpainted overpainting has been invented; the architecture crashes over the heads of society, and the Christ child can not be happy enough to let go; it is well known that it has a miserable, feeble appearance and a whiny, morose face, while the Darmstädter child is in good physical condition and smiles in the friendliest and loveliest way. That ugly child's head, however, has given birth to the brain-bruised hypothesis that the child in the arms of the Madonna was a sick member of the family, a hypothesis for which much ink and paper had been drunk, and what she had always been, now that the Darmstadt picture must at least be recognized as the former and more original, certainly simply ridiculous because it has become obsolete. Thus, in fact, nothing remains of the whole picture of Dresden except the head of the Madonna, from which she still bothered to talk. The undersigned has now, through repeated detailed consideration and support, besides the possible external aids, through a practiced and reliable memory for facial forms and physiognomic expression, increasingly won the conviction that, in his opinion, by direct comparison of the two images, each unbiased one and those capable of judgment would impose upon them immediately as well, that the Madonna's head of Dresden did not produce any original [etc. III.]. These judgments are not so palpable as the facts that came into consideration in the previous point, and for the time being, therefore, they will be doubted and perhaps laughed out at by those who do not know the image of Darmstadt at all or only superficially; but time will put a stop to doubt. "

"There are only two things left for us to do: to say what we now think positively of the Dresden picture, and to explain how the same has lasted so long in authority." The Dresden picture, for the first, is later without any question Copy, without a dash of *Holbein's* hand, and, let us add, even a very moderate copy. The forms have no roundness, the fabrics are unclear and painted indistinctly, the heads lack life and are sensitively coarsened, the hands are wooden and awkward. The colors have no power, they are dusty, chalky, the whole makes the faintly dim impression of a pastel image, the harmony lacks that distinguishes the original. The lack of understanding of the architecture, the sense of the petite and the character of the color-attitude, which manifests itself in the head, do not make us doubt for a moment that the picture is not much older than its certified history, and that we have one in it. See work from the second to the fourth century of the eighteenth century before us. "[Hienach the hypothesis cited in Chapter V. then: The Dresden picture, which was found in Venice, was supposed to have been taken over by the banker Avogadro after the memories of an old man in Amsterdam at Paystatt. As historically, this note has no value, but as in all legends lived in it true moments, so here the memory of the Dutch origin of the picture. According to this suggestion and style, its genesis is much more likely to

coincide with that event which certainly caused a sensation and drew attention to the original, that the latter was sold in an auction in 1700 at the considerable price of 2,000 guilders to Amsterdam in which a large altar piece by Rubens brought in only 1000 guilders. " so here is the memory of the Dutch origin of the picture. According to this suggestion and style, its genesis is much more likely to coincide with that event which certainly caused a sensation and drew attention to the original, that the latter was sold in an auction in 1700 at the considerable price of 2,000 guilders to Amsterdam in which a large altar piece by Rubens brought in only 1000 guilders. " so here is the memory of the Dutch origin of the picture. According to this suggestion and style, its genesis is much more likely to coincide with that event which certainly caused a sensation and drew attention to the original, that the latter was sold in an auction in 1700 at the considerable price of 2,000 guilders to Amsterdam in which a large altar piece by Rubens brought in only 1000 guilders. "

Secondly, his success is nothing short of surprising: the original itself has been lost for more than a century, but *Holbein*'s Madonna is one of the images that can not be spoiled, and the size and violence of each, even the most inadequate reproduction, shines through. Thus, the Dresden picture also took hold of all the minds, and it was praised as the embodiment of perfection, because there was no reason to doubt authenticity, and no opportunity to compare it with anything even better. The Madonna-destroying comparison with the now hanging portrait of Morett von *Holbein* within the Dresden collection continued, as this was a work by *Leonardo da Vinci*; and the rest of *Holbein*'s in Dresden came, as rather insignificant, out of the question. Moreover, the picture had just something that had to give it its entrance: it was imperceptibly brought nearer by its modernization of sensation; here a supposedly old picture to a rare degree reflected the new taste. "

"If the confrontation between the two Madonnas, which was intended for this autumn, is to be achieved in Dresden this year, the Dresden *Holbein* Madonna "in the history of art will from then on only be considered an interesting monument to live on a long mistake. "

Finally in the Kap.VIII. The discussion cited the carpet.

J. Hübner, April 13, 1870 s. No. 5th  
Fechner, April 1870 s. No. 9th

### **19) Jacob Felsing**

Kupferstecher and Prof. in Darmstadt (1870).

The author's important correspondence note concerning a pentimento in the Darmstädter Bild (according to the letter of 15 April 1870), which, if generally acknowledged, will perhaps furnish the most decisive proof of the priority of the Darmstädter Bild, is in Chap. II. The author himself points to this meaning of the Pentimento, with the remark: "as I was also the first to designate the changed proportions of the figures and to draw attention to Mr. v. *Zahn* , which necessarily

explains the priority of our picture without wanting to go as far as Woltmann left.  
" [Comp. also note n. 115.]

## 20) Otto Heyden

court painter in Berlin (1870).

The author signed only with *OH* describes in the Berl. Nachr. Of state and learned things 1870 no. 271 a visit to the Darmstadt picture in Darmstadt, in which he essentially reproduces *Woltmann* 's earlier views , as still contained in his *Holbein* , on the authenticity relationship of both pictures, according to which the Darmstädter picture is not only that of the past but also of *Holbein* 's hand, while 'many hardships and inequalities in the minds and hands 'suggest,' that the Dresdener was not consistently by *Holbein* even though he is executed by a very skilled hand under his direction. "He also found" not the least retouching "in the picture of Darmstadt, and the remark mentioned in chapter II that it was painted on linen canvas and glued only on wood be.

Huebner. 1869, s. No. 5th