

Herman Hamburger - Restitutiecommissie

R restitutiecommissie.nl/en/recommendation/herman-hamburger

Recommendation regarding Herman Hamburger

Herman Hamburger

Report number: RC 1.193

Advice type: NK Collection

Advice date: 18 September 2023

Period of loss of ownership: 1940-1945

Original owner: Private individual

Location of loss of ownership: In the Netherlands

NK3401 – God Appearing to Abraham at Sichem by Nicolaes Moeyaert (photo: Museum Catharijneconvent)



Summary of Recommendation regarding Herman Hamburger

The Restitutions Committee has assessed an application for restitution of the painting *God Appearing to Abraham at Sichem* by Nicolaes (Claes) Moeyaert, which is in the Netherlands Art Property (NK) Collection of the Dutch State. The Committee came to the conclusion on the grounds of the investigation conducted by the Expert Centre Restitution (ECR) that it is highly likely that the artwork came from the private collection of the Jewish art dealer and

collector Herman Hamburger. It has also become sufficiently plausible that Hamburger lost possession of the painting as a result of circumstances directly connected with the Nazi regime.

Research has revealed that Herman Hamburger acquired the work by Moeyaert in 1936. The German authorities declared that Hamburger's possessions in the Netherlands were 'enemy assets' because during the occupation he was abroad. On that basis, the Mühlmann Agency, a German looting organization, was able to get hold of the artwork in 1941 by means of a forced sale. The Mühlmann Agency sold the work on and subsequently delivered it to Germany for Hitler's Führer Museum. It was returned to the Netherlands after the war and taken into the NK Collection.

The Committee has advised the State Secretary for Culture and Media to reconstitute the painting *God Appearing to Abraham at Sichem* by Nicolaes Moeyaert to the heir of Herman Hamburger.

Recommendation regarding Herman Hamburger

On 24 September 2021 the Minister of Education, Culture and Science (hereinafter referred to as the Minister) asked the Restitutions Committee (hereinafter referred to as the Committee) to issue advice. This recommendation concerns the application by XX (hereinafter referred to as the Applicant) for restitution of the painting *God Appearing to Abraham at Sichem* by Nicolaes Moeyaert. The artwork is part of the Netherlands Art Property Collection of the Dutch State (hereinafter referred to as the NK Collection). Its inventory number is NK 3401. Since 1976 it has been in the Museum Catharijneconvent, inventory number RMCC S.23. The painting by Moeyaert was the subject, or one of the subjects, of two previous restitution applications ([RC 1.160](#) and [RC 1.155](#)), which were rejected in 2016. According to the Restitutions Committee at the time, it was not sufficiently plausible that the artwork had belonged to Gustaaf Hamburger and Siegfried Granaat respectively.

1. The Application

In a letter of 24 September 2021, the Netherlands Cultural Heritage Agency (hereinafter referred to as the RCE) asked the Committee on behalf of the Minister to issue advice about restitution of the painting. This was prompted by the request by XX to the Minister as contained in a letter of 13 August 2021, in which he stated he was the only heir of the former owner. The painting was originally supposedly the property of the businessman and art dealer Herman Hamburger.

2. The Procedure and the Applicable Assessment Framework

The Committee told the Applicant in a letter of 1 November 2021 about the request for advice from the Minister and in a letter of 11 February 2022 about the Committee's procedure and regulations. The Committee took note of all the documents submitted by the Applicant and the RCE. It sent copies of all documents to the Applicant and the RCE. The Committee furthermore asked the Restitution of Items of Cultural Value and the Second World War Expert Centre of the NIOD Institute for War, Holocaust and Genocide Studies (hereinafter referred to as the ECR) to launch an investigation into the facts. The findings of the investigation were recorded in the investigation report referred to below.

Chronological overview of the committee's actions and the responses to them

- In a letter of 13 August 2021, the Applicant asked the Minister to reconstitute the painting, which is currently in the Museum Catharijneconvent in Utrecht. On 24 September 2021 the RCE, on behalf of the Minister, asked the Committee to advise about this request.
- On 11 February 2022 the Committee asked the ECR to launch an investigation into the facts. The results were recorded in a draft investigation report, which was sent with a letter dated 17 August 2022 to the RCE and the Applicant for additional information and/or comments. The RCE responded to it on 28 September 2022 and the Applicant did so on 12 October 2022. The ECR amended the wording of the draft investigation report with regard to several points on the basis of the responses. The responses to the draft investigation report and a selection of the relevant correspondence were attached to the amended draft version, which was sent to the Committee on 7 November 2022.
- The final investigation report was approved on 2 December 2022. The Applicant did not respond to this, even after a reminder dated 9 February 2023. The RCE responded in an e-mail van 20 December 2022.
- On 27 July 2023 the Committee sent its draft recommendation and asked whether the Applicant needed a hearing.
- The RCE responded on 31 July 2023 by making a minor change to the draft recommendation and, as regards a hearing, it stated it would comply with the wishes of the Applicant. In an e-mail of 31 August 2023, the Applicant stated he had no comments on the draft recommendation and had no need for a hearing.

3. Establishing the Facts

The Committee establishes the following facts on the grounds of the investigation into the facts.

The Hamburger family

The Jewish businessman and art dealer Herman Hamburger was born on 12 November 1879 in Utrecht as the youngest son in a family with seven brothers: Alexander (1858-1943), David (1860-unknown), Abraham (1862-1934), Isaac/Izaak (1864-1951), Daniel (1868-1959), Willem (1871-unknown) and Jacob (1875-1918). On 4 June 1920 he married Simonne Marie Heumann. Their only son Gilbert Hamburger was born on 23 June 1921. Simonne Marie Hamburger-Heumann died shortly thereafter, on 2 July 1921. Over the years Herman Hamburger and his brothers settled in France. They were involved in a large number of enterprises in which the bank Daniel Hamburger & Co – established in the late nineteenth century by Herman's brother Daniel – played a key role. From 1920 their two nephews Gustaaf and Albert Hamburger (sons of Alexander Hamburger) continued with this bank under the name Hamburger & Co Bankierskantoor, also known as Hambo. Members of the Hamburger family were involved in numerous subsidiaries of the bank through (asset) management and shareholding.

The Hamburgers also owned an art gallery, the N.V. tot Uitoefening van den Kunsthandel. It was located at Herengracht 551 in Amsterdam. Formally speaking the business was managed by Albert Hamburger and his uncle Isaac, with Herman as a non-executive director, but it was Herman who ran it on a day-to-day basis. Together with other family members, Herman was also dealing in art in Paris under the name *Hamburger Frères*.

Herman Hamburger and his son Gilbert both survived the Second World War in France. Isaac Hamburger also survived the war. Albert Hamburger was rounded up in Amsterdam and deported to Auschwitz, where he was murdered on or around 22 October 1943. Gustaaf Hamburger fled the Netherlands and settled in the United States.

After the war Herman Hamburger ran the art gallery again. He died in Amsterdam in 1948 at the age of 69.

Provenance of the painting NK 3401

The claimed artwork is a painting, oil on canvas, by Nicolaes (Claes) Corneliszoon Moeyaert measuring 102 x 168 cm, entitled *God Appearing to Abraham at Sichem*. The painting is signed and dated 1628 and it is part of the NK Collection under inventory number NK 3401. It is currently in the Museum Catharijneconvent in Utrecht.

Research has revealed that the painting was part of the collection of Werner Dahl in Düsseldorf between 1864 and 1905. In 1905 it went under the hammer at the Frederik Muller & Co auction house in Amsterdam. It has furthermore emerged from documentation that in 1911 the painting was the property of David Granaat of Amsterdam and later of his son Siegfried Granaat, who owned an art gallery. Siegfried Granaat was also the owner of the premises where Hambo was housed, Herengracht 579 in Amsterdam. He kept a large art collection in his residence at Herengracht 512. The painting by Moeyaert, part of his collection, hung in the house's dining room.

In 1930 the ownership situation of the artwork changed when Siegfried Granaat sold it, together with dozens of other works of art, to Hambo for a total of NLG 40,305. On the occasion of the transaction, the parties drew up an agreement which stipulated, among other things, that the objects would remain in safekeeping with Granaat provided that he would hand them over to Hambo if the bank so requested. Hambo was also entitled to oblige Granaat to buy back all or some of the goods for the price the bank had paid for them. If Granaat was unable to fulfil this obligation, the bank was entitled without judicial intervention to have the artworks auctioned off or sold privately.

In 1936 Hambo requested Granaat to buy back the works of art, including the painting by Moeyaert. When it emerged that Granaat was unable to do this, Hambo sold the collection to Herman Hamburger. That has been revealed by, among other things, correspondence between Granaat and Hambo that same year, in which it is stated that Hambo sold the works to 'Mr Herman Hamburger, Paris'. According to a statement prepared on 18 June 1936, the works continued in safekeeping with Siegfried Granaat, but this time 'for Mr Herman Hamburger, Paris, 121 Avenue de Wagram'.

This state of affairs was confirmed in a letter of 4 February 1941 from the lawyer J. Jolles to the German who had meanwhile become the manager of Granaat's possessions: '... then followed the sale to Mr. Herman Hamburger, then living in Paris, Avenue Wagram 121. ... The settlement between Hamburger & Co's Bankierskantoor and Granaat was made on 18 June 1936. So the end of the story was that ... Mr Herman Hamburger got free ownership of the objects. Some or all of the items were left by Herman Hamburger at Heerengracht 512, where they still are.'

The artwork during the occupation

On the grounds of regulation 26/1940 of 24 June 1940, the German occupying forces considered the assets in the Netherlands belonging to Herman Hamburger, who remained in France, as 'enemy assets' that could be demanded. The same applied to the possessions of Siegfried Granaat, who had fled to the United Kingdom shortly after the German invasion. Consequently, their goods were in the hands of the Nazi regime at an early stage.

On 23 November 1940, C.H. Oldach was appointed manager (Verwalter) of Siegfried Granaat's assets on the grounds of the aforementioned regulation. After he had been appointed, Oldach analyzed the ownership situation of the items in Granaat's home. On 19 February 1941 he sent a report to the General Section of the Enemy Assets Department of the General Commissariat for Finance and Economics. He enclosed an inventory and stated that it emerged unambiguously from it which household effects and artworks belonged to Herman Hamburger and which to Granaat. The inventory lists the painting by Moeyaert as the property of Herman Hamburger.

On 26 February 1941 an official in the Enemy Assets Department wrote to Oldach saying that he was planning to terminate the management of the assets of Siegfried Granaat, who turned out to be bankrupt. He requested Oldach to contact the Mühlmann Agency, a German looting organization, before that so that the Agency could make a selection of Herman Hamburger's artworks. Oldach did just that and on 12 May 1941 Eduard Plietsch of the Mühlmann Agency came to Granaat's premises on Heerengracht. It emerges from correspondence that Plietsch selected ten paintings from Herman Hamburger's possessions, including the work by Moeyaert.

On 9 September 1941 an agreement was subsequently entered into by, on the one hand, S. Zadoks as administrator of Siegfried Granaat and on the other hand Herman Hamburger; with Hambo employee Hubert Bok acting as representative of Hamburger, 'whose residence and whereabouts are unknown'. Among other things this agreement stated 'that [Herman] Hamburger gave Granaat a number of items he owned for safekeeping, which items were in the premises where Granaat lived at Heerengracht 512 in Amsterdam. ... that the parties know that the "art advisor" Dr Plietsch according to his statement removed the following 10 paintings belonging to Hamburger from the premises on Heerengracht' This was followed by a summary of the ten paintings, including the work by Moeyaert.

The Mühlmann Agency sold the Moeyaert on for RM 13,270 to the Special Mission Linz, the looting organization that made acquisitions for Hitler's future Führer Museum in Linz in Austria. In connection with this sale the Agency paid an equivalent sum of NLG 10,000 to N.V. tot Uitoefening van den Kunsthandel, which was under German management.

After the war Herman Hamburger supposedly submitted a claim to the Dutch authorities about Hubert Bok, the employee who had been involved in the sale of Hamburger's artworks. This resulted in an investigation in connection with suspected collaboration. It can be deduced from the file that Hamburger withdrew the complaint.

The painting after the liberation

Several (internal) declaration forms were found in the SNK's archive concerning the claimed painting by Moeyaert:

- A declaration form completed by Herman Hamburger dated 31 October 1945. On this form, with number 3390, it is stated by means of crossings out that the work was originally with S. Granaat for safekeeping and came into the possession of 'Muehlmann' as a result of a forced sale.
- An internal declaration form dated 6 October 1945, probably completed by an SNK employee. It is stated on the form that the painting was originally owned by Siegfried Granaat and came into the hands of the Mühlmann Agency after confiscation.

- An internal declaration form dated 3 December 1945, probably completed by an SNK employee and, in view of the reference to declaration number 3390, probably completed on the basis of information from the aforementioned declaration by Hamburger. It is stated on the form that the work was originally in the possession of 'Albert Hamburger, Waldeck Pymontlaan 20, South Amsterdam, but was held by S. Granaat of Heerengracht 512, Central Amsterdam, for safekeeping.' and that it came into the possession of 'Dr Mühlmann' as the result of a forced sale. It is not known on what grounds the SNK linked the name Albert Hamburger to the work. It emerges from an undated post-war note from the Bureau for Restoration Payments and the Restoration of Property (Hergo; the successor of the SNK) that, according to Gustaaf Hamburger and his authorized agent R.G. Somers, this information was incorrect.

The artwork by Moeyaert was not returned to the Netherlands until 1957, after which it ended up in the Dutch State's NK Collection. It is not known whether family members were notified of the return. In 1976 the Dutch State placed the work in the Museum Catharijneconvent in Utrecht, where it still is.

Gilbert Hamburger, Gustaaf Hamburger and the SNK/Hergo

There is no specific mention in the correspondence found in the SNK archive from (heirs of) Herman Hamburger of the artwork by Moeyaert. It is possible that this is linked to the fact that the painting did not return to the Netherlands until 1957. There was correspondence, however, about a few other works that the Mühlmann Agency appropriated from Herman Hamburger's collection managed by Granaat and that were returned after the war. On 24 September 1949 Herman's son Gilbert Hamburger wrote a letter to the SNK from London in which he stated that two paintings by Jan Davidsz. de Heem and Willem Kalf 'are reclaimed by my father, the late Herman Hamburger'. He furthermore stated 'as the only heir of the late Herman Hamburger, that the aforementioned paintings had been part of the Granaat collection, which was purchased by the late Herman Hamburger in around 1936 on the instructions of Mr G. Hamburger and that he had consented to the said paintings being put at the disposal of G. [Gustaaf] Hamburger by your Foundation.' It emerges from a letter from Gustaaf Hamburger to the SNK at that time that Gilbert Hamburger had authorized him to take receipt of the two paintings.

On 5 December 1952 a Hergo employee wrote a letter to Hamburger & Co's Bankierskantoor in which he stated that his bureau was holding a portrait of a man by Van Mieris: 'In my documentation I found a declaration form completed by Herman Hamburger, also regarding Mieris: "portrait of a man", on which it is stated that the dimensions are "small", and I also found in my documentation that this painting was supposedly sold for M.3000.-, which sum was deposited at the Deutsche Revisions- und Treuhand A.G. Would you be so kind as to

tell me whether Mr Herman Hamburger believes he is entitled to restoration of rights, in which case proof of former ownership will have to be supplied, while in the event of restitution, among other things the selling price will have to be transferred to my Bureau.'

The aforementioned undated note from Hergo refers to the portrait by Van Mieris: 'According to our information, the painting belonged to HERMAN Hamburger; was with Granaat for safekeeping. ... HERMAN Hamburger is dead and Gilbert is supposedly his son and only heir. It emerges from the file that in the past a painting was given back previously, and the son stated that the painting was his property and could be delivered to Mr Gustaaf Hamburger. It was agreed with Somers that he will write to the son in Paris and that we will then receive a declaration that this was also the case with this painting.'

On 7 September 1953 Hambo wrote to Hergo about the Van Mieris: 'We furthermore enclose a statement by Mr Gilbert Hamburger, only son and heir of the late Mr Herman Hamburger, concerning the release of the painting to Mr Gustaaf Hamburger.'

Shortly after that, Gustaaf Hamburger asserted he was the original owner of the Van Mieris. That emerges from a unilateral statement of 9 October 1953 in which Gustaaf states that 'before the aforementioned painting [by Van Mieris] came into the hands of the Germans, he had been the only rightful owner'. He had this statement registered at a tax office on 16 November 1953. A few weeks before that, on 23 October 1953, he authorized Hambo to receive the portrait of a man by Van Mieris, which happened on 16 December 1953.

The nineteen-seventies: discussion about the ownership

Between 1959 and 1981 members of the Hamburger family initiated various cases against the German State personally and on behalf of the N.V. tot Uitoefening van den Kunsthandel in liquidation. Documentation relating to these cases reveals that the 'Granaat-Hamburger collection', including the artwork by Moeyaert, was the subject of research and discussion for a few years.

In connection with one of these cases, the Hamburger family's lawyer, Werner Diamand, sent a list of works of art on 21 August 1970 to the Berlin Restitution Agency. On a list, the title of which has been cut off, there is the entry '*C. Mooyaert, Biblical scene*'. A letter of 20 August 1970 from Hambo employee Hubert Bok to Diamand explains why this modification had been made. Bok had asked the lawyer to remove the title 'Property of Mr Herman Hamburger, Bordeaux' from the list concerned 'in order to avoid later unnecessary explanations'. Because, he pointed out to Diamand, 'as you already know, these objects served as security for Granaat's obligations in respect of our Bank and Mr Herman Hamburger was only acting for us as a trustee.'

It can be deduced from notes in the file that afterwards the German authorities waited for a few years for an expert's certificate from the Netherlands Institute for War Documentation (RIOD; predecessor of the NIOD Institute for War, Holocaust and Genocide Studies). RIOD researcher Hans van der Leeuw pointed out in a letter to Diamand of 14 November 1973 that various issues still needed to be clarified, in particular the ownership situation of the 'Granaat-Hamburger collection': 'Apart from the said questions about the looting of artworks during the occupation and the partial return after the war, there are still additional issues that need to be resolved. In the first place concerning the ownership of the looted objects. There are no problems in so far as G. Hamburger or the N.V. tot uitoefening van de kunsthandel were the victims. Difficulties do arise, however, particularly with regard to the Granaat-Hamburger collection. In my opinion you should be briefed as well as possible about the status of this collection.'

On 1 April 1974 Hubert Bok – who was the liquidator of the art gallery in the nineteen-seventies – stated in writing to Werner Diamand: 'The original art collection given to the Bank by Mr S. Granaat as security later, in 1936 (deeds available) in consultation with him, became the property of Mr Alex Hamburger (because Mr Granaat sold it to Mr Alex Hamburger). ... Mr Herman Hamburger (director of the art gallery), acted in this transaction as a trustee and he therefore, upon the outbreak of the war, was known to Granaat as owner of the art collection.'

On 1 November 1978 Werner Diamand notified the District Court in Berlin that settlement negotiations had taken place in which the parties – the Hamburger family and the German State – had agreed to have the RIOD conduct an investigation into a number of unresolved issues and that this investigation was still ongoing at the time of writing. On 1 December 1978 a German civil servant wrote in a letter to Diamand that, with regard to the Granaat-Hamburger collection, it was not clear 'who owned the items'.

In Hans van der Leeuw's archive, which is in the NIOD, there are different draft versions of an expert opinion by Van der Leeuw dated 22 December 1978. In one of these versions Van der Leeuw writes with regard to the Granaat-Hamburger collection that it 'was assigned by a Mr. S. Granaat, Heerengracht 512 in Amsterdam to Hamburger & Co's Bankierskantoor as security in 1930/31 and later became the unrestricted property of the Hamburger Group.'

In a second draft version, Van der Leeuw writes that the Granaat-Hamburger collection 'was assigned by a Mr S. Granaat, Heerengracht 512 in Amsterdam to Hamburger & Co's Bankierskantoor as security in 1930/31 and in 1936 became the property of Mr Alexander Hamburger, the father of Mr Albert and Mr Gustaaf Hamburger. The relevant contracts are still in place, I was able to see them.'

In Van der Leeuw's archive there is also a copy or draft of an expert opinion of 17 May 1979 to the German authorities in which Van der Leeuw once again writes that the Granaat-Hamburger collection became the property of Alexander Hamburger in 1936.

At the end of the nineteen-seventies the German government made a settlement proposal with regard to two cases brought by Gustaaf Hamburger and the N.V. tot Uitoefening van den Kunsthandel: compensation of DM 41,000 in respect of Gustaaf Hamburger / German State and DM 53,000 in respect of N.V. tot Uitoefening van den Kunsthandel i.l. / German State. It can be deduced from the contents of the file that payment on the basis of these sums in all probability took place.

4. Substantive Assessment of the Application

The Committee has established that the requirements in section 1 a to e of the assessment framework have been met and that the application is therefore eligible for substantive handling.

Pursuant to section 2 of the assessment framework, the Committee must assess whether it is highly plausible that the painting NK 3401 was the property of Herman Hamburger and on the grounds of section 3 whether it is sufficiently plausible that possession of the painting was lost involuntarily as a result of circumstances directly related to the Nazi regime. To this end the Committee finds as follows:

Ownership requirements (section 2 of the assessment framework)

Documentation dating from the nineteen-thirties that was found during the investigation indicates that Herman Hamburger had been the rightful owner of the painting *God Appearing to Abraham at Sichem* by Nicolaes Moeyaert since 1936. After the purchase, the work remained in the home of Siegfried Granaat at Herengracht 512 in Amsterdam. It emerges from communications from the lawyer J. Jolles and the manager (Verwalter) C.H. Oldach, as well as from an agreement between S. Zadoks and Herman Hamburger, who was in France, all drawn up in 1941, that Herman Hamburger was still owner of the artwork during the German occupation of the Netherlands. Shortly after the war, Herman Hamburger furthermore completed SNK forms concerning the work by Moeyaert and other works with a comparable provenance. After his death in 1948, his son Gilbert Hamburger issued authorizations for release of a few of these works and stated that his father had purchased them around 1936. The undated internal Hergo note also indicates that the Moeyaert was the property of Herman Hamburger. This note about a painting with a comparable provenance, in which Herman emerges as former owner, reveals that contact was established with R.G. Somers, Gustaaf Hamburger's authorized agent ('It was agreed with Somers that he will write to the son in Paris and that we will then receive a declaration that this was also the case with this painting.'). This involvement of Somers indicates that confirmation came from Gustaaf's side that Herman Hamburger (and/or his branch of the family) was the owner.

Although it was asserted later that Herman Hamburger had not been rightful owner of, among other things, the artwork by Moeyaert, and only acted as 'trustee', in the Committee's opinion there are insufficient grounds to support this interpretation. Dutch law does not recognize the concept of the 'trust', so no trust can be formed under Dutch law. It would furthermore have been expected that if Herman Hamburger did not purchase the artwork in 1936 in his personal capacity, this would have subsequently been specified in the relevant sources dating from the nineteen-thirties and -forties. The Committee gives greater weight to the contemporaneous sources from the period when Herman Hamburger was still alive than to sources postdating his lifetime, such as Gustaaf Hamburger's unilateral ownership declaration in 1953 referred to above, and the sometimes contradictory documentation relating to the compensation claims submitted to the German State. It is true that Herman's son Gilbert Hamburger stated in 1949 that the purchase by his father in 1936 had been 'on the instructions of Mr G. Hamburger'. Such instructions, however, do not alter the fact that his father became the owner as a result of the transaction.

On the grounds of this information the Committee has come to the conclusion that it is highly likely that the artwork came from the private collection of Herman Hamburger. This means that the ownership requirement of section 2 of the assessment framework has been met.

The consequence of this is that the Committee now has to evaluate whether, with regard to the artwork, there was involuntary loss of possession as a result of circumstances directly associated with the Nazi regime.

Involuntary loss of possession (section 3 of the assessment framework)

It has been established that in 1941 the artwork *God Appearing to Abraham at Sichem* by Nicolaes Moeyaert got into the hands of the Mühlmann Agency, and was then sold on for Hitler's Führer Museum. During the occupation Herman Hamburger was outside the Netherlands and pursuant to Nazi law came within the scope of regulation 26/1940, which classified his assets as 'enemy assets'. It was on that basis that the Mühlmann Agency could get hold of the artwork by means of a forced sale.

According to the Committee it is highly likely that the work had been the private property of Herman Hamburger since 1936. Given that Hamburger was Jewish, the underlying principle is that the loss of possession in 1941 was involuntary, unless the facts expressly show otherwise. On the grounds of the established facts, the Committee finds that the latter is not the case.

The Committee therefore concludes that the loss of possession was involuntary, caused by circumstances directly related to the Nazi regime. This also means that the requirements relating to involuntary loss of possession in section 3 of the assessment framework have been met.

Conclusion with regard to the restitution application

The Committee concludes that it is highly plausible that the artwork *God Appearing to Abraham at Sichem* by Nicolaes Moeyaert came from the collection of Herman Hamburger, and that it is sufficiently plausible that he lost possession of the work in 1941 involuntarily as a result of circumstances directly related to the Nazi regime.

In view of sections 2 and 3 of the assessment framework (criterion 3.1 and part 2 at the end of section 3), the upshot of all this is that the Committee will recommend that the artwork should be restituted to the Applicant.

5. Recommendation

The Restitutions Committee advises the State Secretary for Culture and Media to retribute the painting *God Appearing to Abraham at Sichem* by Nicolaes Moeyaert, currently part of the Netherlands Art Property Collection under inventory number NK 3401, to the heir of Herman Hamburger.

Adopted at the meeting on 18 September 2023 by D. Oostinga (Vice-Chair), J.F. Cohen, S.G. Cohen-Willner, J.H. van Kreveld and C.C. Wesselink, and signed by the Vice-Chair and the Deputy Secretary.

D. Oostinga, Vice-Chair N.L.E.M. Bynoe, Deputy Secretary

Relevant press release

PAGE

The painting *God Appears to Abraham at Sichem* returns to Herman Hamburger's heir
[Read more](#)