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A Newly Discovered Book with Painted Decorations from Willibald Pirckheimer's Library

The late Seymour de Ricci attributes to Michael Kerney the first suggestion that certain illuminations found in books from Willibald Pirckheimer's library might be by Albrecht Dürer, the humanist's life-long friend. Since Kerney wrote, there have been many additional, and specific, claims advanced to which this essay is intended to add a little light, rather than heat, and to furnish at least one new piece of information.

The new information is the immediate cause of writing. In the summer of 1945 the scholar and London bookdealer E. P. Goldschmidt noticed an exceptionally fine Aldine Greek and Latin Aesop, Venice, 1505, among the books to be sold by Viscount Hambleden at Sotheby's, on July 16. On the first text page his practiced eye immediately recognized Pirckheimer's arms emblazoned, and he purchased the book after only moderate competition. He then showed the volume to Mr Campbell Dodgson, emeritus head of the British Museum Print Room, and an eminent authority on German art, who tended to agree with the attribution of the painted arms to Dürer. Finally he offered the volume to an American client and it is now on loan in the Department of Graphic Arts of the Harvard College Library.

Much circumstantial and artistic evidence can be built up to support the theory of Dürer's authorship. But since numerous claims have already been made for other illumination, as explained above, it seems wise to examine the evidence in this particular discovery coldly. The writer does not pretend to be an authority on Dürer, but only to fairly painstaking research on these arms, and to a keen desire to make no more claims than can be safely supported. More experienced scholars will have to pass on the conclusions. Among these it is hoped that Professor Erwin Panofsky will review the whole subject when he publishes a

A Book from Pirckheimer’s Library

Third edition of his recent very successful two-volume work on Dürener.

Here, first, are the facts about this copy of the Aldine Aesop. Such inferences as can be drawn from them, and an aesthetic appraisal, will then follow in the proper order as the writer moves from certainty to personal opinion.

The book was printed by the scholar-publisher, Aldus Manutius, at Venice in October, 1505. This was just before Dürener’s second trip to that great trading center, from which he wrote back to his wealthy friend as early as the 6th of January 1506. Almost at once Dürener mentioned to Pirckheimer that he had already despatched some of the books he had ordered for his patron. We know from further letters that Dürener had been commissioned particularly to seek Greek books (in which important language of Renaissance scholarship Pirckheimer was one of the first scholars in Germany to become proficient), and also that Dürener was in financial debt to Pirckheimer, a situation which often obtained throughout the remainder of the artist’s hard-pressed life. These are the only facts which can be brought to bear. What follows is deduction or conjecture.

It would not be unnatural, however, for Dürener to try to please his patron by exerting his artistic talent. Pirckheimer’s appreciation of Dürener’s ability is well evidenced by his letters. Moreover, it was a custom of the day frequently to make and exchange presents. Dürener’s journal of his trip to the Low Countries in 1520–21 is full of such instances. With Pirckheimer he was on the closest terms. Many fine drawings and paintings are extant which show his interest in heraldic and ornamental design. About a dozen drawings are for bookplates or marks of ownership, and three of them are for Pirckheimer personally, as well as a woodcut and an engraving for the same purpose. We do not know from Dürener’s letters, however, that he ever illuminated a book for Pirckheimer. The only book decorations that are certainly car-

---

*Notably in letters of 18 August and 13 October 1506. For all Dürener’s letters see QuellenSchriften für Kunstgeschichte, Vol. III, Dürener Briefe, Tagebücher und Reime (Vienna, 1872), pp. 3–56.


*A. Bartsch, Le Peintre Gravé (Leipzig, 1865), VII, 192, Appendix #51, and 113, #106 respectively.

*Panofsky, Albrecht Dürener (Princeton, 1943), II, 161–404, lists those which have been attributed to Dürener. Most of these he is inclined to doubt.
ried out by his own hand are the forty-five marginal pen drawings in
the Emperor Maximilian’s ‘Prayer Book,’ which are signed and dated
1515—nearly ten years later than the period in question. An example
from this book is shown in Plate III.

There is one near-contemporary piece of evidence in favor of Dürer’s
authorship of this particular Aldine Aesop decoration. Pirckheimer’s
library, in an absence of male heirs, descended, after his death in 1530,
to his favorite daughter Felicitas, who had married into the Imhof fam-
ily of Nuremberg. In 1634, one of her descendants, Hans Hieronymus
Imhof, was charged by the other heirs, whose banking affairs had gone
very badly in the first part of the Thirty Years’ War, to sell the bulk of
these books, which had previously been held, despite a sale of art
objects to the Emperor Rudolph in the early 1580’s. H. H. Imhof kept
a financial notebook 6—his ‘Geheimbuchlein’—and under this year
1634, on folio 72 recto, he records the sale of ‘14 books from the Pirck-
heimer Library’ which he describes item by item, particularly as to the
illumination, which he states was by Dürer’s own hand (‘ist von gummi
farben von Albrecht Dürer’s hand gemahlt’).

Number IX in this list is unquestionably the Aesop under discussion.
Not only does Imhof correctly identify it as an edition in Latin and
Greek, but he also describes one of the two illuminated initials con-
taining an owl, and a painted coat of arms which is supported by ‘ein
Wisher mann und weib; halten das Birckheymervappen in Händen.’
The wild man and woman do support Pirckheimer’s shield as stated.
Imhof believed the illumination to be by Dürer, and the purchaser,
Mathieu (or Matthijs) van Overbeke of Leyden, a collector of Dürer’s
art, was of the same opinion. The latter paid a price of 300 Reichstaler
for the fourteen books, which was decidedly more than their current
worth as printed classics. To be sure, the sale does not of itself prove
that these fourteen books are nearer to Dürer than the many other
books which exist with painted Pirckheimer arms. It only shows that
they, at least, were considered authentic by the near descendants of
Dürer’s closest friend, and by a collector who paid a good price—and
a few years later bought several more items from this source in the same
belief.

*The MS was before 1529 in Nuremberg. It is partially reprinted—in so far as it
refers to the books—by Erwin Rosenthal in Jahrbuch der Freussischen Kunstsam-
mlungen, XLIX, Beihfe, Teil I (Berlin, 1928) in an article on ‘Dürers Buchmalereien
für Pirckheimers Bibliothek.’
Plate V
Heretofore only three books from Imhoft’s list have been traced to present-day collections. Mr. Goldschmidt’s discovery of the Graeco-Latin Aesop makes a fourth—which out of fourteen is a sadly small proportion.

From circumstantial one must now move to stylistic evidence, which unfortunately is more complex. Albrecht Dürer had so great an influence and produced so much in his relatively short life (he died at fifty-eight) that one can naturally find some elements common to the Aesop miniature (reproduced in Plate I) and to accepted examples of his work. That is, if we agree the arms are contemporary German work, of which there seems no doubt. The coloring is certainly of the period and country, although it may seem unusual to modern eyes. The wild man and woman are painted a very striking yellow-green, with an intricate overlay of brown hairs, which denote their savage state. Only the faces, feet, hands, elbows, knees, and the like, are bare. The flesh tints contain white lead and have partially oxidized. The skin of the man is much browner than the woman’s—a customary artistic convention. His hair and beard are gray while her hair is brown with greenish overtones. A wreath on her head is green and is touched with gold. The shield is gold in its upper half and scarlet in the lower. Pirckheimer’s emblem, a tree, is gray and white. Most of the ground on which the wild pair stand is gray or a pale green in which flowers and long blades of grass are picked out in gold. But certain details are surprising. The wild man does not have the usual club. The shield seems to be held by straps or ribbons edged with gold and painted dark blue, which are not well differentiated. Neither the man’s right, nor the woman’s left arm is indicated—a curious omission, unlike Dürer, although not immediately noticeable. Yet all other details in this miniature show care in drawing and an inspiration far above the ability of any ordinary craftsman.

The wild man actually is a favorite subject of Dürer’s. It is particularly applicable to Pirckheimer since, as Professor Edgar Wind pointed out to the writer, it signifies crude strength and courage, for which his friend was noted, and in one of Dürer’s letters from Venice (28 August 1506) he reminds Pirckheimer that he is wild in appearance. A number of Dürer drawings, the Krell shutters, which will be mentioned

“See also Jacobo Galli, Diviti-Mosti e Imprese (Milan, 1928), pp. 312-313, #1171 and #1172.

“Mir sehe auch wild,” quoted by Parofsky, op. cit., I, 105.

“At Munich (in Maximilian’s ‘Prayer Book’), at Dresden, etc., as well as Warsaw;
later, and a very important (signed) engraving, the 'Coat of Arms with the Skull,' also feature wild men. In all but one of these cases they are drawn in connection with heraldic emblems, and in several instances the pose is distinctly similar. Professor Wind suggested to the writer that the wild man's features in the Aesop miniature under discussion might be those of Pirckheimer, since they are rather heavy and flat, unlike the notably sharp features in all other renderings of wild men by Dürer. The formal engraved portrait which Dürer made for Pirckheimer and which the latter used as a bookplate (see reproduction, Plate IIIb) shows definite similarities in feature. The gray hair of the miniature could also be significant. Might not the miniature, therefore, be a joke, in the spirit of the times? Might it not represent Pirckheimer, derisively, as a 'wild old man,' and the woman as one of his 'lady friends' to whom Dürer jokingly makes such pointed allusions in his letters from Venice in 1506?

There is also a very close relationship, from all points of view, with a Dürer drawing in Warsaw (before 1939) which is reproduced in Plate IIIa so that the reader may make his own comparison. This drawing is an elaborate and very delicately drawn design in ink for Pirckheimer's bookplate which must be earlier in date (ca. 1503) than the Aesop miniature, since it contains in addition to Pirckheimer's own, the arms of his wife, Crescentia, who died on 17 May 1504, in childbirth.

If Dürer was the artist of the Aesop miniature he must have had this Warsaw drawing for Pirckheimer's ex-libris in mind. The miniature is in no sense a copy of the drawing (which would be an argument against Dürer's authorship, as a great artist rarely 'repeats' exactly). But it has certain very notable features in common. First of all, there is the pose of the woman in both scenes. Her hair is flying, her face turned one-quarter to the front, body quite naked seen from almost full rear, and a wreath around her head. The position of both legs is even more strikingly analogous. For Dürer in 1506 was less concerned with anatomical truth than with compositional relationships. His interest in anatomical truth came later — an interest which led him to write his book on

---

see Lippmann, op. cit., and Charles Natrey, Albrecht Dürer (Paris, 1866), p. 57, reproducing a fine drawing destroyed in the Tuileries fire (1871).

Bartsch 101; J. Meder, Dürer-Katalog (Vienna, 1932), #99.

Cf. the reproduction in Plate VIIb.

human proportions (first published in 1528). The pose is not simply awkward, it is purposely mannered and individual, as is that of Adam
and Eve in the first two woodcuts of Dürer’s ‘Little Passion.’ Such a
feature as this is the handwriting of an individual artist. Since the War-
saw drawing is quite generally accepted as the work of the master,
despite the false signature and date (1503), the Aesop miniature must
have at least a close relationship with him. The delicacy of the two
drawings is another affinity, and the fact that they are both for Pirck-
heimer.

The wild woman’s curious profile and hair suggest Eve’s in Dürer’s
famous engraving of ‘The Fall of Man’ (dated 1504).28 The wild
woman’s profile is also strikingly like the foreshortening in the engraving
of Mary and St Anne29 (reproduced in Plate IIa). In respect to
pose, her figure recalls several Dürer drawings, notably that of a naked
woman18 at Donaueschingen, and the flat-footed stance of Adam and
Eve in a drawing at Vienna18 for the first ‘Little Passion’ woodcut (a
portion of which is reproduced in Plate IVa).

Other instances may be multiplied. The Aesop wild man has a rela-
tionship, as Professor Panofsky has pointed out in correspondence, to
the wild man in the dexter Krell shutter painting at Munich (repro-
duced in Plate VIb). The posture in both cases has an agitation not
really called for by the weight of the shield alone. Equally, as Professor
Wind suggests, the mannered posture of the wild woman’s hand hold-
ing the ribbons or straps in the Aesop miniature closely resembles Eve’s
hand in the drawings30 at the Albertina and the British Museum for the
famous engraving of the ‘Fall of Man’ previously mentioned.

All in all, therefore, the writer feels that the weight of evidence favors
Dürer’s hand in some important phase of the miniature’s execution —
possibly solely in the under drawing, although the coloring is finely
done. Technically speaking, against the drawing being Dürer’s own,
only the carelessness in omitting arms and club, and the lack of definition
in the straps or ribbons holding the shield can be brought to bear.
Otherwise, the analogies are too numerous and too close to be dismissed.

2 Bartsch 13; Meder 1.
34 Bartsch 39.
35 H. Tietze, Kritisches Verzeichnis der Werke Albrechts Dürers (Basle, 1927),
36 Ibid., p. 404, and reproduction on p. 204.
The logical date for the drawing (1506) seems right — during or just after Dürer's trip to Venice. It fits in with the Dürer drawings and prints mentioned, as well as others less striking. And there are the suggestive references in his 1506 letters. Last but not least, the Aesop miniature can bear enlargement. Indeed, when it is so treated, as in the reproduction in Plate V, the feeling of power is enhanced. This is a notable characteristic of good drawing. The work of a copyist would not be likely to pass such a test, although admittedly at this point personal aesthetic judgment comes strongly into play.

A note of caution in making claims, however, is furnished by a plaque in the Metropolitan Museum of Art which Professor Wind called to the writer's attention. This sculpture combines several Dürer elements, related to the Aesop miniature, but is considered by him and by Professor Panofsky 18 more likely to have been executed in his entourage by an artist with access to his drawings. The plaque is also related to a sixteenth-century drawing in Dessau 19 where the nude female figure is combined with a wild man to make a composition decidedly interesting in comparison with the miniature under discussion. It is therefore reproduced in Plate IVb. Here again Dürer's own hand is doubtful. As a result, one sees that copies after Dürer, or containing Dürer elements, were made in or shortly after Dürer's lifetime, and one hesitates to claim too much for any work that cannot be thoroughly authenticated.

When, in this same critical spirit, we consider the initial letters, one of which H. H. Imhof had also indicated in his 'Geheimbuchlein' was painted by Dürer's hand, we are less happy with an enlargement. The owl is quaint indeed and undoubtedly contemporary, but it is a far cry from the lively pen sketch (ca. 1505) in the British Museum.20 The Aesop owl may derive from the study for the small owl in the Vienna 'Maria mit den vielen Tieren,' 21 but the Aesop owl is more awkward. It is not even so fine as a watercolor drawing in the Albertina at Vienna once attributed to Dürer which, despite its signature and date (1508), has been generally rejected. Only the coloring of the Aesop owl seems to resemble the miniature containing Pirkheimer's arms. There are the same little touches of gold in the grass beneath the owl's feet as in the painted arms on the same page. The dark blue of the Greek capital

19 Illustrated in Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte, I (1932), 361.
21 Ibid., Vol. V, plate 460.
letter is repeated in the straps of the shield in the Pirckheimer arms. As for the other initial, on the left-hand page, it is still more routine and carries no conviction at all as being by a master’s hand, although the coloring is of the same general scheme and execution.

Before concluding, the Aesop painting deserves to be compared with the miniature in the Greek edition of Theocritus, also from Pirckheimer’s library, formerly in the Yates-Thompson Collection, and now in the London Library (reproduced in Plate VIa). This book is mentioned by H. H. Imhof (No. XII) in his list of fourteen books sold to van Overbeke. It is also a Greek classic, also printed by Aldus in Venice, and is the most celebrated if not the finest of those illuminated books from Pirckheimer’s library which have survived. The date of illumination of the Theocritus must be somewhat earlier than the Aesop; for, like the Warsaw drawing, it contains Pirckheimer’s wife’s arms, as well as his own, which he never used after her death in 1504. The delicacy of drawing is the same in both cases. From Dr Rosenthal’s description the coloring is of equal individuality and brilliance, and also contains spots which have oxidized. But it is more elaborate. Dr Rosenthal accepts the exquisite landscape without reserve as Dürrer’s work, and bases many of his arguments in favor of eight other volumes, most of which had been sold in 1925 from the Royal Society Library, on similarities with this illumination.

Professor Panofsky, on the other hand, is more cautious. He says, ‘The manual authenticity of this kind of work is as difficult to determine as the exact dates.’ The Theocritus illumination is one of five which he believes may be by Dürrer, although he adds, ‘even here the participation of a professional illuminator is not excluded.’ In addition, the miniature in Aristotle’s *Organon*, Venice, 1495–97, and a somewhat similar miniature in a copy of Simplicius’ Greek commentary on Aristotle, Venice, 1499, in the Royal Library at Copenhagen, seem to him possibly by the master hand. Both, he notes, are also contained in H. H. Imhof’s list of fourteen books, as is the Aesop. But this may be a coincidence. For stylistic and technical reasons the writer agrees with Professor Panofsky’s opinion in so far as can be judged from reproductions of the other illuminations attributed to Dürrer. It seems to him that it is the color scheme, and painting technique,
rather than the drawing which is the common denominator between all
the painted Pirckheimer arms. One must admit a common colorist, or
school of illumination, in order to reconcile the strong similarities, at
the same time that one tries to distinguish the master's hand from a
copyist working with elements from Dürer's designs, in the **under
drawing** of the various miniatures.

In sum, then, the color and the design of the initials argue against
the theory of Dürer's authorship. But they do not conflict with the
writer's theory that Dürer drew the shield and its supporters, leaving
the initials and all the coloring to an assistant, or more likely still, to a
local Nuremberg illuminator who may have worked for Pirckheimer,
so many of whose books bear painted coats of arms. Whoever the color-
ists were (if more than one hand was engaged in these Aesop illumi-
inations), they were German and not Italian. It is more than likely that
they resided in Nuremberg; for otherwise the illuminations in the books
which Pirckheimer bought in many parts of Europe could not have so
much in common as regards their coloring. The fact that there was a
thriving school in the city at this time makes their employment the more
natural since locally available.

* * * * *

A final word as to the more recent provenance of the Aesop. From
Matthijs van Overbeke (1634) on till the early nineteenth century,
the trail is lost. Van Overbeke, merchant, scholar and patron of the
arts, died in 1638, his widow in 1649, his son in 1674. There is appar-
ently no clue where and when his books were sold. In the middle of
the eighteenth century the Aesop was evidently in France; for it was
then bound **(ca. 1750-70)** in fairly plain but fine French red levant
morocco, in the style of Devome, with marbled end papers, by a su-
peior French workshop.

Probably between 1824 and 1831 it came into the hands of Sir John
Hayford Thorold, one of the best collectors of his day in England,
who greatly added to the famous Syston Park Library which his father,
Sir John Thorold, had commenced toward the end of the previous cen-
tury. Seymour de Ricci notes the younger Thorold's habit of pencil-
ing on the flyleaf the name of the dealer from whom he had acquired
the book. In this case we find the name of the bookseller Payne. But
a careful perusal of Payne's own files of his catalogues, which Robert

*English Collectors of Books and Manuscripts*, p. 160, n. r.
A Book from Pirckheimer’s Library

Hoe gave to the Grolier Club in New York, reveals, according to Mr. George L. McKay, the Secretary, no evidence of Thorold’s purchase. The book is not Sir Mark Masterman Sykes’ copy, which was also quite evidently a fine one, having fetched all of £20 in 1824, because that was bound in olive morocco by Lewis (a later and an English binder). Possibly it is Meerman’s copy, later owned by A. A. Renouard, but of this there is no proof.

Besides his bookplate and note of the bookseller Payne, Thorold customarily put one other – and sometimes less happy – mark of ownership upon his books. He had what Michael Kerney enjoyed calling a ‘hideous anchor in gold, a frightful caricature of the Aldine emblem,’ stamped on the two covers by Messrs. Storr and Ridge, bookbinders at Grantham. Actually the anchors (in this case at least) are not too large, or even ugly, and do not seem seriously out of place.

The next mention we have of this Aesop is in the Syston Park Sale Catalogue (Sotheby’s, London, 12-19 December 1884) where under #40 it was sold for £20 10s. without mention of the Pirckheimer provenance or of the painted illumination but only as a ‘very fine copy in red morocco, g.e. [gilt edges] by Derome.’ The purchaser is not noted in the Harvard Library copy of this catalogue. Very possibly he was the Right Honorable William Henry Smith (1825-1891), First Lord of the Treasury and Leader of the House of Commons in the second ministry of Lord Salisbury, since Smith’s armorial label is pasted opposite the Syston Park plate on the inner fly leaf.

From this able Englishman, whose name is carried by the famous chain of W. H. Smith & Sons bookstores all over the British Isles, the volume undoubtedly passed direct to his son, Viscount Hambleden, in whose sale Mr. E. P. Goldschmidt purchased it (Sotheby’s, 16 July 1945, #160). Here at last mention of the illumination is made, but no reference to Pirckheimer, nor to the possible authorship of Dürrer.

PHILIP HOFER

* Article on ‘Sir John Thorold,’ in Contributions towards a Dictionary of English Book-Collectors, Pt. II (September 1892).
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