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Due to the frequency of paintings being stolen or forged, ownership and authenticity of artworks can often be called into question. This case study focuses on investigating the ownership of one painting, the *Blind Man’s Buff*, painted by Jean-Honoré Fragonard. Given the nature of this inquiry, multiple institutions and databases were used to provide primary documentation. The *Blind Man’s Buff* was located in Europe during World War II and was in the hands of a prominent banking family, who were known to have their art collections stolen. I believe that the *Blind Man’s Buff* may be one of these.

The artist, Jean-Honore Fragonard, was considered one of the most important painters of the eighteenth century. He studied as an apprentice under the master painter Francois Boucher. This is where he began painting decorative subjects and pastoral landscapes, as this is what Boucher was known for.\(^1\) With encouragement from Boucher, Fragonard competed for the Prix de Rome in 1752, and though he had not received any training from the academy yet, he won.\(^2\) Before leaving for Rome, Fragonard spent several years studying at the École des élèves protégés in Paris, where he studied history painting and learned how to engrave.\(^3\) After the Prix de Rome, Fragonard became known for his landscapes. He became so popular that his landscape works were attempted to be copied.\(^4\) Fragonard then entered the academy as an associate after a unanimous vote in 1765. This is when Fragonard dove further into the erotic and decorative subject matter of Rococo and his portraits. It was during this time that he painted his most famous painting, *The Swing*.\(^5\)

---


The Rococo art period was characterized by its playful and flirtatious depictions. Images were primarily focused on the fashion and taste of the French aristocrats. Additionally, the incorporation of children’s games into art was common during the Rococo period due to their importance in French culture. These children’s games and leisure activities provided an environment where the rules of decorum in society were more relaxed. Moreover, it was a way that adults, especially courting couples, were able to temporarily escape their responsibilities and feel the excitement and fun of childhood. Rococo artwork began to utilize these well-known children’s games and incorporate patterns of courtship and eroticism, which would satisfy the desire for the romantic pastoral themes that the aristocratic French possessed.

The game called the “Blind Man’s Buff” was common for young adults to play as an imitation of the courtship game. The children’s game version was played by a group of people, and one person was blindfolded. They would be “it”. The other members of the game would try and “buffet”, or hit, the blindfolded. If the player who was blindfolded manages to catch someone who hit them, and successfully guess their identity, that player takes the blindfold. For courtship purposes, the game would be played by a couple, where one, typically a young male suitor, tickles the other who is blindfolded, often on the cheek. Additionally, depictions of

---

this game in artwork often will include a putto who is there to distract the young woman from her suitor.\textsuperscript{11}

Fragonard’s painting, \textit{Blind Man’s Buff} at the Toledo Museum of Art (Figure 1), encompasses all of these requirements, as it was painted with such a flirtatious tone. The painting is set on a terrace, where the space is small, with all the attention brought to the actions on the slim platform. The location gives a feeling as if it was a hidden or secret place that could be taken advantage of for its privacy. The woman in the foreground is very elegantly dressed. Her hat, bowtie, big and puffy dress, and even the shoes point to the status of this woman, but she is also blindfolded. Her male suitor is standing slightly behind her and holding a stand of straw which grazes her cheek touching her face. The young woman reacts with blushing cheeks and a smile. Two putti have also been included on the left, one of which is tickling the woman’s hand with a small fishing pole.

Fragonard included a subtle erotic tone in the painting. The young woman is spilling out of her clothing, to the point that her right breast is beginning to be exposed, yet she still reaches out to find her suitor. Additionally, her eyes can be seen glancing out from beneath her blindfold, showing that she already knows the outcome of her erotic play.\textsuperscript{12} This erotic tone is furthered by the suggestion of the young woman will be losing her innocence, which is reinforced by Fragonard’s use of symbolism. The enclosed garden had become a symbol of a woman’s virginity in the Renaissance era. However, Fragonard painted this garden with a broken wall, and the garden gate is even broken off.\textsuperscript{13}

\textsuperscript{13} Therese Southgate, “The Cover”, \textit{Journal of the American Medical Association (JAMA) Network} 277, no. 6 (1997), 442.
The provenance of any piece of artwork is the most important thing in order to authenticate and prove ownership of an item. A provenance is the history of ownership of the artwork. A provenance should include identifiable information concerning ownership or transfer of the artwork, like a list of owners, auctions, and art collectors. Since the eighteenth century, the provenance of artwork has been important to bring credibility to the dealer or collector and to determine the value of art. It was during this time that the merit of a work had transitioned from being solely based on a critic’s opinion or emotion, and more on the authenticity of the artwork. A provenance will indicate whether a piece has been in a distinguished collection or exhibition, which would point to authenticity and aesthetic quality. With this, the provenance became imperative to a work of art and could increase its value.

During the Nazi era, the provenance became increasingly important in order to ascertain the circumstances of artwork transfers. As early as 1935, Adolf Hitler began collecting art for a future museum in his hometown, Linz. He began using military power to achieve territory gain and his desired art. After the takeover of Austria, the German government introduced the “division laws”, which restricted Jews from owning any form of property. This allowed the private Jewish art collections began to get confiscated for “safeguarding”. The first Jewish art collection that was taken was the private collection of Alphonse and Louis Rothschild in

---

Vienna. \(^{20}\) Next came the museums. On top of wanting to find the best pieces of art for Hitler’s future museum, the Germans also needed to fund the war efforts. In 1939, a massive auction took place with 126 items from Germany’s leading public museums, but all the profits were kept by the German Government. \(^{21}\)

Matters only got worse in 1940, when Hitler signed a decree allowing the seizure of any “degenerate” works of art, which would be those owned by Jews. The Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg (ERR) was formed, headed by Alfred Rosenberg, which would work with the French government to confiscate all Jewish property in the German-occupied regions of France. \(^{22}\) During World War II, Nazis stole more than 60,000 pieces in total of Jewish-owned cultural valuables from French collections. \(^{23}\) The items confiscated by the ERR began to be collected at the Jeu de Paume. \(^{24}\)

The items collected at Je de Paume were subject to varying fates. First, high-ranking German officials were allowed to “shop” there. Many paintings from these seizures were selected by Adolf Hitler for his museum in Linz and many more were selected by Hermann Goering for his private collection in Carinhill. \(^{25}\) Additionally, artwork was sold from the Jeu de Paume or


\(^{23}\) Tom Bazley, *Crimes of the Art World*. (California: Praeger, 2010), 84.


exchanged for other artwork with “greater interests to Germany”. Lastly, over 500 “degenerate” objects at Jeu de Paume were destroyed.\(^{26}\)

One of the Jewish families majorly impacted by the German art looting was the Rothschilds. The Rothschilds are a prominent banking family, who had significant influence throughout Europe in the 19\(^{th}\) and 20\(^{th}\) centuries. The Rothschild banking business started in Frankfort in the 1760s and expanded to London, Paris, Vienna, and Naples.\(^{27}\) However, during the war, the family was heavily targeted as they were a gorgeously wealthy Jewish family with known vast art collections. Additionally, they owned the Rothschild Industries which the German government wanted.\(^{28}\) As Baron Louis de Rothschild was attempting to flee Austria, he was arrested and held for ransom from March 1938 to May 1939. The ransom was believed to be the highest paid ransom in history to date, totaling 21 million dollars.\(^{29}\) This would convert to over 450 million today. In Austria alone, over 3,500 pieces of the Rothschild collection had been confiscated.\(^{30}\)

The Rothschilds that lived in France had fled the country prior to the German occupation, leaving their large art collection behind. In order to protect some pieces from confiscation, the Louvre sheltered a fraction of the Rothschild items, though the rest remained scattered across France.\(^{31}\) Unfortunately, in 1941, the ERR was able to remove Jewish collections from the

\(^{26}\) Database of Art Objects at the Jeu de Paume, Joint Project of Conference on Jewish Material Claims Against Germany and United States Holocaust Memorial Muesem, 2020. https://www.errproject.org/jeudepaume/


French national repositories, including the Louvre, and everything was shipped to the Jeu de Paume. The ERR seized anything of value from the Rothschild palace in Paris, then searched the Rothschild country houses that were in the German-occupied areas of France. The ERR even managed to bring twenty-two chests filled with jewelry from a Rothschild bank vault. It is recorded that the total amount of artwork that was stolen by the ERR had been 21,903 items. Of those items, 5,009 were from the Rothschild collection.

The Jeu de Paume kept very neat records, after the war some of the items that had been cataloged were able to be restituted. Unfortunately, some of the ERR-looted artwork never passed through the storage facilities accessible in the US-occupied zone in Germany to be cataloged. For example, portions of the collections of Robert, Maurice, and Eugene de Rothschild were found abandoned on a country road in France’s unoccupied zone, but they were swiftly sold since many curators from major museums were allowed to choose from the selection. However, with the pressure on countries, especially Germany, to restitute any stolen artwork, the examination of all museum collections began. In the United States, forty-four states committed to examining their collections. So, inadvertently, World War II helped to further develop the importance of research provenance.

---

With the help of the Restitution Commission, some of the Rothschilds’ collections were able to be returned. The restitution commission was created after the war, which would receive and identify works of art and their owners, but leave the responsibility of restitution to the corresponding government. Letters went out to those whose collections were somewhat intact, with the Rothschilds being some of the lucky.38 Additionally, works from the Rothschild seizure in Austria had been located in salt mines.39 In 1947, Baroness Clarice von Rothschild (wife of Baron Alphonse von Rothschild) was able to travel to the mines to confirm the items of their collection. However, she was still forced to donate 250 of the best works to the Austrian state in order to gain permission to export the remaining collection to the United States. It took 52 years, until Austria passed a restitution law, and the remaining works were able to be obtained by the family.40 The French Branch of Rothschilds seemed less concerned with restitution. After they filed an insurance claim on the missing pieces from their collection, it appeared that the need for restitution had fallen lower on their priority list. A small painting of Madame de Pompadour by Boucher, which had been stolen, had been found years later, but the Rothschild let the woman who had stumbled upon the painting keep it due to not wanting to reopen past problems.41

Due to the importance of a provenance, they are normally publicly available on the museum’s websites within the object’s entry. However, the provenance of Blind Man’s Buff is curiously not available on the Toledo Museum of Art website, though some of their other artworks are. Upon inquiry, the following provenance was provided by the Toledo Museum:

“Baron de Saint-Julien, Paris, France, n.d.-1784?
(Saint-Julien sale, Paris, France, June 21, 1784, lot 75, with pendant, to Lebrun).
M[orel] and others sale, Lebrun, Paris, France, April 19, May 3, 1786, lot 177, for 852 livres together with its pendant, bought by Saubert or Sobert.)

Probably Duclos le Jeune, n.d.-1792
(his sale, Paris, France, April 2, 1792)
(Antoine-Charles Dulac, 1791-n.d.).
Comte de Sinéty, Paris, France.
Baron Nathaniel de Rothschild, Vienna, Austria (inv. no. 253)
Baron Maurice de Rothschild, Chateau de Pregny, Switzerland.
(Consigned to Rosenberg & Stiebel, New York, NY, n.d.-1954)
Purchased by Toledo Museum of Art, 1954-present.”

It is important to mention that when the Blind Man’s Buff was sold in the Saint-Julien sale of 1784, the dimensions for the painting and its pendant painting The See-Saw (Figure 2), were significantly larger than the dimensions that are reported today. When sold in the 1786 Morel sale, the dimensions for both paintings were closer to what is reported now, 46 in. by 36 in. It is argued that the paintings were either reformatted from a tall wall painting to smaller dimensions that would fit an easel, or possibly that the dimensions were reported incorrectly on the first sale.42

This provenance raises concern since it has many holes and missing dates. The biggest concern is the gaps in dates surrounding Nathaniel and Maurice de Rothschild’s ownerships, which appears to be around the time of the seizure of the Rothschilds’ collections. Since Baron Nathaniel de Rothschild passed in 1915, the painting must have been owned by the Rothschild family at the very latest by 1915. However, its next certain dated appearance is in New York in 1954, where it is sold to the Toledo Museum. So, where was Toledo’s painting during this time

period and how did it get to New York? With so many artworks from the Rothschilds being stolen between these dates, this gap in the provenance should be hard to ignore.

In the art world, the process of due diligence means investigating and scrutinizing a piece of artwork’s past to validate its provenance. Due diligence is required of art dealers, collectors, and museums that are involved in an art transaction to provide answers for any problematic past entries in the provenance. This may be done by combing through databases or contacting the previous owners. This practice is required to prevent stolen or forgeries from being sold in the art market. If problems are discovered with an artwork’s past, the purchase should not occur. However, this due diligence process often gets overlooked in order to protect a purchase.

In the United States, common law upholds that if an item is stolen, a legal title cannot be transferred to a buyer, within a statute of limitations. However, if it has been discovered that a purchased art piece has a precarious past, due diligence may be able to protect the purchase in certain ways. First, if outside of the statutes of limitations, and if due diligence had been done, a good case could be made by the purchaser for legal ownership. Secondly, if within the statute of limitations, due diligence may affect the amount that has to be paid in compensation. Lastly, due diligence would be an indicator that the purchase was made with no criminal intent, meaning the intent of purchase was not for concealment, money laundering, etc.

Based on the appearance of the provenance, the Toledo Museum of Art has failed to look closer at this painting’s past. The research involved in this case study is intended to trace the history of the *Blind Man’s Buff*, in order to decipher who really has the claim to its ownership.
The Research:

First, the provenance of the *Blind Man’s Buff* can easily be compared to that of its pendant, *The See-Saw*. *The See-Saw* is now owned by the Thyssen-Bornemisza National Museum and is another example of the depiction of child’s play by Fragonard. Unlike the Toledo Museum, the Thyssen-Bornemisza National Museum does have a provenance, of sorts, publicly available.\(^48\) However, after additional inquiry, a more detailed provenance for *The See-Saw* was presented as:

   Auctioned by Le Brun, lot 75, Paris, June 21\(^{st}\) 1784.
Morel Collection, Paris
   Auctioned, lot 177, Paris, May 3\(^{rd}\) 1786.
Joubert.
Conde de Sinéty, Paris.
Collection of Baron Nathaniel de Rothschild, Vienna.
Barón Maurice de Rothschild, Château de Prégny.
Rosenberg and Stiebel, New York, 1956.
Collection of Thyssen-Bornemisza, Lugano, 1956.
Acquired by the Thyssen-Bornemisza Museum, Madrid, 1993.”

When comparing the two, *The See-Saw* and the *Blind Man’s Buff* were both originally in the collection of Baron Saint-Julien. The Toledo Museum has additional entries of ownership for the *Blind Man’s Buff*, in the collections of Duclos le Jeune and Antoine-Charles Dulac. The two provenances realign as they enter the collection of Count Sinéty. The provenance appears to diverge when the pair enters the US art market. They both pass through the art dealer, Rosenberg & Stiebel in New York, where in 1954 the Toledo Museum purchased the *Blind Man’s Buff*

using funds from the Libbey Endowment, and *The See-Saw* was acquired in 1956 by the Baron Hans Heinrich Thyssen-Bornemisza.

Rosenburg & Stiebel was an art dealership started by Jakob Rosenbaum in Frankfurt in 1874. After Rosenbaum’s nephews joined the business, the Rosenburg & Stiebel firm had galleries in Paris, Amsterdam, London, and New York. In the 1920s and 30s, the firm participated in selling private collections for the Soviets, in order to help them raise international currency needed for their rapid industrialization plans. After World War II, the families remaining in Europe moved to New York and sold many of their works to the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York, the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston, the National Gallery of Art in Washington, D.C., and many other public institutions. The Rosenburg & Stiebel firm has also been known to work with the Rothschild family since the original Frankfurt gallery, including selling restituted artwork for Baron Louis von Rothschild. The gallery was eventually closed by grandson Gerald Stiebel and he formed a new entity in Santa Fe, New Mexico, called Pahaana, ltd.

It would be advantageous to confirm which dates Rosenburg & Stiebel acquired both the *Blind Man’s Buff* and the *See-Saw* and from whom. The date that Rosenburg & Stiebel acquired the *Blind Man’s Buff* is not recorded on the provenance given by the Toledo Museum. However, the provenance provided by the Thyssen-Bornemisza Museum for *The See-Saw* notates that

---

Rosenburg & Stiebel acquired the painting in 1956. This means that there was a two-year gap after the sale of its pendant in 1954. If the 1956 date for the See-Saw is accurate, then the two pendants would have had to be separated before they reached Rosenburg & Stiebel. This could be explained by an odd choice by Maurice de Rothschild to split up the painting and its pendant by only selling one, or the paintings had been taken from Maurice de Rothschild, as so many others had, and gotten split up and sold.

Researching records for Toledo’s Blind Man’s Buff proved to have one main difficulty. Fragonard had painted five different versions, all with the same name. There is the Blind Man’s Buff at the Tinkman’s art gallery (Putnam Foundation)53, the Blind Man’s Buff (also known as Playing After the Picnic in the Park) at the Louvre54, the Blind Man’s Buff in a private collection in Switzerland55, the Blind Man’s Buff at the National Museum Gallery of Art56, and finally the Blind Man’s Buff at the Toledo Museum. An example of how this causes confusion would be a 1941 newspaper article from the New York Times, which reports about an art sale with the lead title of “Fragonard Paining sold for $12,500”. In the description, along with listing the other objects that had sold, the article describes that the Jean-Honoré Fragonard’s Blind Man’s Buff had been sold for $12,500 at the Parke-Bernet Galleries auction sale. The painting was sold from the Mrs. Henry Walters collection and was purchased by an unnamed New York dealer.57 However, none of the five Fragonard paintings’ provenance ever report being in a Mrs. Henry Walters collection, nor being sold in New York in 1941.

Since none of Fragonard’s versions of the *Blind Man’s Buff* had mentioned this sale in their provenances, it could definitely be the Toledo Museum’s version. Since the date that Rosenberg & Stiebel acquired the *Blind Man’s Buff* is not recorded on the provenance given, it is possible that Rosenberg & Stiebel was the unnamed New York dealer who purchased this painting in 1941. Additionally, if the split of the pendant paintings occurring before reaching in Rosenberg & Stiebel dealership, this would explain why the article had not mentioned *The See Saw* pendant. The two paintings had been sold separately.

In case Toledo’s painting had truly been sold directly from Maurice de Rothschild to Rosenberg & Stiebel, I attempted to find any other piece of artwork, with a better provenance, that had been previously owned by Maurice and passed through the Rosenberg & Stiebel dealership. Almost all the pieces that I found showed a provenance very similar to the *Blind Man’s Buff*; no dates of Rosenberg & Stiebel purchase and no absolute connection between the two (even saying that Rosenberg & Stiebel “probably” got it from Maurice de Rothschild). However, one painting that I found, *The Visit* by Gerard ter Borch in the Emil Burhle collection, showed an excellent provenance with a solid connection. The painting was owned by Maurice de Rothschild but confiscated and then transferred to Linz, destined for Hitler’s Museum. It was then recovered and returned to Paris to be restituted to Maurice de Rothschild. Maurice then sold the painting to Rosenberg & Stiebel, though still no date was provided.  

In order to discern which of the possibilities happened to the Toledo’s painting, I inquired of any form of documentation that might be left from the Rosenberg & Stiebel purchases of the *Blind Man’s Buff* from Gerald Stiebel, the remaining grandson of the Rosenberg & Stiebel company. I was informed that the archives from the years in question had been donated to the

---

Frick Collection Archives. The Frick Collection is a museum and a research center in New York. Their artwork collection holds many old master paintings and European sculptures, and the Frick Art Reference Library is considered to be one of the top art history research centers. The Frick Collection was kind enough to provide me with the correspondence about the purchases of both the Blind Man’s Buff and the See-Saw. All of these documents have been included (figure 3-figure 24). This may be the first time that these documents have been seen, since the correspondence from the Director of the Toledo Museum of Art, Blake-More Godwin, asked for the purchase to be kept “strictly confidential” in Figure 4. Maurice de Rothschild had consigned the painting to the Rosenberg & Stiebel company, so all of the communications for the purchase of the paintings were done between the director of Toledo Museum of Art, Blake-More Godwin, and Rosenberg & Stiebel, more specifically Eric Stiebel and Saemy Rosenberg. There are three things to note about the documents. First, there is a least one missing letter and a few telephone calls, which causes a gap in the timeline between letters. Secondly, the Rosenberg & Stiebel responses swap back and forth between Eric Stiebel and Saemy Rosenberg, which causes a slight miscommunication. Lastly, when Rosenberg & Stiebel referred to the Blind Man’s Buff pendant painting, The See-Saw, they sometimes mistakenly refer to it as The Swing.

At the beginning of discussions of the painting’s purchase, it appears that the Toledo Museum of Art wished to purchase both Fragonard paintings, the Blind Man’s Buff and The See-Saw. They had also agreed upon a price of $200,000 for the pair (Figure 4). In Figure 5, we can see that Maurice de Rothschild has decided to increase the price to $250,000 for the pair. In the process, Eric Siebel states that Maurice is not in a hurry to sell and is “moody”.

---

The paintings were sent to Toledo Museum to be inspected in person, and Rosenberg & Stiebel once again informed them the price for the pair had increased to $275,000 in order for Maurice de Rothschild to make a total profit of the $250,000 excluding commission (Figure 5). Being unauthorized to spend this amount of money at the time, the Toledo Museum of Art switched directions and requested to purchase only purchase one painting, the Blind Man’s Buff for $135,000, with the option of purchasing The See-Saw within the year (Figure 11). The authorization for this arrangement (known as a Written Option) from Maurice de Rothschild is seen in Figure 14, stating that the Toledo Museum of Art had until December 31st of 1954 to purchase The See-Saw. It appears that after the Blind Man’s Buff purchase, either in a missing letter or a telephone conversation, the Toledo Museum decided that they wanted to have The See-Saw instead of the Blind Man’s Buff. The conversations changed from having a future purchase of The See-Saw to wanting Rosenberg & Stiebel to find another buyer for the Blind Man’s Buff and the money that the Toledo Museum had already paid for their original purchase would be used for The See-Saw (Figure 18).

In the end, the Toledo Museum needed to have one of the paintings for a 17th and 18th century gallery that was soon to open, seen in Figure 21. With Rosenberg & Stiebel unable to find another buyer for the Blind Man’s Buff, the Toledo Museum of Art received the Blind Man’s Buff instead of The See-Saw (figure 22). Five months later, the See-saw was purchased by Baron Thyssen-Bornemisza for $165,000. In Figure 24, we can see correspondence from Rosenberg & Stiebel asking for Maurice de Rothschild’s ownership to be kept out of the Baron Thyssen-Bornemisza catalog.

With this new information, it would not be possible for the Toledo Museum’s version of the Blind Man’s Buff to be the Fragonard painting mentioned in the New York Times Article.
However, that does not dispose of the concern about this sale not being recorded in any of the Blind Man’s Buff versions’ provenance. Additionally, from the documents provided, I believe that there are two reasons that many of the provenances of Maurice de Rothschild’s collection have missing dates surrounding the Rosenberg & Stiebel connection. First, the artwork was probably always consigned through the company, so none of the pieces were directly owned by Rosenberg & Stiebel. In that case, the dates that Rosenberg & Stiebel actually had the artworks could be muddled. Second, it appears that Maurice de Rothschild did not want it to be advertised that he was selling his collection at the time. In Figure 24, we see that Rosenberg & Stiebel asks that Maurice’s ownership of the painting be left out of any catalog entry for The See-Saw.

Though the painting was in Maurice de Rothschild’s hands directly before entering the U.S. art market, that does not mean that the painting was never stolen from him and then returned, like the previously mentioned The Visit by Gerard ter Borch. Concurrent with the research above, I began investigating if there was any physical evidence that would indicate the Blind Man’s Buff had been documented as stolen from the Rothschilds. With the Jeu de Paume being well inventoried, there is a publicly available database that includes information on pieces that had been deposited at the Jeu de Paume or the Louvre from late 1940 to mid-1944.60 In the Jeu de Paume database, there are almost 7,000 artworks inventoried to the Rothschild collections. For Maurice de Rothschild, there are 1,344 items, 16 of which were paintings done by Fragonard.61

Although Toledo’s Blind Man’s Buff is not mentioned in the Jeu de Paume records, the result of

---

60 Database of Art Objects at the Jeu de Paume, Joint Project of Conference on Jewish Material Claims Against Germany and United States Holocaust Memorial Muesem, 2020. https://www.errproject.org/jeudepaume/

61 Database of Art Objects at the Jeu de Paume, Joint Project of Conference on Jewish Material Claims Against Germany and United States Holocaust Memorial Muesem, 2020. https://www.errproject.org/jeudepaume/
this search proves that many paintings, including Fragonard paintings, of Maurice de
Rothschild’s collection did pass through the ERR.

An additional database called the Jewish Digital Cultural Recovery Project, is currently in the
progress of formation, which will include more objects that were taken by French or German
agencies, not just items taken by the ERR. The project’s goal is to have international cooperation
to create a central platform that exhibits the worldwide dispersion of Jewish looted cultural
objects and related archives.\textsuperscript{62} The pilot project for this was completed in July 2021, but
unfortunately at this moment, the database is not complete.\textsuperscript{63} This will be an important source for
provenance research in the future, as it will provide a central location with new information
about what has been stolen since so many pieces have fallen through the cracks.

This led me to the Rothchild Archives. The Rothchild family has their own archives
containing documentation of the Rothchild businesses and families, including some limited
information about their art collections. It is notated by the archive that many of the Rothchild
collections were dispersed after the death of the collector by being passed down to family, given
to museums or galleries, or were dispersed after World War II if taken from the Rothchild
residence.\textsuperscript{64} The archives do accommodate provenance researchers. While the archives list that
they do not hold complete records of most collections, since some Rothschilds have requested
that personal records were to be destroyed after their death, the records they have are available to
view in person upon request. Of the most interest to this project, the Rothchild Archive has
information about the seizure and return of Rothchild collections during and after World War

\textsuperscript{64} “Provenance Research,” The Rothschild Archives, accessed March 17, 2023, https://www.rothschildarchive.org/collections/provenance_research/
II, including the collection of Maurice de Rothschild. Unfortunately, I was unable to access the Rothschild archive, as it is only accessible in person in London.\(^{65}\)

The last database that I searched was the National Archives catalog of the United States. The National Archives hold a collection of documents that are deemed important for legal or historical reasons. Two documents were found referencing a Fragonard’s *Blind Man’s Buff*, which can be seen in Figure 25 and Figure 26. The document in Figure 25 was found in the “Linzer Kunstmuseum List (Only Partly), File No. R&R 35” file, meaning that the works listed were selected for Hitler’s Art Museum in Linz.\(^{66}\) The document is mainly in German, but the Fragonard name is still recognizable. Underneath the French section, there are two paintings by Fragonard, *Das Blindekuhspiel* (the Blind Man’s Game) and *Die Schaukol* (The Swing). Considering that the *Blind Man’s Buff* version that is at the National Art Gallery is a pendant to *The Swing*, I believe that this document is referring to these two paintings, not the Toledo Museum of Art’s painting. This is yet another example of the confusion caused by having multiple paintings titled the same. However, in the file “Paintings Restituted (F), File No. R&R 59”, a page mentions Fragonard *Blind Man’s Buff* and *The See-Saw*, Figure 28.\(^{67}\) Fragonard only painted one painting titled “The See-Saw” and it is the pendant to the Toledo Museum’s version of the *Blind Man’s Buff*, meaning that it is very likely that these are the two that they are


\(^{66}\) Linzer Kunstmuseum List (Only Partly), File No. R&R 35; General Administrative Records, 1946-1950; Records of the Reparations and Restitutions Branch of the U.S. Allied Commission For Austria (USACA) Section, 1945-1950. (National Archives Microfilm Publication M1926, roll 147); Records of U.S. Occupation Headquarters, World War II, Record group 260; National Archives at College Park, College Park, MD.

\(^{67}\) Paintings Restituted (F), File No. R&R 59; General Administrative Records, 1946-1950; Records of the Reparations and Restitutions Branch of the U.S. Allied Commission For Austria (USACA) Section, 1945-1950. (National Archives Microfilm Publication M1926, roll 153); Records of U.S. Occupation Headquarters, World War II, Record group 260; National Archives at College Park, College Park, MD.
referring to. This document is a record that shows that the *Blind Man’s Buff* had been reported stolen. Next to *The See-Saw* painting title, there is a Rothschild name under the claim number column, and the word “ditto” next to the *Blind Man’s Buff*, meaning that the Rothschilds were the ones to make the claim that the paintings had been stolen. Additionally, in the restituted column, there is no receipt number, meaning that the painting was not returned at the time that this document was last updated. The file is a part of the “General Administrative records” series from 1946-1950, which would indicate that the last update to the file fell in some time between those two dates.

**Conclusion**

This unfinished and ignored provenance makes the impression that there might be a cover-up of a bad transaction, especially since the dates missing surround such a tumultuous time in history for art. However, this is not the case. This correspondence I received from the Frick Collection is proof that the Toledo Museum’s purchase was of a legal title and that they would be the legal owner of the painting. It is quite likely, that the Toledo Museum just does not know the information, or else more dates would have been included in the provenance. The issue is that it a requirement for them to know. The information that I have gathered should have been found when purchasing the painting or found during provenance research of their current collections.

An excuse may be that there is confusion between the five different versions of the *Blind Man’s Buff*, since Fragonard named all five versions the same, and that this confusion has prevented any forward movement on provenance research for these paintings. However, I as an undergraduate student was able to make great strides in filling in missing pieces and I do not have the immense artwork connections that the Toledo Museum would have. The information that I uncovered is critical for the connection between entries in the provenance and adds dates to
the ownership of Maurice de Rothchild and Rosenberg & Stiebel. The Toledo Museum needs to do more.

I would urge the Toledo Museum of Art to do three things. First, make the provenance of the *Blind Man’s Buff* publicly available on their website. Second, update the dates to the ownership of Maurice de Rothchild and Rosenberg & Stiebel considering the evidence that I have found in my research. Third, I would urge them to continue research to determine if the painting had been stolen and then repatriated to Maurice de Rothchild, and if so, notate that on the provenance as well.

This is not the only painting whose suspicious provenance is being ignored. What about this New York Times article, which reported the sale of a *Blind Man’s Buff* by Fragonard? None of the provenances of the other four *Blind Man’s Buff* paintings have either the Henry Walter collection or the Perke-Bernet auction sale as an entry. That means that one of them is still incorrect. If there are still questions about ownership in artwork, then provenance research is not over. The Toledo Museum’s painting is just one of many artworks whose provenance is not fully explored. Institutions are not properly doing their due diligence to investigate the provenances of their purchases and their collections.
Figure 1: *Blind Man’s Buff*, Jean-Honoré Fragonard, 1750-1752, oil on canvas, Toledo Museum of Art, Ohio.
Figure 2: *The See Saw*, Jean-Honoré Fragonard, 1750-1752, oil on canvas, Museo Nacional Thyssen-Bornemisza, Madrid.
November 9, 1953

Mr. Blake-More Godwin, Director
The Toledo Museum of Art
Toledo 2, Ohio

Dear Mr. Godwin:

With the help of my brother in Paris, I received today photographs of the two important paintings by Fragonard, which I mentioned to you confidentially on your last visit to New York. If you should be interested, I think we could get them on consignment to New York, so that you could inspect the originals.

I wish to say again that they are of the greatest importance and that they are listed in the old catalogue of the Baron Nathaniel de Rothschild Collection, Vienna. Formerly, they were in the Collection of Baron de St. Julien and are listed in the catalogue of the sale of this Collection 1784, when they were bought by Count Sintey, from whom Baron Nathaniel de Rothschild acquired them. The paintings are engraved by Beauvarlet, 1760.

With kindest regards,

Very sincerely yours,

Eric Stiebel

encl

Figure 3: November 1953 correspondence from Rosenberg & Stiebel (Eric Stiebel) to Blake-More Godwin, Toledo Museum Director. Provided by the Frick Collection regarding the purchase of the Blind Man’s Buff.
Figure 4: February 1954 correspondence from Blake-More Godwin, Toledo Museum Director, to Rosenberg & Stiebel. Provided by the Frick Collection regarding the purchase of the Blind Man’s Buff.
February 8, 1954

Mr. Blake-More Godwin, Director
The Toledo Museum of Art
Monroe Street at Scottwood Avenue
Toledo 2, Ohio

Dear Mr. Godwin:

Many thanks for your two letters of February 4th. You can imagine what satisfaction it gives me that the two famous Rothschild paintings have found a place in your museum.

Both paintings are not only fine specimens of two of the outstanding French painters of the Eighteenth Century, but also quite unusual in their important dimensions.

In accordance with your wish, I am enclosing separate invoices in triplicate with the amount stated on one copy only. I would be grateful if you could let us have payment at your earliest convenience as I have to remit the money to the owner as soon as possible.

Of course, I shall comply with your wish to keep the purchase of the two paintings strictly confidential.

Immediately on receipt of your letter I asked the owner of this two Fragonards to ship the paintings to New York. As soon as I have his reply, I shall inform you about it. Both paintings are of the quality which the photographs indicate and in excellent condition.

On your last visit, you mentioned that you might consider the purchase of the Lemaire if we could reduce the price. In view of the fact that you have made important acquisitions from us recently and as I am convinced that the high quality of this rare picture would make it worthy of your collections, I am prepared to make a special effort in reducing the price from $45,000 to $36,000. I will reserve the painting for you until you let me know your decision.

I want to take this opportunity to thank you for the confidence shown to us. You may rest assured that we appreciate it and that we shall always do our best to justify it.

With kindest regards,

Very sincerely yours,

Saemy Rosenberg

Figure 5: February 1954 correspondence from Rosenberg & Stiebel (Saemy Rosenberg) to Blake-More Godwin, Toledo Museum Director. Provided by the Frick Collection regarding the purchase of the *Blind Man’s Buff*. 
Figure 6: February 1954 correspondence from Blake-More Godwin, Toledo Museum Director, to Rosenberg & Stiebel. Provided by the Frick Collection regarding the purchase of the Blind Man’s Buff.
February 17, 1954

Mr. Blake-Nore Godwin, Director
The Toledo Museum of Art
1209 South Main Street
Toledo, Ohio

Dear Mr. Godwin:

In the absence of Mr. Rosenberg who has left on a short trip, I acknowledge, with thanks, your two letters of February 11th.

As to the Le Nain, I presume that Wildenstein knew of the existence of one or several fine paintings by this Master at Castle Waddesdon but could not get photographs due to the “Rothschild mentality.” Anyhow, the Le Nain which you acquired was not at the Castle anymore in 1954, since the former owner of the Waddesdon Collections, Baron Ferdinand, left it to his brother, Baron Albert in Vienna upon his death. I do not think that Wildenstein was aware of this change of ownership.

I can very well understand that you wish to wait for the outcome of the Fragonard negotiations before deciding on the acquisition of the fine Le Nain. We have put the picture aside for you for the time being.

With regard to the Fragonards, I am sorry to say that the first reaction of the owner was not too favorable. He now asks a price of $250,000 net for him whereas he originally agreed to pay us our commission if we sell the paintings at this price.

As we have had the opportunity to explain to you, this attitude is not new to us, the owner being in no need of money and rather moody.

We now let him know that in accordance with his former instructions, we had quoted you a price of $250,000 including our commission for these paintings and that we could not raise the price. We are still expecting his reaction to this information.

As you know, my brother is living in Paris most of the year and has conducted negotiations with Baron Maurice personally. At present, my brother is in New York for a short visit but will return to Paris by the end of this month. If we have not heard from Baron Maurice by that time, my brother will contact him personally and will do his utmost to get a more favorable decision from him.

Mr. Blake-Nore Godwin, Director

February 17, 1954

We are still hopeful that we shall be able to get the paintings for you at the price quoted but we may have to ask you to allow us a little more time in order to achieve this result.

Kindest regards.

Very sincerely yours,

Eric Stiebel

Figure 7: February 1954 correspondence from Rosenberg & Stiebel (Eric Stiebel) to Toledo Museum Director. Provided by the Frick Collection regarding the purchase of the Blind Man’s Buff.
Mr. Blake-Nore Godwin, Director
The Toledo Museum of Art
Monroe Street at Scottwood Avenue
Toledo 2, Ohio

Dear Mr. Godwin:

It gives me pleasure to inform you that the frames for the Fragonardes are now ready and I have immediately given instructions to Bahn Bros. Fireproof Warehouses, Inc., to ship the pictures to you by air. As soon as I know the flight number, I will send you a telegram.

As you know, these two paintings come from Baron Maurice de Rothschild and were formerly in the Collection of Baron Nathaniel de Rothschild, Vienna. In the catalogue of this Collection, they are listed under Nos. 253 and 254. According to the catalogue, these pictures were painted for Baron de St. Julien.

At the sale of this Collection in 1784, they were acquired by the family of Count Sisely, from whom Baron Nathaniel de Rothschild bought them.

The paintings are engraved by Beaverslet in 1760.

I am enclosing a photocopy of the relevant page in the Julien catalogue.

The price for the pair is $275,000.00, which includes a modest commission for us. I am sorry that we were not able to bring the price down. On the other hand, when you see the paintings, I hope you will be as much impressed as I was by the importance, quality, and charm of these pictures.

Before shipping them, I showed the paintings to Mr. Suhr, who confirmed that both are in an excellent state of preservation.

With kindest regards,

Very sincerely yours,

Saamy Rosenberg

Figure 8: April 1954 correspondence from Rosenberg & Stiebel (Eric Stiebel) to Toledo Museum Director. Provided by the Frick Collection regarding the purchase price of the Blind Man’s Buff.
Mr. Saemy Rosenberg
Rosenberg and Stiebel Inc.
32 East 57th Street
New York 22 N. Y.

Dear Mr. Rosenberg:

The pictures were held over Thursday night in
Cleveland and sent on here Friday evening and delivered
to the Museum this morning. Meanwhile I have received
your letter of April 14, and I too am sorry that you
cannot bring down the price. We were authorized to
acquire one or both, should they meet our approval, at
a price of not over $125,000.00 for one, or, should we
so decide, $250,000.00 for the pair.

Now, if the price is $275,000.00, we must again
consult with our associates and convince them of the
higher value. Moreover, the additional $25,000.00
must be provided by diverting that sum from its allocation
to some other project. This will cause us considerable
embarrassment and trouble and may not be successfully
accomplished. Do you think there is any chance that the
Baron Rothschild would stand by his original price?

With all good wishes, I am

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Director
April 19, 1954

Mr. Blake-More Godwin, Director
The Toledo Museum of Art
Monroe Street at Scottwood Avenue
Toledo 2, Ohio

Dear Mr. Godwin:

Many thanks for your letter of April 17th.

I can very well understand your difficulties created by the additional $25,000.00.

You know how gladly I would help you get the price down; but from former experiences with this particular Collector, we know that once he has decided on a firm price, it is dangerous to ask for a reduction. It is not only improbable that he will reduce the price, but there is always the danger that he might increase his price or withdraw the object altogether.

Still, I feel it my duty to leave no stone unturned and therefore I have sent a detailed cable to my partner, Mr. Hans Stiebel in Paris today, to take this matter up with the Baron. As Mr. Stiebel is in constant contact with the Baron, he might have a chance to find out in a non-commital way, whether any reduction is possible. I asked Mr. Stiebel for a cable reply and I will let you know the outcome of his conversation with the Baron immediately.

Meanwhile, I am with kindest regards,

Very sincerely yours,

Saemy Rosenberg

Figure 10: April 1954 correspondence from Rosenberg & Stiebel (Eric Stiebel) to Toledo Museum Director. Provided by the Frick Collection regarding the purchase price of the *Blind Man’s Buff*. 
Figure 11: May 1954 correspondence from Rosenberg & Stiebel (Saemy Rosenbergx) to the Toledo Museum, Major Otto Wittman. Provided by the Frick Collection regarding the purchase of the Blind Man’s Buff.
June 10, 1954

Mr. Blake–More Godwin, Director
The Toledo Museum of Art
Monroe Street at Scottwood Avenue
Toledo 2, Ohio

Dear Mr. Godwin:

Pursuant to our today’s telephone conversation, I want to repeat the contents of my brother’s letter which I mentioned to you referring to the Fragonard paintings.

My brother writes that the situation has not changed since he last talked to you, namely that although the Baron has not yet given a written option on the “Swing”, he is prepared to sell this painting if and when the necessary funds are available. The Baron is expected in Paris shortly, and my brother will then try to get a written option from him. However, the Baron is very sensitive and if he is pressed for an option, he might get the impression that we do not trust his verbal promise. My brother, of course, wants to avoid this in any case, but primarily because he does not want to jeopardize the purchase of the “Blind Man’s Buff”, being very happy to have got at least this picture for you.

You may rest assured and can count on us that at present nobody else will be able to buy the “Swing” and that it remains reserved for you in the event that we shall be able to find a buyer for the “Blind Man’s Buff.”

If I understood you well, the above arrangement will be satisfactory to you and will enable you to make payment for the “Blind Man’s Buff” about June 15th, which would oblige us greatly.

Kindest regards.

Very sincerely yours,

Eric Stiebel
Figure 13: June 1954 correspondence from Blake-More Godwin, Toledo Museum Director, to Rosenberg & Stiebel. Provided by the Frick Collection regarding the purchase of the *Blind Man’s Buff*. 
Figure 14: Written option from Maurice de Rothschild for the purchase of *The See-Saw*. 

**Baron Maurice de Rothschild**

**Château de Pregny**

Pregny, le 5 août 1954.

**Rosenberg & Stiebel Inc.**

32 East 57th Street,

**New York 22, N.Y.**

Messieurs,

Me référant à mes entretiens avec Monsieur Hans Stiebel, je vous confirme par la présente mon accord de vendre:

1 (un) Tableau de Fragonard " LA BASCULE "

tableau sans cadre, largeur cm. 105, hauteur cm. 120, au prix de :

$ 125,000.-- (cent vingt cinq mille dollars)

absolument net pour moi et occi à condition que ce tableau soit vendu avant la fin de l'année présente et que le produit de cette vente, soit : $ 125,000.-- (cent vingt cinq mille dollars) net me soit versé le plus tard vers le 31 décembre 1954.

Agréez, Messieurs, mes salutations distinguées.

[Signature]  

Maurice de Rothschild
June 16, 1954

Mr. Blake More Godwin, Director
The Toledo Museum of Art
Monroe Street at Scottwood Avenue
Toledo 2, Ohio

Dear Mr. Godwin:

Please excuse the delay in my acknowledging your letter of June 10th.

I wanted to wait until I have an answer from my brother to a cable in which I asked him to let me know the exact time limit and price of the option on the second Fragonard painting. As yet, I have not received an answer from him.

In order not to let you wait any longer, I am enclosing herewith three bills for the Fragonard painting, “Blind Man’s Buff”, one with price, and two without. As soon as I shall hear from my brother, I shall send you a new bill, mentioning the option as requested.

The check you kindly advised sending us, has not reached us up to now, but will probably come in one of the next mails.

Kindest regards.

Very sincerely yours,

ES:LS
Encl.

Eric Stiebel

Figure 15: June 1954 correspondence from Rosenberg & Stiebel (Eric Stiebel) to Toledo Museum Director. Provided by the Frick Collection regarding the purchase of the Blind Man’s Buff.
September 8, 1954

Mr. Blake More Godwin
The Toledo Museum of Art
Monroe Street at Scottwood Avenue
Toledo 2, Ohio

Dear Mr. Godwin:

A short while ago, my brother succeeded in getting a written option from the Baron for the Fragonard painting, "The Swing."

Although the time limit mentioned therein is the end of this year, we feel sure that this is just a matter of formality and that the Baron will not withdraw the painting if unsold, even after that date.

On the basis of the Baron's option, we can offer you the painting at the same price as "Blind Man's Buff," and I am enclosing a new bill for the latter picture mentioning the option for "The Swing."

With kindest regards, I am

Very sincerely yours,

Eric Stiebel

as/If
Encl.

Figure 16: September 1954 correspondence from Rosenberg & Stiebel (Eric Stiebel) to Toledo Museum Director. Provided by the Frick Collection regarding the purchase of the Blind Man's Buff.
Figure 17: September 1954 invoice from Rosenberg & Stiebel to Toledo Museum Director. Provided by the Frick Collection regarding the purchase of the *Blind Man’s Buff* and option of *The See-Saw*. 

Toledo Museum of Art  
Monroe Street at Scottwood Avenue  
Toledo 2, Ohio  

September 8, 1954

A painting by Jean-Honoré Fragonard (1732-1806)

"Blind Man’s Buff"

Engraved by Beuvart in 1760.

Provenance:
Baron de St. Julien for whom the picture is said to have been painted.

Count Sinety whose family acquired the painting in 1784 at the St. Julien Sale (No. 75 of the catalogue).

Baron Nathaniel de Rothschild, Vienna.  
(No. 253 of the catalogue of his collection).

Baron Maurice de Rothschild, Chateau Pregny.

It is understood that the Toledo Museum of Art has the option to buy the painting by Jean-Honoré Fragonard, "The Swing", (companion piece of the above picture and coming from the same collection) at the price of $137,500 until December 31, 1954.

ROSENBERG & STIEBEL, INC.
Figure 18: September 1954 correspondence from Blake-More Godwin, Toledo Museum Director, to Rosenberg & Stiebel. Provided by the Frick Collection regarding the purchase of the Blind Man’s Buff.
Figure 19: September 1954 correspondence from Blake-More Godwin, Toledo Museum Director, to Rosenberg & Stiebel. Provided by the Frick Collection regarding the return of the *Blind Man’s Buff.*
Figure 20: October 1954 correspondence from Rosenberg & Stiebel (Eric Stiebel) to Toledo Museum Director. Provided by the Frick Collection regarding the purchase of the Blind Man’s Buff.
Figure 21: August 1955 correspondence from Blake-More Godwin, Toledo Museum Director, to Rosenberg & Stiebel. Provided by the Frick Collection regarding the purchase of the *Blind Man’s Buff*. 
August 17, 1955

Mr. Blake-More Godwin, Director
The Toledo Museum of Art
Monroe Street at Scottwood Avenue
Toledo 2, Ohio

Dear Mr. Godwin:

Many thanks for your letter of August 1st which was forwarded to me during my vacation.

I regret that your assumption is correct that there have been no new developments which would make it possible for you to have the "See-Saw" instead of the "Blind Man's Buff." Although we succeeded in interesting several collectors in this picture, so far we have, unfortunately, been unable to conclude a definite sale. I have therefore given instructions to ship the "Blind Man's Buff" to you by air, free of all charges, and trust that it will arrive safely.

Hoping that you are having a pleasant summer, and with kindest regards, I am

Very sincerely yours,

Eric Stiebel

Figure 22: August 1955 correspondence from Rosenberg & Stiebel (Eric Stiebel) to Toledo Museum Director. Provided by the Frick Collection regarding the purchase of the Blind Man's Buff.
April 3, 1956

Dr. Heinrich Baron Thyssen-Bornemisza
Villa Favorita
Lugano Castagnola

A painting by Jean-Honoré Fragonard (1732-1806)

"The Swing"

Engraved by Beauvarlet in 1760.

Provenances:
Baron de St. Julien for whom the picture is said to have been painted.

Count Sinry whose family acquired the painting in 1784 at the St. Julien Sale (No. 75 of the catalogue).

Baron Nathaniel de Rothschild, Vienna.
(No. 253 of the catalogue of his collection).

Baron Maurice de Rothschild, Chateau Pregny.

$165,000.00

Payable on or before November 15, 1956.

Figure 23: April 1956 invoice from Rosenberg & Stiebel to the Baron Thyssen-Bornemisza. Provided by the Frick Collection regarding the purchase of The See-Saw.
March 23, 1957

Dr. Giuseppe Groh
Villa Favorita
Lago di Castagnola
Switzerland

Dear Dr. Groh:

Many thanks for your letter of March 20th. In our bill dated April 3, 1956, we mentioned the provenance as follows:

A painting by Jean-Honoré Fragonard (1732-1806)
"The Swing"
Engraved by Besuverlet in 1760.

Provenances:
Baron de St. Julien for whom the picture is said to have been painted.
Count Ninety whose family acquired the painting in 1784 at the St. Julien Sale (No. 75 of the catalogue).
Baron Nathaniel de Rothschild, Vienna, (No. 253 of the catalogue of his collection).
Baron Maurice de Rothschild, Chateau Pregny.

As you see from it, the picture has been in the family of the Vienna Rothschilds for many years, and the last owner, Baron Maurice de Rothschild, had it only a comparatively short time. I would be grateful if you would mention in your catalogue only the Vienna provenance and not Baron Maurice. The Baron is still alive and lives in Switzerland, and he might resent if people should find out that he sold the picture.

With kindest regards,

Very sincerely yours,

Saemy Rosenberg

Figure 24: March 1957 correspondence from Rosenberg & Stiebel (Saemy Rosenberg) to Dr. Giuseppe Groh at the Baron Thyssen-Bornemisza villa. Provided by the Frick Collection regarding the purchase of The See-Saw.
Figure 25: Documentation from the National Archives found in the “Linzer Kunstmuseum List (Only Partly), File No. R&R 35” file. Underneath the French section, there are two paintings by Fragonard, *Das Blindekuhspiel* (the Blind Man’s Game) and the *Die Schaukol* (The Swing).
Figure 26: Documentation from the National Archives Catalog found in the “Painting Restituted (f), File No. R&R 59” file. First two paintings listed are *The See-Saw* and the *Blind Man’s Buff*. Claim was created by A. Rothschild and no receipt of restitution.
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